


A Textual Commentary
on the
Greek Gospels

Vol. 3
Luke

BY
WIELAND WILLKER



Bremen, online published
12th edition 2015

© all rights reserved_

Textual variants in the Gospel of Luke

Results from the variant evaluation:

The best manuscripts of Lk:

1. Primary (=best) witnesses for Lk are: 01, B, L, W¹⁻⁷, Co
P4, P75, T, E (= have lacunae)
W is Alex from ch. 1-7, after that Byz.
2. Secondary (= good) witnesses for Lk are: P45, R¹³⁻¹⁶, 070, 579, 1241, 1342⁶⁻¹⁰
1342 is much better in ch. 6-10 (ca. 6:35-11:15 from a cursory check in IGNTP), elsewhere Byz.
R is particularly good in ch. 13-16 (Waltz).
3. Tertiary: Q, f1, [157, 1612, 1627], 565¹⁻², 700¹⁻¹⁰, 892, 2786
vg, Sy-S
565 is comparatively good in ch. 1-2, later it is Byz.
700 is better in ch. 1-10, later Byz.
The assignment of R has been taken from Waltz online encyclopedia and is consistent with my data (see below).

"Western": D, it, (Sy-S, Sy-C)

"Caesarean": (([Θ, f13, 1071], [f1, 157])) two subgroups, all very weak

"Caesarean" and "Western" manuscripts in Lk:

The Western element in Lk is exceptionally strong: D, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C

To the contrary the Caesarean element is very weak.

1582: This manuscript has been corrected by a later hand to the Byzantine text. I have decided to normally not record these corrections, but only in exceptional cases.

manuscripts with lacunae

Note: The lacunae of P45, P75, R, T, 070 are not noted explicitly at the variants, because they are more often absent than present. Only the lacunae of Ξ from ch. 1-11 have been noted. Also 33 and Sy-S have been noted, explicitly. If one of the fragmentary manuscripts is not given, please refer back to this page.

P45 content:

6:31-41	10:6-22	11:50-12:12	13:29-14:10
6:45-7:7	10:26-11:1	12:18-37	14:17-33
9:26-41	11:6-25	12:42-13:1	
9:45-10:1	11:28-46	13:6-24	

P75 content:

3:18-22	5:37-6:4	7:41-43	17:19-18:18
3:33-4:2	6:10-7:32	7:46-9:2	22:4-end
4:34-5:10	7:35-39	9:4-17:15	

C lacunae:

1:1-2	6:4-36	20:28-21:20
2:6-42	7:17-8:28	22:19-23:25
3:21-4:25	12:4-19:42	24:7-45

R extant:

1:1-13	7:44, 46-47	12:4-15	20:33-20:47
1:69-2:4	7:50	12:40-52	21:12-2
2:16-2:27	8:1-15	13:26-14:1	22:42-56
4:38-5:5	8:25-9:1	14:12-15:1	22:71-23:11
5:25-6:8	9:12-43	15:13-16:16	23:38-23:51
6:18-40	10:3-16	17:21-18:10	
6:49-7:22	11:4-27	18:22-20:20	

T extant:

6:18-26	18:32-19:8	22:20-23:20	24:29-31
18:2-16	21:33-22:3	24:25-27	

E is extant:

1:1-9	2:33-39	6:21-7:6	9:32-33.35
1:19-23	3:5-8	7:11-37	9:41-10:18
1:27-28	3:11-20	7:39-47	10:21-40
1:30-32	4:1-2	8:4-21	11:1-4
1:36-66	4:6-20	8:25-35	11:24-33
1:77-2:19	4:32-43	8:43-50	
2:21-22	5:17-36	9:1-28	

070 is extant:

3:19-30	9:12-16	11:24-42	21:30-22:2
8:13-19	10:21-39	12:5-13:32	22:54-65
8:56-9:9	10:41-11:6	16:4-12	23:4-24:26

33 lacuna:

21:38-23:26

Sy-S lacunae:

1:16-38 5:28-6:11

Sy-C lacunae:

1:1-2:48 3:16-7:33 24:44-51

(It is not clear if the limit of Sy-C in Lk is correct, because in Lk 2:48 Sy-C is cited.)

Western non-interpolations

In D there are several passages omitted which have been labeled "Western non-interpolations" by WH.

Luk 5:39 [12 words]	Luk 22:19b-20 [32]	Luk 24:12 [22]
Luk 10:41-42 [11]	Luk 22:62 [5]	Luk 24:36 [5]
Luk 12:19 [7]	Luk 24:3 [3]	Luk 24:40 [10]
Luk 12:21 [9]	Luk 24:6[5]	Luk 24:51 [5]
Luk 12:39 [3]	Luk 24:9[3]	Luk 24:52 [2]

Further we have one omission probably due to h.t.:

Luk 11:32 [24]

And three omissions for other reasons:

Luke 11:36 [23]

Luk 19:24b-25 [16]

Luk 19:32-33 [23]

Western non-interpolations and John

It is interesting to note that several Western non-interpolations at the end of Luke could be interpreted as harmonizations to John.

Luke 23:38	John 19:20
Luke 24:12	John 20:3-6
Luke 24:36	John 20:19
Luke 24:40	John 20:20

Compare:

K. Snodgras "Western non-interpolations" JBL (1972) 369-79

Noteworthy other manuscripts:

In Lk 131 belongs to f1. It is also f1 in Mk 1-5.

"Text & Textwert" found the following additional manuscripts, which have a valuable text in Lk (noted are the number of "2" readings):

Ξ 040 12/15 80%

070 11/13 85% both fragmentary.

(+ 0110, 0124, 0178, 0179, 0180, 0190, 0191, 0202)

(Lk in: 070, 0124, 0178, 0179, 0190, 0191, 0202)

070 = T; Greek-Coptic bilingual from the 6th CE, Paris, see Gregory I, p. 69.

157, 1612 and 1627 form a group

157 15/46 33%, agrees with 1612 77%.

1612 10/35 29%, agrees with 1627 69%.

1627 8/45 18%, agrees with 1342 (!) 81%.

2786 8/46 17%

(372 and 2737 have only 8% "2" readings)

I also checked the fragmentary palimpsest codex R/027 in IGNTP: R has roughly 30% txt readings (15/49). Waltz in his online TC-Encyclopedia gets 25% on a larger sample size. He finds it particularly good in ch. 13-16 with 60% (20/32) txt readings. The assignment as Cat. 5 (=Byz) by Aland is not correct.

arab^{MS}: Sinai Ar. Parchment 8+28. 8th CE. It was among the new finds from 1975. See NovT 50(2008)28-57.

131 of the 342 variants (38%) are difficult to evaluate (Rating either "-" or "1?").

Lk has 1149 verses. This means that we have

- one significant variant every 3rd - 4th verse, and

- one difficult variant every 9th verse.

About 36 variants (11%) should be reconsidered in NA (Mt: 20, Mk: 13).

Of the variants noted only 26 (8%) have an umlaut in B (plus 2 insecure cases). There are 78 umlauts overall in Lk. This means that 52 of the 78 umlauts indicate rather minor (or unknown!) stuff.

TVU 1

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 1:15 ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον **[τοῦ]** κυρίου, καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίη, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ,

omit 01, A, C, L, f1, 33, 579, 1241, 1342, L844, L2211, al⁶⁰[Ω, 2], Cyr,
NA²⁵, **WH**, **Tis**, **Bal**

txt B, D, W, 28, 565, 892, Maj, Ir^{Lat}, **WH^{mg}**, **[Trg]**
τοῦ θεοῦ Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, al¹⁰

IGNTP has L^c for the omission, against Swanson, who has L^c for the addition. NA and Tischendorf do not list any correction, but have L for the omission. This seems to be correct. IGNTP and Swanson misinterpreted the evidence.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare LXX:

LXX Malachi 3:1 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου

Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:76 Καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ· προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ,

BYZ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου

Byz A, C, D, L, Θ, Ψ, 0130, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892,
1241, Maj, Sy, Ir^{Lat}

txt P4(200 CE), 01, B, W, 0177, pc, Or

ἐνώπιον κυρίου appears 117 times in the LXX, whereas ἐνώπιον τοῦ κυρίου appears only 6 times. Interestingly in Lk 1:76 no variant with the article occurs. This seems to indicate that the reading without the article is the common one and that here the article has been omitted to conform to common usage.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 2

NA28 Luke 1:28 καὶ εἰσελθὼν πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπεν·
χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ.

BYZ Luke 1:28 καὶ εἰσελθὼν ὁ ἄγγελος πρὸς αὐτὴν εἶπεν
χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν.

Byz A, C, D, X, Δ, Θ, f13, 33, 157, 565^{mg}, 892, 1342, Maj,
Latt, Sy, bo^{mss}, goth, Eus, Diatess, [Trg]
εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν
καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου 1071, pc

txt 01, B, L, W, Ψ, f1, 565, 579, 700, 1241, pc, Sy-Pal, Co, Or^{Lem}, Trg^{mg}

Lacuna: E, Sy-S, Sy-C

B: umlaut! (p. 1305, A 17 L) 28 ... σοῦ 29 ἢ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ

(It is not clear if this umlaut indicates this variant or the next one.)

Diatessaron:

Arabic: Et ingressus Angelus ad eam, dixit ei: Ave, gratia plena: Dominus noster tecum, o benedicta in mulieribus.

TVU 3

NA28 Luke 1:29 ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διαταράχθη
καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἶη ὁ ἄσπασμὸς οὗτος.

BYZ Luke 1:29 ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα διαταράχθη ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ,
καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἶη ὁ ἄσπασμὸς οὗτος

Byz A, C, Θ, 0130, f13, 33, 157, 700, (892), 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo^{pt}, goth
txt 01, B, D, L, W, X, Ψ, f1, 565, 579, 1241, pc, sa, bo^{pt}

ἡ δὲ ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διαταράχθη ... 892

Lacuna: E, Sy-S, Sy-C

B: umlaut! (p. 1305, A 17 L) 28 ... σοῦ 29 ἡ δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ

(It is not clear if this umlaut indicates this variant or the previous one.)

Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:12 καὶ ἐταράχθη Ζαχαρίας ἰδὼν καὶ φόβος ἐπέπεσεν ἐπ'
αὐτόν.

Probably added to note that Maria actually saw the angel. There is no reason for an omission.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks it is from verse 12.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 4

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 1:35 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ·

πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ

καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι·

διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον τ ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ.

τ ἐκ σου C*, Θ, f1, 124, 174(=f13), 22, 33, 372, 517, 954, 1675, pc⁹,
a, c, r¹, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-Pal^{ms}, Diatess, Ir^{Lat}, Tert, Adamantius, Epiph
pc = 229^c, 478^c, 544, 1005, 1192, 1210, 1365, 1443, 2372

τ ἐν σοὶ Did

Lacuna: E, Sy-S, Sy-C

B: no umlaut

There is an umlaut on the previous line (1305 B 5 L) for

διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον

Tjitze Baarda translates a comment of Dionysius (Jacob) bar Salibi (12th CE):

Some people make the objection, that we must say *He that was born of thee* and not *in thee*, because a child is born of a woman. And we say (in reply): There are manuscripts in which is written *He that is born of thee*, and (there are) Greek (manuscripts) in which is written neither *of thee* nor *in thee*, but *He that is born is holy*. But (I can maintain my textual choice, for) *born in thee* is (the same as) *conceived in thee*.

A natural addition. There is no reason for an omission.

The addition is supported by early and diverse witnesses. It was in Tatian's Diatessaron (Arabic and Ephrem).

The Arabic Diatessaron reads (Ciasca):

Ideoque quod nascetur **ex te** erit Sanctum, et vocabitur Filius Dei.

Ephrem: Spiritus, ait, veniet et virtus excelsi, quia is qui nascetur **ex te**, Filius Dei vocabitur, quod de corpore ex Maria sumpto, dixit.

(this part is extant only in the Armenian)

Compare:

T.Baarda, "Dionysios bar Salibi and the Text of Luke 1.35" *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963) 225-29

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 5

1. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 1:37 ὅτι οὐκ ἀδυνατήσῃ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ πᾶν ῥῆμα.

BYZ Luke 1:37 ὅτι οὐκ ἀδυνατήσῃ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ πᾶν ῥῆμα

Byz 01^{c2}, A, C, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj, Irg

txt 01*, B, D, L, W, Ξ (=040), 565, pc

B: no umlaut

ἀδυνατεῖ impers. "it is impossible"

txt "because every word from God is not powerless"

Byz "because every word with God is not powerless"

Compare verse 30:

NA28 Luke 1:30 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτῇ· μὴ φοβοῦ, Μαριάμ, εὗρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 10:27 ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει· παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ θεῷ· πάντα γὰρ δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

NA28 Luke 18:27 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστίν.

LXX:

LXX Genesis 18:14 μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σέ εἰς ὥρας καὶ ἔσται τῇ Σαρρα υἱός

Possibly inspired from context verse 30. The meaning is essentially the same for both. Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks it is from the LXX.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 6

2. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 1:42 καὶ ἀνεφώνησεν κραυγῇ μεγάλη καὶ εἶπεν· εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου.

BYZ Luke 1:42 καὶ ἀνεφώνησεν φωνῇ μεγάλη καὶ εἶπεν Εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου

Byz A, D, Δ, Ψ, f1, 157, 700, Maj, Gre, Trg^{mg}

txt B, L, W, Ξ, 565, 579, 1241, Or, WH

ἀνεβώησεν φωνῇ 01, C, F, Θ, 053, 118, f13, 28, 33, 892, 1071, 1424, pc²³

Swanson has wrongly 579 for Byz, NA, IGNTP and Schmidtke for txt! Checked at the film.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 27:46 περὶ δὲ τὴν ἐνάτην ὥραν ἀνεβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων·

NA28 Mark 15:34 καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ έβόησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ:

NA28 Mark 1:26 καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 23:46 καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν.

NA28 Acts 16:28 έφώνησεν δὲ μεγάλῃ φωνῇ [ὁ] Παῦλος λέγων·

Here the words are safe.

κραυγή is a rare word in the NT (6 times, once in Mt, once in Acts, both occurrences are safe).

On the one hand it is possible that φωνῇ has been changed to κραυγῇ to avoid the double φωνη. In the same way the change by 01 et al. could be explained, they left φωνῇ, but changed ἀνεφώνησεν to ἀνεβώησεν.

On the other hand, the rare κραυγή could have been changed to the more common φωνή. Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks φωνῇ has been conformed to the verb.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 7

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 1:46 Καὶ εἶπεν Μαριάμ. Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχὴ μου τὸν κύριον,

Ἐλισάβητ a, b, l*, Ir^{arm}, Or^{Latmss}, Nicetas (†414)

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:41 καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας ἡ Ἐλισάβητ, ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου ἡ Ἐλισάβητ,

NA28 Luke 1:42 καὶ ἀνεφώνησεν κραυγῇ μεγάλη καὶ εἶπεν: εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου.

NA28 Luke 1:56 Ἔμεινεν δὲ Μαριάμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡς μῆνας τρεῖς ...

apud Elisabeth Sy-S, Sy-P, sa^{ms}, geo^{mss}

Jerome (citing from Origen, Hom. Luc. 7.3):

Invenitur beata Maria, sicut in aliquantis exemplaribus repperimus, prophetare. Non enim ignoramus, quod secundum alios codices et haec verba Elisabeth vaticinetur.

In a certain number of manuscripts, we have discovered that blessed Mary is said to prophesy. We are not unaware of the fact that, according to other copies of the Gospel, Elizabeth speaks these words in prophecy.

But according to Zahn (Comm., Exk. III, pp. 748ff.) these words regarding the variant are due to Jerome and do not represent Origen's original homily. See also Zahn in Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, 22 (1911) 253-68.

A much debated point. In the previous verses it is Elisabeth who is speaking. It is possible that someone accidentally or deliberately changed the name here. The following words make not much sense in the mouth of Elisabeth ("from now on all generations will call me blessed").

Harnack notes, that if the subject is changing in verse 46, εἶπεν δὲ would be expected and not καὶ εἶπεν.

Similarly in verse 1:56 the ἔμεινεν ... σὺν αὐτῇ should be either ἔμεινεν δὲ Μαριάμ σὺν τῇ Ἐλισάβητ or simply ἔμεινεν δὲ σὺν τῇ Ἐλισάβητ.

To the opposite WH argue that the change to Elisabeth could have been inspired by these words.

Harnack argues that BOTH Ἐλισάβετ and Μαριάμ are explanatory glosses, and that Ἐλισάβετ is the correct interpretation. Luke simply continues Elisabeth's speech with καὶ εἶπεν. This is also the opinion of Burkitt.

The beginning of the Magnificat is similar to Hannah's Prayer in 1.Sam 1:11 and 2:1ff. Here Hannah gives thanks to the Lord for giving her a son after a long time of infertility. This would then fit of course good to Elisabeth, too.

Note that in 1.Sam 2:1 the Prayer also simply starts with καὶ εἶπεν, with Hannah continue speaking.

Compare:

- F.C. Burkitt "Who spoke the Magnificat?" JTS 7 (1906) 220-7
- E. Ter-Minassiantz "Hat Irenaeus Lk 1:46 Μαριάμ oder Ἐλισάβετ gelesen?" ZNW 7 (1906) 191-2
- Jeffrey Kloha "Elizabeth's Magnificat (Luke 1:46)" in: "Text and Traditions, Essays in honour of JK Elliott, Brill 2014, p. 200 - 219

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 8

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 1:66 καὶ ἔθεντο πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν λέγοντες· τί ἄρα τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο ἔσται; καὶ γὰρ χεὶρ κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

omit: D, it(d, ff², l, q), vg^{ms}, Sy-S

Lat(aur, c, e, f, vg) read txt. a has a lacuna, b is not clear.

B: no umlaut

The last sentence is an afterthought from Luke and is not spoken by the crowd. The manuscripts supporting the omission probably overlooked this and omitted the then inappropriate ἦν. It is also possible that it has been changed deliberately.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 9

NA28 Luke 1:75 ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσαις ταῖς
ἡμέραις _____ ἡμῶν.

BYZ Luke 1:75 ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς
ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς ἡμῶν

Only Byz in NA!

Byz Γ, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 700, 1424, 2542, Maj-part, Sy-S, Or

txt P4(200 CE), 01, A, B, C, D, F, K, L, R, U, V, W, Y, Δ, Π, Ψ, Ω, 0130, 0177,
22, 33, 565, 579, 892, 1241, Maj-part, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

Lacuna: X, Ε

B: no umlaut

A typical LXX term, it appears 33 times in the LXX, but nowhere else in the NT.
The support is rather bad, probably secondary.

Weiss (Lk Com.) notes, that the dative ταῖς ἡμέραις should indicate every
single day. It has been changed into the accusative of length of time, which then
is further defined by τῆς ζωῆς.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 10

3. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 1:76 Καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήση·
προπορεύση γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ,

BYZ Luke 1:76 Καὶ σὺ παιδίον προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήση·
προπορεύση γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ

Byz A, C, D, L, R, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0130, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1342,
Maj, Sy, Ir^{Lat}, Gre, Trg

txt P4(200 CE), 01, B, W, 0177, pc, Or

Lacuna: Ε

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare LXX:

LXX Malachi 3:1 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ
ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 1:15 ἔσται γὰρ μέγας ἐνώπιον [τοῦ] κυρίου, καὶ οἶνον καὶ
σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίη, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου πλησθήσεται ἔτι ἐκ κοιλίας
μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, ἐνώπιον safe!

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 1:2 Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐα τῷ προφήτῃ· ἰδοὺ
ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν
ὁδὸν σου· safe!

NA28 Matthew 11:10 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ
προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

NA28 Luke 7:27 οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν
ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου
ἔμπροσθέν σου. safe!

And:

Odes of Solomon 9:76 καὶ σὺ δέ παιδίον προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήση
προπορεύση γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ

ἑνώπιον κυρίου appears 117 times in the LXX, but only 2 times in the NT (2Co 8:21 and Jam 4:10).

πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου appears only 5 times in the LXX and not in the NT. But the exact LXX parallel here quoted has πρὸ προσώπου μου. Also Mk 1:2, Mt 11:10 and Lk 7:27 have the words.

On the other hand ἑνώπιον κυρίου appears in verse 1:15.

So it's either a conformation to context or to the LXX and Gospel parallels (so Tischendorf).

It is interesting to find πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου in the Odes of Solomon, which are generally dated to around 100-150 CE and are therefore our earliest independent(?) witness.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 11

4. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 1:78 διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπισκέπεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους,

BYZ Luke 1:78 διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν, ἐν οἷς ἐπεσκέψατο ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ ἐξ ὕψους

"By the tender mercy of our God, the dawn from on high will look upon us.

Byz 01^{C2}, A, C, D, R, Δ, E, Ψ, 0130, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Latt, Sy-H, Gre, Trg

txt P4^{vid}(200 CE), 01*, B, L, W, Θ, 0177, pc, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, Trg^{mg}

P4 not noted in NA. The editio princeps (J. Merell, RB 47 (1938) 5-22) gives: ἐν οἷς ἐπι[...] So also Comfort in his book.

The letter is only partly preserved. From the image in the ed.pr. a Iota seems more probable.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

ἐπισκέπεται indicative future middle 3rd person singular

ἐπεσκέψατο indicative aorist middle 3rd person singular

ἐπισκέπτομαι "visit, care for, be concerned about"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:68 ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has looked favorably on his people and redeemed them."

NA28 Luke 7:16 καὶ ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

Fear seized all of them; and they glorified God, saying, "A great prophet has risen among us!" and "God has looked favorably on his people!"

NA28 Acts 15:14 ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

Simeon has related how God first looked favorably on the Gentiles, to take from among them a people for his name.

A typical Lk word.

Possibly the future has been changed to the aorist to harmonize it with verse 68 (so Weiss). On the other hand Lk in the other places always used the aorist.

TVU 12

5. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 2:2 αὕτη ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηναίου.

BYZ Luke 2:2 αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηναίου

Byz 01^{c2}, A, C, L, R, W, Δ, Ε, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj
txt 01*, B, D, Θ, 0177, 543(=f13), 131, 346(=f1), 565, 700, pc, L1043

αὕτην ἀπογραφὴν ἐγένετο πρώτη 01*
αὕτη ἐγένετο ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη D

W: Swanson has here the singular reading αὕτην ἀπογραφὴν in error. Even though the N can easily be confused with the H, the H is certain here from the new (2007) high resolution color images.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

Probably a transcriptional error:

ΑΥΤΗΝΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΗ
ΑΥΤΗΝΑΠΟΓΡΑΦΗ

The peculiarity has been resolved in D by placing the verb before ἀπογραφὴν. The error is probably at least in part accidental. The question is if the error is the omission of one H or the addition of a second H. The former appears to be slightly more probable.

The support for txt is incoherent.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
adding ἡ in brackets?

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 13

NA28 Luke 2:5 ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριὰμ τῇ ἐμνηστευμένη αὐτῷ,
_____ οὔση ἐγκύω.

BYZ Luke 2:5 ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριὰμ τῇ μεμνηστευμένη αὐτῷ
γυναικὶ, οὔση ἐγκύω

Byz A, C^c, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat(ff², l, q, vg), (Sy-S), Sy-H, Gre

txt 01, B, C*, D, L, W, Ξ, 0177, f1, 22, 565, 700, pc, L1043,
it(aur, b, c, d, e, f, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co, goth, Eus

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 1:20 Ἰωσήφ υἱὸς Δαυίδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν
τὴν γυναῖκά σου·

NA28 Matthew 1:24 ... καὶ παρέλαβεν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,

It is possible that γυναικὶ has been added to provide a direct object. The only reason for an omission would have been to avoid the term "wife" in connection with Joseph.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 128) thinks that it is an addition inspired from Mt 1:20, 24.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 14

NA28 Luke 2:9 καὶ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς καὶ δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν.

BYZ Luke 2:9 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς καὶ δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν

Byz A, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal^{ms}, bo, [Trg]

txt 01, B, L, W, Ξ, 565, 579, 700, 1241, pc, L1043, e, Sy-S, sa, Eus

1582 is noted erroneously in Swanson for txt. Checked at the film.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

ἰδοὺ appears 10 times in chapters 1-2. It is a natural addition here and there is no reason to omit it.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 15

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:9 καὶ ἄγγελος κυρίου ἐπέστη αὐτοῖς καὶ δόξα κυρίου περιέλαμψεν αὐτούς, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν.

φόβον μέγαν σφόδρα W, bo
σφόδρα B

B: no umlaut

σφόδρα "very much"

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 17:6 καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ μαθηταὶ ἔπεσαν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα.

NA28 Matthew 27:54 Ὁ δὲ ἑκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμὸν καὶ τὰ γενόμενα ἐφοβήθησαν σφόδρα,

NA28 Mark 4:41 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους·

A natural addition.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 16

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:11 ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον σωτήρ ὅς ἐστιν χριστὸς κύριος ἐν πόλει Δαυίδ.

κύριος χριστὸς
χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς
χριστὸς σωτήρ

W, Sy-S, Sy-P
859, d, Cyprian
346(=f13)

χριστὸς κυρίου
χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς κύριος
χριστὸς

β, r¹, vg^{ms}, Sy-Pal, Ephraem, cj. (J. Weiss)
e
pc³, bo^{ms}

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 2:26 καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν [ἢ] ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου.

The term is unique in the Greek Bible. It is only natural that it has been changed. Note the 'correct' usage in 2:26.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes: "Luke being unacquainted with Hebrew imagined that it was with Μεσσίας that the word σωτήρ was related and not with Ἰησοῦς."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 17

6. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:12 καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν τὸ σημεῖον, εὐρήσετε βρέφος ἑσπαργανωμένον καὶ κείμενον ἐν φάτνῃ.

omit B, Ξ, pc², L1043, **WH**, **Weiss**, **NA²⁵**, **Gre**

txt 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, Maj, Eus, **WH^{mg}**

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [τὸ] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Compare LXX:

LXX Exodus 3:12 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς Μωυσεῖ λέγων ὅτι ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι ἐγὼ σε ἐξαποστέλλω ...

LXX 1 Samuel 2:34 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον ὃ ἥξει ἐπὶ τοὺς δύο υἱούς σου τούτους Οφνι καὶ Φινεες ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ ἀποθάνουσι ἀμφότεροι

LXX 1 Samuel 10:1 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι ἔχρισέν σε κύριος ἐπὶ κληρονομίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἄρχοντα

LXX 2 Kings 19:29 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον φάγη τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν αὐτόματα

LXX Isaiah 37:30 τοῦτο δέ σοι τὸ σημεῖον φάγε τοῦτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἃ ἔσπαρκας

LXX Isaiah 38:7 τοῦτο δέ σοι τὸ σημεῖον παρὰ κυρίου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ποιήσει τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο

LXX Jeremiah 51:29 καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι ἐπισκέψομαι ἐγὼ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς εἰς ποιηρὰ

LXX Isaiah 7:14 διὰ τοῦτο δώσει κύριος αὐτὸς ὑμῖν σημεῖον ἰδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἔξει καὶ τέξεται υἱόν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Εμμανουήλ

From LXX usage the article is the norm.

Difficult.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 18

NA28 Luke 2:14 δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις
εὐδοκίας.

BYZ Luke 2:14 Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις
εὐδοκία.

T&T #1

Byz 01^{C1}, B^{C2}, K, L, P, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, L1043,
δ, Sy, bo, Or^{pt}, Eus, Diatess, WH, Trg^{mg}
omit ἐν: 372, 724, 2737, Sy-5

txt 01*, A, B*^{vid}, D, W, 23, Latt, sa, Or^{pt}, goth, Ir^{Lat},
WH^{mg}, NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal
omit ἐν: Lat, Ir^{Lat}, Weiss

In B (p. 1307 B 5) the C is left unenhanced or has been deleted. It is only hardly visible. It is only hardly visible and further obscured, because exactly on the verso is an Omicron. But it is almost certain.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

There is an umlaut on the previous line (1307 B 4 L) for:

ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις

Lacuna: C, N, Π

B: no umlaut

εὐδοκίας noun genitive feminine singular

εὐδοκία noun nominative feminine singular

εὐδοκία "good will, pleasure, favor"

txt "and on earth peace among men with whom he is pleased"

Byz " and on earth peace, good will toward men"

German: txt "bei den Menschen seines Wohlgefallens"

Byz "und den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen"

Latin: txt hominibus bonae voluntatis it, vg

hominibus consolationis d

Byz hominibus bone volentiae δ

Diatessaron:

Arab: Gloria in altissimis Deo, et in terra pax, et spes bona hominibus.

Ephrem: Good hope for human beings.

A much debated issue. The genitive is the more difficult reading.

See the detailed discussion in WH Intro and Scrivener Intro Vol. 2. Scrivener notes a quote from Dr. Field, who points out that "men of good pleasure" would be according to Graeco-biblical usage, not *ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας*, but *ἄνδρες εὐδοκίας*.

It is difficult to explain how the txt reading could have arisen accidentally.

The omission of the *ἐν* could be due to avoiding a Hiatus: *εἰρήνη - ἐν*.

Harnack (compare NT Textkritik, 1931, p. 153-179): The solution can only come from a correct understanding of the sentence. The sentence can be constructed either as:

Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῶ,
Καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας.

or:

Δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς,
Εἰρήνη ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας.

Most commentators favor the first version. Harnack and Hort go with the second. The first line is straightforward, τὰ ὑψίστα is equivalent to οἱ οὐρανοί and has probably been chosen for poetic reasons (Harnack). But what means ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας ? It has no parallel.

Hort notes that a trajection (hyperbaton) is possible, so that εὐδοκίας belongs to εἰρήνη with the meaning: "peace of [God's] favor in men".

This is apparently the interpretation of Origen! He writes:

εἰ εἰρήνην λέγει ὁ σωτὴρ μὴ διδόναι ἐπὶ γῆς, οὐκ ἔστιν εὐδοκίας εἰρήνη· οὐ γὰρ ἀρνεῖται διδόναι τὴν εἰρήνην, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς λέγει· οὐκ ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. οὐκ εἶπε δὲ εὐδοκίας εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ ταῦτά γε εἶπον παρὰ τοῖς ποιμέσιν οἱ ἄγγελοι.

Origen distinguishes between εἰρήνη as such and εἰρήνη εὐδοκίας. This must be a special peace "through grace". By the way, Origen learned the word from the LXX and thinks the LXX created it. It was apparently not part of the living Κοινὴ Greek at his time.

The Hyperbaton idea is strengthened by the fact that the first line contains one too:

Glory in the highest - to God - and on earth
= Glory in the highest and on earth to God

Peace - to men - of God's grace
= Peace of God's grace to men

Compare also Henoah I, 8: καὶ μετὰ τῶν δικαίων τὴν εἰρήνην ποιήσει ... καὶ τὴν εὐδοκίαν δώσει αὐτοῖς.

Harnack additionally notes that the two sentences are not connected, a καὶ seems to be required. He explains this structure as the two sentences being two hymnic exclamations and also notes the contrast between θεῶ and ἀνθρώποις.

Metzger, who took the words in the first of the two above constructions writes: "The meaning seems to be, not that divine peace can be bestowed only where human good will is already present, but that at the birth of the Saviour God's peace rests upon those whom he has chosen in accord with his good pleasure. It should be noted that the Sahidic version employs the possessive pronoun: 'and peace upon earth among men of his desire [pleasure].' "

ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας is probably a Semitic construction and has been found several times in Hebrew and Aramaic Qumran hymns in the following forms:

"the sons of his [God's] good pleasure"

"the elect of his [God's] good pleasure"

"among men of his good pleasure"

(see: J.A. Fitzmyer, *Theological Studies* 19 (1958), 225-227)

The Byzantine text appears in the LXX Ode 14:1-3. The addition of the Odes to the LXX is relatively late (5th CE?), but I haven't found any details about this. The earliest form of Ode 14 can be found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (4th CE, book 7, sec. V "Daily prayers - A morning prayer", XLVII).

Kilpatrick reviews the evidence and writes: "Whether Luke wrote the genitive or the nominative at 2.14, we should expect to find good idiom and sense." After analyzing the internal evidence he concludes: "The 'received' nominative εὐδοκία suffers from neither ambiguity nor inappropriateness in either context or in form".

Compare:

- J.H. Ropes "Good Will toward men (Lk 2:14)" HTR 10 (1917) 52-56
- J. Jeremias "ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας (Lk 2:14)" ZNW 28 (1929) 13-20
- Gerhard v. Rad "Nocheinmal Lk 2:14 ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας" ZNW 29 (1930) 111-115
- C.-H. Hunzinger "Neues Licht auf Lk 2:14" ZNW 44 (1953) 85-90
- C.-H. Hunzinger "Ein weiterer Beleg zu Lk 2:14" ZNW 49 (1959) 129-30
- R. Deichgräber "Lk 2:14: ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας" ZNW 51 (1960) 132
- R.S. Kilpatrick "The Greek Syntax of Luke 2.14" NTS 34 (1988) 472-75

Rating: ?? (NA probably original)

TVU 19

7. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 2:15 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἀπῆλθον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι, _____ οἱ ποιμένες ἐλάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· διέλθωμεν δὴ ἕως Βηθλέεμ ...

BYZ Luke 2:15 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἀπῆλθον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες εἶπον πρὸς ἀλλήλους Διέλθωμεν δὴ ἕως Βηθλέεμ ...

T&T #2

Byz A, D, P, Δ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj, d, q, Sy-H, goth, [Irg]

txt 01, B, W, Θ, Ξ, f1, 22, 372, 565, 700, 1071, 2737, pc²², L1043, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co, Or^{Lat}, Eus

565, 1241, pc⁵ omit also εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν

καὶ L, 579, pc¹⁶

Note also (word order):

οἱ ἄγγελοι εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν (D), Θ, f13, 28, 33, 157, 1424, Lat

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

There is an **umlaut** on the next line (1307 B 9 L) for:

ποιμένες ἐλάλουν πρὸς indicating the ἐλάλουν/εἶπον variant.

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Luke 2:14 δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῶ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας.

It is possible that οἱ ἄνθρωποι has been omitted due to h.t. (OI - OI - OI) or to improve style. The longer reading is characteristically Lukan in style.

It is also possible that it has been added to have a better separation between the angels and the shepherds. But this then has been done very imperfectly. Now, in the longer reading, the sentence structure is really equivocal: ἀπῆλθον ἀπ' αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες εἶπον ...

In this form it could be interpreted as "*... were gone away from them into heaven the angels and the men, the shepherds said ...*"

To avoid this interpretation several witnesses moved οἱ ἄγγελοι in front of εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν. It is possible that others omitted καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι for that reason. Θ goes so far and does both.

It is also possible that καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι has been added to continue the bipartition from verse 14 of ἐν ὑψίστοις and ἀνθρώποις: That when the angels departed ALSO the men behaved according to Gods will. But the addition appears rather unskillful.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 20

8. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:19 ἡ δὲ Μαριὰμ πάντα συνετήρει τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα συμβάλλουσα ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς.

Μαρία 01*, B, D, R, Θ, 372, 1071, 1241, 1424, pc, L1043, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg
txt 01^{c2}, A, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, Maj

B: no umlaut

Compare variants at Mt 28:1 and Mk 15:40.

Lk always uses Μαριὰμ for Mary in ch. 1-2:

Luke 1:27 Μαριάμ	Luke 1:39 Μαριὰμ	Luke 2:16 Μαριὰμ
Luke 1:30 Μαριάμ	Luke 1:46 Μαριάμ	Luke 2:19 Μαριὰμ
Luke 1:34 Μαριὰμ	Luke 1:56 Μαριὰμ	Luke 2:34 Μαριὰμ
Luke 1:38 Μαριάμ	Luke 2:5 Μαριὰμ	

1:34 C*, D*, 372: Μαριὰ	2:5 D, 372: Μαριὰ
1:38 C*, D, Ψ, 372: Μαριά	157: Μαριὰν
1:39 D, 372: Μαριὰ	2:16 D, 372, 1071, pc: Μαριὰν
1:46 C*, D, 372, 983: Μαριά	2:34 D, f13-part, 28, 372, 1071: Μαριὰν
1:56 D, 372: Μαριὰ	

Lacuna C: 2:5-42

The strong support for Μαριὰ at this point is curious. It's only D and 372 which support Μαριὰ constantly.

For consistency Μαριὰμ should be adopted, but the change here is not clear.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 21

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:22 Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστήσαι τῷ κυρίῳ,

αὐτοῦ D, 118, 205, 209, pc⁶, Lat(a, aur, b, c, d, e, f, ff², g¹, l, r¹, vg), Sy-S, sa^{ms}, arm, Ir^{Lat}(Adv.Haer 3.10.5.157-9)

αὐτῆς not 76^{see below}, Catenae

omit: pc, bo^{pt}, Chrys, Diatess^{Pers.}

Of the Latins only q reads txt.

The reading αὐτῆς is not found in manuscript 76. Gregory checked the manuscript and found αὐτῶν ("Textkritik" vol. 1, p. 146). Hatch confirms this.

B: umlaut! (p. 1307 C 5 R) καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν

B* reads: αἱ ἡμέραι καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν

Umlaut with correction. On the left B3 adds τοῦ before καθαρισμοῦ.

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Luke 2:21 Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν ἡμέραι ὀκτῶ τοῦ περιτεμεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς, τὸ κληθῆν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγγέλου πρὸ τοῦ συλλημφθῆναι αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ.

"After eight days had passed, it was time to circumcise the child; and he was called Jesus, the name given by the angel before he was conceived in the womb."

The purification law applies probably to women here only.

The Western αὐτοῦ probably refers to Jesus, who is mentioned in the previous verse.

NET Bible: "It was Mary's purification that was required by law, forty days after the birth (Lev 12:2-4). However, it is possible Joseph shared in a need to be purified by having to help with the birth or that they also dedicated the child as a first born (Exod 13:2), which would also require a sacrifice that Joseph would bring. Luke's point is that the parents followed the law. They were pious."

αὐτῆς was the reading of the Complutensian Polyglott Bible (1514) and spread from there to a number of editions.

W.H.P. Hatch thinks that αὐτοῦ is Luke's original reading, but a mistranslation from the Aramaic, αὐτῶν is an early correction of this and αὐτῆς the

(underlying) correct reading. That αὐτῆς has been adopted was in part due to the Latin "eius", which was understood as feminine.

αὐτῆς might have come from Lev 12:6

καὶ ὅταν ἀναπληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι καθάρσεως αὐτῆς ...

Compare:

- W.H.P. Hatch "The text of Lk 2:22" HTR 14 (1921) 377-81
- M. Thiessen "Luke 2:22, Leviticus 12, and Parturient Impurity" NovT 54 (2012) 16-29

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 22

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:25 Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος ἦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ᾧ ὄνομα Συμεὼν καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ **εὐλαβής** προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν·

εὐσεβής 01*, K, Π, Γ, 0211, 565, 700, 1071, 1424, al¹², L253, L854, Sy-H
al = 6, 229, 265, 489, 544, 713, 726, 1079, 1219, 1220, 1223, 1313

01* corrected by 01^{c2}.

Lacuna: C, Ξ

B: no umlaut. But there is one on the next line (1307 C 24 R) for:
προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ
here is no variant known.

εὐλαβής and εὐσεβής both mean: "devout, godly, pious"

Compare:

NA28 Acts 23:10 Πολλῆς δὲ γινομένης στάσεως φοβηθεὶς ὁ χιλίαςρχος
εὐλαβήθεις 014, 020, 025, al

εὐσεβής got new support recently (Nov. 2003) by the discovery of a 4th CE inscription on the so called Absalom's tomb in Jerusalem's Kidron valley. This inscription has been found by Joe Zias and Emile Puech. It reads as follows:

1 Ο ΘΑΦΟΣ ΣΥΜΕΩΝ ΟΣ ΗΝ
2 ΔΙΚΑΙΟΤΑΤΟΣ ΑΝΘΡΩΠ[ΟΣ
3 ΚΑΙ ΓΗΡ[Ω]Ν **ΕΥΣΗΒΗΣ** ΤΑΤΟΣ
4 ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΙΝ[ΤΟΥ
5 ΛΑΟΥ
6 ΠΡΟΣΔΕΧ[ΟΜΕΝΟΣ

In modern script:

ὁ τάφος Συμεὼν ὃς ἦν (or Συμεῶνος ἦν)
δικαιοτάτος ἄνθρωπος καὶ γέρων

εὐσεβής τατος καὶ παράκλησιν τοῦ λαοῦ προσδεχόμενος.

It is interesting to note that some manuscripts which read εὐσεβής have a link to Jerusalem. Two have the so called Jerusalem colophon (565, 1071). 1219, 1220 and 1223 are manuscripts from St. Catherine, Sinai. 1313 is a manuscript in the Jerusalem Orthodox Patriarchate.

The error is probably at least in part accidental. εὐσεβής appears 34 times in the LXX, but only 3 times in the NT (2 times Acts), εὐλαβής appears 2 times in the LXX and 4 times in Lk/Acts.

Compare:

E. Puech and J. Ziach "Le Tombeau de Simeon et Zacharie dans la vallee de Josaphat" RB 111 (2004) 563-77 (incl. photos and transcription)

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 23

9. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 2:33 καὶ ἦν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλουμένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 2:33 καὶ ἦν Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλουμένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ

T&T #3

Byz A, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, 892, Maj, it, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, goth
Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ N, 33, 579, pc⁵

txt 01^{cl}, B, D, L, W, f1, 131, 700, 1241, d, vg, sa, bo^{pt}, Or^{Lat}
ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ 01*, L, vg^{ms}, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}
ὁ πατήρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ pc⁴

Ἰωσήφ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ 157, 165, 176, aeth

Sy-S: Pete Williams: "It is possible, however, that *S* was derived from *txt* since the possessive on 'mother' needed to be expressed in Syriac." (p. 56)

Lacuna: C, Ξ

B: umlaut! (1308 A 11 L) πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ

Compare:

NA28 Luke 2:27 καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεῖν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν
omit: pc

NA28 Luke 2:41 Καὶ ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ' ἔτος εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα.

ὁ τε Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ Μαριαμ 1012, a, b, g¹, l, r¹
Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ Μαριαμ c, ff²

NA28 Luke 2:48 ἰδοὺ ὁ πατήρ σου καὶ γὰρ ὁδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε.

omit: a, b, ff², g¹

"your relatives and I" e, β

NA28 Luke 2:43 καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ

Byz A, C, Δ, Ψ, 0130, f13, Maj, it(b, c, f, ff², l, q, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Θ, f1, 788, 983(=f13), 22, 33, 157, 372, 579, 700, 1241,
pc⁷, Lat(a, aur, β, d, e, vg), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo¹

The change to Joseph appears to be clearly secondary to avoid naming him the father of Jesus.

On the other hand it could be argued that there were no doctrinal reasons involved, but stylistical ones: Either both are given a name or none. Therefore Ἰωσήφ has been changed into ὁ πατήρ.

Compare variant 2:43 below!

Interestingly the above noted verses are not treated alike. In 2:27, 41 and 48 only a few witnesses changed the text, whereas in 2:33 and 43 a majority variant appears. This is somewhat strange.

If we assume the Byzantine text to be original, it could be argued that the awkward and ambiguous "Joseph and his mother" has been clarified into "his father and his mother" or "his parents", respectively.

Note:

H.J. Vogels "Die 'Eltern' Jesu (Textkritisches zu Lk 2:33ff.)" BZ 11 (1913) 33-43

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 24

10. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:35 καὶ σοῦ [δὲ] αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχὴν διελεύσεται ῥομφαία - ὅπως ἂν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί.

omit B, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, 579, Lat, Sy-S, Epiph, WH, Bal

txt 01, A, D, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,
a, e, Sy-P, Sy-H, WH^{mg}, [Trg]

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 1:76 Καὶ σὺ δέ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ·
προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ,

It is possible that the addition of δὲ is a conformation to context. It fits well here.

On the other hand the word could have been omitted to not separate σοῦ and αὐτῆς.

Weiss (Com. Lk) argues that δὲ fell out because it separates the two words σοῦ αὐτῆς which belong close together.

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 25

11. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 2:38 καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστᾶσα ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

BYZ Luke 2:38 καὶ αὐτῇ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστᾶσα ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ ἐλάλει περὶ αὐτοῦ πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ

Byz Θ, f1, f13, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat

txt 01, A, B, D, L, N, W, X, Δ, Ξ, Ψ, 0130, 0211, 124(=f13), 28, 33, 157, 579, 1071, pc¹⁶

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

On the one hand one could easily imagine that scribes omitted one of the two identical words, assuming a dittography. On the other hand the supply of a personal pronoun is always possible.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 26

NA28 Luke 2:38 καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστᾶσα ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ θεῷ

BYZ Luke 2:38

καὶ αὐτῇ αὕτη τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστᾶσα ἀνθωμολογεῖτο τῷ Κυρίῳ.

Not in NA but in SQE!

Byz A, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa, goth

txt 01, B, D, L, N, W, Ξ, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, pc, a, d, Sy-H, bo

X: The nomen sacrum looks corrected. There is a blot around the K. It is possible that the scribe originally wrote **ΘΩ** instead of **ΚΩ**.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 2:22 ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστήσαι τῷ κυρίῳ,

NA28 Luke 2:23 καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν
διανοῖγον μήτραν ἅγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται,

NA28 Luke 2:39 Καὶ ὡς ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον κυρίου, ἐπέστρεψαν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν εἰς πόλιν ἑαυτῶν Ναζαρέθ.

Probably a harmonization to immediate context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 27

NA28 Luke 2:38 πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

BYZ Luke 2:38 πᾶσιν τοῖς προσδεχομένοις λύτρωσιν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ.

Byz A, D, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0130, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, d, Sy-H
txt 01, B, W, Π, Ξ, 0233, f1, 565*, pc⁷, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, goth, Ir^{Lat}

Ἱσραήλ pc, a, g¹, r¹, vg^{Cl}, bo^{ms}
ἐν Ἱσραήλ 1071, pc
ἐν τῷ Ἱσραήλ pc

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

λύτρωσις "redemption, liberation, setting free"

It is either

"waiting for redemption of Jerusalem" or

"waiting for redemption in Jerusalem"

The txt reading is ambiguous in this respect. There is no reason for the omission of the ἐν.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 28

12. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 2:40 Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο _____, πληρούμενον σοφία, καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό.

BYZ Luke 2:40 Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι, πληρούμενον σοφίας· καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό

Byz A, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, aur, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{mss}, goth

txt 01, B, D, L, N, W, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-Pal^{mss}, Co, Or^{Lat}
D has ἐκραταιοῦτο καὶ ἠΰξανεν

Lacuna: C, E

B: no umlaut

αὐξάνω "grow"
κραταιόομαι "become strong"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:80 Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεύματι

Possibly a harmonization to verse 1:80 (so Weiss). Is it probable that Luke used the same words as in 1:80 for John, but omitted πνεύματι here? In 1:80 the words are safe.

The Byzantine reading is theologically problematic, because it would indicate that Jesus developed spiritually and was not completely divine from the beginning (see Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, p. 92-94).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 29

13. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:40 Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο, πληρούμενον σοφία, καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό.

Not in NA but in SQE!

<u>ἐν αὐτῷ</u>	D
<u>"in illo"</u>	Lat(aur, f, ff ² , g ¹), vg
<u>"in eo"</u>	β
<u>"cum illo"</u>	it(b, c, l, q, r ¹), vg ^{mss}
<u>"cum eo"</u>	d
<u>"super illum"</u>	e
<u>"super eum"</u>	a

Lacuna: C, Ξ

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 3:22 καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶ εἶδει ὡς
περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν.
εἰς αὐτόν D, Lat, Ir

NA28 Luke 1:66 ... καὶ γὰρ χεὶρ κυρίου ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 30

NA28 Luke 2:42 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν
κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς

BYZ Luke 2:42 καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν
εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς

Byz A, C^{vid}, N, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0130, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, Maj,
Lat, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, goth, [Trg]

txt 01, B, (D), L, W, 983, 1689(=f13^c), 579, 1241, pc,
d, β, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, Trg^{mg}

D reads: ... ἀνέβησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ἔχοντες αὐτὸν κατὰ τὸ ἔθος

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 2:22 Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν
κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα
παραστήσαι τῷ κυρίῳ,

Infancy Gospel of Thomas (late 2nd CE by Schneemelcher):

19. ὄντος δὲ αὐτοῦ δώδεκα ἔτους ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ
ἔθος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν τοῦ πάσχα·

A natural addition. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 31

NA28 Luke 2:43 καὶ τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας, ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτοὺς ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 2:43 καὶ τελειωσάντων τὰς ἡμέρας ἐν τῷ ὑποστρέφειν αὐτοὺς ὑπέμεινεν Ἰησοῦς ὁ παῖς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ

Byz A, C, X, Δ, Ψ, 0130, f13, 892, Maj,
it(b, c, f, ff², l, q, r¹), vg^{ms}, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Θ, f1, 788, 983(=f13), 22, 33, 157, 372, 579, 700, 1241,
pc⁷, Lat(a, aur, β, d, e, vg), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo¹

Lacuna: Ξ

B: umlaut! (1308 B 27 L) καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ.

Compare also minority reading verse 41:

NA28 Luke 2:41 Καὶ ἐπορεύοντο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ' ἔτος εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ τῇ ἑορτῇ τοῦ πάσχα.

ὁ τε Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ Μαρία 1012, pc, it

See above verse 2:33

Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ

Byz A, N, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 892, Maj, it, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}

ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ

txt 01, B, D, L, W, f1, 700, 1241, d, vg, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, Or^{Lat}

Infancy Gospel of Thomas (late 2nd CE by Schneemelcher):

19. οἱ δὲ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ἐνόμισαν αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ συνοδίᾳ εἶναι·

It is very interesting and strange that the reading in verse 41 is not equally well attested.

Note:

H.J. Vogels "Die 'Eltern' Jesu (Textkritisches zu Lk 2:33ff.)" BZ 11 (1913) 33-43

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 32

14. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:47 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ.

omit: B, W, 1241, pc
Tis notes additionally: Or^{Lat}

οἱ ἀκούοντες Ψ

69 reads: ἐξίσταντο δὲ _____ ἐπὶ τῇ συνέσει καὶ ταῖς ἀποκρίσεσιν αὐτοῦ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτοῦ.

Lacuna: Ε

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 12:23 καὶ ἐξίσταντο πάντες οἱ ὄχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον·

NA28 Acts 2:7 ἐξίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἑθαύμαζον λέγοντες·

NA28 Acts 2:12 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες καὶ διηπόρουν,

NA28 Acts 9:21 ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες καὶ ἔλεγον·

omit: P45^{vid}, P74, Ψ*, 049, pc

There is no apparent reason for an omission, but also not for an addition.

Possibly omitted as redundant or for stylistic reasons?

Note the similar omission in Acts 9:21.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 33

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:48 καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεπλάγησαν, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ· τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν οὕτως; ἰδοὺ ὁ πατήρ σου κἀγὼ ὀδυνώμενοι τ ἐζητοῦμέν σε.

τ καὶ λυπούμενοι D, it(a, d, e, ff², l, q, r¹), vg^{mss}, Sy-C
et tristes

Lat(aur, b, β, c, f, vg) read txt.

NA: In the introduction Lk 2:48 is said to be missing in Sy-C, but here it is cited.

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

λυπέω passive: "be sad, be sorrowful, be distressed"

ὀδυνάομαι "be in great pain, be deeply distressed or worried"

Infancy Gospel of Thomas (late 2nd CE by Schneemelcher):

19. ἰνατί τοῦτο ἐποίησας ἡμῖν, τέκνον;

ἰδοὺ ὀδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε.

A quite natural addition. There is no reason for an omission.

The word appears six times in Mt, twice in Mk and twice in Jo. Possibly it was originally meant as a marginal explanation?

Compare next variant.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 34

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 2:48 καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεπλάγησαν, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἢ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ· τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν οὕτως; ἰδοὺ ὁ πατήρ σου κάγῳ ὀδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε.

ζητοῦμέν 01*, B, M, 69, 2766, pc, Co, WH, Weiss, NA²⁵

txt 01^{c2}, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Sy, bo-mss

D: κάγῳ ὀδυνώμενοι καὶ λυπούμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε

Swanson adds M, 69 for ζητοῦμέν, both are not noted in NA and Tischendorf. 69 is noted in IGNTP, too. 69 is correct, checked at the online image.

B: no umlaut

ἐζητοῦμέν	indicative imperfect	active 1st person plural
ζητοῦμεν	indicative present	active 1st person plural
ὀδυνώμενοι	participle present	passive nominative masculine plural

Compare:

NA28 Luke 2:49 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ἤδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με;

Both forms are rare. They appear only here in the NT.

Perhaps the Eta has been omitted to avoid hiatus?

It is possible that ζητοῦμεν is a conformation to the present tense of the preceding ὀδυνώμενοι.

Weiss argues (Com. Lk) that ἐζητοῦμέν is a conformation to the following ἐζητεῖτε in verse 49.

The support for ζητοῦμεν is incoherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 35

15. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 2:52 Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώποις.

BYZ Luke 2:52 Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν _____ σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώποις

omit: A, C, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Gre, SBL

ἐν τῇ 01, L, Co, Or^{pt}, NA²⁵, Bois, Weiss

_____ τῇ B, W, 579, pc, WH

ἐν Clement (Swanson)

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Galatians 1:14 καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ
"I advanced in Judaism"

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 2:40

Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠΰξανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πληρούμενον σοφία, καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ' αὐτό.

Infancy Gospel of Thomas (late 2nd CE by Schneemelcher):

Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν σοφία καὶ ἡλικία καὶ χάριτι·

It appears that the omission might be original. There is no reason for an omission. It is possible that the addition of ἐν or ἐν τῇ was meant to indicate the dative. The omission of ἐν by B et al. is possibly due to oversight (ENEN, so Weiss). On the other hand it could have been added for that reason.

Weiss (Lk Com.) notes that the words could have been omitted to construct the three expressions more parallel: προέκοπτεν σοφία καὶ ἡλικία καὶ χάριτι.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 36

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:1 Ἐν ἔτει δὲ πεντεκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας Τιβερίου Καίσαρος, ἡγεμονεύοντος Ποντίου Πιλάτου τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ τετρααρχοῦντος τῆς Γαλιλαίας Ἡρώδου, Φιλίππου δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ τετρααρχοῦντος τῆς Ἰτουραίας καὶ Τραχωνίτιδος χώρας, καὶ Λυσανίου τῆς Ἀβιληνῆς τετρααρχοῦντος,

βασιλείας B^c

ὄρεινῆς B^c
"hill-country"

βασιλείας (p. 1308 C 31)

ὄρεινῆς (p. 1308 C 40)

B: no umlaut

Both corrections are very weak. They are written in small uncial script in the left margin. The words are indicated for exchange by a vertical wave. Tischendorf in his 8th ed. labels the words with " B^{mg*} ". Does this asterisk indicate that he considers both words as being deleted subsequently? I think the words in the margin are by B^{c1} and are just very faded. In his Vaticanus edition Tischendorf isn't giving a specific corrector's label to the words.

The word βασιλείας is slightly superimposed by the Latin chapter number "·3·". It is not noted in NA and Swanson, but in IGNTP and Tis. One line below in column B are two letters not enhanced. They are equally faded.

It may be that someone tried to delete ὄρεινῆς later, the area around it looks washed out. But βασιλείας above also looks very faded and has no such blot. It is thus more probable that the stain has nothing to do with the word ὄρεινῆς. ὄρεινῆς is not noted in NA, IGNTP and Swanson, but in Tis.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

Now the question is, why these changes? No other manuscript reads thus, as far as I know.

Has ἡγεμονίας been changed to βασιλείας for stylistic reasons, to avoid the double ἡγεμονίας - ἡγεμονεύοντος?

And ὄρεινῆς? Is it another designation for Ἰτουραίας?

Perhaps an early commentary?

TVU 37

16. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:3 καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν [τὴν] περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,

omit A, B, L, N, W, Ψ, 579, L844, pc, Or, **WH, Gre, Trg, SBL**
txt 01, C, D, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 700, 892, 1241, Maj

τὴν πᾶσαν περίχωρον 124

579 is not noted in NA, but in Swanson, IGNTP and Schmidtke. Checked at the INTF film.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 3:5 Τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,

NA28 Mark 1:5 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες,

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 14:35 καὶ ἐπιγνόντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην καὶ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας

NA28 Mark 1:28 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

NA28 Luke 4:14 Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.

omit τῆς: Δ

NA28 Luke 4:37 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο ἦχος περὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς πάντα τόπον τῆς περιχώρου.

NA28 Luke 7:17 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλη τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ. **omit τῆ:** 579

NA28 Luke 8:37 καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλήθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν,

NA28 Acts 14:6 συνιδόντες κατέφυγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας Λύστραν καὶ Δέρβην καὶ τὴν περίχωρον.

Compare LXX:

LXX Genesis 13:10 καὶ ἐπάρας Λωτ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἶδεν πάσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ιορδάνου ὅτι πᾶσα ἦν ποτιζομένη

LXX Genesis 13:11 καὶ ἐξελέξατο ἑαυτῷ Λωτ πάσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ιορδάνου καὶ ἀπῆρεν Λωτ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ διεχωρίσθησαν ἕκαστος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ

The only occurrence without the article:

LXX Deuteronomy 3:13 καὶ τὸ κατάλοιπον τοῦ Γαλααδ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Βασαν βασιλείαν Ωγ ἔδωκα τῷ ἡμίσει φυλῆς Μανασση καὶ πάσαν περίχωρον Αργοβ

From the examples above it appears that the usage WITH the article is the norm. Both singular omissions noted above can be explained as h.t.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 38

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:5 πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείαν καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι εἰς ὁδοὺς λείας.

εὐθείας B, D, Ξ, 892, pc, L32, Lat(a, aur, b, c, ff², vg), Or,
Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt 01, A, C, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1241, Maj,
it(d, e, f, l, q, r¹), Ir^{Lat}

B: umlaut! (p. 1309 A 22 L + 23 L)

ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐ -
θείας καὶ αἱ τραχεῖαι

εὐθείας adjective accusative feminine plural

εὐθείαν adjective accusative feminine singular

λείας adjective accusative feminine plural

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Luke 3:4 ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βίβλῳ λόγων Ἰσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 3:3 οὗτος γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ῥηθεὶς διὰ Ἰσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 1:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ,

LXX parallel:

LXX Isaiah 40:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

LXX Isaiah 40:4 πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθήσεται καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθήσεται καὶ ἔσται πάντα τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείαν καὶ ἡ τραχεῖα εἰς πεδία

πεδία noun accusative neuter plural

These words from Isaiah are not in the parallels. Mt and Mk reproduce only Isa 40:3, not verses 4 and 5.

Note that the corresponding verb is also in the singular: ἔσται. "And it will be the crooked straight." The neuter subject is in the plural: τὰ σκολιὰ. The use of neuter plural with singular verbs is common.

The plural of the final λείας is safe! Here Isaiah uses the plural πεδία.

It is possible that the plural εὐθείας is a conformation to immediate context, either verse 4 or the preceding plural τὰ σκολιὰ, or to the immediately following λείας.

On the other hand εὐθεῖαν could be a harmonization to the LXX, so Weiss.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 39

17. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:7 Ἔλεγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ὄχλοις βαπτισθῆναι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ: γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς;

βαπτισθῆναι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ D, it(b, d, e, l, q, r¹), **Bois**
coram ipso b, l, q, r¹
in conspectus eius d, e

βαπτισθῆναι Sy-S, Sy-P

omit: Sy-C, bo^{ms*}

Lat(a, aur, c, f, ff², vg) read txt (ab ipso).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 3:6 καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

NA28 Mark 1:5 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολυμίται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

NA28 John 3:23 Ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνῶν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ, ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ, καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο.

Gospel of the Ebionites (Eriphanius):

καὶ ἐξῆλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν φαρισαῖοι καὶ ἐβαπτίσθησαν καὶ πᾶσα Ἱεροσόλυμα.

Possibly txt is a harmonization to Mt, Mk.

Burkitt (Evangelion Intro, p. 288) writes:

"Possibly therefore the disturbing cause is the Western reading βαπτισθῆναι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ. This uncommon phrase is very likely to be genuine: possibly even stood in the source from which St. Luke took Lk 3:10-15. It seems to present a view of Jewish Baptism in which the penitent administered the rite to himself, as Naaman did."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 40

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:9 ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

omit: P4(200 CE), Lat(a, aur, ff², vg^{mss}), bo^{ms}, Or^{Jo}
Lachmann and WH both in brackets

καρπούς καλοῦς D, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P

it(b, c, d, e, f, l, q, r¹) read txt.

omit 1. καὶ: D, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 3:10 ἤδη δὲ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται· πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

omit: pc, Sy-S, Ir^{Lat}

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 7:19 πᾶν δένδρον μὴ ποιῶν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται

NA28 Luke 6:43 Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιῶν καρπὸν σαπρὸν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιῶν καρπὸν καλόν.

It is possible that the addition of καλὸν is a harmonization to Mt. Note that D, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C also omit καὶ as a conformation to Mt. These are the only differences to Mt.

Metzger notes that "the omission of καλὸν improves the sense (every unfruitful tree - not only the one that does not bring forth good fruit - is to be cut down)."

It is quite probable that it is at least in part an omission due to homioarcton κα - κα or homioioteleuton -ον -ον.

It is noteworthy that WH have καλὸν in brackets. They very probably did not know P4. P4 has been found in 1880 and was first published in 1892. WH published their text in 1881. Perhaps they were influenced by Lachmann? Or they considered Origen plus Western evidence (Old Latin plus Vulgate) to be enough evidence.

The evidence from Origen is divided, as in the homilies he cites Lk 3:9 with 'good fruit' twice (from Tregelles).

UBS 4 dropped the variant. UBS 3b has "Ir-Lat" and "Or" for the omission.

The SQE has interestingly "Ir" for the omission in Mt 3:10 !

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 41

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:10 Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες· τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν τ;

τ ἵνα σωθῶμεν D, b, d, q, Sy-C, sa^{mss}
ut vivamus b, gat, q, vg^{ms}
salbi simus d

NA28 Luke 3:12 ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τελῶναι βαπτισθῆναι καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν· διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσωμεν τ;

τ ἵνα σωθῶμεν D, d salbi simus

NA28 Luke 3:14 ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ στρατευόμενοι λέγοντες· τί ποιήσωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς;

τί ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν D, d salbi simus

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Acts 16:30 καὶ προαγαγὼν αὐτοὺς ἔξω ἔφη· κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθῶ;

There is no reason for an omission. Probably added for clarification.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 42

18. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:16 ἀπεκρίνατο λέγων πᾶσιν ὁ Ἰωάννης· ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί·

omit: 788(=f13), 63, 64, Cl, Tert, Epiph, Aug, **Bois**

Tert, Aug: "in spiritu et igni."

Cl: ἔρχεται δὲ μου ὀπίσω ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν πνεύματι καὶ πυρί
(Tis has this quote as "Heracl? ap Clem eclog 25")

Sy-S: "... with fire and with the Holy Spirit."

IGNTP, Geerlings and Swanson note the omission by 788, but not NA. It is correct that 788 omits the word. Checked at the film.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 3:11 αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ πυρί:

BYZ Matthew 3:11 αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ

Byz E, S, V, Ω, 2, 28, 517, 579, 1424, Maj, Sy-Pal

txt P101^{vid}, 01, B, C, K, Π, L, M, U, W, Δ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 565, 892?

Lat, Sy, Co

NA28 Mark 1:8 ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ.

Note the omission of ἀγίου in Lk 4:1 by Athanasius (4th CE) and one bo^{ms}:

NA28 Luke 4:1 Ἰησοῦς δὲ πλήρης πνεύματος ἀγίου ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ

Augustine writes (*De Cons. Evang.* II. 12 § 26): *de baptismo autem hoc ab utroque [distat] quia non dixit [Marcus] et igni, sed tantum in spir. sancto. Sicut enim Matthaeus, ita et Lucas dixit, et eodem ordine: Ipse vos baptizabit in spiritu et igni, nisi quod Lucas non addidit sancto. sicut Matthaeus dixit.*

WH: "a remarkable reading", "if better attested, it would be highly probable."

Note that the IQP Crit.Ed. has ἀγίῳ in double brackets (= "probable but uncertain"). They comment: "Is ἀγίῳ in Q or from Mk?" (Q-Mark overlap).

Compare the complete discussion at Mt 3:11.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 43

19. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:20 προσέθηκεν καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ πᾶσιν **[καὶ]** κατέκλεισεν τὸν Ἰωάννην ἐν φυλακῇ.

omit 01*, B, (D), Ξ, pc, b, d, e, Co, **WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Tis, Bal, Bois**
ἐνέκλεισεν D

txt 01^{c2}, A, C, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat, Sy
καὶ ἀπέκλεισεν 565, pc

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [καὶ] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:3 Ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάννην ἔδησεν [αὐτὸν] καὶ ἐν φυλακῇ ἀπέθετο διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 6:17 Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ διὰ Ἡρωδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι αὐτὴν ἐγάμησεν.

Robertson (Wordpictures) notes:

"The absence of the conjunction ὅτι (that) before the next verb κατέκλεισεν (shut up) is asyndeton. This verb literally means shut down, possibly with a reference to closing down the door of the dungeon, though it makes sense as a perfective use of the preposition, like our "shut up" without a strict regard to the idea of "down." It is an old and common verb, though here and Ac 26:10 only in the N.T."

Perhaps καὶ has been added to avoid asyndeton?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 44

20. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:22 καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶ εἶδει ὡς
περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι·

σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

ὁ υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε

Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te

D, it(a, b, c, d, ff², l, r¹), Justin(2x), Eus, Meth, Hil, Aug, Gre, Bois

Lat(aur, e(l), f, q, vg) read txt.

υἱός μου εἶ σὺ ἀγαπητός, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε

Clement (Paed., I, 25, 2)

σὺ μου εἶ ὁ υἱός ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα,

καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε

Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiphanius Panarion 30:13)

Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ διάβολος, ἅμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ
τοῦ Ιορδάνου τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῷ λεχθείσης·

υἱός μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε

ἐν τοῖς ἀπομνημονεύμασι τῶν ἀποστόλων γέγραπται,
προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· προσκύνησόν
μοι ...

Justin (Dialogue with Trypho, 103.8; at least one manuscript adds this also at
88:8b)

The words also appears in the Didaskalia, Origen cites them (Comm. John, book
1, 32), and several other fathers, too: Methodius (Symp. 9), Lactantius (Div.
Inst. IV, 15), Augustine (Enchiridion 49), Faustus, Tyconius, Hilary, and
Juvencus. Not in all cases it is clear that they really cite from Lk.

Lacuna: C, E

B: no umlaut

txt "You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased."

D "You are my son; today I have begotten you."

Augustine (De Cons. Evang. 2.31):

Illud vero quod nonnulli codices habent secundum Lucam hoc illa voce sonuisse quod in psalmo scriptum est: filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te, quamquam in antiquioribus codicibus Graecis non inveniri perhibeatur, tamen si aliquibus fide dignis exemplaribus confirmari possit, quid aliud quam utrumque intellegendum est quolibet verborum ordine de caelo sonuisse?

But once more, with respect to that rendering which is contained in some codices of the Gospel according to Luke, and which bears that the words heard in the heavenly voice were those that are written in the Psalm, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten Thee" [Ps 2:7]; although it is said not to be found in the more ancient Greek codices, yet if it can be established by any copies worthy of credit, what results but that we suppose both voices to have been heard from heaven, in one or other verbal order?

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 1:11 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν·
σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

NA28 Matthew 3:17 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 17:5 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 9:7 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 9:35 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.
BYZ Luke 9:35 Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε

NA28 2 Peter 1:17 λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς ἐνεχθείσης αὐτῷ τοιαῦδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης·

ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτός ἐστιν εἰς ὃν ἐγὼ εὐδόκησα,

for having received from God the Father honor and glory, such a voice being born to him by the excellent glory: 'This is My Son - the beloved, in whom I was well pleased;'

For the D reading compare:

LXX Psalm 2:7 διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα κυρίου κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με
υἱός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε

NA28 Acts 13:33 ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν τοῖς τέκνοις [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ·
υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.

God has in full completed this to us their children, having raised up Jesus, as also in the second Psalm it has been written, "You are my Son; today I have begotten you"

NA28 Hebrews 1:5 Τίνι γὰρ εἶπέν ποτε τῶν ἀγγέλων· υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε;

For to which of the angels did God ever say, "You are my Son; today I have begotten you"?

NA28 Hebrews 5:5 οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐδόξασεν γενηθῆναι ἀρχιερέα ἀλλ' ὁ λαλήσας πρὸς αὐτόν· υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε·

so also the Christ did not glorify himself to become chief priest, but He who spoke unto him: "You are my Son; today I have begotten you"?

A so-called Adoptionistic or Ebionitic reading.

The reading seems to have been widespread and early. Internally it is clearly to be favored: It is the harder reading and the txt reading is possibly a harmonization to Mt/Mk. Acts 13:33 shows that Ps 2:7 is clearly connected with Jesus from early on. Where did the author of Hebrews get his quote? Did he know Lk in this form?

Do the church fathers really quote a special Lukan reading or are they just quoting Ps 2:7?

The version in the Gospel of the Ebionites is clearly a conflation, but of what? Of Mt and Lk? Or of two versions of Lk?

Harnack (*Sprüche Jesu*, Exkurs II, p. 216-9) argues in favor of the D reading: For Luke this reading is inconvenient, considering ch. 1-2. He could have simply followed Mk here. This means that he followed Q, which he considered superior. He also follows Q before and after this. This then means that a report of the baptism was in Q and that it read the words from heaven as given in D and the Old Latin.

Burkitt disagrees. First he notes that it is not certain whether Q had any account of the Baptism of Jesus. Further he writes:

"I can hardly conceive a more 'Adoptionist' way of telling it than that actually taken by Mark. Possibly the story in Mark is capable of a conventionally orthodox interpretation, but the most obvious meaning is Adoptionist, so that when retold in Matthew words are inserted (3:14, 15) to safeguard the dignity of Jesus even before Baptism. I do not see that the Psalm-passage, simply because it has the word 'to-day', more favours the heresy that Jesus only became Son of God at His Baptism (so Streeter, p. 188) than the text of Mark does. In fact I think the 'Western' reading in Lk

3:22 would seem less 'dangerous', because it is the very words of Old Testament Scripture and therefore likely to contain non-obvious mysteries. It should be remembered that the Lucan writings are in their general tendency the least Adoptionist in tone of all the writings of the New Testament with the exception of the Gospel according to Matthew. [... ...] The true deduction is, therefore, that the Western reading in Lk. 3:22, whatever its origin, seemed to those who used it more and not less orthodox than its rival. And that, as a matter of fact, is how it is quoted. Justin Martyr is no Adoptionist; he knew the Gospel of Matthew, but he prefers to cite a text in which the Voice agrees with the Psalm, not that Jesus then in reality became Son of God, but to shew that He fulfilled the prophecy which He aforetime had inspired, meaning that His nativity would come to men from the time when the knowledge of Him came to pass (Just. Tryph. 88). Further, it would be quite in the manner of Luke to substitute a Psalm-passage for a Saying that appeared difficult or shocking, as he substituted 'Into Thy hands I commend my spirit' (Ps. 31:5) for 'Why hast Thou forsaken me?'. "

A curious reading of P4 might be mentioned here for this verse (noted in Comfort, Encountering the manuscripts, p. 331).

Instead of

καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῶ εἶδει
and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form

P4 has:

καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ ΠΝΑ τὸ ἅγιον ΠΝΙ εἶδει

which expands:

καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον πνευματικῶ εἶδει
and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in spiritual form

Comfort writes: The reading "provides a creative alternative to the difficult idea of the Spirit descending in bodily form."

It is not completely clear though, what the abbreviation ΠΝ̄ means. The correct abbreviation for Πνευματικῶ would be ΠΝ̄ικῶ.

Compare:

- F.C. Burkitt Review of Streeter "Four Gospels" JTS 26(1925) 278-294
- Ehrman (Orthodox Corruption, p. 62 - 67 and p. 143 for P4).
- Peter Doble "Codex Bezae and Luke 3:22 - Internal Evidence from Luke-Acts" in: "Text and Traditions, Essays in honour of JK Elliott, Brill 2014, p. 175 - 199

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 45

Lk 3:23 - 3:38 The genealogy in D, Aphraates

Note: W and 579 omit the genealogy in Lk completely. That's remarkable!

The names of the Lukan genealogy from NA²⁷:

23 Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἡλὶ 24 τοῦ Μαθθαὶ τοῦ Λευὶ τοῦ Μελχὶ τοῦ Ἰανναὶ
τοῦ Ἰωσήφ 25 τοῦ Ματταθίου τοῦ Ἀμῶς τοῦ Ναοῦμ τοῦ Ἑσλὶ τοῦ
Ναγγαὶ 26 τοῦ Μάαθ τοῦ Ματταθίου τοῦ Σεμεῖν τοῦ Ἰωσήχ τοῦ
Ἰωδᾶ 27 τοῦ Ἰωανᾶν τοῦ Ῥησᾶ τοῦ Ζοροβαβέλ τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ τοῦ
Νηρὶ 28 τοῦ Μελχὶ τοῦ Ἀδδὶ τοῦ Κωσᾶμ τοῦ Ἐλμαδᾶμ τοῦ Ἦρ 29
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ἐλιέζερ τοῦ Ἰωρίμ τοῦ Μαθθαὶ τοῦ Λευὶ 30 τοῦ
Συμεὼν τοῦ Ἰούδα τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τοῦ Ἰωνᾶμ τοῦ Ἐλιακὶμ 31 τοῦ Μελεᾶ
τοῦ Μεννᾶ τοῦ Ματταθᾶ τοῦ Ναθᾶμ τοῦ Δαυίδ 32 τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ τοῦ
Ἰωβῆδ τοῦ Βόος τοῦ Σαλᾶ τοῦ Ναασσῶν 33 τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ
Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ τοῦ Ἑσρῶμ τοῦ Φάρες τοῦ Ἰούδα 34 τοῦ Ἰακῶβ
τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ Θάρα τοῦ Ναχῶρ 35 τοῦ Σεροῦχ τοῦ
Ῥαγαὺ τοῦ Φάλεκ τοῦ Ἔβερ τοῦ Σαλᾶ 36 τοῦ Καϊνᾶμ τοῦ Ἀρφαξᾶδ
τοῦ Σῆμ τοῦ Νῶε τοῦ Λάμεχ 37 τοῦ Μαθουσαλᾶ τοῦ Ἐνῶχ τοῦ
Ἰάρετ τοῦ Μαλελεήλ τοῦ Καϊνᾶμ 38 τοῦ Ἐνῶς τοῦ Σῆθ τοῦ Ἀδᾶμ
τοῦ θεοῦ. = 77 entries

Four slightly deviating genealogies are given in Swanson, by
E, 2, 28, 1071

They are mixing up the names, perhaps interchanging rows and columns (at least 1071).

Now, D has a very strange genealogy: The first part (Lk 3:24-31) is the Matthean genealogy Mt 1:6-16, but in reversed order. The second part (Lk 3:32-38) is the normal Lukan genealogy.

This D version is also found in Aphraates' homily "Demonstrations 23.21" (ca. 345 CE), Aphraates is known for citing the Diatessaron (which lacks the genealogies). Curious!

D: white = Mt, red = other, green = Lk

23 ... υἱος Ἰωσηφ του Ιακωβ
24 του Μαθθαν του Ελεαζαρ του Ελιουδ του Ιαχειν του Σαδωκ
25 του Αζωρ του Ελιακειμ του Αβιουδ του Ζοροβαβελ
26 του Σαλαθιηλ του Ιεχονιου του Ιωακειμ του Ελιακειμ^{omit Aphr.}
27 του Ιωσεια του Αμωσ του Μανασση του Εζεκεια
28 του Αχας του Ιωαθαν του Οζεια του Αμασιου
29 του Ιωας του Οχοζιου του Ιωραμ του Ιωσαφαδ
30 του Ασαρ του Αβιουδ του Ροβοαμ του Σολομων

31 του Δαυειδ
 32 του Ιεσσαί του Ωβελ του Βοος του Σαλμων του Ναασων
 33 του Αμειναδαβ του Αραμ του Ασρωμ του Φαρες του Ιουδα
 34 του Ιακωβ του Ισαακ του Αβρααμ του Θαρα του Ναχωρ
 35 του Σερουχ του Ραγαυ του φαλεκ του Εβερ του Σαλα
 36 του Αρφαξαδ του Σημ του Νωε του Λαμεχ
 37 του Μαθουσαλα του Αινωχ του Ιαρεδ του Μαλελεηλ του Καιναν
 38 του Αινως του Σηθ του Αδαμ του Θυ

Matthew 1:6-16 reversed:

16 Ἰωσήφ, Ἰακώβ,
 14-15 Ματθάν, Ἐλεάζαρ, Ἐλιοῦδ, Ἀχίμ, Σαδώκ,
 13 Ἀζώρ, Ἐλιακίμ, Ἀβιοῦδ, Ζοροβαβέλ,
 11-12 Σαλαθιήλ, Ἰεχονίας,
 9-10 Ἰωσίας, Ἀμώς, Μανασσῆς, Ἐζεκίας,
 9 Ἀχάζ, Ἰωαθάμ, Ὀζίαν,
 8 Ἰωράμ, Ἰωσαφάτ,
 7 Ἀσάφ, Ἀβιά, Ῥοβοάμ, Σολομών,
 6 Δαυίδ

Notes:

- 1 Aphraates omits του Ελιακειμ. This name is in D only. Regarding its probable origin confer: 2. Chr 36:4 The king of Egypt made his brother **Eliakim** king over Judah and Jerusalem, **and changed his name to Jehoiakim**. So, Ελιακιμ is just another name for Ιωακιμ. Perhaps a marginal gloss that found its way into the text?
- 2 Ιωακιμ is a well known addition in Mt 1:11. Support:
 M, U, Θ, Σ, f1, 33, 1342, al¹⁶⁸, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, geo, (Ir^{Lat}), Epiph
- 3 The addition of του Αμασιου του Ιωας του Οχοζιου is also given in Mt 1:8 by Sy-C, Aeth and Epiphanius (4th CE). Unfortunately D is not extant in this part of Mt. Sy-S reads normal.
 They are taken from 1st Chronicles:
 1.Chr. 3:11-12 Ἰωραμ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Οχοζια υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωας υἱὸς αὐτοῦ 12 Αμασιας υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἀζαρια υἱὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰωαθαν υἱὸς αὐτοῦ
- 4 Unfortunately Sy-C is not extant for this part of Lk. Sy-S reads the normal genealogy.

This obviously secondary genealogy can thus be traced back to Syria in the 4th CE. One could speculate that, perhaps, it is an attempt to add a genealogy to the

Diatessaron? It's inclusion in D, then, would be another indicator for D's closeness to the Diatessaron or some similar document (and for its origin in Syria). William Petersen agrees with this speculation (private email, Dec. 2005).

Codex Fuldensis (547 CE), a Latin Gospel harmony using a Vulgate text, shows a clearly independent attempt to add a combined genealogy. It first has the full Matthean genealogy (Mt 1:1-16) in the normal order and after that the Lukan succession from Abraham to God (Lk 3:34-38). It has the normal Vulgate text and none of the additions known from D/Aphraates:

Mt 1:1-16

Liber generationis Jesu Christi filii David, filii Abraham.
Abraham genuit Isaac,
Isaac autem genuit Jacob.
Jacob autem genuit Judam, et fratres ejus.
Judas autem genuit Phares et Zaram de Thamar.
Phares autem genuit Esrom.
Esrom autem genuit Aram.
Aram autem genuit Aminadab.
Aminadab autem genuit Naasson.
Naasson autem genuit Salmon.
Salmon autem genuit Booz de Rahab.
Booz autem genuit Obed ex Ruth.
[0258B] Obed autem genuit Jesse.
Jesse autem genuit David regem.
David autem rex genuit Salomonem
ex ea quae fuit Uriae.
Salomon autem genuit Roboam.
Roboam autem genuit Abia.
Abia autem genuit Asa.
Asa autem genuit Josaphat.
Josaphat autem genuit Joram.
Joram autem genuit Oziam.
Ozias autem genuit Joatham.
Joatham autem genuit Achaz.
Achaz autem genuit Hiezechiam.
Hiezechias autem genuit Manassen.
Manasses autem genuit Amon.
Amon autem genuit Josiam.

Josias autem genuit Jechoniam
et fratres ejus, in transmigracione
Babylonis. Et post transmigracionem Babylonis,
Jechonias genuit Salathiel.
Salathiel autem genuit Zorobabel.
Zorobabel autem genuit Abiud.
Abiud autem genuit Eliachim.
Eliachim autem genuit Azor.
Azor autem genuit Sadoch.
[0258C] Sadoch autem genuit Achim.
Achim autem genuit Eliud.
Eliud autem genuit Eleazar.
Eleazar autem genuit Mathan.
Mathan autem genuit Jacob.
Jacob autem genuit Joseph virum Mariae,
de qua natus est Jesus, qui vocatur Christus.

Lk 3:34-38

Abraham autem fuit filius Thare.
Qui fuit Nachor. Qui fuit Seruch.
Qui fuit Ragau. Qui fuit Phales.
Qui fuit Heber. Qui fuit Sale. Qui fuit Cainan.
Qui fuit Arphaxat. Qui fuit Sem.
Qui fuit Noe. Qui fuit Lamech.
Qui fuit Mathusale. Qui fuit Enoch.
Qui fuit Jareth. Qui fuit Malelehel.
Qui fuit Enos. Qui fuit Seth.
Qui fuit Adam. Qui fuit Dei.

Irenaeus (Adv Haer III.22.3) seems to have known a text of Luke with 72 generations: "Wherefore Luke points out that the pedigree which traces the generation of our Lord back to Adam contains seventy-two generations, connecting the end with the beginning, and implying that it is He who has summed up in Himself all nations dispersed from Adam downwards, and all languages and generations of men, together with Adam himself."
Much depends on how Irenaeus counted, e.g. if he included Adam or Jesus. (Regarding the 72 nations compare the discussion of the 70/72 at Lk 10:1.)

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 46

NA28 Luke 3:27 τοῦ Ἰωαννᾶν τοῦ Ῥησᾶ τοῦ Ζοροβαβὲλ τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ τοῦ Νηρι

Resa is unknown. The explanation is that Resa is not a name but a title. The list seems to have been reversed from a file that read "Zorobabel Resa", which means "Zorobabel, the prince", Aramaic ܠܫܢܐ "head". By misinterpretation and reversion of the list, this "Resa" then became the father of Zorobabel (see Nestle "Einführung" 2nd ed.).

This is not a TC issue, but possibly connected with the variant 3:33, see below.

Compare also on this and other issues:

G. Kuhn "Die Geschlechtsregister bei Lukas und Matthäus" ZNW 22 (1923) 206-228

TVU 47

NA28 Luke 3:33 τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ τοῦ Ἑσρώμ τοῦ Φάρες τοῦ Ἰούδα

BYZ Luke 3:33 τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ, τοῦ Ἑσρώμ τοῦ Φάρες τοῦ Ἰούδα

Byz τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ

A, D, Π, 33, 565, 1424, Maj-part, Lat, Sy-P, goth, Trg
τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἰωράμ

K, M, S, Y, Δ, Ψ, 118, 205, 209, 2542, (=f1), 28, 700,
892, 1071, Maj-part, b, e, δ, Sy-H

txt τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ

01^{C2}, L, X, Γ, f13, 157, pc, bo, NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Tis
τοῦ Ἀδαμ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ

P4^{vid} (200 CE), 01*, 1241, pc, Sy-S, sa

τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ

B, WH, Trg^{mg}, Bal

τοῦ Ἀδαμ τοῦ Ἀρνὶ

Sy-S, WH^{mg} (!)

Mixed:

τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ

Θ, f1, pc, arab^{MS}
NET-Bible

τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀδμὶν τοῦ Ἀράμ 0102

τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἀρνὶ N

Minority reading:

Ἀμιναδάμ M*, S, Π, Ω, 1, 118, 2, 28, 33, 157, 1424
(β and μ look similar in minuscule)

P4: The noted reading is that of NA. The editio princeps (RB 47, 1938, 5-22), IGNTP, and also P. Comfort have P4 for txt. But space considerations make it very improbable that P4 reads the long Ἀμιναδάβ: (red = unclear)

ΤΟΥΣΑΛΛΑ · ΤΟΥΝΑΛΛΑ[Σ
ΣΩΝ · ΤΟΥΛΛΑ[ΣΑΜ · ΤΟΥ
ΑΔΜΕΙΝ · Τ[Ο]ΥΑΡ[ΝΕΙ] ·
ΤΟΥΕΣΡΩΜ · [ΤΟΥΦΑ

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

Sy-S: acc. to Burkitt the words τοῦ Ἀδαμ τοῦ Ἀρνὶ were added "between the lines".

W and 579 omit the genealogy in Lk completely.

Lacuna: C, E, Sy-C

B: no umlaut

There are certain different genealogies in Lk. Compare above!

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 1:3 ... Ἐσρῶμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀράμ, 4 Ἀράμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀμιναδάβ, ...

NA28 Matthew 1:8 Ἀσάφ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσαφάτ, Ἰωσαφάτ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωράμ, Ἰωράμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ὀζίαν,

The names Ἀδμῖν and Ἀρνὶ appear nowhere else in the Bible. Probably someone changed them to the Byzantine reading using the name from Mt 1:3. Since then one name is missing, a Ἰωράμ has been inserted later. Or, in the case of 0102 and N Ἀράμ has been replaced for one of the unknown names. The reading of Θ, f1 is a conflation of both either accidentally (misinterpreting a correction) or deliberately.

WH note: "Aminadab/Admin and Aram/Arni are evidently duplicate forms of the same pair of names, preserved in different family records."

Then the B reading and the Byzantine reading (A, D et al.) would mean the same. Ἀμιναδάβ is sometimes written as Ἀμιναδάμ, which might explain the Ἀδαμ by P4, 01* et al., but why the other way round?

It is possible that the genealogy used by Luke was originally the other way round and read ARAMAMINADAM, giving Adam, A(d)min and Aram/Arni, the reading of P4, 01* et al. Alert scribes noted the error and changed "Adam+Admin" back to Aminadab (= Byz) or removed Adam (= B).

This means that essentially most of the readings mean the same, only the K et al. reading being really wrong.

The Byzantine reading is identical with Mt and cannot be the original. It cannot explain the strange other combinations. The Θ et al. variants are conflations. We are left with the txt reading, the P4, 01* reading and the B reading. The singular B reading is possibly a homoioarcton error from the P4, 01* reading (AD.. . AD..).

It is possible that the P4, 01* reading is a transcriptional error (AMINADAM - ADAM).

In Lk, as in Mt, it is very probable that the original genealogy obeys the Hebdomadic principle (gr. "seventh"), there are $11 \times 7 = 77$ generations. This has to be taken into account.

Compare also on this and other issues:

G. Kuhn "Die Geschlechtsregister bei Lukas und Matthäus" ZNW 22 (1923) 206-228

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 48

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:36 τοῦ Καϊνάμ τοῦ Ἀρφαξὰδ τοῦ Σήμ τοῦ Νῶε τοῦ Λάμεχ

omit: P75^{vid}, D, d

(acc. to Burkitt Ev. d. Mepharreshe, Aphraates' Homilies omits it, too)

ELAM Sy-S (Αιλαμ ?)

Pete Williams comments (textualcriticism list Dec. 2005):

"Sy-s, rather oddly, has 'Elam', (YLM, where other witnesses have KAINAM. I take this to be an inner-Syriac corruption from qnym (the L and n can readily be confused; q --> (is less obvious). On this theory Sy-s would at least attest the final mu on KAINAM."

P4 has the words.

P4, reconstruction (red letters doubtful):

ΣΕΡΟΥ[ΧΤΟΥΡΑΓΑΥ
ΤΟΥΦΑΛ[ΕΚΤΟ]ΥΕΒΕΡ
ΤΟΥΣΑΛ[ΑΤΟ]ΥΚΑ[Ι]Ν[Α]Μ
ΤΟΥΑΡΦΑΞΑΔΤΟΥ[Σ]Η[Μ]
ΤΟΥΝΩΕΤΟΥΛΑΜ[ΕΧ

P75: This page was integrated into the binding and had not been photographed. Aland explicitly agrees with this omission, as "vid", in his collation of P75. But it is impossible to decide which of the three names Ἐβερ, Σαλὰ or Καϊνάμ had been omitted, because the omission is within a lacuna. Reconstruction:

ΤΟΥ[ΡΑΓΑ]ΥΤΟΥΦ[ΑΛΕΚ]ΤΟΥ[ΕΒΕΡ
Τ]ΟΥ[ΣΑΛΑΤΟΥΑ]ΡΦΑ[ΞΑΔΤΟ]Υ[ΣΗΜ
ΤΟΥΝΩΕΤΟΥ]ΛΑΜΕΧΤΟΥΜΑ[ΘΟΥΣΑ
ΛΑΤΟΥΕΝΩΧ]ΤΟΥΙΑΡΕΤΤΟΥΜ[ΑΛΕ

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

Lacuna: C, E, Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Context:

NA28 Luke 3:35 τοῦ Σερούχ τοῦ Ῥαγαὺ τοῦ Φάλεκ τοῦ Ἐβερ τοῦ Σαλὰ
36 τοῦ Καϊνάμ τοῦ Ἀρφαξὰδ τοῦ Σήμ τοῦ Νῶε τοῦ Λάμεχ
37 τοῦ Μαθουσαλὰ τοῦ Ἐνώχ τοῦ Ἰάρετ τοῦ Μαλελεήλ τοῦ Καϊνάμ

38 τοῦ Ἐνώς τοῦ Σήθ τοῦ Ἀδάμ τοῦ θεοῦ.

LXX parallels:

LXX Genesis 10:22 υἱοὶ Σημ Αἰλαμ καὶ Ασσουρ καὶ Αρφαξαδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Αραμ καὶ Καιναν 23 καὶ υἱοὶ Αραμ ...

LXX Genesis 10:24 καὶ Αρφαξαδ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Καιναν καὶ Καιναν ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σαλα Σαλα δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Εβερ

LXX Genesis 11:12 καὶ ἔζησεν Αρφαξαδ ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα πέντε ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Καιναν

LXX Genesis 11:13 καὶ ἔζησεν Αρφαξαδ μετὰ τὸ γεννηῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Καιναν ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἔζησεν Καιναν ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Σαλα καὶ ἔζησεν Καιναν μετὰ τὸ γεννηῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Σαλα ἔτη τριακόσια τριάκοντα καὶ ἐγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ ἀπέθανεν

LXX Genesis 11:16 καὶ ἔζησεν Εβερ ἑκατὸν τριάκοντα τέσσαρα ἔτη καὶ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Φαλεκ

But note the Hebrew:

וַאֲרַפְכָּשָׁד וְיִלְד וְאָרַם WTT Genesis 10:22

וַאֲרַפְכָּשָׁד יָלַד אֶת־שָׁלַח וְשָׁלַח יָלַד אֶת־עֵבֶר WTT Genesis 10:24

וַאֲרַפְכָּשָׁד חָי חֲמִשָּׁה וּשְׁלֹשִׁים שָׁנָה וַיִּוֹלַד אֶת־שָׁלַח WTT Genesis 11:12

וַיְחִי אַרְבָּעִים וָשָׁנָה אַחֲרַי הוֹלִידוֹ אֶת־שָׁלַח שְׁלֹשׁ

שָׁנִים וְאַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שָׁנָה וַיִּוֹלַד בָּנִים וּבָנוֹת ס

The important point here is that the name Καιναν is not found in the Hebrew OT. But it appears overwhelmingly in the LXX.

The name reappears in Lk 3:37, where it does parallel Gen 5:9 and 1. Chr 1:1.

Since the name Καιναν reappears in verse 37, it has been suggested that its appearance in verse 36 is some kind of copying error. But there is no obvious cause for it.

To the contrary, the omission is much more likely to be accidental. Note similar omissions in the genealogy:

verse 23	omit τοῦ Ἡλὶ ²⁴ τοῦ Μαθθᾶτ	c
verse 24	omit τοῦ Μελχὶ	1220
	omit τοῦ Ἰανναὶ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ	1005
	omit τοῦ Ἰανναὶ	115, L1056
verse 25	omit τοῦ Ἀμῶς	1200, a, b, c, e, l
	omit τοῦ Ναοῦμ	L10
verse 26	omit τοῦ Μάαθ τοῦ Ματταθίου	544

	omit τοῦ Μάαθ	a, aur, b, c, e, l, r ¹
	omit τοῦ Ματτ. τοῦ Σ. τοῦ Ἰωσήχ	716
	omit τοῦ Ματταθίου	213
verse 27	omit τοῦ Ἰωανάν τοῦ Ῥησά	N*, L10
	omit τοῦ Ζοροβαβέλ τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ	a
verse 28	omit τοῦ Ἐλμαδάμ	L854
verse 29	omit verse	828
	omit τοῦ Ἰησοῦ	157, 2757
	omit τοῦ Λευὶ	69, 1424, b
verse 30	omit verse	69
	omit τοῦ Ἰωσήφ	213
	omit τοῦ Ἐλιακίμ	213
	omit τοῦ Ἐλιακίμ.. (31) τοῦ Μεννὰ	1579
verse 31	omit τοῦ Μελεὰ τ. Μεννὰ τ. Ματταθὰ	69
	omit τοῦ Μελεὰ	a, b, e, l, r ¹
	omit τοῦ Μεννὰ	A
	omit τοῦ Ματταθὰ	L854
	omit τοῦ Ναθάμ	213
verse 32	omit τοῦ Βόος	N*
	omit τοῦ Ναασσών	71*, 157, 1458
verse 33	omit τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ ... τοῦ Φάρες	L76
	omit τοῦ Ἐσρώμ ... τοῦ Ἰούδα	2766
	omit τοῦ Ἐσρώμ τοῦ Φάρες	348
	omit τοῦ Ἐσρώμ	047, 1005
	omit τοῦ Φάρες	A
verse 34	omit τοῦ Ἰακώβ	2766
	omit τοῦ Ἀβραάμ	1071
verse 35	omit τοῦ Ῥαγαὺ	480*
	omit τοῦ Ἔβερ	N*
verse 36	omit τοῦ Καϊνὰμ	P75 ^{vid} , D
verse 37	omit τοῦ Μαθουσαλά τοῦ Ἐνώχ	1071
	omit τοῦ Ἐνώχ τοῦ Ἰάρετ	157
	omit τοῦ Μαλελεήλ	e

It is also possible that the name has been omitted
a) because it could not be found in the OT or
b) because it appears a second time in verse 37.

The name ELAM (Αιλαμ) in Sy-S could be a confusion:

LXX Genesis 10:22 υἱοὶ Σημ Αἰλαμ καὶ Ασσοῦρ καὶ Αρφαξὰδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Αραμ καὶ Καϊναν [Αἰλαμ is a brother of Καϊναν.]

The LXX evidence:

Another question is, why is the name in the LXX, but not in the Masoretic text? It has been argued that the name has possibly been added by Christians in order to bring the genealogy in Genesis in line with Luke. But is this really probable? Is it not also possible that this is just one of the many differences of the LXX and the Masoretic text and that Luke read the name in his LXX? Perhaps the name was omitted at some stage to get rid of the problem that Καϊναν in Gen 10:22 is the brother of Αρφαξὰδ, but in 10:24 he is his son?

But note:

Josephus (37-100 CE), who quotes the LXX, does not have Καϊναν. In Ant. book 1 he explicitly writes: "Shem, the third son of Noah, had five sons", and also: "Sala was the son of Arphaxad".

And Julius Africanus (ca. 160-240) wrote in his Chronography, ca. 220 CE:

"And after the flood, Sem begot Arphaxad. Arphaxad, when 135 years old, begets Sala in the year 2397. Sala, when 130 years old, begets Heber in the year 2527. Heber, when 134 years old, begets Phalec in the year 2661, so called because the earth was divided in his days." [he clearly cites the LXX]

So, he omits Καϊναν, too, probably because he did not read it in his LXX (he writes Greek).

The following was given on the LXX-list (Dec. 2005):

- "There are Old Latin manuscripts with and without Καϊναν in Genesis 11. Vulgate is uniform in rejecting Καϊναν." [vg is translated from the Hebrew]
- "The name is also found in Jubilees (Ethiopic for sure)"
- "Gen 10:22-24 and Gen 11:12-13 are not found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, are not found in any of the pre Christian LXX manuscripts, are only found in 2 LXX manuscripts that predate the Great Codices, see P.Berlin Graec.Fol.66 I,II (Rahlfs 911), a Christian manuscript of about the late 3rd century, and P.Beatty IV (Rahlfs 961), a Christian manuscript of about the early 4th century."
- "The sequence KAIKAINANKAI at Gen 10.22 is ripe for corruption and variation. If you want to see how much, check Wevers' Gottingen edition. There is much confusion in the textual witnesses on these matters. I doubt that there is anything certifiably "Christian" about any of it."
- "the Genesis Apocryphon lists the sons of Shem at 1QapGen 12:11. The beginning of the list has been lost, but the end is there. The list is in the same order as the LXX, so fortunately we can see where the Καϊναν would have been at the end of the list. It is not there. We have: ...WR)RPK\$D

LWD W)RM WBNN NQBN XM\$ (...ur Arpachshad Lud and Aram and five daughters). No QYNN."

Looking this up in the Göttingen edition, the papyri P833, P911 and P961 omit *Καιναν* in 10:24, but not 10:22, and have it in chapter 11. Only manuscript 319 omits in all cases.

So, the earliest evidence in the LXX we have for *Καιναν* is from the late 3rd CE (P911).

The only (possible) pre-Christian reference to *Καιναν* can be found in Jubilees. Jubilees was written around 109-105 BCE. The possible references are in ch. 7 and 8.

There is no *Καιναν* in chapter 7 (equals Gen 10:22): "And these are the sons of Shem: Elam, and Asshur, and Arpachshad -this (son) was born two years after the flood- and Lud, and Aram."

But *Καιναν* is mentioned in ch. 8, 1-5: " 1 In the twenty-ninth jubilee, in the first week, [1373 A.M.] in the beginning thereof Arpachshad took to himself a wife and her name was Rasu'eja, the daughter of Susan, the daughter of Elam, and 2 she bare him a son in the third year in this week, [1375 A.M.] and he called his name Kainam. [...] 5 And in the thirtieth jubilee, [1429 A.M.] in the second week, in the first year thereof, he [Kainan or Arpachshad] took to himself a wife, and her name was Melka, the daughter of Madai, the son of Japheth, and in the fourth year [1432 A.M.] he begat a son, 6 and called his name Shelah; [...] and Shelah grew up and took to himself a wife, [...] 7 And she bare him a son in the fifth year [1503 A.M.] thereof, and he called his name Eber

So, depending on who the "he" is in vs. 5, we possibly have the succession from the LXX and Lk 3:36: Αρφαξαδ - Καιναν - Σαλα - Εβερ

List-comment: "None of the Qumran fragments contain Jubilees 8. A Syriac fragment has most of 8:2-4. The Latin and Ethiopic manuscripts of Jubilees tend to be harmonized to the Vulgate and LXX (via the Ethiopic OT). However, the Syriac could be an independent witness to the pre-Christian text of Jubilees if it is translated directly from the Hebrew, as Tisserant argued."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 49

NA28 Luke 4:2 ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου. Καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν _____ ἐπείνασεν.

BYZ Luke 4:2 ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα πειραζόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὐδὲν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις καὶ συντελεσθεισῶν αὐτῶν ὑστερον ἐπείνασεν

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

Byz A, K, W, Δ, Π, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 892, Maj,
f, ff², q, r¹, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Θ, 788(f13), 579, 1241, 2542, pc,
Lat(a, aur, b, c, d, e, l, vg), Sy-S, Co, arm, geo, aeth

Lacuna: C, Ξ

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 4:2 καὶ νηστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα, ὑστερον ἐπείνασεν.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 50

NA28 Luke 4:4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτω μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος.

BYZ Luke 4:4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτὸν λέγων, Γέγραπται ὅτι Οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτω μόνῳ ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος
ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι Θεοῦ.

T&T #4

Byz A, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, Maj,
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth, [Trg]
+ add after ῥήματι: ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος
118, 157, 205, 209, 1071, 1424, al¹¹⁸, bo^{mss}

txt 01, B, L, W, 788(=f13), 264, 1241, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}
Lacuna: C, E
B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 4:4

... ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ.
D, a, b, g¹: ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι θεοῦ.

LXX Deuteronomy 8:3 ... ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος

The addition is well known from Mt and it is only natural to insert it here, too. On the other hand the support for the omission is not very good. But there is no reason for an omission.

It is probable that the addition was not in Q and that it was Mt, who inserted it here from Deuteronomy (so Harnack, Sprüche Jesu). IQP's Crit. ed. does not have it in Q.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 51

NA28 Luke 4:5 Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου

BYZ Luke 4:5 Καὶ ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου

Byz ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν

A, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0102, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, Maj,
it(d, f, ff², l, q), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{mss}, goth

ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν

f13, c, r¹, vg^{ms}, sa^{ms}

εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν

D, 788(=f13)

εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν

01^{C1}, f1, 700, 2542, pc,

sa^{mss}, bo^{pt}, arm, geo

εἰς ὄρος

W, e

ὁ διάβολος

aur, b, g¹, vg^{mss}

"satanas"

Sy-S

txt 01*, B, L, 1241, pc, sa^{mss}, bo^{pt}

Lacuna: C, E

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 4:8 Πάλιν παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν λίαν καὶ δείκνυσιν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν

The support is not good for the omission and the text is slightly awkward without the words ("led him up" to what?). h.t. is possible (ON - ON), note the C1 correction of 01.

The variety of the readings indicates a secondary cause though. Very probably from Mt (so Weiss).

IQP's Crit. ed. has the Matthean ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος [[ὕψηλὸν λίαν]] with ὑψηλὸν λίαν in double brackets indicating doubt that text was present there. This is odd, because both Mt and Lk have ὑψηλὸν. Fleddermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλόν without λίαν.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 52

NA28 Luke 4:8 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· γέγραπται· κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.

BYZ Luke 4:8 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ· Γέγραπται προσκυνήσεις Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις

Byz A, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f13, 157, 1071, 892^{mg}, Maj,
it(b, e, l, q, r¹), Sy-H, bo^{pt}, Justin^{1/2}

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Ξ, f1, 788(f13), 22, 33, 579, 700, 892*, 1241, 2542, pc⁷,
Lat(a, aur, c, d, f, ff², vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, goth, Justin^{1/2}
pc = 372, 903, 1005, 1210, 1365, 2372, L854

788: The omission is not listed in Geerlings and NA, but in IGNTP and Swanson.
It is correct, checked at the film.

892: The words have been added in the margin by the original hand.

Lacuna: C

B: umlaut (1310 C 25 L)

καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· γέγραπται· κύριον

B has: καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς αὐτῷ εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς γέγραπται· κύριον

It is not clear if the umlaut indicates the word order variant in B or the Ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου variant.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 4:10 τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἔπαγε, σατανᾶ·

BYZ Matthew 4:10 τότε λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου Σατανᾶ·

txt 01, B, C*, K, W, Δ, f1, f13, 565, 579*, 700, 892*, k, vg, Sy-P, mae, bo, Or
Byz C^c, D, L, Z, 33, 118^s, 579^c, 1071, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa^{mss}, bo^{mss}
[A, Θ lacuna]

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:23 στραφεὶς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ· ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ·

NA28 Mark 8:33 ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ἔπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ,

It is interesting to note that here no omission of ὀπίσω μου occurs. The text is added in the full Byzantine form. The long form must be old, because it appears already once in Justin (Dial. 103:6).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 53

21. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 4:17 καὶ ἐπεδόθη αὐτῷ βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον·

ἀνοίξας A, B, L, W, Ξ, 788(=f13), 33, 579, 892, 1241, pc³,
NA²⁵, WH, Weiss, Trg
pc = 1195, 1210^c, 2643

txt 01, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, Latt

IGNTP lists all Sy (S, P, H, Pal), Co and Arm for ἀνοίξας.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 4:20 καὶ πτύξας τὸ βιβλίον ἀποδοὺς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ ἐκάθισεν· καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ.

Regarding ἀνοίγω compare also: Rev 5:1-5

Both words mean essentially the same ("open"), but ἀναπτύσσω is used especially for "unrolling scrolls". It is possible that it is a harmonization to immediate context, verse 20 (so Weiss). πτύσσω means "close (a book)".

ἀναπτύσσω is a rare word. It appears only here in the NT and only 6 times in the LXX. ἀνοίγω on the other hand is a very common word, appearing 260 times in the Bible (77 times in the NT).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 54

NA28 Luke 4:18 πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ οὐ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,

BYZ Luke 4:18 Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ οὐ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει

Byz A, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f1, 157, 579^{mg}, 892^{mg}, 1241, Maj, f, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{mss}, Ir^{Lat}
... τῆ καρδία pc²⁰

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Ξ, f13, 33, 579*, 700, 892*, Lat, Sy-S, Co, goth, Or, Eus

579, 892: The words have been added in the margin.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

No parallel. Quote from:

LXX Isaiah 61:1 πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ οὐ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῆ καρδία
τὴν καρδίαν B, L^p, C^p

κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν

Compare also:

LXX Psalm 146:3 ὁ ἰώμενος τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν

There is no reason for an omission. Probably the words have been added to cite Isaiah more completely.

For the question of interpunction compare:

E. Nestle "Lk 4:18-19" ZNW 2 (1901) 153-57

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 55

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 4:25 ἐπ' ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλαὶ χῆραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν γῆν,

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, D, 1241, pc, **Trg**, **WH**

txt 01, A, C, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, Maj, **WH^{mg}**

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare Lukan usage:

NA28 Luke 18:4 καὶ οὐκ ἠθελεν ἐπὶ χρόνον.

NA28 Acts 13:31 ὃς ὤφθη ἐπὶ ἡμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναναβάσιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,

NA28 Acts 16:18 τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἡμέρας.

NA28 Acts 17:2 ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία διελέξατο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν,

NA28 Acts 18:20 ἐρωτῶντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον

NA28 Acts 19:8 Εἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐπαρρησιάζετο ἐπὶ μῆνας τρεῖς

NA28 Acts 19:10 τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἔτη δύο, ὥστε πάντας τοὺς κατοικοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκοῦσαι τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου, Ἰουδαίους τε καὶ Ἕλληνας.

NA28 Acts 19:34 ἐπιγνόντες δὲ ὅτι Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν, φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων ὡς ἐπὶ ὥρας δύο κραζόντων· μεγάλη ἡ Ἔφεσιων.

NA28 Acts 27:20 μήτε δὲ ἡλίου μήτε ἄστρων ἐπιφαινόντων ἐπὶ πλείονα ἡμέρας,

Occurrences without ἐπὶ:

NA28 Luke 2:36 Καὶ ἦν Ἄννα προφῆτις, ... ζήσασα μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἔτη ἑπτὰ ἀπὸ τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς

NA28 Luke 12:19 καὶ ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ μου, ψυχὴ, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά:

NA28 Luke 13:11 καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας ἔτη δεκαοκτῶ

NA28 Luke 13:16 ταύτην δὲ θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ οὖσαν, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτῶ ἔτη

NA28 Acts 7:6 ... καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν ἔτη τετρακόσια:

NA28 Acts 7:36 οὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα.

Ε Π Ι Ε Τ Η Ε Τ Η

Both words look similar. Possibly some accidental error?

ἔτη τρία = accusative of duration of time without ἐπὶ.

The use of ἐπὶ to designate a period of time ("for, over a period of") is common to Luke. The occurrences in Acts (see above) are safe.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 56

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 4:26 καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμφθη Ἡλίας εἰ μὴ εἰς Σάρεπτα τῆς Σιδωνίας πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν.

Σύραν cj. (Julius Wellhausen, 1844-1918)

B: no umlaut

Context:

NA28 Luke 4:25 ἐπ' ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλαὶ χήραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡλίου ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ ἔτη τρία καὶ μῆνας ἕξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, 26 καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμφθη Ἡλίας εἰ μὴ εἰς Σάρεπτα τῆς Σιδωνίας πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν. 27 καὶ πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ ἐπὶ Ἐλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη εἰ μὴ Ναιμὰν ὁ Σύρος.

25 But the truth is, there were many widows in Israel in the time of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, and there was a severe famine over all the land; 26 yet Elijah was sent to none of them

except in Zarephath in Sidon to a widow / Syrian woman.

27 There were also many lepers in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha, and none of them was cleansed

except Naaman the Syrian."

Wellhausen's theory was that the variant originated in an Aramaic source. In Aramaic, a "Syrian woman" is *Aramaja*, and a "widow" is *Armela*. The two words look alike, but so do the Greek words σύραν and χήραν.

χήραν in verse 26 is superfluous, because the widows have already been mentioned in verse 25 and are referred back to in verse 26 with the words πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ("to none of them").

"Syran" would also make a good symmetry with "Naaman the Syrian" in verse 27 and contrasts the "widows in Israel".

Perhaps Luke would have accepted this reading, if he would have heard about it.

TVU 57

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 4:38 Ἀναστάς δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς εἰσηλθεὶν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος ῥ. πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῶ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς.

ῥ καὶ Ἀνδρέου D, it(b, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹), vg^{mss}

Lat(a, aur, f, q, vg) reads txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 1:29 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἦλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἀνδρέου μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου.

Probably a harmonization to Mk 1:29.

It is also possible that the words have been added to get a plural subject for the following καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν.

There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 58

22. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 4:41 ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κραυγάζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.

BYZ Luke 4:41 Ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν, κράζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.

Byz B, C, L, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, L844, L2211,
Maj-part[F, K, Π, Μ, Ν, Σ, Υ, Λ], Trg, WH, Bal, Robinson
κραζόντων 01

txt P75?, A, D, W, 0102, 0211, 118, f13, 157, 700, 1342,
Maj-part[E, G, H, Q, U, V, Γ, Δ, Ω], Or, Trg^{mg}, Tis

P75: not in NA, IGNTP notes it as "vid". Münster in their online "NT transcripts" give it as κραυγάζοντα. Probably space considerations. The image is no help, since it is part of the binding (all black).

IGNTP has L wrongly for txt against NA, Swanson and Tischendorf (L-Edition). Checked at the photo (καὶ λέγοντα has been added in the margin, probably by the original hand.).

B: no umlaut

κραυγάζοντα κραυγάζω

κράζοντα κράζω

meaning is the same for both: "call out, cry out, shout"

No parallel.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 4:33 Καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου καὶ ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· 4:34 Ἐα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἠλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 8:28 ... δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι ... 8:29 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἔκραξαν λέγοντες· τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ; ἦλθες ὧδε πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;

NA28 Matthew 9:27	<u>κράζοντες</u> <u>κραυγάζοντες</u>	01, C*
NA28 Matthew 14:30	<u>ἔκραξεν</u> <u>ἐκραύγαζεν</u>	565
NA28 Matthew 15:22	<u>ἔκραζεν</u> <u>ἔκραξεν</u> <u>ἐκραύγασεν</u> <u>ἐκραύγαζεν</u>	01 ^{c2} , B, D, Θ, f1, 700, 892, pc 01*, Z, 0281, f13, 579, 1241, pc C, L, W, Maj M, L844, L2211, pc
NA28 Matthew 20:31	<u>ἔκραξαν</u> <u>ἔκραζον</u> <u>ἐκραύγαζον</u> <u>ἐκραύγασαν</u>	B, D, L, Z, 085, 0281, 700, 892, pc C, W, f1, 33, 579, Maj Θ, f13 P45, 13, 788
NA28 Mark 5:5	<u>κράζων</u> <u>κραυγάζων</u>	f13
NA28 Mark 15:13	<u>ἔκραξαν·</u> <u>ἐκραύγαζον</u>	565, (700), 1071
NA28 John 11:43	<u>ἐκραύγασεν·</u> <u>ἔκραξεν</u>	C*, W
NA28 John 12:13	<u>ἐκραύγαζον</u> <u>ἐκραύγασαν</u> <u>ἔκραζον</u>	P75, 01, B ^{c2} , D, L, Q, W, 579, L844, al P66, B* A, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Or
NA28 John 19:6	<u>ἐκραύγασαν</u> <u>ἔκραξαν</u>	01*
NA28 John 19:12	<u>ἐκραύγασαν</u> <u>ἔκραζον</u>	01 ^{c2} , Maj

A typical variation.

It is possible that κράζοντα is a conformation to ἀνέκραξεν of verse 33. On the other hand Matthew normally uses κράζω (12 times), but κραυγάζω only once (12:19).

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 59

NA28 Luke 4:41 ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κρ[αυγ]άζοντα
καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ
εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.

BYZ Luke 4:41 ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κράζοντα
καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ
εἶα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι

Byz A, Q, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f1, f13, 157, 892, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth

txt P75, 01, B, C, D, F, L, R, W, X, Ξ, 788(=f13), 33, 579, 700, 1241, 2542, pc,
Lat, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, Marcion^T, Or

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν·
σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

It is a natural addition, probably from Mt (so Weiss) and there is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 60

23. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 4:44 Καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας.

BYZ Luke 4:44 καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

T&T #5

Byz A, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 700, 1071, Maj,
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, bo^{pt}, goth, Trg

txt P75, 01, B, C, L Q, R, f1, 22, 131, 157, 579, 892, 1241, al⁵³, Lect,
Sy-S, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg^{mg}

τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας 447, 740

τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας 744^c (744* = Byz)

τῶν Ἰουδαίων W, 713, 1282^c, 2147

αὐτῶν 517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc⁵ (= 505, 702, 976, 1048, 2522)

Lacuna: Ε

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 4:14 Καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ' ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 1:39 Καὶ ἦλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων.

"Judaeae" Lat^{ms} (s. Zahn)

NA28 Matthew 4:23 Καὶ περιῆγεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας

Note previous verse:

NA28 Luke 4:43 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην.

Note next verse:

NA28 Luke 5:1 ... αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ

Note also:

NA28 Mark 1:28 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

01*: Ἰουδαίας (28: Ἰορδάνου)

NA28 Luke 1:26 Ἐν δὲ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἕκτῳ ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἣ ὄνομα Ναζαρέθ

01*: Ἰουδαίας (pc: Ἰούδα)

NA28 Luke 23:55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ αἱ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθῦναι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ,

179: Ἰουδέας (IGNTP)

NA28 Luke 1:5 Ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας

NA28 Luke 7:17 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πάσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ.

NA28 Luke 23:5 οἱ δὲ ἐπίσχυον λέγοντες ὅτι ἀνασεῖει τὸν λαὸν διδάσκων καθ' ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἕως ὧδε.

NA28 Mark 1:5 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα

Ἰουδαίας is very strange. If it's an error, it must be a very early one, possibly even by Lk himself (in which case we should not correct it, but we will never know). The last mentioned place was in verse 14, Galilea. The next mentioned place, in the following verse 5:1, is the lake of Gennesaret. Also the parallels, including Luke's source Mk, have Galilea.

On the other hand it is possible that Galilea is a harmonization to the parallel accounts. It is quite possible that *Ἰουδαίας* was the original text and that later scribes tried to work around that by changing it to the Mt/Mk parallel or into τῶν Ἰουδαίων or αὐτῶν.

There is no reason why someone should change Galilea into Judea here, except accidentally. The large array of witnesses makes this quite improbable.

Is it possible that the "other cities" in the previous verse 43 inspired some scribes to think of Judea?

Another possibility is that Judea is meant here as "land of the Jews" as in Mk 1:5 (so Weiss). This is also clearly meant in Lk 1:5 and possibly also in Lk 7:17 and Lk 23:5. This interpretation would also be in line with the statement in verse 43 "I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also".

It is interesting that the majority of Lectionaries apparently reads Ἰουδαίας here (Wachtel, SBL 2005).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 61

24. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 5:2 καὶ εἶδεν δύο πλοῖα ἐστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην· οἱ δὲ ἄλιεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες ἔπλυνον τὰ δίκτυα.

δύο πλοῖα P75, 01^{C2}, C^{C3}, D, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700, Maj, Lat, Bois, Trg

πλοῖα 01*

πλοῖα δύο B, W, 579, 892, pc, e, WH, Bal

δύο πλοιάρια A, C*, L, Q^{sic}, R, Ψ, 1*, 33, 1071, 1241, 1424, al, a, f, NA²⁵, WH^{mg}, Gre

πλοιάρια δύο Weiss (no manuscript support)

X omits 5:2a due to parablepsis (λίμνην - λίμνην).

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 John 6:23 ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοι[άρ]ια ἐκ Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.

πλοῖα P75, (01), B, W, Ψ, 157, pc, Lat

πλοιάρια A, (D), L, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 1071, 1424, Maj

NA28 John 6:24 ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ ζητοῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

πλοῖα (01), A, Θ, f1, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj

πλοιάρια P75, 01^{C2}, B, L, N, W, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, al

NA28 Luke 5:3 ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων,

NA28 Luke 5:7 καὶ κατένευσαν τοῖς μετόχοις ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοίῳ

Interesting, because a diminutive appears. Similar to Jo 6:23, see there.

Blass notes that diminutives are not accepted in "good Greek", so it is possible that scribes changed πλοιάρια into πλοῖα.

Difficult.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 23) notes that it is possible that scribes found the little boats too small for τὸν ὄχλον of verse 1. Placing δύο in front of πλοιάρια should emphasize it. He also suggests a possible conformation to Lk 5:3 and 5:7.

Th. Zahn (Comm. Lk.) thinks that the word order variation of $\delta\upsilon\acute{o}$ makes it suspect.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 62

Minority reading:

Luke 5:5; Luke 8:24; Luke 8:45; Luke 9:33; Luke 9:49

NA28 Luke 5:5 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς Σίμων εἶπεν· ἐπιστάτα, δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα.

διδάσκαλε D, a, d (magister, txt = praeceptor)

B: no umlauts

NA28 Luke 8:24 προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα. ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἐπαύσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη.

κύριε, κύριε D, d, Sy-C

διδάσκαλε a, c, e, r¹ (magister)

NA28 Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος· ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.

διδάσκαλε 157, a, d, r¹ (magister)

NA28 Luke 9:33 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διαχωρίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· ἐπιστάτα, καλὸν ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς ὧδε εἶναι, καὶ ποιήσωμεν σκηναὺς τρεῖς, μίαν σοὶ καὶ μίαν Μωϋσεῖ καὶ μίαν Ἡλίᾳ, μὴ εἰδῶς ὃ λέγει.

διδάσκαλε P45, X, 157, pc, a, b, d, r¹ (magister)

NA28 Luke 9:49 Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰωάννης εἶπεν· ἐπιστάτα, εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν.

διδάσκαλε P45, C*, L, Ξ, 157, 892, 1342, pc, e, a, d, r¹, vg^{ms}, Sy-H^{mg}, bo

omit: Sy-C

NA28 Luke 17:13 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν φωνὴν λέγοντες· Ἰησοῦ ἐπιστάτα, ἐλέησον ἡμᾶς.

omit: 472

Probably changed to avoid the unusual (for the NT) term.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 63

25. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 5:10 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου, οἳ ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμονα **ὁ** Ἰησοῦς· μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔση ζωγρῶν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, L, **WH**

txt 01, A, C, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, **[Trg]**

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς D

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησεν τὸν Πιλᾶτον Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας,

Πιλᾶτον ὁ Ἰωσήφ A, Θ, 157, 1424, Maj-part, TR

The addition of the article would only be natural to separate the two names. The same thing happened at the only other appearance of such a construction in the Gospels (see above).

On the other hand the support is limited and B is known to omit articles.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 64

NA28 Luke 5:17 καὶ δύνάμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν.

BYZ Luke 5:17 καὶ δύνάμις κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς.

T&T #6

Byz A, C, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, Maj,
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, goth, Trg

txt 01, B, L, W, Ξ, 579, 2542, pc⁸, Sy-S, sa, Trg^{mg}
pc = 313, 371, 434, 752, 1016, 1264, 1821, 1822

πάντας K, bo^{ms}

αὐτούς πάντας Sy-Pal?

Sy-Pal: UBS and IGNTP have it for the K reading, the conflated extra reading is only in Metzger's commentary. A.S. Lewis says "all have πάντας for αὐτόν."

omit καὶ δύνάμις ... αὐτόν 1241 (h.t.? καὶ ... καὶ?)

X omits καὶ δύνάμις κυρίου ἦν for unknown reasons.

B: no umlaut

εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν AcI "for his healing"

εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς "to heal them"

Compare:

NA²⁷ Luke 4:40 Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτούς πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.

Robertson: "neat Greek, but awkward English". Possibly the AcI has not been understood. αὐτόν is the subject of τὸ ἰᾶσθαι, not the object.

It is possible that αὐτόν has been changed to αὐτούς as a conformation to Lk 4:40. There is no reason for a change from αὐτούς to αὐτόν.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 65

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 5:25 καὶ παραχρῆμα ἀναστὰς ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, ἄρας ἐφ' ὃ κατέκειτο, ἀπήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ δοξάζων τὸν θεόν.

NA28 Luke 5:26 καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεόν καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες ὅτι εἶδομεν παράδοξα σήμερον.

omit: D, M, S, W, X, Ψ, Ω*, 157, 579, 1241, pc¹⁰, e, d
118, 205, 209(=f1),
13, 69, 124, 174, 788(=f13),

καὶ ἔκστασις ἔλαβεν ἅπαντας a

f13: 230, 346, 828, 983 have the words.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:8 ιδόντες δὲ οἱ ὄχλοι ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἐδόξασαν τὸν θεόν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώποις.

NA28 Mark 2:12 καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων, ὥστε ἐξίστασθαι πάντας καὶ δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν λέγοντας ὅτι οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδομεν.

Very probably omitted due to h.t. (ending verse 25).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 66

NA28 Luke 5:33 Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν· _____ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν.

Byz Luke 5:33 Οἱ δὲ εἶπον πρὸς αὐτόν διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν

Byz 01^{*,c2}, A, C, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892^{mg}, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo^{pt}, goth, [Trg]

txt P4(200 CE), 01^{c1}, B, L, W, Ξ, 33, 157, 892^{*}, 1241, pc, sa, bo^{pt}

IGNTP and Hoskier's collation have 157 for txt, Swanson erroneously for Byz. Checked at the film.

892: The words have been added in the margin (triplet insertion sign), probably by the original hand.

Sy-S and Sy-C have lacunae.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:14 Τότε προσέρχονται αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου λέγοντες· διὰ τί ἡμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν [πολλά], οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σου οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

NA28 Mark 2:18 Καὶ ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύοντες. καὶ ἔρχονται καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῶν Φαρισαίων νηστεύουσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν;

Very probably a harmonization to Mt, Mk (so Weiss). There is no reason for an omission.

The omission makes a statement out of a question. Jesus answers in verse 34 although it merely says: ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· So, on the one hand it is possible that the διὰ τί has been added to create a question. On the other hand it is possible that the absence of ἀποκριθεὶς in verse 34 led to the excision of διὰ τί in verse 33 (so Hoskier).

Compare Mk 2:18 where first the statement is made which is then followed by the question!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 67

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 5:33 Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτόν· οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσιν πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν.

οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σου οὐδὲν τούτων ποιοῦσιν.

tui autem discipuli (e:discentes) nihil horum faciunt.

D, d, e, Wellhausen

οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύουσιν (:: Mt 9:14, Mk 2:18)

517, 954, 1424, 1675 = fam. 1424 = von Soden I^{9a}

Sy-S and Sy-C have lacunae.

B: no umlaut

Possibly the words "eat and drink" have been avoided, because Christians were accused by pagan critics to be gluttons and drunkards (so Kannaday).

It is also possible that the words have been changed, because the prayers were not mentioned.

Wellhausen (comm. Lk 1904), to the contrary, thinks that the very general "don't do anything of this" was considered objectionable.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 68

26. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 5:36 Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή γε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ.

BYZ Luke 5:36 Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι Οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἱματίου καινοῦ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίζει καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνεῖ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ

Not in NA, and only Byz in SQE!

ἱματίου καινοῦ
ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ A, C, R, Δ, Ψ, 565, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, goth X, f13, 700, Sy-H

ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας
ἀπὸ σχίσας ἱματίου καινοῦ Ψ, 157^c, 579
Θ, Sy-P

ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας P4(200 CE), 01, B, D, L, W, Θ, Ξ, f1, 22, 33, 157*, 892, 1241, pc, d, Co

P4: Acc. to Comfort P4* reads: ἀπὸ ἱματίου παλαιοῦ σχίσας which has been corrected then into txt. This is not noted in NA and IGNTP. Comfort is probably correct.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

Sy-S and Sy-C have lacunae.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:16 οὐδεὶς δὲ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ· αἴρει γὰρ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱματίου καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται.

NA28 Mark 2:21 Οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή, αἴρει τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ καὶ χεῖρον σχίσμα γίνεται.

One of the rare cases with an omission in the Byzantine text (note also next variant).

Both parallel accounts have the genitive without the preposition, but both use different words here and also the sense is slightly different. It seems that σχίζω, "tear", is required in the first place, because καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίζει = "also the new will be torn" takes up the word again. Possibly it has been added for this reason?

The only reason to omit σχίσας would be to make it more conform to the parallel accounts.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 69

27. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 5:36 Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἱματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μή γε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει
καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ.

BYZ Luke 5:36 Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι Οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα ἱματίου καινοῦ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἱμάτιον παλαιόν· εἰ δὲ μήγε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίζει
καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνεῖ _____ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ

Byz A, K, Π, R, Δ, Ψ, 565, Maj, goth

txt P4(200 CE), 01, B, C, D, L, W, X, Y, Θ, Λ, 0211, 0233, f1, f13, 33, 157,
579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542, al, Latt, Sy, Co
τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ ἐπίβλημα D

P4: The editio princeps (Merell, 1938) reconstructs:

ΤΩ ΠΑΛΑΙΩ ΟΥ [CΥ]Μ
ΦΩΝΗΣΕΙ ΤΟ [ΕΠΙΒ]ΛΗ
ΜΑ ΤΟ ΑΠΟ ΤΟΥ Κ[ΑΙΝ]ΟΥ

Lacuna: E, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

It is possible that in the txt reading a direct subject has been added. This is supported by the fact that in D the word has been added at the end. Is this an independent addition or a re-ordering?

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 70

NA28 Luke 5:38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.

BYZ Luke 5:38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον
καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

T&T #7

Byz A, C, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo^{mss}, goth, [Trg]
βάλλουσιν καὶ ἀμφότεροι τηροῦνται D, it, Sy-P, Marcion^A

txt P4(200 CE), P75^{vid}, 01^{C1}, B, L, W, f1, 33, 131, 157, 579, 700, 1241, pc², Co
01*: βάλλουσιν
W: βάλληται
pc = 5, 301^C

Lacuna: Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 9:17 ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς, καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Mark 2:22 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς.

BYZ Mark 2:22 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς καινοὺς βλητέον.

omit: 01*, B, pc³

pc = 1041, 1282, 2528*

01 corrected by 01^{C1}

Very probably a harmonization to Mt.

Note the rare βλητέον, a verbal adjective from βάλλω: "must be put". This word is basically safe in Lk. It is very questionable if the omission in Mk is correct.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 71

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 5:39 [καὶ] οὐδεὶς πινὼν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστίν.

Western non-interpolation

omit verse: D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹), Marcion?, (Eus)

WH have the verse in brackets.

txt P4, P75 ..., Lat(aur, f, q, vg)

omit καί: P4, P75^{vid}, 01^{C2}, B, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc (see next variant).

Marcion: Harnack thinks that Marcion deleted this verse.

Eusebius: Deduced from his canon tables, which have no extra number for this verse, but assign the whole paragraph '40 II', i.e. present in all three Gospels. (for other canon table cases compare Mt 17:21, Mk 15:28, Lk 22:43-44 and Lk 23:34)

Lacuna: Ξ , Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Context:

³⁰ The Pharisees and their scribes were complaining to his disciples, saying, "Why do you eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners?" ³¹ Jesus answered, "Those who are well have no need of a physician, but those who are sick; ³² I have come to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance." ³³ Then they said to him, "John's disciples, like the disciples of the Pharisees, frequently fast and pray, but your disciples eat and drink. ³⁴ Jesus said to them, "You cannot make wedding guests fast while the bridegroom is with them, can you? ³⁵ The days will come when the bridegroom will be taken away from them, and then they will fast in those days." ³⁶ He also told them a parable: "No one tears a piece from a new garment and sews it on an old garment; otherwise the new will be torn, and the piece from the new will not match the old. ³⁷ And no one puts new wine into old wineskins; otherwise the new wine will burst the skins and will be spilled, and the skins will be destroyed. ³⁸ But new wine must be put into fresh wineskins.

³⁹ And no one after drinking old wine desires new wine, but says, 'The old is good.'"

Compare:

Gospel of Thomas logion 47.3

"No person drinks old wine and immediately desires to drink new wine."

The verse is not in Mt and not in Mk. It has possibly been omitted due to the harmonizing tendency of D in Lk. Another reason for omission might be that the sentence seems to contradict the previous two verses.

Overall the sentence is difficult to understand in the context. This can be seen in the commentaries which have difficulties to come up with a sufficient explanation.

B. Weiss thinks the verse was meant to make excuse for the disciples of John. So also Schlatter. There is no need for everybody to drink the new wine (already now), not all are wedding guests. Schlatter suggests that it is possible that Jesus forbade his disciples to think dismissive about the disciples of John. Compare also Lk 11:1, where the disciples of John have their own prayer, too.

Zahn sees some sympathetic humor here, that Jesus means one should not wonder about the criticism, that it is quite normal.

Plummer says that the word is meant to show "how natural it is that those who have been brought up under these [old] forms should be unwilling to abandon them for something untried. The conversion of an outcast *τελώνης*, who has no such prejudices, may be easier than one whose life is bound up in the formalism of the past."

Trench ("Studies in the Gospels", 1867, p. 185): "no man used to the old straightway desires the new, even though it be of a much higher quality. But let them have time and opportunity little by little to wean themselves from that old, and doubtless there would be found among them those who would grow into liking of this new, which indeed in a higher sense is the oldest of all (Gal 3:17; 1.Jo 2:7-8)."

Compare also Godet, for some other explanations. It is possible to explain the words, but it is not straightforward.

There is no reason for a secondary addition of the words, but it is easily understandable to delete the words due to its difficulty. Perhaps this is also the reason why the words are missing in Mt and Mk.

Why Marcion omitted the sentence is clear, because he thought it validated the authority of the OT.

The saying also appears in the Gospel of Thomas.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 72

28. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 5:39 **[καὶ]** οὐδεὶς πιῶν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστίν.

No txt in NA but in SQE!

omit P4, P75^{vid}, 01^{C2}, B, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc, **WH**

txt 01*, A, C, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, Maj, aur, f, q, vg, **WH^{mg}**

D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹) omit the verse.

WH has the complete verse in single brackets (Western non-interpolation).

B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 5:37 καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει οἶνον νέον εἰς ἀσκοὺς παλαιούς· εἰ δὲ μή γε, ῥήξει ὁ οἶνος ὁ νέος τοὺς ἀσκοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐκχυθήσεται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται·

The addition of καὶ could be a conformation to context, verse 37. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 73

NA28 Luke 5:39 [καὶ] οὐδεὶς πινὼν παλαιὸν _____ θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ· ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστίν.

BYZ Luke 5:39 Καὶ οὐδεὶς πινὼν παλαιὸν εὐθέως θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ, Ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερός ἐστίν.

Byz A, C², Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Vogels εὐθὺς X, pc

txt P4, P75^{vid}, 01, B, C*, L, W, f1, 157, 579, 1241, pc, Co, arm

omit the verse: D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹)

Lacuna: E, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

If one compares the discussion and explanation of the previous variant, εὐθέως makes perfect sense. Godet:

"It is not easy to pass from a system, with which one has been identified from childhood, to an entirely different principle of life. Such men must be allowed time to familiarize themselves with the new principle that is presented to them. ... It is altogether an error in the Alex, that has erased here the word εὐθέως, immediately. The very idea of the parable is concentrated in this adverb. We must not judge such people by their first impression. The antipathy which they experience at the first moment will perhaps give place to a contrary feeling. We must give them time, as Jesus did Nicodemus."

Bengel: "Paulatim mutantur habitus animorum."

It is probable that εὐθέως has been added secondarily to make this interpretation more explicit. Plummer (ICC, 1922): "undoubtedly spurious εὐθέως".

It is in principle possible that the word has been deleted either because it was not understood anymore or the words were interpreted in a different way, but this appears not very probable.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 74

NA28 Luke 5:39 [καὶ] οὐδεὶς πῶν παλαιὸν θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ·
ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστός ἐστίν.

BYZ Luke 5:39 καὶ οὐδεὶς πῶν παλαιὸν εὐθέως θέλει νέον· λέγει γάρ·
Ὁ παλαιὸς χρηστότερός ἐστίν

"the old is good"

"the old is better"

Byz A, C, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, goth, Trg^{mg}
txt P4(200 CE), P75^{vid}, 01, B, L, W, 157, 1241, 1342, pc, Sy-P, Co

omit the verse: D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹)

Lat(aur, f, q, vg) read txt:

melius	aur, f, vg
suavior	q
suavior/melius	δ

Sy-S and Sy-C have lacunae.

From P75 only the last S of χρηστός is visible, but space calculations make it improbable that it read χρηστότερός.

Lacuna: Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

The Byzantine reading indicates a misinterpretation: The person who sticks with the old does not do it because the old is better (in his view), but because it is good (enough). He has not tried the new one, so he cannot know if it is better.

Is it possible that the word has been changed to avoid confusion with Χριστός?

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 75

29. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 6:1 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ σπορίμων,

BYZ Luke 6:1 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ τῶν σπορίμων

T&T #8

Byz A, C, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 892, Maj,
Lat(a, aur, d, f, ff², vg), Sy-H, goth, Gre
Lat = sabbato secundoprimo

txt P4(200 CE), P75^{vid}, 01, B, L, W, f1, 69, 788(=f13), 22, 33, 157, 579, 1241,
2542, pc⁸, it(b, c, e, l, q, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, Co
pc = 588, 697, 791, 1005, 1210, 1365, 2372, 2670

sabbato mane e
= "in the morning" (πρωῖ)

σαββάτῳ δευτέρῳ πρωῖ cj. François Bovon, 1989 (Lk Com.)

Tregelles has σαββάτῳ [δευτεροπρώτῳ] in the margin.

Lacuna: Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 4:31 Καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας.
καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν:

NA28 Luke 6:6 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἐτέρῳ σαββάτῳ

Compare LXX:

LXX Psalm 23:1 ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ τῆς μιᾶς σαββάτων τοῦ κυρίου

LXX Psalm 47:1 ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς τοῖς υἱοῖς Κορε δευτέρῃ σαββάτου

LXX Psalm 93:1 ψαλμὸς τῷ Δαυιδ τετράδι σαββάτων

KJV: "on the second sabbath after the first"

External against internal evidence.

A real mystery. The word occurs nowhere else (M.A. Robinson notes the titles of several psalms, which also contain similar references of (today) unknown meaning). The reading is normally considered as originating through some strange scribal blunder. But the given explanations are quite unsatisfactory. The best is that of Skeat who thinks of a dittography BATWBATW, which was subsequently interpreted as -BATW BA-TW with B and A representing numbers.

Another explanation is that some scribe wrote πρώτῳ here, with reference to the other Sabbath in 6:6, but then remembered an earlier Sabbath in 4:31 and correct the πρώτῳ into δευτέρῳ, which then led to δευτεροπρώτῳ, but this appears very far-fetched. Klein argues that actually Luke himself wrote πρώτῳ.

François Bovon in his Luke commentary conjectures σαββάτῳ δευτέρῳ πρωῖ. The problem with this suggestion is, as Bovon himself acknowledges, that Luke does not like the word πρωῖ and avoids it when he finds it in Mark. However, the advantage of the emendation for the narrative is that the early time of the day explains the hunger of the disciples.

H. Sahlin (NovT 24 (1982) 160-79) notes the word-order variant later in the verse:

NA28 Luke 6:1 καὶ ἥσθιον τοὺς στάχυας ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν.

BYZ Luke 6:1 τοὺς στάχυας καὶ ἥσθιον ψώχοντες ταῖς χερσίν

Sahlin suggests that some scribe wrote δεύτερον πρῶτον above the words to indicate exchange. Another scribe misunderstood this and created the variant.

The meaning was already unknown in Jerome's time. He asked Gregor Nazianz about it, but he didn't know it either.

Eustratius (in his Life of Eutychius) refers to the δευτεροπρώτη κυριακή as the first Sunday after Easter. The word δευτερέσχατος is also known (see Th. Zahn, Comm. Lk.).

It remains strange. If the word is correct, it must have been borrowed from something in the Jewish calendar, and should have been generally known. Then there would be no reason for an omission.

It might additionally be noted that δευτεροπρώτῳ is visually and acoustically similar to the following word διαπορεύεσθαι.

Compare:

- GW Buchanan and C.Wolfe "The 'Second-First Sabbath' (Luke 6:1)"
JBL 97 (1978) 259-262
- T.C. Skeat "The 'Second-First' Sabbath (Lk 6:1): The final solution"
NTS 30 (1988) 103
- Hans Klein "Am ersten Sabbat - Eine Konjektur zu Lk 6:1" ZNW 87
(1996) 290-93

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 76

30. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 6:2 τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασι;

BYZ Luke 6:2 τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι

ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι A, C, K, Π, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, Maj, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth

ποιεῖν ἐν σάββασι Δ, Λ*
ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτω Ψ, f13^a, 1241 (::Mt)

ποιεῖν τοῖς σάββασι 01, (D), U, W, f1, 124, 892, pc
τοῖς σάββασι ποιεῖν L

txt P4(200 CE), P75^{vid}, B, R, 69, 788(=f13), 700, pc, Lat, sa, bo^{pt}

D: ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου τοῖς σάββασι ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;

Lacuna: E, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:2 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπαν αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ οἱ μαθηταί σου ποιοῦσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτω.

ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι 157, 1071

NA28 Mark 2:24 ἴδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασι ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;

Compare:

NA28 Luke 4:31 καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς σάββασι.

NA28 Luke 13:10

Ἦν δὲ διδάσκων ἐν μιᾷ τῶν συναγωγῶν ἐν τοῖς σάββασι.

The D reading seems to be a harmonistic combination from Mt and Mk.

The Byzantine reading could be a harmonization to Mt. There is no reason for an omission. The support for txt is slim. In 4:31 and 13:10 Lk uses ἐν τοῖς σάββασι. Stylistic reasons?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 77

31. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:3 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ [ὄντες].

NA28 Luke 6:4 [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ

omit: P4(200 CE), B, D, Bal

ὡς 01*, W, 579, 892, [Trg]

πῶς 01^{cs}, L, X, Θ, f1, 69, 788(=f13), 33, 157, 700, 1241, pc, L890

ὄντες ὡς A, C, K, Π, Δ, 579, Maj, goth, [Trg^{mg}], Tis

ὄντες πῶς R, f13, 1071, 517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc

πάντες πῶς 124, 174 (=f13), L211

ὄντες Bois

Lacuna: E, Sy-S

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:3 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε ἐπείνασεν καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,

NA28 Matthew 12:4 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ

W: ὡς

NA28 Mark 2:25 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· οὐδέποτε ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὅτε χρεῖαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ____

NA28 Mark 2:26 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ

omit πῶς: B, D

add ὄντες: D

add ἦσαν: Δ

The omission of ὄντες is possibly a harmonization to Mt, Mk (so Weiss). On the other hand it could have been added to improve style. Note the similar changes in Mk!

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 78

NA28 Luke 6:4 [ὡς] εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως λαβὼν ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν ___ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς;

BYZ Luke 6:4 ὡς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔλαβεν καὶ ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς

Byz 01, A, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Sy-H, bo

txt P4^{vid}(200 CE), B, L, W, Ψ, f1, 372, 1352, 1604, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-Pal^{ms}, sa, goth

omit: καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ 700

IGNTP has bo for txt, NA for Byz

Lacuna: C, Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 2:26 καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὖσιν;

omit: D, Lat

There is no reason for an omission. The καὶ fits good and is probably a natural addition here. Note a similar case in the next verse 5 (see below). It is possibly a harmonization to Mk (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 79

Minority reading: Lk 6:5 D

NA28 Luke 6:4 [ὥς] εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως λαβὼν ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ, οὓς οὐκ ἔξεστιν φαγεῖν εἰ μὴ μόνους τοὺς ἱερεῖς; τ

The so called "Cambridge pericope":

τ τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ·

ἄνθρωπε εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς μακάριος εἶ. εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νόμου.

Eodem die videns quendam operantem sabbato et dixit illi:

Homo, siquidem scis, quod facis, beatus es, si autem nescis, maledictus et trabaricator legis.

by D, d

Lacuna: Sy-S, Sy-C

B: no umlaut

"On the same day he saw a man working on the Sabbath and said to him: Man, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed, but if you do not know, you are accursed and a transgressor of the law."

This passage is generally referred to as Lk 6:5D, but D actually shifts verse 5 after verse 10. This way D has three incidents concerning Jesus and the Sabbath which are finished by the statement of Jesus' sovereignty over the Sabbath. Good composition, but excluded by external evidence.

WH: "Possibly from the same source as the Section on the woman taken in adultery."

E Bammel writes: "The old Latin codex Palatinus (e) introduces Luke 6:1 by the addition of *mane* to the normal text, that means in a way which suggests that another story was to follow later on the same day - as it actually does in D. If this is right, it would point to the existence of the pericope at some stage of the Latin version and thereby to a more widespread occurrence, the last trace of which is found in e."

For the phrase παραβάτης τοῦ νόμου compare:

NA28 Romans 2:25 Περιτομή μὲν γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἔαν νόμον πράσσης· ἔαν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ᾗς, ἡ περιτομή σου ἄκροβυστία γέγονεν.

NA28 Romans 2:27 καὶ κρινεῖ ἡ ἐκ φύσεως ἄκροβυστία τὸν νόμον τελοῦσα σὲ τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομῆς παραβάτην νόμου.

NA28 James 2:11 ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν· μὴ μοιχεύσης, εἶπεν καὶ· μὴ φονεύσης· εἰ δὲ οὐ μοιχεύεις φονεύεις δέ, γέγονας παραβάτης νόμου.

A. Plummer (ICC Com. Lk 1922) considers it possible that both Paul and James got the phrase παραβάτης νόμου from the source of the tradition presented in D.

Compare:

- E. Bammel "The Cambridge pericope. The addition to Lk 6:4 in Codex Bezae" NTS 32 (1986) 404-26
- J.D.M Derrett "Luke 6:5 D reexamined" NovT 37 (1995) 232-48
- T. Nicklas "Das Agraphon vom 'Sabbatarbeiter' und sein Kontext: Lk 6:1-11 in der Textform des Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (D)" NovT 44 (2002) 160-175

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 80

32. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 6:5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς·
κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

BYZ Luke 6:5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι
κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου

Byz A, D, L, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, Maj,
Latt, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}, goth, Marcion^E, WH^{mg}, Gre, Trg

txt 01, B, W, 1241, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, WH, NA²⁵

omit ὅτι: P4, 01*, B, W, f1, 157, 579, 700, 954, pc

D has verse 5 after verse 10!

Lacuna: C, Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

P4 is not noted in NA. In IGNTP it is not noted as defective and also not in the apparatus (except that it omits ὅτι). So one must assume that it reads Byz. But this is certainly not correct. P. Comfort has P4 for txt, but the ed. princeps (J. Merrell RB 47, 1938, 5-22) reads (letters in red doubtful):

[ΤΟΥ]C ΙΕΡΕΙC· ΚΑΙ ΕΛΕ
[ΓΕ]N ΑΥΤΟΙC ΚC ΕCΤΙΝ
[ΚΑΙ ΤΟΥ CΑΒΒΑ ΤΟΥ Ο]
[ΥΙΟC] ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ
ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΔΕ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΕΤΕ
ΡΩ CΑΒΒΑ ΤΩ ΕΙCΕΛΘΕΙΝ

This also Skeat (NTS 1997) notes, without presenting the text: "καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου: the καὶ is required by the space". From the above reconstruction this seems reasonable, but it would create a singular reading (note that this is the reading of the TR in Mt!).

Unfortunately the image I have is too bad to make out any letter.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:8

κύριος γάρ ἐστίν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου

f1, 33, 157, 788, 1424, pc, vg (not in NA and not in SQE)

καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

124, 372, 565, al, f, vg^{ms}, Sy-Pal, TR (!)

NA28 Mark 2:28 ὥστε

κύριός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ τοῦ σαββάτου.

Either the txt reading is a harmonization to Mt or the Byzantine reading is a harmonization to Mk (so Weiss). Generally a harmonization to Mt is more probable than to Mk. Also the support is quite limited for the txt reading.

The ὅτι is not in the Matthean parallel (but there is a γάρ, and in verse 12:6 there is a ὅτι). There is no reason to omit the ὅτι in Lk. It was possibly added to separate κύριός from the preceding, because one could interpret the words as καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριός ...

Note also that some witnesses at Mt 12:8 have the reading with καὶ, either as a harmonization to Byz-Lk or to Mk. Interestingly some witnesses in Mt insert the καὶ between ἐστίν and τοῦ σαββάτου, without parallel. This is possibly the reading of P4 in Lk.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 81

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς τ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου. ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

τ ἐν ὀργῇ D, X, Θ, Λ, f1, 230(=f13), 22, 1071, al,
it(aur, b, c, d, ff², l, q, r¹), vg^{ms}, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{msg}, arm, arab^{MS}

τ μετ' ὀργῆς f13, 157, 2542

in ira aur, b, d, ff², l, q, r¹, vg^{ms}
iratus c

et vidit et viliabundus e (= bili abundus? = full of wrath, anger?)

No manuscript of f13 omits this!

f, vg read txt.

D has verse 5 after verse 10!

Lacuna: C, Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ πωρώσει τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

Probably inspired from Mk. This emotional release is a-typical for Lk. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 82

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου. ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ
αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ
Ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ
αὐτοῦ ὕγιης ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

Byz A, D, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 892, 1071, Maj, it, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal

ὕγιης ὡς ἡ ἄλλη E, M, S, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, f13, 28, 700, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj, c

ὡς ἡ ἄλλη ὕγιης 892

ὡς ἡ ἄλλη A, K, Π, Q, U, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 047, 0211, 174, 788(=f13), 157,
565, 2542, al,
b, q, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, arm, geo, goth, [Trg]

ὡς καὶ ἡ ἄλλη D, f1, pc, f, r¹

ὕγιης W, 579

txt P4(200 CE), P75^{vid}, 01, B, L, 33, pc, Lat(a, aur, e, ff², l, vg), Co

D has verse 5 after verse 10!

Lacuna: C, Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

B: umlaut! (1314 B 36 L) 10 ... αὐτοῦ. 11 αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐπλήσθησαν

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:13 τότε λέγει τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ· ἔκτεινόν σου τὴν χεῖρα.
καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ὕγιης ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

ὡς ἡ ἄλλη. it, Sy
ὕγιης 01, C^c, 892*

NA28 Mark 3:5 Ἐκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Mark 3:5 Ἐκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα σου. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ ὕγιης ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

Byz C^c, L, Θ^{Cmg}, f13, 157, 892, Maj, a, b, c, Sy-S
omit ὕγιης 346, a, b, c, Sy-S

txt 01, A, B, C*, K, P, W, Δ, Θ*, Λ, Π, f1, 33, 565, 579, pc,
Lat(aur, e, f, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

εὐθέως D, it(d, ff², i, r¹)

Clearly a harmonization to Mt. The variation is interesting.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 83

33. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 6:17 Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος,

BYZ Luke 6:17 Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ καὶ ὄχλος μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος

Not in NA but in SQE!

Byz A, D, Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy-S, Sy-H, bo, goth, Trg
ὄχλος τῶν μαθητῶν Ψ (Swanson)
ὁ ὄχλος τῶν μαθητῶν Ψ (IGNTP)

txt P75, 01, B, L, W, f1, 579, 892, 1241, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, sa
ὄχλος πολὺς τῶν μαθητῶν 579

μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν 157 (without καὶ)

omit: καὶ ὄχλος μαθητῶν 983

Lacuna: C, E

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 3:7 Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας [ἠκολούθησεν], καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας

NA28 Matthew 4:25 καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 5:29 Καὶ ἐποίησεν δοχὴν μεγάλην Λευὶς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων οἳ ἦσαν μετ' αὐτῶν κατακεῖμενοι.

NA28 Luke 7:11 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναῖν καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς.

The term ὄχλος (πολὺς) μαθητῶν = crowd of disciples, appears nowhere else. But in Lk 5:29 appears ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν.

It is possible that πολὺς has been added as an enhancement or from 5:29. The support is not very good.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 132) thinks that πολὺς has been omitted, because it seemed too much for the group of disciples.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 84

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:17 Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλὴμ ῥ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος,

<u>ῥ καὶ Πιραΐας</u>	01* (corrected by 01 ^{C2})
<u>ῥ καὶ Περαΐας</u>	L150*, L299
<u>ῥ καὶ τῆς Περέας</u>	W, ff ²
<u>ῥ et trans fretum</u>	it (a, b, c, ff ² , l, q, r ¹), vg ^{mss} fretum = "sea, strait, channel"

Lacuna: C, E

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 3:7-8 Καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας [ἠκολούθησεν], καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας 8 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρον καὶ Σιδῶνα πλῆθος πολὺ ἀκούοντες ὅσα ἐποίει ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

Lat = et trans Iordanen

NA28 Matthew 4:25 καὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἱεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου. Lat = et de trans Iordanen

This is the area east of the Jordan. A natural addition, possibly inspired from the parallels, where πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου appears, which represents approximately the same area.

WH: "e has et de transmarinis, omitting the following καὶ τῆς παραλίου, rendered et maritima by most Latins. The Latin reading probably represents καὶ Περαΐας, which must thus be regarded as Western."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 85

34. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 6:25 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν, ὅτι πεινάσετε.

οὐαὶ _____, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.

BYZ Luke 6:25 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι ὅτι πεινάσετε

οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:26 οὐαὶ τ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι·
κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

omit 1. ὑμῖν: K, L, Θ, Ξ, 0147, f13, 579, 892, pc
(not in NA and SQE but in Tis)
f13: 124, 174, 230, 346 have the word.

add 2. ὑμῖν: P75, A, D, P, Q, R, Δ, Ψ, 33, 1071, 1342, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

omit 2. = txt: 01, B, K, L, T, W, X, Θ, Ξ, 0147, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892,
1241, al, Sy-S
f13: 124, 174, 230, 346 have the word.

add 6:26 ὑμῖν: D, W*, Δ, 2, 69(=f13), 1424, pc, b, d, r¹, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, Ir^{Lat}

W: In verse 26, dots above the word indicate it for deletion.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Luke 6:24 Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις, ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν
παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.

The additions can be explained as making the sayings more symmetrical. The omissions could be made for similar reasons, to harmonize with the following "woe's" which miss the ὑμῖν.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 86

35. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 6:26 οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

BYZ Luke 6:26 Οὐαὶ ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι· κατὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

T&T #9

Byz (D), P, Q, R, W, X, Θ, Ξ, 0135, 0211, f1, f13, 22, 157, 700, 1241, Maj,

NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Trg, Bal, SBL

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς ὑμῖν εἴπωσιν D

_____ ὅταν καλῶς ὑμῖν εἴπωσιν 28, pc⁵

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν W, Δ, 2, 1424

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς ἡμᾶς εἴπωσιν 472, 2287

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς _____ εἴπωσιν 69

καλῶς εἴπωσιν ὑμᾶς 01, A, H, L, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, (2542), al³⁵⁰,
Tis

txt P75, B, 2710

Acc. to T&T D reads καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν. This is an error (checked at the facsimile). NA and Swanson have correctly καλῶς ὑμῖν εἴπωσιν.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 6:22 μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·

In verse 22 the word order with the pronoun at the end is safe. This rules out the 01 et al. reading as a conformation to context. The support for this reading is also not coherent.

The support for txt is slim.

In the Gospels καλῶς is invariably followed by the verb. Thus the Byz reading is unusual.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 87

NA28 Luke 6:26 οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι·
κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

BYZ Luke 6:26 οὐαὶ ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἴπωσιν _____ οἱ ἄνθρωποι·
κατὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἐποιοῦν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν

T&T #10

Byz D, L, Γ, Δ, 28, 157, 892*, Maj-part⁹⁹⁷, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-P, bo^{pt}, Marcion^T

txt P75, 01, A, B, E, H, K, Π, M, P, Q, R, U, W, X, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, 0135, 0211, f1, f13,
22, 33, 565, 579, 700, 892^{mg}, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj-part⁶⁵⁰,

Lat, sa, bo^{pt}, goth

omit οἱ: W, f13, pc⁴ (f13: 69, 124, 174, 346 have it)

οἱ ἄνθρωποι πάντες 01, pc³

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally πάντες in brackets in the margin.

Lacuna: C

892: πάντες has been added in the margin (wavy line plus two dots as insertion sign), probably by a later hand.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 6:22 μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι

πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι is a little strange, because it would be quite unusual if ALL would speak well to you. Also, πάντες "was felt to be inconsistent with the other member of the comparison" (Metzger).

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks it is a conformation to 6:22.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 88

36. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:26 οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι·
κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

omit: P75^{vid}, B, 700*, 1241, pc, Sy-S, sa, Weiss

txt 01, A, D, L, P, R, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700^c, 892,
1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, Marcion^T

700: The words are added in the margin by a later hand.

Lacuna: Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 6:23 χάριτε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ
μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς
προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

There is no reason for an omission. On the other hand there is a strong reason
for an addition: to harmonize it with verse 23 (so Weiss).

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the words have been added to supply a subject for
ἐποίουν, overlooking that πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι was the subject.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 89

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:29 τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα παρέχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσης.

<u>εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα</u>	01*
<u>εἰς τὴν _____ σιαγόνα</u>	D, P, W, Θ, 700, 892, 2542, pc, Cl, Or, Tis
<u>ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα</u>	E*, 28, 579, 983, 1241, 1424, 1675
<u>txt + add σου:</u>	r ¹ , sa, arm

txt P75^{vid}, 01^{C2}, A, B, K, Π, L, P, R, X, Δ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 1071, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo, goth

01: The reading of 01* in NA is in error. NA says δεξιὰν is inserted AFTER σιαγόνα. This is not correct according to Tischendorf's facsimile. The error is confirmed by Klaus Witte from Muenster.

P75: has a lacuna, but from space considerations it is very improbable that it has the word δεξιὰν.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 5:39 ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ραπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·

BYZ Matthew 5:39 ἀλλ' ὅστις σε ραπίσει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν [σου] σιαγόνα στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην·

ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν σου σιαγόνα K, Π, M, L, Θ, f13, 579, 700, 1424, Maj-part, Gre

ἐπὶ τὴν _____ σιαγόνα σου D, k, Sy-S, Sy-C, Aug^{codd}.

ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα 01^{C2}, f1, 346(=f13), 22, 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj-part, Or, Cyr

εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα 01*, W, 983, 1689(=f13^c), pc (Legg: Σ?)

one of the previous two: a, f, h, sa

εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα σου B, Eus, [NA²⁵], [WH], Bois, Weiss

NA²⁵, WH have σου in brackets

Interestingly nobody added σου in Lk (well, one manuscript did acc. to Legg: 1604), but quite some omitted δεξιὰν, as does D in Mt.

IQP's Crit. ed. has εἰς τὴν _____ σιαγόνα for Q ! This reading is not supported for Mt and only a minority "Western" reading in Lk.
Fleddermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα σου for Q.
Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 89) has εἰς τὴν [δεξιάν] σιαγόνα [σου].

Compare the discussion in Mt 5:39!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 90

NA28 Luke 6:31 Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.

BYZ Luke 6:31 καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως

Byz 01, A, D, L, P, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 892, 1342, Maj, Lat(b, c, d, e, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth, WH^{mg}, Trg
ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε 565, e
καὶ ὑμεῖς ὁμοίως ποιεῖτε 892

txt P75^{vid}, B, 579, 700, 1241, it(a, aur, ff², l), Ir^{Lat}, Cl, WH, NA²⁵

καλὰ ποιεῖτε r¹, vg^{mss}, Sy-S
bona facite

Tregelles has additionally καὶ ὑμεῖς in brackets in the margin.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:12 Πάντα οὖν ὅσα ἐὰν θέλητε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς·

καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε L
οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ὁμοίως ποιεῖτε 157

There is no reason for an omission. Except possibly to make it more terse, as an aphorism. The addition on the other hand would be quite natural. It could be a partial harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). The support for txt is rather slim.

IQP's Crit. ed. has οὕτως ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς for Q, a reading that is neither in Mt nor in Lk. Fleddermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has the same reading! Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 90) has the Matthean οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 91

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:35 πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδέν ἀπελπίζοντες·

μηδένα 01, W, Ξ, Π, 1071, pc, Sy-S, Sy-P, WH^{mg}

B: no umlaut

μηδέν accusative neuter singular

μηδένα accusative masculine singular

δανίζω "lend (money)"

ἀπελπίζω "expect in return"

"But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for nothing again"

"But love your enemies, and do good, and lend, hoping for no one"

No parallel.

The variant reading μηδένα does not fit the context. It probably arose as a transcriptional error: **ΜΗΔΕΝΑ ΑΠΕΛΠΙΖΟΝΤΕΣ**

ΜΗΔΕΝΑ ΑΠΕΛΠΙΖΟΝΤΕΣ

Accidentally the A has been doubled (so Weiss).

Weiss (*Textkritik*, p. 33) notes additionally that it could also be a reflection on τοὺς ἐχθροὺς which, then, requires the masculine.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 92

37. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:36 Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς **[καὶ]** ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.

omit 01, B, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 579, 1071, pc, c, d, Sy-S, Co, Marcion^T, Cl, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt A, D, Θ, 1582^c, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Cyp, Bas, **[Trg]**

IGNTP adds for the omission P74^{vid}. This is an error, since P74 does not contain Lk. They probably mean P75? But P75 has a lacuna here, and from space considerations it is impossible to judge if a καὶ was present or not due to the varying line length at this position.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 5:48 ἔσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὡς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος τέλειός ἐστιν.

add καὶ: 346, Chrys, Bas

Compare:

NA28 Luke 11:1 δίδαξον ἡμᾶς προσεύχεσθαι, καθὼς καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐδίδαξεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ.

omit καὶ: 01*, Δ, f1, 69, 700, pc
(corr. by 01^{ci})

NA28 Luke 24:24 καὶ ἀπῆλθόν τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εὗρον οὕτως καθὼς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον, αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον.

omit καὶ: P75, B, D, Lat, sa, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, arm

It's only Luke who uses the construction καθὼς καὶ. In both other cases significant witnesses omit καὶ, too. A secondary addition of καὶ is not reported. On the other hand the support for the omission is excellent.

Weiss (Com. Lk) argues that the καὶ is "the usual amplification".

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 93

38. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 6:42 πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου,

BYZ Luke 6:42 ἢ πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου Ἀδελφέ ἄφες ἐκβάλλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου

Byz A, C, D, L, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1241, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, bo, goth, [Trg]

txt B, e, ff², L1056, Sy-S, sa^{ms}, bo^{ms}

πῶς δὲ 01, 579, 892, pc

καὶ πῶς 1365, pc, g¹, gat, vg

P75 is not noted in NA, but in IGNTP (as "vid") and in Swanson for txt. From the facsimile nothing clearly can be seen before the πῶς. Everything is possible. The remaining ink traces cannot be assigned to any letters. From space considerations ἢ πῶς or καὶ πῶς is clearly more suitable.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:4 ἢ πῶς ἐρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἄφες ἐκβάλλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἢ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου;

Previous verse 41:

NA28 Luke 6:41 Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς;

The addition of a particle is only natural here to smooth the abruptness of the text. It could come from Mt (so Weiss).

The support for txt with B only is very thin.

IQP's Crit. ed. has πῶς as safe for Q.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 94

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:42 πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.

D, it (a, aur, b, c, f, ff², l, q, r¹), Sy-S:

(Sy-C has a lacuna here!)

ἢ πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ ὑποκεῖται ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σοῦ καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

"subiacet? hupocrita" a, aur, b, c, ff², l, q

but (!):

"est? hupocrita" d, e

et ecce in oculo tuo trabes subiacet, hupocrita it
et ecce trabis in tuo oculo est, hupocrita d
et ecce in oculo tuo trabis est, hupocrita e
ipse in oculo tuo trabem non videns, hupocrita f, (r¹), vg

B: no umlaut

ὑπόκειμαι "lie below"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:4-5 ἢ πῶς ἐρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος

ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σοῦ;

5 ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σοῦ τὴν δοκόν, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

Sy-C: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ ὑποκεῖται ὑποκριτά.

The overall reading of D, it, Sy-S is clearly a harmonization to Mt.

What is most interesting here are the two words ὑποκεῖται ὑποκριτά. It has been suggested (e.g. Vogels) that this is a very early dittography error in a Greek ancestor of the "Western" text. This may point to an underlying common ancestor of the Old Latin.

Note also the very interesting fact that Sy-C has this text in Mt (where D and Sy-S unfortunately have lacunae)!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 95

NA28 Luke 6:43 Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν.

BYZ Luke 6:43 Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρὸν οὐδὲ _____ δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν

Byz A, C, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa

txt P75, 01, B, L, W, Ξ, 0211, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 2542, pc, b, q, bo, [Trg]

μὴν CI (Paed. 2.45.1)

IGNTP has 579 wrongly for Byz, against NA, Swanson and Schmidtke. Checked at the film.

B: no umlaut

πάλιν here: "on the other hand; also"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:17-18 οὕτως πᾶν δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ, τὸ δὲ σαπρὸν δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ. 18 οὐ δύναται δένδρον ἀγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖν οὐδὲ δένδρον σαπρὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖν.

Compare for this use of πάλιν:

NA28 Matthew 4:7 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πάλιν γέγραπται·

NA28 1 John 2:8 πάλιν ἐντολὴν καινὴν γράφω ὑμῖν, ...

NA28 2 Corinthians 10:7 ... τοῦτο λογιζέσθω πάλιν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ...

πάλιν is not needed here, but it fits good. There is no reason why it should have been added here. Possibly omitted as a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 96

NA28 Luke 6:45 ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν,
καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς _____ ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ _____ προφέρει
τὸ πονηρόν·

ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 6:45 ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν
καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν·

ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ

ἄνθρωπος (Not in NA but in SQE)

Byz 01^{c2}, A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, f13, 33, 157, 1071, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, e, f, ff², q, r¹, vg), Sy, sa^{ms}, goth

txt P75, 01*, B, D, L, Ψ, f1, 579, 700, 892, 1342, pc, it(a, b, d, l), Co

B: no umlaut

θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ

Byz A, C, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, Maj, it, Sy, bo^{ms}

θησαυροῦ 69, 788, 828(=f13^b), 1342, it(c, e, f, q, r¹), vg^{mss}, bo^{mss}

θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ sa, bo^{mss}

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, W, Ξ, f1, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc,

Lat(a, aur, b, d, ff², l, vg), Co, arm

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:35 ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει ἀγαθά,

καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει πονηρά.

Probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). A natural addition to make the saying more symmetrical. The support for the two additions is not exactly identical.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 97

NA28 Luke 6:48 ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν ὃς ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης προσέρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν σαλεῦσαι αὐτὴν διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομηθῆσθαι αὐτήν.

BYZ Luke 6:48 ὁμοίός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν ὃς ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· πλημμύρας δὲ γενομένης προσέρρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν σαλεῦσαι αὐτὴν τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.

Byz A, C, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 700^c, Maj,
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, goth

txt P75^{vid}, 01, B, L, W, Ξ, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, pc,
Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{pt}

omit: P45^{vid}, 700*, Sy-S (h.t. from txt?)

700: The words are added in the margin by a later hand.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:25 καὶ κατέβη ἡ βροχὴ καὶ ἦλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ προσέπεσαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἔπεσεν, τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.

The Byzantine reading is probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). There would have been no reason to change it to the txt reading.

It is in principle possible that the omission was the original. And that both additions are secondary to fill in the gap. But the support is just too slim for that. It is more probable that the omission was caused by h.t. from the text reading (...αι αὐτὴν - ...αι αὐτὴν).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 98

39. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:3 ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 7:4 οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν σπουδαίως λέγοντες ὅτι ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ τοῦτο·

7:3 omit: D, f13, 700, pc, it, bo^{ms}, arm
f13: 124, 174, 230, 346 have the words.
f, vg have the words.

7:4 omit: D, it(a, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹)
πρὸς αὐτὸν C, 700
(C not in NA and IGNTP, but in Tis and Swanson. K. Witte from Muenster confirms this reading.)
Lat(aur, b, f, q, vg) have the words.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 John 4:47 οὗτος ἀκούσας ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἦκει ἐκ τῆς Ἰουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἠρώτα ἵνα καταβῆ καὶ ἰάσῃται αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν, ἧμελλεν γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν.

Strange. No reason for an omission. Note variant 7:6.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 99

NA28 Luke 7:6 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς. ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἔπεμψεν _____ φίλους ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης λέγων αὐτῷ· κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου, οὐ γὰρ ἱκανός εἰμι ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθης·

BYZ Luke 7:6 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἐπορεύετο σὺν αὐτοῖς ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἔπεμψεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος φίλους λέγων αὐτῷ Κύριε μὴ σκύλλου οὐ γὰρ εἰμι ἱκανός ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθης·

Byz 01^{c2}, (A), C, D, L, R, (W), X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, goth, Gre, Trg
ἐπ' αὐτὸν A
πρὸς αὐτούς W

txt P75, 01*, B, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, pc, sa, geo^I
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 7:3 ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὅπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 7:4 οἱ δὲ παραγενόμενοι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν σπουδαίως λέγοντες ὅτι ἄξιός ἐστιν ᾧ παρέξῃ τοῦτο·

There is no reason for an omission. A clarifying addition. Note variant 7:3.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 100

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:6 ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ οὐ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἔπεμψεν φίλους ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης λέγων αὐτῷ· κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου, οὐ γὰρ ἱκανὸς εἰμι ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς·

NA28 Luke 7:7 διὸ οὐδὲ ἑμαυτὸν ἤξιωσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν·
ἀλλὰ εἶπέ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήτω ὁ παῖς μου.

omit: D, 700*, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², gat, l, r¹), Sy-S

700: The words are added in the margin by a later hand.

Lat(aur, f, q, vg) have the words.

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 8:8 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος ἔφη· κύριε, οὐκ εἰμι ἱκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς, _____
ἀλλὰ μόνον εἶπέ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου.

Probably omitted to harmonize with Mt.

This variant is not in the WH list of Western non-interpolations.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 101

40. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 7:7 διὸ οὐδὲ ἑμαυτὸν ἠξίωσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν· ἀλλὰ τ εἶπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήτω ὁ παῖς μου.

BYZ Luke 7:7 διὸ οὐδὲ ἑμαυτὸν ἠξίωσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν· ἀλλ' εἶπὲ λόγῳ καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου

Byz 01, A, C, D, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, Trg^{mg}

txt P75^{vid}, B, L, 1241, sa, bo^{mss3}

τ μόνον C, Ψ, f13, pc, l, r¹, Sy-H**
tantum

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

εἶπὲ imperative aorist active 2nd person singular

ἰαθήτω imperative aorist passive 3rd person singular

ἰαθήσεται indicative future passive 3rd person singular

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 8:8 κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς, ἀλλὰ μόνον εἶπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου.

It is possible that ἰαθήσεται is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). On the other hand it is possible that ἰαθήτω is a harmonization to the immediate context to adjust the form to the imperative εἶπὲ. Note that C, Ψ et al. add μόνον as a further harmonization.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 102

NA28 Luke 7:10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον οἱ πεμφθέντες εὗρον τὸν δούλον ὑγιαίνοντα.

BYZ Luke 7:10 καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ πεμφθέντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον εὗρον τὸν ἀσθενοῦντα δούλον ὑγιαίνοντα

Byz A, C, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 892^{mg}, Maj,
d, f, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, *Gre*, [*Trg*^{mg}]

txt P75, 01, B, L, W, f1, 157, 579, 700, 892*, 1241, 1342, 2786, pc,
it, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Co

892: ἀσθενοῦντα has been added in the margin (wavy line plus two dots as insertion sign) by a later hand.

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

No parallel for this.

It could have been omitted to resolve a possible contradiction: Either he is ill or in good health.

On the other hand it has possibly been added to make clear who is meant, because in verse 8 another slave is mentioned. ἀσθενοῦντα and ὑγιαίνοντα also makes a nice antithesis.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 103

41. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:11 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναὶν καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς.

ἐξῆς adv. "next in a series, in the next place"

ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς "soon afterward"

No txt in NA!

τῆ D, d, e, Sy-S

ἐγένετο τῆ W, pc

ἐγένετο ἐν τῆ 01*, C, K, Π, 28, 124, 174(=f13), 565, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj-part, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}, Bal

ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ P75, 01^{C2}, A, B, L, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1241, 1342, Maj-part [E, F, G, H, R, U, V, Y, Γ, Λ], WH, NA²⁵

one of the last two: Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

IGNTP has 579 for Byz, Swanson and Schmidtke explicitly and NA implicitly for txt, which is correct. Checked at the film.

Lacuna: ☒

B: no umlaut

Similar:

NA28 Luke 8:1 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς

ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς A (not in NA and SQE, but in Tis and Swanson)

NA28 Luke 9:37 Ἐγένετο δὲ τῆ ἐξῆς ἡμέρα

BYZ Luke 9:37 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῆ ἐξῆς ἡμέρα

Byz A, C, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33, 565, 700, 1241, 1424, Maj, Lat

txt 01, B, L, S, W, f1, f13, 579, 1071, pc

τῆς ἡμέρας P45

διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας D, it, Sy-S, sa^{ms}

τῆ ἐξῆς 579

(Only the P45, D variant is in NA and SQE!)

Compare also:

NA28 Acts 21:1 εὐθυδρομήσαντες ἤλθομεν εἰς τὴν Κῶ, τῇ δὲ ἑξῆς εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον κάκειθεν εἰς Πάταρα,

NA28 Acts 25:17 συνελθόντων οὖν [αὐτῶν] ἐνθάδε ἀναβολὴν μηδεμίαν ποιησάμενος τῇ ἑξῆς καθίσας ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἐκέλευσα ἀχθῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα·

NA28 Acts 27:18 σφοδρῶς δὲ χειμαζομένων ἡμῶν τῇ ἑξῆς ἐκβολὴν ἐποιοῦντο

With ἑξῆς sometimes the subject must be supplied:

ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς - ἡμέρα

ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς - χρόνῳ

If we take these meanings here, one could argue that the less definite ἐν τῷ would be more likely to be changed to the more definite ἐν τῇ, than vice versa.

In Lk we have three occurrences:

7:11 ἐν τῇ ἑξῆς
ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς

8:1 ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς

9:37 (ἐν) τῇ ἑξῆς

In Acts: τῇ ἑξῆς (three times)

Other similar occurrences:

ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ... appears 15 times in Lk.

ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ (ἡμέρα) appears elsewhere only once in Lk 1:59.

In Lk we have one firm occurrence of ἐν τῷ and one firm occurrence of ἐν τῇ.

In Acts we have three times τῇ ἑξῆς. Elsewhere most often ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ appears. Thus a certain decision is not possible from internal reasons.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 104

42. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 7:11 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναῖν καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ___ καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς.

BYZ Luke 7:11 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς ἐπορεύετο εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναῖν καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἱκανοὶ καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς

T&T #12

Byz A, C, K, R, X, Δ, Θ, Π, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, 1071, Maj,
b, c, q, Sy-H, goth, Gre, [Trg^{mg}]

txt P75, 01, B, D, F, L, W, Ξ, 157, 579, 1241, 1342, pc⁶,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo
pc = 79, 130, 1604, 2220^c, 2546, 2750

Δ: No Latin (like multi) is given for ἱκανοὶ.

579: NA does not list 579 for txt, but T&T, IGNTP, Swanson and Schmidtke.
Checked at the film.

Minority readings:

συνεπορεύοντο _____ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἱκανοὶ	A, R, U, X, Δ, 69, 565, 892, pc
συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ ___ μαθηταὶ _____ ἱκανοὶ	f1, pc
συνεπορεύοντο _____ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ	157

B: umlaut! (1316 C 27 L) οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλος

Note next verse:

NA28 Luke 7:12 καὶ ὄχλος τῆς πόλεως ἱκανὸς σὺν αὐτῇ

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 28:12 λαβόντες ἀργύρια ἱκανὰ

NA28 Mark 10:46 καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὄχλου ἱκανοῦ

NA28 Luke 8:27 ἔχων δαιμόνια καὶ χρόνω ἱκανῶ οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον

NA28 Luke 8:32 ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν

NA28 Luke 20:9 καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν χρόνους ἱκανούς.

NA28 Luke 23:9 ἐπηρώτα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐν λόγοις ἱκανοῖς,

ἱκανὸς here: "many, quite a few"

ἱκανὸς appears 14 times elsewhere in the Gospels, 3 times in Mt, 3 times in Mk and 8 times in Lk and 18 times (!) in Acts. So, it is a typical Lukan word.

Note especially the occurrence in the next verse with the same meaning.

There is no reason for an addition here, except for a conformation to the next verse 12 (so Weiss). It is possible that it has been omitted, because it is unusual and strange to mention so many disciples. Those many disciples have been mentioned before at 6:17 and here a variation occurs, too:

NA28 Luke 6:17 Καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ,

Here, πολὺς has been omitted by:

A, D, Q, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy-S, Sy-H, bo

The difference between these two variants is that in 6:17 it is the Byzantine + Western text that omits and here it is the Alexandrian + Western text.

Another possibility is that some form of parablepsis occurred:

ΑΥΤΟΥ ΙΚΑΝΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΟΧΛΟΣ

Overall, it is more probable that the word has been omitted than added.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 105

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:19 ἔπεμψεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον λέγων· σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;

ἕτερον 01, B, L, R, W, X, Ξ, Ψ, 124, 983, 28, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2542, al, Marcion^{Adam}, Trg, WH

txt A, D, Θ, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Trg^{mg}

IGNTP and Hoskier's collation have 157 correctly for ἕτερον, against Swanson (and NA, implicitly). Checked at the film.

Unfortunately P75 has a lacuna in verse 19.

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 20:

NA28 Luke 7:20 παραγενόμενοι δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄνδρες εἶπαν· Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς σὲ λέγων· σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἄλλον προσδοκῶμεν;

ἕτερον 01, D, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 983, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, pc

ἄλλον P75, A, B, Θ, f13, 28, 700, 1424, Maj, WH (!)

Evidence combined:

ἄλλον - ἄλλον A, Θ, f13, 700, Maj, NA

ἕτερον - ἕτερον 01, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, pc

ἄλλον - ἕτερον D, f1, pc

ἕτερον - ἄλλον B, 28, 1424, pc, WH

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:3 εἶπεν αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν; safe!

ἕτερον is quite probably a harmonization to Mt (so also Weiss). There is no reason for a change to ἄλλον.

Interesting is the change by D, f1, pc from ἄλλον in verse 19 to ἕτερον in verse 20, which is against the rule. Normally the harmonization happens in the first instance and later the scribe falls back to the correct reading because he is getting used to it.

Sandiyagu analyses the usage of ἕτερος and ἄλλος in Luke and comes to the conclusion that

ἕτερος means "another one of a different kind" and

ἄλλος means "another one of the same kind".

From this she deduces that ἄλλος fits better here and that Luke changed his source to the more correct term, which also accords better with classical norms. Luke uses ἄλλος 11 times and ἕτερος 32 times.

In principal it is also possible that it was not Luke but some scribe who changed ἕτερος into ἄλλος to get the more correct term. But this is improbable, because in Mt ἕτερος is safe.

It is possible that the difference between ἕτερος and ἄλλος was no longer that distinct in later times.

Overall a harmonization to Mt seems to be the most probable explanation, either in verse 19 or in verse 20 or in both verses.

The IQP has ἕτερον in double square brackets in their critical edition, indicating text that is "probable but uncertain".

Compare:

Virginia R. Sandiyagu "ἕτερος and ἄλλος in Luke" NovT 48 (2006) 105-130, esp. p. 123 ff. to the passage.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 106

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:25 ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις εἰσίν.

διάγοντες D, K, Π, 565, pc¹², Cl

B: no umlaut

διάγω "spend ones life, live"

ὑπάρχω "to be", a widely used substitute in H. Gk. for εἶναι.

txt "have luxury" or "be rich"

D "spend luxury" or "live in luxury"

Lat: qui in veste pretiosa sunt et in deliciis

d: qui in vestimentis gloriosis et aepulatione agent

c: qui mollibus vestiuntur (:: Mt 11:8)

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:8 ἀλλὰ τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδοὺ οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέων εἰσίν. qui mollibus vestiuntur

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:41 Ἰάϊρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν,

omit: D, c, d

ἦν 28

NA28 Luke 9:48

ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός ἐστιν μέγας.

omit: D

NA28 Luke 11:13 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες

ὄντες 01, D, K, Π, M, X, 157, 472, 954, 1424, 1675, al

NA28 Luke 16:14 ... οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες

ὄντες f13, 157, 2542, pc

ὑπάρχω is a Lukan favorite (15 times in Lk, 3 times in Mt). There are two different meanings:

- a) substantively as τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, with the meaning "possessions, property"
- b) with the meaning "to be".

There is evidence that scribes felt uncomfortable with the occurrences of ὑπάρχω with the meaning "to be". Almost always some witnesses changed the word (see above).

The IQP text has the Matthean form for Q. So also Fleddermann.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 107

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:27 οὗτός ἐστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

omit: D, it(a, aur, d, l, r¹)

Lat(b, c, e, f, ff², q, vg), Marcion^T have the words.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 1:2 ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου·

BYZ Mark 1:2 ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου,

Byz A, f1, f13, 33, 565, 1342, Maj, Sy-H, Or

txt 01, B, D, K, L, P, W, Θ, Π, Φ, 700*, pc⁴⁰, Sy-P

NA28 Matthew 11:10 ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου.

LXX parallel:

LXX Malachi 3:1 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου

The omission could be due to h.t. (SOU - SOU) or as a harmonization to Mk.

The addition could be a harmonization to Mt.

IQP's Crit. ed. has τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἔμπροσθέν σου as safe for Q.

If we accept the texts as they are in NA, the words constitute a Minor Agreement of Mt/Lk against Mk.

Compare also discussion at Mk 1:2.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 108

NA28 Luke 7:28 λέγω ὑμῖν, μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν Ἰωάννου οὐδεὶς ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν.

BYZ Luke 7:28 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν προφήτης Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ οὐδεὶς ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστίν

Ἰωάννου

P75, 01, B, L, W, Ξ, f1, 22, 157, 579, pc,
Sy-Pal, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, Or, Did

προφήτης Ἰωάννου

Ψ, 700, pc, Sy-S, arm, Gre, [Trg]

Ἰωάννου προφήτης

892, 1342

προφήτης οὐκ ἐστίν

1241

Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ

K, Π, Μ, Χ, 33, 565, al,
it(a, b, c, e, ff², l), vg^{ms}, Sy-H^{mg}, sa^{ms}

προφήτης Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ

A, D, (Δ), Θ, f13, Maj

Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ προφήτης

1424, pc

one of these:

Lat(aur, f, q, r¹, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth

Sy-S: There is a lacuna after Ἰωάννου. Burkitt reconstructs: "a prophet greater than John [the Baptist ...]". NA and IGNTP have Sy-S for the omission of τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ.

D has the part μείζων ... ἐστίν at the end of verse 26.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:11 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ:

There is no reason for an omission. Obviously scribes felt the need to specify more detailed who and what is meant. The variety of additions is a strong indication for a secondary addition. Some added προφήτης, some τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ and the Byzantine text as the most complete has both.

IQP's Crit. ed. omits τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ from Q (= accepts Lk). Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 92) has it in brackets.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 109

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:30 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

omit: 01, D, d, pc, sa

B: no umlaut

ἠθέτησαν ἀθετέω indicative aorist active 3rd person plural

"reject, refuse, ignore; make invalid, set aside; break"

"the purpose of God did they put away for themselves"

No parallel.

The words are not really needed. There is no reason to add them. Without the words the statement is more general.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 110

Minority reading:

BGT Luke 7:31 † Τίνοι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ τίνοι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι;

† Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος

TR

† Ait autem Dominus

vg^{cl}

† Tunc ergo Iesus dixit

f (6th CE)

† Tunc Iesus dixit

P (vg^{ms}, 6th CE) noted in the Stuttgart vg ed.

† And the Lord said.

KJV

† Aber der Herr sprach:

Luther (1545)

Tischendorf lists M^{mg}, but this is just a lectionary note. The same appears e.g. in other manuscripts, e.g. H, S, Y, f1, 28, cp. Swanson (app. C).

Tischendorf adds g¹, but this must be an error. Hugh Houghton checked the film and it has no addition.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 22:31 † Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σιναῖσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον·

† εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Κύριος,

01, A, D, Q, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071,

Maj, Latt, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{mss}, [Trg]

txt P75, B, L, T, 1241, 2542^c, L1231, Sy-S, Co, geo

This variant is noted, because it is found in Erasmus' Textus Receptus (1516) and in the Vulgate. It is probable that the words got into the Textus Receptus from the Vulgate.

Why they got into the Vulgate is not clear, but possibly a lectionary incipit crept into the text. Lk 7:31-35 was a lectionary reading (Friday, 3rd week) and εἶπεν ὁ κύριος is the standard introduction here, see listed manuscripts above.

It is also possible that the addition of the words has to do with the question if the words 7:29-30 were spoken by Jesus (so most commentaries, e.g. Weiss, Zahn) or are an insertion/comment by Luke (so e.g. the NET Bible). Perhaps the words have been added by those who understand it as an insertion to make clear that in verse 31 it is Jesus again who is speaking.

Compare:

24 And when the messengers of John were departed, he began to speak unto the people concerning John, What went ye out into the wilderness for to see? A reed shaken with the wind? [25 ... 27 ...]

28 For I say unto you, Among those that are born of women there is not a greater prophet than John the Baptist: but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he.

29 And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. 30 But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him.

31 And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men of this generation? and to what are they like?

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 111

43. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 7:35 καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

BYZ Luke 7:35 καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων

omit: (01^{c2}), D, L, M, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, 13(=f13), 2, 22, 28, 700, 1241, 1342, al,
d, Sy-C, arm, geo, Ir, Epiph, Bal

Byz A, P, Δ, Ξ, 174, 230(=f13), 33, 565, 1424, Maj, WH^{mg}, Gre, Tis, [Trg^{mg}]

txt (01*), B, W, f13, 157, 579, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Co, WH, NA²⁵, Trg

ἀπὸ παντῶν τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς 01*, Ambrose

ἀπὸ _____ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς 01^{c2}

Latin: "et iustificata est sapientia ab omnibus filiis suis."

Ambrose (4th CE) in his commentary on Luke (chapter 66) mentioned that "many Greek copies" state that wisdom has been justified "by all her works" (omnibus operibus suis).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:19 καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς.

BYZ Matthew 11:19 καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς

Minority readings:

ἀπὸ παντῶν τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς 13, 346, 543, 826, 828, 983 (=f13)

ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς παντῶν pc

ἀπὸ παντῶν τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς 124, 788 (=f13^b)

In principle different insertion points are an indication for a secondary cause. But here there is no reason for an addition.

The word could have been omitted to make the difficult saying easier and/or to conform it to the parallel in Mt.

As to the insertion point no decision is possible. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 198) thinks that the position at the end is for emphasis. Tischendorf notes: "παντῶν ante τῶν: at hoc est fere ex usu Latinorum". Th. Zahn (Comm. Lk.) translates the Byz reading as "justification on the part of her children altogether".

IQP's Crit. ed. has ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς as safe for Q! So also Fleddermann and Harnack.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes:

"Read Σαμάρεια for σοφία. We have here a loose quotation in the form of a proverb from the savage stigmatization addressed to Jerusalem in Ezek. 16:51
Ezekiel 16:51 καὶ Σαμάρεια κατὰ τὰς ἡμίσεις τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν σου οὐχ ἤμαρτεν καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὰς ἀνομίας σου ὑπὲρ αὐτὰς (i.e. Σαμάρειαν and Σόδομα) καὶ ἐδικαίωσας τὰς ἀδελφάς σου (i.e. Σαμάρειαν and Σόδομα) ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἀνομίαις σου αἷς ἐποίησας.

The meaning is that Samaria by comparison *has proved righteous in her sinful works*. 23:4 Σαμάρεια ἦν Οολα καὶ Ιερουσαλημ ἦν Οολιβα. As Samaria's sinful works, according to Ezekiel, have been thrown into the shade by those of Jerusalem, so the sin of your obstinate unbelief has thrown into the shade all previous known iniquities. In Ezekiel there are further comparisons of Jerusalem with Σόδομα and Σύρια; the latter would be nearest paleographically to σοφία, but on the whole I think Σαμάρεια is the most probable lection."

Origen is giving a strange quote in his Jeremiah homilies (XIV, 5):

τὰ δὲ τέκνα τῆς σοφίας καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ἀναγέγραπται· καὶ ἀποστέλλει ἡ σοφία τὰ τέκνα αὐτῆς. These words cannot be found in any Gospel. From the context it appears that Origen wanted to prove with the cited words that the wisdom of God is bringing forth the prophets. Cp. for similar thoughts: Lk 11:49 and Prov 9:1,3 (Hautsch, Evangelienzitate des Origenes, p. 104-5).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 112

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:38 καὶ στᾶσα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ

ἔβρεξέν D, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Marcion^E

rigabat b, ff², l, q, r¹, vg^{ms}

inrigabat a

lavit c

inplevit d

lababat e

aur, f, vg read txt (coepit rigare).

Lacuna: E

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 7:44 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη· βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα; εἰσῆλθόν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὕδωρ μοι ἐπὶ πόδας οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν.

rigavit Lat

inrigavit a, d

lavit c, e

Possibly a harmonization to verse 44.

It is also possible that ἤρξατο βρέχειν is a stylistic improvement.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 113

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:39 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων· οὗτος εἶ ἦν προφήτης,

ὁ προφήτης

B*, Ξ, 205, 482, pc, Weiss

[NA²⁵], [WH], [Trg^{mg}] all have ὁ in brackets

B (p. 1318 A 12): The ὁ has been deleted after the time of the enhancement/ accentuation. It was originally enhanced, then deleted by a slash, and then additionally imperfectly erased.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 21:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι ἔλεγον· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης Ἰησοῦς ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

NA28 John 1:21 σὺ Ἠλίας εἶ; καὶ λέγει· οὐκ εἰμί. ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ;

NA28 John 1:25 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· τί οὖν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς οὐδὲ Ἠλίας οὐδὲ ὁ προφήτης;

NA28 John 6:14

οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

NA28 John 7:40 οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης.

NA28 John 7:52 καὶ ἴδε ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας προφήτης οὐκ ἐγείρεται.

ὁ προφήτης P66*, sa

In the Gospels ὁ προφήτης is a Johannine term.

It makes good sense, but there is no reason for an omission here. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 116) suggests that the term ὁ προφήτης was not understood anymore.

Compare the similar addition by P66* in Jo 7:52.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 114

NA28 Luke 7:44 αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξίν _____ αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν.

BYZ Luke 7:44 αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξίν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

Byz Δ, f13, 28, 33, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C

txt 01, A, B, D, K, Π, L, P, W, X, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 22, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, al, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo, goth

B: no umlaut

Compare verse 38:

NA28 Luke 7:38 καὶ ταῖς θριξίν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασεν καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλειφεν τῷ μύρῳ.

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 115

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:44 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη· βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα; εἰσηλθόν σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὕδωρ μοι ἐπὶ πόδας οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν.

NA28 Luke 7:45 φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ ἀφ' ἧς εἰσηλθον οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας.

εἰσηλθεν L*, 0211, f13, 157, 1071, pc¹⁴,
Lat(a, aur, e, ff², g¹, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{mss}, bo^{mss}

it(b, c, d, f, l, q, r¹), vg^{mss} read 1st person.

L: Tischendorf writes: "ε in εἰσηλθεν secundis primae manus curis in ο mutatum est. Fuerat igitur εἰσηλθον." (folio 140)

B: no umlaut

7:44 Then turning toward the woman, he said to Simon, "Do you see this woman? **I entered** your house; you gave me no water for my feet, but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair.

"You gave me no kiss, but from the time **I came in** she has not stopped kissing my feet."

she came in

Jesus is already in the house of the Pharisee from verse 7:36 on. The woman enters the scene only later, so the 3rd person is perfectly fitting.

It is possible that εἰσηλθον is a conformation to the previous verse 44. On the other hand it is equally possible that the difficult 1st person has been changed to 3rd person.

Compare:

- J. Jeremias "Lukas 7:45, εἰσηλθον" ZNW 51 (1960) 131 [He argues for an Aramaic mistranslation (in which a first singular is identical to the third feminine singular).]
- Hans Drexler "Die grosse Sünderin Lukas 7,36-50," ZNW 59 (1968) 159-173 [Drexler considers the restoration of the original third person unavoidable.]

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 116

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:46 ἐλαίω τὴν κεφαλὴν μου οὐκ ἤλειψας·
αὕτη δὲ μύρω ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας μου.

a)

_____ οὐκ ἤλειψας με Sy-S, Sy-C
ἐλαίω τοὺς πόδας μου οὐκ ἤλειψας a, e, ff², l, Sy-Pal^{mss}
"oleo pedes meos non unxisti"

b)

omit τοὺς πόδας μου: D, W, 079, it (b, c, d, e, q), arm, geo
Lat(aur, f, r¹, vg) have the words

ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας μου A, B, P, Θ, 33, 700, 1071, 1424, 1675, 2766, al
ἤλειψεν μου τοὺς πόδας 01, R, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 892, 1241
Maj
τοὺς πόδας μου ἤλειψεν L, Ξ, 1342, Sy-S, Sy-P

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 7:38 καὶ στα̃σα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα τοῖς
δάκρυσιν ἤρξατο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς θριξὶν τῆς
κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἐξέμασεν καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ
ἤλειψεν τῷ μύρῳ. omit τοὺς πόδας: 2766

NA28 Luke 7:45 φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ ἀφ' ἧς εἰση̃λθον οὐ
διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας.

NA28 John 11:2 ἦν δὲ Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρω καὶ
ἐκμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς,

NA28 John 12:3 Ἡ οὖν Μαριὰμ λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρου νάρδου
πιστικῆς πολυτίμου ἤλειψεν τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐξέμαξεν ταῖς
θριξὶν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ·

a) τὴν κεφαλὴν

The reading τὴν κεφαλὴν is clearly the harder reading. The mention of anointing the head is rather unmotivated, because from verses 38 and 45 (and from the parallel 12:3 in John) it appears that the woman anointed the feet of Jesus. Thus it is only natural to change τὴν κεφαλὴν here into τοὺς πόδας or to omit an object altogether as in Sy-S, Sy-C.

b) τοὺς πόδας μου

Compare the symmetry:

- 44 you gave me no **water** for my **feet**,
but she has **bathed my feet** with her tears and dried them with her hair.
45 You gave me no **kiss**,
but from the time I came in she has not stopped **kissing my feet**.
46 You did not anoint my **head** with **oil**,
but she has **anointed my feet** with **ointment**.

In all three verses "my feet" appears in the second part. It is possible that τοὺς πόδας μου has been omitted as redundant.

Konrad Weiß argues that omission and word-order variants are an indication of a secondary addition. He notes that in verse 38 there is no explicit object for ἤλειψεν. One could of course use the previous τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, but it is also possible that it should be a simple αὐτόν. Then we do not have an anointment of the feet anymore but a normal anointment of Jesus (probably head). In this respect then the omission of D et al. in verse 46 is only consequential.

It is more logical that she wiped her tears from his feet with her hair, but you cannot dry oil. An anointment of the guests feet is historically unknown (Petronius: "Inauditus mos!").

It is possible that the Anointment story in Mk 14:3-9 is basically the same story. Here, too, Jesus' head is anointed.

The parallels in John are inconsistent:

- 11:2 Mary was the one who anointed the Lord with perfume and wiped his feet with her hair;
12:3 Mary ... anointed Jesus' feet, and wiped them with her hair.

It is thus possible that originally no anointment of feet happened at all and the D reading in verse 46 is original. The equivocal style in verse 38 and the explicit John 12:3 led to the addition of τοὺς πόδας in verse 46.

An interesting conjecture might be noted, originally proposed by S.A. Naber 1881 (Mnemosyne) and repeated by H. Sahlin (NovT 24 (1982) 160-79): That in verses 44-46 the οὐκ should be omitted:

- 7:44 you gave me __water for my feet,
but she has bathed my feet with her tears and dried them with her hair.

45 You gave me a kiss, but from the time I came in she has not stopped kissing my feet.

46 You did anoint my head with oil, but she has anointed my feet with ointment.

Compare:

K. Weiß "Der westliche Text von Lk 7:46 und sein Wert" ZNW 46 (1955) 241-44
and compare the next variant.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 117

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:47 οὐ χάριν λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αἱ ἁμαρτίαι αὐτῆς αἱ
πολλάι, ὅτι ἠγάπησεν πολὺ· ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ὀλίγον ἀγαπᾷ.

D: οὐ χάριν δὲ λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αὐτῇ πολλά

d: Propter quod dico tibi: Dimittentur illi multa

e: οὐ χάριν δὲ λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αὐτῇ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι
ᾧ δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ἀγαπᾷ ὀλίγον.

Propter quod dico tibi: Remittentur illi peccata

cui autem pusillum dimittuntur, diligit modicum.

Ephrem: 45 You did not kiss me, but she has not ceased kissing my feet from the moment she entered. 47 Wherefore her many sins are forgive her. The one who is sorgive little loves little.

POxy 4009: διὰ τοῦτο λέγω σοι, ὅτι ἀφείωνται αὐτῇ πολλάι ἁμαρτίαι

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 48:

NA28 Luke 7:48 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῇ· ἀφέωνταί σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.

The verse is problematic:

"Therefore I tell you, forgiven are her sins, which were many, because she did love much. But the one to whom little is forgiven, loves little."

These words do not really fit to the preceding parable. In the parable love is the result of the forgiveness. By contrast in verse 47 the woman is forgiven because she did love much.

The omission of ὅτι ἠγάπησεν πολὺ is probably an attempt to overcome this problem.

Ephrem, in his commentary, is abbreviating the verses, e.g. is he omitting verse 46, also. Thus it is uncertain, what he read in his Diatessaron. At least he is not citing "because she did love much". The Arabic reads the full form.

Compare:

M. Myllykoski "Tears of repentance of tears of gratitude? POxy 4009, the Gospel of Peter and the Western text of Lk 7:45-49." NTS 55 (2009) 380-389

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 118

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:3 καὶ Ἰωάννα γυνὴ Χουζᾶ ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρώδου καὶ Σουσάννα καὶ ἕτεραι πολλαί, αἵτινες διηκόνουν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς.

αὐτῶ 01, A, L, M, X, Y, Π, Ψ, f1, 33, 565, 579, 1241, 1342, Maj-part, it(a, aur, b, l, q), vg^{ms}, Sy-H, Co, Marcion^T

αὐτοῖς B, D, K, W, Γ, Δ, Θ, Λ, Ω, 047, 0211, f13, 28, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj-part [E, F, G, H, S, U, V], Lat(c, d, e, f, ff², r¹, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, goth

IGNTP has Co for αὐτοῖς, NA, Horner and Tis for αὐτῶ.

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

"who served for him/them"

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 27:55 Ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ γυναῖκες πολλαὶ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, αἵτινες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας διακονοῦσαι αὐτῶ.

NA28 Mark 15:40-41 Ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαι, ἐν αἷς καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήτος μήτηρ καὶ Σαλώμη, 41 αἱ ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῶ καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῶ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ αἱ συναναβᾶσαι αὐτῶ εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

And also:

NA28 Matthew 4:11 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄγγελοι προσῆλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῶ.

NA28 Mark 1:13 καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι διηκόνουν αὐτῶ.

Elsewhere in the Gospels only διηκόνουν αὐτῶ occurs.

Possibly αὐτῶ is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 119

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:5 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ κατεπατήθη, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

omit: D, W, pc, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l, q), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P

Lat(aur, c, f, r¹, vg) have the words.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:4 καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν ἃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, καὶ ἐλθόντα τὰ πετεινὰ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.

NA28 Mark 4:4 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν, καὶ ἦλθεν τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 9:58 τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

NA28 Luke 12:24 πόσω μᾶλλον ὑμεῖς διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν.

NA28 Luke 13:19 τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

NA28 Acts 10:12 καὶ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

NA28 Acts 11:6 καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

Compare also verse 12:

NA28 Luke 8:12 οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν εἰσιν οἱ ἀκούσαντες, εἶτα ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ αἶρει τὸν λόγον ἀπὸ τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν.

Lk always adds τοῦ οὐρανοῦ after τὰ πετεινὰ.

The birds here may be taken as a reference to the devil in verse 12. Then the τοῦ οὐρανοῦ would of course not be appropriate.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 120

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:15 τὸ δὲ ἐν τῇ καλῇ γῆ, οὗτοί εἰσιν οἵτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καλῇ καὶ ἀγαθῇ ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ τ.

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

τ [πολλή] ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει ὁ ἔχων ὧτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούέτω

E^c, F^c, G^c, H, M, M, S^{mg}, X, Y, Γ, Λ, 0211, 1^c, 22^c, 118^c, f13, 2, 579, 892^{mg}, 1071, 1424, al

τ πολλή 1241

f13: 788 omits

B: no umlaut

Typical late addition, probably for lectionary reasons (Lk 8:8-15 is the Sunday lection for the 5th week).

Note that the expression appeared 7 verses before, where several witnesses omitted it and transposed it to after v. 15:

NA28 Luke 8:8 καὶ ἕτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα. ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὧτα ἀκούειν ἀκούέτω.

omit: f13, 1071, Lect, Sy-Pal (not in NA but in SQE).

For πολλή compare:

NA28 2 Corinthians 6:4 ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ συνιστάντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῦ διάκονοι, ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν θλίψεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις,

579 has this addition at Lk 8:15, 12:21, 15:10 (with Θ^c), 16:18 (alone) and 18:8 (alone)!

Compare: Teunis van Lopik "Once again: floating words, their significance for textual criticism" NTS 41 (1995) 286-291, p. 289

Compare also discussion at Mk 7:16.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 121

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:16 Οὐδείς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

omit: P75, B

ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν

f1, 579, 1241 (not in NA and SQE)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 5:15 οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

NA28 Mark 4:21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῆ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῆ;

Compare:

NA28 Luke 11:33 Οὐδείς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν [οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον] ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν.

Mt has different words, but the same meaning. Mk does not have the words.

Is it possible that P75, B had the words in the f1, 579 order and then omitted them due to h.t. (σιν- σιν)? Otherwise the omission is difficult to explain.

Weiss thinks (Textkritik, p. 190) that the omission is a harmonization to the parallel in Mk (so also Hoskier and Tischendorf).

It is also possible that the words were adapted from Lk 11:33.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 122

44. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 8:19 Παρεγένετο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον.

BYZ Luke 8:19 Παρεγένοντο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἠδύναντο συντυχεῖν αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον.

Byz 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj, Lat, Gre
txt P75, B, D, X, 070, 579, pc, d, Co

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:46 Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὄχλοις ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰστήκεισαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλήσαι.

NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν.

BYZ Mark 3:31 Ἔρχονται οὖν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔξω ἐστῶτες ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτόν, φωνοῦντες αὐτόν.

ἔρχεται 01, D, G, W, Θ, f1, 565, 892, pc,

it(a, b, d, e, f, ff², q, r¹), vg^{mss}

ἔρχονται A, B, C, L, Δ, f13, 28, 33, 700, 1342, 2542, Maj,

Lat(aur, c, f, l, vg), Sy, Co

Several such variants appear in Mk and also here in the parallel.

Compare Mk at 1:29, 3:20, 3:31, 5:1, 5:38, 8:22, 9:14, 9:33, 11:19.

The plural ist the grammatically correct choice, but the singular is acceptable also.

TVU 123

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:24 προσελθόντες δὲ διήγειραν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· ἐπιστάτα ἐπιστάτα, ἀπολλύμεθα. ὁ δὲ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἐπαύσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη τ.

Not in NA but in SQE!

τ μεγάλη K, Π, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 124, 174(=f13), 28, 157, 565, 1424, al,
magna aur, b, f, vg^{mss}, Sy-H**, sa^{pt}, bo, arab^{MS}

Lacuna: Ε

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:26 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί δειλοὶ ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τοῖς ἀνέμοις καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.

NA28 Mark 4:39 καὶ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἀνέμῳ καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσῃ· σιώπα, πεφίμωσο. καὶ ἐκόπασεν ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.

omit μεγάλη: W, e

Probably a harmonization to Mt/Mk. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 124

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:25 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;

omit: P75, B, 700, aeth, Tert?, **Bois, Weiss**

Tert (Marc. 4:20) has the quote up to ὕδατι, but it is not clear if the other words follow: τίς (ἄρα) οὗτός ἐστιν, ὃς τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῇ θαλάσῃ.

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 26:

NA28 Luke 8:26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν ...

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:27 οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες· ποταπός ἐστιν οὗτος ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούουσιν;

NA28 Mark 4:41 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν φόβον μέγαν καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τίς ἄρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ ὁ ἄνεμος καὶ ἡ θάλασσα ὑπακούει αὐτῷ;

It is possible that the words have been omitted due to confusion over the many KAIs.

Otherwise difficult to explain, because the words are needed: order - obey. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 180) says that the words must come from the parallels, because an omission is difficult to explain.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 125

45. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 8:26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας.

BYZ Luke 8:26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέραν τῆς Γαλιλαίας

NA28 Luke 8:37 καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν,

BYZ Luke 8:37 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν

Lk 8:26

Γερασηνῶν P75, B, D, 0267, Latt, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{ms}

Γαδαρηνῶν A, R, W, Δ^{Gr}, Ψ, 0135, f13, 700^c, 1071, 892, Maj, Sy, goth

Γεργεσηνῶν 01, L, X, Θ, Ξ, f1, 22, 33, 157, 579, 700*, 1241, 1342, pc, bo, Sy-Pal, arm, geo, Eus, Gre

700: The word is added in the margin by a later hand.

B: umlaut! (1319 C 7 R) τῶν Γερασηνῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέρα

Lk 8:37

Γερασηνῶν P75, B, C*, D, 0279, 579, pc, Latt, sa

Γαδαρηνῶν 01^{c2}, A, R, W, Δ^{Gr}, Ψ, 124, 346(=f13), 700^c, 892, Maj, Sy, goth

Γεργεσηνῶν 01*, C^{c2}, L, P, X, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 157, 700*, 1071, 1241, 1342, al, bo, Sy-Pal, arm, geo, Gre

B: no umlaut

Mt 8:28

Γαδαρηνῶν 01*, B, C, M, Δ^{Gr}, Θ, Σ, 174(=f13), 1010, pc, Sy, Epiph

Γεργεσηνῶν 01^{c2}, L, W, X, f1, f13, 22, 157, 700, 892, Maj, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, bo, goth

Γερασηνῶν 892^c, Latt, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, mae-1+2

B: no umlaut

Mk 5:1

Γερασηνῶν 01*, B, D, Latt

Γαδαρηνῶν A, C, f13, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

Γεργεσηνῶν 01^c, L, Δ^{Gr}, (W), Θ, f1, 28, 33, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Sy-S, bo

This difficult case is discussed comprehensively at Mt 8:28.

In Mk and Lk it is a tie between Γερασηνῶν and Γεργεσηνῶν. Externally the support is stronger for Γερασηνῶν, whereas internally one should favor Γεργεσηνῶν.

Gerasa is geographically impossible.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 126

NA28 Luke 8:27 ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔχων δαιμόνια καὶ χρόνῳ ἱκανῶ οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν.

BYZ Luke 8:27 ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὅς εἶχεν δαιμόνια ἐκ χρόνων ἱκανῶν καὶ ἱμάτιον οὐκ ἐνεδιδύσκετο, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν

T&T #13

Byz 01^{C2a}, A, R, D, X, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0135, 0211, f13, 892, 2786, Maj, Lat, Sy
ἀπὸ χρόνων ἱκανῶν ὅς D, (e)

txt P75^{vid}, 01^{*.C2b}, B, L, Ξ, (f1), 33, 157, 579, 1241, 1342, 1612, 1627,
Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, Co, arm
καὶ χρόνῳ πολλῶ f1

B: no umlaut

txt "... who had demons. For a long time he had worn no clothes..."

Byz "... who had demons for a long time. He wore no clothes..."

Compare verse 29:

NA28 Luke 8:29 πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτὸν

"For many times it had seized him;"

A question of punctuation and meaning.

The txt reading is the more unusual one, for it is not really important that he had worn no clothes for a long time.

It is possible that the Byzantine reading is a conformation to verse 29 (so Weiss).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 127

46. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:28 ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν· τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς.

omit Ἰησοῦ: P75, D, R, f1, 69, 579, 1071, al, d, e, bo^{pt}

omit τοῦ θεοῦ: D, E, f1, 892, 954, 1424, 1675, 2542, pc, g¹, d, l, vg^{ms}, geo^{mss}

B: no umlaut

WH have τοῦ θεοῦ in brackets.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 8:29 τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ;

BYZ Matthew 8:29 τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ

Byz: C^c, W, Θ, 1582(f1), f13, 579, 1424, Maj, it, Sy-P, Sy-H

NA28 Mark 5:7 τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου;
omit Ἰησοῦ: f1, 700 (not in NA and SQE!)

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:16 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

NA28 Mark 3:11 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Mark 10:47 καὶ λέγειν· τ υἱὲ Δαυὶδ Ἰησοῦ, ἐλέησόν με.

τ Ἰησοῦ f13, 565

τ Κύριε 28

NA28 Mark 10:48 μᾶλλον ἔκραζεν· τ υἱὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλέησόν με.

τ Ἰησοῦ f13

τ Κύριε 28, 124, 1071

NA28 Luke 1:32 οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται

NA28 Luke 4:41 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Luke 4:41 σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

NA28 Luke 6:35 καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψίστου.

The support for the omissions is quite considerable. The omission of Ἰησοῦ might be due to harmonization to Mt. Note the same omission by f1, 700 in Mk. τοῦ θεοῦ is safe in the parallels. The omission could be due to homoiarcton (τοῦ - τοῦ).

It is interesting to note that Mk has the fullest form here.

The term υἱὸς ὑψίστου appears two more times in Lk (1:32 and 6:35).

It is quite possible that Ἰησοῦ and τοῦ θεοῦ have been added here as a harmonization to Mt and/or Mk.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 128

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:29 παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

παρήγγειλεν

01, A, C, L, W, f1, 33, 565, 892, 1071,

Maj-part[E, G, H, K, Π, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Ω, 028, 047],

Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

παρήγγειλεν txt

P75, B, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1241, 1424, 2542,

Maj-part[F, M, Y, Λ], WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}, Robinson

ἔλεγεν D, e (from Mk)

B: no umlaut

παρήγγειλεν indicative aorist active 3rd person singular

παρήγγελλεν indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 5:8 ἔλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ· ἔξελθε τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 6:8 καὶ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἴρωσιν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ ῥάβδον μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζώνην χαλκόν,
παρήγγελλεν E, F, G, U, W, Y, f13, 1071, 1424, a1

NA28 Luke 8:56 καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὁ δὲ παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν τὸ γεγονός.

παρήγγελλεν K

NA28 Luke 9:21 ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο
παρήγγελλεν M, S, X, Ω, pc

Previous verse 28:

NA28 Luke 8:28 ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῆ μεγάλης εἶπεν· τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς.

Robertson ("Wordpictures") notes: "For he commanded (παρηγγελλεν γαρ). Imperfect active, correct text, for he was commanding."

παρήγγελλεν appears only here in the NT. παρήγγειλεν appears 7 times (3 more times in Lk). At some points παρήγγελλεν is a variant (see above). It is thus possible that παρήγγελλεν is secondary here too. The support is divided.

Weiss (Com. Lk) argues that παρήγγειλεν is a conformation to the aorists of the preceding verse 28. The D reading is from Mk.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 129

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:29 παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηπάκει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐδεσμεύετο ἀλύσειν καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος καὶ διαρρήσων τὰ δεσμὰ ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους.

ἀπὸ B, E, WH, Weiss, NA²⁵, Trg^{mg}

txt P75, 01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241,
Maj, WH^{mg}

B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 8:33 ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους

It is possible that the second ἀπὸ is a conformation to the first ἀπὸ in the verse.

On the other hand it is possible that ἀπὸ has been changed into ὑπὸ to differentiate ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου from ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, but this is not very probable. The support is very slim.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 130

47. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰαῖρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας **[τοῦ]** Ἰησοῦ παρεκάλει αὐτὸν εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ,

omit P75^{vid}, 01*, B, P, S, 472, pc, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Tis, Bal

txt 01^{C1}, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, [Trg]

αὐτοῦ 1342, pc

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:18 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδοὺ ἄρχων εἰς ἐλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ

NA28 Mark 5:22 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων, ὀνόματι Ἰαῖρος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ

Context:

NA28 Luke 7:38 καὶ στᾶσα ὀπίσω παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ A, K, Π, Υ, Θ, 565

NA28 Luke 8:35 ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονός καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ εὔρον καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ
καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.

omit τοῦ: P75, B

αὐτοῦ Lat

NA28 Luke 10:39 καὶ τῆδε ἦν ἀδελφὴ καλουμένη Μαριάμ, [ἡ] καὶ παρακαθεσθεῖσα πρὸς τοὺς πόδας τοῦ κυρίου ἤκουεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ.

omit τοῦ: P75

The omission of the article could be idiomatic usage, but it is a little strange. The support is incoherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 131

48. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:43 Καὶ γυνή οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἣτις ἱατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι, †

BYZ Luke 8:43 καὶ γυνή οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα ἣτις ἱατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ὑπ' οὐδενὸς θεραπευθῆναι

omit: P75, B, D, 0279,

Sy-S, Sy-Pal^{ms}, sa, arm, geo, Or, **NA²⁵**, **WH**, **Weiss**

D, d read for the final clause: ἦν οὐδὲ εἰς ἴσχυεν θεραπεῦσαι

txt 01, A, C, L, P, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal^{ms}, bo, **Bois**

Sy-C adds at the end of the verse:

† καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῇ λέγουσα ἐὰν ἀπελθοῦσα ἄψωμαι κἀν τῶν ἱματίων τοῦ Ἰησοῦ σωθήσομαι.

0279 is one of the recently (1975) discovered Sinai fragments. It is a palimpsest of the 8th/9th CE. B. Aland (Berichte) notes: "strong Byzantine influence".

Tregelles reads txt but has additionally the words in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

προσαναλίσκω / προσαναλώω "spend in addition, spend lavishly"
"having spent on physicians all her living"

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 5:25-26 Καὶ γυνή οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος δώδεκα ἔτη 26 καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἱατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὠφεληθεῖσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χεῖρον ἐλθοῦσα,

δαπανᾶω "to pay out material or physical resources, spend, spend freely"

(The Diatessaron is following Mk here.)

For the Sy-C addition compare:

NA28 Matthew 9:21 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ἐν ἑαυτῇ· ἐὰν μόνον ἄψωμαι τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.

NA28 Mark 5:28 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐὰν ἄψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἱματίων αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 12:44 πάντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς.

The omission is strange. There is no reason for it. Has it to do with Luke being a physician?

If it is a secondary addition, it is very unusual. Scribes normally harmonize to the parallels by using identical or very similar words. But here we have a skillfully rewritten condensation.

Aland: "sounds Lukan". P. Comfort: "could be a true Lukan condensation" (Encountering, p. 333). Nevertheless Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that it is a free gloss from Mk.

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

TVU 132

49. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:44 προσελθοῦσα ὀπισθεν ἥψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἢ ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

omit 1: D, Ψ, 209*, 1071, pc

omit 2: D, it(a, b, d, ff², l, r¹)

Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg) have the words.

ἥψατο ὀπισθεν K, Π, pc

B: no umlaut

omit 2: Western non-interpolation?

Minor agreement between Mt and Lk (see below)

ὀπισθεν = "from behind"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:20 ... προσελθοῦσα ὀπισθεν ἥψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·

NA28 Mark 5:27 ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὀπισθεν ἥψατο τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ·

add τοῦ κρασπέδου: M, f1, 33, 579, 1071, pc, aeth

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 14:36 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μόνον ἄψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ· καὶ ὅσοι ἥψαντο διεσώθησαν.

NA28 Mark 6:56 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κὰν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἱματίου αὐτοῦ ἄψωνται· καὶ ὅσοι ἂν ἥψαντο αὐτοῦ ἐσώζοντο.

Both words have been possibly omitted because they are not really needed. The emphasis is on the touching and the fringe is only marginally interesting, so it is possible that in the Latin translation the words have been omitted. It is also possible that the words have been omitted due to homioarcton (TOU ...OU - TOU ...OU).

On the other hand it is possible that the omission is original and the addition happened very early in the transmission. Note the secondary addition in Mk!

The words τοῦ κρασπέδου constitute one of the so called Minor Agreements between Mt and Lk against Mk. It is possible that the omission of τοῦ κρασπέδου is a harmonization to Mk 5:27.

The omission of ὄπισθεν is not clear. It has been omitted neither in Mt nor in Mk.

Note that K, Π, pc have ἦψατο ὄπισθεν (not in NA and SQE).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 133

50. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος·

BYZ Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,

καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ

C*, K, X, Δ, Ψ, 28, 565, Maj

καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ

01, A, C^{cs}, D, L, P, R, U, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 157, (472), 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, al, Trg, Tis, Bal

one or the other:

Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, goth

txt

P75, B, Π, 700*, al, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, sa, geo

Tregelles has additionally καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 5:31 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἤψατο;

Compare:

NA28 Mark 1:36 καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ,

NA28 Luke 9:32 ὁ δὲ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ ἦσαν βεβαρημένοι ὕπνω·

Lk uses four times οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ (3 times in Acts) and once καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ (Lk 6:3) which he probably took over from Mk.

	<u>σὺν αὐτῷ</u>	<u>μετ' αὐτοῦ</u>
Mt, Mk, Jo	6	28
Lk, Act	16	8

Thus it is clear that Lk prefers σὺν αὐτῷ.

It is strange why so many witnesses inserted here καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ/μετ' αὐτοῦ if it's not original. It is rather improbable that it is a partial harmonization to Mark's οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, but Weiss thinks so. The words

have probably been omitted as awkward. Note that the verb εἶπεν is in the singular.

The support for the omission not coherent (II, 700*).

On the other hand the two different wordings of the addition might indicate its spuriousness.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

add καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ in brackets.

TVU 134

NA28 Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος· ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.

BYZ Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ, Ἐπιστάτα οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν καὶ λέγεις, Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου;

Byz A, C, D, P, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj,
Latt, Sy, goth, Diatess, [Trg]
καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἤψατο C*, D, Ψ, 0291, 28, 1071, pc,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Ir

txt P75, 01, B, L, f1, 22, 157, 1241, pc, Sy-Pal^{mss}, Co, arm, arab^{MS}

Note that D+it has 45a as: καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τίς μου ἤψατο

B: no umlaut

Diatessaron:

Arabic (Ciasca): Negantibus autem omnibus, dixit ei Simon Cephas, et qui eum illo erant: Praeceptor, turbae te comprimunt, et coarctant, et tu dicis: Quis me tetigit?

Ephrem (McCarthy): Was it not when Simon said, *People are pressing in and approaching you, and you say, Who has touched me?*

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 5:30 ... τίς μου ἤψατο τῶν ἱματίων;

NA28 Mark 5:31 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ· βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἤψατο;

Compare next verse 46:

NA28 Luke 8:46 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἤψατό μού τις, ἐγὼ γὰρ ἔγνωνα δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθυῖαν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ.

There is no reason for an omission, except perhaps because the words were considered redundant. There is no omission or variation in Mk.

It seems that scribes added first the Markan words as in C*, D, et al. In a second step the words are harmonized to immediate context: D conformed 45a

to the added Markan words and A, W et al. changed the Markan words to conform to 45a.

Probably the words have been added from Mk to prepare for Jesus words in the next verse 46: ἦψατό μου τις (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 135

NA28 Luke 8:48 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.

BYZ Luke 8:48 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Θάρσει, θύγατερ ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην

Byz A, C, P, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, f13, 892, Maj, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 157, 579, 1241, 1342, pc,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, Co, geo, arm

B: no umlaut

Θάρσει θαρσέω imperative present active 2nd person singular
"Courage! Take courage!"
"Constans esto" q

θυγάτηρ nominative
θύγατερ vocative

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 9:22 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς στραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὴν εἶπεν·
θάρσει, θύγατερ· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

NA28 Mark 5:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε·
C^c adds θάρσει

Probably a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 136

NA28 Luke 8:54 αὐτὸς δὲ _____ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν λέγων· ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε.

BYZ Luke 8:54 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντας, καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἐφώνησεν λέγων Ἡ παῖς ἔγειρου.

Byz A, C, R, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, goth
ἐκβαλὼν πάντας ἔξω καὶ A, K, Π, R, S, U, W, Θ, 0211, 124,
174(=f13), 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1424, pc,
Sy-H, arm

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, X, 0291, f1, 579, 700, 1241, 1342, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C

Lacuna: Ξ

B: umlaut! (1320 C 35 L) αὐτὸς δὲ κρατήσας τῆς

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 5:40 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν πάντας παραλαμβάνει τὸν πατέρα τοῦ παιδίου καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τοὺς μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ εἰσπορεύεται ὅπου ἦν τὸ παιδίον.

ἐκβαλὼν πάντας ἔξω f13

There is no reason for an omission.

The words are probably a harmonization to Mk. The different word-order variants are an indication for a secondary origin.

Note though that ἔξω does not appear in Mk. But the addition is probably quite natural. Compare the following:

NA28 Luke 4:29 καὶ ἀναστάντες ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως

NA28 Luke 13:28 ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐκβαλλομένους ἔξω

NA28 Luke 20:15 καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος

NA28 Acts 7:58 καὶ ἐκβαλόντες ἔξω

NA28 Acts 9:40 ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας ὁ Πέτρος

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 137

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα τ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν

τ ἀποστόλους 01, C, L, X, Θ, Λ, Ξ, Ψ, 070, 0202, 0291, f13, 33, 372, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2542, pc, Lat(a, aur, c, e, f, vg), Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, arm, goth, Gre, [Trg^{mg}]

τ μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ C^c, E, F, H, U, 2, 157, al, it(b, ff², l, q, r¹), vg^{ms}, Eus

txt P75, A, B, D, K, Π, R, W, Δ, 047, 0211, f1, 22, 565, 700, 954, 2766, Maj, d, δ, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa, geo, Marcion^A

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:1 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ

NA28 Matthew 10:2 Τῶν δὲ δώδεκα ἀποστόλων τὰ ὀνόματά ἐστιν ταῦτα·

NA28 Mark 6:7 Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα
add μαθητὰς: D, 1071

NA28 Mark 3:14 καὶ ἐποίησεν δώδεκα [οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν]

Compare:

NA28 Luke 6:13 καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν·

NA28 Luke 9:10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι

Only ἀποστόλους has any claim to be original. μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ is probably from Mt 10:1 (so Weiss). It is interesting how many diverse witnesses support this addition, which is rather unusual (δώδεκα ἀποστόλων appears only once in the Gospels at Mt 10:2). ἀποστόλους is either derived from context 9:10 or from the parallel Mt 10:2 (so Weiss).

It might be noted here the curious fact that Codex Ξ has this sentence three times on three pages, one verse per page! This is certainly deliberate and could be explained as a strong amplification of the word (power over demons and diseases).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 138

51. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:2 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι [τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς].

BYZ Luke 9:2 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας

T&T #15

omit: B, 2206, Sy-S, Sy-C, **NA²⁵**, **WH**, **Weiss**

In NA Marcion^A (Dialog of Adamantius 2:12) is noted, but this is very doubtful because the quote breaks off at this point (see Harnack).

B: no umlaut

τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς

01, A, D, L, E, Ψ, 070, 0202, f1, 33, 38, 157, 579, 1071, 1241, 1612, 2786, **Bois**, **Gre**, **[Trg]**

τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας

C, K, Π, W, X, Δ, Θ, 0211, f13, 565, 700, 892, 1342, Maj

one of the additions:

Latt ("infirmos"), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, goth

πάντας τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας

2766, pc

νοσοῦντας

2542

καὶ ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύειν

1424 (omit ἰᾶσθαι)

ἀσθενεῖς adjective accusative masculine plural

ἀσθενοῦντας participle present active accusative masculine plural

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:7-8 πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε λέγοντες ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. 8 ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε,

Compare:

NA28 Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν ^T

^T "the infirm." Sy-C, Sy-S

As Metzger (commentary) notes: "the evidence of the Old Syriac is weakened by its reading 'the infirm' as the object of 'heal' at the close of verse 1. Likewise, in Lk ἰάομαι, except when passive, always has a direct object."

This is true everywhere in the NT.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks the words are from Mt.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
better remove brackets

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 139

52. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:3 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, μήτε ῥάβδον μήτε πήραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀργύριον μήτε **[ἀνά]** δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν.

T&T #16

omit: 01, B, C*, F, L, Ξ, 070, 0202, 0211, 372, 579, 1241, 1342, pc⁵,

Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo, **WH**

pc = 494, 1513, 2411, 2737, 2796

txt A, C^{C3}, D, K, Π, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 2786, Maj, d, Sy-H, **NA²⁵**, **Weiss**, **[Trg]**

Lat, Sy and other versions are not clear.

Metzger: "... only d, Sy-H and goth express the force of ἀνά, but whether the others simply omit to render the word or whether they rest upon a Greek text that lacked it, is difficult to say. Sy-S reads: "and not even two coats".

B: no umlaut

ἀνά here: "each"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:10 μὴ πήραν εἰς ὁδόν μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας

NA28 Mark 6:9 καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσησθε δύο χιτῶνας.

It is not clear why the word should have been added here. It is not in the parallels and it is not improving style or meaning.

ἀνά appears only 9 times in the Gospels. Meanings:

1. of position in an area: "among, in the midst of"

ἀ.μ. τοῦ σίτου Mt 13:25

ἀ.μ. τῶν ὀρίων Δεκαπόλεως "into the (midst of the) district of Decapolis" Mk 7:31

2. distributive, with numbers: "each, apiece"

ἀνά δηνάριον "a denarius apiece" Mt 20:9-10

ἀπέστειλεν αὐτούς ἀνά δύο "he sent them out two by two" Lk 10:1

κλισίας ὡσεὶ ἀνά πεντήκοντα "by fifties" Lk 9:14

ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς "two or three measures apiece" Jo 2:6
ἀνὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα Mk 6:40 v.l. Lk 9:3.

The word appears twice in the following context: 9:14 and 10:1. It is possible that scribes added it here, remembering 10:1. On the other hand it could have been omitted as carrying no special meaning. The support for the omission is very strong.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 175) thinks that it has been omitted as a conformation to immediate context, where 4 times μήτε without preposition appears.

A. Plummer (ICC Com. Lk 1922) writes: "In ἔχειν we have an anacoluthon; change from direct to oblique oration. For it is scarcely admissible to take ἔχειν as infinit. for imperat. The actual imperat. both precedes (αἴρετε) and follows (μένετε)."

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = prefer omission)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 140

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:6 ἔξερχόμενοι δὲ διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας
εὐαγγελιζόμενοι καὶ θεραπεύοντες πανταχοῦ.

διήρχοντο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας 1071, it(b, c, ff², l, q), Sy-S, Sy-C,
Sy-P, sa^{ms}, arm, Marcion^A

διήρχοντο ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης Λ

κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἤρχοντο D, d

διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς πόλεις X, pc, a

txt P75, 01, A, B, C, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241,
1342, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, e, f, r¹, vg), Sy-H, Co, goth

Sy-S, Sy-C and Sy-P are not noted in NA, but are in IGNTP (and Burkitt).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 10:11 εἰς ἣν δ' ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθητε,

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 9:5 καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἔξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς
πόλεως ἐκείνης τὸν κονιορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε
εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς.

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 8:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς καὶ αὐτὸς διώδευεν κατὰ
πόλιν καὶ κώμην

NA28 Luke 8:4 Συνιόντος δὲ ὄχλου πολλοῦ καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν
ἐπιπορευομένων πρὸς αὐτὸν εἶπεν διὰ παραβολῆς·

NA28 Luke 13:22 Καὶ διεπορεύετο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας διδάσκων

Difficult to judge.

πόλεως appears in the previous verse 5, so it is possible that the addition of
πόλεις is a conformation to immediate context. Possibly it is also stimulated by
13:22. It is not clear why one of those readings should have been changed to the
txt reading.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 141

NA28 Luke 9:7 Ἦκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν,

BYZ Luke 9:7 Ἦκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὰ γινόμενα ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινων ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν

Byz A, C³, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 124, 174, 230, 346(=f13), 700, 892, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt P75, 01, B, C*, D, L, E, f13, 157, (579), 1241, 1342, 2542, pc, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, arm
πάντα τὰ γενόμενα 579

D omits also πάντα καὶ and reads:

τὰ γινόμενα ἠπορεῖτο διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι

B: no umlaut

ἠπορεῖτο ἀπορέω indicative imperfect passive 3rd person singular
"be at a loss, be in doubt, be uncertain"

διηπόρει διαπορέω indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular
"be greatly perplexed, be at a loss"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:1 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὴν ἀκοήν Ἰησοῦ,

NA28 Mark 6:14 Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερόν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ...

NA28 Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν.

BYZ Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἐποίει, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν

Byz A, C, D, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy

txt 01, B, L, (W), Θ, 27, Co

Compare:

NA28 Luke 13:17 ... ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 23:8 καὶ ἤλπιζέν τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενον.

ὑπ' αὐτοῦ: There is no reason for an omission. It has probably been added remembering 13:17 or 23:8 to make the meaning more clear.

ἤπορεῖτο is possibly a partial conformation to Mk 6:20, but D reads ἐποίει here.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 142

53. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:9 εἶπεν δὲ Ἡρώδης Ἰωάννην ἐγὼ ἀπεκεφάλισα· τίς δέ ἐστιν οὗτος περὶ οὗ ἀκούω τοιαῦτα; καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν.

ὁ Ἡρώδης

B, L, N, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc, TR!

Weiss, [WH], NA²⁵, Gre, SBL

txt P75^{vid}, 01, A, C, D, W, Θ, 28, 565, 700, 1071, Maj

WH and NA²⁵ have ὁ in brackets.

P75 not in NA, but in Swanson; as "vid" in IGNTP!

"vid" is justified. From the facsimile one can see that this is in a lacuna, but from space considerations it is pretty certain that ὁ was not present. Ἡρώδης is the beginning of a line. There is a small part broken off, the right vertical bar of H can still be seen.

B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 9:7 Ἦκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν,

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:1-2 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὴν ἀκοήν Ἰησοῦ, 2 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής· αὐτὸς ἠγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.

NA28 Mark 6:14 Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερόν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτίζων ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 23:7 καὶ ἐπιγνοὺς ὅτι ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας Ἡρώδου ἐστὶν ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἡρώδην, ὄντα καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν ταύταις ταῖς ἡμέραις.

<u>ἐξουσίας τοῦ Ἡρώδου</u>	579
<u>πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην</u>	P75, B, T, Θ, pc
<u>τῷ Ἡρώδῃ</u>	D

NA28 Luke 23:12 ἐγένοντο δὲ φίλοι ὁ τε Ἡρώδης καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετ' ἀλλήλων· προϋπήρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς αὐτούς.

<u>ὁ τε Πιλάτος καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης</u>	
<u>καὶ Ἡρώδης</u>	H, S, U, W*, Θ, Ω, 1582, 69, 346, 788, 565

In 9:7 the article comes with ὁ τετραάρχης.

Difficult to judge, the support is not coherent for both readings.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 143

NA28 Luke 9:10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐποίησαν. Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά.

BYZ Luke 9:10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα ἐποίησαν καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαϊδάν

<u>πόλιν</u>	P75, 01 ^{c1} , B, L, X, Ξ*, 33, pc, Sy-S, Co, <u>WH</u> , <u>NA</u> ²⁵
<u>κώμην</u>	D, d
<u>τόπον</u>	Ψ

<u>τόπον πόλεως</u>	f1, 700, Sy-Pal, geo
---------------------	----------------------

<u>τόπον ἔρημον</u> locum desertum	Lat, bo ^{mss}
---------------------------------------	------------------------

omit καλουμένης Βηθσαϊδάν:

<u>τόπον ἔρημον</u>	01*, 157, Sy-C, arab ^{MS}
<u>ἔρημον τόπον</u>	69, 788(=f13), 1241

<u>πόλιν</u> καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά	<u>τόπον ἔρημον</u>	1342
<u>κώμην</u> καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά εἰς	<u>τόπον ἔρημον</u>	Θ, r ¹

<u>ἔρημον τόπον πόλεως</u>	A, Ξ ^c , f13, 565, pc
<u>τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως</u>	C, W, K, Π, Δ, 892, 1424, Maj, (Sy-P), Sy-H, goth

Ξ: The reading of Ξ^c is written in the margin. It is not noted by Tregelles, but by Greenlee, in his correction of the collation, JBL 76 (1957) 237-41. According to Greenlee it is the only marginal reading in Ξ. It's also in NA.

B: no umlaut

Compare second next verse 12:

NA28 Luke 9:12 ... εὐρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, ὅτι ᾧδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:13 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκεῖθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ περὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.

NA28 Mark 6:31 δεῦτε ὑμεῖς αὐτοὶ κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς ἔρημον τόπον

NA28 Mark 6:32 Καὶ ἀπῆλθον ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατ' ἰδίαν.

NA28 Luke 4:42

Γεινομένης δὲ ἡμέρας ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἔρημον τόπον.

Strange collection of all thinkable variants.

It is possible that πόλιν was the original reading and that scribes felt the discrepancy between the "deserted place" mentioned in verse 12 and the πόλις Βηθσαϊδά. It makes no sense to have a feeding in the city. So they changed the passage in various ways.

On the other hand it is also possible that the Byzantine reading is original. It has the same difficulty: Either there is a deserted place or it is the city Bethsaida. So the reading τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαϊδάν ("a desert place of a city called Bethsaida") is a contradiction or at least a difficulty. The other readings are then attempts to correct this.

It has been suggested that the Byzantine reading is a conflation of πόλιν and τόπον ἔρημον (WH § 143).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 144

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:12 Ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν· προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπαν αὐτῷ· ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλῳ κώμας καὶ ἀγροὺς καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὕρωσιν ἐπισιτισμόν, ὅτι ὦδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

τοὺς ὄχλους P75, 01^{C2a}, 047, 28, 157, 472, 565, 1424, 2766, 2786, pc, Lat(aur, c, d, ff², vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, sa^{mss}, bo

τοῦ ὄχλου 01*

txt 01^{C2b}, A, B, C, D, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, Maj

B: no umlaut

Context:

NA28 Luke 8:42 Ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι συνέπιγον αὐτόν.

NA28 Luke 8:45 ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.

NA28 Luke 9:11 οἱ δὲ ὄχλοι γνόντες ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ·

NA28 Luke 9:16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

τοῖς ὄχλοις D, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, bo^{mss}

NA28 Luke 9:18 τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι εἶναι;

Possibly an intensification, conformed to the previous οἱ ὄχλοι in 8:42, 45 and the previous verse 9:11. Note that D, Lat use the plural in 9:16 also.

The support is quite strong.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 145

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:13 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· δότε αὐτοῖς ὕμεις φαγεῖν. οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· οὐκ εἰσὶν ἡμῖν πλείον ἢ ἄρτοι πέντε καὶ ἰχθύες δύο, εἰ μήτι πορευθέντες ἡμεῖς ἀγοράσωμεν εἰς πάντα τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον βρώματα.

φαγεῖν ὕμεις B, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Trg^{mg}, Tis, Bal

txt 01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241,
Maj, WH^{mg}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:16 ὁ δὲ [Ἰησοῦς] εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐ χρεῖαν ἔχουσιν ἀπελθεῖν, δότε αὐτοῖς ὕμεις φαγεῖν.

ὕμεις φαγεῖν αὐτοῖς D

NA28 Mark 6:37 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· δότε αὐτοῖς ὕμεις φαγεῖν.

P45^{vid}: ὕμεις φαγεῖν αὐτοῖς

It is possible that the txt reading is a harmonization to the parallels.

On the other hand the non-harmonistic reading is a singular reading. It is possible that the change has been induced from the desire to emphasize ὕμεις. This is supported by the fact that in both Mt and Mk one witness moves ὕμεις directly after δότε: δότε ὕμεις.

It is also possible that at some point in the transmission of the B text ὕμεις has been omitted accidentally and subsequently has been added at the wrong point.

Overall it appears comparatively more probable that the B reading is an error. That such a rather small harmonization receives such universal support is improbable. But the B reading is unusual and cannot be completely ruled out as secondary.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 146

54. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν ...

εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν

01, X, 1241, 2786, pc, Sy-P, arm

προσηύξατο καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς

D, d

εὐλόγησεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν

et benedixit super illos ...

it(a, b, ff², l, q, r¹), vg^{ms}, Sy-C, (Sy-S), Marcion^E

εὐλόγησεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς

Bois

Lat(aur, c, e, f, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 14:19 λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν ...

NA28 Mark 6:41 καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν ...

Compare:

NA28 Luke 2:34 καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεῶν

NA28 Luke 24:30 λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπέδιδου αὐτοῖς,

NA28 Luke 24:50 καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς.

ἐπ' αὐτούς appears only 3 times in the Gospels, twice in Lk (and 7 times in Acts):

NA28 Mark 6:34 καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ' αὐτούς, "on/for them"

NA28 Luke 9:5 ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς. "against them"

NA28 Luke 19:27 μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεῦσαι ἐπ' αὐτούς "over them"

The reading of 01 et al. is probably a harmonization to Mt, Mk.

There is no reason why $\epsilon\pi'$ should have been deleted so universally.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 147

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

add αὐτοῦ: L, R, Ξ, f13, 33, 892, 1071, 2680, pc (not in NA and SQE!)

txt P75, 01, A, B, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, 157, 579, 1241, Maj

B: no umlaut

Compare complete discussion at Lk 20:45

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 148

55. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:17 καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἐχορτάσθησαν πάντες, καὶ ἦρθη τὸ περισσεῦσαν αὐτοῖς κλασμάτων κόφινοι δώδεκα.

NA28 Luke 9:18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς λέγων· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι εἶναι;

συνήχθησαν 1424, 1675

συνήντησαν P75?, B*, 157, pc, f, goth, WH in the margin

P75 is not noted in any edition. Unfortunately the text is within a lacuna. Extant is: κατὰ μόνας σ ... σαν. Space considerations make it more probable here that P75 has συνήντησαν.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

D has: Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν

"And it came to pass, as they were alone, together with him the disciples"

B has been corrected by the reinforcer (B³): [p. 1321 C 20/21](#). He left the letters HNTH unenhanced and added a new H at the end of the line.

B: no umlaut

συνῆσαν σύνειμι indicative imperfect active 3rd person plural

"be with, come together, gather "

συνήχθησαν συνάγω indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural

"gather together"

συνήντησαν συναντάω indicative aorist active 3rd person plural

"meet"

Parallels: Beginning and end of Luke's Great Omission (6:47 - 8:27)

NA28 Mark 6:44-47 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες. 45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἠνάγκασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβῆναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδάν, ἕως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον. 46 καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. 47 καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἦν τὸ πλοῖον ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θαλάσσης, καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

...

NA28 Mark 8:27 Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰς κώμας Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;

NA28 Matthew 16:13 Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισαρείας τῆς Φιλίππου ἠρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων· τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;

These verses in Lk are the end of Luke's so called *Great Omission* from Mk.

Streeter (*Four Gospels*, p. 176-78) has an interesting suggestion here. He assumes that Luke's copy of Mk actually lacked the omitted part for whatever reason, possibly mutilation. Luke's copy of Mk looked something like this:

6:44 καὶ ἦσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες. 45 Καὶ ... 46 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. ... 47 καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ...

...
8:27 ... καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;

This explains why Luke omits the local reference to Caesarea Philippi which both Mk and Mt have. Luke has quite an abrupt end of the Feeding story.

The textcritical problem here is the word *συνῆντησαν* by B et al. It makes good sense, because Jesus was alone and then quite suddenly the disciples are with him?

"And it came to pass, as he is praying alone, the disciples were with him, and he questioned them"

With the B reading the sense would be:

"And it came to pass, as he is praying alone, his disciples met with him and he questioned them"

It could be argued though that *κατὰ μόνας* is taken with *συνῆσαν* and not with *προσευχόμενον*:

"And it came to pass, as he is praying, his disciples were with him alone and he questioned them"

Streeter thinks that the B reading is ("as so often") original: "It translates Mark's *ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ* in the only meaning that could be given to it, if it followed just after Mk 6:47."

In a footnote (p. 177) he adds: "Probably the original reading was *ἦντησαν* = 'met'. *συνῆσαν* = 'were with', the reading of most manuscripts, is a very early scribe's emendation. Someone then tried to correct an ancestor of B by this text and wrote *συν* over the *ην*, but the next copyist combined the two."

Possibly it is a simple accidental scribal error, συνῆσαν is a rare word (only three times in the NT, all in Lk/Acts: Lk 8:4; 9:18; Acts 22:11)

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 149

56. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς λέγων· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ὄχλοι εἶναι;

οἱ ὄχλοι λέγουσιν 01*, B, L, R, Ξ, f1, 892, 2542, pc,
Weiss, WH, Bois, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P75, 01^{cz}, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 700, Maj, Trg^{mg}
λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι A, 047, 0211, 579, 1241, 1342, 1424, pc

2542 not in NA, but correctly in SQE and IGNTP. Checked at the film.

B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 9:20 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 16:13 ... ἡρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων·
τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;
τίνα οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσιν 01, D, 579, 700

NA28 Matthew 16:15 λέγει αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι;

NA28 Mark 8:27 ...ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς·
τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι;

NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός.

It is quite probable that the txt reading is a harmonization to the parallels. This is supported by the fact that A et al. harmonize even further by replacing οἱ ὄχλοι with οἱ ἄνθρωποι from Mt/Mk.

The support for the 01, B reading is very strong and there would be no reason to change the txt reading.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 150

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:20 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν τ τοῦ θεοῦ.

τ ὑιὸν D, 2766, it(d, e, r¹), bo^{ms}

τ τὸν ὑιὸν 28, 892, 1675, pc, bo^{msc}

Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος f*, l (Mt)

"Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi."

Origen: Mt Comm tom. 1

οἱ γοῦν ἀναγράψαντες Μᾶρκος καὶ Λουκᾶς ἀποκριθέντα τὸν Πέτρον εἰρηκέναι· "Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς;" καὶ μὴ προσθέντες τὸ παρὰ τῷ Ματθαίῳ κείμενον "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος".

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν·
σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 23:35 Καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες λέγοντες· ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν,
εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός.

add ὁ υἱός: P75, 070, f13, 157, 579, 1071, L844, pc, Sy-H, Co, Eus

εἰ υἱός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός B

εἰ υἱός εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ χριστὸς εἶ ὁ ἐκλεκτός D, c

Possibly added from Mt (so Weiss). Note the same addition at Lk 23:35!

The words τοῦ θεοῦ constitute one of the so called Minor Agreements of Mt and Lk against Mk.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 151

NA28 Luke 9:23 Ἐλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

BYZ Luke 9:23 Ἐλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἐλθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ
_____ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι

Byz 01^{cl}, C, D, X, Δ, 565, 579, 1424, Maj, it, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, sa^{ms}, Or?

txt P75, 01*, A, B, K, L, R, W, Y, Θ, Π, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342^z, al, Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H**, Co, goth, TR, Did

omit καὶ ἀράτω ... καθ' ἡμέραν D, a, d, l

1342 has καθ' ἡμέραν after καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

B: umlaut! (1322 A 9 L) αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθείτω

καθ' ἡμέραν "daily"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 16:24 καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

NA28 Mark 8:34 καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθείτω μοι.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 11:3

τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον δίδου ἡμῖν τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν.

A typical Lukan term, it appears only once in Mt/Mk, but 11 times in Lk/Acts. The term has very probably been omitted as a harmonization to Mt/Mk.

The omission by D et al. is probably due to homoioarcton (KAIA - KAIA).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 152

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:26 ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνηθῆ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους, τοῦτον ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπαισχυνηθήσεται, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀγγέλων.

"whoever is ashamed of me and the mine (my followers)"

"whoever is ashamed of me and of my words"

omit: D, it(a, d, e, l), Sy-C
P45, W have the word

Sy-S: Burkitt writes: "με καὶ ... πατρὸς καὶ τῶν illegible"

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 8:38 ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἐπαισχυνηθῆ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶ,

omit: P45^{vid}, W, k, sa
D has the word

The words make good sense both ways. But an omission is more likely, probably due to h.t. (OUS - OUS). Accidental omission is also supported by the fact that the supporting witnesses are not the same in both cases.

But note what Ross writes: "The decisive consideration in this case is that neither Mark nor Luke would have written τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους unless with the intention of giving special emphasis to ἐμοὺς, of which there is no sign in the context; had they wished to convey the sense "ashamed of me and my words" they would have written τοὺς λόγους μου. Mark uses the possessive μου 29 times elsewhere but both he and Luke rarely use ἐμός, and never in a possessive sense with a noun. [...] It therefore seems highly probable, on stylistic grounds alone, that λόγους was missing from the original text both here and in Luke."

Compare:

J.M. Ross "Some unnoticed points in the text of the NT" NovT 25 (1983) 59-72

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 153

NA28 Luke 9:27 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς, εἰσὶν τινες τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐστηκότων οἳ οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ἕως ἄν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Luke 9:27 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς εἰσὶν τινες τῶν ᾧδε ἐστώτων οἳ οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ἕως ἄν ἴδωσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ

Not in NA but in SQE!

Byz A, C, D, K, Π, P, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj

txt P75, 01, B, L, Ξ, f1, pc

B: no umlaut

αὐτοῦ here: adverb of place; strictly "in the very place"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 16:28 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσὶν τινες τῶν ᾧδε ἐστώτων οἳ τινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ...

NA28 Mark 9:1 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσὶν τινες ᾧδε τῶν ἐστηκότων οἳ τινες οὐ μὴ γεύσονται θανάτου ...

Byz: τῶν ᾧδε ἐστηκότων

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 26:36 καθίσατε αὐτοῦ ἕως [οὔ] ἀπελθὼν ἐκεῖ προσεύξωμαι.

ᾧδε 33, 700

ἐκεῖ 472

omit: 01, C*, pc

NA28 Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοὶ καὶ πεζῆ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

D συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ

565 ἦλθον αὐτοῦ

f1 ἦλθον ἐκεῖ

Clearly a harmonization to Mt, Mk.

Possibly the unusual use of αὐτοῦ has been changed to the more common and unequivocal ὧδε. Compare the similar cases above.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 154

57. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:28 Ἐγένετο δὲ μετὰ τοὺς λόγους τούτους ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτὼ **[καὶ]** παραλαβῶν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰωάννην καὶ Ἰάκωβον ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι.

omit P45^{vid}, 01*, B, H, 28, 157, 579, pc,
it(a, b, ff², l, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, **WH**, **Bal**

txt 01^{c2}, A, C, D, L, P, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, d, e, f, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, bo-ms, **WH^{mg}**, **Tis**
καὶ παραλαβῶν τὸν 124, 1071, TR
ἡμέραι **ἔξ** ... 1071

order Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην
P45, P75, C^c, D, L, M, Ξ, 33, 157, 892, 1071, L844, pc,
d, r¹, vg^{cl}, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa-mss, bo

The evidence of the Syriac here is doubtful, compare P. Williams:

P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 160.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 17:1 Καὶ μεθ' ἡμέρας ἔξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν.

NA28 Mark 9:2 Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἔξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ἰάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ' ἰδίαν μόνους. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν,

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 9:10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ὅσα
ἐποίησαν. Καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν
καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 26:37 καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς Ζεβεδαίου ἤρξατο λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν.

NA28 Mark 14:33 καὶ παραλαμβάνει τὸν Πέτρον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰάκωβον καὶ [τὸν] Ἰωάννην μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤρξατο ἐκθαμβεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδημονεῖν

Not clear.

That some kind of harmonization is involved can be seen from the reversed order of Ἰάκωβον and Ἰωάννην, the addition of τὸν and the time indicator ἡμέραι ἕξ.

But it is questionable if the omission of καὶ is a harmonization, because the sentence structure is different here. And one could even argue that a καὶ is present in the parallels as the first word of the sentence.

It's possible that καὶ has been omitted to smooth the sentence.

The addition of καὶ here in Lk could be a conformation to context, verse 9:10 or a reminiscence to Mt 26:37/Mk 14:33. It is also possible that it has been added to separate the nominativus pendens ὡσεὶ ἡμέραι ὀκτῶ (which has no defined connexion) from the following.

Otherwise a secondary addition of καὶ is difficult to explain.

The support for the omission is not coherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

TVU 155

NA28 Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.

BYZ Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε

Byz A, C*, D, P, R, W, X, Δ^{Gr}, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, it(a, aur, d, ff², l), vg^{mss}, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, goth, Marcion^{T, E}
ὁ ἀγαπητός ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα C^{C3}, D, M, Ψ, 1689(=f13), pc, bo^{ms}

txt P45, P75, 01, B, L, Θ, Ξ, f1, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, pc, Lat(b, c, e, f, q, r¹, vg), Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, Co, arab^{ms}
ὁ ἐκλεκτός Θ, f1, 22*, pc

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 17:5 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 9:7 καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός ^T, ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

add ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα: 01^c, Δ

add ὃν ἐξελεξάμην: 0131

Compare:

NA28 Luke 23:35 ... εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός.

NA28 John 1:34 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ.

P106^{vid}, 01*, b, e, ff², Sy-S, Sy-C: ὁ ἐκλεκτός

a, sa: "electus filius"

NA28 1 Peter 2:4 πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζῶντα ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μὲν ἀποδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ θεῶ ἐκλεκτὸν ἔντιμον,

Clearly the Byzantine reading is a harmonization to Mt/Mk. There is no reason for a change to the unusual ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος.

ὁ ἐκλεκτός appears also in Lk 23:35. Note the much discussed v.l. in Jo 1:34.

Note also the reading ὃν ἐξελεξάμην of 0131 in Mk 9:7.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 156

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:37 Ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολὺς.

τῆς ἡμέρας P45
διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l), Sy-S, sa^{ms}
per diem

eo die r¹
in illa die f, vg^{ms}

ἔν τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ A, C, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 28, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1241, 1424,
1342, Maj
τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ 01, B, L, S, W, f1, f13, 892, 1071, pc
τῇ ἑξῆς 579

Lat(aur, c, q, vg) read txt.

Burkitt has: "and on that day again" Sy-C

"and on that day" Sy-S

The 579 reading is not in NA, but in IGNTP, Swanson and Schmidtke. Checked at the film.

Lacuna: ☒

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 17:9 Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἐνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

NA28 Mark 9:9 Καὶ καταβαινόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς

No interval is expressed in Mt/Mk. The omission is therefore probably a harmonization to Mt/Mk.

Similarly Weiss (Textkritik, p. 129) notes that the ἑξῆς has probably been omitted because no overnight stay on the mountain is mentioned.

Compare also variant Lk 7:11 and discussion there.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 157

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:39 καὶ ἰδοὺ πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξαίφνης κράζει
τ καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτὸν μετὰ ἀφροῦ καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
συντριβὸν αὐτόν·

τ καὶ ράσσει 01, 157

τ καὶ ράσσει αὐτόν 230(=f13), pc

τ καὶ ρήσσει αὐτόν 892

τ καὶ ρήσσει (D), (X), Θ, f1, 579, (1342), pc, Latt, Sy-S, arm

IGNTP adds also Sy-C for this reading, probably in error, because Burkitt does not list it.

D: λαμβάνει γὰρ αὐτόν ἐξαίφνης πνεῦμα καὶ ρήσσει
(D omits κράζει)

X, 1342 omit καὶ σπαράσσει.

txt P45, P75, A, B, L, W, Ψ, f13, 33, 700, 1071, Maj,
Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

Lacuna: Ε

B: no umlaut

ράσσει from ῥήγνυμι or ῥήσσω

"dash to the ground (in convulsions); break forth (of a shout)"

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 9:18 καὶ ὅπου ἔαν αὐτόν καταλάβῃ ρήσσει αὐτόν, καὶ
ἀφρίζει καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας καὶ ξηραίνεται· καὶ εἶπα τοῖς
μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἐκβάλωσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 9:42 ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτόν τὸ
δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπάραξεν·

On the one hand a harmonization to Mk is possible (so Weiss). This is probable at least in part, because some witnesses add the Markan αὐτόν, too. It is also possible that it is a conformation to context 9:42.

On the other hand the words could have been omitted due to homioarcton (KAI - KAI) or to improve style (remove redundancy).

A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes: "In several documents this is preceded by καὶ ῥήσσει, which I believe to be right. It was probably omitted because ῥήσσει was thought to express the same as σπαράσσει; but it signifies *throws down*, and this is what happens to the unfortunate epileptics."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 158

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:39 καὶ ἰδοὺ πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξαίφνης κράζει καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτὸν μετὰ ἀφροῦ καὶ μόλις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ συντριβὸν αὐτόν·

μόλις B, R, W, Θ, 0211, f1^{pt}, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, pc,
Weiss, WH, Bois, NA²⁵, Trg^{mg}

txt P75, 01, A, C, D, L, Ψ, 0115, f1^{pt}, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Co

Swanson has f1 for txt, only 118 for μόλις.

IGNTP lists 1*, 118, 205, 209 for μόλις, so also Lake 1902.

I checked the film: 1 reads μόλις, I cannot see any correction. 1582 reads μόλις, too. I didn't check the other manuscripts.

B: no umlaut

μόλις adverb: "hardly, scarcely"

Compare:

NA28 Mark 7:32 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μογιλάλον καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῆ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα.

Lukan usage:

NA28 Acts 14:18 καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντες μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς. μόλις D, 1175

NA28 Acts 27:7 ἐν ἱκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις βραδυπλοοῦντες καὶ μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον, μὴ προσεῶντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην κατὰ Σαλμώνην, μόλις 1175, 1270

NA28 Acts 27:8 μόλις τε παραλεγόμενοι αὐτὴν ἤλθομεν εἰς τόπον τινὰ καλούμενον Καλοὺς λιμένας ᾧ ἐγγὺς πόλις ἦν Λασαία. μόλις 1175

NA28 Acts 27:16 νησίον δέ τι ὑποδραμόντες καλούμενον Καῦδα ἰσχύσαμεν μόλις περικρατεῖς γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης, μόλις 330, 1175, 1243

Compare also:

NA28 Romans 5:7 μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν·

μόγις 01*, 1739, pc, Or

The word appears only here in the Gospels. From the evidence in Acts it appears that μόλις is the normal Lukan usage. μόγις appears also 9 times in the LXX.

It is possible that the more unusual μόγις has been changed into μόλις.

According to Robertson (Wordpictures) μόγις is the old Greek term, whereas μόλις is a late word. μόλις is also the spelling of today's Greek.

The support for μόλις is not coherent.

Overall it appears more probable that μόλις is a conformation to common usage.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 159

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:50 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ κωλύετε· ὅς γάρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν.

omit 01*, B, **NA²⁵**, **WH**, **Tis**, **Bal**

txt P45, P75, 01^{c2}, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241,
Maj

B: no umlaut

01 and B are known to omit articles.

P75 has the article.

Rating: ?? (NA probably original)

TVU 160

58. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:50 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ κωλύετε·
ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν.

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν·
οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν .

P45

"because he is neither against you, nor for you."

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν·
ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν,
ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν.

L, Ξ, Ψ, 33, 892, 1342, pc, Lect^{MSS}, Sy-H**, bo

pc = 7, 60, 267, 349, 659, 1194, 1391, 1402, 1606, 1630, 1654

Lect = L10, L12, L70, L80, L150, (L184), L211, L299, L1127, L1642
(from IGNTP LK)

ὃς γὰρ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν

X^{txt}

(X^{Comm.} reads txt)

txt + Mk 9:39b (οὐδεὶς γὰρ ...)

a, b, r¹, (c, e, l)

txt P75, 01, A, B, C, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy
μεθ' for καθ' (sic!): 579, pc

B: no umlaut

For the ὑμῶν / ἡμῶν variation, see next variant.

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 9:39 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· μὴ κωλύετε αὐτόν. οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἔστιν ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ δυνήσεται ταχὺ κακολογῆσαί με·

NA28 Mark 9:40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν.

Note also:

NA28 Luke 11:23 Ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἔστιν,
καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

A strange variation.

a) the P45 reading:

James R. Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 177) is probably correct in proposing that the P45 reading is a corruption of the L et al. reading due to parablepsis (καθ' ὑμῶν - καθ' ὑμῶν). The scribe omitted the middle part, "but not making sense of this, the scribe then inserted οὐδέ and also, seeking brevity, omitted the superfluous ἔστιν."

So, P45 should be counted to the L et al. reading.

b) The L, Ξ et al. reading:

There is no obvious reason for a secondary origin of this longer reading. On the face of it, it appears redundant. But it makes good sense, because it first states clearly that the man is not against you. Then it is declared that someone who is not against you, is for you.

Forbid him not!

For he is not against you!

For whoever is not against you, is for you.

So, either the words have been added as a clarification or they have been removed as redundant.

It is also possible that some form of parablepsis is involved, either as dittography or as haplography.

Externally the witnesses are overwhelmingly against it.

Nevertheless the support for the longer reading is interesting. On the one hand we have strong Alexandrian witnesses (L, Ξ) and some mixed ones (33, 892, 1342). But there is also considerable support from the Byzantine: One majuscule (Ψ) and (at least) 11 minuscules and 10 lectionaries.

Von Soden labels the minuscules: 7, 267, 659, 1391, 1402, 1606 = I^{φb}

349 = I^{φa}

1194 = I^{φr}

1654 = I^α

60 = K^x

1630 = K^r

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 161

NA28 Luke 9:50 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ κωλύετε· ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν.

BYZ Luke 9:50 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Μὴ κωλύετε· ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν

Byz 01^{c2}, f1, f13, 157, 579, Maj, geo

txt P45, P75, 01^{c1}, B, C, D, K, Π, L, M, W, Ξ, Ψ, 124(=f13), 33, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, pc, Latt, Sy, Co, arm, goth

ἡμῶν ... ὑμῶν Θ, 2542, pc

ὑμῶν ... ἡμῶν 01*, A, X, Δ, 69(=f13), pc

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 9:40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἔστιν.

BYZ Mark 9:40 ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν

Byz A, D, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H

txt 01, B, C, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, k, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, Co

ἡμῶν ... ὑμῶν L, pc

ὑμῶν ... ἡμῶν X, 118, pc

Compare previous verse 49:

NA28 Luke 9:49 ἐπιστάτα, εἶδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ' ἡμῶν.

The Byz/txt readings are exactly opposite in Mk and Lk. It is possible that in some cases harmonization occurred, also the accidental change ὑμῶν / ἡμῶν appears quite often.

It is possible that here in Lk we have a harmonization to the ἡμῶν of the previous verse 49.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 162

NA28 Luke 9:54 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἶπαν· κύριε, θέλεις εἶπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς;

BYZ Luke 9:54 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἶπον, Κύριε θέλεις εἶπωμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς ὡς καὶ Ἡλίας ἐποίησεν

T&T #17

Byz A, C, D, K, Π, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 700^c, 892, Maj, it(a, b, c, d, f, q, r¹), vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth, Marcion^T, [Trg^{mg}]

txt P45, P75, 01, B, L, Ξ, 157, 579, 700*, 1241, 1342, 1612, 1627, pc³, Lat(aur, e, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo^I
pc = 17, 854, 2735

Marcion: Tertullian has (IV, 23):

Repraesentat creator ignium plagam Helia postulante in illo pseudopropheta. Agnosco iudicis severitatem: e contrario Christi <lenitatem, increpantis> eandem animadversionem destinantes discipulos super illum viculum Samaritarum.

Harnack thinks that from this it is certain that Marcion had these words, and probably also 55b-56.

B: umlaut! (1323 B 22 L) καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς; 55 στραφεῖς

No parallel.

The incident is reported in 2.Ki 1:10, 12:

2 Kings 1:10 But Elijah answered the captain of fifty, "If I am a man of God, let fire come down from heaven and consume you and your fifty." Then fire came down from heaven, and consumed him and his fifty. 11 Again the king sent to him another captain of fifty with his fifty. He went up and said to him, "O man of God, this is the king's order: Come down quickly!" 12 But Elijah answered them, "If I am a man of God, let fire come down from heaven and consume you and your fifty." Then the fire of God came down from heaven and consumed him and his fifty.

There is no reason for an omission. It has probably been added to give the reference for the LXX passage.

Zahn thinks that the words have been deleted in connection with the words in 55b-56a. Because only with Elijah included do we have an explicit OT reference, against which the words in 55-56 are directed. Only in that case the words would have suited Marcion well. But the support is quite different. See next variant below.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 163

59. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 9:55 στραφείς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς.

NA28 Luke 9:56 καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην.

BYZ Luke 9:55 στραφείς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Οὐκ οἶδατε οἴου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς:

BYZ Luke 9:56 ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι, ἀλλὰ σῶσαι. καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην

T&T #18, T&T #19

B: no umlaut

add only 55b: D, 669, 1675, d,
Chrys(4th CE), Epiph(4th CE), Did (4th CE)

add only 56a: bo^{mss} (IGNTP)

add both: K, Π, M, U, Y, Γ, Θ, Λ, f1, f13, 2, 579, 700, Maj-part¹³⁰⁰,
Lat(a, aur, b, c, e, f, q, r¹, vg^{WW}), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt},
arm, goth,
Marcion(2nd CE)?, Tert?, Cl?, Diatess^{Arab}, Ambrose(4th CE)
For Marcion 55b-56a is not directly documented, but it is probable that he read it, too (so Zahn and Harnack).

ποιού instead of οἴου: D, f1, 579, 700, al²⁴⁰
οἴου pronoun correlative genitive neuter singular
ποιού adjective interrogative genitive masculine singular

579 has: καὶ εἶπεν, καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν εἶπεν τίς
προς αὐτόν, Οὐκ οἶδατε οἴου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς: ὁ
γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων
ἀπολέσαι, ἀλλὰ σῶσαι. ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν
ἀπέρχῃ. (Probably mixed up. 579 omits verses 56b and 57a)

add 56a before 55b: pc³³

omit = txt P45, P75, 01, A, B, C, L, W, X, Δ, Ξ, Ψ, 047, 0211, 28, 33, 157, 565,
892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2786, Maj-part⁴³⁰ [E, G, H, S, V, Ω],
g¹, l, vgSt, Sy-S, sa, aeth^{mss}, Basil, Codex Fuldensis^{6th CE}

omit καὶ εἶπεν ... κώμην 1241 (sic!)

Diatessaron:

The words are not discussed in Ephrem's commentary, but they can be found in the Arabic translation of the Diatessaron (Ciasca and Preuschen):

55. Et conversus Iesus increpavit illos, dicens: Nescitis cuius spiritus estis.

56. Profecto Filius hominis non venit animas perdere, sed salvare. Et abierunt in aliud castellum.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 8:30 καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 8:33 ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ,

Compare for 56a:

NA28 Matthew 5:17 Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφῆτας· οὐκ ἦλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρῶσαι.

BYZ Matthew 18:11 Ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

NA28 Luke 19:10 ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.

NA28 John 3:17 οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνη τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῆ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ.

Chrysostom (4th CE) mentions the saying 5 times: Homily on Matthew 29, 56, Homily on John 51, Homily on Romans 22, Homily on 1. Cor 33.

It has often been assumed (e.g. Zahn, WH) that the passages belong together with the addition in verse 54 (see previous variant).

Th. Zahn thinks that the words have been omitted because they suited Marcion so well. But why is it that just those Byzantine manuscripts support the text which are normally considered the most "catholic"? WH think that the addition of 55-56 is older than 54b, because it is "bolder", even though the support is not so good. In their rejected readings section they have 56a in brackets, because it is omitted by D.

The diverse support and also the content mark the readings as old. For 55b there is no parallel in the Gospels. It is a very prominent saying, even today well known to everybody through the Textus Receptus. It could very well go back to Jesus, but the limited support makes it unlikely that it originally belonged to Luke's Gospel.

The support for the words is Western (D, Lat + Sy) plus part of the Byzantine text. Of the better Alexandrian manuscripts only 579 supports the words, but this manuscript shows signs of tampering with the text (see above). The Old Syriac is divided. Sy-C has the words, whereas Sy-S omits. It could be argued that the originally purely Western text intruded into part of the Byzantine text with its tendency to have the fullest, most complete text.

It is possible that the words have been added to explain and expand the short "but he turned and rebuked them". So, Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the words 55b have been added by D to explain the short ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς. The addition in verse 56 then comes from Lk 19:10.

On the other hand Zahn notes that without the words this piece would appear "curiously meager" in the row of the 6 short episodes 9:46-62. In all of them Jesus has a profound answer.

There is a catena by Macarius Chrysocephalus which possibly goes back to Clement, who then cites 55b. From Tischendorf:

"Clem teste Macar. Chrysoceph agnoscere videtur. Cf Clem fragment ap Mac Chrysoc or. 8 in Mt cap 8 etc (ed. Mign. 2,765.) At mihi dubium vdtr, extrema eius loci verba sintne et ipsa ex Clem. excerpta: ταυτα τοι και ο κυριος προς τους αποστολους ειποντας εν πυρι κολασι τους μη δεξαμενους αυτους κατα τον ηλιαν· ουκ οιδατε, φησι, ποιου πνευματος εστε.

The words are in the Arabic diatessaron.

Harnack (Marcion, p. 204*, 248*) thinks that Marcion invented these words: "Who should have added it, if not Marcion?" So also Harris (Codex Bezae, p. 233). Tertullian does not mention this though, and he seems to have had the words in his own text (see Zahn, Comm. Lk, Exc. VIII). Tertullian would not have hesitated to note such gross interpolations.

A. Plummer (ICC Com. Lk 1922): "It is quite possible that Οὐκ οἶδατε οἴου πνεύματός ἐστε is a genuine saying of Christ, although no part of this Gospel. The remainder ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς ... may be an adaption of Mt 5:17 and 18:11, and could more easily have been constructed out of familiar materials."

Burkitt is analyzing the Vulgate evidence and concludes that it had originally the short text. He suggests that the omission of the words in Codex Fuldensis is due to it being conformed to the. He shows that Dutch harmonies have the words and that they represent the true wording of the Old Latin harmony. Compare: F.C. Burkitt "St. Luke 9:54-56 and the Western Diatessaron" JTS 28 (1926) 48-53

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 164

60. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:57 Καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶπέν τις πρὸς αὐτόν· ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἀπέρχη.

ὑπάγης P45, D, 157, pc

B: no umlaut

ἀπέρχη ἀπέρχομαι subjunctive present middle 2nd person singular
"go away, leave"

ὑπάγης ὑπάγω subjunctive present active 2nd person singular
"go one's way; go away, depart"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 8:19 καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἀπέρχη.

Interesting difference.

ἀπέρχη could be a harmonization to Mt.

Usage:

	<u>ὑπάγω</u>	<u>ἀπέρχομαι</u>	Ratio
Mt	19	35	0,5
Mk	15	23	0,65
Lk	5	20	0,25
Jo	32	21	1,5
	71	99	

Lk uses ὑπάγω only rarely.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 165

61. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 9:57 ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχη _____.

BYZ Luke 9:57 ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχη κύριε.

Byz A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,
(b), f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, goth

txt P45, P75, 01, B, D, L, Ξ, f1, 157, 1071, 1342, pc,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, arm, geo

διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ... sa^{ms}, bo^{ms}

κύριε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ... b

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 8:19 καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἐὰν ἀπέρχη.

NA28 Matthew 8:21 ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

Context:

NA28 Luke 9:54

ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἶπαν· κύριε,

NA28 Luke 9:59 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον· ἀκολούθει μοι. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν·
[κύριε,] ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

omit: B*, D, V, pc, d, Sy-S, Or, NA²⁵, Tis, WH, Gre, Bois, Weiss

NA28 Luke 9:61 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος· ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 5:8 ἔξελθε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε.

omit: 01*, 2, it, Sy-S, Sy-P, arm, Or, Chr

NA28 Luke 12:41 κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις ...

omit: f13, bo^{ms}

NA28 Luke 14:22 κύριε, γέγονεν ὃ ἐπέταξας, καὶ ἔτι τόπος ἐστίν.

omit: D, 205, 209, 726, 1071, e, c, d

NA28 Luke 19:8 ἰδοὺ τὰ ἡμίσιά μου τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, κύριε,

omit: 063, 579, 1241, it

NA28 Luke 19:16 κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου δέκα προσηγάσατο μνᾶς.

omit: K

NA28 Luke 19:20 κύριε, ἰδοὺ ἡ μνᾶ σου ἦν εἶχον ...

omit: 1071, 2757, Sy-C

NA28 Luke 19:25 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς-

omit: B*

NA28 Luke 22:38 κύριε, ἰδοὺ μάχαιραι ὧδε δύο.

omit: 01*, pc, i, Sy-S

The nomen sacrum κύριε can be easily omitted, as can be seen from the above examples.

Mt has διδάσκαλε at the beginning of the words. Clear harmonization to Mt occurs only in three versional manuscripts.

κύριε has possibly been added from context 9:54, 59, 61.

Compare variant 9:59.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 166

62. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:59 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον· ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

omit: B*, D, pc, d, Sy-S, Or, **NA²⁵**, **Tis**, **WH**, **Gre**, **Bois**, **Weiss**, **Bal**

Tis notes additionally: V/031, 57, Bas(4th CE), Thdrt(4/5th CE)

57 already in Wettstein. IGNTP has V, too.

txt **WH^{mg}**

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally κύριε in brackets in the margin.

B (p. 1323 B 39): Corrected by inserting the nomen sacrum (**ΚC** or **ΚΕ**, not clear) above the line, possibly before the enhancement, but this is not clear. The enhancer left the **N** from **ΕΙΠΕΝ** unenhanced, so he could have inserted it here. The correction can be very early. Tischendorf has it by B³ (= enhancer).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 8:21 ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 9:54

ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἶπαν· κύριε,

NA28 Luke 9:57 ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχη _____.

BYZ Luke 9:57 ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἂν ἀπέρχη κύριε.

Byz A, C, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H

txt P45, P75, 01, B, D, L, Ξ, f1, 157, 1071, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, co

NA28 Luke 9:61 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος· ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε.

The word could have been added from the parallel in Mt or as a harmonization to immediate context (so Weiss). On the other hand the omission by some normal Byzantine manuscripts shows that an accidental omission is probable. The above cited church fathers seem to cite from memory, see Tis.

Compare also variant Mt 8:6 and discussion there.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(remove brackets)

TVU 167

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:59 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς ἕτερον· ἀκολουθεῖ μοι. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· [κύριε,] ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

πρῶτον ἀπελθόντι

01, B, (D), 047, 28, 33, 892, 1342, al, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Trg, Tis, Bal

πρῶτον ἀπελθόντα D

πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν f1, f13, 579, 1071, 1424, pc (= Mt)

πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ 579, 1582^c (=Mt)

txt P45, P75, C, L, (Θ), Ψ, Ξ, 0181, 157, 700, Maj

ἀπελθόντα πρῶτον Θ

ἀπελθεῖν πρῶτον A, K, Π, 2542, al

ἀπελθόντι W, 69, pc

πρῶτον 1241, bo^{mss}

Swanson, IGNTP and Lake (implicitly) have Ψ correctly for txt against NA, which has it wrongly for the 01, B reading. The error still remains in NA28. Checked at the film.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 8:21 ἕτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.
safe!

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 9:61 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος· ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου. ἐπίτρεψόν δὲ μοι πρῶτον D (conformation to verse 59)

It is possible that the 01, B reading is a (partial) harmonization to Mt. f1, f13 et al. harmonize even further and 579 complete to Mt.

There is no reason why the 01, B reading should have been changed into the txt reading.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 168

63. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ___ ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο]

BYZ Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος **καὶ** ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα

Byz 01, A, C, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-H, arm, **Gre**, **[Trg]**, **SBL**

txt P75, B, L, Ξ, 0181, 579, 892, 1071, pc, r¹, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, goth

NA has 1424 erroneously for txt. IGNTP, UBS³ and Swanson have it correctly for Byz! 1424 reads Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν καὶ ἑτέρους ... with καὶ abbreviated, and omitting ὁ κύριος.

omit ὁ κύριος: D, 1424, 1675, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, arab^{MS}

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 9:61 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἕτερος· ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε·

NA28 Luke 23:32 Ἦγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο

Metzger: "internal probabilities are indecisive (copyists may have omitted καὶ as superfluous or inserted it as explanatory)."

καὶ ἕτερος is a typical Lukan phrase. It appears 10 times in Lk and twice in Acts, but elsewhere only once in Mt. All other occurrences are safe! It is possible that we have here a reminiscence of verse 61 (so Weiss).

In his Lk Com. Weiss notes the possibility that the καὶ has been added to contrast the Seventy with the 12 apostles: "the Lord did appoint also other seventy".

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 169

64. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο [δύο] πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον οὗ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι.

BYZ Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος καὶ ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον οὗ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι

Byz 01, A, C, K, Π, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, f, q, r¹, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, goth, Ir, Cl, Or, Marcion^T, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt P75, B, D, M, 0181, 372, pc, Lat(a, aur, b, c, d, e, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo^{ms}, arm, geo, Marcion^A

WH, NA²⁵ both have δύο in brackets.

Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (1323 C 18 R) ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] καὶ ἀπέστειλεν

Same in 10:17:

NA28 Luke 10:17 Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο]

BYZ Luke 10:17 Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα

Byz P45?, 01, A, C, K, Π, L, M, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Sy-C, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, Ir, Cl, Or, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt P45?, P75, B, D, R, 0181, 372, pc, Lat, Sy-S, sa, arm, geo

P45:

B.M. Metzger writes: "The present writer has examined this passage in P45 under natural and artificial light, and has assured himself that the Greek character which follows the letter omicron (standing for '70') is neither b, as Kenyon supposed, nor v, as Roberts thinks, but merely a *diple*, or space filler (>), which scribes would use occasionally in order to bring an otherwise short line even with the right-hand margin of the column. In fact, by consulting Kenyon's volume of Plates of P45 anyone can see the similarity between the disputed character and the diple which appears on the same folio near the top of the column."

For the reading of R in verse 17 Metzger notes: "ex indice capitum"

The reading of Sy-S in verse 17 is acc. to Burkitt "not quite clear".

B: umlaut! (1324 B 24 L)

ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] μετὰ χαρᾶς

No parallel.

Very difficult.

K. Aland argues in a minority vote for omission of the brackets. He sees (correctly) the overwhelming examples for 70 in the LXX. It would be thus only natural to use it here too (so also Weiss).

One important parallel are the 70 elders who were appointed to share the burden of Moses' work (Num 11:16-17, 24-25, Exo 24:1).

It has also been suggested that the confusion has to do with the Septuagint which is most often referred to as LXX = 70, but sometimes (Aristeas) 72 is used as the number of translators (6 elders x 12 tribes).

It is noteworthy that the witnesses are almost identical in verses 1 and 17.

If there is a connection with the other $\delta\upsilon\acute{o}$ $\delta\upsilon\grave{o}$ variant later in verse 1 is not clear (see next variant).

Another point has been suggested: A widespread tradition in the ancient world, both in Jewish tradition and also in Graeco-Roman sources, was that there were altogether 72 nations (compare Gen 10, LXX). In that case, Luke would be using the Table of Nations to emphasize the universalistic aspect of Jesus and his ministry. Ephrem the Syrian (306-73 CE) saw this connection. Against this has been argued that the disciples were sent in pairs.

Compare:

- B.M. Metzger "Seventy or Seventy-two disciples?" NTS 5 (1958/59) 299-306; also in "Historical and Literary Studies", Leiden, 1968, p. 67-76 [sees the evidence very evenly balanced and argues for bracketed $\delta\upsilon\acute{o}$]
- S. Jellicoe "St. Luke and the 'seventy(-two)'" NTS 6 (1959/60) 319-21 [thinks that the Letter of Aristeas is the model Luke used for the story]

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

TVU 170

65. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο [δύο] πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον οὗ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι.

BYZ Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος καὶ ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον οὗ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι

Byz 01, A, C, D, L, W, X, Δ, Ξ, Ψ, 0181, f1, 124, 174, 230, 983, 1689(=f13), 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj, NA²⁵, Tis, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Bal

txt B, K, Π, Υ, Θ, 0211, f13, 565, pc, L2211, Sy-H, Eus, Bois
WH have δύο in brackets.

omit 1582*

Lat has: "binos"

P75 has Β (= numeral "2") at the beginning of a line. The end of the previous line is missing. It seems more probable, also from space considerations, that P75 supports the omission of the second δύο.

P75^{vid}, B, 0181, 579, 700, pc, e, Eus: omit αὐτοὺς.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 6:7 Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο καὶ ἐδίδου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων,

ἀνὰ δύο D, 565, ff², Sy-S

Context:

NA28 Luke 9:3 μήτε [ἀνὰ] δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν.

LXX:

LXX Genesis 7:3 καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πετεινῶν τῶν μὴ καθαρῶν δύο δύο ἄρσεν καὶ θήλυ διατρέψαι σπέρμα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν

LXX Genesis 7:9 δύο δύο εἰσηλθον πρὸς Νωε

LXX Genesis 7:15 εἰσῆλθον πρὸς Νωε εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν δύο δύο ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκός

Compare:

NA28 John 2:6 ἦσαν δὲ ἐκεῖ λίθιναι ὑδρίαὶ ἕξ κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων κείμεναι, χωροῦσαι ἀνὰ μετρητὰς δύο ἢ τρεῖς.

BDAG (3rd ed.):

ἀνὰ δύο δύο *two by two* Lk 10:1; cp. J 2:6;

Also δύο δύο *two by two* Mk 6:7 (this way of expressing a distributive number is found also in LXX, Gen 7:3, 9, 15 and is widely regarded as a Semitism [Wellhausen, Einl.² 1911, 24; JWackernagel, TLZ 34, 1909, 227]. Nevertheless it occurs as early as Aeschyl., Pers. 981 [but s. Mussies 218: perh. not distributive but w. emotional value]; Soph., fgm. 191 Nauck²; POxy 121, 9 [III AD] τρία τρία;

cp. the mixed expr. κατὰ δύο δύο in the magical pap POxy 886, 19 [III AD], in Medieval Gk. and in Mod. Gk.

On Mk 6:7 see JJeremias, NT Essays: Studies in Memory of TWManon 59, 136-43.

It is possible that the double form, considered as vulgar and semitic has been reduced to the singular form.

On the other hand the double form could be a harmonization to Mk.

The support without B would be clearly secondary.

Note also the omission of αὐτοὺς by several witnesses:

αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο δύο K, Y, Θ, Π, f13, 565, al, Sy-H, Eus

ἀνὰ δύο δύο B

αὐτοὺς ἀνὰ δύο 01, A, C, D, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 33, Maj

ἀνὰ δύο (P75?), 0181, 579, 700, pc, Eus^{acc. to Tis}

Rating: - (indecisive)

(brackets ok)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = omit δύο)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 171

NA28 Luke 10:11 καὶ τὸν κοινορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν·

BYZ Luke 10:11 Καὶ τὸν κοινορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν _____ ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν·

Byz Δ, Λ, 124, 174, 230, 346, 788(=f13), 2, 28, 565,
Maj, aur, vg

txt

εἰς τοὺς πόδας

P45, P75, 01, B, D, R, 0181^{vid}, 157, pc, it, vg^{mss}

εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν

A, C, G, K, Π, L, M, U, W, X, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33,
579, 700, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, al,
f, Sy, Co, goth

εἰς τοὺς πόδας ὑμῶν

892

P45, W* omit the preceding ὑμῶν.

892: Harris (JBL 1890) has it correctly. NA is giving it for the A reading. IGNTP has it for txt. 892 reads also the first ἡμῖν as ὑμῖν, but omits ὑμῶν after πόλεως.

IGNTP has 1241 correctly for εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν. NA erroneously notes 1241 for txt. Checked at the film.

0181 has a lacuna, but from space considerations it is almost certain that it read txt (compare Wessely, Stud Pal. u. Pap. 12, p. 241, no. 185 and S. Porter NT Papyri and Parchments, Vienna, 2008, p. 127).

B: no umlaut

ἀπομάσσομαι "wipe off, wipe clean"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 10:14 καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ δέξηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἔξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κοινορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 9:5 καὶ ὅσοι ἂν μὴ δέχωνται ὑμᾶς, ἐξερχόμενοι ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης τὸν κοινορτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν ἀποτινάσσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ' αὐτούς.

Probably a rather late omission within the Byzantine tradition. Either accidentally or to improve style.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 172

NA28 Luke 10:11

πλὴν τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤγγικεν _____ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Luke 10:11

πλὴν τοῦτο γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ

Byz A, C, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 700, 1071, Maj, f, l, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, goth

txt P45, P75, 01, B, D, L, Ξ, 0181, f1, 33, 157, 579, 892, 954, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, L184, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, bo, arm, geo, Marcion^T

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 10:9 καὶ θεραπεύετε τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ λέγετε αὐτοῖς: ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

omit ἐφ' ὑμᾶς: Γ, pc⁴, bo^{ms}

NA28 Luke 11:20 εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ [ἐγὼ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 3:2 ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NA28 Matthew 4:17 ἤγγικεν γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NA28 Matthew 10:7 ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν.

NA28 Mark 1:15 ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

Probably added from immediate context 10:9 (so Weiss). There is no reason for an omission. At 10:9 only very few witnesses omits.

It is possible principally that the words have been omitted, because the phrase is more general then and appears four times without them in the Gospels. But then it would have happened similarly at 10:9.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 173

66. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:14 πλὴν Τύρω καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἢ ὑμῖν.

omit: P45, D, 472, 1009, 1241, d, e, l, geo^{2A}, arab^{M5}, **Bois**

ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως f13, 1424, 1675, pc, r¹, Sy-C, sa^{mss}, goth (from Mt)
ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη Ψ, pc, Sy-S, geo^{mss} (verse 12)

txt P75, 01, A, B, C, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, f1, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1071,
1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co
ἐν τῇ κρίσει ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται f1

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 12:

NA28 Luke 10:12 λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι Σοδόμοις ἐν τῇ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη
ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνη.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:22 πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, Τύρω καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον
ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρα κρίσεως ἢ ὑμῖν.

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 12:41 ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει

NA28 Luke 11:32 ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει

NA28 Matthew 12:42 βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει

NA28 Luke 11:31 βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει

The reading of f13 et al. is a harmonization to Mt. The reading of Ψ is a conformation to verse 12.

The omission is difficult to explain. In Mt the words are safe.

IQP's Crit. ed. has ἐν τῇ κρίσει as safe for Q.

Rating: - (indecisive)

(for the omission)

TVU 174

67. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 10:15 καὶ σύ, Καφαριναοῦμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ;
BYZ Luke 10:15 καὶ σύ Καπερναοῦμ, ἢ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα.

Byz A, C, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0115, (f1), f13, 33, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, e, f, i, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, goth, Cyr
ἢ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα C, 157, 2542, pc, [Trg^{mg}]
ἢ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψώθῃς 1582
ἢ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψώθῃς Tis, Weiss (see below)

txt P45, P75, 01, B*, D, (L, Ξ, 579, 700, 1071), pc,
it(a, b, d, r¹), Sy-C, Sy-S, Co
μὴ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; L, Ξ, 579, 700, 1071, Gre (in Mt: txt)

ἢ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; 1, 22, 1582*?
ἢ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψώθῃς B^{C3-A?}
μὴ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσε B^{C3-B?}

B: no umlaut

1582 (p. 175r): Swanson has 1582 erroneously for μῆ, but it clearly reads ἦ. It then reads ὑψώθῃς. The only question is if there is a correction after the Sigma of ὑψώθῃς, as Swanson is judging it. There is a free space after the Sigma and it looks washed out. But it could be just a smudge or thin parchment. Letters from the verso shine through. Amy Anderson consulted the microfilm, too, and wrote:

On Swanson's opinion of a correction in the last word, I'm not sure I agree. There certainly is a large space there, but Ephraim often does that. What appears to be a smudge where the final HI would be might be a letter showing through from the other side. I'd have to make overhead photocopies of both sides of the folio and lay them together to be sure. More important, the smudge does not include any sign of a high left side extender as is typical in Ephraim's H (looks like an "h"). And there is really not enough room for the iota adscript. (Though I do have to add that some of the corrector's erasures are absolutely invisible on the microfilm.)"

B (p. 1324 B 4): The corrections in B are not entirely clear. NA and Tis have **H** for B^C (Tis: "B^{3?}"). Swanson has **MH**. The **M** is there, but it is not clear if it is enhanced or not. The **M** is not canceled. It's slightly less dark than the previous **M**, difficult to judge. An **Y** from the verso shines through the page and can give the impression as if there is a weak cancel bar through it. It is possible that it has been erased and later rewritten. But, what is clear is that there is a canceled rough breathing above the **H**.

The **TOY** has been written above the line in dark uncial script. It is not clear by what corrector. **Tis** thinks by B³.

B^c also reads ὑψωθήσει with the **ΕΙ** written above the unenhanced **H**. **Weiss**, following **Tis** thinks that the **H** has been canceled by a corrector. It is possible that there is a stroke from top left to bottom right through the **H**. This then has subsequently been changed into **ΕΙ**.

Tischendorf thinks that B³ canceled the **M** from **MH** (and added a rough breathing above the **H**) and canceled the final **H** from ὑψωθήση, but later restored it back to **MH** (erasing the rough breathing) and ὑψωθήσει.

For the discussion, see Mt 11:23

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 175

68. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 10:15 καὶ σύ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ;
ἕως τοῦ ἄδου καταβήσῃ.

BYZ Luke 10:15 καὶ σύ Καπερναούμ, ἢ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα,
ἕως ἄδου καταβιβασθήσῃ.

Byz P45, 01, A, C, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, 0115, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892,
1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, WH^{mg}, Gre, Bois, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P75, B, D, 579, 1342, pc, d, Sy-S, Sy-C, arm, WH, NA²⁵, Weiss

Same in Mt:

NA28 Matthew 11:23 καὶ σύ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ;
ἕως ἄδου καταβήσῃ:

BYZ Matthew 11:23 καὶ σύ Καπερναούμ, ἢ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
ὑψωθείσα, ἕως ἄδου καταβιβασθήσῃ:

Byz 01, C, L, X, Θ, Σ, Φ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 700, 892, Maj,
Sy-P, Sy-H, mae-1, bo, Gre

txt B, D, W, 163, 372, 2680, 2737, Latt, Sy-C, Sy-S, sa, Ir^{lat}

B: no umlaut

See discussion in Mt 11:23.

IQP's Crit. ed. has καταβήσῃ as safe for Q.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 176

69. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:16 Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει,
καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ·

ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

"Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me,
and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me."

ὁ δὲ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.

D, it(d, i, l), Justin

Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg) read txt.

ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με

καὶ ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.

E^c, Θ, 1582, f13, 22, pc, (a, b), r¹, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, arm
f13: 69, 230 have the txt version.

καὶ ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων ἀκούει τοῦ πέμψαντός με

καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ·

ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

0115, 2766, pc, Diatess^{Arab}

Apostolic Constitutions 8:46 I

Ὁ ὑμῶν γὰρ ἀκούων ἐμοῦ ἀκούει,

καὶ ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων ἀκούει τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.

καὶ ὁ ὑμᾶς ἀθετῶν ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ·

ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Pseudo-Ignatius, Ephesians 5

Ὁ ὑμῶν ἀκούων ἐμοῦ ἀκούει,

καὶ ὁ ἐμοῦ ἀκούων ἀκούει τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός

ὁ ὑμᾶς ἀθετῶν ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ·

ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν πέμψαντά με

The same also in Cyprian (Epistulae 59:4 and 66:4).

B: no umlaut

ἀθετέω "reject, refuse"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 10:40 Ὁ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται,
καὶ ὁ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Compare:

NA28 John 5:24 ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων
καὶ πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον

NA28 John 13:20 ὁ λαμβάνων ἂν τινα πέμψω ἐμὲ λαμβάνει,
ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ λαμβάνων λαμβάνει τὸν πέμψαντά με.

NA28 John 14:24 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ·
καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸς
ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός.

Note that ἀκούω takes a Genitive object.

The addition by Θ et al. is possibly intended to make the saying more symmetrical:

	He who is hearing you,	does hear me;
and	he who is putting away you,	does put away me;
and	he who is putting away me,	does put away him who sent me;
and	he who is hearing me,	does hear him who sent me;

Joachim Jeremias ("Unknown Sayings") regards the addition as "a pedantic expression of the *parallelismus membrorum*". He thinks that it spoils the structure of step parallelism.

It is also possible that it is a conflation of the Western reading and the txt reading.

The origin of the Western reading is strange. Possibly it is just another (oral?) version of a well known saying?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 177

70. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:19 ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄψεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πάσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήση.

ἀδικήσει 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 1071, 1241,
al[E, H, M, Γ, Λ, 047, 2], Did, NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Trg

txt P45, P75, B, C, Ψ, 0115, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892,
Maj[F, G, K, Π, N, S, U, Y, Δ, Ω], TR, Or, Cyr, WH^{mg}

B: no umlaut

ἀδικήση subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular

ἀδικήσει indicative future active 3rd person singular

No parallel.

Probably at least in part accidental. The support is divided, impossible to judge on internal grounds.

Note the very strong triple negative.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 178

71. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 10:21

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο [έν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν·

BYZ Luke 10:21

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι ὁ
Ἰησοῦς, καὶ εἶπεν

T&T #20

"At that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit"

<u>τῷ πνεύματι</u>	A, W, Δ, Ψ, 69, 124, 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Bois
<u>έν τῷ πνεύματι</u>	P45 ^{vid} , 0115, f13, 157, 892, 2542, pc, Cl
<u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u>	P75, B, C, K, Π, Θ, f1, 579, 1071, al ⁴⁰ , NA²⁵ , WH , Gre , Weiss , Trg , SBL
<u>έν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u> <u>one of the last two:</u>	01, D, L, X, Ξ, 33, 1241, pc, Tis , Bal Lat, Sy, Co, arm

add ὁ Ἰησοῦς:

1. before [έν] τῷ πνεύματι	L, N, X, Θ, f13, 33, 579, 1071, al ²⁹ , Lat(c, e, ff ² , r ¹ , vg ^{mss}), Sy-P
2. after [έν] τῷ πνεύματι	A, C, W, K, Π, Ψ, 0115, 0211, f1, 124(=f13), 565, 700, 892, 1342, 2786, Maj, f, q, Sy-H, bo ^{pt} , Cl
3. no addition	P45 ^{vid} , P75, 01, B, D, Ξ, 157, 1241, 1612, pc ⁹ , Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo ^{pt}

Combined (the better witnesses labeled):

<u>τῷ πνεύματι</u>	1612, pc ⁹
<u>έν τῷ πνεύματι</u>	P45 , 157
<u>έν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u>	01 , D, Ξ , 1241
<u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u>	P75 , B
<u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>	pc ⁸
<u>τῷ πνεύματι</u> <u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>	A, W, Ψ, 0211, 565, 700, 1342 , 1424, Maj
<u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u> <u>έν τῷ πνεύματι</u>	N, f13, 2780, al ²⁷
<u>έν τῷ πνεύματι</u> <u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>	0115, 892, 2309, 2542

<u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u> <u>έν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u>	L , X, 33
<u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u> <u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u>	Θ, 579 , 1071
<u>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ</u> <u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>	C, K, Π, f1

B: umlaut! (1324 B 35 L) τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν·

Diatessaron:

Arabic (Ciasca and Preuschen): "Et in ipsa hora exultavit Iesus Spiritu sancto"

= ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ

Ephrem (McCarthy): "At that time and in that moment, Jesus exulted in his spirit"

= ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:25 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Luke 10:20 πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίrete ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται, χαίrete δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 2:8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι

NA28 Mark 8:12 καὶ ἀναστενάζας τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ λέγει·

And he sighed deeply in his spirit

NA28 Mark 12:36 αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ εἶπεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ·

NA28 Luke 2:27 καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν·

NA28 Luke 4:1 καὶ ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ

NA28 John 11:33 ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν

he was greatly disturbed in spirit and deeply moved.

NA28 John 13:21 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι

After saying this Jesus was troubled in spirit

Compare LXX:

LXX Psalm 9:3 εὐφρανθήσομαι καὶ ἀγαλλιάσομαι ἐν σοί

LXX Psalm 19:6 ἀγαλλιασόμεθα ἐν τῷ σωτηρίῳ σου

LXX Isaiah 65:14 ἰδοὺ οἱ δουλεύοντές μοι ἀγαλλιάσονται ἐν εὐφροσύνῃ

LXX Lamentations 2:19 ἀνάστα ἀγαλλίασαι ἐν νυκτὶ

The insertion of ὁ Ἰησοῦς at different places clearly indicates a secondary addition. The last explicit mentioning of Jesus was in Lk 9:62, 21 verses away and is here only natural.

The omission of τῷ ἁγίῳ is probably due to the strangeness of the phrase. It is unique in the NT. Weiss (Lk Com.): "the dative instr. gave offence". Externally the omission is clearly secondary.

On the other hand it could be argued that scribes were used to add ἁγίῳ to πνεύματι. Or they added the word to distinguish the spirit in verse 21 from "the spirits" in verse 20.

ἀγαλλιάω sometimes appears with ἐν in the LXX. The witnesses for the addition/omission of ἐν are very evenly divided. It might be worth checking Luke's dative usage.

Rating: - (indecisive) for ἐν
Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) for the others

TVU 179

72. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:21 Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο [έν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν ...

omit: P45, 27*, Marcion^{T,E}, Pseudo-CI

Marcion additionally omits πάτερ and reads tendentiously: κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἄτινα ἦν κρυπτά σοφοῖς καὶ συνετοῖς ...

So also Pseudo Clementine Homily XVIII, 15: I thank you, Lord of heaven and earth, that what was concealed from the wise, you have revealed to suckling babes.

27* is noted in IGNTP.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:25 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις·

Possibly the words are a harmonization to Mt?

IQP's Crit. ed. has the words as safe for Q.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 180

NA28 Luke 10:22 πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου,

BYZ Luke 10:22 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς εἶπεν Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου

T&T #21

Byz A, C, K, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0115, 124, 174, 230, 346, 983, 1689(=f13), 28, 157, 565, 1071, Maj, it(c, f, ff², i, l, q, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-H

txt P45, P75, 01, B, D, L, M, Π, Ξ, 070, f1, f13, 22, 33, 131, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2737, 2786, al¹³⁰, Lat(a, aur, b, d, e, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, arm, geo, goth

B: umlaut! (1324 C 3 L) πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ

Compare next verse 23:

NA28 Luke 10:23 Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν· μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:27 Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, ...
καὶ στραφεὶς does not appear in Mt.

In the Byzantine text Jesus turns round to his disciples in two subsequent verses. This is very probably in error. It is possible that an early ancestor of the Byzantine text copied this accidentally from the next verse. It is also possible that the scribe wanted to move the verse from verse 23 to verse 22, but forgot to delete it in verse 23, or he deleted it incompletely and the next copyist copied it in error.

If the words were omitted to avoid repetition, they would have been omitted in verse 23 and not in the first place (so Weiss).

It should be noted that at Lk 10:22 a lection begins. This could explain possibly the move of the phrase? It makes good sense at this position, because it smoothes down the abrupt transition from Jesus prayer to the words to the disciples.

It could be argued that in verse 23 the κατ' ἰδίαν belongs to στραφεὶς, so that in this verse he turns around generally and in verse 23 he turns to the disciples privately. But Metzger thinks it is more probable that κατ' ἰδίαν has to be taken with εἶπεν.

IQP's Crit. ed. omits the words in both verse 22 and 23 for Q.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 181

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:23 Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν· μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε.

omit: D, (1424), pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C
IGNTP adds Sy-P
μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν 1424

f, q, δ read txt (seorsum)

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

It is not clear why Lk says this κατ' ἰδίαν, so the phrase has possibly been omitted as difficult. It is possible that he said the previous words to all Seventy and now turns to the Twelve.

There is no real difference in meaning if one takes κατ' ἰδίαν with στραφεὶς or with εἶπεν.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 182

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:24 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφήται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

omit:

D, it(a, d, e, ff², i, l), vg^{ms}, Marcion^T

καὶ δίκαιοι

b, q, r¹, vg^{ms} ("et iusti")

καὶ δίκαιοι καὶ βασιλεῖς

1424

Marcion has: ὅτι οἱ προφῆται οὐκ ἴδαν ἃ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε.

(*dico enim vobis quia prophetae non viderunt quae vos videtis*)

Lat(aur, c, f, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 13:17 ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

omit καὶ δίκαιοι: B* (added by B^{cl})

The omission is not really a harmonization to the parallel (as indicated in NA).

A harmonization would have been the replacement of καὶ βασιλεῖς with καὶ δίκαιοι (as in b, q), or the conflation as in 1424.

IQP's Crit. ed. has καὶ βασιλεῖς as safe for Q.

Harnack (*Sprüche Jesu*, p. 22) thinks that καὶ βασιλεῖς should be kept, since a later addition is difficult to explain, but an omission is understandable. And if it's in Lk, it is also in Q.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 183

73. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:27 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης **[τῆς]** καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.

omit P75, B, Ξ, 070, (f1), 472, L844, (L2211), pc, **WH**
ἐν ὅλῃ — καρδία f1, L2211

txt 01, A, C, (D), L, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, **WH^{mg}**, **[Trg]**
ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ D, 157

B: no umlaut

See complete discussion at Mt 22:37

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 184

74. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 10:30 ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ.

BYZ Luke 10:30 ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ τυγχάνοντα.

Byz A, C, K, W, K, Π, X, Δ, Ψ, 070, f13, 157, 565, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

txt P45, P75, 01, B, D, L, Θ, Ξ, f1, 22, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc

not clearly expressed: all versions

B: no umlaut

τυγχάνοντα τυγχάνω participle present active accusative masculine singular
here: to prove to be in the result, "happen, turn out"

"they left him for half-dead, (as indeed he was)"

Note similar sounding variants (but unrelated) in the next verse:

D: 10:31 κατὰ τυχὰ ἱερέυς τις ("by chance", τύχη)

P75^c: 10:31 κατὰ συγτυχείαν ἱερέυς τις ("by chance", συντυχία)

txt, P75* 10:31 κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερέυς τις ("by chance", συγκυρία)

No parallel.

The word is typical for Lk and appears 7 times in Lk/Acts.

There is no reason why the word should have been added, possibly as an intensification?

The word is used here (and only here!) with the meaning of εἶναι. This demotic usage was perhaps considered erroneous and lead to its deletion.

The support for the word is not very good though.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 185

75. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:32 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευίτης [γενόμενος] κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἔλθων καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρήλθεν.

omit γενόμενος P75, 01^{c2}, B, L, X, Ξ, 070, 0190, f1, 33, 372, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, pc, NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Bal, SBL

txt A, C, K, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 700, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, Bois, Tis

omit ἔλθων P45, D, Π, al, Lat

omit ἔλθων καὶ SyS, Sy-C, Sy-P, arm (acc. to IGNTP, but Burkitt has: "when he arrived at the place")

ἔλθων at the place of γενόμενος: Sy-Pal (Tis, not in IGNTP)

01* omits due to h.t.

(28 in UBS wrongly for the omission. K. Witte from Muenster confirms that it is wrong.)

B: no umlaut

Compare verses 31, 33:

NA28 Luke 10:31 κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερεὺς τις κατέβαινε ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκεῖνη καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἀντιπαρήλθεν·

NA28 Luke 10:33 Σαμαρίτης δέ τις ὁδεύων ἦλθεν κατ' αὐτὸν καὶ ἰδὼν ἐσπλαγχνίσθη,

Compare:

NA28 Acts 27:7 ἐν ἰκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις βραδυπλοοῦντες καὶ μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδον

No parallel.

The sentence with γενόμενος and ἔλθων is a bit redundant (asyndeton). The question is if the Byzantine text is a conflation of the other texts or if the other texts are attempts to remove the redundancy.

It is possible that the 'redundancy' is intended:

"he came to the place, going and seeing, he passed by on the other side."

If ἔλθων was present originally, then there is no reason for adding γενόμενος.

It is possible that scribes missed a verb with κατὰ (in verse 31 κατέβαινε)

and in 33 ἦλθεν κατ') and inserted γενόμενος. Later or at the same time ἐλθὼν has been omitted.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 151) argues for the omission, that the word has been inserted because scribes overlooked that ἐλθὼν belongs to κατὰ τὸν τόπον. They missed a verb and added γενόμενος.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = omit γενόμενος)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 186

NA28 Luke 10:35 καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον
ἐκβαλὼν ἔδωκεν δύο δηνάρια τῷ πανδοχεῖ

BYZ Luke 10:35 Καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον
ἔξελθὼν, ἐκβαλὼν δύο δηνάρια ἔδωκεν τῷ πανδοχεῖ,

Byz A, C, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 700, Maj, q, Sy-H
omit δύο: f13, pc

ἐκβαλὼν δύο δηνάρια ἔδωκεν
01, L, X, Ξ, 070, 0190, f1, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, pc,
NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

ἐκβαλὼν δηνάρια δύο ἔδωκεν
D

ἐκβαλὼν ἔδωκεν δύο δηνάρια
txt P45, P75, B, WH^{mg}

one of the last two: Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co

B: no umlaut

ἐπὶ τὴν αὔριον "the next day"

No parallel.

The word order of the txt reading is very awkward.

To the contrary the reading ἐκβαλὼν δύο δηνάρια ἔδωκεν is straightforward: "taking out two denaries, he gave to the innkeeper". It is an improvement over the txt reading in that it connects ἐκβαλὼν directly with δύο δηνάρια and brings ἔδωκεν next to the dative object, which is the norm.

If the Byzantine reading would have been original, and ἔξελθὼν has been omitted secondarily, there would have been no reason to change the smoother word order into the awkward txt reading. Thus txt must be original.

ἔξελθὼν has probably been added to indicate that the Samaritan is going forth, since later in the verse he says, that he will come back.

It is noteworthy that no witness is omitting ἐκβαλὼν.

The combination of P45 and P75 curious.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 187

76. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 10:38 Ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς κώμην τινά· γυνὴ δὲ τις ὀνόματι Μάρθα ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν.

BYZ Luke 10:38 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ αὐτὸς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς κώμην τινά· γυνὴ δὲ τις ὀνόματι Μάρθα ὑπεδέξατο αὐτόν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.

T&T #22

Byz A, B^{C2}, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, WH^{mg}, Gre

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν

P3^{vid}(6th CE), 01^{*·C2}, C*, L, Ξ, 33, 579, pc,

NA²⁵, WH, Trg^{mg}, Tis, Bal

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῆς

01^{C1?}, C^{C2}

εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἑαυτῆς

P

εἰς τὸν οἶκον [αὐτῆς]

Trg

εἰς τὸν οἶκον

Weiss (no manuscripts support)

txt = omit: P45, P75, B*, sa

P3 reads: (from the edition of Porter, NT Greek papyri, 2008)

ΕΔΕΞΑΤ]ΟΑΥΤΟΝΕΙΣΤΗΝΟΙΚ[ΙΑΝ
ΚΑΙΤΗΔΕ]ΗΝΑΔΕΛΦΗΚΑΛΟΥΜΕ[ΝΗΜΑ

It is not completely clear if P3 reads αὐτῆς or not, but it clearly reads one of the longer readings.

01: There is some deletion in the right margin, but if it really was αὐτῆς cannot be established from the photos. Tischendorf, NA and the online transcription support the above readings. Swanson and IGNTP do not note the correction. All agree on the 01* reading.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

In B (p. 1325 B 7), the words εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς are written above the line and into the right margin in minuscule script, but have been erased later. Parts are still legible. The correction is noted neither in Tis nor in NA, but in T&T.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:56 Ἐμεινεν δὲ Μαριάμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡς μηνᾶς τρεῖς, καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.

NA28 Luke 19:6 καὶ σπεύσας κατέβη καὶ ὑπεδέξατο αὐτὸν χαίρων.

The different additions indicate a secondary cause. The additions are only natural. There is no reason for an omission.

The argumentation of Weiss (Textkritik, p. 23f.) is this: The words εἰς τὸν οἶκον were in the ancestor of B, but B omits due to h.t. (ον - ου). For the omission of αὐτῆς manuscripts O1, C et al. are additional proof, but for the decision οἶκον - οἰκίαν Weiss goes with B. [curious!]

ὑποδέχομαι appears 9 times in the Bible, but nowhere with this addition.

The phrase εἰς τὸν οἶκον appears 15 times in Luke, εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν 5 times.

The support is slim and not coherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 188

77. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 10:40 ἡ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλήν διακονίαν· ἐπιστᾶσα δὲ εἶπεν, κύριε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἡ ἀδελφή μου μόνην με κατέλιπεν διακονεῖν; εἰπέ οὖν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται.

BYZ Luke 10:40 Ἡ δὲ Μάρθα περιεσπᾶτο περὶ πολλήν διακονίαν· ἐπιστᾶσα δὲ εἶπεν, Κύριε, οὐ μέλει σοι ὅτι ἡ ἀδελφή μου μόνην με κατέλειπεν διακονεῖν; Εἰπέ οὖν αὐτῇ ἵνα μοι συναντιλάβηται.

Byz A, B*, C, L, Θ, Ξ, 1071, 1424,
Maj[E, G, H, K, Π*, M, P, V, Y, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ω, 028, 047, 0211, 2],
Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, SBL, Robinson

txt P45, P75, 01, B^{C2}, D, (W), Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241,
al[F, U, Y, Π], Bas, TR!
ἐνκατέλιψεν W
ἐγκατέλιψεν 13

B p. 1325 B 18: The € looks slightly less dark, but this is not certain. Tischendorf thinks that the letter is not enhanced.

B: no umlaut

κατέλιπεν indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
κατέλειπεν indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular

Compare:

NA28 Luke 7:45 φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ ἀφ' ἧς εἰσηλθόν οὐ διέλιπεν καταφιλοῦσά μου τοὺς πόδας.

διέλειπεν 01, A, L, W, Ξ, 079, f13, 33, 565, 892, 1241, 1424, L844,
Maj-part[K, Π, M, Δ, Λ]

διέλιπεν B, D, P, Θ, Ψ, f1, 157, 579, 700, L2211, Maj-part[F, H, S, U, Γ]

NA28 Acts 18:19 κατήνησαν δὲ εἰς Ἔφεσον, κάκεινους κατέλιπεν αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς δὲ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν διελέξατο τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις.

κατέλειπεν A, H, L, P, 33, pc
κατέλιπεν P74^{vid}, 01, B, D, E, Ψ, 1241, 1739, Maj

Probably at least in part accidental or a spelling variant. The imperfect makes good sense: "she kept on leaving me".

A similar variant occurs at Lk 7:45 and Act 18:19. Extremely difficult to judge. Both forms are very evenly supported.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 189

78. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:41 Μάρθα Μάρθα, μεριμνᾶς καὶ θορυβάζῃ περὶ πολλά,

NA28 Luke 10:42 ἐνὸς δέ ἐστιν χρεία: Μαριὰμ γὰρ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτῆς.

omit (see next variant): D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², i, l, r¹), Sy-S

ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία Sy-Pal, arm, geo, bo^{2mss}, arab^{MS}

ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἐνὸς P3(6th CE), 01^{C2}, B, C^{C2}, L, 070, f1, 33, 579, 1342, pc, Sy-H^{mg}, bo, aeth, Or, Cyr^{Alex}

NA²⁵, WH, Gre, SBL

ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν ἢ ἐνὸς 01*

ὀλίγων δέ χρεία ἐστιν ἢ ἐνὸς B, Weiss

txt ἐνὸς δέ ἐστιν χρεία: P45, P75, A, C*, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, f, q, vg), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, Bois

38: wrongly noted in Tischendorf for the Sy-Pal reading. Checked at the film. 38 reads txt.

Lacuna: ☒

B: no umlaut

Basically this is a choice between:

ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἐνὸς 01, B, Or ...

and:

ἐνὸς δέ ἐστιν χρεία P45, P75, A ...

Fee: "One is clearly the deliberate revision of the other. The real question then is, which variant came second? That is, which one can best be explained as the revision of the other?"

The meaning of the longer reading is probably (Godet, 1890): "There needs but little (for the body), or even but one thing (for the soul)."

Fee: "Few things are really needed, or, if you will, only one; for that is indeed what Mary has chosen ..."

This longer reading is rather difficult to understand (Godet: "There is subtlety in this reading, too much perhaps.").

But there is no reason why someone should change the straightforward txt reading to the longer one. It has been argued that the uncompromising exclusiveness of the txt reading should be qualified, but is this probable?

Metzger thinks that the longer reading is a conflation of the txt reading and the reading of 38 et al. But the 38 reading is just too weakly attested to take it seriously. It seems more probable to see it as an other attempt to smooth down the longer reading.

The πολλά - ὀλίγων makes a good contrast.

Fee notes that the γὰρ following Μαριάμ makes no real sense with the short reading (and has been changed to δὲ in the Byzantine text), but it fits good with the long reading as an explanation of the ἢ ἐνός.

Possibly the complete omission by D is just another attempt to avoid the difficult ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἐνός (see next variant).

A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes: "A locus desperatus. Part of the corruption is ἢ ἐνός, which probably represents a marginal comment referring to ὀλίγων and meaning 'or write ἐνός'."

So also C.H. Turner ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158).

Compare:

G. Fee's article on this passage in "NT TC - it's significance for exegesis" Essays in honor of B. M. Metzger, Oxford, 1981, p. 61 - 75. He argues for the originality of the long reading.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
adopt longer reading.

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 190

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 10:41 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ κύριος· Μάρθα Μάρθα, μεριμνᾷς καὶ θορυβάζῃ περὶ πολλά, 10:42 ἐνὸς δέ ἐστιν χρεία· Μαριὰμ γὰρ τὴν ἀγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο ἥτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτῆς.

for the labeled part:

θορυβάζῃ Μαριὰμ D, WH^{mg}
Μαριὰμ it (a, b, e, ff², i, l, r¹), Sy-S
Lat(aur, f, q, vg) have txt

omits only 42a:

c

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation.

txt "Martha, Martha, you are worried and distracted by many things;
there is need of only one thing. Mary has chosen the better part, ..."

D: "Martha, Martha, you are worried; Mary has chosen the better part, ..."

θορυβάζω "trouble, bother"

This variant is connected with the previous one.

The argument from Metzger that it might be an accidental omission due to homioarcton (MAR - MAR) is not probable. It is not clear how exactly this could have happened. It is more probable that it "represents a deliberate excision of an incomprehensible passage" (also Metzger).

Note also that D does not read the same as the Old Latin.

It is possible that this omission by D is a radical attempt to avoid the difficult ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἐνὸς (see previous variant).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 191

NA28 Luke 11:2 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε·
Πάτερ,
ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·
ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·

BYZ Luke 11:2 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς Ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε
Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς,
ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·
ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·
γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου. ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

a) ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς

Byz A, C, D, P, W, X, m Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f13, 33^{vid}, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj,
it, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

txt P75, 01, B, (L), f1, 22, 700, 1342, pc, aur, vg, Sy-S, Marcion^T, Or
ἡμῶν L, pc, arm

B: umlaut! (1325 B 41 L) λέγετε· Πάτερ, ἁγιασθήτω

b) γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ...

Byz 01, A, C, D, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f13, 33^{vid}, 157, 579, 700, 892, Maj,
it, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo
only γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου a, vg^{mss}, sa, bo^{mss}

txt P75, B, L, f1, 22, 1342, pc, vg, Sy-S, Sy-C, arm, Marcion^T, Or

P45: has a lacuna of about 7 lines here, but from space calculations it appears almost impossible that P45 contained all long variants of the Lord's prayer. Probably it read txt everywhere.

Lacuna: ☒

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:9 οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς· Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·

NA28 Matthew 6:10 ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου· γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου, ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς·

Clearly a harmonization to Mt and/or to the common liturgical usage.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 192

79. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:2 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε·

Πάτερ,

ἁγιασθήτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·

ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου·

700^{11th CE}, Tert(c. 200), Greg-Nyss (4th CE), Maximus Conf. (5th CE)

ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

162^{12th CE}:

ἐλθέτω σου τὸ πνεῦμά τὸ ἅγιον καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

Marcion^T (2nd CE) or some other early Western text used by Tert:

ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου

D, d:

ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ἐλθέτω σου ἡ βασιλεία

Gregory from Nyssa cites the passage three times:

ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

ἐλθέτω τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά σου _____ καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

ἐλθέτω ἐφ' ἡμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἅγιον καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

B: no umlaut

"Thy holy spirit come upon us and cleanse us"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 11:13 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς ποιηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.

Gregory and Maximus state expressly that Luke has "holy spirit" where Mt has "kingdom".

The wording of the reading in Marcion (known from Tertullian) is not completely clear. It is possible acc. to Harnack (Marcion) that it was the same as that in 700.

These readings are probably the adaption of a different liturgical prayer into the Lord's prayer. Metzger notes: Compare the similar prayer in the Greek form of the Acts of Thomas, 27:

ἔλθὲ τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμά καὶ καθάρισον τοὺς νεφροὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτῶν.

Possibly the words are inspired from Lk 11:13.

Streeter ("Four Gospels", p. 277) writes: "Now in view of the immense pressure of the tendency to assimilate the two versions of this specially familiar prayer, and of the improbability that various orthodox Fathers should have adopted (without knowing it) the text of Marcion, the probability is high that the reading of 700, 162, which makes the Gospels differ most, is what Luke wrote."

Compare also:

- R. Leaney "The Lucan text of the Lord's Prayer (Lk 11:2-4)" *NovT* 1 (1956) 103-111
- R. Freudenberger "Zum Text der zweiten Vaterunserbitte" *NTS* 15 (1968) 419-32

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 193

NA28 Luke 11:4 καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν,
καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν·
καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν.

BYZ Luke 11:4 καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν
καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίεμεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν·
καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν
ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

Byz 01^{C1}, A, C, D, P, R^{vid}, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj,
it, vg^{mss}, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}

txt P75, 01*, B, L, f1, 22, 700, 1342, pc,
vg, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, Marcion^T, Or

P45: has a lacuna of about 7 lines here, but from space calculations it appears almost impossible that P45 contained all long variants of the Lord's prayer. Probably it read txt everywhere.

R: lacuna ... πο]νηροῦ

Lacuna: Ε

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:13 καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν,
ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

Again a clear harmonization to Mt and/or liturgical usage. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 194

NA28 Luke 11:11 τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς
ἰχθύν, καὶ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει;

NA28 Luke 11:12 ἢ καὶ αἰτήσῃ ὠόν [egg], ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον;

BYZ Luke 11:11 τίνα δὲ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς
ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

ἢ καὶ ἰχθύν, μὴ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

BYZ Luke 11:12 ἢ καὶ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ὠόν μὴ ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον

Byz 01, A, C, D, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, (579), 892, 1342, Maj,

Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, WH^{m9}, Trg, Tis

omit ὁ υἱὸς 01, L, 157, 1342, pc, vg

omit καὶ 01, L, 28, 33, 157, 700, 892, pc

txt P45, P75, B, 1241, pc, ff², i, l, Sy-S, sa, arm, Or, Marcion^E, Bois, Weiss

ἰχθύν, μὴ 1241, Or, NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Bal

omit ὁ υἱὸς 1241

omit ἢ καὶ ἰχθύν μὴ ... αὐτῷ 174, 788(=f13) (h.t.?)

579 reads Byz, but has ἢ καὶ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ ὠόν μίαν from 12a for ἢ καὶ ἰχθύν due to parablepsis.

892: ὁ υἱὸς looks like written above an erasure. What was originally there, cannot be seen anymore. It's the last word on the page (f. 221, image 4460).

Tregelles has additionally [ἄρτον ...ἢ καὶ] in brackets in the margin.

Or Mt Comm. tom. 14:25

τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν τὸν πατέρα υἱὸς αἰτήσῃ ἰχθύν, μὴ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

in particular:

αἰτήσῃ τὸν πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύν καὶ B

αἰτήσῃ ___ πατέρα ὁ υἱὸς ἰχθύν καὶ P75

___ πατέρα αἰτήσῃ _ υἱὸς ἰχθύν καὶ P45

αἰτήσῃ τὸν πατέρα _____ ἰχθύν μὴ 1241

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:9-10 ἢ τίς ἐστὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσῃ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ; 10 ἢ καὶ ἰχθὺν αἰτήσῃ, μὴ ὄφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ;

There is no reason for an omission. Probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss and Streeter, p. 276).

Metzger notes that one of the pairs could have been omitted due to an accident in transcription, but it is difficult to imagine how exactly this should have happened. This difficulty is already noted by Weiss in his Lk Com.

IQP's Crit. ed. has the Matthean wording for Q. So also Harnack.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 195

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:13 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.

πνεῦμα ἀγαθόν

P45, L, 2786, pc⁵, aur, vg, Sy-H^{mg}

ἀγαθὸν δόμα

D, it(a², b, c, d, ff², i, l, r¹) "bonum datum"

δόματα ἀγαθὰ

Θ, 892, Sy-S, arm

(892 not in IGNTP, checked at the film.)

πνεῦμα ἀγαθὸν δόμα

vg^{ms (E)} "spiritum bonum datum"

Lake gives δόματα ἀγαθὰ in his collation, but 1241 reads txt, checked at the film.

f, q read txt.

Lacuna: ☒

B: no umlaut

Ambrose (381 CE, De Spiritu Sancto, book 1, ch. 5):

Secundum Lucan autem invenies ita scriptum: Quanto magis pater vester de caelo dabit spiritum sanctum petentibus se. ... Nec fallit quia nonnulli codices habent etiam secundum Lucan: Quanto magis pater vester de caelo dabit bonum datum petentibus se.

But according to Luke you will find it written thus: "How much more will your Father from heaven give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?" ... Nor does it escape us that some manuscripts also have according to Luke: "How much more will your Father from heaven give a good gift to them that ask Him?"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:11 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὄντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἀγαθὰ τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.

Compare also:

LXX Nehemiah 9:20 καὶ τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἔδωκας

LXX Psalm 142:10 τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὀδηγήσει με ἐν γῆ εὐθείᾳ

Probably the changes to ἀγαθός are conformations to immediate context δόματα ἀγαθὰ in the same verse.

IQP has for Q the Matthean δώσει ἀγαθὰ. So also Harnack.

Compare:

J. Lionel North "Praying for a Good Spirit: Text, Context and Meaning of Luke 11.13" JSNT 28.2 (2005) 167-188 [Learned article, but rather far-fetched. Discusses the possible meanings of πνεῦμα ἄγαθόν.]

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 196

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:14 Καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον [καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν] κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφὸς καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι.

T&T #23

omit: P45, P75, 01, A*, B, (D), L, 0211, f1, 788(=f13), 22, 33, 157, 892, 1241, 1612, 1627, pc³, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, arm, **WH**, **SBL**
pc = 382, 660*, 1210, 1331

txt A^c, C, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, **NA²⁵**

D, d has:

ταῦτα δὲ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ προσφέρετε αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος κωφὸς καὶ ἐκβαλόντος αὐτοῦ πάντες ἐθαύμαζον.

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:33 καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες· οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ.

NA28 Matthew 12:22 Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαιμονιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφός, καὶ ἐθεράπευσεν αὐτόν, ὥστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:22 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διανεύων αὐτοῖς καὶ διέμενεν κωφός.

NA28 Luke 5:1 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ

NA28 Luke 5:17 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων,

NA28 Luke 7:12 μονογενῆς υἱὸς τῆ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὴ ἦν χήρα,

NA28 Luke 14:1 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν.

NA28 Luke 17:16 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν Σαμαρίτης.

NA28 Luke 19:2 Ζακχαῖος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἀρχιτελώνης

As Metzger notes, the expression "appears to be a Semitism in the Lukan style". But the support for the shorter reading is very weighty.

It is very probable that the txt reading is correct. There is no reason for an addition. To the contrary, the omission is only natural, to improve style and understanding (Weiss: "to directly connect δαιμόνιον with the adjective"). Misreading αὐτὸ as αὐτὸς would mean, that Jesus himself is mute.

IQP's Crit. ed. has the Matthean (9:33) καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός as safe for Q.

Matthew has this twice (9:32-34 and 12:22-24). καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν is a typical Lukan expression (7 times, see above).

Pete Williams comments on Sy-S, C:

"SC read 'and it happened as he was casting out a demon from a deaf man, and when it came out ...'. [...] This expression is probably motivated by a desire to avoid the dual attribution of the term 'dumb' as found in Greek texts. These use κωφός both of the spirit and of the person from whom the spirit is cast out. In sum, whatever their *Vorlage*, SC paraphrase, but there are plausible reasons internal to Syriac why they might not represent καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν if it were in their *Vorlage*."

P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 124-25.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(omission wrong)

External Rating: - (indecisive) (!)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 197

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:15 τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον· ἐν Βεελζεβούλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια· †

† ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· πῶς δύναται σατανᾶς σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν;

A, D, K, Π, M, W, X, 346(=f13), 157, 579, 1071, al, a², d, r¹, Sy-H, aeth

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

BGT Matthew 9:33 καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός. καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες· οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ.

NA28 Mark 3:23 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ἐν παραβολαῖς ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· πῶς δύναται σατανᾶς σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν;

Interesting harmonization to Mk.

Note that P45 has a curious singular reading in this verse:

For εἶπον it reads: ἐλάλησαν ὄχυροὶ λέγοντες (:: Mt)

ὄχυρός "*strong, firm; substantively bold persons*"

It has been suggested that this is a mishearing of ὄχλοῖ.

Compare J.R. Royse (*Scribes and Correctors*, 2008, p. 178).

Perhaps a marginal note that slipped into the text?

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 198

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:23 Ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

σκορπίζει με 01*, C^c, L, Θ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, Sy-S, gat, bo, Gre

Sy-S: Burkitt writes: "At the end of the verse is an illegible word in S: probably we should read 'scattereth [me] indeed' ".

01: corrected by 01^{c2} (dots above it).

P45 omits μετ' ἐμοῦ.

Lacuna: Ε

B: no umlaut

σκορπίζω "scatter, disperse"

Same in Mt:

NA28 Matthew 12:30 ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

σκορπίζει με

01, 33, 1582*, pc, Sy-H^{mg}, bo

See Ehrman "Corruption", p. 135-136:

If the scribes wanted to supply a prepositional phrase as a personal object (as with the previous verbs), κατ' ἐμοῦ would be the natural addition. The addition of με makes no sense in context.

Ehrman sees this as a corruption against the Gnostic separation of Jesus and Christ.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 199

80. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 11:24 Ὅταν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον· **[τότε]** λέγει· ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον·

BYZ Luke 11:24 Ὅταν τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον·
_____ λέγει Ὑποστρέψω εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον·

Byz P45, 01*, A, C, D, R, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, Maj,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, geo, Or^{1/2},
NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
WH have it in brackets

txt P75, 01^{C2}, B, L, X, Θ, Ξ, 070, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, pc,
b, l, Sy-H, Co, Or^{1/2}, **[Trg^{mg}]**

Swanson wrongly adds Π for txt, against NA and IGNTP. Π does not have τότε (checked at the film).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:43-44 Ὅταν δὲ τὸ ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα ἐξέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι' ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ οὐχ εὐρίσκει. 44 τότε λέγει· εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ἐπιστρέψω ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον· καὶ ἐλθὼν εὐρίσκει σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον.

It is possible that τότε is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss, Hoskier), where it is save. On the other hand the omission could be a stylistic improvement.

IQP's Crit. ed. has τότε in double brackets, indicating doubt that text was present. Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 95) has it in brackets, too.

Rating: - (indecisive)
brackets ok.

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 200

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:25 καὶ ἔλθὼν εὕρισκει σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον.

"it finds it [empty], swept, and put in order."

σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ 01^{c2}, B, C, (L), R, Γ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, f, l, r¹, Sy-H**, bo, Or
L omits καὶ, Sy-H** has σ. καὶ σ.

WH, [Trg^{mg}], both with σχολάζοντα in brackets.

txt P75, 01*, A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, 070, 157, 1071, 1241, Maj,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa, arm, NA²⁵

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:44 τότε λέγει· εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ἐπιστρέψω ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον· καὶ ἔλθὼν εὕρισκει σχολάζοντα σεσαρωμένον καὶ κεκοσμημένον.

There is no reason for an omission. The addition is very probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss, Hoskier).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 201

NA28 Luke 11:29 καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ.

BYZ Luke 11:29 καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου

Byz A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892^c, 1342, Maj, it(e, f, q, r¹), vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo

txt P45, P75, 01, B, D, L, Ξ, 700, 892*, 1241, 2542, pc, L1043, Lat(a, a², aur, b, c, d, ff², i, vg), Sy-Pal, sa, Justin (Dial. 107:1)

Δ: omits τοῦ.

Sy-C omits τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ. 30 καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο

and reads: εἰ μὴ 30 Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον, (possibly some kind of parablepsis τὸ - τὸ).

892: The words have been added in the margin by a later hand (umlaut insertion sign).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:39 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἐπιζητεῖ, καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:4 καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ.

BYZ Matthew 16:4 καὶ σημεῖον οὐ δοθήσεται αὐτῇ εἰ μὴ τὸ σημεῖον Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου.

Byz C, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, it, Sy

txt 01, B, D, L, 579, 700, pc, Lat

There is no reason for an omission. Clearly a harmonization to Mt.

IQP's Crit. ed. omits τοῦ προφήτου in Q. So also Harnack.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 202

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:30 καθὼς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἔσται καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ.

ὁ Ἰωνᾶς B, Δ, 472, pc, Weiss, [WH], [NA²⁵]

txt P75, 01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1241, Maj, L1043

WH and NA²⁵ have the article in brackets.

B: no umlaut

Probably an error due to dittography: ἐγένετο ὁ Ἰωνᾶς.

On the other hand it is basically possible that ὁ has been omitted due to h.t., but the support is extremely slim and incoherent.

IQP has the reading without the article as safe for Q. So also Harnack.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 203

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:31 βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ **αὐτούς**, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Σολομῶνος ᾧδε.

αὐτήν P45, P75, 1424, pc, d, vg^{ms}

P75* omits νότου (added by secunda manu).

B: no umlaut

"A queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with the men of this generation, and shall condemn them"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:42 βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Σολομῶνος ᾧδε.

Compare next verse:

NA28 Luke 11:32 ἄνδρες Νινευῖται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινούσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλείον Ἰωνᾶ ᾧδε.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt or to the next verse.

The meaning is basically the same. In the txt reading the αὐτούς refers to τῶν ἀνδρῶν, whereas αὐτήν refers to τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

An interesting combination of support.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 204

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:32 ἄνδρες Νινευίται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

omit verse D, d

B: no umlaut

previous verse 31:

NA28 Luke 11:31 ... καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομώνος ὧδε.

Compare parallel:

NA28 Luke 11:31-32

31 βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομώνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομώνος ὧδε.

32 ἄνδρες Νινευίται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν· ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

NA28 Matthew 12:41-42 reversed!

42 βασίλισσα νότου ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομώνος, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Σολομώνος ὧδε.

41 ἄνδρες Νινευίται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν, ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἰδοὺ πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ ὧδε.

Possibly due to h.t.

Acc. to Harnack Marcion omitted this too, but Marcion completely slashed verses 11:29-32.

Mt has the same verse in identical wording. But the interesting fact is that Lk has the two verses reversed. Mt has the more logical order because in the preceding verses Jonah is the topic. It would be natural to end with "something greater than Jonah is here!" and then go on with the queen of the south.

It is possible that the omission by D is original and that some early scribe added the verse as a harmonization to Mt, but added it at the wrong place. But this is rather improbable.

On the other hand it is possible that in an ancestor of D the verse has been labeled for omission and transfer before verse 31. This led accidentally to complete omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 205

81. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:33 Οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν [οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον] ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν.

omit: P45, P75, L, Γ, Ξ, 070, f1, 69, 788(=f13), 22, 700, 1241, pc,
Sy-S, sa, arm, geo, Or?, **Bois**

txt 01, A, B, C, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 892, 1342, Maj,
Latt, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, **WH, NA²⁵**

Οὐδεὶς λύχνον ἄψας τίθησιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. 579 (M+!)

Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον 28 (Lk 8:16 !)

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 5:15 οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

NA28 Mark 4:21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· μήτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον τεθῆ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῆ;

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:16 Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

This addition is very probably inspired from Mt/Mk. There is no reason to omit it, except possibly as a harmonization to 8:16, but the wording in 8:16 is different. This is not very probable.

Compare especially the harmonization by 579.

Weiss (Lk Com.) argues that the words have been omitted as unnecessary: It has already been noted that the λύχνον has been put εἰς κρύπτην, why then put it ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον?

IQP's Crit. ed. has: καὶ τίθησιν αὐτὸν [[εἰς κρύπτην]] with the double brackets indicating doubt that text was present. They also indicate (by grey highlighting) that it's not clear what text might have been present within the brackets. In their earlier, preliminary text they have ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον here (so also Fleddermann).

In "Die Spruchquelle Q" (WBG, Darmstadt, 2007, p. 127) Paul Hoffmann says that the IQP editors consider οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον in Lk secondary. The committee was undecided also, if ὑπὸ τὸν μόνδιον (Mt) or εἰς κρύπτην (Lk) was the original Q reading.

Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 95) thinks that the Matthean form is original.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = omit the words)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 206

82. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 11:33 Οὐδείς λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν [οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον] ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φῶς βλέπωσιν.

BYZ Luke 11:33 Οὐδείς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φέγγος βλέπωσιν

From here on Ξ is not extant anymore!

Byz P45, A, K, Π, L, W, Γ, Δ, Ψ, 124, 565, 700, Maj-part,
NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg^{mg}, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P75, 01, B, C, D, X, Θ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424,
Maj-part, WH, Trg
βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς X, 0211, 118, 205, 209(=f1), f13, pc (8:16 !)

579 harmonizes to Mt:

... ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 5:15 οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνον καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:16 Οὐδείς δὲ λύχνον ἄψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

Gospel of Peter 9:

μεγαλη φωνη εγενετο εν τω ουρανω και ειδον ανοιχθεντας τους ουρανους και δυο ανδρας κατελθοντας εκειθεν πολυ φεγγος εχοντας και εγγισαντας τω ταφω

φέγγος appears only 2 times in the NT:

NA28 Matthew 24:29 καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς,

NA28 Mark 13:24 καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φέγγος αὐτῆς,

In 8:16 φῶς is safe.

There is no reason to insert φέγγος here. Weiss also argues that φῶς is probably a conformation to the φῶς in 8:16 (so also Hoskier).

This is one of the cases suggested by Metzger ("Lucianic recension", 1959) where one could have an old relict of the earliest Antiochian text. Not necessarily correct, but at least older than any possible recension.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: - (indecisive)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 207

83. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 11:34 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός τ ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου.

BYZ Luke 11:34 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός τ ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς _____.

Not in NA but in SQE (070 not noted)!

Byz 01^{c2}, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, 33, 157, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa
τ σου Θ

txt P45, P75, 01*, A, B, C, D, M, W, f13, 1241, pc, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, geo
τ σου D, Lat, Sy-P, bo

B: no umlaut

Note also the similar addition later in the verse:

NA28 Luke 11:34 ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ἀπλοῦς ᾖ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἐστίν· ἐπὰν δὲ ποιηρὸς ᾖ, καὶ τ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν.

τ ὅλον 01^{c2}, f1, 28, pc, Sy-C, Co (not in NA but in SQE)

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:22 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς τ. ἐὰν οὖν ᾖ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ἀπλοῦς, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἔσται·

τ σου B, it, vg^{cl}

NA28 Matthew 6:23 ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ποιηρὸς ᾖ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται.

Compare verse 34b:

NA28 Luke 11:34 ... ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου ἀπλοῦς ᾖ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἐστίν· ἐπὰν δὲ ποιηρὸς ᾖ, καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν.

On the one hand σου could have been omitted to shorten the saying like an aphorism or as a harmonization to Mt.

On the other hand it could have been added from immediate context, 34b.

Note that D et al. add yet another σου after σώματός.

The addition of ὅλον is clearly a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 208

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:34 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου.
ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς ᾖ,
καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινόν ἐστιν·
ἐπὰν δὲ τ πονηρὸς ᾖ,
καὶ τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινόν.

Not in NA!

τ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου P75^{C?}, X, pc⁶, a, vg^{ms}, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo^{pt}
pc = 213, 343, 713^c, 716, 1229, 2487 (from IGNTP)

P75: This reading is possibly supported by P75 already.

The words are added in small script above the line, but the letters are impossible to make out with certainty.

Comfort ("The text of the earliest NT Greek manuscripts") writes: "There are ten small letters, possibly Coptic, above δὲ πονηρὸς."

Aland (collation of P75 Lk in NTS 10, 1963/64, p. 10) writes: "Zusatz von P^{C2} über der Zeile (+ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου = Sy-S,C, sa, bo^{pt} ?) nicht zu entziffern." (engl. = "addition by C2 above the line, undecipherable")

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:22 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός.
ἐὰν οὖν ᾖ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς,
ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου φωτεινὸν ἔσται·
6:23 ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρὸς ᾖ,
ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται.

This is a clear harmonization to Mt.

It is only remarkable because of its possible support from P75.

The IQP has chosen the long, Matthean form for Q. So also Harnack.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 209

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.

NA28 Luke 11:36 εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινόν, μὴ ἔχον μέρος τι σκοτεινόν, ἔσται φωτεινὸν ὅλον ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῆ ἀστραπῆ φωτίζῃ σε.

"if then your whole body is lightened, not having any part darkened, the whole shall be lightened, as when the lamp by the brightness may give you light."

B: no umlaut

εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος, τὸ σκότος ποσον

Si ergo lumen, quod in te est, tenebrae sunt, ipsae tenebrae quantae sunt.

D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², i, l, q, r¹), **WH^{mg}**

Lat(aur, c, f, vg) read txt.

11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.

εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος ποσον

Sy-C

11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.

εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος ποσον

11:36 εἰ δὲ τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινόν, μὴ ἔχον μέρος τι σκοτεινόν, ἔσται φωτεινὸν ὅλον ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῆ ἀστραπῆ φωτίζῃ σε.

1241

11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.

εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμα τὸν ἐν σοὶ λύχνον μὴ ἔχον φωτεινόν σκοτεινόν ἐστίν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὅταν ὁ λύχνος [σου] ἀστράπτῃ φωτίζει σε.

f, q (Greek reconstruction by WH, see below)

f: Si enim corpus, quod in te est, lucernam non habuerit lucentem, tibi tenebrosa est, quanto magis autem lucerna tua fulgens lucebit tibi.

q: Si ergo corpus tuum, lucernam non habens lucidam, obscurum est, quanto magis, cum lucerna luceat, inluminat te.

"if then your body, the lamp in you not having lightened, darkened is, how much more, when the lamp is lightened, it will enlighten you."

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:23 ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς σου πονηρὸς ᾦ, ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται. εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος πόσον.

The D reading is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss).

WH: "A curious recasting of the verse is substituted in q and, with some variations, added at the end in f: its original, to judge by comparison of the two forms, which are both corrupt, was probably: [reconstruction, see above]

"All the extant variations are probably due to the extreme difficulty of the verse. The passage probably contains a primitive corruption somewhere, though no conjecture that has yet been made has any claim to be accepted."

(Intro, Notes on select readings p. 61)

Compare:

W. Brandt "Der Spruch vom lumen internum" ZNW 14 (1913) 97-116

compare also note by A. Pallis (Notes, 1928)

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 210

84. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:38 ὁ δὲ Φαρισαῖος ἰδὼν ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου.

ἤρξατο διακρινόμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διὰ τί

coepit intra se reputans dicere: Quare ...

D, pc, Lat, Sy-C, Marcion^T

Of the Latins only f reads txt.

B: no umlaut

διακρίνω "evaluate, judge; recognize, discern"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 15:1-2 Τότε προσέρχονται τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων Φαρισαῖοι καὶ γραμματεῖς λέγοντες· 2 διὰ τί οἱ μαθηταί σου παραβαίνουσιν τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων; οὐ γὰρ νίπτονται τὰς χεῖρας [αὐτῶν] ὅταν ἄρτον ἐσθίωσιν.

An interesting variation. There is no apparent reason for it.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 211

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:43 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς T¹ καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς T².

T¹ καὶ τὴν πρωτοκλησίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις f13 (not 174, 230)

T² καὶ τὰς πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις
et primos discubitos in conviviiis C, D, 1071, pc,
b, d, l, q, r¹, aeth^{mss}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 23:6 φιλοῦσιν δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς

NA28 Mark 12:39 καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις,

NA28 Luke 20:46 προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν γραμματέων τῶν θελόντων περιπατεῖν ἐν στολαῖς καὶ φιλοῦντων ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλισίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις,

Clearly a harmonization to the parallels.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 212

NA28 Luke 11:44 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, _____ ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι [οἱ] περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἶδασιν.

BYZ Luke 11:44 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκριταί, ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἶδασιν

Byz A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 892, Maj,
it(b, d, f, i, q, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}
omit ὑποκριταί D, d, i, r¹

txt P45, P75, 01, B, C, L, f1, 33, 1241, pc,
Lat(a, aur, c, e, ff², l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

Matt. 23:13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29

NA28 Matthew 23:27 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί,

Compare:

NA28 Luke 11:39 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν· νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ
Φαρισαῖοι τ τ ὑποκριταί D, b, d

NA28 Luke 11:42 ἀλλὰ οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι

NA28 Luke 11:43 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι

NA28 Luke 11:44 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι

NA28 Luke 11:47 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι

NA28 Luke 11:52 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι

Probably a harmonization to the Woe's in Mt 23. It is interesting that no such addition appears in verse 47. There would be no reason to omit the phrase if originally present.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 213

NA28 Luke 11:48 ἄρα μάρτυρές ἐστε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν, ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς, ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε.

BYZ Luke 11:48 ἄρα μάρτυρεῖτε καὶ συνευδοκεῖτε τοῖς ἔργοις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν ὅτι αὐτοὶ μὲν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε αὐτῶν τὰ μνημεῖα.

T&T #24

Byz A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj, f, q, bo^{pt}, [Trg^{mg}]

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, 579, 1241, 2766, pc²,
it(a, b, d, e, i, l, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo^{pt}, Or
pc = 1446, 1593

τοὺς τάφους αὐτῶν f1, f13, 157, 1612, 1627, aur, c, vg

B: no umlaut

τάφος "grave, tomb"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 23:29 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τοὺς τάφους τῶν προφητῶν καὶ κοσμεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν δικαίων,

Compare previous verse 47:

NA28 Luke 11:47 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν, οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς.

In the Gospels οἰκοδομέω is almost always used transitively with an object.

The two exceptions are:

NA28 Luke 14:30 λέγοντες ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἤρξατο οἰκοδομεῖν καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἐκτελέσαι.

NA28 Luke 17:28 ὁμοίως καθὼς ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ· ἦσθιον, ἔπινον, ἠγόραζον, ἐπώλουν, ἐφύτευον, ὠκοδόμουν·

17:28 is a listing, an object is not needed. In 11:48 and 14:30 the object must be supplied from context.

So, the addition is only natural and there is no reason for an omission.

The τάφους by f1, f13 is from Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 214

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 11:51 ἀπὸ αἵματος Ἰαβὲλ ἕως αἵματος Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξύ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐκζητηθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης.

Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχείου ὃν ἐφόνευσαν ἀνὰ μέσον

D, pc (a, d, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa^{ms}, bo^{pt}, geo)

Zacchariae fili Barachiae quem occiderunt inter medium altaris	d, Sy-C
Zachariae quem occiderunt inter altarium	a

ναοῦ for οἴκου: D, pc, d, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, arm, geo

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 23:35 ὅπως ἔλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον ἐκχυννόμενον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος Ἰαβὲλ τοῦ δικαίου ἕως τοῦ αἵματος Ζαχαρίου υἱοῦ Βαραχείου, ὃν ἐφονεύσατε μεταξύ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.

From Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 215

85. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 11:53 Κάκειθεν ἐξελθόντος αὐτοῦ

ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων,

BYZ Luke 11:53 λέγοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτούς,

ἤρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι δεινῶς ἐνέχειν καὶ ἀποστοματίζειν αὐτὸν περὶ πλειόνων

Byz A, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1071, Maj, Latt, Sy, Gre
txt (P45), P75, 01, B, C, L, 33, 579, 1241, pc, Co

Καὶ 69, 788 (=f13)

λέγοντος δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτούς ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ

D, X, Θ, 157, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H^{mg}, arm, arab^{MS}

"in the presence of all the people"

coram omni plebe b, i, l, q

coram omni populo a, f, r¹

in conspectu totius populi c, e

in conspectu omnis populi d

P45 omits αὐτοῦ: IGNTP and Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 109) note this as "vid". I concur with this. Even though the words are within a lacuna, the space is not sufficient to include αὐτοῦ. This is not noted in NA.

P45: Κάκειθεν ἐ[ξελθόντος ἤρξαντο οἱ γρ]αμματεῖς

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 9:30 Κάκειθεν ἐξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,

Compare for the D variant:

NA28 Luke 8:47 ἀπήγγειλεν ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ ὡς ἰάθη παραχρῆμα.

NA28 Luke 14:10 τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι.

NA28 Acts 6:5 καὶ ἤρρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους

NA28 Acts 19:19 συνενέγκαντες τὰς βίβλους κατέκαιον ἐνώπιον πάντων,

NA28 Acts 27:35 λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαρίστησεν τῷ θεῷ ἐνώπιον πάντων

At Lk 11:47 starts a lection. No place is mentioned in verses 47 - 53. So it is not clear from where he went outside.

The location is mentioned in verse 37: "While he was speaking, a Pharisee invited him to dine with him; so he went in and took his place at the table."

The addition by D, Θ et al. is strange, possibly inspired from 8:47? ἐνώπιον παντὸς appears only in Lk in the Gospels. It is possible that it has been added to explain the hostility, because Jesus denounced them "in the presence of all the people".

Zahn (Comm. Lk) thinks that the addition was perhaps inspired from Mt 23:1:

NA28 Matthew 23:1

Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 216

86. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 11:54 ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν _____ θηρεύσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ _____.

BYZ Luke 11:54 ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν ζητούντες θηρεύσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

a) ζητούντες

Byz A, C, (D), W, X, Δ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 892, Maj, it, Sy, [Trg]

txt P45^{vid}, P75, 01, B, L, Θ, f1, 579, 1241, aur, vg, Co, geo

b) ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ

Byz A, C, (D), W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892^{mg}, Maj, Latt, vg, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Gre, [Trg]

txt P45, P75, 01, B, L, 579, 892*, 1241, pc, Sy-S, Co

D, (Sy-S), Sy-C read: omitting ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν

ζητούντες ἀφορμὴν τινὰ λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ ἵνα εὕρωσιν κατηγορήσαι αὐτοῦ

Old Latin reads: (omitting ἐνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν)

ζητούντες ἀφορμὴν τινὰ λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ ἵνα _____ κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ

Quaerentes occasionem aliquam invenire de illo, ut eum accusarent.

892: The words have been added by a later hand.

B: no umlaut

ἐνεδρεύω "lie in ambush, lie in wait; plot"

ἀφορμὴ "opportunity, occasion"

θηρεύω "hunt, catch"

Byz: "seeking to catch something out of his mouth, that they might accuse him."

D, Sy-S, Sy-C:

"seeking an opportunity to get something from him, that they might accuse him."

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 12:10 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος χεῖρα ἔχων ξηράν. καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν λέγοντες· εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεῦσαι; ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 3:2 καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσει αὐτόν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

Lukan parallel has here:

NA28 Luke 6:7 παρετηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι εἰ ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεύει, ἵνα εὕρωσιν κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ.

Rare words in this verse:

ἐνεδρεύω appears only here and in Acts 23:21 and θηρεύω appears only here, in the NT. Both words appear several times in the LXX though.

The two variants should be taken together, because the support is almost the same. Only Θ, f1 omit only ζητοῦντες. But Θ also omits αὐτόν, thus this omission in Θ is due to h.t. (ντες - ντες).

So, why should anybody add or omit these words?

The txt reading is rather short and not completely clear: "lying in wait for him, to catch him in something he might say." The Byzantine addition makes it clear why they are lying in wait.

The final words could have been omitted due to h.t. (αὐτοῦ - αὐτοῦ). But there is no explanation for the omission of ζητοῦντες.

WH: "The figurative language of txt is replaced in D et al. by a simply descriptive paraphrase. ... In Byz both phrases are kept, the descriptive being used to explain the figurative."

It is possible that the readings by the Old Latin and Sy-C, Sy-S are just a free rendering of the Byzantine reading and that the D reading then is a back-translation into Greek.

ἄφορμή is another rare word, that appears only here in the Gospels (but 6 times in the epistles).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 217

87. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:1

Ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου,
ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους,

πολλῶν δὲ ὄχλων συνπεριεχόντων κύκλω,
ὥστε ἀλλήλους συμπνίγειν

D, (Lat, Sy)

Lat: "Multis autem turbis circumstantibus ita ut se invicem concularent, ..."

B: no umlaut

συμπνίγω "choke, crowd around, crush"

txt "At which time the myriads of the multitude having been gathered together,
so as to tread upon one another"

D "But large crowds were surrounding him,
so that they were pressing themselves."

No parallel.

Possibly changed for stylistic reasons?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 218

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:4 Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβηθήτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἔχόντων περισσώτερόν τι ποιῆσαι.

πτοήθητε P45, 700

B: no umlaut

πτοέομαι subjunctive aorist passive 2nd person plural
"be terrified or startled"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 21:9 ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκαταστασίας, μὴ πτοηθήτε. δεῖ γὰρ ταῦτα γενέσθαι πρῶτον, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος. φοβηθήτε D, q

NA28 Luke 24:37 πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν.

φοβηθέντες 01, W

θροηθέντες P75, B, 1241 (θροέομαι "be alarmed or startled")

Compare next verse 5:

NA28 Luke 12:5 ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθήτε. φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν. ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε.

A rare word. πτοέομαι appears nowhere else in the NT except in these two verses in Lk. φοβήθητε appears 3 times in the next verse, where it is save. Probably accidental.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 219

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:8 Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ.

ὁμολογήσει

A, B*, D, 13, 983, 157, 472, 579, 1241, 1342, 1424,
al[S, Γ, Δ, 028, 047, 0211], Trg^{mg}, WH

txt P45, P75, 01, B^{c2}, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, Maj, CI

2nd ὁμολογήσει:

ὁμολογήσει P45, P75, 01, A, B, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565,
700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj

ὁμολογήσῃ F, G, M, V, Λ, 69, 124, 1071, al
(Swanson notes B^c here, but this is in error.)

B p. 1328 A 31: There are some dots visible above the **€**, but these do not look like an **H**.

B: no umlaut

ὁμολογήσῃ subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular

ὁμολογήσει indicative future active 3rd person singular

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 10:32 Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν [τοις] οὐρανοῖς. safe!

Compare:

NA28 John 9:22 ταῦτα εἶπαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐφοβοῦντο τοὺς Ἰουδαίους· ἤδη γὰρ συνετέθειντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ χριστόν, ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται.

ὁμολογήσει H, Γ, Λ, Θ, 788, 2*, 28, 1424, pc

Interestingly the word in the Matthean parallel is safe.

ὁμολογήσει could be a harmonization to Mt. Since the Matthean reading is safe and a similar variation occurs in John, it appears more probable that ὁμολογήσει is the correct reading.

Weiss (Com: Lk) argues that the first ὁμολογήσει is a conformation to the second.

IQP has the ει of ὁμολογήσει in double square brackets, indicating text that is "probable but uncertain".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 220

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:8 Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Luke 12:9 ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ.

omit: 01*^{vid}, 259, Marcion^{T.(E)}

01* has an unclear correction in verse 8 for τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ. According to Tischendorf, Swanson and NA 01* omits τῶν ἀγγέλων. According to IGNTP 01* omits τοῦ θεοῦ.

Tischendorf writes: "τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ: haec omnia videtur A scripsisse, prioribus litteris τῶν ἄγ in litura positis. Scripserat prima manus, ni fallor, nil nisi τοῦ θεοῦ."

Dirk Jongkind studied the passage and concluded "that Tischendorf was right but that the replacement of τοῦ θεοῦ with τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ was made by scribe D and not by scribe A who wrote the main text."

Timothy A. Brown from the Sinaiticus transcription project wrote:

"In verse 8 the letters ΤΩΝ ΑΓ are written by the first hand over an erasure. What the first hand originally wrote and then erased is not clear. The ΤΟΥ ΘΥ at the end of the line appears to have been written by a first hand and then reinforced by a later corrector since the article is certainly a first hand and traces of the associated nomen sacrum appear beneath the corrector's ink. - Amy Myshraal is the other transcriber in the Codex Sinaiticus Project. She has independently concluded the same correction scenario I've outlined above."

According to the apparatus of NA, 01* omits both times, verse 8 and 9. This is not correct. Timothy A. Brown confirmed this. The omission in verse 9 is also not in Tischendorf, Swanson and IGNTP.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

omit verse 9: P45, pc, e, Sy-S, bo^{ms} (h.t.)

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 10:32-33 Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖ 33 ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνήσηταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν [τοῖς] οὐρανοῖς.

The omission is probably a harmonization to Mt. There is no reason why the angels should have been added secondarily. The omission by 01 is probably just accidental.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 221

88. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 12:14 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπε, τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς;

BYZ Luke 12:14 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ "Ἀνθρωπε τίς με κατέστησεν δικαστὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς

T&T #25

Byz A, Q, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 124, 174, 230(=f13), 1424, Maj
μεριστὴν ἢ δικαστὴν 472, pc²³

txt P75, 01, B, L, 070, 0153, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1241, 1627, 2786,
pc⁸, sa
pc = 16, 182, 556, 752, 1243, 1528, 1579, 2317

iudicem aut divisorem Lat (=either Byz or txt), bo

κριτὴν D, a?, c, d, Sy-S, Sy-C, Tert

δικαστὴν 28, pc¹⁰

μεριστὴν 1291, sa^{ms}

κριτὴν ἢ δικαστὴν 69

ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν 157, pc²

ἄρχοντα καὶ μεριστὴν pc¹⁶

ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἢ μεριστὴν pc¹¹

B: no umlaut

μεριστής "divider, one who decides a dispute over inheritance"

δικαστής "judge"

No parallel.

Compare:

LXX Exodus 2:14 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν

NA28 Acts 7:27 ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπὼν· τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν ἐφ' ἡμῶν;

NA28 Acts 7:35 Τοῦτον τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἠρνήσαντο εἰπόντες· τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστὴν;

μεριστής appears nowhere else in the Greek Bible. δικαστής appears twice in Acts 7, but nowhere else in the NT (13 times in the LXX). Internally δικαστής as the rarer word should be preferred, but externally it is not very well supported. It is possible that δικαστής has been remembered from Exo 12:14. Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the δικαστήν comes from Act 7:27 and that D omits the μεριστήν as superfluous.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 222

NA28 Luke 12:15 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· ὁρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ πάσης πλεονεξίας, ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἢ ζωῇ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ.

BYZ Luke 12:15 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς Ὅρᾶτε καὶ φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ τῆς πλεονεξίας ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τῷ περισσεύειν τινὶ ἢ ζωῇ αὐτῷ ἐστὶν ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐτοῦ

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis.

Byz Γ, Δ, Λ, 124(=f13), 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj

txt P75, 01, A, B, D, H, K, L, M, N, Q, R, U, W, X, Θ, Π*, Ψ, 070, 0153, 0211, f1, f13, 22, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al, Latt, Sy, Co, Cl

B: umlaut! (1328 B 25 L) φυλάσσεσθε ἀπὸ πάσης πλεονεξίας

No parallel.

Either one is greedy or not. Probably πάσης means something like "all kinds of".
The Byzantine variant is also ruled out externally.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 223

89. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 12:18 καὶ εἶπεν· τοῦτο ποιήσω, καθελῶ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω καὶ συναΐξω ἐκεῖ πάντα τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου

BYZ Luke 12:18 καὶ εἶπεν Τοῦτο ποιήσω καθελῶ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω καὶ συναΐξω ἐκεῖ πάντα τὰ γενήματά μου καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου

Byz A, Q, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33^{vid}, Maj, aur, f, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, Tis, Bal

τὰ γενήματά μου 01*, D, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Gre

txt P45^{vid}, P75, 01^{c2}, B, L, X, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Sy-Pal, Co
τὸν σῖτον μου... P75*, 01^{c2}, f13

τὸν σῖτον μου καὶ τὰ γενήματά μου καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου 346

P45 reads πάντα τὸν [... lacuna. So probably σῖτον follows.

B: no umlaut

σῖτος "grain, wheat"

γένημα "product, harvest"

No parallel.

Compare LXX:

LXX Exodus 23:10 ἕξ ἔτη σπερείς τὴν γῆν σου καὶ συναΐξεις τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς

LXX Leviticus 25:20 ἐὰν δὲ λέγητε τί φαγόμεθα ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἐβδόμῳ τούτῳ ἐὰν μὴ σπείρωμεν μηδὲ συναγάγωμεν τὰ γενήματα ἡμῶν

LXX Isaiah 29:1 οὐαὶ πόλις Αριηλ ἣν Δαυιδ ἐπολέμησεν συναγάγετε γενήματα ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπ' ἐνιαυτὸν φάγεσθε γὰρ σὺν Μωαβ

LXX Jeremiah 8:13 καὶ συναΐξουσιν τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν λέγει κύριος

The unusual τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά has been replaced by a more common term which now also agrees in number (plural). If the Byzantine reading is a conflation of txt and the Western reading (as WH see it) is not clear. 346 shows a clear conflation.

It is also possible that the Western reading is an omission due to h.t. from the Byzantine reading (..α μου - ..α μου).

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 26) notes that τὸν σῖτον has been replaced by the more general τὰ γενήματα by scribes overlooking that with τὰ ἀγαθὰ already a general term follows.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 224

90. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:19 καὶ ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ μου, ψυχὴ, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου.

omit: D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff²)

Lat(aur, f, q, vg) read txt.

WH have the term in brackets

εἰς ἔτη πολλά: i, l, r¹

in annos multos

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

No parallel.

There is no reason for an omission. But also not for an addition. Strange.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 187) notes that the words have been omitted because they do not seem to fit as spoken to a "soul".

Aland (NT Papyri II) notes: "without the words the text sounds much softer and is more 'Gospel-like' ".

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 225

91. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:20 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ θεός· ἄφρων, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν σου ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ· ἃ δὲ ἠτοίμασας, τίτι ἐσται;

αἰτοῦσιν P75, B, L, Q, 070, 33, 579, pc, Trg, WH

txt 01, A, (D), W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 700, 892, 1241, Maj

B: no umlaut

ἀπαιτέω "demand in return; demand"

αἰτέω "ask, request, require, demand"

No parallel.

Context:

NA28 Luke 11:13 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς πονηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἀγαθὰ διδόναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατήρ [ὁ] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα ἅγιον τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτόν.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 6:30 παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει.

NA28 1 Peter 3:15 κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἔτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαὺν παντὶ τῷ αἰτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος, ἀπαιτοῦντι 01²², A, Ψ, pc

The 3rd person plural is interesting. Robertson notes: "The rabbis used 'they' to avoid saying 'God'."

It is possible that ἀπαιτοῦσιν has been changed into αἰτοῦσιν to avoid a double preposition ἀπ... ἀπὸ (noted also by Metzger).

On the other hand it is possible that the preposition has been added to use a more specific word.

It is also possible that some kind of error is involved, because ΑΠ and ΑΙΤ look similar: ΑΠΑΙΤΟΥΣΙΝ

Luke uses ἀπαιτέω once more in Lk 6:30.

The support is very good for αἰτοῦσιν.

Metzger notes: "the compound verb may have been preferred by those who saw in it implications concerning the origin of the soul (cf. 'he is required to return the soul that was lent him', Wisdom Sol. 15:8)."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 226

92. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:21

οὕτως ὁ θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν †.

omit verse: D, d, a, b

WH have the words in brackets

At the end of the verse one finds the addition:

† ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω

E^c, F^c, H, (S), U, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, 118^c, f13, 2, 579, 892^c, 1071, al³⁵

579 has this addition at Lk 8:15, 12:21, 15:10 (with Θ^c), 16:18 (alone) and 18:8 (alone)!

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

No parallel.

Again a strange omission. No reason for an omission or addition.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that it has been omitted for being difficult to understand. An explanation of the parable is already given in verse 15.

Aland (NT Papyri II) thinks that the words have been omitted as being too banal ("zu platt"). Snodgrass (JBL 91, 1972, 369-79): "superfluous".

Note that most Old Latin witnesses have the words and only a and b support the omission. Thus it is not really fully "Western".

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 227

93. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:22 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς **[αὐτοῦ]**· διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε.

omit αὐτοῦ: P45^{vid}, P75, B, 1241, Weiss

add αὐτοῦ: 01, A, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, Maj, Bois, [NA²⁵], [WH], Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal
WH and NA²⁵ in brackets.

B: no umlaut

Compare complete discussion at Lk 20:45.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 228

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:22 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς [αὐτοῦ]·
διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε,
μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσηθε.

τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν

P45, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 1241, Maj, a, e, vg^{cl}, Sy-C, Sy-P, Cl

txt P75, 01, A, B, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Π, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 2542, al,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H

τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν

B, 070, 0211, f1, f13, 28, 33, 1424, al, a, vg-mss, Sy-P, Cl^{pt},
Weiss, [WH], [NA²⁵]

txt P45^{vid}, P75, 01, A, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, Cl^{pt}

1: There are dots above ὑμῶν after ψυχῇ. But from the (bad) film it is not clear if these are cancelation dots or just accidental.

1 and 1582 read ὑμῶν both times. Checked at the film.

NA has f1 both times incorrectly for txt (as Lake). IGNTP and Swanson have it correctly for the B reading.

WH and NA²⁵ have ὑμῶν after σώματι in brackets.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:25 Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν
τί φάγητε [ἢ τί πίητε], μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσηθε. οὐχὶ ἡ
ψυχὴ πλείον ἐστιν τῆς τροφῆς καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἐνδύματος;

Very probably a harmonization to Mt.

IQP has ὑμῶν both times, taking the text from Mt.

Weiss argues (Com. Lk) that the ὑμῶν has been omitted, because there was none after ψυχῇ, too.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 229

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:27

κατανοήσατε τὰ κρίνα πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιᾷ οὐδὲ νήθει·

"how they grow: they neither toil nor spin"

οὔτε νήθει οὔτε ὑφαίνει

D, a, d, (it), Sy-S, Sy-C, aeth, Cl(I),

Diatess^{Ephrem}, Marcion^T, **NA²⁵**, **Tis**, **Weiss**

d: ... neque neunt, neque texunt.

a: ... non texunt, neque neunt.

... non texunt, nec neunt. (Marcion, via Tert)

b, c, ff², i, l, r¹: quomodo crescunt, non laborant, neque neunt, neque texunt.

Ephrem commentary (Mc Carthy): **"they neither spin nor weave"**

The Arabic translation of the Diatessaron has the traditional form.

txt: aur, (e), f, q, vg

B: no umlaut

"they neither spin nor weave"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:28 πῶς αὐξάνουσιν· οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὐδὲ νήθουσιν·

BYZ Matthew 6:28 πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιᾷ, οὐδὲ νήθει·

This change is strange. Metzger suggests, it might be a stylistic refinement in view of the following reference to Salomon's clothing.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 48) and Blass see the txt reading as a conformation to Mt.

The D reading may come from the Old Latin, of which the majority has "texunt", but most as a conflation. In Mt the Latin text is fixed.

Compare the discussion at Mt 6:28.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 230

NA28 Luke 12:31 πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν.

BYZ Luke 12:31 πλὴν ζητεῖτε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν

Byz P45, A, D^{c1}, Q, W, X, Δ, Θ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, Cl
τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην 983, 1689(=f13)
πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ f1, 28, 1241, pc (:: Mt)

txt 01, B, D*, L, Ψ, 579, 892, pc, a, c, Co

τὴν βασιλείαν P75

892: Harris notes in his collation that it omits τοῦ Θεοῦ. This is wrong. Royse confirmed from the microfilm (Scribal Habits, p. 12) that 892 reads αὐτοῦ. It is correctly noted in NA and IGNTP.

B: umlaut! (1329 A 17 L) βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 6:33 ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν [τοῦ Θεοῦ]
omit: 01, (B), pc⁶, (k), l, sa, bo, Eus, **NA²⁵**, **WH**

Compare previous verse:

NA28 Luke 12:30 ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τοῦ κόσμου ἐπιζητοῦσιν, ὑμῶν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ οἶδεν ὅτι χρήζετε τούτων.

The Byzantine text is probably a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). The object to which αὐτοῦ refers is in the previous verse ὁ πατὴρ. The question is if there was an object at all originally. There is no reason for an omission, neither for Byz nor for txt. But P75 is known to omit personal pronouns.

IQP's Crit. ed. has αὐτοῦ safe for Q. So also Harnack.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 231

NA28 Luke 12:38 κὰν _____ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ _____ κὰν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθη καὶ εὕρη οὕτως, μακάριοί εἰσιν _____ ἐκεῖνοι.

BYZ Luke 12:38 καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθη ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ φυλακῇ καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθη καὶ εὕρη οὕτως μακάριοί εἰσιν οἱ δούλοι ἐκεῖνοι

Not in NA and SQE (only the D, f1 variants)!

Byz A, P, Q, W, 157, Δ, Ψ, f13, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, f, q, vg, sa, **Trg^{mg}**
καὶ ἐὰν _____ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ W
157 omits ἔλθη

txt P75, 01, B, L, X, Θ, 070, 33, 579, 892, (1241), Sy-S, (Sy-C), bo, arm
Θ, 070, 33, 579, 892, arm have οἱ δούλοι
1241 omits κὰν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ (h.t.?)
omit ἐκεῖνοι: 01*, b, **Tis, Bal**

D, d, c:

καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθη τῇ ἑσπερινῇ φυλακῇ καὶ εὕρησιν οὕτως ποιήσει καὶ ἐὰν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ· μακάριοί εἰσιν _____ ἐκεῖνοι.

f1, it, Sy-C, Ir^{Lat}:

καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθη τῇ ἑσπερινῇ φυλακῇ καὶ εὕρη οὕτως ποιοῦντας
μακάριοί εἰσιν ὅτι ἀνακλίνει αὐτούς καὶ διακονήσει αὐτοῖς
κὰν _____ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ _____ κὰν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθη καὶ
εὕρη οὕτως μακάριοί εἰσιν οἱ δούλοι ἐκεῖνοι

Tregelles has ἔλθη and φυλακῇ in brackets in the margin, but οἱ δούλοι in brackets in the text.

B: no umlaut

ἡ ἑσπερινῇ φυλακῇ "the first watch of the night"

Compare previous verse 37:

NA28 Luke 12:37 μακάριοι οἱ δούλοι ἐκεῖνοι, οὓς ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος εὕρησιν γρηγοροῦντας· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι περιζώσεται καὶ ἀνακλινεῖ αὐτούς καὶ παρελθὼν διακονήσει αὐτοῖς.

The variants are probably attempts to expand the rather condensed style. Words are borrowed from the previous verse. The ἑσπερινῇ φυλακῇ is strange, though. Possibly a common term.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 232

94. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 12:39 τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἤδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται,

_____ οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 12:39 τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἤδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται,

ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυγῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ

Byz 01^{c1}, A, B, L, P, Q, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 1241, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{ms}, bo, WH, Trg

txt P75, 01*, (D, d), e, i, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, arm, Marcion^T, WH^{mg}, NA²⁵

D, d leave οὐκ ἂν but omit the following ἀφῆκεν ... αὐτοῦ:

39 τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἤδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, οὐκ ἂν 40 καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἔτοιμοι, ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

Tregelles has additionally [ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

ἐγρηγόρησεν γρηγορέω "be or keep awake; watch, be alert"

διορυχθῆναι / διορυγῆναι "dig through, break in"

διορύσσω

both: infinitive aorist passive

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:43 Ἐκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἤδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία φυλακῆ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἂν καὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴασεν διορυχθῆναι τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ.

Weiss and Aland think the words are from Mt. In Mt the words are safe.

It is possible that the omission is due to h.t. (..AI - ..AI). This is supported by the 01^{c1} correction.

The later omission by D, d must be accidental, because it makes no sense: "If he had known the hour the thief comes, he would not (come)." It is possible that D, d have omitted one line.

IQP's Crit. ed. has the short version as safe for Q. Harnack considers the Matthean form original (Sprüche Jesu, p. 98).

The support by P75 is interesting.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 233

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:40 καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ἡ ὥρα οὐ δοκεῖτε ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

T&T #26

omit: f1 (1, 118, 205, 209, 1582, 2193)
131, 2542 have the words.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:44 διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἕτοιμοι, ὅτι ἡ οὐ δοκεῖτε ὥρα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

Previous verse 39:

NA28 Luke 12:39 τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποία ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, οὐκ ἂν ἀφήκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

Following verse 41:

NA28 Luke 12:41 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας;
καὶ εἶπεν D, d

No reason for an omission.

Is it possible that it originated in a parablepsis omission from ἔρχεται verse 39 to ἔρχεται verse 40 with an subsequent incomplete correction?

It is also possible that the ancestor of f1 read καὶ εἶπεν in verse 41 as does D, so that a καὶ - καὶ parablepsis error would be possible.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 234

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:42 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος· τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος †, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ διδόναι ἐν καιρῷ [τὸ] σιτομέτριον;

† ὁ ἀγαθός D, 157, c, d, e, Sy-C

et bonus

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:45 Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκετείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφήν ἐν καιρῷ;

Possibly a natural addition. In Mt the words are safe.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 235

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:47 Ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνούς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ ἐτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ δαρήσεται πολλάς·

μὴ ἐτοιμάσας L, W, f13, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, arm

ποιήσας P45

μὴ ποιήσας D, 69, 2766, pc, d, Marcion^A, Ir^{Lat}, Or, Bas, Amb

aur, f, vg read txt.

B: no umlaut

"and not having prepared, nor having done according to his will"

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 12:43 μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος, ὃν ἐλθὼν ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ εὐρήσει ποιοῦντα οὕτως.

NA28 Luke 12:48 ὁ δὲ μὴ γνούς, ποιήσας δὲ ἄξια πληγῶν δαρήσεται ὀλίγας.

Probably one or the other word have been omitted because it was considered superfluous.

C.H. Turner thinks that ἢ ποιήσας was a marginal gloss ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 236

NA28 Luke 12:53 διαμερισθήσονται πατήρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί , μήτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα, πειθερά ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πειθεράν.

BYZ Luke 12:53 Διαμερισθήσεται πατήρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ, καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί· μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρί, καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητρί· πειθερά ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς, καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πειθεράν αὐτῆς.

θυγατέρα 01, B, D, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
θυγατρί A, W, Ψ, f13, 33, 1241, 1424, Maj, Robinson

τὴν θυγατέρα P45, P75, L, Θ, (070), f1, 157, 579, 700, 892, 2542, pc, Eus

ἐπὶ μητρί A, Ψ, 070, f13, 33, 565, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj

ἐπὶ μητέρα 01

ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα P45, P75, B, D, L, Θ, f1, 124, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 10:35 ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πειθεράς αὐτῆς,

It appears most probable that the omissions of the article are accidental omissions due to conformation to immediate context. This is confirmed by the fact that the Byzantine text also changed the accusatives into datives to conform them to the preceding words. Θ even changed νύμφην and πειθεράν into the datives.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 237

95. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:54 Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις· ὅταν ἴδητε [τὴν] νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε ὅτι ὄμβρος ἔρχεται, καὶ γίνεται οὕτως·

omit P75, 01, A, B, L, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, al[N, X, Δ], Co, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, Bois, SBL

txt P45, D, W, Θ, 070, 28, 565, 1424, Maj

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:2-3 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· [ὀψίας γενομένης λέγετε· εὐδία, πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ οὐρανός· 3 καὶ πρωΐ· σήμερον χειμῶν, πυρράζει γὰρ στυγνάζων ὁ οὐρανός. τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε διακρίνειν, τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε;]

It would be only natural to omit the article here, because no specific cloud is needed, but just "a cloud".

On the other hand it is possible that there actually is a specific kind of cloud indicating rain.

The support is strongly in favor of the reading without the article.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 238

96. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 12:56 ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;

BYZ Luke 12:56 ὑποκριταί τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τοῦτον πῶς οὐ δοκιμάζετε;

T&T #27

Byz P45, A, (D), W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, **NA²⁵**, **Gre**, **Weiss**, **Trg^{mg}**, **Tis**, **Bal**
οὐ δοκιμάζετε D, 515, 1505, it, Sy-S, Sy-C
(IGNTP adds: sa^{ms}, bo^{mss}, Marcion^T)

txt P75, 01, B, L, X, Θ, 070, 33, 892, 1241, 2786, pc⁴, ff², I, Sy-H^{mg}, Co, **WH**
πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζετε 070
pc = 213, 1215, 1574, 2502

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 16:3 τὸ μὲν πρόσωπον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ γινώσκετε
διακρίνειν τὰ δὲ σημεῖα τῶν καιρῶν οὐ δύνασθε;
G, M, N, U, W, 33, al οὐ δύνασθε δοκιμάζετε;
L οὐ δοκιμάζετε;

It is possible that οἴδατε has been inserted and the verb changed to the infinitive for stylistic reasons, to make the saying more symmetrical. On the other hand the words could have been changed to avoid the repetition.

The meaning is different in the two readings:

txt "but why do you not know how to interpret the present time?"

Byz "but why do you not interpret the present time?"

Very evenly divided support.

Note the reminiscence in Mt 16:3 to the Lukan form.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 239

97. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:5 οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὴ μετανοῆτε πάντες
ὡσαύτως ἀπολεῖσθε.

μετανοήσητε

01^{*.C2}, A, D, L, Θ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 1241, 1424, al[M, U, X],
Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt P75, 01^{C1}, B, W, Ψ, 33, 892, Maj, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}

B: no umlaut

μετανοῆτε subjunctive present active 2nd person plural

μετανοήσητε subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural

Compare verse 3:

NA28 Luke 13:3 οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν μὴ μετανοῆτε πάντες
ὁμοίως ἀπολεῖσθε.

μετανοήσητε A, D, Θ, f1, (f13), 157, (579), 892^{mg}, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542,
al[M, X, Γ]

μετανοῆτε P75, 01, B, L, W, Ψ, 33, Maj, WH

twice μετανοῆτε: P75, 01^{C1}, B, W, Ψ, 33, Maj

twice μετανοήσητε: A, D, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 1241, 1424

3 μετανοῆτε 5 μετανοήσητε: 01^{*.C2}, L

3 μετανοήσητε 5 μετανοῆτε: 1071, pc

These two variations must be considered together.

A similar variation occurs with ὡσαύτως/ὁμοίως in the same verses. Many witnesses read ὁμοίως in verse 5. It is thus probable that a conformation to verse 3 appeared.

The support for μετανοῆτε in verse 3 is extremely strong. It is probably correct. It appears now probable that a lot of witnesses conformed the saying in verse 5 to verse 3 (so Weiss). Therefore μετανοήσητε in verse 5 should be original. But this combination is supported by 01* and L only.

The support for μετανοῆτε in verse 5 is also very strong. It is therefore also quite possible that the present is correct in both verses. In this case the origin

of μετανοήσητε needs to be explained. Perhaps the aorist seemed more suitable? Luke used the aorist of μετανοέω twice before (10:13 and 11:32). It should also be noted that εἰ μὴ is normally followed by the aorist.

Rating: - or 2? (= indecisive or NA probably original)
(slight preference for the txt reading)

TVU 240

NA28 Luke 13:7 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀμπελουργόν· ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκω.

BYZ Luke 13:7 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀμπελουργόν· Ἴδοὺ τρία ἔτη _____
ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκω·

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

Byz A, W, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, 33, 700, 1424, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, Θ, 070, f13, 157, 372, 579, 892, 1241, 2542, pc,
Latt, Sy-C, bo, arm, geo
ἀφ' ἧς 157

IGNTP does not have Sy-C and bo, Hoskier has Sy-S for txt, Burkitt for Byz.

B: no umlaut

No parallels.

ἀφ' οὗ seems to be a typical Lukan expression ("for, since"). It appears 5 times in Lk, but nowhere else in the Gospels:

Lk. 8:35, 38; 13:7, 25; 24:21 - All these other occurrences are safe.

Possibly omitted here for stylistic reasons?

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 241

98. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 13:7 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀμπελουργόν· ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκω. ἔκκοψον **[οὖν]** αὐτήν, ἵνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ;

BYZ Luke 13:7 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀμπελουργόν, Ἴδού, τρία ἔτη ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ, καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκω· ἔκκοψον _____ αὐτήν· ἵνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ;

Byz 01, B, D, W, f1, 157, 1241, 1342, Maj, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P,
[Weiss](#), [WH](#), [NA²⁵](#), [Gre](#), [Trg](#), [Tis](#), [Bal](#), [SBL](#)

txt P75, A, L, X, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0211, 0233, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1071, al,
Lat, Sy-H, Co, arm

IGNTP has Sy-S for txt.

B: no umlaut

The conjunction fits good here. On the other hand it could have been omitted to straighten the narrative.

The support for both readings is diverse.

There is some variation with οὖν in Lk:

<u>omit οὖν:</u>	3:10	D, N
	14:33	W, Λ
	14:34	A, D, N, W, Λ, Ψ, f1, 157, Maj (οὖν already in verse 14:33)
	16:27	W
	20:29	D
	20:33	01*, 157
	20:44	D
	21:7	D, f1, f13, 579, 1071, pc
	21:14	01*
<u>add οὖν:</u>	6:36	A, D, P, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, Maj
(not exhaustive)	10:36	A, C, D, W, Θ, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj
	11:34	A, C, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, Maj
	12:7	01, A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj
	12:20	D
	12:40	A, W, f13, 33, Maj

13:15	A, W, Θ, Ψ, 157, Maj
15:28	P, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj
17:22	D, 157, 1071
20:5	A, C, D, f1, 33, 157, al
21:8	A, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
22:36	A, Q, W, Ψ, f1, 157, Maj
23:20	W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, Maj

οὐν is replaced by δε̅ or vice versa in: 3:7, 6:9, 10:2, 10:37, 13:18, 19:12, 22:70

Except for B, the witnesses supporting the omission, omit οὐν also in other cases, especially D (5 times) and W (3 times). D and the Byzantine text also add οὐν several times (D 6 times!). This reduces the weight of these witnesses here. The Byzantine text adds more often (10 times) than it omits (only once).

Overall the evidence is not conclusive.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 242

99. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:7 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἀμπελουργόν· ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐχ εὕρισκω. ῥ ἔκκοψον [οὖν] αὐτήν, ἵνατί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεῖ;

ῥ φέρε τὴν ἀξίνην. D
adfens securem. d

B: no umlaut

Nestle notes a comment by Jülicher that this might be a theological gloss to 3:9. NA28 Luke 3:9 ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται

TVU 243

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:8 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς λέγει αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἄφες αὐτήν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ἔτος, ἕως ὅτου σκάψω περὶ αὐτήν καὶ βάλω κόπρια.

κόφινον κοπρίων D
cofinum stercoris it(a, aur, b, c, e, ff², i, l, q, r¹), vg^{ms}
qualum stercoris d
"basket of dung"

cofinum in circuitu f
e, vg read txt (vg: stercora, e: stercus).

B: umlaut! (1330 C 1 L)

βάλω κόπρια. 9 κἄν μὲν ποιήση καρπὸν

This is one of the readings that suggest that the Old Latins ultimately go back to one exemplar or tradition.

WH note that it is possible ("from context") that Origen knew this reading, too. It is in the Latin Rufinus.

Perhaps the reading originated from some sort of dittography?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 244

NA28 Luke 13:9 κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν εἰς τὸ μέλλον· εἰ δὲ μή γε,
ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν.

BYZ Luke 13:9 κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ καρπὸν · εἰ δὲ μήγε, εἰς τὸ μέλλον,
ἐκκόψεις αὐτήν

Byz P45^{vid}, A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, Maj, Latt, Sy, Trg^{mg}

txt P75, 01, B, L, 070, 69(=f13), 33^{vid}, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Co
εἰς τὸ μέλλον· ἀφήσεις· εἰ δὲ μή γε 070

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

txt " ... and if it bears fruit in the future... But if not, you can cut it down."

Byz " ... and if it bears fruit. But if not, in the future, you can cut it down."

A question of word-order and punctuation.

In the txt reading the sentence is left incomplete. The reading of 070 shows that scribes felt something missing. The Byzantine reading is a stylistic improvement.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 245

100. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:15 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος καὶ εἶπεν· ὑποκριταί , ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγῶν ποτίζει;

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἀπαγῶν 01*, B*, Θ, f1, pc, WH

txt P45, P75, 01^{c2}, A, B^{c1}?, D, W, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}

Swanson adds erroneously Ψ for ἀπαγῶν against NA, IGNTP and Lake (implicitly). Checked at the film.

ἀπαγαγῶν participle aorist active nominative masculine singular

ἀπάγων participle present active nominative masculine singular

B p. 1330 C36: ΑΓ is written above the line. Difficult to judge. Tischendorf writes: "B² ut vdtr et B³". B² would be B^{c1} and B³ the enhancer (= B^{c2}). This means that the correction was already there and the enhancer only reinforced it, but this is impossible to judge from the facsimile.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Lukan usage:

NA28 Luke 4:5 Καὶ ἀναγαγῶν αὐτὸν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου safe!

NA28 Luke 11:23 Ὁ μὴ ὦν μετ' ἐμοῦ κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συναγῶν μετ' ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει. safe!

NA28 Luke 15:13 καὶ μετ' οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συναγαγῶν πάντα ὁ νεώτερος υἱὸς ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς χώραν μακρὰν

συναγῶν P75!

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 21:18 Πρωὶ δὲ ἐπαναγῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπέινασεν.

ἐπαναγαγῶν 01*, B*, L

Possibly at least in part accidental. Either erroneous duplication or omission.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 246

101. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:17 καὶ ταῦτα λέγοντος αὐτοῦ κατησχύνοντο πάντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἔχαιρεν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐνδόξοις τοῖς γινομένοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

omit: P45, D, pc, it(b, (d, e), ff², i, l, q, r¹)

Lat(a, a², aur, c, f, vg) read txt.

D, d, e: καὶ _____ κατησχύνοντο _____ οἱ
ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῷ,

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Possibly changed to improve style?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 247

NA28 Luke 13:19 ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως, ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κήπον ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἠΰξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 13:19 ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κήπον ἑαυτοῦ καὶ ἠΰξησεν καὶ ἐγένετο εἰς δένδρον μέγα, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατεσκήνωσεν ἐν τοῖς κλάδοις αὐτοῦ

T&T #28

Byz P45, A, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, [Trg^{mg}]

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, 070, 892, 1241, 2542, pc⁶,
it(a, a², b, d, e, ff², i, l, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo
pc = 251, 794, 1229, 2437, 2487, 2790^c

ὡς ὄρος μέγα 2660

ὡς for εἰς: 892, 1424, al⁶⁰
no ὡς / εἰς: D, f1, al³³

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 13:32 ὃ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῆ μείζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται δένδρον^T, ...

λάχανον "garden-plant, vegetable"

^T μέγα Sy-P^{ms}, sa, aeth, geo^B

NA28 Mark 4:32 καὶ ὅταν σπαρῆ, ἀναβαίνει καὶ γίνεται μείζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὥστε δύνασθαι ὑπὸ τὴν σκιὰν αὐτοῦ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνοῦν.

κλάδος branch

It is possible that μέγα has been deleted as a harmonization to Mt. To the contrary Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that μέγα is from the Matthean μείζον.

On the other hand it could have been added to heighten the contrast, possibly borrowed from Mark.

IQP's Crit. ed. has the short form as safe for Q. So also Harnack.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 248

102. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:21 ὁμοία ἐστὶν ζύμη, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυσεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.

ἐκρυσεν

B, L, 047, 0303, 157, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, 2542,
al[K, Π, N, U, 118, 124, 2*], WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P75, 01, A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 579, 1241, Maj

P45 is not in NA, but in Swanson and IGNTP it is noted for ἐκρυσεν!

Comfort/Barrett also have ἐκ[ρυσεν].

According to the Münster online "NT-Transcripts" only the first ε can be seen.

I have checked the plate: There is some vertical bar visible after the ε. But this could equally well be from a K or from an N. Then the lacuna starts. The lacuna is too large to make any convincing arguments from space. P45 should not be cited for this variant.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 13:33 Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοῖς· ὁμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ζύμη, ἣν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἐνέκρυσεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὗ ἐζυμώθη ὅλον.

ἐκρυσεν G, L, N, f1, 346, 2, 28, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, al

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 13:44 Ὅμοία ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυρῶ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, ὃν εὐρῶν ἄνθρωπος ἐκρυσεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ὑπάγει καὶ πωλεῖ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει καὶ ἀγοράζει τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκεῖνον. safe!

NA28 Matthew 25:18 ὁ δὲ τὸ ἐν λαβὼν ἀπελθὼν ὥρυσεν γῆν καὶ ἐκρυσεν τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ.

ἀπέκρυσεν W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj

It is quite possible that ἐνέκρυψεν is a harmonization to Mt. Interestingly a lot of MSS have ἔκρυψεν in Mt, possibly a harmonization to Lk? On the other hand there could be a general tendency to omit prepositions. The contrary tendency to add a preposition can be seen in Mt 25:18.

IQP has ἐνέκρυψεν as safe for Q. So also Harnack.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 249

NA28 Luke 13:27 καὶ ἔρει λέγων ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα [ὑμᾶς] πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας.

BYZ Luke 13:27 Καὶ ἔρει, Λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες οἱ ἐργάται τῆς ἀδικίας.

T&T #29

ἔρει 01, 579, 1627, al¹⁹, Lat, Sy-P, sa, bo^{pt}

ἔρει λέγω P75*, A, D, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 700, 1241, 1424, Maj, d ("dicet dico"), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, Gre, Trg

ἔρει λέγων P75^c, B, 0211, 205, 892, 2766, al²⁰
In P75 the N is written above the line, probably contemporary.
IGNTP notes additionally: 0211, 205, 1424, 2766
Swanson has 1424 for λέγω, correctly, checked at the image.

ἔρω Justin(2nd CE), Or(3rd CE), 2. Clement 4:5 (in a mixture of quotes)
Justin^{1/2}: καὶ τότε ἔρω αὐτοῖς·
Justin^{1/2}, Origen: καὶ ἔρω αὐτοῖς·

The assignment of the Sy and Co versions is rather questionable (taken from NA).

B: no umlaut

ἔρει indicative future active 3rd person singular

Byz But he shall say: "I tell you, ...

txt But he shall say, telling you ...

Compare previous verse 25:

NA28 Luke 13:25 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἔρει ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:23 καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνω ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 25:12 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς.

NA28 Luke 12:19 καὶ ἔρω τῇ ψυχῇ μου

NA28 Luke 15:18 καὶ ἔρω αὐτῷ· πάτερ,

Compare LXX:

LXX Ezekiel 28:9 μὴ λέγων ἐρεῖς θεός εἰμι ἐγώ

LXX 1 Samuel 20:21 ἐὰν εἴπω λέγων τῷ παιδαρίῳ ὧδε ἡ σχίζα ἀπὸ σοῦ

LXX Numbers 11:27 ἀπήγγειλεν Μωϋσῆ καὶ εἶπεν λέγων ...

There is no reason to change any other reading into the txt reading.

This awkward phrase is interpreted by Metzger as the translation of a Hebrew infinitive absolute: "he will *indeed* say to you".

The simple ἐρεῖ could be a harmonization to verse 25. Or the λέγω has been omitted as being redundant.

The ἐρεῖ λέγω could be a partial conformation to Mt 25:12 (so Weiss).

IQP's Crit. ed. has καὶ ἐρεῖ λέγων as safe for Q.

Fleddermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has καὶ ἐρῶ λέγων!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 250

103. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:27 καὶ ἔρεῖ λέγων ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα [ὑμᾶς] πόθεν ἐστέ· ἀπόστητε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ πάντες ἐργάται ἀδικίας.

οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς

01, A, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1424,
Maj, Lat(a, a², aur, c, e, f, q, r¹, vg),
Sy, Co, 2nd Cl, Or, **Bois**

οὐκ οἶδα

P75, B, L, R, 070, 346(=f13), 157, 1241, 2542, pc,
b, ff², i, l, **NA²⁵**, **WH**, **Gre**, **Weiss**, **Trg**, **SBL**

οὐδέποτε εἶδον ὑμᾶς

D, d, e (from Mt)

omit οὐκ ... ἐστέ:

Justin (2 times), Origen (once)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Immediate context:

NA28 Luke 13:25 ... καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἔρεῖ ὑμῖν· οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:23 καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.

Compare also (the parable of the ten Bridesmaids):

NA28 Matthew 25:12 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς.

2. Clement 4:5

καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν· ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, πόθεν ἐστέ, ἐργάται ἀνομίας.

LXX 1 Samuel 25:11 καὶ δώσω αὐτὰ ἀνδράσιν οἷς οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν εἰσὶν

NA28 John 20:13 καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτόν.

It is interesting to note that ὑμᾶς in verse 25 is safe. It is probable that it has been added in verse 27 as a harmonization to immediate context (so Weiss). It is also possible that it is a harmonization to Mt (note especially the D reading). On the other hand it is possible that ὑμᾶς has been omitted to make for a more smooth/straight reading.

The meaning is slightly different with or without the ὑμᾶς:

- a) "I do not know from where you are."
- b) "I don't know you, where you are from."

IQP's Crit. ed. has οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς as safe for Q.

There is no really convincing argument that ὑμᾶς is original here. Possibly the committee assumed that Luke did not write this statement in two different ways in verse 25 and 27.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

ὑμᾶς in apparatus.

TVU 251

NA28 Luke 13:31 Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ προσῆλθάν τινες Φαρισαῖοι

BYZ Luke 13:31 Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσῆλθόν τινες Φαρισαῖοι

Byz B^{C1}, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, 157, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa^{ms}, bo, Trg

txt P75, 01, A, B*, D, L, R, X, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 2766, pc,
d, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, Trg^{mg}

B: no umlaut

In B (p. 1331 B 31) the **Ω** is cancelled by a slash and **HME** is written above it. The **Ω** is left unenhanced and the letters **HME** are enhanced. The slash through the **Ω** looks old/unenhanced, but Tischendorf thinks the correction is by B³ (= enhancer). NA disagrees with Tischendorf and assigns this correction to B^{C1}. I agree with NA.

33 has a lacuna here.

No parallel.

A typical variation. In this case ἡμέρα seems to be the more normal expression, because it is not really interesting if it happened "in that hour".

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 252

NA28 Luke 13:35 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν _____.

BYZ Luke 13:35 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος.

Byz D, N, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 13, 346, 828, 983(=f13), 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj-part, Lect^{pt}, it(a, b, c, d, f, l, q, r¹), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, Ir^{Lat}
ἔρημος ὑμῖν 157

txt P45^{vid}, P75, 01, A, B, K, Π, L, R, S, V, W, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, 047, f1, 69, 124, 174, 230, 788(=f13), 565, 579, Maj-part, Lect^{pt}, Lat(aur, e, ff², i, vg), Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, arm

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 23:38 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος.

omit: B, L, ff², Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, NA²⁵, WH, Weiss

LXX:

LXX Jeremiah 22:5 ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ποιήσητε τοὺς λόγους τούτους κατ' ἑμαυτοῦ ὡμοσα λέγει κύριος ὅτι εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος

There is no reason for an omission. Probably added to harmonize with Mt (so also Weiss). It is also possible that the word has been added as a clarification. Interesting distribution of the minuscules. All the good minuscules (except 579) are for Byz.

Clement of Alexandria once cites the words with ἔρημος (Paed. 1.79.3), but it is impossible to know if he is quoting Mt or Lk.

IQP's Crit. ed. has the short form as safe for Q. H

A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes: "the addition being due to misunderstanding ἀφίεται, which was taken to mean *is left* whereas it means ἐγκαταλείπεται, *is being forsaken*."

Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 26) writes that ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος is only a rendition of the Jeremian εἰς ἐρήμωσιν ἔσται ὁ οἶκος οὗτος but not fully logical and not in good Greek, which was improved by Luke in omitting ἔρημος.

Compare discussion at Mt 23:38!

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 253

104. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 13:35 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν.
λέγω [δὲ] ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἴδητέ με ἕως [ἤξει ὅτε] εἴπητε·
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

BYZ Luke 13:35 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος·
λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ με ἴδητέ ἕως ἂν ἤξει ὅτε εἴπητε
Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου

B: no umlaut

<u>ἕως</u>	P75, B, L, R, 892, <u>WH</u>
<u>ἕως ἂν</u>	P45, 01, M, N, X, (Δ, Θ), f1, f13, 157, 788(=f13), 1071, (1241), pc, e, i, Sy-P, arm, geo <u>ἀπ' ἄρτι ἕως ἂν</u> Δ, Θ, 1241, sa ^{mss} , bo (:: Mt)
<u>one of the above:</u>	Co
<u>ἕως _____ ὅτε</u>	K, Π, pc
<u>ἕως ἂν ἤξει ὅτε</u>	A, W, Ψ, 124, 174, 230, 346(=f13), 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat <u>ἀπ' ἄρτι ἕως ἂν ἤξει ὅτε</u> Δ (Mt) <u>... ὅτι</u> H <u>... ὅταν</u> 579 <u>ἤξει</u> A, W, 28, 579, 1424, pm <u>ἤξη</u> Ψ, 565, 700, f13-part, pm
<u>ἕως _____ ἤξει ὅτε</u>	D, 047, 2487, <u>NA²⁵</u> , <u>Gre</u> , <u>Bois</u> , <u>Weiss</u>

IGNTP and Swanson have f1 correctly for the P45 reading, NA and Lake have it for the Byzantine reading. IGNTP: 1, 118, 131, 205, 209, 1582.
1 and 1582 definitely read the P45 reading. Checked at the film.

788: IGNTP and Geerlings have it correctly for the P45 reading, Swanson wrongly for Byz. Checked at the film.

ἥξει ἥκω indicative future active 3rd person singular

ἥξη subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular

"have come, be present, come"

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 23:39 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ με ἴδητε ἀπ' ἄρτι ἕως ἄν
εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

Compare also:

NA28 Revelation 2:25 πλὴν ὃ ἔχετε κρατήσατε ἄχρι[ς] οὗ ἄν ἥξω.

NA28 Luke 15:4 καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολωλὸς ἕως εὗρη αὐτό:

One of the very rare cases where a reading is adopted that is read by D almost alone!

"you will not see me until *(the time) comes when* you say"

ὅτε with subjunctive (ὅτε εἴπητε) is a very rare construction. There is no other example in the Greek Bible. There are attempts to change that to ὅτι or ὅταν. The construction with ὅταν is common (66 times in the NT).

Therefore it is very improbable that ὅτε is a secondary insertion.

The construction of ἄν with a future ἥξει is also rare (2 times in NT, 9 times in LXX). The normal way would be a subjunctive.

Luke has one other example of this kind at 15:4 ... ἕως εὗρη αὐτό. Here the subjunctive is used.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 152) thinks the omission of ἥξει ὅτε is a harmonization to Mt 23:39.

IQP's Crit. ed. has ἥξει ὅτε in double brackets indicating doubt that text was present. Fleddermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has it in his text. Harnack has it in brackets, too (Sprüche Jesu, p. 100).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 254

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 14:5 καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν· τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς [= ox] εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται,

ὄνος 01, L, X, Y, K, Π, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al,
"donkey" Lat("asinus"), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, bo

ὄνος υἱὸς Θ, 2174, (Sy-C: υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς ἢ ὄνος)

πρόβατον D, d ("ovis", from Mt)

υἱὸς P45, P75, A, B, W, Δ, 047, 0211, 700, 954, 1424, 1675, 2766, Maj,
e, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 12:11 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἔξει πρόβατον ἔν καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσῃ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ;

Compare:

NA28 Luke 13:15 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος καὶ εἶπεν· ὑποκριταί, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βόυν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει;

Overall the main point is: If it is permissible to rescue on the sabbath an animal that has fallen into a well, *a fortiori* it is permissible to heal a human being. υἱὸς makes no real sense in this respect. But if it's an error, it must be a very early one, because the attestation is excellent and widespread.

It has been conjectured (John Mill) that υἱὸς is a corruption of ὄϊς = Sheep (lat. ovis).

It is possible that "son" was felt a bit inappropriate here and has been changed to either "donkey" or "sheep" fitting better to "ox".

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that ὄνος comes from Lk 13:15 (so also Tregelles) and πρόβατον from Mt 12:11.

This is what Edward Cook wrote on his blog (28th June 2005):

"I'm still plugging along in Casey's *Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*. I observe that he approves (p. 30) of Matthew Black's hypothesis of Aramaic wordplay at the origin of Luke 14:5. Here's the text of the NIV with the proposed Aramaic originals in parentheses: "If one of you has a son (*bar*) or an ox (*be'ir*) that falls into a well (*ber*) on the Sabbath day, will you not immediately pull him out?" Casey calls this "perfectly plausible." There are at least two problems with this theory. One is that *be'ir* (בעיר) is not the Aramaic word for "ox," which is *tor* (תור). *Be'ir* just means "livestock, large domestic animal," and could include other animals as well as oxen. One of Casey's methodological principles is that one should not just translate backwards to get at the original Aramaic, but also ask how a suggested Aramaic original would have likely been translated. In this case, I think that *be'ir* would surely have been rendered as *ktenos*, not as *bous*, which is what the Lukan text has. *Bous* most reasonably points back to *tor*, and that dissolves the wordplay.

That's one problem. Another one is the textual problem in this verse. For "son" (*huios*) in the Nestle-Aland critical text, the Textus Receptus has "ass" (*onos*), which is supported by Sinaiticus, among others. "Son" looks to be better attested; on the other hand, "son" spoils the *a fortiori* argument apparently used by Christ in this verse (compare the similar story in Matt. 12:9-13): If animal, why not human? On the other hand, perhaps the argument is not *a fortiori*, but *a maiori ad minus*; since the custom allows the greater breach of Sabbath law, it should allow the lesser: If lifting, why not healing? It's a toss-up, and the textual decision is interwoven with the exegetical choice.

A remote possibility is that the original Aramaic (if there was such a thing) read *bar torin*, calf, literally, "son of oxen," and that this somehow made it into the Gospel as "son or ox" (*bar o tor*). I doubt that's what happened, but I mention it for the sake of completeness."

R. Harris writes on πρόβατον:

A pretty betacistic confusion will be found in Luke 14:5, where the Latin [of D] is: CUIUS EX VOBIS OVIS AUT BOBIS,

where *bovis* is a Vulgar Latin nominative: here it is clear that *ovis* is wrong, being either a repetition of *vobis* or a correction of *bovis*: if it is a dittograph we may replace some other word: some persons will imagine a confusion with υἱὸς which has the same letters; others will read the equivalent of ὄνος. Finally *ovis* has been taken over into the Greek and has produced the well-known reading τίνος ὑμῶν πρόβατον ἢ βοῦς.

(Text and Studies II, part 1, p. 63)

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 255

105. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 14:10

τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι.

BYZ Luke 14:10

τότε ἔσται σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον _____ τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι

Byz P97^{vid}(6/7th CE), D, K, Π, W, Δ, Ψ, 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj,
Lat, Sy-S, goth

txt P75, 01, A, B, L, N, X, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al,
π, r¹, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, geo

ἐνώπιον τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι πάντων L547

P97 reads:

ΤΟΤΕ ΕΣΤΑΙ ΣΟΙ ΔΟΞΑ ΕΝΩΠ[ΙΟΝ
Τ]ΩΝ ΣΥΝΑΝΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΩΝ ΣΟΙ

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare the strange addition by D, Φ after Mt 20:28.

There is no reason for an omission.

ἐνώπιον is a typical Lukan word. It appears 22 times in Lk (plus 13 times in Acts), but elsewhere in the Gospels only once in Jo.

It is possible that the double ...των τῶν lead to confusion.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 256

NA28 Luke 14:15 Ἀκούσας δέ τις τῶν συνανακειμένων ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μακάριος ὅστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Luke 14:15 Ἀκούσας δέ τις τῶν συνανακειμένων ταῦτα εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μακάριος ὅς φάγεται ἄριστον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ

Byz A*, K^c, Π, W, 047, 0211, f13, 700, 954, 1424, 1675, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, goth

txt P75, 01, A^c, B, D, G, H*, K*, L, N, P, R, X, Δ, Θ, Λ, Ψ, f1, 174(=f13), 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, Cl, Eus

33 has a lacuna.

B: umlaut! (1332 B 15 L) μακάριος ὅστις φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν

ἄριστον "meal, noon meal, feast"

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 14:12 ὅταν ποιῆς ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον, ...

It is possible that one is a scribal oversight, because the two words are looking similar. ἄριστον appears in the immediate context and is not very good attested.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 257

106. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 14:17 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις· ἔρχεσθε, ὅτι ἤδη ἔτοιμά ἔστιν.

BYZ Luke 14:17 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἰπεῖν τοῖς κεκλημένοις Ἐρχεσθε ὅτι ἤδη ἔτοιμά ἔστιν πάντα.

T&T #30

B: no umlaut

ἔστιν πάντα A, (^sD), P, W, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, Maj,

Lat(a, aur, d, e, f, r¹, vg), Sy, Co, goth, [Trg]

εἰσιν πάντα 01^{C1}

ἔστιν B, it(b, c, ff², i, l, q), WH, NA²⁵, Bois, Weiss

εἰσιν P75, 01^{*.C2}, L, R, Θ, 579, pc, WH^{mg}, Gre

one of these two: P45

T&T note L, R, Θ wrongly as follows:

ἔστιν B, L, R, Θ, 192

εἰσιν P75, 01^{*.C2}, 579

P45 is not noted in NA. According to the Editio Princeps and Swanson it reads:

...] ΤΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΗΡΖΑΝΤΟ ΑΠΟ ΜΙ [...

It is also noted this way in Münster's online "NT transcripts", but with the T as insecure (underdot). Probably they did not note it because it is not completely clear if it is ἔστιν or εἰσιν. From the plate no decision is possible, a Sigma cannot be ruled out.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

01: There is a completely erased correction in the left margin, impossible to make out, but the insertion sign ./ can be guessed. From the images it is not clear if this erasure is connected with εἰσιν. But all critical editions agree on it being πάντα (TIS, NA, Swanson, IGNTP, online transcription). Timothy A. Brown comments: "There is some evidence of an erasure above and to the right of the nu in EISIN. This is admittedly not very obvious, even in the raking light images we have. There is, nevertheless, at least some evidence. Besides this, we were always hesitant to contradict previous scholarship without a compelling reason to do so and Tischendorf saw a correction here as well. Thus, the reading you see online."

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

ἔτοιμα adjective nominative neuter plural

πάντα adjective nominative neuter plural

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 22:4 ἰδοὺ τὸ ἄριστόν μου ἠτοιμάκα, οἱ ταῦροί μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθυμένα καὶ πάντα ἔτοιμα· δεῦτε εἰς τοὺς γάμους.

πάντα is very probably a harmonization to Mt. There is no reason for an omission.

The more difficult question is, if it reads ἔστιν or εἰσιν. The question is to what this refers. Since ἔτοιμα is neuter, it should be the dinner or the meals:

1. the dinner is ready
2. the meals are ready

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 80) notes that the plural and the addition of πάντα could have originated from the want to indicate that many things must be prepared for a supper.

IQP's Crit. ed. has ἔτοιμά ἔστιν as safe for Q.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) for πάντα

Rating: - (indecisive) for ἔστιν or εἰσιν

TVU 258

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 14:24 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κεκλημένων γεύσεταιί μου τοῦ δείπνου.

BYZ Luke 14:24 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κεκλημένων γεύσεταιί μου τοῦ δείπνου πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ

support: E^c, F^{mg}, G, H, M^{*}, S, X, Y, Γ, Λ, Ψ^c, Ω, 0211, 1^c, 118^c, f13, 713, 2, 28^c, 579, 700, 892^{mg}, 1071, 2766, Maj-part, Sy-Pal^{ms}, geo^{mss}

Ψ: πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν has been added in the margin (INTF image 970).

B: umlaut! (1332 C 20 L) γεύσεταιί μου τοῦ δείπνου

From:

NA28 Matthew 22:14 πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 20:16 οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι.

BYZ Matthew 20:16 Οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἔσχατοι πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ.

A natural addition, probably from lectionary usage.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 259

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 14:32 εἰ δὲ μή γε, ἔτι αὐτοῦ πόρρω ὄντος πρεσβείαν ἀποστείλας ἐρωτᾷ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην.

<u> </u> εἰρήνη	P75, it
<u> </u> εἰς εἰρήνην	B, 482, pc, <u>WH</u> ^{mg1}
<u>τὰ εἰς</u> εἰρήνην	K, Π, pc ¹¹
<u> </u> πρὸς εἰρήνην	01*, Γ, 788(=f13), 1241, pc ⁵ , <u>WH</u>

τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην 01^{c2}, A, D, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Maj, aur, f, vg, Sy-H, WH^{mg2}, NA²⁵

The (other) versional evidence is not definite.

The omission of τὰ by 788 is given correctly in IGNTP and Swanson, but not Geerlings. Checked at the film.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 19:42

λέγων ὅτι εἰ ἔγνωσ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην:

NA28 Acts 7:26 τῇ τε ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὥφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένοις καὶ συνήλασεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην εἰπών· ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοί ἐστε· ἵνατί ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους;

The omission of τὰ is probably a confusion over a presumed dittography:

ΕΡΩΤΑΤΑΠΡΟΣ

It is possible that also the P75 omission is caused by such a confusion:

ΕΙΣΕΙΡΗΝΗΝ

That this is the main cause of the variation can be seen from Lk 19:42, where only one τὰ appears and the words are safe.

The εἰς is clearly a conformation to immediate context, verse 28. It is also possible that some idiom is involved.

Curiously K, Π, read τὰ πρὸς in verse 28 and τὰ εἰς in verse 32.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 260

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 15:1 Ἦσαν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐγγίζοντες πάντες οἱ τελῶναι καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ.

omit: W, pc, Lat(aur, b, c, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa^{mss}, aeth

πάντες ἐγγίζοντες L, R, 1071, pc

it(a, d, e, f, ff², i, r¹) read txt.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Probably omitted because it seems impossible that ALL tax collectors were coming near.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 261

107. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 15:16 καὶ ἐπεθύμει χορτασθῆναι ἐκ
τῶν κερατίων ὧν ἤσθιον οἱ χοῖροι, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ.

BYZ Luke 15:16 καὶ ἐπεθύμει γεμίσει τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ
τῶν κερατίων ὧν ἤσθιον οἱ χοῖροι καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδίδου αὐτῷ

T&T #31

Byz A, P, Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 157, 157, 700, 892, 1612, 1627, Maj,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, goth, NA²⁵, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
Byz but with ἐκ: pc¹⁴

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, R, f1, f13, 579, 1241, 2766, 2786, al²⁰,
d, e, f, Sy-C, sa, WH, Trg^{mg}
al = 251, 343, 494, 589, 609, 695, 716, 794, 809, 827, 1220, 1229, 1396,
1446, 1557, 1593, 1604, 2487, 2546, 2661
txt but with ἀπὸ: 69, 1241, pc⁵

γεμίσει τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ χορτασθῆναι ἀπὸ W, a

γεμίσει ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ 1228

33 has a lacuna here!

B: no umlaut

ἐπεθύμει ἐπιθυμέω indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular
"long for, desire"

χορτασθῆναι χορτάζω infinitive aorist passive
pass. "be satisfied, eat one's fill"

γεμίσει γεμίζω infinitive aorist active
"fill"

γεμίσει τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ = "fill his belly"

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 16:21 καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου·

The combination of ἐπιθυμέω and χορτασθῆναι appears only here and in 16:21, where the phrase is safe. It seems quite probable that the txt reading is a harmonization to 16:21 (so Weiss).

What would be the reason to change it here to "fill his belly"? Zahn (Comm. Lk) finds it "rough but fitting".

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 262

108. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 15:17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν ἔφη· πόσοι μίσθιοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου περισσεύονται ἄρτων, ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῶ ῶδε ἀπόλλυμαι.

BYZ Luke 15:17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν εἶπεν Πόσοι μίσθιοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου περισσεύουσιν ἄρτων ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῶ _____ ἀπόλλυμαι

Byz λιμῶ _____ A, P, Q, W, X, Δ, 69, 174, 230(=f13), 157, 1071, Maj, sa^{ms}, goth

txt λιμῶ ῶδε P75, 01, B, L, Ψ, 579, 892, 2542, pc, e, ff², Sy-H, Sy-Pal, [Trg^{mg}]

ῶδε λιμῶ D, N, R, U, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 700, 1241, al, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co, arm, geo, Trg

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 13:2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶ· βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφελθῆ ῶδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ.

omit ῶδε: A, K, Π, M, X, Γ, 69, 1241, 2542, Maj-part, Lat(e, ff², i, k, l, r¹, vg), NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss

Different insertion points are sometimes an indication for a secondary cause.

Weiss (Lk Com.) notes that the ῶδε separates λιμῶ and ἀπόλλυμαι which belong together. He also suggests that the omission might be due to h.t. from the D et al. reading: ἐγὼ δὲ ῶδε.

Burgon suggests that the D reading could have originated from a misinterpretation of ἐγὼ δὲ = **ΕΓΩΔΕ**. Perhaps some scribe reduplicated the three last letters **ΩΔΕ** and got ἐγὼ δὲ ῶδε.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 263

109. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 15:21 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτῶ· πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱὸς σου Τ.

T&T #32

Τ ποιήσόν με ὡς ἓνα τῶν μισθίων σου

01, B, D, U, X, 983, 1689(=f13), 33, 700, 1241, 2680, al²⁰⁰, some Lect⁹, d, vg^{mss}, Sy-H, aeth, WH [in brackets]

txt P75, A, L, P, Q, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0211, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1424, 1612, 1627, 1675, 2766, 2786, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co, goth, NA²⁵

R: omits due to h.t. (vs 19 υἱὸς σου - 21 υἱὸς σου)

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare verse 19:

NA28 Luke 15:19 οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱὸς σου·
ποιήσόν με ὡς ἓνα τῶν μισθίων σου.

It would be only natural with verse 19 in the back to repeat the phrase here (so argue also Weiss and Zahn).

On the other hand an omission due to h.t. is also possible (SOU - SOU).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 264

110. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 15:22 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ·

ταχὺ ἔξενέγκατε στολήν τὴν πρώτην

BYZ Luke 15:22 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ

ἔξενέγκατε τὴν στολήν τὴν πρώτην

Byz A, P, Q, R, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 69, 124, 174, 230, 788(=f13), Maj, Sy-P, sa^{mss}

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, X, 13, 346, 828, 983(=f13), 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc,

Latt, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H** , Sy-Pal, sa^{mss}, bo, arm, goth, [Trg]

ταχέως... D, f13, 157

... τὴν πρώτην στολήν 579

IGNTP notes X as "X*". There is a short bar above ταχὺ, but this is by the same pencil, who also added the verse numbers, thus it is very late. Probably by Tregelles. The same bar appears four lines below, noting the addition of αὐτοῦ after εἰς τοὺς πόδας. This does not justify a *.

B: umlaut! (1334 A 15 L) αὐτοῦ· ταχὺ ἔξενέγκατε στολήν

No parallel.

There is no reason for an omission.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 155) thinks that ταχὺ has been omitted, because of its unusual position in front of the verb.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: ?? (NA probably original)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 265

111. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 16:4 ἔγνων τί ποιήσω, ἵνα ὅταν μετασταθῶ ἐκ τῆς οἰκονομίας δέξωνταί με εἰς τοὺς οἴκους αὐτῶν.

ἑαυτῶν 01, B, N, P, R, X, Ψ, 070, 124, ^s157, 579, 1071, pc,
Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P75, A, D, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, Maj, Trg^{mg}

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

A typical variation. Impossible to judge on internal grounds. Externally the support is also divided.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 266

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 16:12 καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς ὑμῖν δώσει;

ἡμέτερον B, L, some Lect⁴, pc, Or^{pt}, NA²⁵, WH, Weiss

ἑμὸν 157, e, i, l, Marcion^T

ἀληθινὸν 33^{vid}, pc (v. 11)

μέγα 2. Cl, Ir^{Lat} (versus μικρὸν, see below)

txt WH^{mg}

B: no umlaut

txt "and if in the other's you became not faithful,
your own, who shall give to you?"

var. "our own, who shall give to you?"

"my own, who shall give to you?"

"the true, who shall give to you?"

"the great, who shall give to you?"

Compare previous verses 10+11:

NA28 Luke 16:10 Ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ ἄδικος καὶ ἐν πολλῷ ἄδικός ἐστιν.

NA28 Luke 16:11 εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει;

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 25:21+23 ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἦς πιστὸς, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστήσω·

2. Clement 8:5

λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ·

εἰ τὸ μικρὸν οὐκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει;

λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστὸς ἐστίν,

2. Clement seems to cite from memory. His text is a combination of verses 12 and 10 plus an allusion to Mt 25:21.

The reading of B, L is probably one of the typical HM - UM scribal errors.

On the other hand the ὑμέτερον could be a conformation to the immediately following ὑμῶν (so Weiss). ἡμέτερον is certainly the more difficult reading.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 267

112. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 16:12 καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς ὑμῖν δώσει;

δώσει ὑμῖν

01, D, L, R, Θ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 2542, pc,
Ir^{Lat}, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P75, A, B, P, W, f1, f13, 157, 1241, Maj, WH^{mg}

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare immediate context:

NA28 Luke 16:11 εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει; safe!

Possibly the txt reading is a conformation to immediate context, verse 11.

There is no reason to change the txt reading into the 01 reading.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 268

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 16:17 εὐκοπώτερον δέ ἐστὶν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν παρελθεῖν ἢ τοῦ νόμου μίαν κεραίαν πεσεῖν.

"But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one stroke of a letter in the law to be dropped."

τῶν λόγων μου Marcion^T
τοῦ νόμου μου cj. (Lipsius)
B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 5:18 ἀμὴν γὰρ λέγω ὑμῖν· ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ, ἰῶτα ἐν ἧ μίᾳ κεραίᾳ οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου, ἕως ἂν πάντα γένηται.

Compare previous verse 16:

NA28 Luke 16:16 Ὁ νόμος καὶ οἱ προφῆται μέχρι Ἰωάννου· ἀπὸ τότε ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ εὐαγγελίζεται καὶ πᾶς εἰς αὐτὴν βιάζεται.

"The law and the prophets were in effect until John came; since then the good news of the kingdom of God is proclaimed, and everyone tries to enter it by force."

It is not really logical to say in verse 16 that the law and the prophets go until John, and then in verse 17, that the law will never pass away.

It is possible that very early a μου fell out due to h.t. as Lipsius suggested. Marcion's version is of course suspect as fitting perfectly his own teaching. Cf. Tertullian, Adv. Marcionem 4,33 = PL II 441b.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 269

NA28 Luke 16:18

Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει, καὶ ___ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.

BYZ Luke 16:18

Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἑτέραν μοιχεύει καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει

Byz 01, A, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13-part, 892, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt P75, B, D, L, 69, 788(=f13^b), 983, 1689(=f13^c), 157, 579, 1241, 2542, pc, Latt, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, geo, Marcion^T

omit ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς: D, 28, pc, Sy-S, Sy-P, bo^{ms}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 5:32 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὃς ἔαν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχᾶται.

NA28 Matthew 19:9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται^T.

^TBYZ καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας μοιχᾶται.

NA28 Mark 10:11-12 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχᾶται ἐπ' αὐτήν· 12 καὶ ἔαν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχᾶται.

Probably added to make the words more symmetrical (so Weiss). There is no reason for an omission.

The omission of ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς is probably a harmonization to Mt.

IQP's Crit. ed. has the short form as safe for Q. Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 101) has the Matthean form for Q.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 270

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 16:19 † Ἄνθρωπος δὲ τις ἦν πλούσιος, καὶ ἐνεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον εὐφραϊνόμενος καθ' ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς.

† Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἑτέραν παραβολὴν

† And he began to say

D, M^{mg}, d, Sy-C, vg^{ms}, Diatess^{Aph}

Diatess^{Arab}

B: no umlaut

See Scrivener Codex Bezae, p. LI.

Scrivener notes that several lectionaries have the words and also M in its margin. But this is not unusual, because it's a typical introduction for a lection.

It is not certain though that this addition by D indicates an early lectionary system. It is more probable that it was just meant to smooth down the abrupt start of the story after the discussion with the Pharisees.

Zahn (Comm. Lk) notes that from early on (Tert., Ambrose, Jerome) it was the question if the following story was a parable or a historical account.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 271

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 16:19 Ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος Τ, καὶ ἐνεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον εὐφραινόμενος καθ' ἡμέραν λαμπρῶς.

Τ ὀνόματι Νευης P75

Τ ὀνόματι Νινευη sa, aeth^{mss}, arab^{ms} ("Niniveh")

Νινευής 36^{mg}

Νινευίς 37^{mg}

The gloss in manuscript 36 reads in full: τον δε πλουσιον εν τισιν αντιγραφοις ευρομεν τουνομα Νινευης. 37 is probably dependent on this (see Royse Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 688 and 772/3 for aeth).

Finaeus De pascha computus XVII (242 CE), anonymous treatise (Pseudo-Cyprian)

Finees Priscillian, tract IX, 11th letter (4th CE)

Amonofis gloss in a manuscript "Aurora" owned by Petrus of Riga

arab^{MS}: Sinai Ar. Parchment 8+28. It was among the new finds from 1975. See NovT 50(2008)28-57.

B: no umlaut

The Latin pseudo-Cyprianic treatise "De pascha computus" written 242 CE in Africa or Rome declares (ch. 17):

"Fire has been prepared by God for all sinners, in the flame of which, as was indicated by the son of God himself, that rich man Finaeus is burned."

Compare:

LXX Exodus 6:25 καὶ Ελεαζαρ ὁ τοῦ Ααρων ἔλαβεν τῶν θυγατέρων Φουτιηλ αὐτῷ γυναῖκα καὶ ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ τὸν Φινεες αὐται αἱ ἀρχαὶ πατριᾶς Λευιτῶν κατὰ γενέσεις αὐτῶν

LXX Numbers 25:7 καὶ ἰδὼν Φινεες υἱὸς Ελεαζαρ υἱοῦ Ααρων τοῦ ἱερέως ἔξανέστη ἐκ μέσου τῆς συναγωγῆς καὶ λαβὼν σειρομάστιν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ

Compare next verses:

NA28 Luke 16:20 πτωχὸς δέ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος

NA28 Luke 16:21 καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου. ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ.

It seems probable that a name has been added for the rich man, because also the poor man has a name. Note that the rich man is the more important character in the story!

Originally proposed by Gressmann 1918, it seems possible that the story ultimately goes back to an old Egyptian folktale (at least it resembles it in certain aspects) in which this name possibly appeared. This then would explain the emergence of the name in the Sahidic dialect. For the story see Grobel.

Grobel suggests that the name is a combination of the Fayyumic **NINE** (= none) and **OYE** (= someone), resulting in "Nobody".

The name "Niniveh" may also be an allusion to the rich city of Nineveh and God's judgment upon it.

It is probable that the spelling of P75 is just a scribal error for ΝΙΝΕΥΗ, possibly as a haplography **ΟΝΟΜΑ ΤΙΝΙΝΕΥΗC**.

In the LXX Aaron's son Eleazar has a son named Phinehas, ΦΙΝΕΕC. The name appears 34 times in the LXX. It is possible that the names have been associated: Eleazar = Lazarus; Phinehas = Niniveh? This has originally been suggested by Harnack (compare Zahn).

Grobel proposes that Finees may be a combination of the Bohairic article φ and the name ΝΕΥΕC.

Amenofis is an Egyptian kings name.

Cyril notes an early Jewish tradition (ὡς ἡ Ἑβραίων παράδοσις ἔχει) that there was a poor and sick man in Jerusalem with the name Lazarus.

Lazarus is the only named character in any of the parables.

Another suggestion is that possibly the rich man is the high priest Caiaphas:

"According to chapter 16, the rich man wears purple, he keeps Lazarus 'outside the gate', he's rich, he denied the resurrection, and he had five brothers. High priests wear purple. High priests opened and closed the gates to the Temple compoles. High priests are rich. Sadducean high priests denied the resurrection. Caiaphas was a high priest, he wore purple, he was very wealthy, he was a Saducee and he had **five** brother-in-laws who reigned as high priests in Jerusalem." (Canterbury Tales blog entry by Taylor Marshall, Aug. 27, 2008)

Cadbury draws attention to another interesting issue: P75 has an erasure in verse 21: ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου.

After τοῦ first something else was written, which then was erased and πλουσίου was written above it. Nothing can be seen of the original writing though. Cadbury writes:

"Every one of its eight letters is upon the erased surface and its initial π is written more broad than is usual in this handwriting. It seems likely that the underwriting, the erasing, and the overwriting were all done in turn by the original scribe of about A.D. 200. In the light of the unusual expression for the same person two verses earlier, one would like to know what the scribe first wrote here, under these eight letters. Was it the same eight letters, then erased and then rewritten? or was it an attempted genitive or an indeclinable form of νευης? or of a longer word like Nineveh? The editor, Professor R. Kasser of Geneva, has kindly replied to my inquiry to the effect that the original does not show to the naked eye any lines or parts of the underlying letters, any more than does the facsimile. What about infrared light?"

Compare:

- Th. Zahn Comm. Lk
- H. Gressmann "Vom reichen Mann und Lazarus" Abhandlungen der kön. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss. phil.-hist. Kl. 7, Berlin, 1918
- L.Th. Lefort "Le nom du mauvais riche (Lk 16:19) et la tradition copte" ZNW 37 (1938) 65-72
- K. Grobel "Whose name was Neves" NTS 10 (1963-64) 373 - 382
- H.J. Cadbury "A proper name for Dives" JBL 81 (1962) 399 - 402 and 84 (1965) 73
- J.R. Royse "Scribal Habits" 2008, p. 687-90

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 272

NA28 Luke 16:21 καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι
ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου·
ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 16:21 καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι
ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου·
ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἀπέλειχον τὰ ἔλκη αὐτοῦ

T&T #35

Byz 01^{c2}, A, D, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 2786,
Maj, Lat(a, aur, d, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, goth, [Irg]
ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ψιχίων f1

txt P75, 01*, B, L, 79*,
it(b, c, e, ff², i, l, q, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, sa, bo^{pt}, Cl

B: no umlaut

ψιχίου "small crumb, scrap (of food)"

πιπτόντων πίπτω participle present active genitive neuter plural

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 15:27 ἡ δὲ εἶπεν· ναὶ κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει
ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων
αὐτῶν.

Possibly a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss).

On the other hand the words could have been omitted due to h.t. (TWN - TWN)
or deliberately because the expression is slightly redundant ("of the crumbs,
the falling"). Note 79*, clearly accidentally!

Strong versional support.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 273

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 16:31 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· εἰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν οὐκ ἀκούουσιν, οὐδ' ἂν τις ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆ πεισθήσονται.

He said to him, "If they do not listen to Moses and the prophets, even if someone rises from the dead, they will not be convinced."

ἀναστῆ καὶ ἀπελθῆ πρὸς αὐτούς πιστεύουσιν
ἀναστῆ καὶ ἀπελθῆ πρὸς αὐτούς πιστεύουσιν αὐτῷ
ἀναστῆ καὶ ἀπελθῆ πρὸς αὐτούς ἀκούουσιν αὐτοῦ

D

Ir^{Lat}

r¹

ἀναστῆ πιστεύσωσιν

157, Lat(aur, f, vg), arm

ἀναστῆ πιστεύουσιν αὐτῷ

c, i, l, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-Pal^{ms}, geo

ἀπελθῆ πιστεύουσιν

W, it(a, b, e, ff², q)

ἀπελθῆ πιστεύουσιν αὐτῷ

Sy-S, Sy-C

ἀπελθῆ ἀκούουσιν αὐτοῦ

Marcion^A

ἐγερθῆ πεισθήσονται

P75, 579

B: no umlaut

πείθω "persuade, convince"

No parallel.

Compare previous verse 30:

NA28 Luke 16:30 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· οὐχί, πάτερ Ἀβραάμ, ἀλλ' ἂν τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν πορευθῆ πρὸς αὐτούς μετανοήσουσιν.

and also:

NA28 Luke 16:11 εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἀληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει;

The D et al. reading is probably a free conformation to the previous verse. There is no reason why this should have been changed universally to the txt reading.

The πιστεύουσιν is either a misreading of πεισθήσονται or a conformation to verse 11.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 274

NA28 Luke 17:3 προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. Ἐὰν ἀμάρτη _____ ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ ἄφες αὐτῷ.

BYZ Luke 17:3 προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἐὰν δὲ ἀμάρτη εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ καὶ ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ ἄφες αὐτῷ

Byz D, K, Π, X, Δ, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj,
c, d, e, q, r¹, vg^{mss}, bo^{mss}, geo^{mss}, **Bois**

txt 01, A, B, L, W, Θ, Π, f1, 892, 1071, 1241, 2766, pc,
Lat(a, aur, b, f, ff², i, l, λ, vg), Sy, Co, arm, geo^I, goth, Cl

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 4:

NA28 Luke 17:4 καὶ ἐὰν ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ καὶ ἐπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ λέγων· μετανοῶ, ἀφήσεις αὐτῷ.

omit εἰς σὲ: 1424, 1675, L859, Sy-S, bo^{ms}

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 18:15 Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμαρτήσῃ [εἰς σὲ] ὁ ἀδελφός σου,

BYZ Matthew 18:15 Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ ὁ ἀδελφός σου

txt D, L, W, Θ, 078, f13, 33, 892, 1424, Maj, Latt, Sy, mae, bo^{pt}
omit 01, B, 0281, f1, 579, pc, sa, bo^{pt}, (Or) WH, NA²⁵

NA28 Matthew 18:21 κύριε, ποσάκις ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς ἐμὲ ὁ ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀφήσω αὐτῷ; ἕως ἐπτάκις;

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context, verse 4.

IQP's Crit. ed. has εἰς σὲ in double brackets, indicating doubt that text was present. Fleddermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has the words in his text. Harnack has the short form as safe (Sprüche Jesu, p. 67, 101).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 275

NA28 Luke 17:4 καὶ ἐὰν ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ
καὶ ἐπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ λέγων· μετανοῶ, ἀφήσεις αὐτῷ.

BYZ Luke 17:4 καὶ ἐὰν ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀμάρτη εἰς σὲ
καὶ ἐπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιστρέψῃ λέγων Μετανοῶ ἀφήσεις αὐτῷ

τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιστρέψῃ W, K, Π, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, f
E, 13, 983(=f13), pc omit ἀμαρτήσῃ ... ἡμέρας
due to h.t.

τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ A, Λ, (f1), 157, 579, 1071, al,
Lat(aur, e, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, bo^{pt}, goth
f1: ἐπὶ σὲ

ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ 01, B, D, L, X, Ψ, 892, 1241, (2542), pc, it,
Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, Cl
2542: ἐπὶ σὲ

B: umlaut! (1336 A 8 L) ἐπτάκις ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ λέγων·

ἐπιστρέψῃ subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular
"turn, turn back, return"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 7:44 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη·
NA28 Luke 10:23 Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν·

τῆς ἡμέρας has clearly been added to make the saying more symmetrical.
The main question is if the πρὸς σὲ is original. It is also possible that it has
been added for symmetry.

The combination of στρέφω with πρὸς appears only in Lk in the Greek Bible.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) for τῆς ἡμέρας

Rating: 2? (NA probably original) for πρὸς σὲ

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 276

113. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 17:9 μὴ ἔχει χάριν τῷ δούλῳ ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὰ διαταχθέντα;

BYZ Luke 17:9 μὴ χάριν ἔχει τῷ δούλῳ ἐκείνῳ, ὅτι ἐποίησεν τὰ διαταχθέντα; οὐ δοκῶ.

T&T #36

Byz A, (D, f13), W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 892, Maj, Lat, (Sy-P), Sy-H, Weiss, [Trg^{mg}]
αὐτῷ; οὐ δοκῶ. D, f13, 2, pc³⁵, Lat, Sy-P, goth

txt P75, 01, B, L, f1, 22, 28, 157, 1192, 1241, pc⁹,
a, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo^I
pc = 17, 501, 554, 594, 740, 1208, 1210, 1416, 2127
αὐτῷ; X, 213, 765, 1612
ἐκείνῳ 214, 2522 (for τὰ διαταχθέντα)

B: no umlaut

οὐ δοκῶ = "I think not"
τὰ διαταχθέντα = "what was commanded"

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 17:10 οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ...

Metzger suggests that the "I think not" might be a marginal note that found its way into the text.

It is possible that the words have been added to give an answer to the question.

Weiss (Lk Com.) sees no reason for a secondary addition, but thinks that οὐ δοκῶ fell out accidentally before οὕτως of verse 10.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 277

114. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 17:11 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ
καὶ αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας.

BYZ Luke 17:11 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ
καὶ αὐτὸς διήρχετο διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας

Byz A, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj

txt P75^{vid}, 01, B, L, 579, pc

μέσον D

ἀνὰ μέσον f1, f13, Titus Bostrensis (4th CE)

διήρχετο τὴν Ἱεριχώ καὶ διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας 28, it (not k), Sy-C

Swanson has correctly 1424 for Byz, against NA, IGNTP! Checked at the image.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

διὰ μέσον appears only here in the Greek Bible.

This is the only instance in the N.T. of διὰ with the accusative in the local sense of "through". It is either an error or original. If original, the other readings are attempts to correct this.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 4:30 αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.

Here the text is safe. It's the only instance of διὰ μέσου in the NT.

NA28 Mark 7:31 Καὶ πάλιν ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τῶν ὀρίων Τύρου ἦλθεν διὰ
Σιδῶνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὀρίων
Δεκαπόλεως.

Again safe. It's the only occurrence of ἀνὰ μέσον in the Gospels.

ἀνὰ μέσον is a typical LXX term. It appears there 370 times, but only 4 times in the NT.

NA28 Luke 23:45 τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος, ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ
ναοῦ μέσον.

"in the midst"

Is it possible that the reading of D is the original (so Zahn, Einleitung)?

For the 28 et al. Ἱεριχώ variant compare:

NA28 Luke 19:1 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο τὴν Ἱεριχώ.

Possibly a scribe read διήρχετο and remembered the verse 19:1 and added τὴν Ἱεριχώ.

Please note the reading of f1 and f13. One of those rare readings which is supported exclusively by f1 and f13. Common ancestor?

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 278

115. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:12 Καὶ εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τινὰ κώμην ἀπήντησαν
[αὐτῷ] δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες, οἱ ἕστησαν πόρρωθεν

omit P75, B, (D), L, pc, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, q), Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, SBL
... κώμην ὅπου ἦσαν δέκα ἄνδρες λεπροὶ D

txt 01, A, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, r¹, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, [Trg]

ὑπήντησαν 01, D?, L, N, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 2542, al

ἀπήντησαν P75, A, B, W, Ψ, Maj

B: no umlaut

ἀπαντάω "meet"

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 14:13 ... καὶ ἀπαντήσῃ ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος
βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ safe!

NA28 Luke 8:27 ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ
τῆς πόλεως

ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ A, D, L, Θ, f13, Maj

txt P75, 01, B, E, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 579, 700, 1342, pc

Not the similar variation at Lk 8:27. The addition of the pronoun is only natural.
All other occurrences of ἀπαντάω have the pronoun safe.

The D reading appears to be a variant based on similar sound. It may indicate
either dictation or "self-dictation".

The support for ὑπήντησαν is very good.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 279

116. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:12 Καὶ εἰσερχομένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τινα κώμην ἀπήντησαν [αὐτῷ] δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες, οἱ ἕστησαν πόρρωθεν

No txt in NA!

ἀνέστησαν B, F, 157, 579, pc

txt P75, 01^{cz}, A, D, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, Maj, WH^{mg}
καὶ ἕστησαν D

omit οἱ ἕστησαν πόρρωθεν 01*

F, 157, 579 not in NA, but in Swanson and IGNTP! F and 157 also in Hoskier's collation of 157. 579 is in Schmidtke. F has been checked from the online image. 157 and 579 have been checked at the film.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἀνίστημι "stand up"

B "who stood up at a distance"

txt "who stood at a distance"

The meaning is different for the two variants. The variation is curious, there is no obvious reason for it. With ἕστησαν the meaning is clear and normal. There would be no reason for a change. On the other hand, why should one change ἀνέστησαν ?

Perhaps ἀνέστησαν has been inspired by the previous ἀπήντησαν ?

The support by F is strange and suggests an error.

Rating: - (= indecisive)

TVU 280

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:14 καὶ ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Τ πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν αὐτοὺς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν.

Τ τεθεραπευσθε D
Curati estis d

Τ θέλω, καθαρῖσθητε· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθησαν P75^{mg}

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 8:3 θέλω, καθαρῖσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.

NA28 Mark 1:41-42 θέλω, καθαρῖσθητι· 42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπήλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.

NA28 Luke 5:13 θέλω, καθαρῖσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπήλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

Compare Egerton 2, line 40-41:

ὁ δὴ κύριος ἔφη αὐτῷ· θέλω καθαρῖσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἀπέστη ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα·

Interesting rare addition in P75.

The addition is only natural. The scribes overlooked that the cleansing happened only later "in their going".

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 281

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:17 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· οὐχὶ οἱ δέκα ἐκαθαρίσθησαν; οἱ δὲ ἑννέα ποῦ;

οὐχ B, L, W, S, Ω, pc, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg

txt 01, A, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 892, 1241, Maj

εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὗτοι δέκα D

οὐχὶ οἱ δὲ οὗτοι A, Π, 0211, 157, pc

οὐχ οἱ δὲ οὗτοι W

Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (p. 1336 B 27 L)

ἑννέα ποῦ; 18 οὐχ εὐρέθησαν

οὐχὶ emphatic form of οὐκ

Compare next verse 18:

NA28 Luke 17:18 οὐχ εὐρέθησαν ὑποστρέψαντες δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ εἰ μὴ ὁ ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος;

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 4:22 οὐχὶ υἱὸς ἐστὶν Ἰωσήφ οὗτος;

οὐχ A, Θ, f1, 33, Maj

NA28 Luke 15:8 οὐχὶ ἄπει λύχνον καὶ σαροῖ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ ζητεῖ ἐπιμελῶς ἕως οὗ εὕρη;

οὐχ f13

NA28 Luke 17:8 ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ·

οὐχ P75, Λ, (f1), 579

NA28 Luke 22:27 οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος;

οὐχ D, K, Π, Μ, Θ, f1, 124

It is possible that οὐχ is a conformation to the next verse 18, where οὐχ is safe.

The support for οὐχί is not coherent. As can be seen from the examples, a change from οὐχί to οὐχ occurs frequently.

Compare also the discussion at Joh 6:42.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 282

117. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:19 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀναστὰς πορεύου·

ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

NA28 Luke 17:20 Ἐπερωτηθεὶς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων

omit: B, sa^{mss7}

sa^{mss3} have the words

B: no umlaut

The phrase appears 7 times in the Gospels:

Mt 9:22; Mk 5:34; 10:52; Lk 7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42

Compare:

NA28 Luke 18:42 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀνάβλεψον·

ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

There is no reason for an addition. Probably omitted accidentally. The support from 7 Sahidic manuscripts is interesting. It indicates that the error is earlier than B.

Buttmann (TSK 33, 1860) notes that all ten were made clean, not only the Samaritan, thus it is not really correct that his faith healed him.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 283

118. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 17:21+23 οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν· ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἡ· ἐκεῖ, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν.

BYZ Luke 17:21 οὐδὲ ἐροῦσιν Ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἡ ἰδοὺ Ἐκεῖ Ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστίν

ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἡ· _____ ἐκεῖ· P75, 01, B, L, 157, 1241, 2542, pc,
it(e, ff², i, l, s), Sy-S, sa, arm, geo
ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἡ _____ κεῖ· Θ (sic!)

ἰδοὺ ὧδε, _____ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· Π*, 063, 118, 205, 209(=f1), 69(=f13), 892, pc
ἰδοὺ ὧδε, καὶ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· W, L1642
ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἡ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· A, (D), K, Π^c, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 579, 700,
1424, Maj, Lat(a, aur, b, c, d, f, λ, q, r¹),
Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, goth, Trg

Tregelles has additionally ἡ [ἰδοὺ] ἐκεῖ in the margin.

IGNTP has 892* for the Π* reading.

33 has a lacuna here.

B: no umlaut

Minority readings:

NA28 Luke 17:23 καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, [ἡ·] ἰδοὺ ὧδε·
μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε μηδὲ διώξητε.

BYZ Luke 17:23 καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἡ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ·
μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε μηδὲ διώξητε

ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, ἡ· ἰδοὺ ὧδε· P75, B, 579, WH, Bois
ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, καὶ· ἰδοὺ ὧδε· 01
ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, _____ ἰδοὺ ὧδε· L, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C,
NA²⁵, WH^{mg}, Tis, Gre, Weiss, Bal, SBL

ἰδοὺ ὧδε, _____ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· D, H, W, X, 69(=f13), 28, 33, al,
Lat(e, q, vg), Sy-P

ἰδοὺ ὧδε, _____ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ὁ χριστός K, Π, S, 2542, pc
ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἡ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ· A, R, Δ, Θ, Ψ, (f1, f13), 157, 700, 892, 1241,
1424, Maj, it^{pt}(a, aur, c, d), vg^{mss}, Sy-H, bo, goth
it^{pt}(b, f, ff², i, λ, r¹, s)

ἰδοὺ ὧδε, καὶ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ·
ἰδοὺ ὧδε, ἡ· ἐκεῖ· f13, l, sa

ἰδοὺ ὧδε, μηδὲ διώξητε ἡ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ὁ χριστός μὴ πιστεύσητε (N), f1

Support for omission of ἦ: D, L, W, [H, K, Π, S], f13, 28, 33, 2542, al,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P

According to Tischendorf B* originally wrote:

ἰδοὺ ὦδε, ἦ· ἰδοὺ ὦδε B*

In the facsimile this is difficult to see. That there was some correction is probable, but what exactly this was is difficult to judge, an ω is possible. Also it is not clear which corrector is responsible for that. Tischendorf writes: "ex ὦδε priore correctum est ἐκεῖ, a B³ demum ut vdtr".

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:23 Τότε εἰάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη·

ἰδοὺ ὦδε ὁ χριστός, ἦ· ὦδε, μὴ πιστεύσητε·

NA28 Mark 13:21 Καὶ τότε εἰάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη·

ἴδε ὦδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε·

The support for the omission of ἦ in verse 23 is not very good, mainly Western. When compared with the addition of ἰδοὺ in verse 21, the support is similar. But in verse 21 the committee did not add ἰδοὺ (not even in brackets). The brackets have probably been added because 01 and L deviate from B here. But 01 is a singular reading (except for some Old Latins).

The variation in order is probably inspired from verse 21, where it's ὦδε - ἐκεῖ without variation. Also a (corrected) scribal error from parablepsis is thinkable (IDOU - IDOU). There is no reason for a deliberate change to the txt order.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

Brackets: Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

= read txt, but remove brackets in verse 23.

TVU 284

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:23 καὶ ἐροῦσιν ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, [ἦ·] ἰδοὺ ὧδε·

μὴ ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ διώξητε.

μὴ _____ διώξητε P75, B, 13, 69, 346, 788(=f13), sa, arm
f13:124, 174, 230, 828, 983, 1689 have the words
WH have ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ in brackets

μὴ ἐξέλθητε _____ 157, pc, Sy-P, geo

μὴ ἐξέλθητε μηδὲ διώξητε 579

μηδὲ διώξητε ἦ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ὁ χριστός μὴ πιστεύσητε
f1, Sy-H^{mg} (Mt)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:23 Τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη· ἰδοὺ ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἦ· ὦ
δε, μὴ πιστεύσητε·

NA28 Matthew 24:26 ἐάν οὖν εἴπωσιν ὑμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐστίν, μὴ
ἐξέλθητε· ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, μὴ πιστεύσητε·

NA28 Mark 13:21 Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη· ἴδε ὧδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε
ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύετε·

P75, B, f13 probably omitted ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ as redundant. A secondary addition of the words is quite improbable. It is also possible that the omission originated in a parablepsis error from the N reading, or in a h.t. error from the f1 reading.

The omission by 157, pc is probably due to h.t. (..HTE - ..HTE).

The f1 reading is a partial harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 285

119. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:24 ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ].

BYZ Luke 17:24 ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἡ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν λάμπει οὕτως ἔσται ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ

omit: P75, B, D, it(a, aur, b, c, d, e, ff², i, λ, s), sa, WH, Bal

txt 01, A, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat(f, l, q, r¹, vg), Sy, bo, goth, WH^{mg}, NA²⁵, Bois

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:27 ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπή ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν, οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου _____ · safe!

Compare verse 22:

NA28 Luke 17:22 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς· ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ὅτε ἐπιθυμήσετε μίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἰδεῖν καὶ οὐκ ὄψεσθε.

The term could have been omitted due to h.t. (so Weiss). But this is improbable in light of the variety of very good witnesses. It could also have been omitted as a harmonization to Mt.

On the other hand the words could have been added as a reference to the "days of the son" mentioned in verse 22.

Rating: - (indecisive)

Brackets ok.

TVU 286

NA28 Luke 17:33 ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ζωογονήσῃ αὐτήν.

BYZ Luke 17:33 ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἀπολέσῃ αὐτήν ζωογονήσῃ αὐτήν.

περιποιέομαι "obtain, acquire, win; preserve, save (life)"

Byz 01, A, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj,
Lat(a, aur, e, f, ff², l, r¹, vg), Sy-H
τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ f13, 28, 1071, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa^{ms}
σῶσαι for ζωογονήσῃ f1, 69, 788(=f13^b), pc, it

ὃς ἂν θελήσῃ ζωογονήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ...
D, d, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa

txt P75, B, L, 579, b, c, i, q

33 has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 10:39 ὁ εὐρών τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:25 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν. ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν.

NA28 Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν. ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

NA28 Luke 9:24 ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν. ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.

The reading by D et al. is an attempt to make the saying more symmetrical, by using the same word as in the second part of the verse. θελήσῃ is probably an allusion to the same saying in Mk 8:35par. From here also comes the Byzantine σῶσαι, which replaced the rare περιποιήσασθαι. This word appears 31 times

in the LXX, but only 3 times in the NT (Act 20:28; 1Ti 3:13) and only here in the Gospels.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 287

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:33 ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ ζωογονήσει αὐτήν.

ἀπολέσει

01?, A, L, 13, 788, 983, 157, 579, 1071, 1342,
al[N, R, S, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π*, 063, 0211, 2], WH, NA²⁵, Tis, Bal

txt B, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1241, Maj

ἀπολέσῃ for first ἀπολέσει: E, H, W, Π^c, 047, 28, 1241, 1424, pc¹⁸

01: NA notes: "01 incert." 01 reads ΑΠΟΛΕΣΙΖΩΟΓΟΝΗ... The question is if the Iota stands for ει or η. IGNTP does not note 01. For the first ἀπολέσει 01 also has ἀπολέσι. Tischendorf, in his 8th edition, has 01 for ἀπολέσει, without note. In Lk 9:24 and Mt 16:25 01 correctly reads ἀπολέσει and ἀπολέσῃ. In Mk 8:35 01 reads twice ἀπολέσει. In Mt 10:42, Mk 9:22, 41, Lk 15:8, Jo 10:10 01 has correctly ἀπολέσῃ. In Mk 12:9 and Lk 20:16 01 reads correctly ἀπολέσει. But in Mt 10:39 and 21:41 it reads ἀπολέσι for ἀπολέσει. So, 01 never reads ἀπολέσι for ἀπολέσῃ, but twice for ἀπολέσει.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 10:39 ὁ εὐρών τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν. safe!

NA28 Matthew 16:25 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν.

ἀπολέσει¹: ἀπολέσῃ 28

ἀπολέσῃ²: ἀπολέσει D, H, L, W, Δ, 33, 346, 1071, 1424, pc

NA28 Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσει τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἑμοῦ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

ἀπολέσει²: ἀπολέσῃ A, L, W, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj (|| Mt)

NA28 Luke 9:24 ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλη τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.

ἀπολέσει¹: ἀπολέσῃ Θ, Ω, 1

ἀπολέσῃ²: ἀπολέσει W, Θ, Λ, 69, 346, 2, 28, 157, 1071, 1424

NA28 John 12:25 ὁ φιλῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολλύει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ μισῶν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτήν.

ἀπολέσει A, D, Θ, f1, f13, 579, 892, 1342, Maj

ἀπολέσῃ 346, 1071, 1424

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 10:19 καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ.

ἀδικήσει 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, f1, 28, 33, 1071, 1241, al, Did, WH

ἀδικήσῃ P45, P75, B, C, Ψ, 0115, f13, 157, 579, 700, Maj, TR, Or, Cyr

NA28 Luke 12:8 Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων,

ὁμολογήσει A, B*, D, 13, 983, 157, 472, 579, 1241, 1342, 1424, al, WH

ὁμολογήσῃ P45, P75, 01, B^{c2}, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 700, Maj, Cl

A typical variation.

Probably at least in part accidental. The support is divided, impossible to judge on internal grounds.

If one excludes 01 from the list, ἀπολέσει would be clearly secondary.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 288

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:36

BYZ Luke 17:36

SCR Luke 17:36 δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ· ὁ εἷς παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται.

add verse: D, U, f13, 579, 700, 1071, 2766, al, Latt, Sy, arm, arab^{MS}

D reads: δύο ἐν ἀγρῷ· εἷς παραληφθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται.

69, 788(=f13^b) omit.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:40 τότε δύο ἔσονται ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, εἷς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἷς ἀφίεται·

NA28 Matthew 24:41 δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐν τῷ μύλῳ, μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται.

Previous verses 35-36:

NA28 Luke 17:34 ἔσονται

δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς, ὁ εἷς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται·

NA28 Luke 17:35 ἔσονται

δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, ἢ μία παραλημφθήσεται, ἢ δὲ ἕτερα ἀφεθήσεται.

It is possible that the words have been accidentally omitted due to h.t. This happened to 01*+pc, for verse 35. 346 copied verse 35 twice.

But the overwhelming external evidence is against the originality of the verse, which must have been borrowed from Mt. Both Mt and Lk present two examples each, but both different ones. The wording of the verse taken over from Mt has been conformed to the preceding verses in Lk.

Note that the complete Latin and Syriac versions have the verse. The Arabic Diatessaron also has it in a Lukan block: Lk 17:28-37.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 289

120. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:4 καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν ἐπὶ χρόνον. μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ· εἰ καὶ τὸν θεὸν οὐ φοβοῦμαι οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπον ἐντρέπομαι,

ταῦτα δὲ

B, L, Q, T, 579, 892, 2542, pc, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, SBL

txt 01, A, D, R, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 1241, Maj

Swanson has Q for txt against NA, IGNTP and Tischendorf's Q-edition.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel:

NA28 Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο]

omit δὲ: U, pc⁷

Compare:

NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησεν τὸν Πιλάτον Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας

omit δὲ: 2, 28^s, 157, 700, 1424, Maj[E, G, K, Π*, M, S, X, Y, Γ, Δ, Λ]

NA28 Acts 18:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα χωρισθεὶς ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἦλθεν εἰς Κόρινθον.

Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Ψ, Maj

The reading μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ is clearly the more unusual reading.

It is basically possible that at a very early time in the transmission some scribe accidentally omitted δὲ and added it at the wrong point. That δὲ can be omitted, can be seen from the examples above. But in these examples no μετὰ ταῦτα δὲ appears.

It is interesting to note that the complete omission of δὲ is not recorded for 18:4.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 290

121. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:10 ἄνθρωποι δύο ἀνέβησαν εἰς τὸ ἱερόν προσεύξασθαι, ὁ εἰς Φαρισαῖος καὶ ὁ ἕτερος τελώνης.

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, D, R, T, X, pc, Trg, WH
εἰς Φαρισαῖος καὶ εἰς τελώνης D

txt P75, 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, WH^{mg}
ὁ εἰς αὐτῶν 070 (acc. to Ford, 1799)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 7:41 δύο χρεοφειλέται ἦσαν δανιστῆ τινι· ὁ εἰς ὄφειλεν δηνάρια πεντακόσια, ὁ δὲ ἕτερος πενήκοντα. safe!

NA28 Luke 17:34 λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς, ὁ εἰς παραλημφθήσεται καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθήσεται·

omit \acute{o} ¹: A, D, L, R, W, X, Ψ, 700, 1342, Maj

txt P75, 01, B, Θ, Π, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 2542, pc, TR

omit \acute{o} ²: 700, 1342, pc

It is possible that the addition of \acute{o} is a conformation to the following \acute{o} ἕτερος. (D conforms the second part to the first.)

The omission of the second \acute{o} is not recorded.

A similar construction appears in the previous context at 17:34 where three of the five witnesses omit \acute{o} , too (T has a lacuna).

Difficult!

Weiss (Com. Lk) argues that the \acute{o} has been omitted because the εἰς has been combined thoughtlessly with Φαρισαῖος.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 291

122. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:11 ὁ Φαρισαῖος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα προσηύχето·

T&T #37

<u>ταῦτα πρὸς ἑαυτὸν</u>	P75, 01 ^{c2} , B, T, Θ, Ψ, f1, 131, 579, 892, 1241, 2766, 2786, pc ¹⁷ , Lat(a, aur, e, vg), Sy-Pal, NA²⁵ , WH , Gre , Weiss , Trg
<u>ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτὸν</u>	L
<u>ταῦτα</u>	01*, 828 ^c , pc ² (=1481, 1563*), it, sa, geo ¹ , Tis , Bal
<u>πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα</u>	A, Q, W, X, Δ, f13, 157, 700, 1424, Maj, Sy, WH^{mg} , Trg^{mg}
<u>καθ' ἑαυτὸν ταῦτα</u>	D, 2542, geo ²
<u>omit:</u>	828*, 1071, pc ² (=2605, 2788)

bo reads one of the long readings.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 24:12 καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.
he went home

LXX 2 Maccabees 11:13 πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιβάλλων τὸ γεγονός περὶ αὐτὸν
by himself he pondered what happened to him ...

The question here is to what πρὸς ἑαυτὸν belongs and what it means.

If it goes with "standing", it is difficult to understand what "standing by himself" should mean. This interpretation is only possible with the Byzantine reading, so, it could be that the txt reading is an attempt to get rid of this problem.

If it goes with "praying", there are two possibilities:

- a) it means "standing, he prayed this by himself" or
- b) "standing, he prayed this to himself".

The omission by O1 et al. is due to h.t.: ταῦτα πρὸς ἑαυτὸν προσηύχετο. So, one could count it as supporting the P75, B reading.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = prefer P75 reading)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 292

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:12 νηστεύω δις τοῦ σαββάτου, ἀποδεκατῶ πάντα ὅσα κτῶμαι.

ἀποδεκατεύω

P75, 01*, B, T, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Tis, Bal

txt 01^{c2}, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἀποδεκατῶ from ἀποδεκατόω "give a tenth"

No parallel.

Both forms are the same lemma! Indicative present active.

It is possible that ἀποδεκατεύω is a conformation to the preceding νηστεύω.

An orthographic question. One should go with txt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 293

123. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:13 ὁ δὲ τελώνης μακρόθεν ἐστὼς οὐκ ἤθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπάραι εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀλλ' ἔτυπεν τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ λέγων· ὁ θεός, ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ.

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἑαυτοῦ B, Q, T, L844, L2211, pc, Trg, WH

txt 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj

omit f1, 22, pc

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

A typical variation. Luke uses ἑαυτοῦ often (11 times) compared to Mt (once) and Mk (none).

Impossible to judge.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 294

124. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:24 ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς περίλυτον γενόμενον εἶπεν·

T&T #38

omit: 01, B, L, f1, 157, 579, 1241, 1541, 1612, 2542, Sy-Pal, Co, geo, arab^{MS}

NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Weiss, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt A, (D), R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 078, f13, 33, 700, 892, 2786, Maj,

Latt, Sy, goth, Bois

ἰδὼν δὲ αὐτὸν περίλυτον γενόμενον εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς D, pc⁶, it

ἰδὼν δὲ περίλυτον αὐτὸν γενόμενον ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν 1424, pc⁴

B: no umlaut

περίλυτος "very sad, deeply distressed"

"And Jesus, having seen him become very sorrowful, said"

Compare previous verse 23:

NA28 Luke 18:23

ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας ταῦτα περίλυτος ἐγενήθη· ἦν γὰρ πλούσιος σφόδρα.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:23 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·

NA28 Mark 10:23

Καὶ περιβλεψάμενος ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ·

The words are a repetition from the previous verse. The question is if they are original or not. Metzger argues that it is typical for Lk to repeat a word or phrase in adjacent passages.

It is possible that the omission and word order variation occurred, because the words in the txt reading could be misunderstood as if Jesus himself became sorrowful.

On the other hand it is possible that the words have been added to make clear, what Jesus is seeing.

Rating: - (indecisive)
brackets ok.

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = prefer omission)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 295

125. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 18:25 εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

BYZ Luke 18:25 εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν

Byz τρυμαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος τρυμαλιᾶς βελόνης A, K, Π, P, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj f1, f13, 579

txt τρήματος βελόνης 01, B, D

τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος R
τρυπήματος βελόνης L, 22^c, 157, 1241, pc

τρυπήματος βελόνης μαλιᾶς ῥαφίδος Θ (sic!)

B: umlaut? (1338 A 19 L) τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ [τῆς] τρυμαλιᾶς [τῆς] ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

τρυπήματος βελόνης f13, pc

τρήματος ῥαφίδος 01*

NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

τρυπήματος 01^{c2}, D, L, W, Z, Γ, Δ, f1, f13, 2, 28, 33, 579, 892, 1010, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj-part (Robinson)

τρυμαλιᾶς C, K, M, U, Θ, 124(f13), 157, 565, 700, Maj-part

τρήματος 01*, B, WH, NA²⁵

A curious variation. The meaning is the same for all.

Compare discussion at Mt.

Nestle speculates that τρήμα and βελόνη is the language of a physician. So also Hobart ("Medical Language in St. Luke", Dublin 1882, p. 60) who writes: "The words used by St. Luke are those which a medical man would naturally

employ, for βελόνη was the surgical needle and τρήμα the great medical word for a perforation of any kind."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 296

NA28 Luke 18:28 Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος· ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφέντες τὰ ἴδια ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι.

BYZ Luke 18:28 Εἶπεν δὲ Πέτρος Ἴδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι

Byz 01*, A, P, R, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 33, 579, 700, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt 01^{c2}, B, D^s, L, 157, 892, 2542, pc, it^{pt}(b, ff², r¹), Sy-H^{mg}, Co
τὰ ἴδια καὶ 157
τὰ ἴδια ἀφέντες D

πάντα τὰ ἴδια Θ, f1^s, f13, it^{pt}(a, c, e, l, q), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa^{ms}, arm, geo
πάντα τὰ ἴδια ἀφέντες f1

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:27 ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι·

NA28 Mark 10:28 ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἠκολουθήκαμέν σοι.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt/Mk, where the words are safe.

Θ et al. have a conflation of both.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 297

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:29 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς τ ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα ἕνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ,

τ ἢ ἀδελφὰς D, X, Δ, Ψ, 579, 1071, 1241, pc, d, sa^{mss}

579 and 1071 omit ἢ ἀδελφοὺς, probably due to homioiarcton.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:29 καὶ πᾶς ὅστις ἀφήκεν οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου, ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει.

NA28 Mark 10:29 ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδεὶς ἐστὶν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἕνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,

Compare:

NA28 Mark 3:32 καὶ ἐκάθητο περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος, καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου ἕξω ζητοῦσίν σε.

omit: 01, B, C, K, Π, L, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 2, 28, 33, 157, 372, 517, 565, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2737, 2766, 2786, [G, Y] Maj-part⁴⁵⁰,

Lat(aur, e, f^c, l, r¹, vg), Sy, Co, WH

txt A, D, 124, 700, 954, [E, F, H, M, S, U, Γ, Ω] Maj-part¹¹⁵⁰,

it(a, b, c, d, f*, ff², q), vg^{mss}, Sy-H^{mg}, NA²⁵

Probably added from Mt/Mk.

That the words are omitted accidentally by so large a range of witnesses is very improbable.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 298

126. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:30 ὅς οὐχὶ μὴ [ἀπο]λάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

ἀπολαμβάνω "receive, get back, recover"

ὅς οὐχὶ μὴ λάβῃ B, **NA²⁵**, **WH**, **Weiss**
ὅς οὐ μὴ λάβῃ M, 2, 472, 1071, pc¹³

ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἔπταπλασίονα D, it

txt 01, A, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,

WH^{mg}, **Bois**

οὐχὶ μὴ 01, L, f1, 124, 579, 892, 1241

οὐ μὴ A, K, Π, P, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 28, 33, 157, 700, 1424, Maj

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:29 ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει.

NA28 Mark 10:30 ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ ἀπολάβῃ 01, f1, pc

Compare:

NA28 Luke 6:34 καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν,

BYZ Luke 6:34 καὶ ἐὰν δανείζητε παρ ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν,

Byz A, D, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 892, Maj

txt 01, B, L, W, Ξ, (157), 579, 2542, pc

Clement ("Quis dives salvetur" IV.10 and XXV.2):

ἀπολήμψεται ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν δὲ ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ

λαμβάνω is always slightly equivocal. It can mean "take" or "receive". This problem is overcome by the prefix ἀπο.

It is clear that D is a harmonization to Mk. Its support for λάβῃ is therefore of little value.

ἀπολαμβάνω is a Lukan word (5 times, only once in Mk). Note that also in Lk 6:34 λαβεῖν has been replaced by ἀπολαβεῖν.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 299

127. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:30 ὃς οὐχὶ μὴ [ἀπο]λάβῃ πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

ἑπταπλασίονα

D, it, sa^{ms}, Sy-H^{mg}, Cypr, Diatess^{Ephrem-Armenian}

septies tantum

ἑκατονταπλασίονα

472, 1241, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C

Lat(aur, f, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

In the Armenian translation of the Diatessaron commentary of Ephrem, there is this quotation (McCarthy, the Syriac has a lacuna):

When the Lord said, *He will receive sevenfold at that time*, these are [the seeds] which yield a harvest in a short time.

Preuschen and Ciasca have for the Arabic Diatessaron: *twice!*

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:29 καὶ πᾶς ὅστις ἀφήκεν οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγροὺς ἔνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου, ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήμψεται καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει.

πολλαπλασίονα B, L, 579, pc, sa, mae-1, Or, NA²⁵, WH, Weiss

txt 01, C, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, mae-2

NA28 Mark 10:30

ἐὰν μὴ λάβῃ ἑκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:8 καὶ φυὲν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἑκατονταπλασίονα.

Weiss suggests that the more general term has been replaced by a concrete one.

"Sevenfold" does not appear in the NT.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 300

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:32 παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπυσθήσεται

omit καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται

D, L, 828, 700, 1241, 2766, pc⁶,
it(a, b, d, e, ff², i, q), vg^{ms}, Sy-P

omit καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπυσθήσεται

pc, l, r¹, arm

omit καὶ ἐμπυσθήσεται

P, R, pc³

ἐμπυσθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται 892

P. Williams on Sy-P: "In Luke 18:32, NA27 suggests that *P* omits καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται with some Greek witnesses. However, *P* has the same equivalent as *SC* have for καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται, namely the verb يُضْرَبُ, but has it at a different point in the list of actions, and thus in v. 33." (p. 135)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 20:19 καὶ παραδώσουσιν αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν εἰς τὸ ἐμπαῖξαι καὶ μαστιγῶσαι καὶ σταυρῶσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται.

NA28 Mark 10:34 καὶ ἐμπαίξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπύσουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ μαστιγώσουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν, καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται.

Very probably all cases of h.t. (in Latin the words all end in -tur).

There is no reason for an addition. The omission by D, L et al. could also be a harmonization to Mk, who does not have the word.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 301

128. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:40 σταθείς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν. ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν·

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit B, D, T, 157, 2542, WH

txt 01, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 1241, Maj, [Trg]

omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς: A

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Context:

NA28 Luke 18:42 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
safe!

Compare:

NA28 Luke 22:52 Εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους

add ὁ: L, W, Ψ, f13, Maj

omit Ἰησοῦς: D, f1, pc

txt P75, 01, A, B, T, Θ, pc

NA28 John 2:24 αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς

add ὁ: 01, A, W^{sup}, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj

omit Ἰησοῦς: 083

txt P66, P75, B, L, 050, 1241, pc

Omissions and additions of the article happen very often. Normally the Byzantine text adds the article. On the other hand B is known to omit articles.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 302

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 18:40 σταθείς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν. ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν.

omit: D, f1, 22, pc⁷, it(a, d, e, ff², i, l, s), Sy-S, Sy-C, Marcion^A

omit ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν: 2766

Lat(aur, b, c, f, q, r¹, vg) read txt.

Origen Mt Comm. tom. 16:13 has the words.

B: no umlaut

ἀχθῆναι ἄγω infinitive aorist passive

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 20:32 καὶ στάς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐφώνησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἶπεν· τί θέλετε ποιήσω ὑμῖν;

NA28 Mark 10:49 καὶ στάς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· φωνήσατε αὐτόν. καὶ φωνοῦσιν τὸν τυφλὸν λέγοντες αὐτῷ· θάρσει, ἔχειρε, φωνεῖ σε.

Compare:

NA28 Acts 5:21 καὶ ἀπέστειλαν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἀχθῆναι αὐτούς.

NA28 Acts 25:6 ἐκέλευσεν τὸν Παῦλον ἀχθῆναι.

NA28 Acts 25:17 ἐκέλευσα ἀχθῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα·

NA28 Acts 25:23 καὶ κελεύσαντος τοῦ Φήστου ἤχθη ὁ Παῦλος.

Acts 25:6, 17 and 23 show that Luke can use the word absolutely ("to be brought"). At these places the words are safe.

Possibly the words have been omitted for stylistic reasons.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 303

129. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 19:5 καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον, ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς _____ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· Ζακχαῖε, σπεύσας κατάβηθι, σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μείναι.

BYZ Luke 19:5 καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν αὐτόν· καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Ζακχαῖε σπεύσας κατάβηθι σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ σου δεῖ με μείναι

Byz A, D, Q, R, W, Δ, Ψ, f13, 33^{vid}, 157, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy-H, goth, [Trg^{mg}]

καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτόν Ψ

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διέρχεσθαι

αὐτόν εἶδεν καὶ

D

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διέρχεσθαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶδεν αὐτόν ἀναβ. ὁ Ἰ. 157

txt 01, B, L, T, Θ, 0139, f1, 579, 1071, 1241, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co, arm, geo

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare previous verses 3+4:

NA28 Luke 19:3 καὶ ἐζήτηε ἰδεῖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τίς ἐστίν καὶ οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου, ὅτι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ μικρὸς ἦν.

NA28 Luke 19:4 καὶ προδραμῶν εἰς τὸ ἔμπροσθεν ἀνέβη ἐπὶ συκομορέαν ἵνα ἴδῃ αὐτόν ὅτι ἐκείνης ἡμελλεν διέρχεσθαι.

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 21:1

Ἀναβλέψας δὲ εἶδεν τοὺς βάλλοντας εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον

The words could have been omitted due to homoioarcton (ει... - ει...) or to improve style (omission of a redundant phrase).

The combination of ἀναβλέπω with εἶδεν is not unusual.

On the other hand the words could have been added to indicate that Jesus actually recognized him: "he looked up and *saw* him".

The readings of D and 157 are probably back-translations from the Latin.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 304

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 19:13 καλέσας δὲ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα μνᾶς καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· πραγματεύσασθε ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι.

πραγματεύσασθαι

01, A, L, R, 13, 346, 828, 1071, 1342, al[E, Y, Γ, 047, 063], WH

πραγματεύεσθαι D, W, Θ, 131, 205, 472, 579, pc

txt B, Ψ, f13, 157, 892, 1241, Maj, WH^{mg}

πραγματεύεσθε U, Λ, f1, pc

U actually reads πραγματεύσθε according to Swanson.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

πραγματεύσασθε imperative aorist middle 2nd person plural

πραγματεύεσθε imperative present middle 2nd person plural

πραγματεύσασθαι infinitive aorist middle

πραγματεύεσθαι infinitive present middle

Probably at least in part accidental, because ε and αι were pronounced alike. The infinitive makes it indirect speech, the imperative direct.

In Lk εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς always introduces direct speech. Therefore the infinitive would be unusual here.

The indirect speech also seems awkward in connection with the following 1st person ἔρχομαι. One would expect a 3rd person subjunctive here. Additionally for the indirect speech εἶπεν must have the sense of "command", which is unusual. All this indicates a spelling error.

It should be noted though that Luke uses this mixture of direct and indirect speech elsewhere. Compare:

NA28 Acts 1:4 καὶ συναλιζόμενος παρήγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἣν ἠκούσατέ μου,

"And being assembled together with them, he commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, says he, 'you did hear of me;'"

Robertson (Wordpictures) even writes: "Change from indirect discourse ... to direct discourse ... Luke often does this (orator ariata)."

IQP has πραγματεύσασθε in double square brackets, indicating text that is "probable but uncertain".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 305

NA28 Luke 19:15 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθεῖν αὐτὸν λαβόντα τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ εἶπεν φωνηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς δούλους τούτους οἷς δεδώκει τὸ ἀργύριον, ἵνα γνοῖ τί διεπραγματεύσαντο.

BYZ Luke 19:15 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθεῖν αὐτὸν λαβόντα τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ εἶπεν φωνηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς δούλους τούτους οἷς ἔδωκεν τὸ ἀργύριον ἵνα γνῶ τίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο.

T&T #39

Byz A, W, Θ, 047, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, 1424, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, **NA²⁵**, **Gre**, **Weiss**, **Bal**

τίς τί πραγματεύσατο Δ

τίς τί ἐπραγματεύσατο 0233, 954, 1071, 1675, 2680, al⁷⁸

τίς πέπραγματεύσατο W (error for τί ἐπ..)

txt 01, B, D, L, Ψ, 157, 579, 1241, 1612, 2542, pc¹⁰, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, Or, **WH**

τί ἐπραγματεύσαντο 157, 179, 1612, 2542

τίς διεπραγματεύσαντο 1241, pc⁸

(IGNTP does not list 1241 for ..σαντο)

τίς τί διεπραγματεύσαντο R

Origen: Mt Comm. tom 14:13

B: no umlaut

Byz "what any one had gained by trading"

txt "what they had gained by trading"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 19:13 καλέσας δὲ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα μνᾶς καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· πραγματεύσασθε ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι.

τίς requires the singular, but without it the plural is needed.

τίς τί appears only here and in Mk 15:24 (where it is safe).

It is possible, as Metzger argues, that the Byzantine reading arose as an attempt to make the text more precise: Not what they all, together, gained, but what each man on his own gained.

It is also possible that an early error lies behind this, a confusion of the TISTI (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 306

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 19:24 καὶ τοῖς παρεστῶσιν εἶπεν· ἄρατε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
τὴν μνᾶν καὶ δότε τῷ τὰς δέκα μνᾶς ἔχοντι-

NA28 Luke 19:25 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς-

NA28 Luke 19:26 λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται, ...

T&T #40

omit verse 25: D, W, pc⁸, d, b, e, ff², Sy-S, Sy-C, bo
pc = 16, 60*, 282, 690, 930^c, 1454, 1510, 2591

B: no umlaut

h.t. (δέκα μνᾶς - δέκα μνᾶς): 047, 69, pc¹⁰

24 He said to the bystanders, 'Take the pound from him
and give it to the one who has ten pounds.'

25 (And they said to him, 'Lord, he has ten pounds!')

26 'I tell you, to all those who have, more will be given;

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 25:28 ἄρατε οὖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ
τὸ τάλαντον καὶ δότε τῷ ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα·

NA28 Matthew 25:29

τῷ γὰρ ἔχοντι παντὶ δοθήσεται καὶ περισσευθήσεται,

There is no reason why the words could have been added later. Metzger suggests as a possibility a marginal comment that found its way into the text, but considers it improbable. He notes that the sentence has the ambiguity as to who is it that speaks εἶπαν. Are these the "bystanders" noted in verse 24 or are they the people to whom Jesus was telling the parable?

It is more probable that the words have been omitted either to improve style, remove the difficulty or to harmonize to Mt. It is also possibly connected with the h.t. error.

IQP's Crit. ed. omits this verse in Q, too. So also Fleddermann.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 307

130. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 19:29 ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθητῶν

BYZ Luke 19:29 ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

Byz A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj, [Trg]

txt 01, B, L, 579, WH (not in NA, but in SQE!)

B: no umlaut

Compare complete discussion at Lk 20:45.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 308

131. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 19:30 λέγων· ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην, ἐν ἣ εἰσπορευόμενοι εὐρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, ἐφ' ὃν οὐδεὶς πώποτε ἀνθρώπων ἐκάθισεν, καὶ λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.

NA28 Luke 19:31 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμᾶς ἐρωτᾷ· διὰ τί λύετε; οὕτως ἐρεῖτε· ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει.

NA28 Luke 19:32 ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.

NA28 Luke 19:33 λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς· τί λύετε τὸν πῶλον;

NA28 Luke 19:34 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει.

omit δεδεμένον ... ἀγάγετε D*, d*

omit διὰ τί λύετε: D, it

D, d: καὶ ἀπελθόντες, ἀπεκρίθησαν
Et euntes sic dixerunt

G*, 063, 477 omit verses 32-34 due to h.t.

(ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει - ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει)

g¹ omits verse 33 due to h.t. (it reads ἐστῶτα τὸν πῶλον in verse 32)

B: umlaut! (1339 C 25 R) αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι
(Compare also previous variant!)

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:2 λέγων αὐτοῖς· πορεύεσθε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐθέως εὐρήσετε ὄνον δεδεμένην καὶ πῶλον μετ' αὐτῆς· λύσαντες ἀγάγετέ μοι.

NA28 Matthew 21:3 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη τι, ἐρεῖτε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν χρεῖαν ἔχει· εὐθὺς δὲ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτούς.

[Mt inserts LXX quote here, verses 4-5]

NA28 Matthew 21:6 πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

NA28 Mark 11:3-6 καὶ ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη· τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἶπατε· ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρεῖαν ἔχει, καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε. 4 καὶ ἀπῆλθον καὶ εὔρον πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου καὶ λύουσιν αὐτόν. 5 καὶ τινες τῶν ἐκεῖ ἐστηκότων ἔλεγον αὐτοῖς· τί ποιεῖτε λύοντες τὸν πῶλον; 6 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἀφήκαν αὐτούς.

It is probable that D shortens the story to bring it more in line with the shorter text of Mt. Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the words are omitted as superfluous.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 309

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 19:32 ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὔρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Τ.

NA28 Luke 19:33 λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς· τί λύετε τὸν πῶλον;

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

<u>Τ</u>	<u>τὸν πῶλον</u>	U
<u>Τ</u>	<u>ἔστῶτα τὸν πῶλον</u>	157, 1071, 2766, al ¹⁴ , Lat(t), arm, aeth, Sy-H, Sy-Pal ^{mss2} , arm, Or 157 omits τὸν D, d omit v. 32, 33.

1071 omits 33a: λυόντων ... πῶλον

Or: Mt Comm. tom. 16:18

καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς δὲ τοιαῦτά φησιν· "ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὔρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἔστῶτα τὸν πῶλον"

B: umlaut? (1339 C 25 R) αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι
(See also next variant!)

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:6 πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς

NA28 Mark 11:4 καὶ ἀπήλθον καὶ εὔρον πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφοδίου καὶ λύουσιν αὐτόν.

No exact parallel for the words.

The addition is only natural, possibly inspired from Mk. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 310

132. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 19:36 πορευομένου δὲ αὐτοῦ ὑπεστρώννυον τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν
ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.

ἑαυτῶν A, B, R, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, 124, al[K, Π, N, U],
Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, SBL

txt 01, D, L, f13, 157, 579, 892, Maj

omit 1241, pc

IGNTP and Swanson have f1 correctly for ἑαυτῶν against NA and Lake.
Checked 1 and 1582 at the film.

B: no umlaut

Compare Lk 16:4 above.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 311

133. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 19:38 λέγοντες· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις.

BYZ Luke 19:38 λέγοντες Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου· εἰρήνη ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις

ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς 01^{C2}, A, L, R, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, f, q, vg),
WH^{mg1}, Gre, Trg, SBL
βασιλεὺς H, 063, pc
ὁ ἐρχόμενος W, Λ*, pc, vg^{mss}, bo^{ms}
ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ ἐρχόμενος 579 (sic!)

ὁ βασιλεὺς 01*, 69^{vid}, pc, Or, WH^{mg2}, Tis, Bal
ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεὺς B, 372, WH, NA²⁵
ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλεὺς D, it
ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου εὐλογημένος βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ
157, r¹, Sy-H**
εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Co

69 reads: εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρ βασιλεὺς ἐν... This must be an error. It may be that there is a weak bar through the Rho, but that is not fully clear from the (old film) image.

B: no umlaut

Byz "Blessed be he who comes as king in the name of the Lord."

txt "Blessed be he who comes, the king, in the name of the Lord."

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:9 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·

NA28 Mark 11:9 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·

NA28 John 12:13 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου,
[καὶ] ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

The omission of ὁ βασιλεὺς is clearly a harmonization to the parallels (which are safe).

D expands the txt reading in two separate clauses.

The support by B only is extremely slim.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 121) considers the B reading difficult which then results in various changes. He notes that the omission by O1 might be due to h.t.: ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεὺς. D to the contrary moves the difficult ὁ βασιλεὺς after εὐλογημένος.

Zahn (Comm. Lk) notes that the O1* reading is very improbable because in this case ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου would depend on εὐλογημένος, which is a very unusual construction.

The article before βασιλεὺς also has to be rejected because in that case ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου is not connected with ὁ ἐρχόμενος anymore.

The Byzantine reading is for Zahn also not acceptable due to its strange word order. ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου and ὁ ἐρχόμενος belong together. Zahn therefore favors the D reading.

On the other hand it is quite possible that one of these more difficult readings gave rise to the smooth D reading.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 312

NA28 Luke 19:42 λέγων ὅτι

εἰ ἔγνωσ _____ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτη καὶ σὺ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην·
νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου.

BYZ Luke 19:42 λέγων ὅτι

Εἰ ἔγνωσ καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτη τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην·
† νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου·

T&T #41

B: no umlaut

καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτη N, R, W, Δ, f13, 700, 2786,

Maj, vg, Sy-H, Eus, Tis, Bal

καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ _____ ταύτη A, Ψ, f1, 131, 124, 565, al¹⁵⁰

_____ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτη καὶ σὺ 1241, Trg^{mg}

καὶ σὺ _____ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτη D, Θ, 2542, pc,

it, geo, Gre, Trg

καὶ σὺ _____ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτη ἡρώτησας ἂν 157

_____ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτη καὶ σὺ 01, B, L, 579, 892, pc¹², Or

pc = 5, 871, 968, 1011, 1012, 1048,

1416, 1451, 1566, 2126, 2328, 2437

καὶ γε limiting "at least"

intensifying "even; though"

after εἰρήνην:

† σου A, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13^{a,c}, Maj, Sy, bo

† σοι D, f13^b, 157, pc, Lat

txt 01, B, L, Θ, 579, pc, sa, bo^{pt}

No parallel.

The txt reading is clearly the more difficult one:

txt "If recognized on this day even you the things that make for peace!"

Byz "If recognized even you, at least, on your day the things that make for peace!"

The addition of καὶ γε is probably for intensifying purposes. There is no reason for an omission.

Zahn (Comm. Lk) thinks that the καὶ γε short after καὶ provoked changes. He also thinks that the σου after εἰρήνην is original.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 313

NA28 Luke 19:45 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας

BYZ Luke 19:45 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγοράζοντας.

Byz A, C, (D), R, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 2542, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, goth

καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας

C, Ψ

καὶ ἀγοράζοντας

N, f13, 2542, pc

ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ

28

ἐν .. ἀγοράζοντας + Mt 21:12b:

D, Λ, pc, it, vg^{mss}, Sy-H**, arm

txt 01, B, L, f1, 22, 579, 1241, pc, Sy-Pal, Co, geo, arab^{MS}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:12 Καὶ εἰσῆλθεν Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἐξέβαλεν πάντας τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν κατέστρεψεν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς,

NA28 Mark 11:15 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλούντων τὰς περιστεράς κατέστρεψεν,

Probably harmonizations to Mt/Mk (so also Weiss).

h.t. is possible (..NTAS - ..NTAS), but the diverse additions indicate a secondary cause.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 314

134. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 20:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις

BYZ Luke 20:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων, διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν λαὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις

Byz A, K, Π, Δ^{Gr}, 047, 0211, W, 700, Maj, goth, Tis, von Soden, Gre, Bal

txt 01, B, C, D, L, M, N, Q, R, Θ, Ψ, f1, (f13), 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, al, Latt, Sy, Co
οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς f13

add ἐκείνων: A, C, W, Δ, Θ, f13, 33, Maj

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:23 Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν προσήλθον αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ

NA28 Mark 11:27 καὶ ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι

Compare also:

NA28 Acts 4:1 Λαλούντων δὲ αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ἐπέστησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαῖοι,

This is a case of external against internal arguments. Internally everything is in favor of ἱερεῖς. But the external support is overwhelmingly against it.

It is possible that οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς is a harmonization to Mt/Mk. Especially the combination with γραμματεῖς and πρεσβυτέροις makes a change to ἄρχιερεῖς likely.

οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς appears 33 times in the NT, but nowhere else is a variation, except in Mk 2:26 where Δ reads ἱερέως but for a different reason (internal difficulty).

To the contrary, in some of the cases, where ἱερεῖς appears, some witnesses changed it to ἄρχιερεῖς (Mk 1:44 by f13, 33, 892^{mg}, pc, Lat; Mk 2:26 by 28, 579, Lk 5:14 by 047; Lk 17:14 by 047, pc; Jo 1:19 by Sy-S, C).

So the only possibility for a change from ἀρχιερεῖς to ἱερεῖς is an accidental error. If on the other hand ἱερεῖς is original, the error must be a very early one to have infected all strands of the transmission.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 25) notes that it might be a reminiscence of Act 4:1 where also the apostles talk πρὸς τὸν λαόν.

H. Greeven argues in favor of the Byzantine reading (NTS 6, 1959/60, 281-96, p. 295).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 315

135. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 20:9 Ἦρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· ἄνθρωπός [τις] ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν χρόνους ἰκανούς.

BYZ Luke 20:9 Ἦρξατο δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην· Ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα, καὶ ἐξέδοτο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν χρόνους ἰκανούς·

Byz 01, B, (C, D), L, R, Ψ, f1, 33, 579, 892, 1424, Maj, it, vg^{WW}

Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσεν ἄνθρωπός D

ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπός ἐφύτευσεν C

txt A, W, Θ, f13, 157, 1071, 1241, 2542, al, r¹, vg^{Steph}, vg^{Sixt}, vg^{Stutt}, Sy, TR

it: homo quidam

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:33 Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε. ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης ὅστις ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα ...

ἄνθρωπος τις C³, X, Θ^c, 124, 346, 788, 28, 157, 1071, Maj-part

NA28 Mark 12:1 Καὶ ἤρξατο αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν· ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν ...

ἄνθρωπος τις W, Θ, f13, 565

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 22:35 καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν [νομικός] πειράζων αὐτόν·

νομικός τις E*, F, G, H, 0233, 2, 372, pc

Lukan usage:

NA28 Luke 10:25 Καὶ ἰδοὺ νομικός τις ἀνέστη

omit τις: 0211*

NA28 Luke 10:30 ἄνθρωπος τις κατέβαινε ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ

omit τις: 1195, 1510

NA28 Luke 14:2 Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν ὑδρωπικὸς ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ.

omit τις: D, f1, 124, pc

NA28 Luke 14:16 Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπός τις ἐποίει δεῖπνον μέγα

omit τις: P, 2643

NA28 Luke 15:11 Εἶπεν δέ· ἄνθρωπός τις εἶχεν δύο υἱούς.

safe!

NA28 Luke 16:1 ἄνθρωπός τις ἦν πλούσιος ὃς εἶχεν οἰκονόμον,

omit τις: 2643

NA28 Luke 16:19 Ἄνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος

safe!

NA28 Luke 18:35 τυφλὸς τις ἐκάθητο παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ἐπαιτῶν.

safe!

NA28 Luke 19:12 ἄνθρωπός τις εὐγενῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν

safe!

This use of τις is typical for Luke. He uses it 9 times. In 5 cases τις has been omitted by a small number of witnesses.

But in this case the majority omits it. It is thus quite probable that τις has been added as a conformation to Lukan usage (so also Weiss).

Metzger notes: "On the one hand Luke commonly writes ἄνθρωπός τις; on the other hand, many of the same witnesses that insert τις here also insert τις in the clearly secondary reading in Mark."

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 316

NA28 Luke 20:13 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος· τί ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἴσως τοῦτον _____ ἐντραπήσονται.

BYZ Luke 20:13 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος Τί ποιήσω πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἴσως τοῦτον ἰδόντες ἐντραπήσονται

Byz A, R, W, Δ, Θ, f13, Maj, Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, [Trg^{mg}]

txt 01, B, C, D, L, Q, Ψ, 0211, f1, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc,
it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo

B: no umlaut

ἴσως adv. "perhaps, it may be"

ἐντραπήσονται ἐντρέπω indicative future passive 3rd person plural
pass. "respect, regard; be ashamed, be made ashamed"

Compare next verse 14:

NA28 Luke 20:14 ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ ...

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:37-38 ὕστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ λέγων· ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. 38 οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ἰδόντες τὸν υἱὸν εἶπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς·

NA28 Mark 12:6-7 ἔτι ἓνα εἶχεν υἱὸν ἀγαπητόν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἔσχατον πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὅτι ἐντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. 7 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν

Probably a harmonization to immediate context, verse 13.

On the other hand it is possible that the word has been omitted as a harmonization to Mt/Mk, or to improve style (2 times ἰδόντες).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 317

NA28 Luke 20:19 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαόν. ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην.

BYZ Luke 20:19 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν _____ ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην εἶπεν

Not in NA but in SQE!

Byz G, S, V, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, 047, 565, 700*, 1342, 1424, Maj-part

txt 01, A, B, C, D, K, Π, L, R, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700^c, 892,
1071, 1241, Maj-part, Latt, Sy, Co, goth
τὸν ὄχλον N, W, Ψ, 0117, 22, pc
τοὺς ὄχλους Sy-H

700: The words have been added in the margin by a later hand.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:46 ἐφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὄχλους,

NA28 Mark 12:12 καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον.

Probably an accidental omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 318

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:20 Καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὥστε παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος.

ἀποχωρήσαντες D, Θ, it, aeth, goth

ὑποχωρήσαντες W

μετὰ ταῦτα Sy-S, Sy-C

omit: Sy-P

recessissent	it, vg ^{ms}
discessissent	a
redissent	c
recedentes	d
secesserunt	e

aur, vg read txt.

B: no umlaut

παρατηρέω "watch closely; observe, keep"

ἀποχωρέω / ὑποχωρέω "go away, leave"

"So they watched him and sent spies"

"So they left him and sent spies"

Compare previous verse 19:

NA28 Luke 20:19 Καὶ ἐζήτησαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ' αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαόν, ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην.

"When the scribes and chief priests realized that he had told this parable against them, they wanted to lay hands on him at that very hour, but they feared the people."

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 22:16 καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν αὐτῷ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτῶν μετὰ τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν λέγοντες·

NA28 Mark 12:13 Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν πρὸς αὐτόν τινὰς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἑρωδιανῶν ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 3:2 καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσει αὐτόν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 6:7 παρετηροῦντο δὲ αὐτόν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι

NA28 Luke 14:1 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἦσαν παρατηρούμενοι αὐτόν.

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 12:12 Καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτόν κρατῆσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον, ἔγνωσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν. καὶ ἀφέντες αὐτόν ἀπῆλθον. "So they left him and went away."

WH: "the absolute use of παρατηρήσαντες was evidently a stumbling block."

In Lk 6:7 παρατηρέω is combined with transitive with αὐτόν: "they watched him". Here we have no personal pronoun "him". They were watching their chance. Interestingly no one added a pronoun.

The replacements "go away" might have been suggested from Mk 12:12 to add the missing departure of the γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς from verse 19.

There is no reason to change the D, W, Θ reading into the txt reading.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 319

NA28 Luke 20:23 κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς·

BYZ Luke 20:23 κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς τί με πειράζετε

Byz A, C, D, P, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, [Trg^{mg}]
τί με πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί C, 0211, 1071^s, pc, l

txt 01, B, L, f1, 0266^{vid}, 230(=f13), 157, 579, 892, 1241, 1424, pc,
e, Co, arm, arab^{MS}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:18 γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν εἶπεν·
τί με πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί;

NA28 Mark 1 ὁ δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ἵνα ἴδω.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt/Mk. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 320

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:24 δείξατέ μοι δηνάριον· τ τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφὴν; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Καίσαρος.

τ οἱ δὲ ἔδειξαν αὐτῷ· καὶ εἶπεν·

01, C, L, N, 0211, 0266^{vid}, f1, f13, 33, 157, (579), 892, 1071, 1241, 2766, al, Sy-H, Co, arm

τ οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν πρὸς αὐτὸν δηνάριον· καὶ εἶπεν·

579, c

et ostenderunt denarium. Et dixit eis

txt A, B, D, K, Π, M, P, U, W, Θ, Ψ, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, goth

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:19 ἐπιδείξατέ μοι τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήνσου. οἱ δὲ προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ δηνάριον.

NA28 Mark 1 τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ἵνα ἴδω.

NA28 Mark 12:16 οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν. καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τίνος ἡ εἰκὼν αὕτη καὶ ἡ ἐπιγραφὴ; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· Καίσαρος.

There is no reason for an omission. Probably an early addition to separate the two sentences, inspired from Mt/Mk.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: - (indecisive = possibly addition original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 321

NA28 Luke 20:24 δείξατέ μοι δηνάριον· τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Καίσαρος.

BYZ Luke 20:24 Ἐπιδείξατέ μοι δηνάριον· τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν; ἀποκριθέντες δὲ εἶπον, Καίσαρος.

Byz A, C, D, W, Γ, Θ, f1, Ψ, f13, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, f, Sy-H
omit δὲ: D, W, Γ, Θ, f1, pc, Lat, Trg, Gre, SBL
καὶ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον G

txt 01, B, L, N, 0266^{vid}, 33, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, Co
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:21 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· Καίσαρος.

NA28 Mark 12:16 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· Καίσαρος.
λέγουσιν A, 579, 1342, pc

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 20:23 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ...

NA28 Luke 20:24 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Καίσαρος.

NA28 Luke 20:25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· ...

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 20:39 Ἀποκριθέντες δέ τινες τῶν γραμματέων εἶπαν· διδάσκαλε, καλῶς εἶπας. safe!

NA28 Luke 20:34 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·

BYZ Luke 20:34 Καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

add ἀποκριθεὶς A, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-H

First, it is interesting to mention that no harmonization to Mt occurred, like in Mk.

It appears probable that οἱ δὲ εἶπαν has been changed into ἀποκριθέντες δὲ εἶπον, to avoid repetition and to improve style: οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Καίσαρος. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς is rather dull. It is very improbable that the change went the other way round.

The second ἀποκριθέντες δὲ, some verses later, is safe. Also the other two occurrences of ἀποκριθέντες in Lk, 9:19 and 17:37, are safe.

It happens quite often that the Byzantine text is adding a form of ἀποκρίνομαι, compare:

Mt 26:63	A, C, D, W, Maj, it, Sy
Mk 5:9	D, E, 565, 700, Maj-part, it
<u>Mk 7:6</u>	P45, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Latt, Sy-H
<u>Mk 8:28</u>	A, f1, Maj, Sy-H
<u>Mk 9:12</u>	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H
<u>Mk 9:38</u>	A, C, D, W, f1, f13, 565, 700, Maj, it, Sy-H
Mk 10:5	A, D, W, f1, f13, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P
Mk 10:20	A, C, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Latt, Sy
Mk 10:29	A, C, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 700, Maj, Latt, Sy-H
Mk 12:17	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H
<u>Mk 12:24</u>	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H
<u>Mk 13:2</u>	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H
<u>Mk 13:5</u>	A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H
<u>Mk 14:20</u>	A, W, Δ, f1, f13, 565, 700, Maj, k, Sy-H (not in NA, but in SQE)
Lk 14:5	01*, A, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj, vg, Sy-H
<u>Lk 20:34</u>	A, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-H

Every position has to be carefully checked for possible harmonization to the parallels (underlined = harmonization to parallel).

The combination of ἀποκρίνομαι and λέγω appears about 150 times in the NT and about 100 times in the LXX. It seems to be more in agreement with Semitic syntax.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 322

136. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:26 καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρίσει αὐτοῦ ἐσίγησαν.

τοῦ 01, B, L, 892, 1241, pc, Gre, Trg^{mg}, WH, SBL

txt A, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj

τοῦ ῥήματος αὐτοῦ Θ, 579

B: no umlaut

"and they were not able to take hold on his/the saying before the people"

Compare immediate context, verse 20:

NA28 Luke 20:20 Καὶ παρατηρήσαντες ἀπέστειλαν ἐγκαθέτους ὑποκρινομένους ἑαυτοὺς δικαίους εἶναι, ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ λόγου, ὥστε παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος.

Probably the txt reading is a conformation to verse 20 (so also a minority of the UBS committee, notes Metzger). There would be no reason to change αὐτοῦ.

The only possibility is an accidental omission (**A**1 - **A**Υ, so Weiss).

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 323

137. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:27 Προσελθόντες δέ τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων,
οἱ [ἀντι]λέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν

BYZ Luke 20:27 Προσελθόντες δέ τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων
οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν

T&T #42

οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες A, P, W, Δ, f13, 157, 700, Maj, a, Sy-H, **NA²⁵**, **Weiss**
contradicentes δ
contradicunt a

οἱ ἀπαρνοῦνται 79 ("deny")

οἱ λέγοντες 01, B, C, D, L, N, Θ, 0211, f1, 22, 33, 131, 372, 565, 579,
892, 1071, 1241, 1612, 2680, 2737, 2766, 2786, al⁶⁵, Lat,
Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co, goth, **WH**, **Trg**

οἵτινες λέγουσιν Ψ, pc² (Mk)

B: no umlaut

ἀντιλέγω "object to, oppose"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:23 Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσῆλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαῖοι,
λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν

BYZ Matthew 22:23

[οἱ] λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν ...

NA28 Mark 12:18 Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν,
οἵτινες λέγουσιν ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες·

ἀντιλέγω is used 7 times by Luke (3 times in the Gospels and 4 times in Acts, always basically safe). It is used elsewhere only once in John (also safe).

μη/οὐκ sometimes appears after verbs which have a negative sense, but is left untranslated. Compare:

NA28 1 John 2:22 ὁ ἀρνούμενος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός;
"who denies that Jesus is the Christ?"

There is no reason for a change to ἀντιλέγω. Overall it seems more probable that the O1, B reading is either a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss) or an attempt to remove the difficulty with the double negation. It is extremely good supported though.

Rating: - (indecisive)
brackets ok.

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 324

NA28 Luke 20:28 λέγοντες· διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν, ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα, καὶ οὗτος ἄτεκνος ἦ. ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 20:28 λέγοντες Διδάσκαλε Μωσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ ἔχων γυναῖκα καὶ οὗτος ἄτεκνος ἀποθάνῃ ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ

Byz A, W, Δ, Θ, f13, Maj, it^{pt}(a, f, c, i), Sy-H, goth

txt 01^{c2}, B, L, P, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 372, 579, 892, 1071, pc⁷,
Lat(aur, e, ff², l, q, r¹, vg), Co, arm, geo

ἦν 01^{c1}, 579 (01* omits due to h.t. γυναῖκα - γυναῖκα)

ἀποθάνῃ ἄτεκνος ἔχων γυναῖκα D, d, e

1241 has ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων τέκνα ἵνα λάβοι
for ἀποθάνῃ ... ἵνα λάβῃ (cp. Mk)

B: no umlaut

ἦ εἰμί subjunctive present active 3rd person singular

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:24 ἐάν τις ἀποθάνῃ μὴ ἔχων τέκνα, ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ...

NA28 Mark 12:19 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι ἐάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνῃ καὶ καταλίπη γυναῖκα καὶ μὴ ἀφῆ τέκνον,

The Byzantine reading is probably a harmonization to immediate context. It removes the one-letter word ἦ, which might cause trouble for the reader.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 325

NA28 Luke 20:30 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος

BYZ Luke 20:30 καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ οὐτὸς ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκνος.

Byz A, P, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, [Trg^{mg}]
καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν ... Θ, 579
omit καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναῖκα: 2766

txt 01, B, D, L, 0266^{vid}, 157, 892, 1241, pc, d, e, Co, geo

B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 20:29 ἑπτὰ οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα ἀπέθανεν ἄτεκνος:

NA28 Luke 20:31 καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν, ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐ κατέλιπον τέκνα καὶ ἀπέθανον.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:26 ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ δεύτερος καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἕως τῶν ἑπτά.

NA28 Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν καὶ ἀπέθανεν μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα· καὶ ὁ τρίτος ὡσαύτως·

The Byzantine expansion is probably a harmonization to immediate context, verse 29 and 31, and to the parallel in Mt/Mk to expand the condensed style.

There is no reason for an omission, except possibly to shorten the repetitive style.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 326

NA28 Luke 20:32 ὕστερον _____ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν.

BYZ Luke 20:32 ὕστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνή

Byz A, P, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, sa^{mss}, goth, Trg^{mg}
καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν δὲ πάντων 33

txt 01, B, D, L, 0266^{vid}, f1, 157, 579, 892, pc,
c, d, i, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa^{mss}, bo

ὕστερον δὲ πάντων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν 1241

omit δέ: 01*, B, D, f13, 33, 579, 700, Maj-part[E, H, S, Δ, Λ, Ω, 047, 0211, 2],
Lat(aur, c, d, i, vg), Sy-H**, sa^{ms}, bo^{mss}
01: corrected by 01^{c2}

omit πάντων: it(a, c, d, ff², i, l, r¹)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:27 ὕστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν ἡ γυνή.

BYZ Matthew 22:27 ὕστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνή

NA28 Mark 12:22 καὶ οἱ ἑπτὰ οὐκ ἀφήκαν σπέρμα. ἔσχατον πάντων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt/Mk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 327

138. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:34 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τγαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται,

τ γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν

"are begotten and beget"

D, it^{pt}(a, d, r¹), vg^{mss},
Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H^{mg}, ⁵Or

γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν

but omit γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται:
it^{pt}(c, e, ff², i, l, q)

generantur et generant

ff², i, q

generant et generantur

c, e, l

generantur et generant nubunt et nubuntur

vg^{ms} (Book of Kells)

generant et generantur nubunt et nubuntur

a

nascuntur et generant nubunt et nubuntur

r¹

pariuntur et pariunt nubunt et nubuntur

d

Lat(aur, f, vg) read txt: "nubunt et traduntur ad nuptias"

Or: Mt Comm. tom. 17:34

κατὰ μὴν τὸν Λουκᾶν τοῦτο οὐ ζητηθήσεται, ἀναγράψαντα τὸν σωτῆρα εἰρηκέναι· "οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γεννῶσιν καὶ γεννῶνται γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται,"

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Weiss (Lk Com.): [the addition is] "not unskillful".

Burkitt: "I incline to regard it as a genuine clause of S. Luke's Gospel." (Evangelion Intro, p. 299).

Zahn (Comm. Lk) considers the words original: "appropriateness immediately evident".

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 328

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:36 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες.

μέλλουσιν D, W, Θ, it, Sy-H^{mg}, Cyp, Marcion^T

ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν τῷ θεῷ

nam sunt similes angelis Dei

D, pc, it(a, c, d, e, ff², gat, i, l), vg^{ms}

ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν

r¹, vg^{ms}, Sy-S

ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι εἰσιν θεοῦ καὶ

157

ἰσάγγελοι ἔσονται, τέκνα τοῦ θεοῦ

Justin (Dial. 81:4)

aur, f, q, vg read txt.

B: no umlaut

But there is one on the next line (1341 C 9 R):

ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες. 37 ὅτι δὲ ἐγείρονται

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 22:30 ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσιν.

NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Probably attempts to avoid the difficult υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 329

139. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:44 Δαυὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ, καὶ πῶς αὐτοῦ υἱὸς ἐστίν;

αὐτὸν κύριον

A, B, L, Q, (R), 0211, 33, (1241), al[K, Π, Μ, Υ],

Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, SBL

αὐτὸν καλεῖ κύριον 1241, pc

καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον R, pc

txt 01, (D), W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, Maj

κύριον αὐτὸν λέγει D

B: no umlaut

This refers to verse 42:

NA28 Luke 20:42 αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν· εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 22:45 εἰ οὖν Δαυὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστίν;

NA28 Mark 12:37 αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον, καὶ πόθεν αὐτοῦ ἐστίν υἱός; Καὶ [ὁ] πολὺς ὄχλος ἤκουεν αὐτοῦ ἠδέως.

It is possible that αὐτὸν κύριον is a harmonization to the parallels, which are both safe. This is supported by the even further harmonizations by 1241 and R.

On the other hand it is possible that the txt reading is a conformation to the word order in verse 42.

Weiss argues (Com. Lk) that κύριον has been put before αὐτὸν to emphasize it.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 330

140. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 20:45 Ἀκούοντας δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ
εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ]:

omit B, D, 2542, d, l, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, Bois, SBL

txt 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co

πρὸς αὐτοὺς Q
τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς Γ

f1: NA has 1 erroneously for the omission. IGNTP, Lake and Swanson do not list 1 separately. Checked at the film.

B: no umlaut

Compare also complete discussion at Mt 8:21 and Mk 6:41.

NA28 Luke 5:30 καὶ ἐγόγγυζον οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν
πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· ...

omit αὐτοῦ: C*

NA28 Luke 6:1 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ διαπορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν διὰ
σπορίμων, καὶ ἔτιλλον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤσθιον τοὺς στάχους
ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσίν.

omit αὐτοῦ: 28

NA28 Luke 6:20 Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς
μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν· ...

omit αὐτοῦ: D, 372

NA28 Luke 7:11 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν
καλουμένην Ναῖν καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ
ὄχλος πολὺς.

omit αὐτοῦ: f1, pc

NA28 Luke 8:9 Ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τίς αὕτη εἴη ἡ
παραβολή.

omit αὐτοῦ: W, 700

NA28 Luke 9:14 ἦσαν γὰρ ὡσεὶ ἄνδρες πεντακισχίλιοι. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· ...

omit αὐτοῦ: 579, 700, 2542, 2766

NA28 Luke 9:16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

add αὐτοῦ: L, R, Ξ, f13, 33, 892, 1071, pc (not in NA and SQE!)

NA28 Luke 9:18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνῆσαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί,

add αὐτοῦ: M, N, U, W, Y^c, Θ, f1, 22, f13, 579, 892, 1071, 1424, 2542, 2766, al²⁶

NA28 Luke 9:43 ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειότητι τοῦ θεοῦ. Πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐποίει εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ·

omit αὐτοῦ: 0115

NA28 Luke 10:23 Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν·

add αὐτοῦ: U, 1424, pc³

NA28 Luke 12:1 Ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ πρῶτον·

omit αὐτοῦ: D

NA28 Luke 12:22 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς [αὐτοῦ]· διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε.

omit αὐτοῦ: P45^{vid}, P75, B, 1241

add αὐτοῦ: 01, A, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj

NA28 Luke 16:1 Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς·

omit αὐτοῦ: P75, 01, B, D, L, R, 69, 788, 579, 1071, 1241, 2542, pc

add αὐτοῦ: A, P, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, Maj

NA28 Luke 17:1 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ· ἀνένδεκτόν ἐστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἐλθεῖν, πλὴν οὐαὶ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται·

omit αὐτοῦ: W, Θ, Ψ, f1, Maj[E, G, H, K, Π, N, Γ, Δ, Λ] (not in NA but in SQE!)

add αὐτοῦ: P75, 01, A, B, D, L, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 2766,

al[F, M, U, X, 2*]²⁶

NA28 Luke 17:22 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς:

add αὐτοῦ: A, X, al²⁰

NA28 Luke 18:15 Προσέφερον δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ βρέφη ἵνα αὐτῶν ἄπτηται· ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπετίμων αὐτοῖς.

add αὐτοῦ: M, Y, Π, 346, al¹⁷

NA28 Luke 19:29 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανία[ν] πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν, ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθητῶν

omit αὐτοῦ: 01, B, L, 579, pc, it (not in NA but in SQE!)

add αὐτοῦ: A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, Maj

NA28 Luke 19:37 ἐγγίζοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν ἤρξαντο ἅπαν τὸ πλήθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλη περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων,

add αὐτοῦ: Θ, 179

NA28 Luke 20:45 Ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ

εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ]:

omit αὐτοῦ: B, D, f1, 2542

add αὐτοῦ: 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co

NA28 Luke 22:39 Καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη κατὰ τὸ ἔθος εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν, ἠκολούθησαν δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ μαθηταί.

omit αὐτοῦ: P75, 01, A, B, D, L, Q, T, W, Δ^c, Θ, Ψ, 118*, f1, f13, 892, 1241, 2542, pc⁹

add αὐτοῦ: 983, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj[E, F, G, H, Q, Δ* (not in NA but in SQE (add)!)]

NA28 Luke 22:45 καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς εὗρεν κοιμωμένους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης,

add αὐτοῦ: f1, TR

At the following verses the pronoun is safe: 6:13, 6:17, 7:18¹⁺², 8:22, 11:1¹⁺²

At the following verses the words without pronoun are safe: None!

At the following verses the Byzantine text adds the pronoun:

12:22, 16:1, 19:29, 20:45, 22:39

At the following verses the Byzantine text omits the pronoun:

17:1

At the following verses a minority adds the pronoun:
9:16, 9:18, 10:23, 17:1, 17:22, 18:15, 19:37, 22:45

At the following verses a minority omits the pronoun:
5:30, 6:1, 6:20, 7:11, 8:9, 9:14, 9:43, 12:1
(smaller font size indicates singular readings)

Added vs. omitted: Mt 21 : 9
Mk 8 : 14
Lk 13 : 9

As in Mk there is no case where the reading without the pronoun is safe. There are no outstanding witnesses that omit or add several times. In about 8 cases the reading without the pronoun is comparatively safe. In about 16 cases, the reading with the pronoun is comparatively safe. Thus Luke has no clear preference for either case, but uses the pronoun more often than not.

The following 4 cases are problematic:

Luke 9:16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

add αὐτοῦ: L, R, Ξ, f13, 33, 892, 1071, pc (not in NA and SQE!)
txt P75, 01, A, B, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, 157, 579, 1241, Maj

Parallels:

NA28 Mk 6:41 καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ] ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς,

omit 01, B, L, Δ, 33, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, 1424, pc, d, sa-mss, bo

add P45, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa-mss

NA28 Matthew 14:19 ... καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.

add Θ, f13, 892

This variant is not in NA and SQE and therefore not discussed in Ellingworth's article.

Externally L and Ξ are excellent witnesses in Lk and R, 892 also have often good text, but overall, the reading without the pronoun externally has to be

preferred. Internally in Luke the pronoun is more often added than omitted and Luke uses it more often than not.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

Luke 12:22 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς [αὐτοῦ]· διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε.

omit αὐτοῦ: P45^{vid}, P75, B, 1241, Weiss

add αὐτοῦ: 01, A, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, Maj
WH and NA²⁵ in brackets, too.

No parallel.

Externally the evidence is very evenly divided. Internal evidence favors the omission in Lk.

Ellingworth writes: "The longer reading seems appropriate at the beginning of a pericope." - But it is not clear what he means by this statement, because the pronoun could have been added secondarily for this reason.

Metzger notes: "In accordance with Lukan usage, the majority of the committee preferred to adopt αὐτοῦ". - But Lukan usage is not clear, he uses both forms almost uniformly distributed.

Rating: - (indecisive)

Luke 19:29 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανία[ν] πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλούμενον Ἐλαιῶν, ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθητῶν
19:30 λέγων·

txt omit αὐτοῦ: 01, B, L, 579 (not in NA, but in SQE!)

add αὐτοῦ: A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1342, Maj

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 11:1 ... ἀποστέλλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ safe!
11:2 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς

NA28 Matthew 21:1 ... τότε Ἰησοῦς ἀπέστειλεν δύο μαθητὰς
21:2 λέγων αὐτοῖς

τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ Θ, f13, 28, 33, 157, pc

Externally the omission is favored. Internally it could be a harmonization to Mt. On the other hand the longer reading could be a harmonization to Mk, but this is normally less likely.

If the pronoun is wrong here, it is interesting that Mk has the pronoun safe, but both Mt and Lk omit it.

Ellingworth writes: "In favor of the presence of αὐτοῦ in Lk is the fact that Lk 19:30, unlike Mt 21:2, omits the following αὐτοῖς of Mk 11:2."

Rating: - (indecisive)

Luke 20:45

Ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ]:

omit αὐτοῦ: B, D, 2542, WH, Weiss, Bois, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, SBL

add αὐτοῦ: 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 23:1 Τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλάλησεν τοῖς ὄχλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ safe!

It is rather improbable that the addition of the pronoun is a harmonization to Mt, because the wording is completely different. Internal evidence generally favors the omission in Lk. Externally the support for the longer reading is stronger. If one excludes D and 1 from the consideration as untrustworthy MSS in Lk, it remains B, which itself is not the most trustworthy MSS with respect to pronouns.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

Compare:

P. Ellingworth "(His) disciples" NovT 42 (2000) 114-126

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) (9:16)

Rating: - (indecisive) (12:22)

Rating: - (indecisive) (19:29)

Rating: 2? (NA probably original) (20:45)

TVU 331

NA28 Luke 21:4 πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς πάντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλεν.

BYZ Luke 21:4 ἅπαντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς ἅπαντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλεν

Byz A, D, Q, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Gre, [Trg]

txt 01, B, L, X, f1, 579, 1241, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, Co, geo

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 12:44 πάντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον, _____ αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα ὅσα εἶχεν ἔβαλεν ὅλον τὸν βίον αὐτῆς.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 21:1 Ἐναβλέψας δὲ εἶδεν τοὺς βάλλοντας εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον τὰ δῶρα αὐτῶν πλουσίους.

There is no reason for an omission. Probably an explaining gloss.

τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θεοῦ appears 6 times in Lev 21-23. It's a special term of an offering.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 332

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:4 πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς πάντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλεν τ.

τ ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνη, ὁ ἔχων ὠτα ἀκούειν, ἀκουέτω

E^c, G, H, M^c, S, Γ, Λ, 063, 0211, f13, 892^{mg}, 1071, 2766, al, Lect¹⁶, Sy-Pal

B: no umlaut

A typical addition.

Lk 20:46-21:4 was a Saturday lection.

579 has this addition at Lk 8:15, 12:21, 15:10 (with Θ^c), 16:18 (alone) and 18:8 (alone)!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 333

141. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:6 ταῦτα ἃ θεωρεῖτε ἐλεύσονται ἡμέραι ἐν αἷς οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται T1 λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ T2 ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

T&T #43

T1 ὦδε X, f1, 22, 33, 131, 579, 1241, pc¹⁰, e, s, Sy-C, (Sy-S)

T2 ὦδε 01, B, (D), L, f13, 892, 2542, pc², it, Co, **WH**
ἐν τοίχῳ ὦδε D, it(a, c, d, ff², i, q, r¹, s)
(τοιχος "wall")

txt A, K, Π, Q, W, Γ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 157, 700, 1071, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{ms}, bo^{ms}, **NA²⁵**

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:2 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐ βλέπετε ταῦτα πάντα; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὦδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

W* omits ὦδέ, otherwise save.

NA28 Mark 13:2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶ· βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῆ ὦδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῆ.

omit ὦδε: A, K, Π, Γ, 69, 157, Maj-part, Lat, NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 15:17 ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῶ ὦδε ἀπόλλυμαι.

BYZ Luke 15:17 ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῶ _____ ἀπόλλυμαι

Byz A, P, Q, W, 69, 174, 230(=f13), 157, 1071, Maj, sa^{ms}

txt λιμῶ ὦδε P75, 01, B, L, Ψ, 579, 892, 2542, pc, e, ff², Sy-H, Sy-Pal

ὦδε λιμῶ D, N, R, U, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 700, 1241, al,

Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co, arm, geo

The reading of X, f1 et al. is clearly a harmonization to Mt/Mk.

The reading of 01, B et al. could be a harmonization, too, but with the addition of ὦδε at a different position, but this is rather improbable.

On the other hand it could be argued that the O1, B reading is original and that the omission (of the $\omega\delta\epsilon$ in position 2) is a harmonization to Mt/Mk (improbable, too). Or it has been omitted to improve style. The $\omega\delta\epsilon$ at position 2 does not appear in the parallels and it seems rather out of place.

Note the omission of $\omega\delta\epsilon$ in Mk 13:2, also by the Byzantine text. It is possible that the omission is intended to make the saying more general. Compare also the omission at Lk 15:17.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
change to O1, B reading

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 334

NA28 Luke 21:11 σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται, φόβητρά τε καὶ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἔσται.

BYZ Luke 21:11 σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι κατὰ τόπους καὶ λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται φόβητρά τε καὶ σημεῖα ἀπ οὐρανοῦ μεγάλα ἔσται

Byz A, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, Maj, Gre, Trg^{mg}
txt 01, B, L, 0211, 33, 579, 1071

omit καὶ: 0102^{vid}, 892, 1241, pc

If one enlarges the length of the variation unit, B has a singular reading:

<u>καὶ</u> κατὰ τόπους <u>λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ</u> ἔσονται	B
___κατὰ τόπους <u>λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ</u> ἔσονται	1241
___κατὰ τόπους <u>λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ</u> ἔσονται	0102 ^{vid} , 892, pc
κατὰ τόπου <u>ν</u> καὶ <u>λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ</u> ἔσονται	157
<u>καὶ</u> κατὰ τόπους <u>λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ</u> ἔσονται	01, 0211, L, 33, 579, 1071
κατὰ τόπους καὶ <u>λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ</u> ἔσονται	A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, Maj
κατὰ τόπους καὶ _____ <u>λοιμοὶ</u> ἔσονται	Y ^c , 69, pc ²
κατὰ τόπους καὶ <u>λιμοὶ</u> _____ ἔσονται	X, pc ⁵

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:7 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους·

NA28 Mark 13:8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοί· ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα.

The meaning is different regarding the position of καὶ.

txt "there will be great earthquakes, and in various places famines and plagues"

Byz "there will be great earthquakes in various places, and famines and plagues"

The term σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους appears in the Matthean and Markan parallels. It is thus possible that καὶ has been moved after τόπους as a harmonization to the parallels. The evidence of 0102, 892 and 1241 regarding καὶ is indecisive, because it is not clear at what point in the sentence καὶ has been omitted.

Compare also next variant!

Rating: 2? (= NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 335

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:11 σεισμοί τε μεγάλοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται, φόβητρά τε καὶ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἔσται.

λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ

B, 157, 1241, pc, Lat, (Sy-S), Sy-C, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Trg

txt 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, Maj,
e, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co?, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}

λιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ 13, 230

omit καὶ λιμοὶ Y^c, 69, pc²

omit καὶ λοιμοὶ X, pc⁵

B: no umlaut

"famines and plagues"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:7 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους·

λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ C, K, Π, Θ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, mae-1

λοιμοὶ καὶ λιμοὶ L, W, 33, L2211, pc, Lat, Sy-Pal

txt 01, B, D, E*, 892, pc, it(a, b, d, ff²), Sy-S, sa, mae-2

NA28 Mark 13:8 ἐγερθήσεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λιμοί· ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων ταῦτα. λοιμοὶ Θ

Compare:

NA28 Luke 15:14 δαπανήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα ἐγένετο λιμὸς ἰσχυρὰ κατὰ τὴν χώραν ἐκείνην, καὶ αὐτὸς ἤρξατο ὑστερεῖσθαι.

λοιμὸς 69*

NA28 Luke 15:17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν ἔφη· πόσοι μίσθιοι τοῦ πατρὸς μου περισσεύονται ἄρτων, ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῶ ὧδε ἀπόλλυμαι.

λοιμῶ 69*

The words probably sounded very similar or identical.

The evidence in Mt is indecisive. It is possible that the longer form is original there, too. But even in that case it is not clear which order is original.

Internally there is no decision possible regarding the word order of λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ. Externally the txt reading has to be preferred.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 336

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου.

NA28 Luke 21:18 καὶ θριξ̄ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται.

NA28 Luke 21:19 ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

omit verse: Sy-C, Marcion^E

Eriphanius (scholion 58): Πάλιν παρέκοψε τό· θριξ̄ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται.

B: no umlaut

17 "You will be hated by all because of my name.

18 But not a hair of your head will perish.

19 By your endurance you will gain your souls."

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:9-10 Τότε παραδώσουσιν ὑμᾶς εἰς θλίψιν καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔθνων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. 10 καὶ τότε σκανδαλισθήσονται πολλοὶ καὶ ἀλλήλους παραδώσουσιν καὶ μισήσουσιν ἀλλήλους·

Compare also:

NA28 Matthew 10:22 καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου· ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.

NA28 Mark 13:13 καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.

NA28 Matthew 10:30 ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἡριθμημέναι εἰσίν.

NA28 Luke 12:7 ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πᾶσαι ἡριθμῆνται. μὴ φοβεῖσθε· πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε.

It is possible that the words have been omitted as harmonization to Mt, but this is improbable, because the following words are different in Mt and Lk. It is also possible that the words have been omitted as inappropriate at this place.

There is no reason why the words should have been added secondarily.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 337

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:19 ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

κτήσεσθε

A, B, Θ, f13, 33, pc, Lat(c, f, ff², l, s, vg), sa, bo^{pt}, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Trg

txt 01, D, L, R, W, Ψ, f1, 69, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, it(d, i, q)

κτήσασθαι 01, L, R, W, Δ, 047, 131, 579, 1071, pc

κτήσεσθαι A, 13, 828^c

ώσσετε Marcion^T (from Mt, Mk?)

B: umlaut! (p. 1342 C 7 L) κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

κτήσασθε imperative aorist middle 2nd person plural

κτήσεσθε indicative future middle 2nd person plural

κτήσασθαι infinitive aorist middle

κτήσεσθαι infinitive present middle/passive

κτάομαι "acquire, gain"

Context:

NA28 Luke 21:12-18 Πρὸ δὲ τούτων πάντων ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ διώξουσιν, παραδιδόντες εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς καὶ φυλακὰς, ἀπαγομένους ἐπὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ ἡγεμόνας ἕνεκεν τοῦ ὀνόματός μου· 13 ἀποβήσεται ὑμῖν εἰς μαρτύριον. 14 θέτε οὖν ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν μὴ προμελετᾶν ἀπολογηθῆναι· 15 ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν ἣ οὐ δυνήσονται ἀντιστῆναι ἢ ἀντειπεῖν ἅπαντες οἱ ἀντικείμενοι ὑμῖν. 16 παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν, 17 καὶ ἔσεσθε μισούμενοι ὑπὸ πάντων διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου. 18 καὶ θρῖξ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται.

ἐπιβαλοῦσιν indicative future active 3rd person plural

διώξουσιν indicative future active 3rd person plural

ἀποβήσεται indicative future middle 3rd person singular

δώσω indicative future active 1st person singular

δυνήσονται indicative future middle 3rd person plural

παραδοθήσεσθε indicative future passive 2nd person plural

θανατώσουσιν indicative future active 3rd person plural

ἔσεσθε indicative future middle 2nd person plural

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 24:13 ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.

NA28 Mark 13:13 ὁ δὲ ὑπομείνας εἰς τέλος οὗτος σωθήσεται.

It is possible that κτήσεσθε is a conformation to immediate context, where no less than 8 indicative future forms appear (so also Metzger).

It should be noted that there is additionally the alternative of the infinitive, which is supported by important witnesses. This could well be just an orthographical variation, since αἰ and ε sound identical. And it also makes no real sense.

There is no reason to change the indicative into the imperative.

On the other hand Weiss argues (Com. Lk), that the ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν does not fit to the imperative.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 338

142. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:24 καὶ πεσοῦνται στόματι μαχαίρης καὶ αἰχμαλωτισθήσονται εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πάντα, καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ ἔσται πατουμένη ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν, ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν.

No txt in NA!

καὶ ἔσονται καιροὶ

B, D?, [WH], Weiss

καιροὶ καὶ ἔσονται καιροὶ

L, 892, 1241, bo

txt 01, A, C, R, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj

WH have καὶ ἔσονται in brackets.

D omits [καὶ ἔσονται] καιροὶ ἐθνῶν (parablepsis from B reading? see next verse!)

Tischendorf adds Sy-H^{mg cod} for the L reading.

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse:

NA28 Luke 21:25 Καὶ ἔσονται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἄστροις,

BYZ Luke 21:25 Καὶ ἔσται σημεῖα

ἔσονται 01, B, D, pc

ἔσται A, C, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1241, Maj

Either this is a curious multiple error, or the B or the L reading is original. Since both the B and the L reading are rather awkward, it would be only natural to change them.

Also the meaning of the sentence is not clear.

Robertson (Wordpictures) writes:

"Until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled" (αχρι ου πληρωθωσιν καιροι εθνων). First aorist passive subjunctive with αχρι ου like εως ου. What this means is not clear except that Paul in Ro 11:25 shows that the punishment of the Jews has a limit. The same idiom appears there also with αχρι ου and the aorist subjunctive."

The D reading makes no sense, because an object is missing. The only explanation is that it is a parablepsis error from the B reading. D therefore seems to be a witness for the B reading.

It is possible that καὶ ἔσονται fell out due to homoiarcton καὶ - καὶ (from the B reading) or καιροὶ - καιροὶ (from the L reading).

A secondary origin of καὶ ἔσονται is difficult to explain. Some kind of dittography error has been suggested with the beginning of verse 25, but I cannot see how this could be reasonably explained. It appears more probable that either the B or the L reading are original.

Note that only 01, B, D read ἔσονται in verse 25.

The only possibility I can see is that perhaps someone wrote καὶ ἔσονται next to καὶ ἔσται in verse 25 as a possible replacement and a subsequent scribe added it at the wrong place.

With the B, L et al. reading it is possible to take καὶ ἔσονται καιροὶ with the following:

"and Jerusalem shall be trodden down by nations, till the times be fulfilled.

And there will be times of the Gentiles, there will be signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars, ..."

Rating: 1? (= NA probably wrong)

TVU 339

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:30 ὅταν προβάλωσιν τ ἤδη, βλέποντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν γινώσκετε ὅτι ἤδη ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος ἐστίν·

τ τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν D, 157, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H^{mg}, Marcion^T

"folia" (leaf) r¹ (:: Mt)

Marcion: cum fructum protulerint

Of the Latins only a reads txt.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:32 Ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολήν· ὅταν ἤδη ὁ κλάδος αὐτῆς γένηται ἀπαλὸς καὶ τὰ φύλλα ἐκφύη
γινώσκετε ὅτι ἐγγὺς τὸ θέρος·

Probably a clarifying addition.

Weiss (Lk Com.) notes: "D, it add the object to προβάλωσιν, but wrongly, because the fruits do not come when the summer is near."

Possibly a misreading/misunderstanding of θέρος "summer" with θερισμός "harvest, crop".

Mt correctly has φύλλα ("leaves").

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 340

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:34 Προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς μήποτε βαρηθῶσιν

ὑμῶν αἰ καρδίαι ἐν κραιπάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς καὶ ἐπιστῆ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἢ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη

αἰ καρδίαι ὑμῶν

A, B, T, W, X, f13, 579, 1424, 2542, al, Ir^{Lat}, Trg, WH

txt 01, C, D, L, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 21:18 καὶ θριξ̄ ἐκ τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν οὐ μὴ ἀπόληται.

NA28 Luke 21:19 ἐν τῇ ὑπομονῇ ὑμῶν κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

NA28 Luke 21:28 ἀρχομένων δὲ τούτων γίνεσθαι ἀνακύψατε καὶ ἐπάρατε τὰς κεφαλὰς ὑμῶν, διότι ἐγγίζει ἡ ἀπολύτρωσις ὑμῶν.

In the immediately preceding context the pronoun always comes after the noun without variation. Elsewhere in Luke the pronoun is also invariably after καρδία (5 times) and always safe. There would have been no reason to change this order here.

Possibly the pronoun has been put in front for emphasis.

The support for αἰ καρδίαι ὑμῶν is incoherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 341

143. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 21:34-21:35 Προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς μήποτε βαρηθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι ἐν κραιπάλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς καὶ ἐπιστῆ ἕφ' ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη 35 ὡς παγίς: ἐπεισελεύσεται γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς καθημένους ἐπὶ πρόσωπον πάσης τῆς γῆς.

BYZ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη: 35 ὡς παγίς γὰρ ἐπελεύσεται

Byz A, C, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat(aur, f, q, r¹, vg), Sy
txt 01, B, D, L, 070, 0179, 157, 579, pc, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², i), Co

IGNTP omits the γὰρ after ἐπεισελεύσεται for 01*, B, D

T has a lacuna exactly after παγίς.

B: no umlaut

ὡς παγίς = "like a trap"

ἐπιστῆ ἐφίστημι subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular
"come up, to or before, approach; stand by or near; appear"

αἰφνίδιος "sudden; unexpected"

The difference here is one of punctuation, ruled by the position of the γὰρ:

txt:

"... and suddenly that day may come on you 35 like a trap.
For it will come upon all who live on the face of the whole earth."

Byz:

"... and suddenly that day may come on you. 35 But like a trap
it will come upon all who live on the face of the whole earth."

Compare:

LXX Isaiah 24:17 φόβος καὶ βόθυνος καὶ παγίς ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τοὺς
ἐνοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

"Fear, and the pit, and the snare are upon you, O inhabitant of the earth!"

The overall meaning is basically the same.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 342

144. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 21:36 ἀγρυπνεῖτε δὲ ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι ἵνα κατισχύσητε ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι καὶ σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

BYZ Luke 21:36 ἀγρυπνεῖτε οὖν ἐν παντὶ καιρῷ δεόμενοι ἵνα καταξιωθῆτε ἐκφυγεῖν πάντα τὰ μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι καὶ σταθῆναι ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

Byz A, C, D, R, Δ, Θ, f13, 700, Maj, Latt, Sy, Trg^{mg}

txt 01, B, L, T, W, X, Ψ, 070, f1, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Co

κατισχύσατε W

κατισχύσηται 0179, 579

B: no umlaut

κατισχύσητε κατισχύω subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural

"be able, have strength, overcome, prevail"

καταξιωθῆτε καταξιόω subjunctive aorist passive 2nd person plural

"count worthy, make worthy"

txt "... that you may be able to escape all these things ..."

Byz "... that you may be accounted worthy to escape all these things ..."

Compare:

NA28 Luke 20:35 οἱ δὲ καταξιωθέντες τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐκείνου τυχεῖν καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τῆς ἐκ νεκρῶν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται·

NA28 Matthew 16:18 κἀγὼ δέ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ᾗδου οὐ κατισχύσουσιν αὐτῆς.

It is possibly at least in part a misreading of the similar looking words:

ΚΑΤΙΣΧΥΧΗΤΕ

ΚΑΤΑΞΙΩΘΗΤΕ

Both are rather rare words (καταξιόω two times in Lk, κατισχύω 3 times, twice in Lk, once in Mt).

It is possible that καταξιόω has been adopted from 20:35. κατισχύω could come from the well known Mt 16:18.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 343

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 21:38 καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ὄρθριζεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ
ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ †.

† insert John 7:53-8:11 f13

f13a: 13, 346, 543, 826

f13b: 69, 124, 788

f13c: 983

174, 230, 1689 have the pericope in John only, with a similar text as f13 here.

Note that some manuscripts read ὄρει here (C*, U, pc⁵, Lect), instead of ἱερῷ.
This is probably due to the influence of the PA and lectionary usage. Interesting
is the early attestation by C*!

B: no umlaut

The lectionary reading for Pentecost was Jo 7:37-52 + 8:12. Some manuscripts excised the PA therefore and placed them at some other appropriate place. One such place was after Lk 21:38, because the situation seemed similar to that described in John 8:1-2.

Luke 21:37-38 "Every day he was teaching in the temple, and at night he would go out and spend the night on the Mount of Olives, as it was called. 38 And all the people would get up early in the morning to listen to him in the temple."

John 8:1-2 "while Jesus went to the Mount of Olives. 2 Early in the morning he came again to the temple. All the people came to him and he sat down and began to teach them."

See the extra file on the PA for a detailed discussion.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 344

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:5 καὶ ἐχάρησαν καὶ συνέθεντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι.

NA28 Luke 22:6 καὶ ἐξωμολόγησεν, καὶ ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν τοῦ παραδοῦναι αὐτὸν ἄτερ ὄχλου αὐτοῖς.

omit: 01*, C, N, L48, L150*, L292, L1599, it(b, ff², i, l, q), Sy-S, Eus

01: corrected by 01^{ci}

N: καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἐζήτει (Mt)

Lat(a, aur, c, d, e, f, r¹, vg) read txt.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:15 εἶπεν· τί θέλετέ μοι δοῦναι, κἀγὼ ὑμῖν παραδώσω αὐτόν; οἱ δὲ ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια. 16 καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἐζήτει εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῶ.

NA28 Mark 14:11 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἐχάρησαν καὶ ἐπηγγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἀργύριον δοῦναι. καὶ ἐζήτει πῶς αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως παραδοῖ.

It is possible that the omission is a harmonization to Mt/Mk. This is supported by the fact that N adds the Matthean ἀπὸ τότε, too.

It is also possible, at least in part, that the omission is accidental, due to the many KAIs in the immediate context. Note that e.g. f1 omits καὶ ἐχάρησαν in verse 5.

The words are also omitted in several lectionaries, so maybe there is a lectionary reason? Lk 21:37-22:8 was the normal Friday lection (12th week) in the Synaxarion.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 345

145. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:7 Ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων, [έν] ἧ ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα·

omit P75^{vid}, B, C, D, L, Ψ, 579, 892, 1241, pc,
Weiss, Trg, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, SBL

txt 01, A, W, Θ, f1, f13, 157, Maj, Lat

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:17 Τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες· ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμέν σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα;

NA28 Mark 14:12

Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθουον,

Compare:

NA28 Luke 13:14 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος, ... ἔλεγεν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὅτι ἔξ ἡμέραι εἰσὶν ἐν αἷς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι· ἐν αὐταῖς οὖν ἐρχόμενοι θεραπεύεσθε καὶ μὴ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου.

omit ἐν αἷς: B* (corr. by B^{c1})

NA28 Acts 4:12 καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἢ σωτηρία, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.

The omission is strange. Externally the shorter reading is clearly superior, but internally it is awkward. Possibly idiom?

Weiss argues (Com. Lk) that the ἐν has been added to indicate the dative.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 346

NA28 Luke 22:14 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ.

BYZ Luke 22:14 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα ἀνέπεσεν καὶ οἱ δώδεκα ἀπόστολοι σὺν αὐτῷ

Byz 01^{C2}, A, C, P, R, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat(aur, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, arm, Marcion^E

txt P75, 01*, B, D, 157, pc, it, Sy-C, sa

οἱ ἕνδεκα ἀπόστολοι 348

οἱ δώδεκα 01^{C1}, L, X, 1071, 1241, pc⁵, sa^{mss}

οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Sy-S

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:20 Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης ἀνέκειτο μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα ^T.
^T add μαθητῶν: 01, A, L, W, Δ, Θ, 33, 892, 1424, pm, Lat, Sy-H, Co

NA28 Mark 14:17 Καὶ ὀψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 11:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσων τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, μετέβη ἐκεῖθεν τοῦ διδάσκειν καὶ κηρύσσειν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτῶν.

omit: f1, 22, pc, mae-2

NA28 Mark 3:16 [καὶ ἐποίησεν τοὺς δώδεκα,]

omit: A, C^{C2}, D, L, (W), Θ, f1, (f13), 33, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, arm, geo, Gre, Bois

txt 01, B, C*, Δ, 565, 579, 1342, pc¹, sa^{ms}, WH, NA²⁵, Weiss

δώδεκα is a natural expansion probably derived from Mt/Mk. Note the similar expansion in Mt.

On the other hand it has been suggested that δώδεκα has been omitted to avoid describing Judas Iscariot as an apostle (note the reading by 348 !). It is possible that the other readings are also attempts to remove the problem.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 347

146. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ
ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἔξ αὐτοῦ,
ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῆ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ

<u>οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἔξ αὐτοῦ</u>	C ² , P, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 157, 700, Maj, NA²⁵ , Gre
<u>οὐκέτι μὴ φάγομαι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ</u>	D, d, pc
<u>οὐκέτι μὴ φάγω ἔξ αὐτοῦ</u>	Ψ
<u>οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἀπ' αὐτοῦ</u>	f13

<u>οὐ μὴ φάγω ἔξ αὐτοῦ</u>	A, H, Θ
<u>οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ</u>	C*?, f1, 22, 1071, Lat, Sy, Or, Weiss , [Trg] , Bal

txt <u>οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ</u>	P75, 01, B, C*?, L, 0211, 1(=f1), 579, 892, 1241, al, a, Co, WH
----------------------------	---

Lake and IGNTP have 1 wrongly for txt. It reads οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ, as does 1582. Checked at the film.

Swanson and Tischendorf's NT have C* for txt, NA and IGNTP for the f1 reading. Tischendorf/IGNTP have labeled C* "vid". In Tischendorf's C-edition is only the correction given, in smaller letters. He writes: "Inde ab **ΟΤΙ** scriptis B. Ante defuit ΟΥΚΕΤΙ. Praeterea non assequor an quid aliter habuerit; conjecerim quidem pro **ΕΞ ΑΥΤΟΥ** fuisse **ΑΥΤΟ**."

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

οὐκέτι "no longer, no more"

No parallel.

But compare:

NA28 Mark 14:25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

omit οὐκέτι: 01, C, D, L, W, Ψ, 0103, 892, 1342, pc³⁴, a, f, k, bo

Compare also next variant 22:18

NA28 Luke 22:18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.

On the one hand οὐκέτι could have been added to soften the abrupt saying:
"I will not eat until..." - "No more will I eat until..."

On the other hand οὐκέτι could have been omitted to remove the double negation. The same thing happened in Mk 14:25. It is also possible that the omission is a conformation to verse 18.

Of course it is also possible that the omission in Mk is due to harmonization to Lk.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that οὐκέτι could have been omitted accidentally in front of οὗ. If οὐκέτι would be a harmonization to Mk, a better insertion point is of course verse 18.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes: "[the variant ἐξ αὐτοῦ] seems to me to be far preferable to αὐτὸ, for it is intelligible that αὐτὸ should be substituted in accordance with the foregoing τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν, whereas I do not see that any one would think of altering αὐτὸ into the less obvious construction of ἐξ αὐτοῦ."

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 348

147. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, **[ὅτι]** οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἢ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.

omit P75^{vid}, B, C, (D, G), L, (f1, 157), d, **Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Trg, SBL**
txt 01, A, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat

λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν **οὐ μὴ** πῖω D, G, f1, 157, pc

ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ 1604 (Mk)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Context:

NA28 Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

omit ὅτι: C*, D, N, X, pc

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:29 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου

omit ὅτι: P45, 01, B, D, Z, Θ, 0281, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1071, pc

add ὅτι: A, C, L, W, 579, 700, 1424, Maj

NA28 Mark 14:25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου

It is possible that the omission of ὅτι is a harmonization to Mt, but here the evidence is divided. On the other hand the addition could be a conformation to immediate context, verse 16.

λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν appears 4 more times elsewhere in Luke, always with ὅτι safe.

There is no reason for an omission here, except for redundancy.

The word order variation by D et al. is probably intended to avoid a double ἀπὸ τοῦ: ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος. The Byzantine text leaves out ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν completely.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 349

NA28 Luke 22:18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.

BYZ Luke 22:18 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω _____ ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως ὅτου ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ

Byz A, C, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H

txt P75, 01, B, D, G, K, Π, L, M, W, f1, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, [Trg]

ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐ μὴ πῖω D, G, f1, 157, pc, d, e, r¹, Sy-S, Sy-C

omit ὅτι: P75^{vid}, B, C, D, L, f1, 157

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Mark 14:25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πῖω _____ ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι _____ οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ

omit ὅτι: C*, D, N, X, pc

The phrase ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν appears in the Gospels 5 times in Lk (+ once in Acts) and once in the PA (Jo 8:11). In the LXX it appears 29 times (15 times apocrypha).

It is interesting to note that in verse 16 Byz adds οὐκέτι, whereas here Byz omits ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (compare previous variant):

	<u>verse 16</u>	<u>verse 18</u>
Byz	οὐκέτι	-
txt	-	ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν

The omission by Byz is either due to homoioarcton (ἀπὸ τοῦ - ἀπὸ τοῦ) or deliberately to avoid the double ἀπὸ τοῦ.

Note that D et al. moved the phrase in front of οὐ μὴ πίω (and omitted ὅτι) probably for that reason.

Weiss (Lk Com.) suggests that it has been omitted as a harmonization to Mk by scribes who overlooked that it replaced the οὐκέτι of Mk.

ὅτι: λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν appears almost always with ὅτι. In 22:16 it is omitted also by some witnesses. The other instances in Lk (Lk 3:8; 10:24; 14:24; 22:37) are safe. The support for the omission in this case is very good.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 350

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:19-20 καὶ λαβῶν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

omit: D, it, (Sy-C), **Weiss**

it = a, b, d, e, ff², i, l

NA²⁵, **WH** both have the words in double brackets.

omit verses 17+18: L32, Sy-P, bo^{ms}, Marcion(probably, Harnack)

verse 17, 18 after 19a: b, e

verse 17, 18 after 19b: Sy-C (omits verse 20), **Trg^{mg}** (!)

vs 19 + 20a + 17 + 20b + 18: Sy-S

Marcion has the words basically. The exact wording is not clear, but he had the longer text. He omits καινή.

Tregelles writes in the margin: "17 et 18 forsitan post ver. 19 et postea om. ver. 20."

Lat(aur, c, f, q, r¹, vg) read txt. Compare Wordsworth White.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δούς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν· λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 καὶ λαβῶν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· πῖετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,

NA28 Mark 14:22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβῶν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβῶν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.

Compare:

NA28 1 Corinthians 11:24 καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

NA28 1 Corinthians 11:25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνήσαι λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Compare also Didache 9:2-3:

2 πρωτον περι του ποτηριου ευχαριστουμεν σοι πατερ ημων υπερ της αγιας αμπελου δαυιδ του παιδος σου ης εγνωρισας ημιν δια Ιησου του παιδος σου σοι η δοξα εις τους αιωνας

3 περι δε του κλασματος ευχαριστουμεν σοι πατερ ημων υπερ της ζωης και γνωσεως ης εγνωρισας ημιν δια Ιησου του παιδος σου σοι η δοξα εις τους αιωνας

This is the same sequence as preserved in D et al. (cup - bread).

Externally the longer form is clearly superior. That Marcion supports the longer text is a strong argument for its originality. Schürmann makes it probable that also Justin and Tatian attest the longer form.

The proponents of the shorter form normally argue that the longer version is an adaptation of 1.Co 11:24-25. This is possible, but it is equally probable that the words are so similar, because they are used liturgically from early on.

Sequence:

15 eat this Passover

16 I will not eat it until

17 Then he took a cup,

18 from now on I will not drink

19 he took a loaf of bread,

20 the cup after supper,

The problem felt by some scribes with the longer text was possibly that they mixed the two separate blocks. If one takes verses 17+18 with 19+20, then the strange sequence cup - bread - cup appears.

For this reason D et al. omitted 19b+20 getting the sequence cup - bread. A few witnesses similarly omitted verses 17+18 to get rid of the problem. This is the argumentation of Metzger.

The first problem with these explanations is that it would have been much better for a scribe to omit the first cup (verse 17) to get the normal Pauline sequence bread - cup. It is the first cup, that is problematic, not the second. It would be very improbable that a scribe chose that part of the section for omission that was most familiar to him through Paul's words in 1. Cor.

It could be argued that a scribe, who had written 17-19a already, noted the strange composition only then and chose to omit the last cup.

The second problem is, why has verse 19b been omitted?

The simplest way to get rid of the problem of the wrong sequence is shown by the Old Latin b and e: Taking the short version, they transposed verses 17+18 after 19a and got the common Pauline formula.

Another attempt was apparently more successful: The addition of an adaption of Paul's familiar words.

The reading of Sy-S is a secondary attempt to remove any repetition in the sequence.

Along these lines is the argumentation of WH for the shorter reading.

Chadwick notes that in verse 15 the bread is not explicitly mentioned but implied. Perhaps Luke found in his source only 15-18 and added 19a for the overlooked bread? "The result of this operation was to produce the extraordinary confusion of the shorter text. ... it was the third evangelist himself who initiated a long development of correction and expansion."

Schürmann also argues that the verses 15-18 are a closed unit to which 19a did not belong. Then some redactor added 19a. But 19a is a torso, a rudiment of an originally two-part liturgy. Continuing from 19a with verse 21 Πλὴν ἰδοὺ ... is awkward (J. Jeremias: "äußerst hart"):

19a Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body."

21 But see, the one who betrays me is with me, and his hand is on the table.

Other internal observations:

Schürmann observes that verses 19b-20 contain 7 differences to the Pauline text 1.Co 11. This makes a direct adaption from Paul unlikely.

Burkitt notes that in the longer reading ἐστίν is omitted:

τοῦτό ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου but: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον

This he considered unusual for Luke, because Luke normally is adding such things to his source material.

It is possible that the differences in order and wording reflect actual differences in the execution of the Supper in the various early Christian groups. Note e.g. that Paul has the cup separately "after" the meal and not during the meal.

Steven Notley wrote [private communication, Jan. 2003]:

"The blessings at any Jewish meal (regardless whether this is a Passover or not) over the bread (and always in conjunction with the wine) is at the beginning of the meal. Certainly not during or after the meal. In pre-70 Jewish Passovers there was also an additional cup following the meal (thus also Paul). Mk/Mt clearly present Jesus reversing the order of blessings (unlike Paul). Something that is unheard of in the history of Jewish tradition outside of Qumran. I presented a paper at SBL last year and have an article forthcoming exploring what might possibly have motivated the early Church (and perhaps also the Qumran sectarians) to change the order."

and, clarifying:

"At all Jewish meals (including Passover) there is a blessing (Qiddush) at the beginning of the meal which is always cup-bread. In addition at Passover there is an additional cup (or cups). Prior to 70 the evidence indicates that at Passover there was only one additional cup (the Kos Brachah--cup of blessing) after the meal.

Luke's shorter and longer versions both accord with Jewish tradition. In other words, at the beginning of the meal the order was cup-bread (Qiddush). Mk/Mt by presenting the bread-cup together give us an order of blessing for the Qiddush unknown outside of the DSS.

What is scarcely noticed by scholarship is that Paul's deft insertion of META TO DEIPNHSAI indicates he is not following Mk/Mt's presentation of a reversal of the Qiddush. Instead, he is now identifying the cup as that which followed the meal (i.e. the Kos Brachah) not the cup at the beginning of the meal (as Mk/Mt)."

Nestle, Zahn, Dobschuetz, Burkitt and others think that the shorter form is original. Of the newer scholars it is defended by Ehrman and Parker.

Ehrman and Parker note that in the short form there is no reference to the death of Jesus. Parker writes (Living Text):

"It is a rite more or less just handed over - the cup is given with the brief instruction 'Divide it among ourselves.' They are to do this 'in memory of me'. Jesus has no part in this. He will eat and drink only in the kingdom of God. There is virtually no liturgical elaboration and above all no reference to the death of Jesus. ... It is [this] absence that shorter Luke stands out most markedly as an original contribution. ... This leads us to conclude that shorter Luke is to be preferred. For longer Luke harmonizes on two counts: in wording with 1Co, and in sense with Mark (who is here Pauline in thought).

Compare:

- F. Blass "Zu Lk 2 ff." TSK 69 (1896) 733-37 [who thinks that originally the complete verses 19 and 20 were missing. All readings are attempts to insert the Last Supper somehow.]
- WH, Intro - Notes on select readings 63-64

- H.E.D. Blakiston "The Lucan account of the institution of the Lord's supper" JTS 4 (1903) 548-55
- F.C. Burkitt "On Luke 22:17-20" JTS 28 (1927) 178-81
- H.N. Bate "The shorter text of St. Luke 22:15-20" JTS 18 (1927) 362-68
- P. Benoit "Le recit de la cene dans Lk 2-20" RB 48 (1939) 357-93
- K. Goetz "Das vorausweisende Demonstrativum in Lk 22:19.20 und 1. Cor 11:24" ZNW 38 (1939) 188-90
- H. Chadwick "The shorter text of Luke 2-20" HTR 50 (1957) 249-58
- P. Parker "Three Variant Readings in Luke-Acts" JBL 83 (1964) 1965-70
- H. Schürmann "Lk 22, 19b-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung" in "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien", Düsseldorf 1968, p. 159 - 192
- JH Petzer "Luke 22:19b-20 and the structure of the passage" NovT 26 (1984) 249-52
- Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, p. 198 - 209.
- DC Parker, *Living Text*, p. 151 - 157
- Wayne C. Kannaday "Apologetic discourse and the scribal tradition", SBL 2004, p. 156-162

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 351

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:22 ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου κατὰ τὸ ὠρισμένον πορεύεται, πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται.

omit: D, d, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, **Bois**

For πλὴν οὐαὶ: οὐαὶ δὲ L950, geo

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:24 ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.

NA28 Mark 14:21 ὅτι ὁ μὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.

The words could be a harmonization to Mt, Mk.

It is possible that the words have been omitted to avoid repetition.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 352

NA28 Luke 22:30 ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου
ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, καὶ καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων
τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

BYZ Luke 22:30 ἵνα ἐσθίητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου
_____ καὶ καθίσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων
κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ

Not in NA and not in SQE but in Tis!

Byz E, F, G, H, S, V, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, 047, 174, 230(=f13), 2, 22, 565, 1342, 1424,
1675, Maj, geo^{III}, Robinson

txt P75, 01, A, B, (D), K, Π, L, M, N, Q, U, T, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579,
700, 892, 1071, 1241, al, Latt, Sy, Co, TR
omit μου: D, d, e, gat, g¹, l, vg^{mss}, Sy-C
βασιλεία αὐτοῦ 69

IGNTP erroneously has W for the omission. Bruce Prior confirms that the phrase is there from the facsimile.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Probably omitted due to h.t. (MOU - MOU) or for stylistic reasons. There is no reason for a secondary addition.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 353

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:30 ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, καὶ **καθήσεσθε** ἐπὶ θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

κάθησθε B^{*,(C1)}, T, Δ, (892), pc, **Trg^{mg}**, **WH**
καθιεισθε 892

καθήσεσθε 01, A, B^{C2}, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700, 1241,
Maj-part[N, S, Π*, Ω, 047, 0211], **WH^{mg}**

καθίσεσθε 124, 983, 579, 1424, 2542, L844,
Maj-part[E, F, K, Π^c, Γ, M, U, V, X,Y,Γ, Λ, 2], **Robinson**

καθίσησθε H, al, TR

καθέζησθε D

Lacuna: 33

IGNTP alone has P75^{vid}, but this is very doubtful, there is almost nothing visible. What can be seen looks more like an H, though.

B p. 1344 B 16: Originally **ΚΑΘΗCΘΕ** has been written.

Two corrections took place: **ΚΑΘΗ^{ce}CΘ^{AI}Ε**

CΕ has been added above **HC** and **AI** has been added above the **Ε**.

The **CΕ** has probably been written by the reinforcer (so also Tischendorf). The **AI** appears to be written by the first hand corrector B^{C1}. The end-**Ε** and the **AI** written above appear both to be not enhanced. Possibly the enhancer was in doubt about the correct text?

B: no umlaut

καθήσεσθε	indicative	future	middle 2nd person plural
καθίσεσθε	indicative	future	middle 2nd person plural
κάθησθε	indicative	present	middle 2nd person plural
ἔσθητε/πίνητε	subjunctive	present	active 2nd person plural

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 19:28 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνου δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθήσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

καθίσῃσθε C, D*, 33, 700, 892, 1241, Maj-part

καθεσθήσεσθε Z, f1, 579, pc

txt 01, B, C, D^c, L, W, Δ, Θ, 0281, f13, Maj-part

It is possible that the κάθησθε reading is a conformation to the present forms ἔσθητε/πίνητε earlier in the verse (so Weiss).

On the other hand καθήσεσθε could be a harmonization to Mt.

If the original reading of B has already been corrected by B^{c1}, the value of B as a witness for κάθησθε is greatly reduced. Together with the incoherence of the support it is probable that it's a conformation to context.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 354

148. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 22:31 _____ Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξή
τήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον·

BYZ Luke 22:31 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Κύριος, Σίμων Σίμων ἰδοὺ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξή
τήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον·

Byz 01, A, D, Q, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, Maj,
Latt, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{mss}, [Trg]

txt P75, B, L, T, 1241, 2542^c, L1231, Sy-S, Co, geo

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

With the previous verse the 'Dispute about Greatness' ended. But Jesus continues to speak, so a new introduction is not needed.

On the one hand the words could have been added for lectionary purposes to indicate a new pericope.

On the other hand the words could have been deleted as being inappropriate with Jesus still speaking.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the words have been added to smooth the abrupt transition from the promise to the disciples to the warning of Peter.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 355

149. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 22:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· λέγω σοι, Πέτρε, οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνήση εἰδέναι.

BYZ Luke 22:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν Λέγω σοι Πέτρε οὐ μή φωνήση σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήση μή εἰδέναι με

txt "... until three times you have denied that you know me."

Byz "... before three times you have denied, (not) to know me."

οὐ P75, 01, B, L, Q, T, X, Θ, Ψ, 372, 579, 892, 1241, 2542, pc⁹

οὐ μή A, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 157, 565, Maj (not in NA, but in SQE)

μή² by:A, D, W, Δ, 118, 1582(=f1), f13, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 2542, Maj,

πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήση μή εἰδέναι με A, W, Δ, 565, 700, 1424, Maj
πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήση μή εἰδέναι 118, 1582

πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήση με εἰδέναι Ψ, 1
πρὶν τρίς ἀπαρνήση με εἰδέναι Q^{sic}

ἕως ὅτου τρίς με ἀπαρνήση μή εἰδέναι με D, pc
ἕως οὗ τρίς ἀπαρνήση μή εἰδέναι με K, al
ἕως τρίς ἀπαρνήση μή εἰδέναι με 892, Bal
ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνήση μή εἰδέναι f13, 2542, NA²⁵, Weiss

ἕως οὗ τρίς ἀπαρνήση εἰδέναι με M, X, Π, pc

ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνήση εἰδέναι P75^{vid}, 01, B, L, T, Θ, 579, WH
ἕως τρίς ἀπαρνήση με εἰδέναι 157

ἕως οὗ ἀπαρνήση μή τρίς 1241 (:: Jo)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἀπαρνέομαι "reject, disown"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 20:27 Προσελθόντες δέ τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, οἱ ἀντιλέγοντες ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἀντιλέγοντες by: A, W, f13, Maj, Sy-H

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:34 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήση με.

NA28 Mark 14:30 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήση.

NA28 John 13:38 ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήση ἕως οὗ ἀρνήση με τρίς.

As in Lk 20:27 and 22:16 we have here the problem of a double negation. In both cases it is the Byzantine textform that has the double negation.

This addition of μὴ is probably intended to intensify the negation as in οὐ μὴ.

One additional problem is that μὴ and με sound identical. Since both make sense it was probably the origin of several readings. E.g. the variant by Ψ, 1 is probably one.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the οὐ μὴ comes from Jo, but the ἕως has been changed into πρὶν ἢ from (Mt)/Mk. The μὴ has been omitted accidentally after ἀπαρνήση and the με has been moved to the end to supply an object for εἰδέναι.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 356

150. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:36 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ἀλλὰ νῦν ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον ἀράτω, ὁμοίως καὶ πήραν, καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν.

Not in NA but in SQE!

ἀρεῖ D, d

πωλήσαι

D

πωλήσει

E, G, H, N, S, V, Δ, Γ, Λ, Ω, 047, 0211, f13, 2, 565, 700, 1342, 2766, pm

ἀγορασάσει

D,

E, F, H, N, S, U, V, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, 047, 0211, f13, 2, 157, 565, 700, 1342, 2766, pm

βαλλάντιον ὁμοίως ἀράτω 1241

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἀράτω imperative aorist active 3rd person singular

ἀρεῖ indicative future active 3rd person singular

ἀγορασάτω imperative aorist active 3rd person singular

ἀγοράσει indicative future active 3rd person singular

πωλήσαι infinitive aorist active

πωλήσει indicative future active 3rd person singular

βαλλάντιον "purse"

No parallel.

Nestle (Intro) notes a comment by Basilides (4th CE, Asceticon):

ἀράτω ἦτοι ἀρεῖ· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων ἔχει ...

ὡς μὴ εἶναι πρόσταγμα ἀλλὰ προφητείαν προλέγοντος τοῦ κυρίου·

= "ἀράτω or ἀρεῖ: Because so [ἀρεῖ] the majority of copies have it. ...

as it is not an order, but a prophesy said in advance by the Lord."

It makes quite good sense if it is not an order ("Take it!" - "Buy one!"), but a future prediction: "he will take it" - he will buy one".

The meaning of $\pi\omega\lambda\hat{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$ in D is not clear, possibly it is just an error.

Note also the following:

J.R. Harris in his preface to Margaret Gibson's translation of Isho'dad of Merv's commentaries writes (1911, p. XXVII):

"Occasionally we shall find an ethical variant for which it will be difficult to obtain a sponsor amongst the N.T. editors. In Luke 22:36 (where the suggestion is made that the sale of a garment might secure the purchase of a sword) we are told that

In many copies there stands in place of the words Sell his garment, etc. the sentence Pray for your enemies.

Whoever the people were who had made this correction in the Gospel of Luke, they had certainly not lost sight of the spirit of the Gospel in their study of the letter. (I suppose the statement that many ancient MSS have the passage indicated would hardly secure it a position on the margin of the Revised Version!)"

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 357

NA28 Luke 22:37 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.

BYZ Luke 22:37 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί τὸ Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει

Byz K, Π, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 565, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy

txt 01, A, B, D, H, L, Q, T, W, X, f1, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 2542^c, L844, pc⁸, b, d, f, r¹, Co

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 8:17 καὶ γινούσ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὐπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν;

BYZ Mark 8:17 καὶ γινούσ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε οὐπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε ἔτι πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν

Byz A, K, Π, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, f, l, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H

txt P45^{vid}, 01, B, C, D, L, N, W, Δ, (Θ), 0143^{vid}, f1, f13, 28, 33, (565), 579, 892*, 1241, pc, it, Co

NA28 John 4:35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται;

omit: P75, D, L, S, Π, Ω, 086^{vid}, 118, f13, 28, 1241, L844*, pm, Sy-C

NA28 Romans 5:8 συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι ἔτι ἀμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν.

omit: 131, 460, 618, 1836*, 2147

It is possible that ἔτι fell out accidentally after ὅτι, or that it has been omitted for stylistic reasons to avoid the awkward ὅτι ἔτι. Note similar omissions at Jo 4:35 and Ro 5:8.

It might have been added to make clear that the fulfillment of the prophecy has yet to come (suggested by Weiss).

Note the addition of ἔτι at Mk 8:17 with similar support.

Usage ἔτι: Mt: 8 times, Mk 5 times, Lk 16 times, Jo 8 times.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 358

151. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:43-44 [[ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. 44 καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἔκτενέστερον προσήχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.]]

T&T #45

omit completely:

P75, 01^{C1}, A, B, N, R, T, W, 0211, 13*, 579, 1071*, pc⁴, f, Sy-S, sa, bo, Hier^{mss}, arm, geo, Cl?, Or?, **Weiss**

pc = 158, 512*, 552, 1128

P69 also omits v. 42 and 45a (see below)!

01^{C1}: the words are cancelled by curved marks AND by dots.

A omits the words, but has the Eusebian numerals for the passage in the margin.

WH, **NA²⁵** both have the words in double brackets.

Bal has the words in single brackets

omit verses 42-44: P69(3rd CE), see below

add the words:

01*,^{C2}, D, K, Π, L, Q, X, Δ*, Θ, Ψ, 0171, f1, 13^{mg}, 174, 230(=f13), 157, 565, 700, 892*, 1071^{mg}, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, bo^{mss}, Diatess, Jus, Ir, Julian, Chrys, Did, Hipp, Eus, Hier^{mss}, **Bois**, **Trg**

with obeli: Δ^C, Π^C, 230(=f13), 0171, 892^{mg}, 1424, pc³⁴, bo^{mss}

Harnack adds: E, S, V, Γ, pc

The 0171 fragment contains only the end of verse 44, with a dot at the end.

add after Mt 26:39 and after Lk 22:42: f13, 713

T&T additionally add: E, M^{mg}, S, V, Γ, Π, Ω, 118^C, 131(=f1), 1241, pc²⁶, Sy-Pal probably in error!

- C has a lacuna in Lk, but adds the words at Mt 26:39 in the margin!
- Note that the verses in Lk originally stood in 01.
- One Sy-P manuscript has in the margin: "Haec pericope non reperitur in evangeliiis apud Alexandrinos."

Lacuna: C, 33

B: no umlaut

Variants in the text:

43 [[ὥφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος T¹ ἀπ' T² οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. 44 καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο¹ ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ῥ¹ῶσει θρόμβοι αἵματος ῥ²καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν².]]

<u>T¹ κυρίου</u>	1424, pc, c, Sy-H
<u>T² ἀπὸ τοῦ</u>	D, Q, U, Θ, Ψ, 828, 983, 1071 ^c , 1241, pc (compare next TVU!)
<u>ῥ¹ ἐγένετο δὲ</u>	D, L, Δ, Θ, (f13), 1241, Maj, Sy-H txt: 01*, V, X, Ψ, f1, 157, pc, Lat
<u>ῥ¹ ὡς</u>	D, 2542
<u>ῥ² καταβαίνοντος</u>	01*, X ^c , 346, pc, Lat, Sy-P
<u>ῥ² τῆς γῆς</u>	Q, U ^c , Ψ, 892, pc

f13:

The situation for f13 is rather complicated:

- All f13 manuscripts, except 174 and 230, have the text in Mt! But 174 has a reference to Lk in Mt and 230 has a reference to Mt in the margin of Lk. 174 and 230 are probably just displaying the standard Byzantine text here. 13 unfortunately has a lacuna in Mt.
- 124, 543 do not have the text or a note on it in Lk at all, but have a link to Lk in Mt.
- 13*, 69, 788 and 826 have ὥφθη δὲ either in the text or in the margin of Lk. 13 has the verses in the top margin of Lk (unfortunately in part cut off).
- 346, 828, 983 and 1689 have the verses in the text of Lk without signs of doubt, but all three have also a reference to Mt (828 in Mt and 983 in Lk).

So the f13 reading is to have the text in Mt. But all f13 manuscripts show and note some knowledge that the verses also belong to Lk. Five manuscripts actually have the full text in Lk (13^{mg}, 346, 828, 983, 1689). The simple statement in NA "f13 om. hic et pon p. Mt 26:39" is therefore misleading.

f13 shows other signs of such textual variations for liturgical purposes, e.g. the transfer of the PA from John to Lk 21:38.

Manuscript C/04:

C unfortunately has a lacuna in Lk. A corrector notes the verses in Mt in the margin with a reference to Lk. The beginning is unreadable: ... [Λ]ουκα κφ. σπγ· ωφθι δε αυτω αγελος ... και αναστας απο της προσευχεις ερχετε· ζτι. ις κφ. ματθ. ση~.

Clivaz writes: "The scribe even indicates the Eusebian number of the Lukan passage, and quotes from Lk 22:43 to 22:45a ... Three little crosses can be seen in this marginal note ..."

Regarding the date Clivaz writes: "This marginal note in C has not been dated by NA. Returning to Tischendorf's remarks, we can learn that the little crosses are a reminder of the text's use in liturgical readings, and can be traced to the second corrector, who lived in Constantinople in the 9th CE (C3)."

0171 is our earliest Greek witness (ca. 300 CE). It is fragmentary and preserves only a part of verse 44.

It reads:

ΤΟ ΚΑΙ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ] Ο ΙΔ
ΡΩΣΑΥΤΟΥ ΩΣ ΕΙ] ΘΡΟ
ΒΟΙΑΙΜΑΤΟ] ΣΚΑΤΑ ΒΑΙ
ΝΟΝΤΕΣ Ε] ΠΙ ΤΗΝ ΓΗΝ

new column:

⁴⁵ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΑ Π[Ο ...

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

Lectionary usage:

The reason for the inclusion of the verses in Mt is clearly lectionary usage. Raymond E. Brown writes ("The Death of the Messiah" p. 181, n. 4):

"Luke 22:43-45a was read on Holy Thursday (between Mt 26:21-39 and Mt 26:40-27:2); when it became customary to read Lk 22:39-23:1 as a pericope on Tuesday of the last week before Lent, Lk 22:43-44 was omitted from it to avoid duplication."

It is thus clear that the transfer of the verses between Mt and Lk has no impact on the textual problem of the originality of these verses. This variation is secondary and is due to liturgical influences.

Aland is wrong if he assigns f13 a strategic role here for the solution of the problem: "This kind of fluctuation in the NT manuscript tradition is one of the surest evidences for the secondary character of a text."

This may be true in other cases, but here it has no relevance.

It is possible that the omission in later witnesses has to do with this lectionary usage. Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 407ff.) thinks that the passage was labeled with certain marks either to indicate transfer to Mt or simply to indicate the passage for lectionary use. These marks then misled some scribes to omit.

Compare:

T. van Lopik "Once again: Floating words ..." NTS 41 (1995) 286-291

P69:

In P69 (3rd CE, POxy 2383) also verse 42 is omitted. Due to the fragmentary state of the papyrus the text is not completely safe. After verse 41 it continues probably with verse 45 *καὶ ἀναστὰς ...* Possibly this indicates a secondary deletion in the exemplar of P69?

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

P69 probably reads:

ΠΑΣΘΗΠΑΥΤΩΝΩΣ]ΕΙΛΙΘΟΥΒ[ΟΛΗΝ
ΚΑΙΘΕΙΣΤΑΓΟΝΑΤΑΠΡΟΣ]ΗΥΧΕΤΟ
[ΚΑΙΑΝΑΣΤΑΣΑΠΟΤΗΣΠΡΟΣΕΥΧΗΣ]
ΕΛΘΩΝΠΡΟΣΤΟΥΣ]ΜΑΘΗΤΑΣΚΟΙ
ΜΩΜΕΝΟΥΣΑΠΟΤΗ]ΣΛΥΠΗΣ[Κ]ΑΙ
ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ · ... ca. 4 ...]ΤΙΚΑΘΕΥΔΕ
ΤΕΑΝΑΣΤΑΝΤΕΣΠΡΟΣ]ΕΥΧΕΣ[Θ]Ε
ΙΝΑΜΗΙΣΕΛΘΗΤΕΕΙΣΠΕΙΡ]ΑΣΜΟΝ

Note that this reconstruction is based on a new suggestion for line 4 by T.A. Wayment (ref. below). The old reconstruction by Turner (ed. pr., followed by IGNTP) suggested an omission of verse 45a, too. This is obsolete now.

P69: reconstructed text: P69 omits the red parts.

41 [καὶ αὐτὸς ἀπεσπάσθη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὡς]εὶ λίθου β[ολὴν καὶ θεὸς τὰ γόνατα προσ]ηύχετο

42 λέγων· πάτερ, εἰ βούλει παρένεγκε τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ' ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.

43 ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. 44 καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

45 [καὶ ἀναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς] μαθητὰς κοί[μωμένους ἀπὸ τῆ]ς λύπης, 46 καὶ [καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·] τί καθεύδε[τε; ἀναστάντες προσ]εύχεσθε, [ἵνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς πειρ]ασμόν.

Discussion of P69:

According to Aland (Festschrift Ramon Roca-Puig, 1987) this omission points to a deliberate excision of the prayer.

If the verses 43-44 were present in the exemplar of P69 is impossible to say. Agreements of P69 with the D text may increase the probability that the verses were originally present.

Regarding P69, there are two possibilities:

- 1 The P75, A, B et al. reading (omission) is original. Then the scribe of P69 deleted verse 42, perhaps deliberately to get rid of the equally problematic saying of the cup to pass from him.
- 2 The 01*, D et al. reading (inclusion of the verses) is original. Then the scribe of P69 deleted the words either accidentally or deliberately, similar to point 1.

Both points are equally possible and probable. Therefore one cannot assign P69 as a witness for the omission of verses 43-44, but only, as a "third way", for the omission of 42-44.

Clivaz suggests that P69 could be "a fragment of Marcion's redaction of the Gospel of Luke". The excision only makes sense "in a type of Christianity that preserved a single Gospel, as did Marcion", because the sentence of the cup is present also in Mt 26:39 and in Mk 14:36. We don't know for certain, but there is no evidence that these verses were in Marcion's gospel (compare Clivaz for references).

P69 is not noted in NA and incorrectly (for the omission of 43-44 only) in SQE.

Fathers evidence:

Justin (2nd CE): Dialogue with Trypho, ch. 103

ΕΝ ΓΑΡ ΤΟΙΣ ΑΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΣΙΝ - [γεγραπται] ΟΤΙ ΙΔΡΩΣ ΩΣΕΙ ΘΡΟΜΒΟΙ ΚΑΤΕΧΕΙΤΟ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΕΥΧΟΜΕΝΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣ· ΠΑΡΕΛΘΕΤΩ, ΕΙ ΔΥΝΑΤΟΝ, ΤΟ ΠΟΤΕΡΙΟΝ ΤΟΥΤΟ.

"For in the memoirs - [it is recorded] that with sweat like drops he was covered, while He was praying, and saying, 'If it be possible, let this cup pass.'

It is noteworthy that Justin does not mention blood, he only says: "sweat like drops".

Irenaeus (2nd CE): Against Heresies, III, ch. 22

" ... nor would he have wept over Lazarus, nor have sweated great drops of blood (ουδ' αν ιδρωσε θρομβους αιματος); nor have declared, 'My soul is exceeding sorrowful' nor, when his side was pierced, would there have come forth blood and water. For all these are tokens of the flesh which had been derived from the earth, which he had recapitulated in himself, bearing salvation to his own handiwork."

Diatessaron:

Arabic (Ciasca): 43. Apparuit autem illi Angelus de caelo , confortans eum. Et cum timeret, continua oratione orabat. 44. Et factus est sudor eius, sicut rivulus sanguinis, et cecidit in terram.

Ephrem (Armenian, the Syriac has a lacuna): "His sweat became like drops of blood."

Eusebius (early 4th CE), canon table: Eusebius has the verses listed under X 283, verses peculiar to Luke. (for other canon table cases compare Mt 17:21, Mk 15:28, Lk 5:39 and Lk 23:34)

Emperor Julian (331-363 CE):

Julian was the last non-Christian ruler of the Roman Empire. In a fragment of an assumed commentary on Luke of Theodore of Mopsuestia, a reference to the Gospel of Luke ascribed to Julian the Apostate is preserved. It is possibly from the (now lost) Emperor's 2nd book against the Galilaeans (= Christians):

ἀλλὰ καὶ τοιαῦτα προσεύχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
οἷα ἄνθρωπος ἄθλιος συμφορὰν φέρειν εὐκόλως οὐ δυνάμενος,
καὶ ὑπ' ἀγγέλου ὧν ἐνισχύεται.

τίς δὲ καὶ ἀνήγγειλέ με, Λουκᾶ, περὶ τοῦ ἀγγέλου,
εἰ καὶ γέγονε τοῦτο;

"And even such things Jesus prays, such as a wretched man unable to bear misfortune calmly, and from an angel being strengthened. But who has told you, Luke, of the angel, that this has happened?"

For details compare: T. Baarda, NovT 30 (1988) 289-296

For Julian compare also the comment by Cyrill below.

Hilarius (ca. 350 CE), De Trinitate 10:41 (text from CCSL 62A as found in CLCST):

"Nec sane ignorandum a nobis est, et in graecis et in latinis codicibus conplurimis uel de adueniente angelo uel de sudore sanguinis nihil scribuntur repperiri. Ambigentes, utrum hoc in libris uariis aut desit aut superfluum sit incertum enim hoc nobis relinquitur de diuersitate librorum;

Certe si quid sibi ex hoc heresis blanditur, ut infirmum adfirmet cui opus fuerit angeli confortantis auxilio, meminerit creatorem angelorum creationis suae non eguisse praesidio; tum deinde necessario eo modo eum confortari, quo modo et tristem esse. Nam si nobis tristis est, id est propter nos tristis est, necesse est ut et propter nos sit confortatus et nobis: quia qui de nobis tristis est et de nobis confortatus est, ea confortatus est condicione qua tristis est. Sudorem uero nemo infirmitati audebit deputare: quia et contra naturam est sudare sanguinem, nec infirmitas est, quod potestas non secundum naturae consuetudinem gessit.

Neque ad heresim infirmitatis pertinere ullo modo poterit, quod aduersum heresim fantasma mentientem proficiat per sudorem sanguinis ad corporis ueritatem."

"Certainly we cannot overlook that in very many Greek and Latin manuscripts nothing is recorded of the angel's coming and the sweat like blood. So, someone may have doubt, if this, in different books, is either missing or considered redundant - this is left undetermined, because of the differences in the books.

Some heresy utilizes the words, to assert Jesus weakness, who needed the help of an angel, but please consider that the creator of the angels does not need this protection. [...] The bloody sweat is a witness against the heresy, which speaks mendaciously of an illusion [of Jesus body, docetism], the sweat manifests the truth of the body."

Epiphanius, "Ancoratus" 31.5 and 37.1 (374 CE) writes (from Harnack, NT Textkritik, 1931):

ἀλλὰ καὶ "ἔκλαυσεν" κεῖται ἐν τῷ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίῳ ἐν τοῖς ἀδιορθώτοις ἀντιγράφοις, καὶ κέχρηται τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ ὁ ἅγιος Εἰρηναῖος ἐν τῷ κατὰ αἱρέσεων πρὸς τοὺς δοκῆσαι τὸν Χριστὸν πεφηνέναι λέγοντας. ὀρθόδοξοι δὲ ἀφείλαντο τὸ ῥητὸν φοβηθέντες καὶ μὴ νοήσαντες αὐτοῦ τὸ τέλος καὶ τὸ ἰσχυρότατον·

"καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἰδρωσεν, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡς θρόμβοι αἵματος καὶ ὤφθη ἄγγελος ἐνισχύων αὐτόν."

But also "he wept", as it is written in the Gospel according to Luke in the unrevised copies - and the holy Irenaeus used this in *Against Heresies* [3.22.2] in witness to those saying Christ appeared merely in spirit, but the orthodox have removed the passage, since they feared and did not know his end and greatest strength - and "having been in agony, he sweat, and his sweat became as drops of blood, and an angel appeared, strengthening him."

NA for comparison:

44 καὶ γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσήχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

43 ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν.

Harnack thinks that Epiphanius has read the words in reversed order, but this might simply be due to inaccurate quoting.

Athanasius of Alexandria (4th CE): There is a possible allusion in his "Against the Arians III 440a (PG 26, p. 440):

... ἀκούοντες δέ, ὅτι ἔκλαυσεν, ἵδρῳ, πέποιθεν, ...

'And Christ's enemies seem to me to show plain shamelessness and blasphemy;' for, when they hear 'I and the Father are one', they violently distort the sense, and separate the unity of the Father and the Son; but hearing of his tears, sweat or sufferings, they do not advert to his body, but on account of these rank in the creation him by whom the creation was made.

Jerome (ca. 400 CE, Against the Pelagians 2.16):

"In quibusdam ["certain"] exemplaribus tam Graecis quam Latinis invenitur scribente Luca: *Apparuit illi angelus ...* "

Testament of Abraham 20:5 (original probably Jewish, 1st or 2nd CE):

κατηῆλθε ὁ ἰδρῶς ἐκ τῆς ὀψεως αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος

"the sweat came down from his eyes like drops of blood"

This is the closest verbal parallel to Lk 22:44, perhaps a Christian interpolation? The Testament also presents the theme of the cup (as "bitter cup of death"), the confrontation between the will of Abraham and the will of God, and Abraham's triple request to Death for going away.

Severus of Antioch preserves a statement from Cyrill († 444 CE) from an otherwise lost work. Severus writes in "the 3rd letter of the 6th book of those after the exile" to the "glorious Caesaria":

But, as to the passage about the sweat and the drops of blood, know that in the divine and evangelical Scriptures that are at Alexandria it is not written. Wherefore also the holy Cyril in the 12th of the books written by him on behalf of the religion of all the Christians against the impious demon-worshipper Julian plainly stated as follows:

"But, since he said that the divine Luke inserted among his own words the statement that an angel stood and strengthened Jesus, and his sweat dripped like blood-drops or blood, let him learn from us that **we have found nothing of this kind inserted in Luke's work**, unless perhaps an interpolation has been made from outside which is not genuine. The books therefore that are among us contain nothing whatever of this kind; and I therefore think it madness for us to say anything to him about these things: and it is a superfluous thing to oppose him on things that are not stated at all, and we shall be condemned to be laughed at and that very justly."

In the books therefore that are at Antioch and in other countries it is written, and some of the fathers mention it; among whom Gregory the Theologian made mention of this same passage in the 2nd homily on the Son [Or. Theol. IV. 16]; and John bishop of Constantinople in the exposition composed by him about the passage, 'My Father if possible let this cup pass from me.'

[compare E.W. Brooks, *Patrologia Orientalis* 14, p. 245-6]

Anastasius of Sinai (7th CE, *Viae Dux* 22.3):

Κὰν γὰρ μιᾶς ἢ καὶ δευτέρας γλώττης ἐπεχείρησέ τις νοθεῦσαι τὰ βιβλία, ἠλέγχετο εὐθὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἑβδομήκοντα γλωσσῶν ἢ ῥαδιουργία αὐτοῦ. Ὅρα γοῦν, ὅτι τινὲς ἐπεχείρησαν παρεπᾶραι τοὺς θρόμβους τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδρώτος Χριστοῦ ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ Λουκᾶν εὐαγγελίου καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν. Ἐλέγχονται γὰρ τὰ μὴ ἔχοντα τὸ κεφάλαιον ἐκ πολλῶν καὶ διαφόρων εὐαγγελίων ἔχόντων αὐτὸ. ἐν γὰρ πᾶσι τοῖς ἐθνικοῖς εὐαγγελίοις κείται καὶ ἑλληνικοῖς πλείστοις.

For even if someone attempts to adulterate the books of one or even two tongues, immediately his fraud is disproved by the other seventy tongues. At any rate, be aware that some attempted to delete the drops of blood, the sweat of Christ, from the Gospel of Luke and were not able. For those lacking the section are disproved by many and various gospels having it; for in all the gospels of the nations it remains and in most of the Greek.

Historia passionis Domini (Latin, 14th CE): cited from Clivaz/SQE

"Sequitur Luc. 22. Apparuit autem ei angelus de celo confortans eum. Qualiter autem angelus Christum in agonia sue oracionis confortaverit dicitur in Evangelio Nazareorum. Et idem ponit Anselmus in planctu suo. Constans esto domine modo enim venit tempus quo per tuam passionem redimendum est genus humanum in Adam venditum."

"According to Luke 22. So an angel appeared to him, strengthening him. And the words by which the angel strengthened Christ in his struggle in prayer, are reported in the Gospel of the Nazarenes. And the same is also adduced by Anselm in his lamentation: Be constant, Lord, for now comes the time in which through thy passion mankind sold in Adam will be ransomed."

Vocabulary and Style:

Harnack (and also Blass) think that the words are original: They have a typical Lucan flavor. Compare:

NA28 Luke 1:11 ὥφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου ...

ὥφθ* appears 10 times in Lk/Act, but only once in Mk (9:4) and once in the parallel Mt (17:3).

Hapax legomena: ἀγωνία, ἰδρῶς, θρόμβοι appear only here in the NT. But this is not really surprising, Luke has an extensive vocabulary.

R. Brown (Death) writes: "in style and vocabulary this passage is closer to Lk than to any other NT author."

Hoskier notes that the use of γίνομαι in γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ and καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἰδρῶς αὐτοῦ might be medical language, at least language typical for Luke. Compare:

NA28 Acts 10:4 ἔμφοβος γενόμενος "becoming afraid" (again 24:25)

NA28 Acts 12:11 ἐν ἑαυτῷ γενόμενος "came to himself"

NA28 Acts 16:27 ἔξυπνος δὲ γενόμενος "having come out of sleep"

NA28 Acts 16:29 ἔντρομος γενόμενος "trembling"

NA28 Acts 15:25 γενομένοις ὁμοθυμαδὸν "come together with one accord"

NA28 Acts 28:8 ἐγένετο δὲ ... πυρετοῖς καὶ δυσεντερίῳ
"lay sick with fever and dysentery"

This indicates that the wording in this passage appears to be typical for Luke.

On the other hand ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ appears nowhere else in Lk nor the NT. Lk uses ἄγγελος κυριοῦ etc.

Compare also John 12:27-30:

"Now my soul is troubled. And what should I say 'Father, save me from this hour'? No, it is for this reason that I have come to this hour. 28 Father, glorify your name." Then a voice came from heaven (φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), "I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again." 29 The crowd standing there heard it and said that it was thunder. Others said, "An angel has spoken to him." 30 Jesus answered, "This voice has come for your sake, not for mine.

According to Harnack these words were adapted from Lk. But John changed them considerably: the angel and the blood have been removed, the strengthening is not for Jesus, but for the others.

So, if John was inspired from Luke, he must have read the verses in his edition of Luke.

Luke parallels several accounts of his passion narrative in Acts. It has been suggested (Tuckett), that the Agony story is paralleled by Paul's shipwreck:

Acts 27:23-25 For last night there stood by me an angel of the God to whom I belong and whom I worship, 24 and he said, 'Do not be afraid, Paul; you must stand before the emperor; and indeed, God has granted safety to all those who are sailing with you.' 25 So keep up your courage, men, for I have faith in God that it will be exactly as I have been told.

The parallelism seems clear.

R. Brown (Death of the Messiah, p. 186-7) notes that there might be an allusion to the LXX version of Deu 32:43:

LXX Deuteronomy 32:43 εὐφράνθητε οὐρανοί ἅμα αὐτῷ καὶ προσκυνησάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ εὐφράνθητε ἔθνη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνισχυσάτωσαν αὐτῷ πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἐκδικᾶται καὶ ἐκδικήσει καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἀνταποδώσει καὶ ἐκκαθαριεῖ κύριος τὴν γῆν τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ

"Rejoice, ye heavens, with him, and let all the angels of God worship him; rejoice ye Gentiles, with his people, and let all the sons of God strengthen themselves in him; for he will avenge the blood of his sons, and he will render vengeance, and recompense justice to his enemies, and will reward them that hate him; and the Lord shall purge the land of his people."

WH: "These verses and the first sentence of 23:34 may be safely called the most precious among the remains of this evangelic tradition which were rescued from oblivion by the scribes of the second century." They also write: "Notwithstanding the random suggestions of rash or dishonest handling thrown out by controversialists there is no tangible evidence for the excision of a substantial portion of narrative for doctrinal reasons at any period of textual history."

A. Plummer (ICC Com. Lk 1922) adds: "It matters little whether Lk included them in his narrative, so long as their authenticity as evangelic tradition is acknowledged. In this respect the passage is like that respecting the Woman taken in Adultery. [...] we need have no hesitation whatever in retaining it as a genuine portion of historical tradition. It is true, whoever wrote it."

Metzger writes: "Nevertheless, while acknowledging that the passage is a later addition to the text, in view of the evident antiquity and its importance in the textual tradition, a majority of the Committee decided to retain the words in the text but to enclose them within double square brackets."

Nestle: Not original, but from an early time.

Harnack thinks that Marcion deleted the words for dogmatic reason (Marcion, p. 247*).

Discussion:

The words were known from the earliest times on. Justin and Irenaeus (2nd CE) quote them and they appear, already in an expanded form, in the Gospel of the Nazarenes (2nd CE).

The wording appears to be typically Lukan.

It is possible that the verses had been edited out, because it was felt inappropriate for Jesus to show such human weakness (ἀγωνία and strengthening by an angel). Elsewhere in Lk Jesus is always calm and in control. This is supported by Epiphanius, who thinks that the passage was suppressed by anxious orthodox (anti-ebionitic). Also Hilarius hints at this (see above).

On the other hand it has been suggested that the words have been added to show that Jesus was a real human being and not a super-human God (anti-docetic, ebionitic).

See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, p. 187 - 194: "...three writers of the 2nd century: Justin, Irenaeus and Hippolytus. Remarkably, in all three cases the verses are cited to the same end, to counter any notion that Jesus was not a real flesh and blood human being."

But is a strengthening by an angel really necessary to show that? The agony and sweat would have been sufficient.

So, either

- a) someone omitted the words because they possibly indicated a not fully divine Jesus, or
- b) someone added the words to show that Jesus was a real flesh and blood human being.

It is noteworthy that the equally shocking word from the passing of the cup, which was so offensive to Celsus, has not been edited out in the same way. We only know this omission from P69.

Both, addition and omission are explicable on doctrinal grounds, so not decisive. In favor of the omission is the note by Epiphanius. Hilarius notes both arguments (ebionitic and docetic). Very early patristic support and stylistic reasons support the originality of the words.

Against this stands strong external support for the omission:

P75, 01^{C1}, A, B, R, T, W, 579, Sy-S, sa, bo.

But the support in favor of the words is also not bad:

01^{*.C2}, D, L, Q, 0171^{300 CE}, f1, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-C

Very difficult! Overall, I think there is a slight edge in favor of the words.

Compare also the variant Lk 23:34, where the external evidence is similar.

Compare:

- A. Harnack "Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu, I. Zu Lk 22:43-44" in "Studien zur Geschichte de NT und der Alten Kirche, I: Zur Neutestamentlichen Textkritik", 1931, p. 86-91
- L. Brun "Engel und Blutschweiß Lk 22:43-44" ZNW 32 (1933) 265-276 [argues for the inclusion of the words with the argument that Lk nowhere else shortens the account of Mk without adding some replacement.]
- J.H. Neyrey "The Absence of Jesus' Emotions - the Lucan Redaction of Lk 22:39-46" Biblica 61 (1980) 153 - 171
- B.D. Ehrman and M.A.Plunkett "The angel and the agony: The textual problem of Lk 22:43-44" CBQ 45 (1983) 401-16 [argues for the short text]
- M. Patella "The death of Jesus: The diabolic force and the ministering angel", dissertation, Paris, 1999, esp. p. 9-15, 64-73
- CM Tuckett "Luke 22, 43-44, The Agony in the Garden ..." in "Festschrift Delobel, Leuven 2002, p. 131 - 144
- Claire Clivaz " 'A Sweat like Drops of Blood' - at the crossing of Intertextual reading and textual criticism", SBL contribution 2004.
- Claire Clivaz "The Angel and the Sweat Like 'Drops of Blood' (Lk 22:43-44): P69 and f13" HTR 98 (2005) 419-440
- T.A. Wayment "A new transcription of POxy 2383 (P69)" NovT 50 (2008) 351-57
- Claire Clivaz "Some Remarks on Thomas A. Wayment, A New Transcription of P. Oxy. 2383 (P69)" NovT 52 (2010) 83-87
- Claire Clivaz "L'Ange Et la Sueur de Sang (Lk 22:43-44): Ou Comment On Pourrait Bien Encore Ecrire L'Histoire", Biblical Tools and Studies 7, Peeters Leuven, 2010, 733 pages
- T.A. Wayment "P.Oxy. 2383 (P69) One More Time" NovT 54 (2012) 288-292
- Lincoln H. Blumell "Luke 22:43-44: An Anti-Docetic Interpolation or an Apologetic Omission?" TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism, 2014 (argues for authenticity)

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
in single brackets in the text.

TVU 359

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:43

[[ὡφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἀπό τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

D, Q, U, Θ, Ψ, 0233, 828, 983, 1071^c, 1241, pc, [Trg](#), [WH](#)

txt 01*, L, f1, 157, 565, 700, 892, 1424, Maj, [WH^{mg}](#)

omit verse:

P69(3rd CE), P75, 01^{C1}, A, B, N, R, T, W, 0211, 579, 1071*, pc⁴, [Weiss](#)

1241 not noted in NA, but correctly in IGNTP and Lake! Checked at the film.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 9:54 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης εἶπαν· κύριε, θέλεις εἶπώμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς;

ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ Ξ, L, 124, 579, 1071, pc

NA28 Luke 17:29 ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἐξῆλθεν Λῶτ ἀπὸ Σοδόμων, ἔβρεξεν πῦρ καὶ θεῖον ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀπώλεσεν πάντας.

ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ 063, pc

NA28 Luke 21:11 σεισμοὶ τε μεγάλοι καὶ κατὰ τόπους λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ ἔσονται, φόβητρά τε καὶ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἔσται.

ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ S, 1424

ἀπὸ οὐρανοῦ 13, pc

Difficult. It is not clear if the verses were originally in Lk.

Luke uses both forms and both variations occur.

The external evidence is in favor of txt.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 360

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:47 Ἔτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος ἰδοὺ ὄχλος, καὶ ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰούδας εἷς τῶν δώδεκα προήρχετο αὐτοῦς καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλήσαι αὐτόν τ.

τ τοῦτο γὰρ σημεῖον δεδώκει αὐτοῖς· ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν

hoc enim signum dederat eis dicens: Quemcumque osculatus fuero, hic est. (Tenete eum. b,c)
D, E, H, X, Θ, 0211, f13, 713, 2, 700, 1071, 2766, pm, Lect^{mss}
it(aur, b, c, d, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, geo, aeth

add additionally κρατήσατε αὐτόν: X, 0211, pc, b, c, arm, geo, aeth

f13: 174, 230 omit

Lat(a, e, f, ff², i, l, q, vg) omit.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:48 ὁ δὲ παραδιδούς αὐτόν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς σημεῖον λέγων· ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν, κρατήσατε αὐτόν.

NA28 Mark 14:44 δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδιδούς αὐτόν σύσημον αὐτοῖς λέγων· ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός ἐστιν, κρατήσατε αὐτόν καὶ ἀπάγετε ἀσφαλῶς.

Probably added from the Mt/Mk parallels. There is no reason for an omission. The diverse supporting witnesses indicate an early date of origin.

D. Parker (Living Text) writes: "The harmonization is interesting, in that it is not simply a verbatim transference of the material, but a slight revision, or rather a number of independent revisions, so that Matthew's words will fit the Lukan context better."

For the exact wording of the various witnesses check the IGNTP volume.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 361

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:51 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἔατε ἕως τούτου·
καὶ ἀψάμενος τοῦ ὠτίου ἰάσατο αὐτόν.

D, it(a, d, e, f, ff², r¹), arm^{ms}:

καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ

from Mt?

from verse 50

Et extendens manum (suam Iesus) tetigit eum et redintegrata est auris eius.

tangens f,q

restituta est auricula d,r¹

omit suam Iesus: d, f, r¹

omit Iesus: a

Lat(aur, b, c, q, vg) read txt.

omit verse: 0171, Marcion^F

Marcion omitted 22:49-51 according to Eriphanius: Παρέκοψεν ὁ ἐποίησε Πέτρος, ὅτε ἐπάταξε καὶ ἀφείλετο τὸ οὖς τοῦ δούλου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἐκτείνω "stretch out, extend"

Compare previous verse 50:

NA28 Luke 22:50 καὶ ἐπάταξεν εἰς τις ἐξ αὐτῶν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τὸν δούλον καὶ ἀφείλεν τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν.

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:51 Καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰς τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ καὶ πατάξας τὸν δούλον τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὠτίον.

Compare also:

NA28 Luke 5:13 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἤψατο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου. ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ.

Weiss (Lk Com.) suggests that the rephrasing is due to a supposed discrepancy: In verse 50 the ear is cut off, so, how can he touch it and heal it? This then has been changed by D into:

"And reaching out his hand he touched him and restored his ear."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 362

152. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 22:61 καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ, καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς.

BYZ Luke 22:61 Καὶ στραφεὶς ὁ κύριος ἐνέβλεψεν τῷ Πέτρῳ. Καὶ ὑπεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου, ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι, ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς.

Byz A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj,
Trg, Tis, Weiss, NA²⁵, Bal, Gre, Bois, SBL

txt P69, P75, 01, B, L, X, T, 070, 0153, 124, 579, 892, 1241, pc, WH, UBS¹⁻⁴

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:75 καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος Ἰησοῦ ...
safe!

NA28 Mark 14:72 καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ...
τοῦ ῥήματος M, W, f1, f13, 28, 579, 700, al

The commentators and editions generally assume that ῥήματος is a harmonization to Mt.

NA²⁷ and UBS seemed to be impressed by the support from the early papyri. But it is incomprehensible why some scribe should change τοῦ ῥήματος into τοῦ λόγου. All other occurrences of ῥήματος are safe.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 363

153. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 22:61 πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι σήμερον ἀπαρνῆση με τρίς.

BYZ Luke 22:61 Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι _____ ἀπαρνῆση με τρίς

Byz A, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, 565, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, sa^{mss}

txt P69(3rd CE)^{vid}, P75, 01, B, K, Π, L, M, T, X, 070, 0153, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, al, b, ff², l, Sy-S, Sy-H**, sa, bo
f13 has σήμερον φωνῆσαι

δὶς Sy-C

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

σήμερον "today"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:75 ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι _____ τρίς ἀπαρνῆση με·

NA28 Mark 14:72 πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δὶς _____ τρίς με ἀπαρνῆση·

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 26:34

ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι _____ τρίς ἀπαρνῆση με.

NA28 Mark 14:30

σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἢ δὶς ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνῆση.

NA28 Luke 22:34

οὐ φωνήσει σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνῆση εἰδέναι.

σήμερον appears in the Jesus prediction in Mk and Lk, but not in Mt. In the exact parallels σήμερον does not appear in Mt and Mk.

On the one hand it is possible that σήμερον has been added from the prediction accounts.

On the other hand it could have been omitted as a harmonization to Mt/Mk (so Weiss).

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 364

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 22:62 καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

omit verse: 0171^{vid}, it (a, b, e, ff², i, l, r¹)

WH have the verse in single brackets.

Lat(aur, c, d, f, q, vg) read txt.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 26:75 καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τοῦ ῥήματος Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήθη με· καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

NA28 Mark 14:72 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ῥῆμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δὶς τρίς με ἀπαρνήθη· καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν.

Compare next verse 63:

NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες,

BYZ Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες

It is basically possible that the verse has been added as a harmonization to Mt (so actually the NEB!). But the support is just too weak for that. It is therefore more probable that the words have been omitted accidentally (the next verse 63 also begins with καὶ).

The text of fragment 0171 has been carefully reconstructed by J. N. Birdsall: J. Neville Birdsall, "A fresh examination of the fragments of the Gospels of St. Luke in manuscript 0171 and an attempted reconstruction with special reference to the recto)" in: "Philologia Sacra", Festschrift for Frede/Thiele, Freiburg 1993.

He concludes: "We have confidence that the study of the extant fragments have laid a sure foundation for our contention that, ...the whole of verse 62 was not found in the folium when still undamaged."

D. Parker writes (Living Text): "There is no obvious reason why a scribe should deliberately omit the reference, and the likelihood is that the words are a later addition from Matthew."

A serious objection to the originality of the verse comes from the fact that the αὐτὸν in the next verse 63 does not refer to Peter, but to Jesus. In verse 62 Peter is the subject. So the αὐτὸν would naturally refer to Peter in verse 63, too. This has been felt from early on and the Byzantine text replaces τὸν Ἰησοῦν for αὐτὸν.

61 The Lord turned and looked at Peter. Then Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said to him, "Before the cock crows today, you will deny me three times."

62 And he went out and wept bitterly.

63 Now the men who were holding him began to mock him and beat him;

On the other hand without verse 62 the situation is not much better. In verse 61 still Peter could be seen as the last mentioned subject.

CM Tuckett (in G. Strecker "Minor Agreements", p. 134) writes: "The theory of a textual corruption of the text of Luke, with a harmonizing addition being made fairly early, still seems to be the best solution. Such a theory can claim (little) support in the manuscript tradition; it eases the problem of the Lukan narrative sequence; it makes the gospel texts differ; and moreover, when coupled with a theory of Matthew's text is a secondary attempt to explain and ease the very hard Markan text, it provides a reasonably coherent explanation of the manuscript evidence of all three synoptic texts."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 365

154. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 22:64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν
ἐπηρώτων λέγοντες· προφήτευσον, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε;

BYZ Luke 22:64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἔτυπτον αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον,
καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν, λέγοντες Προφήτευσον τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε

"and having blindfolded him, (they were striking him on the face)"

Byz A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, ff², i, l, q, vg), Sy-H
αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον ἔτυπτον αὐτὸν D, d

αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον 063, 070, f1, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa
(063 acc. to Gregory, Textkritik, III, p. 1059 and IGNTP)

txt P75, 01, B, K, Π, M, L, T, 1241, pc, it(b, c, e, r¹), bo
ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν 01

063 not in NA! Checked at the film. It reads:

καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ ἐπιρώτουσι λέγωντες·

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:67-68 Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ
ἐκολάφισαν αὐτόν, οἱ δὲ ἐράπισαν 68 λέγοντες· προφήτευσον
ἡμῖν, χριστέ, τίς ἐστὶν ὁ παῖσας σε;

NA28 Mark 14:65 Καὶ ἤρξαντό τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν
αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτόν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ·
προφήτευσον, καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ῥαπίσμασιν αὐτόν ἔλαβον.

Compare previous verse 63:

NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτόν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ
δέροντες, δέρω "beat, strike, hit"

The Byzantine reading adds the striking in verse 64 a second time. It could have been omitted therefore as being redundant.

The words could have been added as a harmonization to the parallels, but the words are not identical.

Weiss (Lk Com.) suggests that the words have been added, because of the following $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\varsigma$.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 366

155. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 22:68 εὖν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε.

BYZ Luke 22:68 εὖν δὲ καὶ ἐρωτήσω οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε μοι,
ἢ ἀπολύσητε.

T&T #46

Byz A, D, N, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 0211, f13, 700, 1278^c, 2786, Maj,

Latt, Sy, Weiss, [Trg]

ἢ ἀπολύσητε 892, pc³⁹

ἢ ἀπολύσητε μοι/με pc⁵, a

εὖν δὲ ἐρωτήσω, οὐ μὴ ἀπολύσητε. 2542

txt P75, 01, B, L, T, 1241, 1278*, bo

μοι Θ, f1, 22, 157, 579, 1612, pc¹⁴, vg^{ms}, sa

omit verse: pc² (901, 2729), e, vg^{ms} (h.t.)

T&T has Θ and Ψ wrong (interchanged).

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

"you will not answer me or send me away"

No parallel.

It is possible that the words have been omitted due to h.t. (HTE - HTE, so Weiss). Note the evidence of 1278! It appears that the personal pronoun has been added independently.

It is also possible that the words have been omitted because they were incomprehensible. The whole verse is slightly strange.

On the other hand the words could have been added to give some kind of explanation as to what the question might be.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the words are too difficult to have been added secondarily, note the missing object!

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 367

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:2 Ἦρξαντο δὲ κατηγορεῖν αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· τοῦτον εὗραμεν διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν Τ¹ καὶ κωλύοντα φόρους Καίσαρι διδόναι Τ² καὶ λέγοντα ἑαυτὸν χριστὸν βασιλέα εἶναι.

Τ¹ καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφητᾶς

et solventem legem nostrum et prophetas

it(b, c, e, ff², gat, i, l, q, r²), vg^{mss}, Marcion^E

Τ² καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα

et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis;

non enim baptizantur sicut et nos, nec se mundant.

c, e, Marcion^E

but c, e have it at the end of verse 23:5

"and our sons and wives he turns away from us"

"for they do not receive baptism in the same way as we do, nor do they purify themselves."

Acta Pilati A: τοῦτον οἶδαμεν ὄντα υἱὸν Ἰωσηφ τοῦ τέκτονος ἀπὸ Μαρίας γεννηθέντα, καὶ λέγει ἑαυτὸν υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ βασιλέα· ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σάββατα βεβηλοῖ καὶ τὸν πάτρον νόμον ἡμῶν βούλεται καταλύσαι.

Lat(a, aur, d, f, r¹, vg) read txt.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 5:17 Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας·

Possibly omitted as conflicting with Jesus teaching, e.g. Mt 5:17.

On the other hand the first insertion fits perfectly to Marcion's doctrine.

JR Harris (Codex Bezae, p. 230f.) also is seeing these as Latin Marcionite corruptions. Both these accusations are the same as those presented against Marcion and his followers, "who do not hold to the perfunctory method of baptism, but demand a severe ascetic preparation for the rite."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 368

NA28 Luke 23:6 Πιλᾶτος δὲ ἀκούσας _____ ἐπηρώτησεν
εἰ ὁ ἄνθρωπος Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν,

BYZ Luke 23:6 Πιλᾶτος δὲ ἀκούσας Γαλιλαίαν ἐπηρώτησεν
εἰ ὁ ἄνθρωπος Γαλιλαῖός ἐστιν·

"And Pilate having heard of 'Galilee' ..."

Byz A, D, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, Maj,
Latt, Sy, sa, Trg

txt P75, 01, B, L, T, 070, 1241, bo, arab^{MS}

Tregelles has additionally [Γαλιλαίαν] in brackets in the margin.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

A natural addition of the missing object.

On the other hand the word could have been omitted as redundant.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 369

NA28 Luke 23:8 Ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν, ἦν γὰρ ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν _____ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλπιζεν τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενον.

BYZ Luke 23:8 ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν ἦν γὰρ θέλων ἐξ ἱκανοῦ ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν **πολλὰ** περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλπιζεν τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενον

Byz A, W, R, X, Δ, Ψ, f13, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H
περὶ αὐτοῦ **πολλὰ** f13

txt P75, 01, B, D, K, Π, L, M, T, Θ, 070, f1, 157, 579, 1241, al,
d, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 14:1 Ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὴν ἀκοήν Ἰησοῦ,

NA28 Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δίκαιον καὶ ἅγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτόν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἤκουεν.

A natural addition. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 370

156. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:11 ἐξουθενήσας δὲ αὐτὸν [καὶ] ὁ Ἡρώδης σὺν τοῖς στρατεύμασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐμπαίξας περιβαλὼν ἐσθήτα λαμπρὰν ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν τῷ Πιλάτῳ.

αὐτὸν ὁ A, B, D, K, Π, R, Δ, Θ, f1, 174, 230, 983, 1689(=f13), 157, 892, 2542, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo^{pt}, sa, WH, NA²⁵, Weiss, Trg

αὐτὸν W, 063, 1241, al

αὐτὸν καὶ 13

αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ P75, 01, L, N, T, X, Ψ, f13, 579, pc, a, d(!), Sy-H^{mg}, bo^{pt}, WH^{mg}, Bois, Tis, Bal, Gre

καὶ αὐτὸν ὁ 070

omit 2nd καὶ: P75

NA has 2542 wrongly for the W reading. It reads αὐτὸν ὁ Ἡρώδης. Checked at the film.

13: The reading has been checked at the film.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἐξουθενέω "despise, treat with contempt"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέροντες, "And the men who were holding Jesus were mocking him, beating him;"

No parallel.

καὶ here with the meaning "even, also".

The καὶ could have been added as a connection to the previous verse:

NA28 Luke 23:10 εἰστήκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς εὐτόνως κατηγοροῦντες αὐτοῦ.

10 The chief priests and the scribes stood by, vehemently accusing him.

11 But having treated him with contempt **also** Herod with his soldiers, **and** having mocked, having dressed him in a bright robe, he did send him back to Pilate."

On the other hand it could have been omitted because an explicit rejection is not mentioned. Both arguments are not very probable.

It is possible that it has been added to intensify the expression, "*even he*".

It is also possible that the word has been omitted because of the rare meaning.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 165) thinks that the καὶ has been added (in view of the following ἐμπάξας) in retrospect at verse 22:63.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: ?? (NA probably original = tendency to omit brackets)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 371

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:12

ἐγένοντο δὲ φίλοι ὃ τε

Ἡρώδης καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετ' ἀλλήλων·

προϋπήρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὄντες πρὸς αὐτούς.

ὄντες δὲ ἐν ἀηδία ὁ

Πιλάτος καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης ἐγένοντο φίλοι ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

Cum essent autem in dissensionem (d: lite)

Pilatus et Herodes facti sunt amici in illa (d: ipso) die.

D, c, d

Note that in the text version there is a word order variant of the names, as in the D-reading:

Ἡρώδης καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος

P75, 01, B, L, T, Ψ, 070, 124, 579, 892, 1071,
1241, 1424, 1675, Lat, sa, bo^{ms}

Πιλάτος καὶ ὁ Ἡρώδης

A, D, K, Π, N, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 565,
700, Maj, Sy

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

προϋπάρχω = "be or exist previously"

ἔχθρα = "hostility, ill will, hatred"

ὄντες ἐν ἀηδία = "being at odds"

No parallel.

Strange variation.

The D reading contains the rare word ἀηδία which appears nowhere else in the NT and only once in the LXX (Prov. 23:29).

The only reasonable explanation is that the verse has been changed to improve style.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 372

NA28 Luke 23:15 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης, ἀνέπεμψεν γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ·

BYZ Luke 23:15 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης ἀνέπεμψα γὰρ ὑμᾶς πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ·

Byz A, D, W, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, 124, 174, 230, 346(=f13), 700, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, Trg

txt P75, 01, B, K, Π, L, M, T, Θ, 070, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al,
aur, f, vg^{mss}, Co, Trg^{mg}
ἀνέπεμψαν... 070

ἀνέπεμψεν γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς f13, pc, vg^{mss}, Sy-H^{mg}
ἀνέπεμψα γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς 788, al, vg^{mss}

ἀνέπεμψα γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, arm, geo²

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Neither has Herod [found this man guilty]

txt "for he sent him back to us"

070 "for they sent him back to us"

Byz "for I sent you back to him"

f13 "for he sent him back to you"

788 "for I sent him back to you"

Sy "for I sent him back to him"

Compare verse 7 and 11:

NA28 Luke 23:7 [Πιλᾶτος] ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἡρώδη,

NA28 Luke 23:11 [Ἡρώδης] ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν τῷ Πιλάτῳ.

Metzger writes: "In the transmission of this clause, copyists became hopelessly confused..."

The txt reading makes the best sense. First Pilate sent Jesus to Herod, Herod sent him back to Pilate. So the natural answer of Pilate would be: "Herod has not found this man guilty, for he sent him back to us."

The Byzantine reading seems to mean: "I have examined him in your presence and have not found this man guilty - nor has Herod - for I sent you back to him."

The Byzantine reading does not deal with the Herod clause at all.

The other readings are probably just errors.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 373

157. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 23:17

BYZ Luke 23:17 ἀνάγκην δέ εἶχεν ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς κατὰ ἑορτὴν ἓνα.

T&T #47

Byz 01, (D), W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 131, 157, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo^{pt}, [Trg^{mg}]
ἀνάγκην δέ εἶχεν κατὰ ἑορτὴν ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς ἓνα.

D, Θ, Ψ, 579, 892^{mg}, 1424, 1675, pc¹⁴

add ἓνα δέσμιον: al¹²⁹

συνήθειαν for ἀνάγκην N, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa^{mss} (from Jo)

add after verse 19 D, pc², d, Sy-S, Sy-C, aeth
(not noted in T&T)!

txt P75, A, B, K, Π, L, T, 070, 0211, 892*, 1241, pc²³,
a, vg^{ms}, sa, bo^{pt}, Diatess^{Arab}

Arabic Diatessaron: There is a long Lukan block in ch. 50 from Lk 23:4-18a, but it is omitting verse 17.

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:15 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν εἰώθει ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἓνα τῶ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον ὃν ἤθελον.

NA28 Mark 15:6 Κατὰ δὲ ἑορτὴν ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἓνα δέσμιον ὃν παρη τοῦντο.

NA28 John 18:39 ἔστιν δὲ συνήθεια ὑμῖν ἵνα ἓνα ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ πάσχα·

Compare next verse:

NA28 Luke 23:18 Ἀνέκραγον δὲ παμπληθεὶ λέγοντες ...

It is possible that the verse has been omitted very early due to homoioarcton (ἀνάγκην δέ - ἀνέκραγον δὲ). Later some witnesses inserted it at the wrong place. But the insertion after verse 19 could also be explained as D having an exemplar that was originally without the verse. Possibly the words were written in the margin and then inserted at the wrong place.

On the other hand it is possible that the sentence has been added as an early attempt to harmonize the text with Mt/Mk (so Weiss).

Problematic with this view is that the harmonization is not exactly like the Mt/Mk wording. Especially ἀνάγκη does not appear here. ἀνάγκη appears 3 times in Lk and once in Mt. Note that some witnesses have συνήθειαν here from John.

It has also been noted that without the words the story is rather difficult to understand. But A. Plummer (ICC Com. Lk 1922) notes: "The passage reads more naturally without the gloss than with it."

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
put the words in brackets into the text.

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 374

158. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 23:23 οἱ δὲ ἐπέκειντο φωναῖς μεγάλαις αἰτούμενοι αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ κατίσχυον αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν.

BYZ Luke 23:23 οἱ δὲ ἐπέκειντο φωναῖς μεγάλαις αἰτούμενοι αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι καὶ κατίσχυον αἱ φωναὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων.

T&T #48

"And they were pressing with loud voices asking him to be crucified, and prevailing were the voices of them, and those of the chief priests."

Byz A, D, N, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 131, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 2786,

Maj, c, d, f, Sy, [Trg]

καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων 1253

καὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων 1424

καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων 2680

txt P75, 01, B, L, 070, 130, 755, 1241, Lat, Co, arab^{MS}

Lacuna: 33

B: umlaut! (1346 B 40 L) φωναὶ αὐτῶν. 24 Καὶ Πιλάτος ἐπέκρινεν

No parallel.

Sounds like an afterthought.

It is possible that the words have been omitted to improve style. It is also possible that they have been omitted due to h.t. (..WN - ..WN).

On the other hand the words could have been added to specify those who were responsible for Jesus death.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 375

159. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 23:27 Ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ γυναικῶν αἰ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν.

BYZ Luke 23:27 Ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος τοῦ λαοῦ, καὶ γυναικῶν αἰ καὶ ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἐθρήνουν αὐτόν.

No noted in NA, but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz C⁶³, K, Π, P, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700^c, Maj, Sy-H

txt P75, A, B, C*, D, N, X, Ψ, 0124, 0211, 33, 700*, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, 1675, 2542, 2766, Lat(a, aur, b, d, e, f, ff², g¹, l, vg), Co, arm

καὶ 69, 579, c

omit 01, L, r¹
but L reads αἰκόπτοντο for αἰ ἐκόπτοντο

700: The words have been added in the margin by a later hand.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Mark 15:41 αἰ ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ

BYZ Mark 15:41 αἰ καί, ὅτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, ἠκολούθουν αὐτῷ,

αἰ _____ 01, B, Ψ, 083, 33, 892, 1424, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co

καί A, C, L, W, Δ, L844^c, al, l, vg

αἰ καί D, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Sy-H

Regarding the Syriac Pete Williams comments:

"In Mark 15:41, while NA27 is right that it is unlikely that the wording of *SP* could have been produced from a text reading *καί* for *txt*'s *αἰ*, the outside possibility that *S* or *P* were produced from a text reading *αἰ καί* as D Θ f^{1.13} ⲙ should not be overlooked, when full consideration is made of the tendency of Syriac translations to overlook *καί* in the meaning of 'also'."

P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 146.

It is probable that the variation here is due to the similarity of the letters. The question is if it's an omission or an addition.

On the one hand it is possible that καί has been omitted to improve style (omitting a redundant word) or due to parablepsis. On the other hand καί could have been added to avoid an error like that in L, mixing up the two e-sounds.

Bill Warren suggests on the textualcriticism list (13. Sept 2006) that the καί has been added to get the meaning "both ... and" or "not only ... but also":

"and among them were women who were both lamenting and wailing for him."

Warren writes: "Clarity is added that the women (professional or customary social mourners?) were the ones doing both acts of lamenting him and singing/wailing a funeral dirge for him (and not the large multitude of the people, although such an understanding would be awkward anyway). καί could have been added for both clarity and as a fairly common way to unite the two participles with a common subject."

It is possible that καί has been added for this reason. On the other hand αἰ καὶ could already be the original reading with this meaning.

The support for καί without αἰ is just too slim, otherwise one could presume that αἰ καὶ is a conflation.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 376

160. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:28 στραφεῖς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ' ἐμέ· πλήν ἐφ' ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν,

omit P75, 01^{*.c2}, B, L, Trg, WH, NA²⁵, Tis, Bal

txt 01^{c1}, A, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 5:10 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν.

omit ὁ: B, L, WH Rating: - (indecisive)

NA28 Luke 9:50 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ κωλύετε· ὅς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν.

omit ὁ: 01^{*}, B, WH Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

NA28 Luke 18:40 σταθεῖς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν. ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν·

omit ὁ: B, D, T, 157, WH Rating: - (indecisive)

Difficult. Strong external support.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 377

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:31 ὅτι εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται;

omit B, C, 070, 1675, pc, Weiss, WH, NA²⁵

txt P75, 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψf1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj,
WH^{mg}, [Trg]

omit 2nd τῷ:L211

B: no umlaut

Curious. There is no reason for an omission except accidentally. The support is incoherent.

The article could have been added as a conformation to the second half of the verse.

Rating: 2? or - (=NA probably original or indecisive)

TVU 378

NA28 Luke 23:32 Ἦγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο σὺν αὐτῷ _
ἀναιρεθῆναι.

BYZ Luke 23:32 Ἦγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι δύο κακοῦργοι σὺν αὐτῷ
ἀναιρεθῆναι

Byz A, C, D, L, P, Q, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241,
Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-C, Gre, Trg, Bal

txt P75, 01, B

δύο 1071

omit ἕτεροι: e, c, Sy-S, Co

Tis printed δύο κακοῦργοι but wrote in the corrections:
"text eodem modo voluit Tischendorfius κακοῦργοι δύο"

B: no umlaut

txt "Also other criminals, two, were led with him"

Byz "Also others, two criminals, were led with him"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 10:1 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα

LXX Isaiah 53:12 διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸς κληρονομήσει πολλοὺς καὶ τῶν
ἰσχυρῶν μεριεῖ σκῦλα ἀνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν
καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη

Therefore I will allot him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the
strong; because he poured out himself to death, **and was numbered with the
transgressors**; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.

The txt version could be read as describing Jesus as a criminal.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 379

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:32 Ἦγοντο δὲ καὶ ἕτεροι κακοῦργοι δύο σὺν αὐτῷ Τ1
ἀναιρεθῆναι Τ2 .

Τ1 Ioathas et Maggattras |

Τ2 ... et Capnatas r¹ (having a lacuna before)

B: no umlaut

Codex Rehdigerianus, I (8th CE) reads in full:

"ducebantur autem et alii duo latrones cum illo Ioathas et Maggattras crucifigerentur

Codex Usserianus, r¹ (7th CE) reads in full:

"duceba]ntur autem et alii duo m[aligni] cum illo
ut crucifigere[ntur ...] et Capnatas

(the manuscript suffered damage from fire and water, so only one name is left.)

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 27:38 Τότε σταυροῦνται σὺν αὐτῷ δύο λησταί,
εἷς ἐκ δεξιῶν Τ1 καὶ εἷς ἐξ ἐωνύμων Τ2 .

Τ1 nomine Zoatham c

Τ2 nomine Camma c

The same addition occurs in Mk 15:27 by the same manuscript c.

NA28 Mark 15:27 Καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ σταυροῦσιν δύο ληστές,
ἓνα ἐκ δεξιῶν Τ1 καὶ ἓνα ἐξ ἐωνύμων Τ2 αὐτοῦ.

Τ1 nomine Zoathan c

Τ2 nomine Chammatha c

See "Names for the Nameless in the NT"

in B. Metzger "New Testament Studies", Leiden 1980

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 380

161. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:34 [[ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν· πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.]] διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους.

T&T #49

omit: P75, 01^{C1}, B, D*, W, Θ, 070, 579, 1241, pc⁷, a, b^c, d, Sy-S, sa, bo,

Marcion, Weiss

pc = 31*, 38, 435, 597*, 1808*, 2622^L, 2633

οἱ δὲ διαμεριζόμενοι ... 579

NA²⁵ and WH both have the words in double brackets.

txt 01^{*.C2}, A, C, D^{C2}, K, Π, L, Q, X, Δ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 131, 157, 700, 892,

1071, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{mss}, arm,

Diatess, Ign, Ir^{Lat}, Or, Eus, Hipp, Chrys, Cyr, etc., Bois, Trg, Tis, Bal

- In E with asteriscus.

- A omits πάτερ

- εἶπεν for ἔλεγεν: A, K, Π, M, al¹⁰⁰

01^{C1}: The words are deleted by curved marks, similar to 22:43-44

D^{C2}: Scrivener: "not earlier than the 9th CE."

I am not so sure, I think that they could be earlier. The words were added at the bottom margin where verse 33 ends and the Section number TK has been added after the words have been added. Also TKA has been added within the last line before διαμεριζόμενοι.

b: (from Hoskier's review of the ed.pr.) "What happened in b was this. The first hand omitted *dividentes etiam vestimenta ejus miseris sortem*, but had clearly written *Ihs autem dicebat pater dimitte illis nesciunt quid faciant*. In order to repair the omission of the second clause the second hand of b calmly effaced the whole of the first clause "But Jesus said Father forgive them ...", and wrote IN ITS PLACE the second clause!

πάτερ, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν

"grant to, permit them"

church fathers (Epiphanius, Gregory of Nyssa, Ephrem Graecus, Philagathus)

Lat: Pater dimitte illis non enim sciunt quid faciunt.

B: no umlaut

Fathers evidence:

Many church fathers from the 2nd, 3rd and 4th CE cite the verses.

For the full record compare IGNTP Lk vol. 2, p. 217-18.

Gospel of the Nazarenes (2nd CE): for the Latin texts see SQE to the passage

- "As it is said in the Gospel of the Nazarenes: Due to this word [Lk 23:34a], Thousands of Jews who were standing around the cross became believers." (found in Haimo (of Auxerre, 9th CE) Halberstatensis, Comm. in Isa 53:12)
- "Note that in the Gospel of the Nazarenes one can read that due to this word, 8000 have been converted later, namely 3000 on Pentecost (Acts 2) and later 5000 (Acts 4)." (found in Historia passionis Domini f. 55r, also quoted in Chronicon Salernitanum, see Flusser)

Gospel of the Hebrews (2nd CE, possibly, quoted by Jerome in epistle 120, 8, 9):

But so much loved the Lord Jerusalem, that he wept and lamented over the city and, hanging on the cross, he said: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." And he achieved what he begged for, and immediately many thousands of Jews believed, and up to the 42nd year they had time to repent. (see SQE for the Latin).

Diatessaron:

Arabic (Ciasca): "Pater mi, dimitte illis: non enim sciunt, quid faciunt."

Ephrem cites the words three times (from McCarthy):

"Father forgive them, for they do not know." (ch. X §14, p. 173)

"Forgive them, because they do not know what they are doing." (ch. XXI §3, p. 318)

"... for they know not what they are doing." (ch. XXI §18, p. 326)

The second quotation is given in an anti-Marcionite context, where Ephraem is arguing against an "alien God". It has thus been proposed (Harnack) that these words were also in Marcion's gospel. But this is doubtful, since we have two other references (Tertullian and Epiphanius, see below) who both do not have the words.

Ignatius (probably a late 2nd CE forgery), to the Ephesians, ch. 11, 10.3

πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν προσήχετο· "Πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς οὐκ οἶδασιν ὃ ποιοῦσιν."

He threatened not, but prayed for His enemies, "Father, forgive them, they know not what they do."

Irenaeus (2nd CE), *Against Heresies* Book III

16.9 et cum tyrannidem pateretur, rogabat Patrem ut ignosceret his qui se crucifixerant.

and when He underwent tyranny, He prayed His Father that He would forgive those who had crucified Him.

18.5 Et ex hoc autem quod Dominus in cruce dixerit: "Pater, remitte eis, non enim sciunt quid faciunt."

He exclaimed upon the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,"

Marcion (2nd CE), does not have the words. There are two references:

Epiphanius, *Haer* 42.11.6, scholion οα' (71):

23:33 Καὶ ἤλθόντες εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Κρανίου τόπος, ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν 34 καὶ διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους, 45 καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος.

Tertullian (ca. 210 CE) *Adv. Haer.* IV, 42,4:

Sed et duo scelesti circumfiguntur illi, ut inter iniquos scilicet deputaretur. Vestitum plane eius a militibus divisum, partim sorte concessum, Marcion abstulit,

Moreover two malefactors are crucified around Him, in order that He might be reckoned amongst the transgressors. Although His raiment was, without doubt, parted among the soldiers, and partly distributed by lot, yet Marcion has erased it all (from his *Gospel*),

Clement of Alexandria (around 200 CE) *Stromateis* I, 45,6:

Οὐχὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ Ὀρθοδοξασταὶ καλούμενοι ἔργοις προσφέρονται καλοῖς οὐκ εἰδότες ἃ ποιοῦσιν.

"And did not the Lord make all things by the Word? Even the beasts work, driven by compelling fear. And do not those who are called orthodox apply themselves to good works, knowing not what they do?"

This is often cited, but is too vague an allusion.

Origen^{Lat} (early 3rd CE), *Homily on Leviticus* 2, ch. 1:5, via Rufinus:

Quod et Dominus confirmat in evangeliis, cum dicit: "Pater, remitte illis; non enim sciunt, quid faciunt".

But it is said of the sin of the congregation, 'if they are ignorant and the word concealed from their eyes and they do one thing of all the commands of the Lord which they ought not do', then it is also apparent that 'the entire congregation' can sin through ignorance. The Lord also confirms this in the *Gospels* when he says, "Father, forgive them for they do not know what they are doing."

This reference is not certain, though. Rufinus changed the text of this work a lot. Compare "*Homilies on Leviticus*", translated by G.W. Barkley, Introduction, p. 21.

A comparatively new proposed reference is: Origen, De Pascha (περὶ πάσχα), a commentary by Origen on Passover, Exo 12:1-11, discovered 1941 among the Tura papyri (monastery of St. Arsenios), copied in the 6th CE and first published 1979. It reads in book II, IV.2 (= orig. page 43, 7-14):

Ἡ γὰρ θύσις γίνεται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ... καὶ σκότῳ τεθλιμμένη, ἣτις ἐστὶν ἄγνοια. Καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ τὴν τούτου ἀρχὴν τοῦ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἄρχοντος ἐν πολλῇ ἀγνοίᾳ τυφλώσεώς εἰσι, ... Ἡ γὰρ τούτου θύσις ἢ δι' αὐτῶν ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ ἐγένετο, διὰ τὸ μὴ αὐτοὺς γινώσκειν ὃ ποιοῦσιν· ἔνθεν καὶ ἀφίεται αὐτοῖς· καλὸν γὰρ ἕνα ἄνθρωπον ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ ὅλου τοῦ λαοῦ. οὐ γὰρ ἔξον προφήτην ἔξω Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἀποθανεῖν, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν τῶν ἐπὶ εἰρήνῃ καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνοικεῖν πειρωμένων.

For the sacrifice (of the lamb) happened in Egypt ... and (it is) oppressed by darkness, which is ignorance. And those who life under this ruling in Egypt are full of ignorance, like blindness. ... For this sacrifice, which was done by them in ignorance, **because they do not know what they do, hence therefore they are forgiven**, because it is good that one man dies for the whole people. Because it is not lawful for a prophet to die outside of Jerusalem, which is (outside of) of those who want to live in peace and righteousness.

It is very probable, that this is a reference to Lk 23:34.

Hippolytus (early 3rd CE), Zahn quotes Hippolytus c. Judaeos 3:

Christ, talking in Psalm 69, is saying: ἔλεγον· "πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς" τοις ἔθνεσιν

Expository Treatise against the Jews: David the son of Jesse. He, singing a certain strain with prophetic reference to the true Christ ... in which (strain) the Christ who humbled Himself and took unto Himself the form of the servant Adam, ... speaks thus in the **69th Psalm:** ... Wherefore "they that sit in the gate spoke against me," for they crucified me without the gate. "And they that drink sang against me," that is, (they who drink wine) at the feast of the passover. "But as for me, in my prayer unto Thee, O Lord, **I said, Father, forgive them,**" namely the Gentiles, because it is the time for favor with Gentiles. "Let not then the hurricane (of temptations) overwhelm me ...

also "Benedictions of Jacob" (Εἰς τὰς εὐλογίας τοῦ Ἰακωβ), p. 38:

τὸ οὖν κατακυβηταῖον τὸν Ἰσαὰκ τὸ ἐπισπλαγχνισθῆναι τὸν λόγον ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ λαοῦ παραπτώματι. καὶ γὰρ ὁ σωτὴρ δεόμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἔλεγεν· "πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν ὃ ποιοῦσιν."

(compare: Texte und Untersuchungen 38.1: C. Diobouniotis "Hippolyts Schrift über die Segnungen Jakobs")

Didascalia Apostolorum, Syriac (3rd CE), ch. 6: cited from M. Gibson's translation, 1903, p. 32: for even our Saviour made supplication to His Father for those that had sinned, as it is written in the Gospel, "My Father, they know not what they do, nor what they speak, yet, if it be possible, forgive them."

ch. 26: p. 111 (found in *Codex Sangermanensis*, Paris, only) for because of the Nation which did not believe in the Christ, and laid hands upon Him, on the Son of man, that laid hands on Him blaspheming ; and our Lord said, "It shall be forgiven unto them"; and again our Lord said about them, "My Father, they know not what they do, nor what they speak; if it be possible, forgive them"; but again also the Gentiles blaspheme against the Son of man, because of the Cross, and to them he hath also given forgiveness,

Apostolic Constitutions (4th CE), an amplification of the *Didascalia Apostolorum*
Book II, ch. 16: For our Saviour Himself entreated His Father for those who had sinned, as it is written in the Gospel: "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do." (οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τὶ ποιοῦσιν)
Book V, ch. 14: And a little afterward, when He had cried with a loud voice, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," (οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν ὃ ποιοῦσιν).

Eusebius (early 4th CE), canon table: Eusebius has this verse listed under X 320, verses peculiar to Luke. (for other canon table cases compare Mt 17:21, Mk 15:28, Lk 5:39 and Lk 22:43-44)

Pseudo-Basiliius of Caesarea (4th CE), *Adversus Eunomium* IV, PG 29, 697.26
Ἐπὶ τῶν οὖν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀμαρτάνειν μελλόντων, ἵνα μὴ ἀμάρτωσι, καὶ οὐκ ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦτο δεκτέον. ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ σταυρωθεὶς ἔλεγε· Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐκ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσιν.

So, it refers to them, who wanted to sin against Him, that they do not sin, and not to Him. For them He said on the cross: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Ambrose (339-397) is citing the words in his exegesis of Job (*De interpellatione Iob et David*): cited from CSEL 32.2

- 1, 5:12 (p. 218) unde et in euangelio dicit dominus Iesus: Dimitte illis, pater, quia nesciunt quid faciunt.
- 2, 2:6 (p. 237) denique in cruce positus de persecutoribus suis conuiciantibus sibi dicebat: Pater, dimitte illis, quia nesciunt quid faciant, ut oraret pro calumniantibus, quibus poterat ipse dimittere.

Gregory of Nyssa (335-394), *De perfectione christiana* (PG 46, 272):

Τίς οὖν κατὰ τῶν ταῦτα ποιούντων ἢ ἄμυνα; *Πατερ, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσι.*

A sword, clubs, chains, whips ... [etc.], and all of these terrible things were applied to him without cause, nay, rather, in return for innumerable good works! And how were those who did these things repaid? 'Father, yield to them, for they do not know what they are doing.' Eriphanius has *συγχώρησον*, too, in his description of the stoning of James, see below.)

Hilarius (ca. 350 CE) quotes the word several times in refuting Arian misinterpretations, *De Trinitate* I: 32, X:48, X:71.

Acts of Philip (4th CE) (e cod. Vatic. gr. 824), Section 132:

Ὁ δὲ Ἰωάννης καὶ Βαρθολομαῖος καὶ Μαριάμη διεκώλυον αὐτὸν (i.e. Philip) λέγοντες ὅτι Ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν ἐραπίσθη, ἐμασίχθη, ἐξετάσθη, χολὴν καὶ ὄξος ἐποτίσθη, καὶ ἔλεγεν. Πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

And John and Bartholomew and Mariamme restrained him, saying: Our Master was beaten, was scourged, was extended on the cross, was made to drink gall and vinegar, and said, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.

Pseudo-Clement (4th CE) *Recognitions* book VI, ch. 5

Wherefore, in short, the Master Himself, when He was being led to the cross by those who knew Him not, prayed the Father for His murderers, and said, "Father, forgive their sin, for they know not what they do!"

Homily XI, chapter 20 section 5:

αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ διδάσκαλος προσηλωθεὶς ἠΰχετο τῷ πατρὶ τοῖς αὐτὸν ἀναιροῦσιν ἀφεθῆναι τὸ ἀμάρτημα εἰπών. "Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν ἃ ποιοῦσιν."

For the Teacher Himself, being nailed to the cross, prayed to the Father that the sin of those who slew Him might be forgiven, saying, "Father, forgive them their sins, for they know not what they do."

Acta Archelai/Hegemonius (4th CE), *Disputation with Manes* LI:

Ibi Moyses orat ut parcatur a plagis Pharaoni ac populo eius; et hic dominus noster Iesus orat indulgeri Pharisaeis, dicens: Pater, ignosce eis, quoniam nesciunt quid faciunt.

There, Moses prayed that Pharaoh and his people might be spared the plagues; and here, our Lord Jesus prayed that the Pharisees might be pardoned, when He said, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Chrysostom (ca. 400 CE) is citing the words several times. e.g. In epistulam ad Ephesios PG 62, 55.9:

Καὶ μετὰ τὸ σταυρωθῆναι, τί φησι, Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν ὃ ποιοῦσι. Καὶ πρὸ τούτου κακῶς παθῶν, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα κακῶς παθῶν, μέχρις ἐσχάτης ἀναπνοῆς περὶ αὐτῶν πάντα ἔπραττεν, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐδέϊτο.

Homily on "Father, if it be possible..." (Against Marcionists and Manichaeans), section 4:

He commanded men to pray for their enemies: this also again He teaches by means of His acts: for when He had ascended the cross He said "Father forgive them for they know not what they do."

Homily LXXVIII on Matthew:

[Jesus] on the very cross crying aloud, "Father, forgive them their sin."

Ad Cor. Hom. 7 (NPNF1-12.36 alt.):

For in that passage also he said not, 'They know not me,' but, 'They know not what they do.' What they did not know, then, was the thing they were accomplishing, the dispensation hidden in that event [περὶ αὐτῆς τοῦ πράγματος τῆς οἰκονομίας].

De Cruce et Latrone, Hom. 1 (PG 49, 405):

"What then? Did he forgive them the sin? He did forgive them, if they wished to repent. For if he had not forgiven them the sin, Paul would not have become an apostle; if he had not forgiven them the sin, three thousand and five thousand and many myriads of Jews would not have believed."

In principium actorum (PG 51, 111): After quoting Luke 23:34a, he writes:

"For he did not immediately bring the punishment and retribution on them, but he waited for longer than 40 years after the cross. For the Savior was crucified under Tiberius, but their city was taken under Vespasian and Titus. . . . He desired to give them time to repent . . . but since they remained incurable, he led the punishment and retribution to them."

Pseudo-Justin (ca. 400 CE), Quaestiones et Responsiones ad Orthodoxos, no. 119

Some manuscripts ascribe this work to Justin Martyr (about 150), but it is generally recognized as a much later work. It has been ascribed to Theodoret (who died about 458), to Diodorus of Tarsus (about 370), and left as an anonymous work of about 400.

ποτὲ μὲν λέγων ὁ κύριος· πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσι. (see Harnack TC for full quote).

Hesychius of Jerusalem (ca. 400 CE), Commentarius brevis (in Psalmos), Psalm

58 section 12:

Περὶ γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁ κύριος· μὴ στήσης αὐτῶν τὴν ἀμαρτίαν ταύτην· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν, τί ποιοῦσιν. πανταχοῦ γὰρ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν αὐτῶν ἐξεδέχετο ὁ κύριος.

Jerome (ca. 400 CE), in Epistle 120, 8, 9 (PL 22, 993) he quotes 23:34 as a prove for Jesus' love for Jerusalem:

In tantum autem Jerusalem amavit Dominus, ut fleret eam, et plangeret, et pendens in cruce loqueretur: "Pater, ignosce illis: quod enim faciunt, nesciunt."

and adds:

Itaque inpetravit quod petierat multaque statim de Judaeis milia crediderunt.

(compare the Hebrew Gospels above)

Cyril Alexandrinus (ca. 425 CE) considered the words an interpolation in his book XIII of 'Contra Julianum' (lost, but cited by Arethas in his "Commentary on Revelation", 9th CE):

"πατέρ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσιν." εἰ καὶ Κυρίλλω τῷ Ἀλεξανδρεῖ ἐν ἰγ' τῶν κατὰ Ἰουλιανοῦ ἐλέγχω πρὸς νόθον τοῦτο τὸ ῥητὸν ἔδοξεν ἀποσκυβαλίσαι· ἀλλ' εἰ ἐκεῖνος οὕτως, ἡμῖν οὐ τοῦτο δοκεῖ. ὅτι μὴδὲ πάντες οἱ παρόντες Ἰουδαῖοι τῆς τόλμης τῶν ἀρχιερέων ἐκοινώνουν, οὓς πάντας εἰκὸς ὕστερον σφραγισθῆναι τῇ πίστει, καθὸ καὶ δούλους αὐτοῦς Θεοῦ ὁ Ἄγγελος καλεῖ. (from: J. A. Cramer "Catena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum VIII", Oxford 1840, p. 287 on Rev 7:4-8)

Philagathus (10th CE) Homily 3 section 12 (found in TLG)

Προδότης ὁ μαθητής, φυγάδες οἱ φοιτηταί, ἕξαρνος ὁ Πέτρος, μάχαιραι καὶ δᾶδες καὶ ξύλα καὶ φάσγανα, σιαγόνες ῥαπιζόμεναι, πρόσωπον ἐμπυόμενον, νῶτος πληγαῖς ἐκδιδόμενος, μάρτυρες ψευδεῖς, κριτήριον ἀσεβές, ἀπόφασις ἀπηνής, στρατιῶται κατατρυφῶντες τῆς σκυθρωπῆς ἀποφάσεως ἐν χλευασμοῖς καὶ εἰρωνείαις καὶ ὕβρεσι καὶ ταῖς ἐκ καλάμου πληγαῖς, ἦλοι καὶ χολή καὶ ὄξος, καὶ τελευταῖον Σταυρός. Τίς οὖν κατὰ τῶν ταῦτα ποιοούντων ἢ ἄμυνα, Πάτερ, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς. οὐ γὰρ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσιν. Οὕτω καὶ τὴν λύπην μακροθυμία νικήσας καταστρατηγεῖ τὸν ἀντίπαλον, τῆς κατ' αὐτοῦ νίκης τὸν τρόπον ὁδοποιήσας ἡμῖν.

Philagathus thinks that Jesus is addressing the soldiers. He is using the rare form *συγχώρησον*, as also does Gregory of Nyssa (see above)._

For *συγχώρησον* compare also:

Cramer, Catena in Lucam, Page 167 (found in TLG)

Πόθεν δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἀνένηψεν, οὕπω γὰρ ἦν τὰ κατὰ τὸν σταυρὸν θεασάμενος θαύματα, ἐκ τῶν λόγων ἴσως ὧν περὶ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς παρρησία πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ὡς πρὸς Πατέρα, ἐφθέγγετο λέγων, "Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς. οὐ γὰρ οἶδασι τί ποιοῦσιν." ὡς γὰρ ἴσος ἴσω διαλεγόμενος καὶ πατέρα ἐκάλει, καὶ, "ἄφες", σὺν πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ ἔλεγεν. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, Κύριε, παρακαλῶ σε, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς, δεικνὺς ὅτι τὰ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐφ' ὕβρει λεγόμενα, εἰς βλασφημίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνατρέχουσι, διὰ τὸ τῆς θεότητος ὁμοούσιον.

"Ephraem Graecus" (collective name for Greek pseudepigraphical writings under the name Ephraem Syrus), *Sermo in transfigurationem domini et dei salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi*, page 27 (found in TLG):

Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦν Θεός, τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ πῶς ἐσχίσθη καὶ αἱ πέτραι ἐρράγησαν καὶ οἱ τάφοι ἀνεώχθησαν, Εἰ οὐκ ἦν σὰρξ, Θεέ μου, Θεέ μου, ἵνατί με ἐγκατέλιπες, τίς ἔκραξε, Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦν Θεός, Πάτερ, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς, τίς εἶπεν, Εἰ οὐκ ἦν σὰρξ, ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ μετὰ τῶν ληστῶν τίς ἐκρέματο, Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦν Θεός, τῷ ληστῇ πῶς ἔλεγε, σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, Εἰ οὐκ ἦν σὰρξ, ὄξος καὶ χολὴν τίνι προσήνεγκαν, ...

Compare also: The Stoning of Stephen

NA28 Acts 7:60 θεὸς δὲ τὰ γόνατα ἔκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· κύριε, μὴ στήσης αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἐκοιμήθη.

Then he knelt down and cried out in a loud voice, "Lord, do not hold this sin against them."

The stoning of James the Just:

This story is transmitted by Eusebius in his Church History book 2, chapter 23 and he said to have got it from Hegesipp († 180 CE):

καὶ ἤρξαντο λιθάζειν αὐτόν, ἐπεὶ καταβληθεὶς οὐκ ἀπέθανεν· ἀλλὰ στραφεὶς ἔθηκε τὰ γόνατα λέγων· παρακαλῶ, κύριε θεὲ πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

And they began to stone him, for he was not killed by the fall; but he turned and knelt down and said: "I entreat you, Lord God our Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

So also Epiphanius (3rd CE) Panarion 78.14.5:

καὶ προσευξάμενος ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτὸν ῥιψάντων, καὶ φάσκων, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

And knelt in prayer for those who had thrown him down and said: "Yield to them, for they know not what they do."

The early Christians predominantly believed that Luke 23:34a was a prayer for the Jews, but there also was the idea that the siege of Jerusalem in 70 CE was divine retribution for Jesus' death. Thus it seemed that God had ignored Jesus' prayer. An alternative was to interpret the siege of Jerusalem as a punishment for the death of James, not Jesus.

Nathan Eubank (2010) writes: "In light of the fact that (a) we know Eusebius did not actually believe that James's death alone precipitated the siege and (b) James is shown dying with a prayer widely attributed to Jesus on his lips, it is possible that the account of the death of James is yet another example of early Christians attempting to explain why Jerusalem was sacked despite Jesus' prayer for the Jews."

Gospel context:

No other Gospel has these words of Jesus. Mt is following Mk closely:

Mt

33 And when they came to a place called Golgotha (which means Place of a Skull),

34 they offered him wine to drink, mixed with gall; but when he tasted it, he would not drink it.

35 And when they had crucified him,

38 *Then two bandits were crucified with him, one on his right and one on his left.*

35 they divided his clothes among themselves by casting lots;

Mk

22 Then they brought Jesus to the place called Golgotha (which means the place of a skull).

23 And they offered him wine mixed with myrrh; but he did not take it.

24 And they crucified him,

27 *And with him they crucified two bandits, one on his right and one on his left.*

24 and divided his clothes among them, casting lots to decide what each should take.

Lk

33 When they came to the place that is called The Skull,

they crucified Jesus there

with the criminals, one on his right and one on his left.

34 Then Jesus said, "Father, forgive them; for they do not know what they are doing."

And they cast lots to divide his clothing.

K. Haines-Eitzen notes that there may be a reminiscence to Isa 53:12:

LXX Isaiah 53:12 καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη

"and for their sins he was given over"

Haines-Eitzen notes Luke's fondness for Isa 53 and verse 12 (compare Lk 11:22 and 22:37): "Each time, the reference cites a portion of the Isaiah verse in chronological order."

NA has at Lk 23:34 in the apparatus a parallel sign *p*), indicating that they think the words are a harmonization to Acts 3:17:

NA28 Acts 3:17 Καὶ νῦν, ἀδελφοί, οἶδα ὅτι κατὰ ἄγνοιαν ἐπράξατε
ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν·

"And now, brothers, I know that you acted in ignorance, as did also your rulers."

It is possible that the words have been omitted, because

1. of anti-Judaic tendencies in the post-apostolic church. The words could be interpreted as Jesus forgiving the Jews. The discussion in the early church shows that this word was very offensive to Christians in light of the strong anti-Judaism.
2. they might contradict Jesus previous pronouncement of judgment (23:29-31).
3. to harmonize the account with Mt and Mk (improbable).

The words basically fit Luke's thinking and motives. The vocabulary is typically Lukan. It can also be noted that Luke uses ΠΑΤΕΡ as an address in prayer several times, two more times in the passion narrative (22:42, 23:46).

Blass and Zahn consider the words genuine. Harnack is undecided. In his "Marcion" (p. 236*, 248*) he considers the words added by Marcion, in his TC studies he considers them as probably genuine ("with a question mark").

Note the similar support for the verses 22:43-44!

23:34

omit: P75, 01^{C1}, B, D*, W, Θ, 579, 1241, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}

txt 01^{*.2}, A, C, D^{C2}, K, Π, L, Q, X, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}, Diatess

22:43-44:

omit: P75, 01^{C1}, A, B, N, R, W, 579, 1071*, pc⁴, f, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}

txt 01^{*.C2}, D, K, Π, L, Q, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, 174, 230(=f13), 892*, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H**, bo^{pt}, Diatess
C has a lacuna. f13 has txt at Mt 26:39.

Of the important manuscripts only A, D, Θ and 1241 read different in both verses.

Especially interesting is that 01 has been corrected in both verses by C1, obviously from a different source! (This has already been noted by Streeter: "Four Gospels" p. 123)

This looks very much like an intentional deletion ('recensional activity'). Both words are clearly problematic on doctrinal grounds. But the deletion must have happened very early, because the support is early, widespread and good.

But these arguments were not convincing to all textual critics:

Hort wrote: "Its omission, on the hypothesis of its genuineness, cannot be explained in any reasonable manner. Willful excision, on account of the love and forgiveness shown to the Lord's own murderers, is absolutely incredible: no various reading in the NT gives evidence of having arisen from any such cause. [...] Few verses of the Gospels bear in themselves a surer witness to the truth of what they record than this first of the Words from the Cross: but it need not therefore have belonged originally to the book in which it is now included. ... Nevertheless ... it has exceptional claims to be permanently retained, with the necessary safeguards, in its accustomed place."

Nestle: "ganz merkwürdig" (quite peculiar).

Weiss: "schlechterdings nicht [zu] erklären"
(= [secondary omission] quite impossible).

The problem is to come up with a good explanation for a secondary addition of the words.

It has been suggested that the words have been added in reminiscence of Act 7:60. It is also possible that the words come from Hegesippus (Stoning of James the Just, see above). This has been suggested by D. Flusser. But why only in Lk and not also in Mt and Mk, which are very similar at this point? And why with a different wording?

The words do not fit very good into the context:

33 When they came to the place that is called The Skull, they crucified Jesus there with the criminals, one on his right and one on his left. 34 Then Jesus said, "Father, forgive them; for they do not know what they are doing." And they cast lots to divide his clothing. 35 And the people stood by, watching; but the leaders scoffed at him, saying, "He saved others; let him save himself if he is the Messiah of God, his chosen one!"

This might indicate a secondary interpolation.

It should be noted that from a narrative point of view, Jesus words are probably not directed to the Jews, but to the Roman soldiers. They do not understand what is happening. Nevertheless the words have been taken by most as directed to the Jews (compare the Jewish Christian Gospels above). The subjects of the verbs both before and after the prayer are the soldiers. Philagathus (see above) is one of the few who is seeing the soldiers as being the ones to whom Jesus is talking.

Whitlark and Parsons give another argument by pointing out that with these words, the number of sayings spoken by Jesus from the cross is now Seven.

Seven is a symbol for completeness. When the four Gospels were collected into a single collection, it was realized that one saying was 'missing' to make up a complete Seven. This led to the addition of the saying from some "floating tradition". Perhaps it was Tatian, our first witness to the saying, who originally added the words?

Peter Head comments on this (ETC Blog, Aug. 2006):

"To me this argument is interesting, even somewhat clever, but not actually convincing. To be fair I don't accept the starting point about the four-gospel collection, so never really get on board with the basic assumptions, but for me the whole approach seems a little problematic. Basically to accept this argument you have to be able to envisage a scribe in the mid-to-late second century, familiar with a four-gospel collection, interested in counting the sayings of Jesus, finding something problematic in the resultant number six, having access to a "floating" saying (perhaps through the Diatessaron) and adding this in order to make up the number to seven, not after the other six but at this point in Luke. I find most of these steps fairly problematic myself. They certainly haven't shown any evidence that a scribe is likely to count sayings like this."

Whitlark and Parsons also point out that the support for the reading prior to the 4th CE is limited to the Western texttype. This is interesting, because such an addition fits the character of the texttype, but it is not entirely correct (01*).

Nathan Eubank analyzed the church fathers evidence and concludes that all fathers clearly see the words as directed to the Jews and not to the soldiers. He is wrong though that Marcion has the words. They are not in Epiphanius. Eubank further notes the interesting fact that some fathers read συγχώρησον ("grant to, permit them") instead of ἄφεσις and suggests that this is "another strategy for avoiding the exculpation of the Jews. [...] This version of the prayer would have been attractive to those who found the forgiveness of the Jews unpalatable, and it may be that συγχώρησον found its way into the text as a gloss of ἄφεσις."

Very difficult!

Overall there seems to be a slight edge in favor of the genuineness of the words.

Lk 23:34 together with Lk 22:43-44 are two of the most important variants in the Gospels, perhaps THE two most important. If we accept these words to be genuine, which I am inclined to do (still with a big question mark, of course), then we must accept that P75/B suffered from some strange, selective, but serious recensional activity.

Compare:

- E. Graf "Über die Echtheit und die Bedeutung der Worte in Lk 23:34: Vater, vergib ihnen etc." TSK 34 (1861) 749-64
- A. Harnack "Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu, I. Zu Lk 23:33.34" in "Studien zur Geschichte de NT und der Alten Kirche, I: Zur Neutestamentlichen Textkritik", 1931, p. 91-98
- D. Daube "For they know not what they do: Lk 23:34", *Studia Patristica* 4.2 (1961-2) 58-70
- D. Flusser "Sie wissen nicht, was sie tun" in: *Kontinuität und Einheit*, Festschrift Franz Mussner, Freiburg, 1981, p. 404-7
- J.H.Petzer "Eclecticism and the text of the NT" in "Text and Interpretation" Brill, Leiden 1991, p. 47-62, esp. 54-60
- T.M. Bolin "A Reassessment of the textual problem of Lk 23:34a" *Proceedings: Eastern Great Lakes and Midwestern Biblical Society* 12 (1992) 131-44
- J. Delobel "Luke 23:34a: A Perpetual Text-Critical Crux?" in Festschrift T. Baarda, 1997, p. 25 - 36 [where he argues that the parallelism with Acts 7:60 is intended and typical for Luke.]
- K. Haines-Eitzen "Luke 23:34a" in "Guardians of Letters", Oxford, 2000, p. 119-124
- J.A. Whitlark and M.C. Parsons "The 'Seven' Last Words: A Numerical Motivation for the Insertion of Luke 23:34a." *NTS* 52 (2006) 188-204
- N. Eubank "A Disconcerting Prayer: On the Originality of Luke 23:34a" *JBL* 129 (2010) 521-536

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
put the words in single brackets

External Rating: - (indecisive)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 381

162. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 23:34 [[ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν· πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.]]

διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους.

BYZ Luke 23:34 Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν, Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἶδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν.

Διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἔβαλον κλήρον.

Byz P75, 01, B, C, D, L, W, 070, 0250, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Trg, WH
txt A, N, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 1424, pc, Trg^{mg}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:35 Σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλήρον, safe!

NA28 Mark 15:24 Καὶ σταυροῦσιν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλήρον ἐπ' αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη.

βάλλοντες κλήρους H, f13^a

NA28 John 19:24 ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ [ἢ λέγουσα]· διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν μου ἔβαλον κλήρον. safe!

The Byz reading is externally clearly to be preferred.

Internally it could be a harmonization to the parallels, which are basically safe (so Weiss). But note the same variation in Mk. Perhaps the plural is an idiom?

Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)

TVU 382

NA28 Luke 23:35 Καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. ἔξεμυκτῆριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες λέγοντες·

BYZ Luke 23:35 καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. ἔξεμυκτῆριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντες

Byz A, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat(a, aur, f, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, Eus

txt P75, 01, B, C, (D), L, Q, X, Ψ, 070, 69, 788(=f13^b), 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc, it, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co

D: καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς ὄρων. ἔμυκτῆριζον αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ·

B: no umlaut

ἐκμυκτηρίζω "make fun of, ridicule"

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:41 ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἔλεγον·

NA28 Mark 15:31 ὁμοίως καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων ἔλεγον·

There is no reason for an omission, but also not for an addition.

There is a slight redundancy with the words, because the καὶ = "also" already indicates that they do it together:

"and the rulers also were sneering with them"

But it is also possible to read the καὶ as "even":

"And the people stood by (silent), but the leaders even scoffed at him"

Possibly the σὺν αὐτοῖς has been added to blame all the Jews more clearly.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 383

163. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 23:35 Καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες λέγοντες· ἄλλους ἕσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν,
εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός.

BYZ Luke 23:35 καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντες "Ἄλλους ἕσωσεν σωσάτω ἑαυτόν
εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός

Only incomplete in NA and SQE!

B: no umlaut

Byz εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός
A, C, K, Π, M, N, Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Trg

01*: εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός

txt εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός.
01^{c1}, L, W, f1, WH, NA²⁵, Trg^{mg}

εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός
P75, 070(omit ὁ), f13, 157, 1071, L844, pc, l, r¹, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, Eus

εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός
579, geo^I

εἰ υἱός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός B
εἰ υἱός εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ χριστὸς εἶ ὁ ἐκλεκτός D, c

omit ὁ ἐκλεκτός: 047, e

Sy-S, Sy-C do not support υἱός.

K. Witte from Muenster confirms that 892 reads Byz here.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:40 σῶσον σεαυτόν, εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, [καὶ] κατάβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

NA28 Mark 15:30 σῶσον σεαυτόν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

NA28 Mark 15:32 ὁ χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ,

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν·

σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.

NA28 Matthew 26:63 καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐξορκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπῃς εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Mark 14:61 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;

NA28 Luke 4:34 ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

υἱὸς 579

NA28 Luke 9:20 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν τ τοῦ θεοῦ.

τ υἱὸν D, it, bo^{ms}

τ τὸν υἱὸν 28, 892, pc

NA28 Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.

NA28 John 11:27 ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.

NA28 John 20:31 ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύ[σ]ητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ,

Clearly ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ is secondary, a well known phrase from Gospel context.

Is it possible that the B reading is a misreading/hearing of οὗτός / υἱός ?

Note that this phrase is a Minor Agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk, who does not have it.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 384

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:37 καὶ λέγοντες·

εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν.

λέγοντες· χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων,

περιτιθέντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκάνθινον στέφανον

Dicentes: Habe Rex Iudaeorum, imponentes illi et de spinis coronam. d

Et dicentes: Ave Rex Iudaeorum, libera te, imposuerunt autem illi et spineam coronam. c

D, c, d

λέγοντες· χαῖρε· εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν.

περιτιθέντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκάνθινον στέφανον

Sy-S, Sy-C

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:29 καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ κάλαμον ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ γονυπετήσαντες ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες· χαῖρε, βασιλεῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

NA28 Mark 15:17-18 καὶ ἐνδιδύσκουσιν αὐτὸν πορφύραν καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον· 18 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀσπάζεσθαι αὐτόν· χαῖρε, βασιλεῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων·

NA28 John 19:2-3 καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκανθῶν ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῦ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν περιέβαλον αὐτὸν 3 καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον· χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ ἐδίδοσαν αὐτῷ ῥαπίσματα.

It seems to be a harmonization to the other Gospels, but in a strange way. It appears that the first part of the verse is nearest to John and the second part is nearest to Mark. Also the order of the events is interchanged: The χαῖρε comes before the crowning.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 385

NA28 Luke 23:38 ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφή ἐπ' αὐτῷ
ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος.

BYZ Luke 23:38 ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφή γεγραμμένη ἐπ αὐτῷ
γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς, καὶ Ρωμαικοῖς καὶ Ἑβραικοῖς.
οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων

Byz 01^{*C2}, A, C^{C3}, D, Q, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579^C, 892,
Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, Gre, [Trg^{mg}]
ἐπ' αὐτῷ γράμμασιν... 01^{*}, 372
ἐπιγεγραμμένη ἐπ αὐτῷ... A, D, Q
ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένη... X, Ψ, f13, 33, 2766, pc
... Ἑλληνικοῖς, καὶ Ἑβραικοῖς, καὶ Ρωμαικοῖς 157, pc³
... Ἑλληνικοῖς, καὶ Ρωμαικοῖς 69^{*}, 346

txt P75, 01^{C1}, B, L, 070, 1241, a, sa, bo^{pt}, arab^{MS}
ἐπ' αὐτῷ γεγραμμένη C^{*}, a, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa^{ms}
αὕτη γεγραμμένη 579^{*}
[ἐπιγεγραμμένη] ἐπ' αὐτῷ Trg (no manuscript support)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:37 Καὶ ἐπέθηκαν ἐπάνω τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ τὴν
αἰτίαν αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένην· οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν
Ἰουδαίων.

NA28 Mark 15:26 καὶ ἦν ἡ ἐπιγραφή τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη·
ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

NA28 John 19:20 καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί
, Ἑλληνιστί.

BYZ John 19:20 καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί, Ῥωμαϊστί.

There is no reason for an omission. A secondary cause is indicated by the different introductory words in early witnesses and the different order of the languages. On the other hand the diversity is limited. It is interesting that the wording and order of the languages is not identical to that in Jo. This seems to indicate a recollection from memory (compare ἐπιγεγραμμένη by A, D, Q from Mk).

It is also interesting to mention that in John f13 and 579 add the words not in verse 20, but in verse 19, the position where they are in Lk (579 has them again in verse 20):

NA28 John 19:19 ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ· ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένον [†]. Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

† Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί f13
Ἑβραϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί, Ῥωμαϊστί 69, 579

This indicates that scribes felt this to be an appropriate place for the words.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 386

164. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:39 Εἷς δὲ τῶν κρεμασθέντων κακούργων ἐβλασφήμει αὐτὸν λέγων· οὐχὶ σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός; σῶσον σεαυτὸν καὶ ἡμᾶς.

omit λέγων: B, L, 1241, WH, NA²⁵, Weiss, Tis, Bal

omit λέγων ... ἡμᾶς D, d, e

Tregelles has λέγων in brackets.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:39-40 Οἱ δὲ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες· ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις οἰκοδομῶν, σῶσον σεαυτὸν, εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, [καὶ] κατάβηθι ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

NA28 Mark 15:29-30 Καὶ οἱ παραπορευόμενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κινοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες· οὐὰ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, 30 σῶσον σεαυτὸν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.

In the parallels they are the passers-by who insulted him. One Old Latin (l) replaced the words omitted by D, e, with the words from Mt/Mk.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 387

165. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:43 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀμήν σοι λέγω, σήμερα μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.

A punctuation issue!

B^c reads: ΛΕΓΩΧΗΜΕΡΟΝΝΜΕΤΕΜΟΥ

This is also the interpretation of Sy-C for which Burkitt has:
"Amen, I say to thee to-day, that with me thou shalt be in the Garden of Eden."
(Sy-S has the normal text, in this respect.)

λέγω ὅτι, σήμερα L, 892, L1627, b, c, Co, Sy

μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ σήμερα AM 118 Ps 8, 11 (1.8)
μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ σήμερα ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ Apo, Hil

D: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τῷ ἐπιπλήσονται, Θάρσει σήμερα
μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ.

B p. 1347 A 39: There is a brown dot, a low point squeezed between the N and the M. I would term it "of unknown origin". There is no extra space between the letters which one would expect if this is a comma. It is at least clear, that this is not from the original scribe. First, he did not use such dots and even if he did, he would have added an extra space, but there is none. So, it is either a blot, or someone for whatever reason added a dot later. The ink looks similar to that of the letters, so it is either enhanced or has been added later with a similar ink. If it is deliberate, it is unusual, the enhancer did not add such things.

Those dots appear elsewhere. I have not looked into this systematically, but have been pointed to p. 1452 (Rom 7-8) in B. Here those dots appear quite often. There are high and low points. B uses high points elsewhere, probably at least in part by the original scribe. This should be investigated in more detail!

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, [click here](#).

If the dot in B is deliberate one could interpret this as:

"Truly I tell you today, you will be with me in Paradise."

against txt:

"Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in Paradise."

Note also the *Gospel of Nicodemus* (4-5th CE, compiled from older sources): cited from Tischendorf

Ο ΔΕ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ· ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΛΕΓΩ ΣΟΙ ΑΛΗΘΕΙΑΝ ΙΝΑ ΣΕ ΕΧΩ ΕΙΣ ΤΟΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΣΟΝ ΜΕΤ' ΕΜΟΥ. (Part 1: Acts of Pilate)

"And he said to him: 'Today I tell you the truth, that I should have you in Paradise with me.'"

ΚΑΙ ΕΥΘΥΣ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΜΟΙ ΟΤΙ ΑΜΗΝ ΑΜΗΝ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΛΕΓΩ ΣΟΙ, ΜΕΤ' ΕΜΟΥ ΕΣΗ ΕΝ ΤΟ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΣΩ. (Part 2: Descent of Christ into Hades)

"And immediately he said to me: Amen, amen, today I tell you, You will be with me in Paradise."

The question has also been discussed by church fathers:

Makarius of Magnesia (ca. 400 CE): Zahn writes in his commentary on Lk:

"Makarius agitates against those who, unable to believe in Christ's ability to reach the paradise, punctuate after σήμερον."

Hesychius of Jerusalem (5th CE), *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 93, columns 1432-33.

ΠΩΣ Η ΥΠΟΣΧΕΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΝ ΛΗΣΤΗΝ ΠΕΠΛΗΡΩΤΑΙ, ΟΤΙ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΜΕΤ' ΕΜΟΥ ΕΣΗ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΣΩ; ΜΕΤΑ ΓΑΡ ΤΟΝ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΝ Ο ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΕΙΣ ΑΔΟΥ ΕΠΙ ΕΛΕΥΘΕΡΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΝΕΚΡΩΝ ΠΑΡΑΓΙΝΕΤΑΙ· ΕΔΕΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΛΗΣΤΗΝ, ΥΠΕΥΘΥΝΟΝ ΟΝΤΑ ΤΩ ΝΟΜΩ ΤΗΣ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ. ΤΙΝΕΣ ΜΕΝ ΟΥΤΟΣ ΑΝΑΓΙΝΩΣΚΟΥΣΙΝ· ΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ ΣΟΙ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ, ΚΑΙ ΥΠΟΣΤΙΖΟΥΣΙΝ ΕΙΤΑ ΕΠΙΦΕΡΟΥΣΙΝ, ΟΤΙ ΕΤ' ΕΜΟΥ ΕΣΗ ΕΝ ΤΟ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΣΩ. ["Some indeed read this way: 'Truly I tell you today,' and put a comma; then they add: 'You will be with me in Paradise.'"] ΩΣ ΑΝ ΕΙΠΟΙ ΤΙΣ, ΟΤΙ ΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ ΣΟΙ ΣΗΜΕΡΟΝ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΣΤΑΥΡΟΥ ΩΝ, ΕΣΗ ΜΕΤ' ΕΜΟΥ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΣΩ. ΕΙ ΔΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΓΙΝΩΣΚΕΙΝ ΔΕΙ, ΩΣ ΤΗ ΣΥΝΗΘΕΙΑ ΔΟΚΕΙ, ΟΥΔΕΝ ΕΝΑΝΤΙΟΥΤΑΙ· ΤΟΥ ΣΩΤΗΡΟΣ ΗΜΩΝ, ΤΗ ΑΠΕΡΙΓΡΑΠΤΩ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΤΗΤΙ, ΟΥΚ ΕΝ ΑΔΗ ΜΟΝΟΝ ΠΑΡΑΓΕΓΟΝΤΟΣ, ΑΛΛΑ ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙΣΩ ΑΜΑ ΤΩ ΛΗΣΤΗ, ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΑΔΟΥ, ΚΑΙ ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑΤΡΟΣ, ΚΑΙ ΕΝ ΤΩ ΤΑΦΩ ΑΤΕ ΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΑ ΠΛΗΡΟΥΝΤΟΣ.

Theophylact (12th CE), Edition: *Patrologia Graeca*, Vol. 123, column 1104.

Άλλοι δε εκβιαζονται το ρημα, στιζοντες εις το Σημερον ιν' ε το λεγομενον τοιουτον· Αμην εγω σοι σημερον ειτα το μετ' εμου εση εν το παραδεισω επιφεροντες.

"But others press upon the saying, putting a punctuation mark after 'today,' so that it would be said this way: 'Truly I tell you today'; and then they add the expression: 'You will be with me in Paradise.'"

Scholia 237, 239, 254. found in Tischendorf

αλλοι - το ρητον εκβιαζονται· λεγουσι γαρ δειν υποστιζοντας αναγινωσκειν· αμην λεγω σοι σημερον, ειτ ουτος επιφερειν το· μετ εμου εση etc.

"Others press upon what is spoken; for they say it must read by putting a comma thus: 'Truly I tell you today,' and then adding the expression this way: 'You will be with me' etc."

Burkitt comments on the Syriac:

"Ephraim quotes the words of Jesus three times and each time without the prefixed 'To-day,' as in C and in A 437. But he says also 'Our Lord shortened His distant liberalities and gave a near promise, To-day and not at the End ... Thus through a robber was Paradise opened.' The punctuation attested by C is referred to but not approved by Barsalibi, who says (in his Commentary on S. Matthew): 'Some hold that when he said *To-day*, it was not of that Friday that He said that in it the robber should be in Paradise, but at the end of the world; and they read the passage *Amen, amen (sic), to-day*, adding a colon, and afterwards *With Me thou shalt be in Paradise*, i.e. at the end of the world.' But possibly this is an extract from some Greek commentator, for in Greek no change would be required in the text if this view were adopted, while in Syriac it involves [a] transposition." [Burkitt Evangelion da-Mepharreshe, Vol. 2, 1904, p. 304]

It might also be interesting that already Origen (185-254 CE) writes: "It belongs to the resurrection that one should be on the first day in the paradise of God" (Comm. John, book 10, 21). But this is only a general statement, not focusing on this verse and should be read in context.

This punctuation is a relevant issue for Jehovah's Witnesses, because they have the comma after "today" in the NWT, which suits their beliefs.

If we accept the dot in B to be deliberate, then the only thing we can safely say is that one person at one time found it useful to place a comma here. It was certainly NOT the original scribe.

The dot in B is not of much relevance because the punctuation question exists independent of it. The punctuation, if there was any at all, was, like spelling, very irregular in the early manuscripts. Any punctuation in ancient manuscripts is VERY doubtful. The punctuation in Nestle-Aland or GNT is NEVER based on a punctuation in a manuscript. It is ALWAYS a decision based on grammar, syntax, linguistics and exegesis.

Some manuscripts added a ὅτι, to make clear that σήμερον has to be taken with the following. D adds θάρσει.

This is not really a textcritical issue, but one that has to be decided by exegetes and translators. An immediate thought is that it would be banal, to note that Jesus is saying this today, when else should he be saying it? It would be rather awkward. On the other hand it is not clear that Jesus entered the paradise on that day. Was he not in Hades for three days?

Interestingly B. Weiss concludes ("Die Vier Evangelien"), that the παράδεισος must therefore be within the Hades.

Carl Conrad wrote on the Bgreek mailing list (Jan 15 2000):

"I have personally come around to think that associating the SHMERON with AMHN LEGW SOI is not only likely but that Jesus-saying here cited in Luke's narrative seems better suited to its context. I'll add too, that while some may have theological reasons for wanting to understand SHMERON with ESHi MET' EMOU ..., my own thinking here has more to do with a judgment of historical probability in the context.

I should add also that one thing about this text that's always struck me as fascinating is that, IF one assumes that SHMERON belongs with ESHi (as I have until now thought preferable), this Jesus-saying is surely inconsistent with the generally-consistent futuristic eschatology of a delayed Parousia which we find set forth in Luke. And while one may occasionally find items in any one NT book that are hard to square with other data in the same NT book, yet this is jarringly inconsistent, and the more I've thought about it, the more unlikely the meaning derived from understanding SHMERON with ESHi seems to me."

Marcion omitted the complete sentence.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 388

166. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 23:45 τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος, ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον.

BYZ Luke 23:45 καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος, καὶ ἐσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον

T&T 50

Byz A, C^{C3}, D, Q, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj, Latt, Sy, Or^{mss}, Marcion^E, Irg

txt P75, 01, B, C*, L, 070, 579, 2542, pc⁷, Sy-H^{mg}, Co, Or^{mss}
P75 and B have ἐκλειπόντος, which can be present tense or an itacism.
2542 has ἐκλάμποντος
pc = 597, 968, 1012, 1451, 1626, 2528, 2705

τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος 22, pc¹⁸

omit: C^{C2}, 33, pc⁵, vg^{ms} (homoioarcton? KAI ES.. - KAI ES..)

pc = 159, 443*, 1137, 1195*, 1373*

IGNTP notes wrongly 1424 for the omission against NA and Swanson.

Checked at the image. 1424 reads Byz.

Sy-Pal adds at the end of the verse:

"and the moon hid its light and the stars fell and the rocks split and graves were opened and the bodies of many saints arose and were seen by many."

B: no umlaut

Origen (Comm. ser. Matt. 134):

[Lucas] secundum pleraque exemplaria habentia sic: "et erat hora fere sexta et tenebrae factae sunt super omnem terram usque ad horam nonam, et obscuratus est sol". In quibusdam autem exemplariis non habetur: "tenebrae factae sunt et obscuratus est sol"; sed ita: "tenebrae factae sunt super omnem terram sole deficiente".

Luke according to very many copies, which have "And it was about the sixth hour, and a darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour; and the sun was darkened". In some copies however the words "And the sun was darkened", do not occur, but "There was darkness over all the land, the sun being eclipsed".

ἐκλιπόντος ἐκλείπω participle aorist active genitive masculine singular

"fail, give out; cease, end"

ἐσκοτίσθη σκοτίζομαι indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular

"be or become darkened"

No parallel.

Compare:

LXX Job 31:26 ἢ οὐχ ὄρω μὲν ἥλιον τὸν ἐπιφάσκοντα ἐκλείποντα
σελήνην δὲ φθίνουσαν οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἔστιν

"do we not see the shining sun eclipsed, and the moon waning?"

LXX Isaiah 60:20 οὐ γὰρ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιός σοι καὶ ἡ σελήνη σοι οὐκ ἐκλείψει "or your moon (shall not) withdraw itself"

LXX Isaiah 13:10 οἱ γὰρ ἀστέρες τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ὁ Ὠρίων καὶ πᾶς ὁ
κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσιν καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ
ἡλίου ἀνατέλλοντος καὶ ἡ σελήνη οὐ δώσει τὸ φῶς αὐτῆς

"For the stars of heaven, and Orion, and all the host of heaven, shall not give their light; and it shall be dark at sunrise, and the moon shall not give its light."

LXX Amos 8:9 καὶ ἔσται ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός καὶ
δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος μεσημβρίας καὶ συσκοτάσει ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τὸ
φῶς

"And it shall come to pass in that day, says the Lord God, that the sun shall go down at noon, and the light shall be darkened on the earth by day"

LXX Psalms of Solomon 17:31 τί φωτεινότερον ἡλίου καὶ τοῦτο ἐκλείπει

"What is brighter than the sun? Yet it can be eclipsed."

The txt reading is a Genitivus Absolutus. The meaning is not entirely clear. It could mean "the sun's light failed" or "the sun was eclipsed".

The Byzantine reading is the easier reading. It is possible that the prophecies of Isa 13:10 and Amos 8:9 provide a basis for reading the verb σκοτίζομαι.

33 omits probably due to homioarcton (KAI ES.. - KAI ES..).

It is possible that the txt reading indicates an (at full moon impossible) eclipse. Then a change is only natural.

[Jews and others in the ancient Near East followed a lunar calendar in which each month averaged 29.5 days in length. They had twelve months in most years, each month beginning with a new moon. The Old Testament specifies that the

Passover/Pascha is to be observed on the 14th day of the first month (alternately known as Abib or Nisan, see Deuteronomy 16:1-7).]

Zahn (Comm. Lk) thinks that the txt reading is an attempt to explain the darkening in a physical way as an eclipse. He tends to adopt the Byz reading. According to him it is not the sun which caused the darkening, but that the darkness was so complete that also the sun was dark.

Compare also next variant for ἐκλείποντος / ἐκλιπόντος_

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 389

167. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:45 τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος, ἐσχίσθη δὲ τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον.

T&T 50

ἐκλείποντος P75^c, B, C*?, pc (597, 968, 1012, 1451, 2528), WH
txt ἐκλιπόντος P75*, 01, C*?, L, 070, 579

ἐκλάμποντος 2542 ("shine", sic)

ἐκλείψαντος 1626, 2705

τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος 22, pc¹⁸

καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος A, C^{c3}, (D), W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, Maj

omit τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος C^{c2}, 33, pc⁵

IGNTP has C*^{vid} for ἐκλείποντος against Swanson, NA and T&T.

Tischendorf has ἐκλιπόντος as "vid" in his NT. But in his C-edition he writes: "Post **ΕΝΑΤΗΣ** statuo primitus scriptum fuisse **ΤΟΥ ΗΛΙΟΣ ΕΚΛΕΙΠΟΝΤΟΣ**. **Τ** litteram primam tantopere perspexi ut ederem. Restant alia quoque antiquae scripturae indicia. **C** correxit **ΚΑΙ ΕΣΚΟΤΙΣΘΗ Ο ΗΛΙΟΣ ΚΑΙ** (deleto **ΔΕ** quod sequitur). **B** locum intactum reliquisse videtur; nisi forte erasit scripturam primaevam nihilque in ejus locum substituit. Quae ratio egregium hoc habet quod rasuram ad manum secundam (quippe quae consueverit eradere, quum manus tertia eradat raro) non ad manum tertiam auctorem refert. **Τ** illud quidem non potest non primae manus esse."

Robert Lyon agrees with this, but has τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντες.

B: no umlaut

ἐκλιπόντος participle aorist active genitive masculine singular

ἐκλείποντας participle present active genitive masculine singular

ἐσκοτίσθη indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular

ἐσχίσθη indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular

Context:

NA28 Luke 23:44 Καὶ ἦν ἤδη ὡσεὶ ὥρα ἕκτη καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν ἕως ὥρας ἐνάτης

τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος: Genitive absolute "the sun was darkened".

One could assign this to the typical **ΕΙ** - **Ι** variations, but note the correction in P75, where the corrector deliberately changed this. Why? Idiom?

Internally the aorist is a conformation to the context? Externally the aorist is better supported.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 390

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:49 Εἰστήκεισαν δὲ πάντες οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ ἀπὸ μακρόθεν καὶ γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὀρῶσαι ταῦτα.

"the wives who followed him"

τῶν συνακολουθησάντων Dura-Europos fragment (0212)

"the wives of those who had followed him"

et mulieres eorum c

"and their wives"

B: no umlaut

Plooij suggested that the difference in the Dura fragment originated by a mistranslation from a Syriac vorlage (see Petersen's "Diatessaron", p. 201):

"if we retain in Syriac the participle of the Greek and render as literal as possible, we get *nēhē 'ailēn d'atēn 'ammēh*, which needs only the addition of a *d* before *'ailēn* to get the sense of the Greek of Dura."

Compare:

D. Plooij "A Fragment of Tatian's Diatessaron in Greek" Exp.Tim. 46 (1934-35), 471-476

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 391

168. Difficult variant:

NA28 Luke 23:50 Καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων
[καὶ] ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος

BYZ Luke 23:50 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀνὴρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ, βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων,
ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος-

Byz A, (B), W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj,
Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Trg, SBL
ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς ___ δίκαιος B, WH^{mg}

txt P75, 01, (C), L, X, 33, pc, c
καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ C

omit D, Γ, it

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:57 Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, τοῦνομα Ἰωσήφ, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἐμαθητεύθη τῷ Ἰησοῦ·

NA28 Mark 15:43 ἐλθὼν Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας εὐσχήμων βουλευτῆς, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσδεχόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, τολμήσας εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πιλάτον καὶ ἠτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησεν τὸν Πιλάτον Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, ὢν μαθητῆς τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κεκρυμμένος δὲ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἵνα ἄρῃ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν ὁ Πιλάτος. ἦλθεν οὖν καὶ ἦρεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἦλθεν ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰαῖρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ

NA28 Luke 16:14 Ἦκουον δὲ ταῦτα πάντα οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες καὶ ἐξεμυκτήριζον αὐτόν.

omit καὶ: W, Λ, 983, 2, 472, 1675*, pc⁶

The addition of καὶ would be only natural to smooth the text flow. On the other hand it could have been omitted to shorten the description. Note that B even omits the last καὶ also. Compare a similar case in Lk 16:14.

The external evidence is divided. It is more diverse for the shorter reading.

Without καὶ, the meaning would be slightly different, depending of the affiliation of ὑπάρχων:

βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων καὶ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος
"a counselor being and a man good and righteous"

βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων ___ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος
"a counselor, being a man good and righteous"

or:

"a counselor being, a man good and righteous"

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 392

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:52 οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἠτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ †

† Pilatus autem cum audisset, quia exspiravit, clarificavit Dominum et donavit corpus Ioseph. c (12th CE)

But Pilatus, when he heard that he had expired, he praised the Lord and granted Joseph the body.

B: no umlaut

Compare:

Mark 15:44-45 Pilatus autem mirabatur si iam obisset et accersito centurione interrogavit eum si iam mortuus esset 45 et cum cognovisset a centurione donavit corpus Ioseph.

44 Then Pilate wondered if he were already dead; and summoning the centurion, he asked him whether he had been dead for some time. 45 When he learned from the centurion that he was dead, he granted the body to Joseph.

The Old Latin codex Colbertinus is famous for several of these embellishments, compare the addition of the names Zoatham and Camma in Mt 27:38 and Mk 15:27 and the following variant Lk 23:53 about the large stone. The number of variants in Colbertinus is especially high in chapter 23 of Luke, compare: (23:2 + et solventem legem et prophetas, 3 + audiens, + tu es Iesus, 4 populum, 5 + et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis non enim baptizatur sicut nos, 6 + a galilaea, de galilaea, 9 + quasi non audiens, 12 cum essent autem in dissensionem pilatus et herodes facti sunt amici in illa die, 15 invenimus, 23 + et sacerdotum, 26 susceperunt ergo Iesum et portans crucem suam ducebant illum, 37 ave rex iudaeorum libera te. imposuerunt autem illi et spineam coronam, 42 ad Iesum domine, 43 + credis, 48 frontes suas, 51b om. 52 this variant 53 next variant, 54 ante sabbatum)

This addition was probably inspired from Mk 15:44-45. Since the wording is different, it is probably a recollection from memory.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 393

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 23:53 καὶ καθελὼν ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ σινδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὕπω κείμενος T1,2.

T1 καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον μέγαν ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.

U, f13, 700, al, vg^{ms}, bo^{mss}, aeth

f13: 69, 788 don't have the addition

T2 D, 070, (1071), c, d, sa

D: καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκεν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον ὃν μόγις εἴκοσι εκυλίον

1071: καὶ τε θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκεν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον

070(=0124): καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκαν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον μέγαν ὃν μόγις εἴκοσι ἄνδρας εκυλίον

d: "etposito eo inposuit in monumento
movebant"

lapidem quem vix viginti

c: "et cum positus esset in monumento, posuerunt lapidem quem vix viginti
volvebant"

vg^{ms}: "et inposito eo inposuit monumento lapidem magnam" (Book of Kells)

Note also that D, d add τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ for αὐτὸ, probably a repetition from the previous verse.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:60 καὶ προσκυλίσας λίθον μέγαν τῇ θύρᾳ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπῆλθεν.

NA28 Mark 15:46 καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.

NA28 Mark 16:3 τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;

NA28 John 20:1 Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται πρῶτῃ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου.

Context:

NA28 Luke 24:2 εὔρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου,

1. The additions by f13 et al. are from the Mt/Mk parallel. There is no reason for an omission.

2. The addition by D et al.:

This is thought to be a Latin verse which was translated into Greek by the scribe of D (so J. Rendel Harris) and which Scrivener has traced back to Homer's *Odyssey* (IX. 240).

Odyssey IX. 240: The part is from the Cyclops story:

ἀτὰρ ἔπειτα ἐπέθηκεν θυρεὸν μέγαν ὑψόσε ἀείρας ὄβριμον.

But then he put a door-stone large high lift up strong.

οὐκ ἀνὰ τὸν γε δύο καὶ εἴκοσι ἄμαξαι ἐσθλαὶ τετράκυκλοι

Not up it at least two and twenty wagons good four-wheeled

ἀπὸ οὔδεος ὀχλίσειαν τόσσην ἠλίβατον ἐπέθηκεν θύρησιν.

from the earth move so great high he put the door.

"Then he [the cyclops] rolled a huge stone to the mouth of the cave, so huge that two and twenty strong four-wheeled wagons would not be enough to draw it from its place against the doorway."

Compare also:

Vergil "*Aeneid*" 12.899:

"Nec plura effatus saxum circumspicit ingens, saxum antiquum ingens, campo quod forte iacebat, limes agro positus, litem ut discerneret arvis. Vix illud lecti bis sex cervice subirent, qualia nunc hominum producit corpora tellus."

"Then, as he rolled his troubled eyes around, an antique stone he saw, the common bound of neighboring fields, and barrier of the ground; So vast, that twelve strong men of modern days The enormous weight from earth could hardly raise."

And note also:

Josephus' *Wars of the Jews*, Book 6, chapter 5, paragraph 3

"Moreover, the eastern gate of the inner [court of the] temple, which was of brass, and vastly heavy, and HAD BEEN WITH DIFFICULTY SHUT BY TWENTY MEN, and rested upon a basis armed with iron, and had bolts fastened very deep into the firm floor, which was there made of one entire stone, WAS SEEN TO BE OPENED OF ITS OWN ACCORD about the sixth hour of the night."

Compare:

J. Rendel Harris, *Text and Studies II*, part 1, p. 47-52

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 394

NA28 Luke 23:55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ αἶ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῶ,

BYZ Luke 23:55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ _____ γυναῖκες αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι αὐτῶ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ὡς ἐτέθη τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ

Byz 01, A, C, W, Δ, 063, 2, 700, 2766, Maj, Tis, Bal

txt P75, B, L, P, X, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 22, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al, Sy, Co

one of the above: Lat(aur, c, f, vg)

καὶ TR (Tischendorf: "cum minusc VIX mu"), probably an error by Erasmus.

δύο D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², q, r¹), vg^{ms}, Trg^{mg}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:61 Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ Μαριὰμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου.

NA28 Mark 15:47 ἡ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωσήτος ἐθεώρουν ποῦ τέθειται.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 23:49 καὶ γυναῖκες αἶ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῶ

NA28 Luke 24:10 ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ αἶ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς. ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα,

It is possible that αἶ and δύο are attempts to specify that known women are meant. The names are given in Lk 24:10 (more than two!). δύο possibly comes from the parallels, which have the two Marias at the tomb.

On the other hand it is equally possible that the word has been omitted because it is not clear which women are meant.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 121) thinks that the omission is a thoughtless conformation to verse 49. He further notes that L writes ΔΕ Ε ΓΥΝΑΙΚΕΣ, which could then easily result in an omission.

Regarding the proposed Erasmus error καὶ γυναῖκες it might be interesting to check the actual manuscript 2, which contained printer notes. The only other manuscript besides manuscripts 1 and 2 Erasmus did use (for the Gospels) is manuscript 817. He did know 69 also.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 395

169. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 24:1 Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα ἦλθον φέρουσαι ἃ ἠτοίμασαν ἀρώματα.

BYZ Luke 24:1 τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὄρθρου βαθέως ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα φέρουσαι ἃ ἠτοίμασαν ἀρώματα καὶ τινές σὺν αὐταῖς

Byz A, C^{C3}, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj,
f, q, r¹, Sy, sa, bo^{mss}

txt P75, 01, B, C*, L, 124*(=f13), 33, Lat, Sy-Pal^{ms}, bo

καὶ τινές σὺν αὐταῖς

ἐλογίζοντο δὲ ἐν ἑαυταῖς· τί ἄρα ἀποκυλίσει τὸν λίθον

Cogitabant autem inter se, quisnam esset, qui revolveret lapidem c

Cogitabant autem intra se, quis utique revolveret lapidem d

D, c, d, sa

(they omit ἀρώματα)

ἀρώματα. καὶ τινές σὺν αὐταῖς

ἐλογίζοντο δὲ ἐν ἑαυταῖς· τί ἄρα ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον

070

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 16:3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς· τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;

Compare verse 10:

NA28 Luke 24:10 ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς.

Compare:

Lk 23:53 τ D, 070, (1071), c, sa

καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκεν τῷ μνημειῷ λίθον ὃν μόγις εἴκοσι ἐκυλίον·

The Byzantine addition is strange. In 23:55 only "women" are noted. So why is it needed to add here "and certain others with them"? Is it possible that it is inspired from the similar term in verse 10?

The addition by D et al. is a harmonization to Mk. Note that the same witnesses also have the addition of the large stone at 23:53. Possibly Tatianic (see JR Harris, *Codex Bezae*, p. 188f.).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 396

170. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:3 εἰσελθοῦσαι δὲ οὐχ εὔρον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 579, 1071, 1241, pc², Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, bo^{ms}

omit: D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l, r¹), SBL

WH have the term in double brackets.

txt P75, 01, A, B, C, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [τοῦ κυρίου] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 23:52

οὗτος προσελθὼν τῷ Πιλάτῳ ἠτήσατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 53 καὶ
καθελὼν ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ σινδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι
λαξευτῷ οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὕτω κείμενος.

for αὐτὸ: τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ D, d

NA28 Mark 16:19 Ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τὸ λαλήσαι αὐτοῖς
ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ.

WH: "the combination of ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς is not found in the genuine text of the Gospels, though perhaps in Mk 16:19".

But the term is found in Acts 15 times! In the epistles it appears 37 times and twice in the Revelation, in sum 54 times. So, actually it is rather surprising that the term is NOT in the Gospels, except here. It is possible that the title κύριος Ἰησοῦς was intended only for the resurrected Jesus and has therefore been omitted here.

If the term is not original here, it must be a very early addition. Why should it have been omitted? See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, p. 219: It might be an

"orthodox corruption" to make sure that it was indeed the body of the Lord Jesus that was in the tomb. When the verse ends with σῶμα, it could mean that the heavenly Christ has left the (physical) body of Jesus before he died.

D. Parker (Living Text) speculates of "a three-stage development of this text, from:

'And entering they did not find *the body*' to:

' ... *the body of Jesus*' to:

' ... *the body of the Lord Jesus*' ".

But it is also quite possible that the variant by 579 et al. is probably influenced from 23:52.

Note that D alone **adds** τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ in 23:53. Probably this is simply a repetition from verse 52, but it shows that the scribe seems not too concerned with this issue.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 397

171. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:6 οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἠγέρθη. μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὧν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ

omit:

ἠγέρθη
ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν
οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἠγέρθη
οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἀλλὰ ἀνέστη

D, it, arm^{mss}, geo^{II}, **Bois**, **Weiss**

Marcion^E

c ("resurrexit a mortuis")

C*, Sy-P

W

Lat(aur, f, q, vg) read txt.

NA²⁵, **WH** both have the phrase in double brackets.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 28:6 οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε, ἠγέρθη γὰρ καθὼς εἶπεν

NA28 Mark 16:6 ἠγέρθη, οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε. Ἴδε ὁ τόπος ὅπου ἔθηκαν αὐτόν.

It is difficult to imagine why the words would have been deleted. Aland (NT Papyri II) suggests that οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε has been omitted as superfluous, because it is very clear that Jesus is not there.

The problem is that without the words, the text does not really make sense:

5 The women were terrified and bowed their faces to the ground, but the men said to them, "Why do you look for the living among the dead? *He is not here, but has risen.* 6 Remember how he told you, while he was still in Galilee, 7 that the Son of Man must be handed over to sinners, and be crucified, and on the third day rise again."

The wording is not the same as in the parallels. Nevertheless οὐκ ἔστιν ὧδε could be a harmonization to the parallels (so Weiss).

The reading of C* is clearly a harmonization to Mt.

The words could have been added to clarify and strengthen the reality of the Resurrection.

Weiss in his Lk Com. notes that the words are not needed, because already in verse 3 the women noted that he is not there:

NA28 Luke 24:3 εἰσελθοῦσαι δὲ οὐχ εὔρον τὸ σῶμα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

A good suggestion came from Jim Snapp (on the TC list, 6 Dec. 2002). If the reading by it-c was the original (Western) reading, then the omission could be due to h.t.:

verse 5: ... τί ζητεῖτε τὸν ζῶντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν.

verse 6: ἠγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν. μνήσθητε ὡς ἐλάλησεν ...

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 398

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:9 Καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἑνδεκα καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς.

omit: D, it, arm, geo

Lat(aur, f, q, vg) read txt.

WH have the term in single brackets

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 28:8 Καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης ἔδραμον ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 16:8 καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἔκστασις· καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν· ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.

Compare verse 2:

NA28 Luke 24:2 εὗρον δὲ τὸν λίθον ἀποκεκυλισμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου.

The words could be a harmonization to Mt/Mk, but it is more probable that they are an accidental omission due to homoiocriton (AP.. - AP..). It is also possible that the words are omitted as superfluous (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 399

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:9 Καὶ ὑποστρέψασαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου ἀπήγγειλαν ταῦτα πάντα τοῖς ἑνδεκα καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς.

NA28 Luke 24:10 ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς. ῥ ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα,

omit: A, D, W, Γ, 788(=f13), 1241, al, Lect²², d, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H**

ἦν δὲ K, Π, U, Ψ, f1, 69(=f13), 2, 22, pc, Lat, Co

txt P75, 01, B, L, X, Δ, Θ, 070, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, Maj

ῥ αἰ 01⁶², K, Θ, Ψ, 700, Maj

Tregelles has ἦσαν δὲ in brackets.

B: no umlaut

The sentence ἦσαν δὲ ... αὐταῖς breaks the continuation from verse 9 to the following ἔλεγον ... It looks like an editorial gloss. Note especially the double καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς - καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς.

By omission of the ἦσαν δὲ it is possible to continue the sentence from verse 9 and to supply a subject for ἀπήγγειλαν. It is also possible to start a new sentence with ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία though. In that case αἰ is not allowed before ἔλεγον.

ἦσαν δὲ without αἰ could mean that a new sentence starts with καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ. In that case the curious situation is that it were the unnamed αἰ λοιπαὶ who report the events to the disciples. To avoid that interpretation αἰ was added.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 400

172. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:12 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.

omit verse: D, it (a, b, d, e, l, r¹), Marcion?, **NA²⁵**, **Weiss**, **Tis**, **Bal**

WH have the verse in double brackets.

Tregelles has the verse in single brackets.

The Arabic Diatessaron does not have the verse. It has this sequence:

Lk 24:9, Mk 16:10b, **Lk 24:10**, Mk 16:11, **Lk 24:11a**, Mk 16:12a, **Lk 24:13b-35**

Marcion: Harnack thinks that Marcion deleted this verse.

Lat(aur, c, f, ff², vg) have the verse.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation.

Parallel: _

NA28 John 20:3-6 Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς καὶ ἦρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. 4 ἔτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ· καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς προέδραμεν τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ ἦλθεν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, 5 καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια, οὐ μέντοι εἰσῆλθεν. 6 ἔρχεται οὖν καὶ Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθῶν αὐτῷ καὶ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα,
NA28 John 20:10 ἀπήλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί.

<u>Luke</u>	<u>John</u>
Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς	3 ὁ Πέτρος
ἔδραμεν	4 προέδραμεν
ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον	3 εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον
καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει	5 καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει
τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα,	5/6 τὰ ὀθόνια
καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν	10 ἀπήλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς
θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.	

The verse could be a composition from Joh 20:3-6,10 (so Weiss). But this would be a rather creative composition, which was alien to later scribes. Luke is

missing the other disciple. Also the reaction of the disciples is described differently: in John it is faith, in Luke it is astonishment. Luke 24:12 would be a clumsy summarization of John 20:3-10, for Luke 24:12 misses the essential point of John 20:3-10. So either this verse in Lk is a *very* early addition or both evangelists drew from a common source. Aland (NT Papyri II) writes: "If there is a connection between Lk and Jo, then Lk is primary and Jo is secondary."

This verse has an un-Lukan feature, the historic present βλέπει. Of the 93 occurrences of the historic present in Mk, Lk changed 92 (Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, p. 212 - 217). Compare also the present in Lk 24:36: λέγει, another Western non-interpolation. Luke has 12 instances of the historic present in his Gospel, mainly verbs of speech.

Other words or phrases not used by Luke elsewhere are: παρακύψας, ὀθόνια, ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν.

All these features appear in the Johannine parallel.

On the other hand there are some typical Lukan features as well:

1. ἀναστὰς: appears 28 times in Lk/Acts. Elsewhere 2 times in Mt and 6 times in Mk.
2. θαυμάζω: Mt-Mk-Lk-Act: 7-4-13-5
3. τὸ γεγονός: this term appears 5 times in Lk and 3 times in Acts, but elsewhere only once in Mk.

Neiryneck: "the joining of the verb θαυμάζειν and τὸ γεγονός in one expression creates a valid example of Lukan style."

If the verse is a secondary addition based on John, its origin is difficult to explain. M. Matson ("In Dialogue with another Gospel, SBL 2001, p. 207) writes: "The scribe must have

1. turned to a copy of Jo 20:3-10, or known it fairly closely by heart
2. modified the account by deleting the reference to the other disciple (despite the presence of a reference to another disciple in 24:24)
3. added the Lukan stylistic form of a pleonastic ἀναστὰς
4. modified the term προέδραμεν, in which προ must clearly refer to the race between Peter and the other disciple, to ἔδραμεν, yet
5. left the term βλέπει uncorrected, and
6. added the Lukan terms θαυμάζω and τὸ γεγονός.

In other words, the interpolation would not have been a simple harmonization to a variant version in John. What is necessary to this reconstruction is a fairly sophisticated editor of text or traditions with an eye to Lukan style."

It is very difficult to find a reason for the omission of the verse, except accidental. In John there are two disciples, in Luke it is only one, perhaps this discrepancy was a reason for deletion? Ehrman suggests that the verse has been omitted to avoid its Johannine flair within the Synoptics since there was a significant opposition to the Gospel of John in the 2nd and third CE.

Note what Ehrman writes in footnote 129 (page 254/55): "Franz Neiryneck has convincingly shown that Marcion, the Diatessaron, and the Palestinian Syriac cannot be cited in support of the Western text here, despite their appearance in most of the apparatuses. See his "Lc xxiv 12: Les temoins du texte occidental. [Evangelica, p. 313-28, Leuven, 1982]"

Weiss (Lk Com.) notes that when the apostles in verse 11 found "these words ... an idle tale, and they did not believe them" it is not really logical for Peter getting up and running immediately to the tomb. Also the ἐξ αὐτῶν of verse 13 refers back directly to verses 10/11 (αὐτῶν).

Compare:

NA28 Luke 24:10 ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς. ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα, 11 καὶ ἐφάνησαν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ λῆρος τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, καὶ ἠπίστουν αὐταῖς.

12 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.

13 Καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἦσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίου ἐξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣ ὄνομα Ἐμμαοῦς,

The verse could be omitted without disrupting the sense and flow of the narrative.

It also seems that verse 24 is in contradiction to verse 12, because in verse 24 one is told that more than one went to the tomb:

NA28 Luke 24:24 καὶ ἀπῆλθόν τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εὔρον οὕτως καθὼς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον, αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον.

"Some of those who were with us went to the tomb and found it just as the women had said; but they did not see him."

This contradiction could be an argument for the originality of the shorter reading, but could also be the cause for the omission of verse 12.

Compare:

F. Neiryck "Luke 24:12" in Festschrift Delobel 2002, p. 145 - 158

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 401

NA28 Luke 24:12 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια μόνα, καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.

BYZ Luke 24:12 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀθόνια κείμενα μόνα καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός

κείμενα μόνα X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, ff², vg^{mss}), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal^{mss}, bo^{ms}

μόνα κείμενα L

κείμενα A, K, Π, 063, 69(=f13), 579, 2542, al, vg

μόνα P75, 01^{c2}, B, W, 070, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co

omit: 01*, sa^{mss2}

Weiss omits the verse, but (as always) has it in the margin, which reads κείμενα μόνα. Same **Bal**.

D, it (a, b, d, e, l, r¹) omit whole verse (see previous variant).

B: no umlaut

Parallel: _

NA28 John 20:5 καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ ὀθόνια,

The Byzantine addition is probably a harmonization to Jo. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 402

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:13 Καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἦσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἑξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣ ὄνομα Ἐμμαοῦς,

ἑκατὸν ἑξήκοντα 01, K*, Π, N*, Θ, 079^{vid}, 0211, pc, L844, L2211
"100 + 60" g¹, vg^{mss}, Sy-H^{mss}, Sy-Pal, arm, geo, arab^{MS},
Jerome, Or?, Eus(Onomastikon), [Merck](#)

ἑπτὰ e ("septem", from: 7 Roman miles = 60 stades)

txt P75, A, B, D, L, W, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579,
700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co

Scholium in manuscripts 34, 194: "[regarding 160:] so the accurate copies and Origen's confirmation of the truth."

N: S. Porter in his "NT Papyri and Parchments" (Vienna, 2008, p. 155) writes: "ἑκατὸν is deleted by the original author. NA includes this manuscript (N) with 01, K*, Θ, 079^{vid} as reading ἑκατὸν here, an apparent error as the scribe has clearly crossed out the letters." and: "[It] is crossed out with short diagonal strokes, one stroke per letter. Although it cannot be determined who crossed the word out, he lines are drawn in the same fashion as the rest of the manuscript." - Swanson notes this deletion, too. Swanson does not note anything regarding K, though, which he also has for the long reading.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

τό στάδιον: a distance of about 190 meters, almost a furlong stade, one-eighth mile, about 600 feet. 60 stadia = 12 km, 160 stadia = 30 km.

The village Emmaus cannot be determined with certainty. BDAG (3rd ed, 2000) mentions 3 possibilities:

1. The old Emmaus of Maccabaeian times, not infreq. mentioned by Josephus, later Nicopolis, and now Amwâs; so Eusebius and Jerome (Onomastikon). It is located rather far from Jerusalem for the 60 stades of vs. 13; but F-Mabel (RB 34, 1925, 347-67) prefers to take the v.l. 160 stades as the original (but s. Metzger).
2. Since the middle ages some have thought of present-day el-Kubêbe (65 stades from Jerusalem; Baedeker, Plummer, Zahn et al.
3. The military colony of Vespasian, about 34 stades west of Jerusalem, called Ἀμμαοῦς in Jos. (Bell. 7, 217, where a v.l. has ἐξήκοντα for τριάκοντα: an assimilation to Lk 24:13?) and presumably identical w. present-day Kaloniye.

The distance must be short enough to go back to Jerusalem in the evening, see verses 29, 33:

29 But they urged him strongly, saying, "Stay with us, because it is almost evening and the day is now nearly over." So he went in to stay with them.

33 That same hour they got up and returned to Jerusalem; and they found the eleven and their companions gathered together.

It is possible to go from Amwas/Nikopolis to Jerusalem in 5 hours.

It is possible that the 60 stades have been changed to 160 to conform to the identification by Eusebius and Jerome.

V. Michel (in the Fleckenstein book, 2003) makes it quite clear that from local tradition and early fathers witnesses, only Amwas/Nikopolis can be the Emmaus of the Lukan story. There were two streets connecting Emmaus and Jerusalem, one 147 (27 km) stades long, the other 186 (35 km) stades long.

We have therefore two contradictory arguments: 60 stades is better attested in the manuscripts tradition, but Amwas/Nikopolis (160 stades) is better attested by early tradition.

It has also been suggested that what Luke originally meant was that they were still on the way to Emmaus and after walking 60 stades the narrated things happened (so actually the Peschitta!).

Compare:

- J. Read-Heimerdinger "Where is Emmaus? Clues in the text of Lk 24 in Codex Bezae" in Parker/Taylor "Studies in the early text of the Gospels and Acts", Birmingham, 1999, p. 229-244
- Sylvie Chabert d'Hyères: http://www.dammarilyn.com/comm/oulam_en.html
- K.H. Fleckenstein, M. Louhivuori, R. Riesner "Emmaus in Judäa", Giessen, 2003 (with interesting archaeological details and 10 pages bibliography)
- C.P. Thiede " Die Wiederentdeckung von Emmaus bei Jerusalem" ZAC 8 (2005) 593-599
- R. Riesner " Wo lag das neutestamentliche Emmaus (Lukas 24,13)?" ZAC 11 (2007) 201-220

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 403

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:13 Καὶ ἰδοὺ δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἦσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίου ἐξήκοντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣ ὄνομα Ἐμμαοῦς.

Οὐλαμμοῦς D
Ulammas d
"Cleofas et Ammaus" b, e, ff², r¹

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

For the Οὐλαμμοῦς compare:

LXX Genesis 28:19 καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἰακωβ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου Οἶκος θεοῦ καὶ Ουλαμλους ἦν ὄνομα τῇ πόλει τὸ πρότερον

A: Ουλαμμοῦς

"And Jacob called that place "house of God"; and the name of the city was Oulamlos at the first."

The Hebrew reads "Luz" for "Oulamlos": "Ancient place and seat of worship in Ephraim on border of Benjamin, identif. with *Luz* (former name); later important place of worship; abode of prophet; Jereboam set up one of the golden calves at Bethel." (Whittaker) - Bet-El is about 90 stades (17 km, 12 miles) south of Jerusalem. Today it is called El Bireh.

Is D preserving the original here or is it an independent correction to overcome the problem of the distance (compare previous variant)?

Eusebius in his "Onomasticon" writes: "Bethel (Βαιθήλ) is now a village twelve miles from Jerusalem to the right of the road going to Neapolis. It was formerly called Oulammaus (Οὐλαμμοῦς) and also Luza. It was given to the lot of the tribe of Benjamin, near Bethaven and Gai. Josue also fought there killing the king." Jerome writes in his Onomasticon translation: "porro quod quidam putant secundum errorem Graecorum uoluminum Ulammaus antiquitus nuncupatam, uehementer errant."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 404

173. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 24:17 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὐς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους περιπατοῦντες; καὶ ἐστάθησαν σκυθρωποί.

BYZ Luke 24:17 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὐς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους περιπατοῦντες καὶ ἐστὲ σκυθρωποί;

Byz A^c, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, Trg^{mg}
καὶ ἔσται A^c, P, W, Γ, Ω

txt P75, 01, A*, B, L, 070, 579, Sy-Pal^{mss2}, Co
καὶ ἐστήσαν L
et steterunt e

omit: D, Cyr

καὶ εἰς τί ἐστὲ Bal (conj.)

B: no umlaut

σκυθρωποί "looking sad, gloomy, sullen, sour"

ἐστε indicative present active 2nd person plural from εἶμι

ἐστάθησαν indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural from ἴστημι

ἔστησαν indicative aorist active 3rd person plural from ἴστημι

No parallel.

txt

"What are you discussing with each other while you walk along?" They stood still, looking sour.

Byz

"What are you discussing with each other while you walk along and looking sad?"

D

"What are you discussing with each other while you walk along sad?"

Regarding the meaning of σκυθρωποί:

Metzger argues that they are "displeased on being interrupted in their conversation by a stranger", thus the meaning "gloomy, sour" would be fitting. Compare Mt 6:16. In the Byzantine reading the question continues and the meaning "sad" would more be appropriate. But it is also possible that also the txt meaning is "sad" and "they stood still, sad".

1. The form ἐστάθησαν :

Originally, formally, ἐστάθησαν is an aorist passive, strictly speaking with the meaning "to be placed". However, in line with later developments, where the passive often intrudes into the province of the middle, the passive aorist ἐστάθη etc. came to assume active meaning. The form ἐστάθησαν is therefore in Koine semantically identical to ἔστησαν "they stood (still)".

The θη form is concurrent with the active form in the Koine, although within the text of the GNT the forms from στήναι are twice as frequent as the forms from σταθῆναι. But they are simply earlier and later forms. Similar variants occur at Mt 2:9, 27:11, Lk 6:8, 24:36 (ἐστάθη - ἔστη).

That the θη form itself wasn't the problem is clear since the simple solution ἐστήσαν wasn't adopted (except in a singular reading of L).

2. The style of καὶ ἐστάθησαν and καὶ ἐστὲ :

Some commentators consider the καὶ ἐστάθησαν reading inappropriate. E.g. Baljon writes: "absurda lectio est" and Godet in his commentary on Lk (1889) likewise feels it "borders on the absurd". They do not explain why, though. Baljon, in his GNT (1898), has a curious conjecture in the text: καὶ ἐς τί ἐστὲ (with ἐς for εἰς and εἰς τί = "why"). In the footnote he writes:

Conjectura opus est. Holwerda supponit lacunam inter περιπατοῦντες et σκυθρωποί, quam librarii variis modis suppleverunt (vide V.d.S. Bakhuyzen et V. Manen). Harting (cf. V.d.S. B.) legit: καὶ ἐς τί σκυθρωποί; (vide Mt 14:31). Praefero hanc conjecturam lectionibus codicum.

Perhaps what they mean is the connection with καὶ. Although καὶ may be pardoned (with some difficulty) in Semitic Greek, the appropriate construction to express the idea (even for the NT) should have been: οἱ δὲ ἐστάθησαν. But Luke's Greek is not consistently smooth.

Zahn (Comm. Lk.) finds it improbable that Luke would continue the sentence with the awkwardly connected καὶ ἐστὲ and not adding a τί or διατί.

Other commentators suggest that it would have been more suitable to use a participle here: καὶ ὄντες σκυθρωποί, but σκυθρωποί is not caused by nor is it a parallel to their *walking*, but by their *discussion* of the news that had reached them, hence ἐστὲ σκυθρωποί is correct in this context.

3. Direct speech or Lukan statement:

Weiß (Textkritik p. 78) suggests that the reason for a change to direct speech was to remove the disciples' sadness as a result of Jesus' question. The sadness seemed more suitable (to scribes) to be the result of their conversing rather than part of Jesus' question.

Another argumentation in favor of the txt reading is that there is no reason for stopping and standing still. There is no mention of them starting again, only that they came near a village in verse 28. So, it is possible that scribes changed the reading so that no stopping is involved anymore.

Also it could be argued that verse 18 continues with ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ, assuming that Jesus talk continued to the end of verse 17.

The D reading is also fully possible grammatically. Semantically, the witness of this manuscript is not a third alternative, but must be added to the witness of the Majority text. Both say almost the same thing. D connects their being σκυθρωποί with their walking (modifying), the Majority with their discussion (paratactic). But in both cases the σκυθρωποί is Jesus' characterization of them, not a Lucan remark, as in the text.

Cyrill read actually the D text: Comm. Lucam 72 (PG 72.944).

Overall it seems that the commentators are quite divided over the issue. Difficult.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 405

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:18 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἰς τ ὀνόματι Κλεοπάς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἰερουσαλὴμ καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωσ τὰ γενόμενα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις;

τ ἐξ αὐτῶν P, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 157, 579, 1071, 1241, 2542*, pc, it(a, b, d, f, ff², l, r¹), Sy, sa, bo^{pt}, arm, geo, aeth
ex ipsis b, f, ff², l
ex eis a, d, r¹

τ ad eum e

f13: 174, 230 omit

Lat(aur, c, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

A natural addition.

Several witnesses assign a name to the companion of Cleopas here.

"Nathanael" V/031 in the margin.

"Simon" S/028 in the margin.

"Ammaus" b, e, ff², r¹ (at 24:13).

"Amaon" Ambrose

(the last two are probably a corruption of Emmaus.)

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 406

NA28 Luke 24:21 ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων
λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ· ἀλλὰ γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσιν τούτοις τρίτην
ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο.

BYZ Luke 24:21 ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων
λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ· ἀλλὰ γε _____ σὺν πᾶσιν τούτοις τρίτην
ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον, ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο

Byz A, (D*), P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sa, bo^{ms}, [Trg]

D*, 22, pc, Lat^{pt} ἡμέραν σήμεραν ἄγει
D^c, Lat^{pt} ἡμέρα ἄγει

txt P75, 01^{c2}, B, D^{c2}, L, 070, f1, 579, vg^{mss2}, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, bo
ταύτην ἡμέραν 01*

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

"and we were hoping that he it is who is about to redeem Israel, and also with all
these things, this third day is passing today, since these things happened."

There is no reason for an omission, except that it might have been considered
redundant after τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν.

A natural addition. Possibly an idiomatic phrase?

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 407

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:24 καὶ ἀπῆλθόν τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εὔρον οὕτως καθὼς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον, αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον.

No txt in NA and SQE!

omit P75, B, pc, **Trg, WH**

txt 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj

ὥς εἶπὸν αἱ γυναῖκες D, c, e

B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 Luke 24:22 ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκές τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενόμεναι ὀρθρινὰ ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον,

A similar phrase appears in immediate context, verse 22: "but also women".

The phrase καθὼς καὶ appears two more times in Lk (6:36 and 11:1).

It is possible that καὶ has been omitted as a confusion over an assumed dittography: **ΚΑΙ** - **ΑΙ** (so Weiss).

The words "just as also the women said" seems to imply that the women said so, but also some one else. But this is not the case. So, καὶ could have been omitted as misleading.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 408

NA28 Luke 24:29 καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτὸν λέγοντες· μείνον μεθ' ἡμῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλικεν ἤδη ἡ ἡμέρα. καὶ εἰσηλθεν τοῦ μείναι σὺν αὐτοῖς.

BYZ Luke 24:29 καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτὸν λέγοντες Μείνον μεθ ἡμῶν ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἐστὶν καὶ κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ εἰσηλθεν τοῦ μείναι σὺν αὐτοῖς

Byz A, D, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, f13, 157, 892, 1241, Maj, c, d, l, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, sa
txt P75, 01, B, L, T, Ψ, 0196, f1, 124, 22, 33, pc, Lat, Sy-P, bo

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [ἤδη] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

It is probable that ἤδη has been omitted because of confusion over the many Etas, either accidentally or deliberately to make reading easier.

ΗΔΗΗΜΕΡΑ
ΗΗΜΕΡΑ

On the doubtful Syriac attestation compare P. Williams:

P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 166-67

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 409

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:32 καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους·

οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν **καιομένη** ἦν [ἐν ἡμῖν] ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;

οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἦν ἡμῶν **κεκαλυμμένη** ὡς ἐλάλει ... D, d, sa^{mss}
Was not our heart covered as he was speaking ...

coopertum ("covered") d

exterminatum ("banished, expelled") e

excecatum ("blinded") c

optusum ("dull, deafened") l

ardens ("burning") a, aur, b, f, ff², r¹, vg

"heavy" Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Diatess^{Arab}, sa^{ms}

Upon this Isho'dad of Merv remarked: "*Did not our heart become heavy within us, etc. The Greek says burn and both of them have one meaning. It was heavy, that is to say like lead in deep waters; it burned, like a blazing firebrand.*" (compare M. Gibson's translation, p. 207).

Probably just translation freedom, to avoid the more difficult *burning*.

W.C. Allen suggests a misread Aramaic word, cp. "Difficulties in the text of the Gospels explained from the Aramaic" JTS 2 (1901) 299

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 410

174. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:32 καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν
καιομένη ἦν [ἐν ἡμῖν] ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς διήνοιγεν ἡμῖν
τὰς γραφάς;

omit:

P75, B, D, 1203, (it, Sy-S, Sy-C), geo^I, (Or), WH

omit ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν

a, b, ff², l, r¹, Or (probably h.t. ἡμῖν ...)

omit ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν c, e, Sy-S, Sy-C (probably h.t. ἐν ... ἐν)

txt 01, A, L, P, W, X, 33, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241,
Maj, WH^{mg}, NA²⁵

B: no umlaut

"Was not our heart burning within us"

No parallel.

Possibly omitted as superfluous or to improve style (so Aland):

ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν ... ἐν ἡμῖν.

It is possible that the omission is at least in part accidental: ...ένη ἦν ἐν ἡμῖν.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 411

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:33 Καὶ ἀναστάντες αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ εὔρον ἠθροισμένους τοὺς ἑνδεκά καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς,

Luke 24:34 **λέγοντας** ὅτι ὄντως ἠγέρθη ὁ κύριος καὶ ὤφθη Σίμωνι.

λέγοντες D, 1200, Sy-S, (Sy-C?, Sy-P?), bo^{ms}

Sy-S: And they found the Eleven while gathered, and those who were with them, *and presented themselves / appeared, telling them*: "Truly our Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon."

1200 is noted in IGNTP

Equivocal: Sy-C, Sy-P, Latt

Sy-C: And they found the Eleven while gathered, and those who were with them, *when they told*: "Truly our Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon".

Sy-P: And they found the Eleven who were gathered, and those who were with them, *when they told / while telling*: "Truly our Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon".

Latt: dicentes (can be both a nominative and an accusative participle)

Ilaria Ramelli draws attention to this neglected variant. He writes:

"This [the reading **λέγοντες**] solves a big difficulty in the logical sequence of the Greek text with **λέγοντας** instead of **λέγοντες** in v. 34: if the Eleven already know that Jesus has risen and has appeared to one of them, Simon, how is it that they are scared, doubt, cannot believe and think of a phantom when Jesus appears to them immediately afterwards (vv. 36-38)? If, on the contrary, the announcers of the resurrection in v. 34 are the Emmaus Disciples, this difficulty vanishes, and the Simon to whom they claim Jesus appeared is not to be identified with Simon Peter / Cephas, but with another Simon, probably one of the two Emmaus Disciples themselves."

"One of the Emmaus Disciples was likely Clopas / Cleopas / Cleophas, and the other was Simon, who, according to Hegesippus (*ap. Eus. HE 3,11,1*), was the son of Cleophas."

So, as Ramelli reads it, the two Emmaus disciples Clopas and Simon came back and told the Eleven, that Jesus is risen and appeared to Simon.

What is a bit strange about this is that it is said that he appeared to Simon only. Why not saying "appeared to us"?

On the other hand, λέγοντες may just be a simple scribal error.

Compare:

- Ilaria Ramelli "The Emmaus Disciples and the *Kerygma* of the Resurrection (Lk 24,34)" ZNW 105 (2014)1-19

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 412

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:36 Ταῦτα δὲ αὐτῶν λαλούντων αὐτὸς ἔστη ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

omit: D, it (a, b, e, ff², l, r¹), **NA²⁵**, **Gre**, **Bois**, **Weiss**, **Tis**, **Bal**, **SBL**
WH have the verse in double brackets.

add: G, P, W, 579, 1241, pc,

Lat(aur, c, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, arm, geo

καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν. ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθαι· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν· μὴ φοβεῖσθαι· ἐγὼ εἰμι.

G, P, 1241
W
579

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation.

Parallel:

NA28 John 20:19 ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

NA28 John 20:21 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] πάλιν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

NA28 John 20:26 καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἶπεν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 14:27 θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

NA28 Mark 6:50 θαρσεῖτε, ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

NA28 John 6:20 ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγὼ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

Compare following verse 37:

NA28 Luke 24:37 πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν.

"They were startled and terrified, and thought that they were seeing a ghost."

It is possible that it's a harmonization to Jo (so Weiss). Several witnesses harmonized even further by adding Jesus words "Don't be afraid" from the Walking on the Water story.

Without the words the story is more coherent, because when Jesus greets them it would be more difficult to understand why they then think, it is a ghost.

On the other hand it is possible that scribes just for that very reason, to make the story more dramatic, have omitted the words. Note φάντασμα by D in the following verse.

Note the un-Lukan historic present λέγει, as in 24:12. While λέγει appears several times in Lk, it is not common.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 413

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:37 πτοηθέντες δὲ καὶ ἔμφοβοι γενόμενοι ἐδόκουν πνεῦμα θεωρεῖν

φάντασμα D, d, Marcion^T
fantasma

B: no umlaut

No parallel, but compare:

NA28 Matthew 14:26 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἐταράχθησαν λέγοντες ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν.

NA28 Mark 6:49 οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἔδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστίν, καὶ ἀνέκραξαν.

Possibly the word is more dramatic and has been used to intensify the story. Note the omission of the greeting in the previous verse by D, it.

Note Ignatius to Smyrna 3:2: [Ἰησους] ἔφη αὐτοῖς·

λάβετε, ψηλαφήσατέ με καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον.

From an apocryphal source, either GHebrew (Jerome) or Doctrina Petri (Origen)?

Compare:

Deborah Thompson Prince "The 'Ghost' of Jesus: Luke 24 in Light of Ancient Narratives of Post-Mortem Apparitions" JSNT 29 (2007) 287-301

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 414

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:40 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας.

omit verse: D, it (a, b, d, e, ff², l, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-C, Marcion^T, **NA²⁵**, **Gre**, **Bois**, **Weiss**, **Tis**, **Bal** **WH** have the verse in double brackets. **Tregelles** has the verse in single brackets.

Marcion: Harnack thinks that Marcion deleted this verse.

Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Parallel:

NA28 John 20:20 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν _____ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῖς.

BYZ John 20:20 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῦ.

Compare previous verse 39:

NA28 Luke 24:39 ἴδετε τὰς χεῖράς μου καὶ τοὺς πόδας μου

It is possible that the words have been omitted as being redundant (so Aland). Hands and feet have already been mentioned in verse 39.

On the other hand it is possible that the words have been added as a harmonization either to immediate context or to John (so WH, Weiss, Zahn, also D. Parker).

See Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, p. 217 - 219.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 415

175. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 24:42 οἱ δὲ ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ μέρος·

BYZ Luke 24:42 οἱ δὲ ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ μέρος
καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσίου κηρίου.

T&T #52

"and of an honeycomb,"

Byz K, N, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 131, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj,
Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, Justin, Tert,
Cyr-Jer, Epiph, Jerome, [Trg]

txt P75, 01, A, B, D, L, W, Π, 579, pc³, d, e, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}, Cl, Diatess^{Arab-1/2}
pc = 1079, 1377*, 2411

B: no umlaut

Justin (2nd CE): καὶ ἔφαγεν κηρίον καὶ ἰχθὺν (De Resurrectione, ch. 9)

"He did eat honeycomb and fish.

Tertullian (2nd CE): Favos post fella gustavit (De Corona, ch. 14)

"For it was after the gall He tasted the honeycomb"

Clement (ca. 200 CE, Paed. 2.15.2): οἱ δὲ ... ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὀπτοῦ
μέρος· καὶ φάγων ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ...

Diatessaron: The verse is not commented upon in Ephrem's commentary, but it is in the Arabic Diatessaron. One manuscript has *honey*, the other not (B).

No parallel.

Note next verse 43:

NA28 Luke 24:43 καὶ λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν.

Compare:

NA28 John 21:9 ὡς οὖν ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακιὰν
κειμένην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον καὶ ἄρτον.

"they saw a charcoal fire there, with fish on it, and bread."

The term appears 9 times in the LXX. There is no reason for an omission, except possibly due to h.t. καὶ - καὶ. Also possible it that Egyptian asceticism was adverse to so sweet a food as honey (so Burgon).

Metzger notes: "Since in parts of the ancient church honey was used in the celebration of the Eucharist and in the baptismal liturgy, copyists may have added the reference here in order to provide scriptural sanction for the liturgical practice."

On the other hand it is basically possible that the words have been omitted as a partial harmonization to Jo 21:9, where bread and fish are mentioned and not fish and honey.

Note that both Justin and Tertullian mention it! Even Clement Alex. alludes once to it:

"Have you anything to eat here? said the Lord to the disciples after the resurrection; and they, as taught by Him to practice frugality, "gave Him a piece of broiled fish;" and having eaten before them, says Luke, He spoke to them what He spoke. And in addition to these, it is not to be overlooked that those who feed according to the Word are not debarred from dainties in the shape of honeycombs. For of articles of food, those are the most suitable which are fit for immediate use without fire, since they are readiest; and second to these are those which are simplest, as we said before." (Paedagogus, book 2.1.15.2-3)

Is it even possible that the words got into the manuscripts from this Clement quote? In Greek the relevant sentence is:

Πρὸς τούτοις οὐδὲ τραγημάτων (καὶ) κηρίων αμοίρους περιορατέον τοὺς δειπνοῦντας κατὰ Λόγον.

Compare also the story of Joseph and Aseneth 16. Here the angelic visitor says:

τὸ μέλι τοῦτο πεποιήκασιν αἱ μέλισσαι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξ' αὐτοῦ ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ πᾶς ὃς φάγεται ἐξ' αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

This food of immortality may be connected with the resurrection. For Kilpatrick this is an argument for originality, but it is none. It could equally well be the reason for a secondary addition.

Compare:

- J.W. Burgon "Traditional text" 1896, p. 240 - 252
- G.D. Kilpatrick "Luke 24:42-43" NovT 28 (1986) 306-308

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 416

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:43 καὶ λαβῶν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἔφαγεν τ.

add:

K, Π*, Θ, f13, L844, L2211, pc,

Lat(aur, c, r¹, vg), Sy-C, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, arm, geo^I, aeth

τ καὶ τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

K, f13, L2211, pc, arm, geo^I

τ καὶ πᾶσιν λαβῶν ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

Π* (Π^c omits)

τ λαβῶν τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

pc, L844

καὶ φάγων ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν λαβῶν
τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

Θ, pc,

Lat(aur, c, r¹, vg), Sy-C, Sy-H**, bo^{pt}

Et accipiens coram illis manducavit et reliqua accepit et dedit illis

r¹

Et cum manducasset coram eis

summens reliquias dedit eis.

aur, vg

Accipit coram illis

summens reliquias dedit eis.

c

B: no umlaut

ἐπίλοιπος "remaining"

No parallel. A strange addition.

But compare:

NA28 John 21:13 ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς καὶ λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον καὶ δίδωσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τὸ ὄψάριον ὁμοίως.

ἐπίλοιπος appears 26 times in the LXX, but only once in the NT (1.Pe 4:2). Possibly inspired from liturgical usage.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 417

NA28 Luke 24:44 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα

BYZ Luke 24:44 Εἶπεν δὲ _____ αὐτοῖς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι _____ οὓς ἐλάλησα

Not in NA but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz 01, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo^{pt}

txt P75, A, B, D, K, Π, L, N, X, Ψ, 33, 157, 579, pc, d, r¹, sa, bo^{pt}, Cl

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Probably omitted due to confusion over double OU OU. Possibly also because it is redundant.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 418

NA28 Luke 24:46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι
οὕτως γέγραπται _____ παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν
καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ,

BYZ Luke 24:46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι
οὕτως γέγραπται **καὶ οὕτως ἔδει** παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν
καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ

Byz A, C², W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{ms}
οὕτως ἔδει W
_____ ἔδει 579

txt P75, 01, B, C*, D, L, pc, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹), vg^{ms}, Sy-Pal, Co, Ir^{Lat}

Sy-C has a lacuna.

Sy-S omits οὕτως γέγραπται probably due to parablepsis (οὕτως - οὕτως).

B: no umlaut

Compare verse 26:

NA28 Luke 24:26 οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς
τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ;

Compare next verse 47:

NA28 Luke 24:47 καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς
ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ

Probably a harmonization to immediate context (verse 26) to smooth out the
abrupt οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν. There is no reason for an omission.

Weiss (Lk Com.) notes that the words do not fit to the following κηρυχθῆναι.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 419

176. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 24:47 καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

BYZ Luke 24:47 καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη

T&T #53

Byz A, C, D, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 131, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj, Latt, Sy-S, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, WH^{m9}, Gre, Bois, Trg, SBL

txt P75, 01, B, pc⁵, Sy-P, Co, WH, NA²⁵, Weiss
pc = 1253, 1519, 2445, 2796, 2808

καὶ εἰς 2446, Sy-Pal^{ms}

Sy-C has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 26:28 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

NA28 Mark 1:4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης [ὁ] βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

NA28 Luke 3:3 καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς πᾶσαν [τὴν] περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν,

NA28 Acts 5:31 τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτῆρα ὑψώσεν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ [τοῦ] δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

External support is quite slim.

Both words are conform to Lukan usage (see Acts 5:31).

The term with εἰς is probably better known to scribes from John the Baptist's story and so they changed from καὶ to εἰς. This is quite possible because the support is slim and Egyptian only (except Sy-P).

It is also possible that the first εἰς has been changed to καὶ because another εἰς is following with a different reference, to improve style (so Weiss).

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)

TVU 420

177. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:49 καὶ **[ἰδοὺ]** ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς·

omit: P75, 01, D, L, 33, 579, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, **Gre, Tis, Bal**

καὶ **ἰδοὺ** ἐγὼ A, B, C, (W), X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, (f1), f13, 157, 892, Maj, f, q, Sy-H
καὶ ἐγὼ **ἰδοὺ** W, Π, f1, pc

Sy-C has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 10:16 Ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα

NA28 Matthew 11:10 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου

NA28 Matthew 23:34 Διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφήτας

In the Gospels the phrase "ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω" is always preceded by ἰδοὺ. It is quite probable that therefore the word has been added here, too.

The external support for the omission is very good and the different insertion points also indicate a secondary origin.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 421

178. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:49 καὶ [ἰδοὺ] ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμᾶς·

ἔξαποστέλλω 01^{c2}, B, L, X, Δ, 33, 157, 892, L2211, pc,
NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P75, 01*, A, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 1241, Maj

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 10:16 Ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς

NA28 Matthew 11:10 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου

NA28 Matthew 23:34 Διὰ τοῦτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ὑμᾶς προφήτας

NA28 Mark 1:2 ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου

NA28 Luke 7:27 ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου,

NA28 Luke 10:3 ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων.

ἔξαποστέλλω appears 137 times in the LXX, but only once in the NT (Act 22:21).

There is no reason to change here to the compound verb. It is much more probable that the word has been changed to the very common ἀποστέλλω.

The support for ἔξαποστέλλω is not coherent.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 422

NA28 Luke 24:49 ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει _____ ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν.

BYZ Luke 24:49 ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε δύναμιν ἐξ ὕψους

Byz A, C^{C2}, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj,
f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}

txt P75, 01, B, C*, D, L, Lat, Sy-S, sa, bo^{pt}

Sy-C has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 24:47 καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ

There is no reason for an omission. The addition is only natural.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 423

179. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:50 Ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἔξω ἕως πρὸς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς.

ἕως πρὸς P75, 01, B, C*, L, f1, 33, 579, pc, L2211
a, Sy-S, Sy-P, arm, geo,

NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

ἕως εἰς 157

ἔξω ἕως εἰς A, C^{c3}, (D), W^c, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj,
(Lat), Sy-H, Bois

ἔξω ἕως W*, pc

ἔξω πρὸς D, pc, Lat

ἕως e ("quasi")

ἔξω ἕως πρὸς txt (no support!), NA^{26ff.}

Sy-C has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

LXX Genesis 15:5 ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔξω καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ

LXX Judges 19:25 καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτήν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἔξω

LXX 2 Samuel 13:18 καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτήν ὁ λειτουργὸς αὐτοῦ ἔξω

ἔξω is superfluous: Ἐξήγαγεν ... ἔξω. It could be argued that the duplication is an imitation of Semitic style, but that does not necessarily mean that it is secondary. The construction appears about 10 times in the LXX.

This case is similar to the previous cases of double negation (20:27, 22:16, 22:34). In all cases the double form is supported by the Byzantine text, here, too. Weiss (Lk Com.) notes that this is a very frequent addition.

The longer reading could also be a conflation of the P75, B and the Western reading.

On the other hand it is possible that ἔξω has been deleted as unnecessary.

NA^{26,27} take ἔξω ἕως as one variant and πρὸς as another. This results in a reading that is not supported by any witness. This is not very fortunate.

On the other hand it is also clear that the words do not really belong together as one variant. ἔξω belongs to ἐξήγαγεν and could be taken as one variant. The other variant then would be ἕως πρὸς. I think this would be a more natural separation.

In that case the distribution of witnesses would be:

omit ἔξω P75, 01, B, C*, L, f1, 33, 579, pc
have ἔξω A, C^{C3}, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj

ἕως πρὸς P75, 01, B, C*, L, f1, 33, 579, pc
ἕως εἰς A, C^{C3}, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = go with the P75, B reading)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 424

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:51 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. 52 Καὶ αὐτοὶ ...

omit: 01*, D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l), geo¹, **NA²⁵**, **Gre**, **Weiss**, **Tis**, **Bal**
WH have the phrase in double brackets

καὶ ἀνεφέρετο Sy-S

Aland (NT Papyri II) notes that Sy-S has καὶ ἀνεφέρετο or a synonymous phrase. In NA²⁷ Sy-S is listed for the complete omission. Burkitt has: "he was lifted up from them". Sy-C has a lacuna.

ἀπέστη for διέστη: D

01: corrected by 01^{c2}.

Lat(aur, c, f, gat, q, r¹, vg) read txt.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Acts 1:1-2 Τὸν μὲν πρῶτον λόγον ἐποιησάμην περὶ πάντων, ᾧ Θεόφιλε, ὧν ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, 2 ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἀνελήμφθη.

Codex Gigas: 1:2 ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὓς ἐξελέξατο (similar also Augustinus).

and Codex D: 1:2 ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας ἀνελήμφθη ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, οὓς ἐξελέξατο, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ...

The ascension in Acts:

NA28 Acts 1:9 Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπὼν βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη καὶ νεφέλη
ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.

Codex D: Καὶ ταῦτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ νεφέλη
ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπήρθη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 16:19 Ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τὸ λαλήσαι αὐτοῖς ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ.

With or without the words stand or falls the classification of the pericope as an ascension story.

It is possible that the words have been omitted due to homoioarcton (..N KAI A.. - ..N KAI A..). This is possibly the case for the omission in O1*. That the omission in the Western text is accidental is improbable, though, because it is connected with similar changes in Acts 1:2, 9. The evidence points here clearly to a deliberate change.

Luke points back to the ascension in Acts 1:1-2: "I wrote about all that Jesus did and taught from the beginning until the day [ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας] when he was taken up [ἀνελήμφθη] ..."

It is not clear if the phrase "until the day" means, that the ascension itself has already been narrated. There is a Western tradition (Codex Gigas, Augustinus) which omits the words ἀνελήμφθη in Acts 1:2. Codex D has the word but appears to be a mixture of Gigas and the normal text.

It is possible that the words have been deleted deliberately to remove a double ascension in Luke - Acts: First in Luke, shortly after the resurrection (recapitulated in Act 1:2), second in Acts 1:9, 40 days later.

On the other hand it is possible that the words have been added, when Luke and Acts were separated by one or more Gospels in the canon, for clarity. Streeter ("Four Gospels", p. 142) writes regarding an assimilation to Acts: "If so, it is an assimilation of an incredibly unskillful kind; for it makes the Ascension take place on Easter Day instead of forty days later as the Acts relates."

But it is not completely clear that the events in 24:44-53 follow immediately those in 24:36-43.

See also Ehrman (Orthodox Corruption, p. 227 - 232), who argues that the words have been added to strengthen the orthodox emphasis on the bodily ascension of Jesus. This argument can be reversed of course. It is equally possible that the words have been omitted to deny a bodily ascension of Jesus.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 180) sees the phrase as a free reminiscence of Act 1:9-10. He further notes (Lk Com.) that it could have been added to explain the unclear διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

ἀναφέρω appears only 3 times in the Gospels, here and in Mk 9:2/Mt 17:1. But in the parallel Lk 9:28 to Mk 9:2/Mt 17:1 Lk changes ἀναφέρει into ἀνέβη. But it is possible that Lk changed the word to get rid of the historic present. Note that Lk in Acts 1:2 uses ἀνελήμφθη. ἀναφέρω could thus be labeled "un-Lukan".

It is possible, even probable that this omission is connected with the omission of προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν in verse 52. It is not really conceivable that both omissions are accidental. G. Lohfink noted that in Hellenistic rapture stories the element of Proskynesis is closely related to an ascension.

Regarding the change of διέστη into ἀπέστη:

Zwiep notes that

- ἀπέστη fits better to ἀπ' αὐτῶν
- D several times replaces a verb by some form of ἀφίστημι
- D also has a similar change in Act 1:9:
νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπήρθη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.
for
ἐπήρθη καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.
- ἀφίστημι is the more conventional term for the disappearance of a heavenly being according to Lohfink, p. 170-1.

Overall a deliberate omission to harmonize Lk with Acts appears to be the most probable explanation. Taking the editorial activity in Lk 24:51-52 and Act 1:2+9 together, it accords well with other changes of the Western text.

Zwiep concludes: "The conclusion that emerges from the preceding analysis is that in all three textual units (Lk 24:50-3, Act 1:1-2, 9-11) a development from the B-text to the Western text gives a more convincing (while more consistent) explanation of the evidence than the reverse. The Western reviser quite consistently removes stylistic, chronological and theological obstacles throughout the whole narrative and thereby creates a new 'de-mythologized' narrative picture, conform to his own theological (or more precisely, christological) outlook: he removes any suggestion that Jesus ascended physically - with a body of flesh and bones - into heaven. [..] it appears that the 2nd and 3rd CE christological controversies [gnostic and docetic] provide a most plausible setting in which a radical reinterpretation of the ascension narrative such as undertaken by our 'Western' scribe could take place."

Compare:

- F. Graefe "Der Schluss des Lukasevangeliums und der Anfang der Apostelgeschichte" TSK 61 (1888) 522-41
- F. Graefe "Textkritische Bemerkungen zu den drei Schlusskapiteln des Lukasevangeliums" TSK 69 (1896) 245-81
- G. Lohfink "Die Himmelfahrt Jesu" StANT 26, München, 1971, p. 171-4
- A.W. Zwiap "The text of the ascension narratives" NTS 42 (1996) 219-244

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 425

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:52 Καὶ αὐτοὶ προσκυνήσαντες αὐτὸν ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης

omit: D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l), Sy-S, **NA²⁵**, Gre, Weiss, Tis, Bal

Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg) read txt

WH have the phrase in double brackets.

Sy-C has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

No parallel. Compare:

NA28 Matthew 28:9 καὶ ἰδοὺ Ἰησοῦς ὑπήντησεν αὐταῖς λέγων· χαίρετε. αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσαι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.

NA28 Matthew 28:17 καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν προσεκύνησαν, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν.

This omission is probably related to the omission in the previous verse 51. It would seem possibly not appropriate to worship Jesus without an ascension being mentioned. G. Lohfink noted that in Hellenistic rapture stories the element of Proskynesis is closely related to an ascension.

Weiss (Lk Com.) thinks that the words have been added from Mt 28:17.

Compare:

- G. Lohfink "Die Himmelfahrt Jesu" StANT 26, München, 1971, p. 171-4
- A.W. Zwiap "The text of the ascension narratives" NTS 42 (1996) 219-244

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 426

180. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 24:53

καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ _____ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν.

BYZ Luke 24:53

καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν

εὐλογοῦντες

P75, 01, B, C*, L, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Co, geo, arab^{MS}, Trg^{mg}

αἰνοῦντες

D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l, r¹), vg^{mss}, Trg^{mg}, Tis, Bal

αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες laudantes et benedicentes

A, C^{C2}, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579,
892, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, [Trg]

Sy-C has a lacuna.

B: no umlaut

αἰνοῦντες αἰνέω participle present active nominative masculine plural
"praise"

Compare:

NA28 Luke 24:50-51 Ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς [ἔξω] ἕως πρὸς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτούς. 51 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογεῖν αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν ...

αἰνέω appears 7 times in Lk-Acts (4 times in Lk), but nowhere else in the Gospels. Only once in the epistles (Rom 15:11).

εὐλογέω appears 14 times in Lk, 5 times in Mt, 6 times in Mk and once in Jo. In the epistles it appears 16 times.

Overall αἰνέω is the more rare word and more specific to Lk.

It is possible that εὐλογέω has been changed to αἰνέω, because in the two previous verses 50 and 51 εὐλογέω is used as Jesus blessing the disciples. So here it would then appear in a different meaning ("praise") and possibly considered inappropriate (so Weiss).

The Byzantine reading is a clear conflation of txt and the Western reading.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 427

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 24:53 καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν. τ

insert PA: 1333^C

B: no umlaut

1333 (11th CE) is a Byzantine manuscript with 93% Byz readings according to T&T.

M. Robinson Oct. 2002 on the TC list:

"Lk ends on one page bottom, recto, with 5 lines left empty (leaf 148). Next page (verso of leaf 148) contains the pericope complete before the list of kephalaia for Jn. It is written in a darker ink, but not necessarily by a different scribe, since there are a number of similarities to the style of the opening segment of John which follows. The title of the PA page reads EUa EIS T> K/ TOU OKTWs Tu OSIas PELAGIAS (= the lectionary reading for Pelagia, Oct 8th). Also, the PA is written in 2 cols., 26 ll per page, as in the rest of the manuscript. In the main text of John, the PA is not present. However, in loc. 7:53 there is a stylized cross at the end of 7:52, and written in the margin between columns is something regarding '... Η ΠΕΡΙΚΟΠΗ ΤΟΥ ... ΓΥΝΑΙΚΟΣ', part of which was not decipherable."