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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
   \[ P4, P75, T, \Xi \] (= 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
   \[ \text{vg}, \text{Sy-S} \]
   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":([ \Theta, 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:

P75 content:
4:34-5:10 7:35-39 9:4-17:15

C lacunae:
3:21-4:25 12:4-19:42 24:7-45

R extant:
6:18-40 10:3-16 17:21-18:10
6:49-7:22 11:4-27 18:22-20:20

T extant:
| Zeal: extant: | | | | |
| 1:19-23 | 3:5-8 | 7:11-37 | 9:41-10:18 |
| 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 | |

| 070 extant: | | | | |

| 33 lacuna: | | | | |
| 21:38-23:26 | |

| Sy-S lacunae: | | | | |
| 1:16-38 | 5:28-6:11 | |

| Sy-C lacunae: | | | | |

(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 12:19 [7]
- Luk 12:21 [9]
- Luk 12:39 [3]
- Luk 22:19b-20 [32]
- Luk 24:3 [3]
- Luk 24:6[5]
- Luk 24:9[3]
- Luk 24:12 [22]
- Luk 24:36 [5]
- Luk 24:40 [10]
- Luk 24:51 [5]
- 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 24:12  John 20:3-6

**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):

| Manuscript | Number of "2" Readings | Percent | Fragmentary?
|------------|------------------------|---------|------------------
| Ξ 040      | 12/15                  | 80%     | both fragmentary.
| _070       | 11/13                  | 85%     | (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

| Manuscript | Number of "2" Readings | Percent | Agreement with Other Manuscripts
|------------|------------------------|---------|----------------------------------
| 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<sup>WS</sup>: 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
1. one significant variant every 3<sup>rd</sup> - 4<sup>th</sup> verse, and
2. one difficult variant every 9<sup>th</sup> 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 ἐσταὶ γὰρ μέγας ἐννόησιον [τοῦ] κυρίου, καὶ οἶνον καὶ σίκερα οὐ μὴ πίῃ, καὶ πνεύματος ἀγίου πλησθήσεται ἐτὶ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ,

omit 01, A, C, L, f1, 33, 579, 1241, 1342, L844, L2211, al60[Ω, 2], Cyr, NA28, WH, Tis, Bal

txt B, D, W, 28, 565, 892, Maj, Irlat, WHma, [Trg]
τοῦ θεοῦ Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, al10

IGNTP has Lc for the omission, against Swanson, who has Lc 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 ἀγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὂδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου

Compare:
NA28 Luke 1:76 Καὶ οὐ δὲ, παιδίον, προφήτης υψίστου κληθήσετι προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐννόησιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὂδὸς αὐτοῦ, BYZ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου

BYZ Α, C, D, L, Θ, Ψ, 0130, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Sy, Irlat
txt P4(200 CE), 01, B, W, 0177, pc, Or

ἐννόησιον κυρίου appears 117 times in the LXX, whereas ἐννόησιον 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)
NA28 Luke 1:28 καὶ εἰσελθὼν πρὸς αὐτήν εἶπεν·
χαίρε, κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ.

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

B: umlaut! (p. 1305, A 17 L) 28... σοῦ 29 ἡ δὲ ἔπι τῷ λόγῳ
(It is not clear if this umlaut indicates this variant or the next one.)

Streeter notes (Four Gospels, p. 123-4) that 565 adds the words in the margin with the note "not found in the ancient copies".
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 3

BYZ Luke 1:29 ἡ δὲ ἰδοὺςα διεταράχθη ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἶτη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος

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

ἡ δὲ ἰδοὺςα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ διεταράχθη ... 892

Lacuna: Ξ, 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:

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)
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**

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

Byz 01ć, A, C, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj, Trg

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:

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 10:27 ἐμβλέψας αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει· παρὰ ἀνθρώποις ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ’ οὐ παρὰ θεῷ· πάντα γὰρ δυνατὰ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

LXX:
LXX Genesis 18:14 μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα εἰς τὸν καιρὸν τούτον ἀναστρέψω πρὸς σὲ εἰς ὠρας 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

BYZ Luke 1:42 καὶ ἄνεφώνησεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ εἶπεν Ἐὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν καὶ εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου

Byz  A, D, Δ, Ψ, f1, 157, 700, Maj, Gre, Trg

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

ἄνεβωνησεν φωνῇ 01, C, F, Θ, 053, 118, f13, 28, 33, 892, 1071, 1424, pc

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 ἄνεβωνησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ λέγων·
NA28 Mark 15:34 καὶ τῇ ἐνάτῃ ὥρᾳ ἔβωνησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς φωνῇ μεγάλῃ·

NA28 Mark 1:26 καὶ σπαράξαν αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον καὶ φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐξῆλθεν εἰς αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Acts 16:28 ἔφωνησεν δὲ μεγάλῃ φωνῇ [ὁ] Παύλος λέγων·

Here the words are safe.

κραυγῇ 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 φωνῇ. In the same way the change by 01 et al. could be explained, they left φωνῇ, but changed ἄνεφώνησεν to ἄνεβωνῆσεν.

On the other hand, the rare κραυγῇ could have been changed to the more common φωνῇ. 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 Ἄρσιμ: Μεγαλύνει ἡ ψυχή μου τὸν κύριον,

Ἐλλοσάβετ a, b, l*, Irarm, OrLatmss, Nicetas (†414)
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 1:41 καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἦκουσεν τὸν ἀσπασμὸν τῆς Μαρίας ἢ Ἐλλοσάβετ, ἐσκίρτησεν τὸ βρέφος ἐν τῇ κοιλίᾳ αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἀγίου ἢ Ἐλλοσάβετ.

NA28 Luke 1:56 Ἐμείλεν τὸ Ἄρσιμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡς μήνας τρεῖς ... apud Elisabeth Sy-S, Sy-P, sa²ns, geo²ms

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

Invenitur beata Maria, sicut in aliquantis exemplaribus reperimus, 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 Ἐμείλεν ... ὡς αὐτῇ should be either Ἐμείλεν δὲ Αρσίμ σὺν τῇ Ἐλλοσάβετ or simply Ἐμείλεν δὲ σὺν τῇ Ἐλλοσάβετ.
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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 8
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 1:66 καὶ έθεντο πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν λέγοντες· τί ἀρα τὸ παιδίον τούτο ἔσται; καὶ γὰρ χεῖρ κυρίου ἤν μετ’ αὐτοῦ.

omit: D, it(d, ff², l, q), vgms, 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 ἤν. It is also possible that it has been changed deliberately.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 9

BYZ Luke 1:75 ἐν ὀσιότητι 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


Lacuna: Χ, Ξ

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 οὐ δὲ, παιδίον, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ· προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ,

BYZ Luke 1:76 Καὶ οὐ παιδίον προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ· προπορεύσῃ γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδὸς 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: Ξ

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare LXX:

LXX Malachi 3:1 ἴδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου καὶ ἐπιβλέψειται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου

Compare context:


Compare also:

NA28 Mark 1:2 Καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν τῷ Ἡσαίας τῷ προφήτῃ· ἴδος ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου. safe!

NA28 Matthew 11:10 ἴδος ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.

NA28 Luke 7:27 οὕτως ἔστων περὶ οὐ γέγραπται· ἴδος ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὅς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου. safe!

And:

Odes of Solomon 9:76 καὶ οὐ δὲ παιδίον προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ προπορεύσῃ γὰρ πρὸ προσώπου κυρίου ἑτοιμάσαι ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ
εὐνώπιον 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 εὐνώπιον 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)
4. Difficult variant

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

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

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

Byz 01ct, A, C, D, R, Δ, Ξ, Ψ, 0130, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj.
Latt, Sy-H, Gre, Trg

txt P4vid (200 CE), 01*, B, L, W, Θ, 0177, pc, vgms, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, Trgmg

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

ἐπισκέψεται 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 ὁτι 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."
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 ὄνοματι 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.
Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
   (after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 12
5. Difficult variant


BYZ Luke 2:2 ἀўτῃ ἢ ἀπογραφῇ πρώτῃ ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου

Byz 01ε, A, C, L, R, W, Δ, Ξ, 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

ἀўτην ἀπογραφὴν ἐγένετο πρώτη 01*
ἀўτῃ ἐγένετο ἀπογραφή πρώτη D

W: Swanson has here the singular reading ἀўτην ἀπογραφὴ 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:

ἈΥΤἮΝΑΠΟΓΡΑΡΗÑ  ἘΛΒΟΤΗΝΑΠΟΓΡΑΡΗÑ

The peculiarity has been resolved in D by placing the verb before ἀπογραφή. 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 ἢ in brackets?

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 13

BYZ Luke 2:5 ἀπογράψασθαι σὺν Μαριὰμ τῇ μεμηνησεμένη αὐτῷ γυναικὶ, ὀφθη ἐγκύῳ

Byz A, 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 uίος Δαυίδ, μὴ φοβηθῆς παραλαβεῖν Μαρίαν τήν γυναῖκα σου;
NA28 Matthew 1:24 ... καὶ παρέλαβεν τήν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ,

It is possible that γυναῖκι 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)
ΤVU 14

BYZ Luke 2:9 καὶ ἴδοὺ ἀγγέλος 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-Palms, 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

ἵδοιClusters 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:

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 Ὅ δε ἐκατόνταρχος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ τηροῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἰδόντες τὸν σεισμόν 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:

κύριος χριστός    W, Sy-S, Sy-P
χριστός Ἰησοῦς    859, d, Cyprian
χριστός σωτήρ    346(=f13)

χριστός κυρίου    β, r1, vgms, Sy-Pal, Ephraem, cj. (J. Weiss)
χριστός Ἰησοῦς κύριος    e
χριστός    pc3, boms

B: no umlaut

Compare:

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)
6. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

omit B, Ξ, pc², L1043, WH, Weiss, NA²⁸, Gre
txt 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, Maj, Eus, WHmag

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 Μωυσεί λέγων ὅτι ἔσομαι μετὰ σοῦ καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι ἐγώ σε ἐξαποστέλλω ... LXX 1 Samuel 2:34 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον ὃ ἤξει ἐπὶ τοὺς δύο υἱοὺς σου τούτους Οφνι καὶ Φινς εἰς ἡμέρα μιᾷ ἀποβαίνοντα ἀμφότεροι LXX 1 Samuel 10:1 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον ὃτι ἐχρισέν σε κύριος ἐπὶ κληρονομιὰν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἀρχοντα LXX 2 Kings 19:29 καὶ τοῦτό σοι τὸ σημεῖον φάγη τούτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν αὐτόματα LXX Isaiah 37:30 τοῦτο δὲ σοι τὸ σημεῖον φάγη τούτον τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν ἐν ἐσπαρκας LXX Isaiah 38:7 τοῦτο δὲ σοι τὸ σημεῖον παρὰ κυρίου ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ποιήσει τὸ ρήμα τοῦτο LXX Jeremiah 51:29 καὶ τοῦτο ὑμῖν τὸ σημεῖον ὅτι ἐπισκέψομαι ἐγὼ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς εἰς πονηρά LXX Isaiah 7:14 διὰ τοῦτο δώσει κύριος αὐτὸς ὑμῖν σημεῖον ἵδιον ἢ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ ἥξει καὶ τέξεται υἱὸν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ

From LXX usage the article is the norm.
Difficult.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 18


T&T #1

Byz 01\textsuperscript{Cl}, B\textsuperscript{C2}, K, L, P, Δ, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, L1043, δ, Sy, bo, Or\textsuperscript{pt}, Eus, Diatess, WH, Trg\textsuperscript{ma}

omit ἐν: 372, 724, 2737, Sy-S

txt 01*, A, B\textsuperscript{vid}, D, W, 23, Latt, sa, Or\textsuperscript{pt}, goth, Ir\textsuperscript{Lat}, WH\textsuperscript{ma}, NA\textsuperscript{25}, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal

omit ἐν: Lat, Ir\textsuperscript{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 Deao, 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 ἀνθρώποι 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 υψίστως θεῷ,
Καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἀνθρώπως εὐδοκίας.

or:
Δόξα ἐν υψίστως θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς,
Εἰρήνη ἀνθρώπως εὐδοκίας.

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

Hort notes that a trajectory (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 εἰρήνην οὐ γὰρ ἀρμεῖται διδόναι τὴν εἰρήνην, ἀλλ’ ἀπλῶς λέγει: οὐκ ἠλέουν βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, οὐκ εἴπε δὲ εὐδοκίας εἰρήνην, ἀλλὰ ταυτά γε εἴπον παρὰ τοῖς ποιμέσοιν 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 Κοινή 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 Henoch 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 θεῷ and ἀνθρώπος.

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].'

ἀνθρώπος 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 "ἀνθρώποι εὐδοκίας (Lk 2:14)" ZNW 28 (1929) 13-20
- Gerhard v. Rad "Nocheinmal Lk 2:14 ἀνθρώποι 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: ἀνθρώποι εὐδοκίας" ZNW 51 (1960) 132

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
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 ἔως Βηθλεέμ ...

BYZ Luke 2:15 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἀπῆλθον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν οἱ ἄγγελοι καὶ οἱ ἀνθρώποι οἱ ποιμένες εἶπον πρὸς ἀλλήλους Διέλθωμεν δὴ ἔως Βηθλεέμ ...

T&T #2

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

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

565, 1241, pc⁹ 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:

It is possible that οἱ ἀνθρώποι 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 ἀνθρώποι 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 ἀνθρώποι for that reason. Θ goes so far and does both.

It is also possible that καὶ οἱ ἀνθρώποι 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:

**María** 01*, B, D, R, Θ, 372, 1071, 1241, 1424, pc, L1043, WH, NA25, Gre, Trg
**txt** 01*, 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 Μαριάμ for Mary in ch. 1-2:


1:34  C*, D*, 372: Μαριά  2:5  D, 372: Μαριά
1:38  C*, D, Ψ, 372: Μαριά  157: Μαριάν
1:56  D, 372: Μαριά

Lacuna C: 2:5-42

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

For consistency Μαριάμ 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 παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ,

αὐτοῦ D, 118, 205, 209, pc⁶, Lat(a, aur, b, c, d, e, f, ff², g¹, l, r¹, vg), Sy-S, sa⁷, arm, IrLat(Adv.Haer 3.10.5.157-9)

αὐτῆς not 76 see below, Catenae

omit: pc, bopt, Chrys, Diatess depress

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:
TVU 22

Minority reading:

εὐσεβῆς 01*, Κ, Π, Γ, 0211, 565, 700, 1071, 1424, αl12, L253, L854, Sy-H
al = 6, 229, 265, 489, 544, 713, 726, 1079, 1219, 1220, 1223, 1313

01* corrected by 01c2.
Lacuna: C, Ξ

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

εὐλαβῆς and εὐσεβῆς both mean: "devout, godly, pious"

Compare:
NA28 Acts 23:10 Πολλής δὲ γυνομενής στάσεως φοβηθεὶς ὁ χιλίαρχος εὐλαβηθεὶς 014 020 025 αl

εὐσεβῆς 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 ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΣ
3 ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ [Ω]Ν ΕΥΧΒΗΣ
4 ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΚΛΗΣΙΝ ΤΟΥ
5 ΛΑΟΥ
6 ΠΡΟΣΔΕΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ

In modern script:
ο τάφος Συμεών ὃς ἦν (ος Συμεώνος ἦν)
δικαιοτάτος ἄνθρωπος καὶ γέρων
εὐσεβῆς τατος καὶ παράκλησιν τοῦ λαοῦ προσδεχόμενος.

It is interesting to note that some manuscripts which read εὐσεβῆς 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. εὐαεβής 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:

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
9. **Difficult variant**


BYZ Luke 2:33 καὶ ἢν Ἰώσηφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ θαυμάζοντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλομένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ

**T&T #3**

**Byz** A, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, 892, Maj, it, vg*ss*, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bopt, goth

'Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ' N, 33, 579, pc

**txt** 01°C, B, D, L, W, f1, 131, 700, 1241, d, vg, sa, bopt, Or*Lat*

ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ 01*, L, vg*ms*, Sy-S, Sy-Hmg

ὁ πατήρ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ pc

'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


ὤ τε Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ Μαριάμ 1012, a, b, g¹, l, r¹

Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ Μαριάμ c, ff²


omit: a, b, ff², g¹

"your relatives and I" e, β


**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, bopt, 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-Hmg, sa, bopt, 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 Ἰωάννης 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:

**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 δὲ, παιδίον, προφήτης ψύστων κλήθησι· προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον κυρίου ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ,

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

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

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

**Rating:** - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

**External Rating:** 1? (NA probably wrong)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 25

11. **Difficult variant**


**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, pc

**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

BYZ Luke 2:38
καὶ αὐτῇ αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐπιστάσα ανθωμολογεῖτο 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

Χ: 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 2:23 καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου ὅτι πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοίγων μήτραν ἄγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται,

Probably a harmonization to immediate context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
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**


BYZ Luke 2:40 Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠζανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεῦμα, 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, txt

D has ἐκραταιοῦτο καὶ ἠζανεν

Lacuna: C, Ξ
B: no umlaut

αὔξάνω "grow"
kραταιοῦμαι "become strong"

**Compare:**
NA28 Luke 1:80 Τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἠζανεν καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο πνεῦμα

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 πνεῦμα 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:

Not in NA but in SQE!

εὖ αὐτῷ D
"in illo" Lat(aur, f, ff², g'), vg
"in eo" β
"cum illo" it(b, c, l, q, r¹), vg
"cum eo" d
"super illum" e
"super eum" a

Lacuna: C, Ξ
**B: no umlaut**

Compare:
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 ὁ ἐγένετο ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἀναβαινόντων αὐτῶν
catat τὸ ἔθος τῆς ἑορτῆς

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

Byz A, C, 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'), 579, 1241, pc,
d, β, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co, Tρgma

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

Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

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

Infancy Gospel of Thomas (late 2nd CE by Schneemelcher):
19. ὁντος δὲ αὐτοῦ δώδεκα ἐτος 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)

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

Byz A, C, X, Δ, Ψ, 0130, f13, 892, Maj,
it(b, c, f, ff^1, l, q, r'), 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, pc', Lat(a, aur, β, d, e, vg), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Sy-H^mg, sa, bo^pt, arm, geo^1

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 ἐπορεύουσην οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ κατ' ἐτος εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ τῇ ἔορτῇ 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^ms, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^pt
ὁ πατὴρ 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)
14. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

 omit: B, W, 1241, pc
Tis notes additionally: Or<sup>Lat</sup>

οἱ ἀκούοντες Ψ

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

Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 12:23 καὶ ἐξίστατο πάντες οἱ ὅχλοι καὶ ἔλεγον:
NA28 Acts 2:7 ἐξίστατο δὲ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον λέγοντες:
NA28 Acts 2:12 ἐξίστατο δὲ πάντες καὶ διηπόρουν,
NA28 Acts 9:21 ἐξίστατο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες καὶ ἔλεγον:
 omit: P45<sup>vid</sup>, 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)
Minority reading:

καὶ ὀδυνώμενοι D, it(a, d, e, ff², l, q, r'), vg², Sy-C
et tristes

Lat(aur, b, b, 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. ἵνα τοῦτο ἐποίησας ἡμῖν, τέκνον; ἰδοὺ ὀδυνώμενοι ἔζητομέν 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:

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

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

D: κἀγὼ ὁ ὅμωμενοι καὶ λυποῦμενοι εζητοῦμεν σε
 Swanson adds M, 69 for ζητοῦμεν, 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

ἐζητοῦμεν indicative imperfect active 1st person plural
ζητοῦμεν indicative present active 1st person plural
ὁμωμενοι participle present passive nominative masculine plural

Compare:
 NA28 Luke 2:49 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς: τί ὁτι ἐζητεῖτε με; οὐκ ἤδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναι 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 ὁμωμενοι.
 Weiss argues (Com. Lk) that ἐζητοῦμεν 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**


BYZ Luke 2:52 Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν σοφίᾳ καὶ ἠλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώποις

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

*ἐν τῷ* 01, L, Co, Orpt, NA2⁵⁷, Bois, Weiss

*ἐν* B, W, 579, pc, WH

*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 ἤζειν καὶ ἐκρατοῦτο πληροῦμενον σοφία, καὶ χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ’ αὐτό.

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

’Ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν σοφίᾳ καὶ ἠλικίᾳ 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 τῷ 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 σοφίᾳ καὶ ἠλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
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 "Bmg". Does this asterisk indicate that he considers both words as being deleted subsequently? I think the words in the margin are by Bc 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 "3:3". 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 ὀρεινῆς 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 ὀρεινῆς. ὀρεινῆς 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 ὀρεινῆς? 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 ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν,

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 Ἰεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου,
NA28 Mark 1:5 καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα καὶ οἱ Ἰεροσολυμίται πάντες,

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 14:35 καὶ ἐπιγινόντες αὐτὸν οἱ ἀνδρεὶς τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου ἀπέστειλαν εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον ἐκείνην καὶ προσήηνεγκαί αὐτῷ πάντας τοὺς κακῶς ἔχοντας
NA28 Mark 1:28 καὶ ἠχύληθεν ἡ ἀκοή αὐτοῦ εὕθες πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περίχωρον τῆς Γαλιλαίας.
NA28 Luke 7:17 καὶ ἠχύληθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ πᾶσῃ τῇ περιχώρῳ. omit τῆς: Δ
NA28 Luke 8:37 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν ἀπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασσηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν,
NA28 Acts 14:6 συνιδόντες κατέφυγον εἰς τὰς πόλεις τῆς Λυκαονίας Δύστραν καὶ Δέρβην καὶ τὴν περιχώρου.
Compare LXX:
LXX Genesis 13:10 καὶ ἐπάρας Ὁωτ τοὺς ὁφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἶδεν πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου ὅτι πᾶσα ἦν ποτιζομένη
LXX Genesis 13:11 καὶ ἐξελέξατο ἑαυτῷ Ὁωτ πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ ἀπήρεν Ὁωτ ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ διεχωρίσθησαν ἐκαστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ

The only occurrence without the article:
LXX Deuteronomy 3:13 καὶ τὸ κατάλοιπον τοῦ Γαλααδ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν Βασαν βασιλείαν Ὡγ ἔδωκα τῷ ἡμίσει φυλῆς Μανασσῆ καὶ πᾶσαν περίχωρον Ἀργοβ

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 πληρωθῆσαι καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθῆσαι, καὶ ἔσται τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείαν καὶ αἱ τραχείαι εἰς ὀδοὺς λείας:

εὐθείας adjective accusative feminine plural
εὐθείαν adjective accusative feminine singular
λείας adjective accusative feminine plural

Compare previous verse:
NA28 Luke 3:4 ὥς γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὀδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ·

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 3:3 αὕτος γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ρηθεὶς διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου λέγοντος· φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὀδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 1:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ· ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὀδὸν κυρίου, εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ,

LXX parallel:
LXX Isaiah 40:3 φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὀδὸν κυρίου εὐθείας ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
LXX Isaiah 40:4 πᾶσα φάραγξ πληρωθῆσαι καὶ πᾶν ὄρος καὶ βουνὸς ταπεινωθῆσαι καὶ ἔσται πάντα τὰ σκολιὰ εἰς εὐθείαν καὶ ἡ τραχεία εἰς πεδία

pedía 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 ὀλίγος is safe! Here Isaiah uses the plural πεδία.

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

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

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
17. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 3:7 "Ελέγεν οὖν τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις οὐχ οἱ βαπτισθήναι ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ: γεννήματα ἐχθρῶν, τίς ὑπέδειξεν ὑμῖν φυγεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>βαπτισθήναι ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ</th>
<th>D, it(b, d, e, l, q, r¹), Bois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coram ipso</td>
<td>b, l, q, r¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in conspectus eius</td>
<td>d, e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>βαπτισθήναι</th>
<th>Sy-S, Sy-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>omit:</td>
<td>Sy-C, boⁿˢᵉ*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ἔξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χῶρα καὶ οἱ Ἰεροσολυμῖται πάντες, καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ ἐξομολογούμενοι τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν.

NA28 John 3:23 Ἡν δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Ἄινῳ ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ, ὅτι ὤδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ, καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο.

Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiphanius):

καὶ ἐξήλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν φαρισαίοι καὶ ἐβαπτίθησαν καὶ πᾶσα Ἰεροσόλυμα.

Possibly txt is a harmonization to Mt, Mk.

Burkitt (Evangelion Intro, p. 288) writes:

"Possibly therefore the disturbing cause is the Western reading βαπτισθήναι 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:

omit: P4(200 CE), Lat(a, aur, ff², vgms), boms, Or²⁰
Lachmann and WH both in brackets

καρποὺς καλοὺς D, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P

omit 1. καὶ: D, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 3:10 ἥδη δὲ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ρίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται. πᾶν οὖν δένδρον μὴ ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν ἐκκόπτεται καὶ εἰς πῦρ βάλλεται.

omit: pc, Sy-S, Ir²⁰

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

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 homoioarcton κα – κα or homoiooteleuton -ον -ον.
It is noteworthy that WH have καλόν 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 ἐπηρωτῶν αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες: τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν ἦν;

ἀνασώθωμεν D, b, d, q, Sy-C, sa
ut vivamus b, g, t, q, vg
salbi simus d

NA28 Luke 3:12 ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τελῶναι βαπτισθήναι καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὸν· διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσωμεν ἦν;

ἀνασώθωμεν D, d salbi simus


τί ποιήσωμεν ἀνασώθωμεν D, d salbi simus

Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

No parallel.
Compare:
NA28 Acts 16:30 καὶ προαγαγῶν αὐτοὺς ἐξώ ἔφη· κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἀνασώθω;

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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
18. **Difficult variant**

**Minority reading:**


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

Tert, Aug: "in spiritu et igni."

Cl: ἔρχεται δὲ μου ὅπισω 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 ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. 

BYZ Matthew 3:11 αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ

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

txt P101\textsuperscript{11}, 01, B, C, K, Π, L, M, U, W, Δ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 565, 892?

Lat, Sy, Co

NA28 Mark 1:8 ἔγω ἔβαπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

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

NA28 Luke 4:1 Ἡσοῦς δὲ πλὴρης πνευματος ἁγίου ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ


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

Note that the IQP Crit.Ed. has ἁγίῳ in double brackets (= "probable but uncertain"). They comment: "Is ἁγίῳ 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:

omit 01*, B, (D), Ξ, pc, b, d, e, Co, WH, NA28, Gre, Tis, Bal, Bois  

ἐνέκλεισεν  D

txt 01C2, 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 ὦ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης κρατήσας τὸν Ἰωάννην ἔδησεν καὶ ἐν φυλακῇ ἀπέθετο διὰ Ἡρῳδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 6:17 Αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ Ἡρῴδης ἀποστείλας ἐκράτησεν τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἔδησεν αὐτὸν ἐν φυλακῇ διὰ Ἡρῳδιάδα τὴν γυναῖκα Φιλίππου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, ὦτι 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 ἁγιὸν σωματικῶς εἶδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν, καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι: 
spathēs, ὦ οὗτος μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοι εὐδόκησα.

ο̣ς οὗτος μου εἶ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα 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.

ui̊ς μοι εἰ σὺ ἀγαπητός, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε

Clement (Paed., I, 25, 2)

σὺ μου εἰ ὦ οὗτος ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοι εὐδόκησα.
καὶ πάλιν· ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε

Gospel of the Ebionites (Epiphanius Panarion 30:13)

Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ὁ διάβολος, ἀμα τῷ ἀναβῆναι αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου τῆς φωνῆς αὐτῶ λεχθέισης·
i̊ς μοι εἰ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα σε
ἐν τοῖς ἀπομημονεύσι σῶν ἀποστόλων γέγραπται,
προσελθὼν αὐτῷ καὶ πειράζων μέχρι τοῦ ἐξεπν αὐτῷ· προσκύνησον 

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 perhbeatur, 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 υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

NA28 Matthew 3:17 καὶ ἴδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὦ εὐδόκησα.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 17:5 καὶ ἴδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὦ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

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

BYZ Luke 9:35 Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε

NA28 2 Peter 1:17 λαβὼν γὰρ παρὰ θεοῦ πατρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν φωνῆς ἐνεχθέσθη σαυτὸς τοιάδε ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης· ὁ υἱὸς 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 υἱὸς μου εἰ σὺ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγένηκα 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"

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

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 unconvenient, 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
kaì kataβήναi toì pneûìma toì áγιον soìmatikì kai eìdei  
and the Holy Spirit descended upon him in bodily form
P4 has:
kaì kataβήναi toì PNA toì áγιον PNI eìdei  
which expands:
kaì kataβήναi toì pneûìma toì áγιον pneûmati(κω) eìdei  
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 πνεüματικὁ means. The correct abbreviation for πνεûματικὁ would be πνευκω.
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).

Rating: - (indecisive)
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 NA:

23 Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἡλί 24 τοῦ Μαθθατ τοῦ Λευί τοῦ Μελχὶ τοῦ Ἰανναίς τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ 25 τοῦ Ματθαίου τοῦ Ἀμώς τοῦ Ναοῦ τοῦ Ἑσλὶ τοῦ Ναγγαί 26 τοῦ Μᾶθο τοῦ Ματθαίου τοῦ Σεμεὼν τοῦ Ἰωσῆ τοῦ Ἰωδᾶ 27 τοῦ Ἰωαννᾶ τοῦ Ἡρώου τοῦ Ζωροβαβέλ τοῦ Σαλαθίηλ τοῦ Νηρί 28 τοῦ Μελχὶ τοῦ Ἀδδί τοῦ Κωσᾶμ τοῦ Ἑλμαδάμ τοῦ Ἠρ 29 τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ἑλλέζερ τοῦ Ἰωρίμ τοῦ Μαθθατ τοῦ Λευί 30 τοῦ Συμεών τοῦ Ἰουδαί τοῦ Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ Ἑλλάκτω τοῦ Ἑλλάδ καὶ τοῦ Μειναὶ τοῦ Ματθαὰ τοῦ Ναθαμί τοῦ Δαυίδ 32 τοῦ Ἰεσσαί τοῦ Ἰωβῆδ τοῦ Βός τοῦ Σαλὰ τοῦ Ναασωιν 33 τοῦ Ἀμιναδὰβ τοῦ Ἀδμῖν τοῦ Ἀρνὶ τοῦ Ἑσρώμ τοῦ Φάρες τοῦ Ἰουδᾶ 34 τοῦ Ἱακώβ τοῦ Ἰακὼκ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ τοῦ Θάρα τοῦ Ναχώρ 35 τοῦ Σερουχ τοῦ Ραγαί τοῦ Φάλεκ τοῦ Ἐβερ τοῦ Σαλὰ 36 τοῦ Καϊνᾶμ τοῦ Ἀρφαξὰδ τοῦ Σήμη τοῦ Ὁσὺ τοῦ Λάμεχ 37 τοῦ Μαθουσαλὰ τοῦ Ἐνώχ τοῦ Ἰάρετ τοῦ Μαλελεὴλ τοῦ Καϊνᾶμ 38 τοῦ Ἐνώκ τοῦ Σήθ τοῦ Ἀδὰμ 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 ... νεός Ἰωσὴφ τοῦ Ἰακὼβ
24 τοῦ Μαθθαν τοῦ Ελεάζαρ τοῦ Ελιουντ τοῦ Ιαχειν τοῦ Σαδωκ
25 τοῦ Αζωρ τοῦ Ελλακιμ τοῦ Αβιουντ τοῦ Ζωροβαβελ
26 τοῦ Σαλαθιηλ τοῦ Ιεχουου τοῦ Ἰωακιμ τοῦ Ἑλλακιμ ἀποτ Αφρ.
27 τοῦ Ἰωσεία τοῦ Ἀμώς τοῦ Μανασση τοῦ Ἑζεκεια
28 τοῦ Ἀγας τοῦ Ἰωθαν τοῦ Ωειεί τοῦ Ἀμαῖου
29 τοῦ Ἰωας τοῦ Οχαζίου τοῦ Ἰωραμ τοῦ Ἰωσαφαδ
30 του Άσαρ του Αβιουδ του Ροβοαμ του Σολομών
31 του Δαυιδ
32 του Ιεσσαί του Ωβελ του Βοος του Σαλμών του Ναασσων
33 του Αμειναδαβ του Αραμ του Ασρωμ του Φαρες του Ιουδά
34 του Ιακώβ του Ισακ του Αβραάμ του Θαρα του Ναχωρ
35 του Σερουχ του Ράγαου του φαλεκ του Εβερ του Σαλα
36 του Αρφαζάδ του Σημ του Νεε του Λαμεχ
37 του Μαθουσάλα του Αινώχ του Ιαρέδ του Μαλελεπλ του Καναν
38 του Αινως του Σηθ του Αδαμ του θό

Matthew 1:6-16 reversed:

16 Ἦωσηφ, Ἰακώβ,
14-15 Μαθᾶν, Ἐλεάζαρ, Ἐλιουδ, Ἀχίμ, Σαδώκ,
13 Ἀζώρ, Ἐλιακίμ, Ἀβιουδ, Ζοροβαβέλ,
11-12 Σαλαθηλῆ, Ἰεχουνᾶς,
9-10 Ἰωσίας, Ἀμώς, Μανασσῆς, Ἐζεκίας,
9 Ἀχαζ, Ἰωαθάμ, Ὀζίαν,
8 Ἰωράμ, Ἰωσαφάτ,
7 Ἀσάφ, Ἀβιὰ, Ἀροβάμ, Σολομών,
6 Δαυιδ

Notes:
- Aphraates omits tou Eliakeim. 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, Ελιακίμ is just another name for Ἰωακίμ. Perhaps a marginal gloss that found its way into the text?
- Ἰωακίμ is a well known addition in Mt 1:11. Support:
  - M, U, Θ, Σ, f1, 33, 1342, al³⁶⁸, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, geo, (IrLat), Epiph
- The addition of του Αμασίου του Ιωας του Ὀχοζίου 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 Ἰωράμ νῦν αὐτῶν Ὀχοζία, νῦν αὐτῶν Ιωας νῦν αὐτῶν 12 Αμασίας νῦν αὐτῶν Αζαρία, νῦν αὐτῶν Ἰωαθαν νῦν αὐτῶν
- 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 Hizechiam.
Hizechias autem genuit Manassen.
Manasses autem genuit Amon.
Amon autem genuit Josiam.
Josias autem genuit Jeconiam
et fratres ejus, in transmigratione
Babylonis. Et post transmigrationem Babylonis,
Jeconias 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 Eileazar.
Eileazar 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 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)
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 ܢܘܹܐܢܝܐ "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 Matthaüs" ZNW 22 (1923) 206-228
TVU 47
NA28 Luke 3:33 τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀδμήν τοῦ Ἄρνη τοῦ Ἐσρώμ τοῦ Φάρες τοῦ Ἰούδα

BYZ Luke 3:33 τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἄραμ, τοῦ Ἐσρώμ τοῦ Φάρες τοῦ Ἰούδα

Byz τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἄραμ
    A, D, Π, 33, 565, 1424, Maj-part, Lat, Sy-P, goth, Trg
τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἄραμ τοῦ Ἰωάμ
    K, M, S, Υ, Δ, Ψ, 118, 205, 209, 2542, (=f1), 28, 700, 892, 1071, Maj-part, b, e, δ, Sy-H

txt τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀδμήν τοῦ Ἄρνη
    01, L, X, Γ, f13, 157, pc, bo, NA28, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Tis
τοῦ Ἀδαμ τοῦ Ἀδμήν τοῦ Ἄρνη
    P4 4th (200 CE), 01*, 1241, pc, Sy-S, sa
    τοῦ Ἀδμήν τοῦ Ἄρνη B, WH, Trg, Bal
    τοῦ Ἀδαμ τοῦ Ἄρνη Sy-S, WHmg (!)

Mixed:
τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἀδμήν τοῦ Ἄρνη Θ, f1, pc, arab
τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἀδμήν τοῦ Ἄρνη 0102
τοῦ Ἀμιναδάβ τοῦ Ἀράμ τοῦ Ἄρνη 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)

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.

Sy-S: acc. to Burkitt the words τοῦ Ἀδαμ τοῦ Ἄρνη were added "between the lines".
W and 579 omit the genealogy in Lk completely.
Lacuna: C, Ξ, Sy-C
B: no umlaut

There are certain different genealogies in Lk. Compare above!

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 1:3 ... Ἐσρώμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀράμ, ἦ Ἀράμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἀμμανάδᾶβ, ...
NA28 Matthew 1:8 Ἀσάφ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωσαφάτ, Ἰωσαφάτ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰωράμ, Ἰωράμ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ὀζίαν,

The names Ἁδμὼν and Ἄρνι 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 Θ 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. Ἀμμανάδᾶβ is sometimes written as Ἀμμανάδაμ, which might explain the Ἁδμὼν 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 x 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 Ἅρφαξαδ τοῦ Σήμ τοῦ Νῶε τοῦ Λάμεχ

omit: P75vid, 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 qynm (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):

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:

Lacuna: C, Ξ, Sy-C
B: no umlaut

Context:
NA28 Luke 3:35 τοῦ Σεροῦχ τοῦ Ῥαγαῦ τοῦ Φάλεκ τοῦ Ἐβερ τοῦ Σαλὰ
36 τοῦ Καϊνάμ τοῦ Ἅρφαξαδ τοῦ Σήμ τοῦ Νῶε τοῦ Λάμεχ
37 τοῦ Μαθουσαλὰ τοῦ Ἑωνῆ τοῦ Ἰάρετ τοῦ Μαλεληὰ τοῦ Καὺνὰμ
38 τοῦ Ἑωνῆς τοῦ Σήθ τοῦ Ἄδαμ τοῦ θεοῦ.

LXX parallels:
LXX Genesis 10:22 υἱὸι Σήμ Αϊλαμ καὶ Ασσουρ καὶ Αρφαξαδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Αραμ καὶ Καινὰμ 23 καὶ υἱὸι Αραμ ...
LXX Genesis 10:24 καὶ Αρφαξαδ εγέννησεν τὸν Καινὰμ καὶ Καινὰμ εγέννησεν τὸν Σαλά Σαλά δὲ εγέννησεν τὸν Εβερ
LXX Genesis 11:12 καὶ ξησεν Αρφαξαδ ἕκατὸν τριάκοντα πέντε ἔτη καὶ εγέννησεν τὸν Καινὰμ
LXX Genesis 11:13 καὶ ξησεν Αρφαξαδ μετὰ τὸ γεννῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Καινὰμ ἔτη τετρακόσια τριάκοντα καὶ εγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ ἀπέθανεν καὶ ξησεν Καινὰμ ἕκατὸν τριάκοντα ἔτη καὶ εγέννησεν τὸν Σαλὰ καὶ ξησεν Καινὰμ μετὰ τὸ γεννῆσαι αὐτὸν τὸν Σαλὰ ἔτη τριάκοσια τριάκοντα καὶ εγέννησεν υἱοὺς καὶ θυγατέρας καὶ ἀπέθανεν
LXX Genesis 11:16 καὶ ξησεν Εβερ ἕκατὸν τριάκοντα τέσσαρα ἔτη καὶ εγέννησεν τὸν Φαλεκ

But note the Hebrew:

The important point here is that the name Καινὰμ 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 Καινὰμ 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 Ἡλλὰ ταυτοῦ Μαθαθᾶτ c
verse 24 omit τοῦ Μελχὶ 1220
omit τοῦ Ἰανναὶ τοῦ Ἰωσῆφ 1005
omit τοῦ Ἰανναὶ 115, L1056
verse 25 omit τοῦ Ἁμώς 1200, a, b, c, e, l
omit τοῦ Ναουμ L10
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:
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 Καιναν in Gen 10:22 is the brother of Αρφαξαδ, but in 10:24 he is his son?

But note: Josephus (37-100 CE), who quotes the LXX, does not have Καιναν. 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 Καιναν, 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 Καιναν in Genesis 11. Vulgate is uniform in rejecting Καιναν." [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 Græc.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 Καιναν would have been at the end of the list. It is not there. We have: ... } RPK$D LWD
Looking this up in the Göttingen edition, the papyri P833, P911 and P961 omit \( \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \nu \) 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 \( \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \nu \) is from the late 3rd CE (P911).

The only (possible) pre-Christian reference to \( \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \nu \) can be found in Jubilees. Jubilees was written around 109-105 BCE. The possible references are in ch. 7 and 8. There is no \( \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \nu \) 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 \( \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \nu \) 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 Kainan. [...] 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; [...] 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: \( \text{Αφαξαδ̄} - \kappa \alpha \nu \nu \alpha \nu - \Sigma \alpha \lambda \alpha - \text{Εβερ} \)

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

BYZ Luke 4:2 ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα 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 νυστεύσας ἡμέρας τεσσεράκοντα καὶ νύκτας τεσσεράκοντα, ὑστερον ἐπείνασεν.

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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
NA28 Luke 4:4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἐπὶ ἁρτῳ μόνῳ ζῆσεται ὁ ἀνθρωπός.


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)
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 ψηλὸν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου

Byz ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ψηλὸν
A, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0102, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, Maj,
it(f, ff, l, q), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo mss, goth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ó διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ψηλὸν λίαν</th>
<th>f13, c, r1, vg mss, sa mss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰς ὄρος ψηλὸν λίαν</td>
<td>D, 788 (=f13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς ὄρος ψηλὸν</td>
<td>01C, f1, 700, 2542, pc, sa mss, bo pt, arm, geo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς ὄρος</td>
<td>W, e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;satanas&quot;</td>
<td>aur, b, g1, vg mss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Lacuna: C, Ξ
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 4:8 Πάλιν παραλαμβάνει αὐτὸν ὁ διάβολος εἰς όρος ψηλὸν 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 ψηλὸν λίαν with ψηλὸν λίαν in double brackets indicating doubt that text was present there. This is odd, because both Mt and Lk have ψηλὸν. Fleddermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has ὁ διάβολος εἰς ὄρος ψηλὸν without λίαν.
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
  (after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 52

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

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

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

txt 01, B, Δ, L, W, Ξ, f1, 788(f13), 22, 33, 579, 700, 892\textsuperscript{*}, 1241, 2542, pc\textsuperscript{7}, Lat(a, aur, c, d, f, ff\textsuperscript{2}, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, arm, geo, goth, Justin\textsuperscript{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.

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

Lacuna: C

B: umlaut (1310 C 25 L)

καὶ ἀποκριθέεις ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· γέγραπται· κύριον

B has καὶ ἀποκριθέεις αὐτῷ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς γέγραπται· κύριον

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

Parallel:

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

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

txt 01, B, C\textsuperscript{*}, K, W, Δ, f1, f13, 565, 579\textsuperscript{*}, 700, 892\textsuperscript{*}, k, vg, Sy-P, mae, bo, Or

Byz C\textsuperscript{c}, D, L, Z, 33, 118\textsuperscript{5}, 579\textsuperscript{c}, 1071, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa\textsuperscript{ms}, bo\textsuperscript{ms}

[A, Θ lacuna]

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 16:23 στραφεῖς εἶπεν τῷ Πέτρῳ· ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ·

NA28 Mark 8:33 ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὑπαγε 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:**

**ἀνοίξας** A, B, L, W, Ξ, 788 (=f13), 33, 579, 892, 1241, pc³, NA²⁵, WH, Weiss, Trg

pc = 1195, 1210c, 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:**

Regarding ἀνοίγω compare also: Rev 5:1-5

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

ἀναπτύξας 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 εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαει αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστείλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,

BYZ Luke 4:18 Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ` ἐμέ οὐ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν, κηρύξαει αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν ἀποστείλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει

BYz A, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f1, 157, 579\textsuperscript{mg}, 892\textsuperscript{mg}, 1241, Maj, f, vg\textsuperscript{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo\textsuperscript{mss}, Ir\textsuperscript{lat}

... τῇ καρδίᾳ pc\textsuperscript{20}

txt 01, B, D, L, W, Ε, 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 εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ τὴν καρδίαν B, L\textsuperscript{2}, C\textsuperscript{2}
kηρύξαει αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφεσιν 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 4:25 ἐπ' ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλαὶ χήραι ἠσαν ἐν ταῖς ἁμέρας ᾿Ηλίου ἐν τῷ Ῥιζαήλ, ὅτε ἐκλείασθε ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ ἑτη τρία καὶ μήνας ἕξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν 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
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare Lukan usage:

NA28 Acts 13:31 ὡς ὄφθη ἐπὶ ἁμέρας πλείους τοῖς συναναβάσασιν αὐτῷ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς Ιερουσαλήμ,
NA28 Acts 16:18 τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει ἐπὶ πολλὰς ἁμέρας.
NA28 Acts 17:2 ἐπὶ σάββατα τρία διελέξατο αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν,
NA28 Acts 19:8 Ἐἰσελθὼν δὲ εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν ἐπαρρησιάζετο ἐπὶ μῆνας τρεῖς.
NA28 Acts 19:10 τοῦτο δὲ ἐγένετο ἐπὶ ἑτη δύο, ὡστε πάντας τοὺς κατουκοῦντας τὴν Ἀσίαν ἀκούσα τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἑλληνας.
NA28 Acts 19:34 ἐπηγνώντες δὲ ὅτι Ἰουδαίος ἦστιν, φωνὴ ἐγένετο μία ἐκ πάντων ως ἐπὶ ώρας δύο κραζόντων· μεγάλη ἡ Ἀρτεμίς ᾿Εφεσίων.

Occurrences without ἐπὶ:
NA28 Luke 2:36 Καὶ ἦν ᾿Αννα προφήτις, ... ζήσασα μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἐτη ἐπὶ ἀπὸ τῆς παρθενίας αὐτῆς
NA28 Luke 12:19 καὶ ἐρώ τῷ ψυχῆ μου, ψυχῆ, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κεῖμενα εἰς ἑτη πολλὰ·
NA28 Luke 13:11 καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνὴ πνεῦμα ἔχουσα ἀσθενείας ἐτη δεκακοτῶς
NA28 Luke 13:16 ταύτην δὲ θυγατέρα ᾿Αβραάμ οὐσαν, ἦν ἔδησεν ὁ σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἑτη
NA28 Acts 7:6 ... καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ κακώσουσιν ἐτη τετρακόσια.
NA28 Acts 7:36 οὗτος ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ποιήσας τέρατα καὶ σημεία ἐν γῆ Αἰγύπτω καὶ ἐν ἐρυθρᾷ θαλάσσῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτη τεσσεράκοντα.

ΕΠΙ ΕΤΗ
ΕΤΗ
Both words look similar. Possibly some accidental error?
ἐτη 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:

Σύραν cj. (Julius Wellhausen, 1844-1918)

Context:
NA28 Luke 4:25 ἐπ’ ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, πολλαὶ χήραι ἦσαν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ᄂΗλίου ἐν τῷ ᄂΗσαρῆλ, ὅτε ἐκκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανὸς ἐπὶ ἐτή τριά καὶ μήνας ἕξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, 26 καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέμψε ΄Ηλίας εἰ μὴ εἰς Σάρπετα τῆς Σιδωνίας πρὸς γυναῖκα χήραν. 27 καὶ πολλοὶ λεπροὶ ἦσαν ἐν τῷ ᄂΗσαρῆλ ἐπὶ ᄂΕἰλισαίου τοῦ προφήτου, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκαθαρίσθη εἰ μὴ Ναιμᾶν ὃ ᄂ΢ύρος.

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:

καὶ Ἰλαρίων

D, it(b, c, d, e, ff², l, r'), vg

Lat(a, aur, f, q, vg) reads txt.  
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Mark 1:29 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ τῆς συναγωγῆς ἐξελθόντες ἤλθον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν Σίμωνος καὶ Ἰλαρίων 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 ἤρωτησαν αὐτὸν.
There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 58

22. Difficult variant:


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, Tis

P75: not in NA, IGNTP notes it as "vid". Münster in their online "NT transcripts" give it as κραζείς. 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:
Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 8:28 ... δύο δαίμονις ὁμολογοῦντες τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ; ἠλθεὶς ὁ δὲ πρὸ καιροῦ βασανίσαι ἡμᾶς;

NA28 Matthew 9:27 κράζοντες κραυγάζοντες 01, C*

NA28 Matthew 14:30 ἔκραξεν ἔκραύγασεν 565

NA28 Matthew 15:22 ἔκραξεν ἔκραύγασεν 01, C2, B, D, Θ, f1, 700, 892, pc ἔκραζον C, L, W, Maj ἔκραυγαζόν M, L844, L2211, pc


NA28 Mark 5:5 κράζων κραυγάζων f13

NA28 Mark 15:13 ἔκραξαν ἔκραυγαζόν 565, (700), 1071

NA28 John 11:43 ἔκραυγαζεν ἐκράξεν C*, W

NA28 John 12:13 ἐκραύγαζον ἐκραύγασσαν P75, 01, B C2, D, L, Q, W, 579, L844, al ἐκραζόν P66, B* A, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Or

NA28 John 19:6 ἐκραυγάσαν ἐκραζαν 01*

NA28 John 19:12 ἐκραυγάσαν ἐκραζόν 01 C2, Maj
A typical variation. It is possible that κράζωντα 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

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

Byz  A, Q, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f1, f13, 157, 892, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo², 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, bo², arm, Marcion¹, 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 ζωντος.

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**


T&T #5

Byz   A, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 700, 1071, Maj,
      Latt, Sy-P, Sy-Η inaug, bopt, goth, Trg

txt   P75, 01, B, C, L, Q, R, f1, 22, 131, 157, 579, 892, 1241, al53, Lect,
      Sy-S, Sy-H, sa, bopt, WH, NA28, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trgma

τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Γαλιλαίας  447, 740
τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας  744c (744* = Byz)

tديدة Ιουδαίων   W, 713, 1282c, 2147
αὐτῶν   517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc5 (= 505, 702, 976, 1048, 2522)

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Compare:


Parallels:

NA28 Mark 1:39 Καὶ ἤλθεν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς αὐτῶν εἰς όλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ τὰ δαίμονια ἑκβάλλων.

"Judaean" Latms (s. Zahn)

NA28 Matthew 4:23 Καὶ περιήγη οὖν ὡλὴ τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ διδάσκων ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας

Note previous verse:

Note next verse:
NA28 Luke 5:1 ... αὐτὸς ἦν ἐστῶς παρὰ τῇν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ

Note also:
NA28 Mark 1:28 καὶ ἔξηλθεν ἡ ἀκοὴ αὐτοῦ εὐθὺς πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην τὴν περιχώρου τῆς Γαλιλαίας.
01*: Ἰουδαίας (28: Ἰορδάνου)

NA28 Luke 1:26 Ἐν δὲ τῷ μηνὶ τῷ ἔκτῳ ἀπεστάλη ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριὴλ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἥ ὄνομα Ναζαρέθ
01*: Ἰουδαίας (pc: Ἰούδα)

NA28 Luke 23:55 Κατακολουθήσασα δὲ αἱ γυναίκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνελθησθεῖσαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ,
179: Ἰουδαίας (IGNTP)

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

NA28 Mark 1:5 καὶ ἔξηπορεύετο 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)
24. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>δύο πλοῖα</th>
<th>P75, 01(^{ce}), C(^{c3}), D, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700, Maj, Lat, Bois, Trg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>πλοῖα</th>
<th>01(^{*})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πλοῖα δύο</td>
<td>B, W, 579, 892, pc, e, WH, Bal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>δύο πλοιάρια</th>
<th>A, C(^{<em>}), L, Q(^{sic}), R, Ψ, 1(^{</em>}), 33, 1071, 1241, 1424, al, a, f, NA(^{fe}), WH(^{ma}), Gre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πλοιάρια δύο</td>
<td>Weiss (no manuscript support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

**Compare:**

NA28 John 6:23 ἀλλὰ ἤλθεν πλοιάρια ἐκ Τιβεριάδος ἐγώς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>πλοῖα</th>
<th>P75, (01), B, W, Ψ, 157, pc, Lat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πλοιάρια</td>
<td>A, (D), L, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 1071, 1424, Maj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA28 John 6:24 ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια καὶ ἠλθον εἰς Ἐκαρναμοῦν ήτούντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>πλοῖα</th>
<th>(01), A, Θ, f1, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πλοιάρια</td>
<td>P75, 01(^{ce}), B, L, N, W, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, al</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA28 Luke 5:3 ἐμβάς δὲ εἰς ἐν τῶν πλοῖων.

NA28 Luke 5:7 καὶ κατένευσαν τοὺς μετόχους ἐν τῷ ἑτέρῳ πλοῖῳ

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 διώκειν makes it suspect.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
   (after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 62

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 5:5 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς Σίμων εἶπεν ἐπιστάτα, δὴ ὦλης νυκτὸς κοπιᾶσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματι σου χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα.

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

B: no umlauts

NA28 Luke 8:24 προσελθόντες δὲ διηγείραν αὐτόν 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

didáskale a, c, e, r¹ (magister)

NA28 Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τις ὁ ἅψαμενός μου; ἀρνούμενων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὀχλοὶ συνέχουσιν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.

didáskale 157, a, d, r¹ (magister)


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


didáskale P45, C*, L, Ξ, 157, 892, 1342, pc, e, a, d, r¹, vg⁸⁸, Sy-H⁰⁹⁰, bo

omit: Sy-C


omit: 472
Probably changed to avoid the unusual (for the NT) term.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
25. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 5:10 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην γίνος Ζεβεδαίου, οἱ ἦσαν κοινωνοὶ τῷ Σίμωνι. καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Σίμωνα ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἄνθρωπος ἔσῃ 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 Ἰωσῆφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας,
Πιλᾶτον ὁ Ἰωσῆφ  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

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, Trq
txt 01, B, L, W, Ξ, 579, 2542, pc⁸, Sy-S, sa, Trq₂⁷
pc = 313, 371, 434, 752, 1016, 1264, 1821, 1822

πάντας K, bo₇
αὐτοὺς 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 δύναμις ... αὐτόν 1241 (h.t. καὶ ... καὶ?)
X omits καὶ δύναμις κυρίου ἦν for unknown reasons.
B: no umlaut

εἰς τὸ ἱάσθαι αὐτόν AcI "for his healing"
εἰς τὸ ἱάσθαι αὐτούς "to heal them"

Compare:
NA²⁷ Luke 4:40 Δύναμος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἀπαντεῖς ήσοι εἴχοι ἀσθενοῦντας νόσον ποικίλαις ἥγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ ἐνὶ ἕκαστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεῖς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς.

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


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 ἐκστασίς ἔλαβεν ἀπαντας a

f13: 230, 346, 828, 983 have the words.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:8 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ ὀχλοὶ ἐφοβήθησαν καὶ ἔδόξασαν τὸν θεόν τὸν δόντα ἐξουσίαν τοιαύτην τοῖς ἀνθρώπους.

NA28 Mark 2:12 καὶ ἤγερθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον ἐξῆλθεν ἐμπροσθεὶς πάντων, ὡστε 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


Byz 01*, C, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892mg, Maj, Latt, Sy, bopt, goth, [Trg]

txt P4(200 CE), 01, B, L, W, Ξ, 33, 157, 892*, 1241, pc, sa, bopt

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 ἠμεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι νηστεύομεν [πολλά], οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σοῦ οὐ νηστεύοσιν;

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 νηστεύοσιν, οἱ δὲ σοὶ μαθηταὶ οὐ νηστεύοσιν;

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 αὐτοῦ· 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 ἀποκριθεῖς 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!
TVU 67

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 5:33 Οἱ δὲ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὸν· οἱ μαθηταὶ ᾽Ιωάννου νηστεύουσιν πικνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται ὡμοίως καὶ οἱ τῶν Φαρισαίων, οἱ δὲ σοὶ ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν.

οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ σοι 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

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)
Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 5:36 "Ελεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι οὐδὲς ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἰματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἰμάτιον παλαιὸν· εἶ δὲ μὴ γε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἐπίβλημα τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ.

BYZ Luke 5:36 "Ελεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι Οὐδὲς ἐπίβλημα ἰματίου καινοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἰμάτιον παλαιὸν· εἶ δὲ μὴ γε, καὶ τὸ καινὸν σχίσει καὶ τῷ παλαιῷ οὐ συμφωνήσει τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ.

Not in NA, and only Byz in SQE!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ἰματίου καινοῦ</th>
<th>ἀπὸ ἰματίου καινοῦ</th>
<th>A, C, R, Δ, Ψ, 565, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, goth, X, f13, 700, Sy-H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἰματίου καινοῦ σχίσας</td>
<td>ἀπὸ ἰματίου καινοῦ σχίσας</td>
<td>Ψ, 157*, 579, Θ, Sy-P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P4: Acc. to Comfort P4* reads: ἀπὸ ἰματίου 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 οὐδὲς δὲ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπίβλημα ράκους ἄγναφον ἐπὶ ἰμάτιῳ παλαιῷ· αἰρεῖ γὰρ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰματίου καὶ χείρον σχίσα γίνεται.

NA28 Mark 2:21 Οὐδὲς ἐπίβλημα ράκους ἄγναφον ἐπιράπτει ἐπὶ ἰμάτιον παλαιὸν· εἰ δὲ μὴ, αἰρεῖ τὸ πλήρωμα ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ καὶ χείρον σχίσα 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 σχίζας 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 οὐδὲς ἐπίβλημα ἀπὸ ἰματίου καὶ νοῦ σχίσας ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἰμάτιον παλαιὸν· εἰ δὲ μὴ 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 Οὐδὲς ἐπίβλημα ἰματίου καινοῦ ἐπιβάλλει ἐπὶ ἰμάτιον παλαιὸν· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, 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

tὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ ἐπίβλημα  D

P4: The editio princeps (Merell, 1938) reconstructs:

Τῷ ΠΑΛΑΙΩ ΟΥ [ΣΥ]Μ

ΦΩΝΗΣΕΙ ΤΟ[ἘΠΙΒΛΗΜΑ]

ΜΑ ΤΟ ἈΠΟ ΤΟΥ Κ[ΑΙΝΟΥ]

Lacuna: Ξ, 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

BYZ Luke 5:38 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοῦς βλητέον
καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

T&T #7

Byz A, C, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, goth, [Trg]
βάλλουσιν καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται D, it, Sy-P, Marcion

txt P4(200 CE), P75 vid, 01, B, L, W, f1, 33, 131, 157, 579, 700, 1241, pc, Co
01*: βάλλουσιν
W: βάλλεται
pc = 5, 301

Lacuna: Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 9:17 ἀλλὰ βάλλουσιν οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοῦς,
καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντηροῦνται.

NA28 Mark 2:22 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοῦς.
BYZ Mark 2:22 ἀλλὰ οἶνον νέον εἰς ἁσκοῦς καινοῦς βλητέον.
omit: 01*, B, pc
pc = 1041, 1282, 2528
01 corrected by 01

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:

Western non-interpolation

omit verse: D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff, l, r), Marcion?, (Eus)

WH have the verse in brackets.

txt P4, P75 ..., Lat(aur, f, q, vg)

omit καὶ: P4, P75id, 01c2, 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)
**Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:


No txt in NA but in SQE!

*omit* P4, P75\vid, 01\textsuperscript{cz}, B, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc, WH
*txt* 01\textsuperscript{*}, A, C, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, Maj, aur, f, q, vg, WH\ms

D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff\textsuperscript{2}, l, r\textsuperscript{1}) omit the verse.

WH has the complete verse in single brackets (Western non-interpolation).

**B: no umlaut**

Compare context:


The addition of καὶ could be a conformation to context, verse 37. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
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)
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)
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, 01, B, L, W, f1, 69, 788(=f13), 22, 33, 157, 579, 1241, 2542, pc, 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" (πρωΐ)

**σαββάτω δευτέρω πρωΐ**  c.j. François Bovon, 1989 (Lk Com.)

*Tregelles has σαββάτω [δευτεροπρώτω] in the margin.*

Lacuna: Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C  
B: no umlaut

**Compare:**

NA28 Luke 4:31 Καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοῦμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ ἦν διδάσκων αὐτούς 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 ὧν ὁ θεὸς τοῖς νεοῖς Κορε δευτέρα 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 BATW/BATW, which was subsequently interpreted as -BATW BA-TW with B and A representing numbers.

Another explanation is that some scribe wrote πρῶτω here, with reference to the other Sabbath in 6:6, but then remembered an earlier Sabbath in 4:31 and correct the πρῶτω into δευτέρω, which then led to δευτεροπρῶτω, but this appears very far-fetched. Klein argues that actually Luke himself wrote πρῶτω.

François Bovon in his Luke commentary conjectures σαββάτω δευτέρω πρώι. The problem with this suggestion is, as Bovon himself acknowledges, that Luke does not like the word πρώι 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:
BYZ Luke 6:1 τοὺς στάχυας καὶ ἠσθιον ψώχοντες ταῖς χεραίν
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.
Eustatius (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 δευτεροπρῶτω 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 σάββασιν:
BYZ Luke 6:2 τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν

**ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν** A, C, K, Π, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, Maj, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, goth

**ποιεῖν ἐν σάββασιν** Δ, Λ*

**ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ** Ψ, f13°, 1241 (∶Mt)

**ποιεῖν τοῖς σάββασιν** 01, (D), U, W, f1, 124, 892, pc

**τοῖς σάββασιν ποιεῖν** L

txt P4(200 CE), P75vid, B, R, 69, 788(=f13), 700, pc, Lat, sa, bopt

**D:** ἵδε τί ποιοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ σου τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;

Lacuna: Ξ, Sy-S and Sy-C

**B:** no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 12:2 οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι ἰδόντες εἶπαν αὐτῷ ἵδον οἱ μαθηταὶ σου ποιοῦσιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ποιεῖν ἐν σαββάτῳ.

**ποιεῖν ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν** 157, 1071

NA28 Mark 2:24 ἵδε τί ποιοῦσιν τοῖς σάββασιν ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν;

Compare:

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 σάββασιν. Stylistic reasons?

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 6:3 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοῦς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰσσοῦς: οὐδὲ τούτῳ ἀνέγνωτε ὃ ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὦτε ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ὁντες.


omit: P4(200 CE), B, D, Bal

------ ὡς 01*, W, 579, 892, [Trg]
------ πῶς 01a2, L, X, Θ, f1, 69, 788 (=f13), 33, 157, 700, 1241, pc, L890

ὁντες ὡς A, C, K, Π, Δ, 579, Maj, goth, [Trgmas], Tis
ὁντες πῶς R, f13, 1071, 517, 954, 1424, 1675, pc
πάντες πῶς 124, 174 (=f13), L211
ὁντες Bois

Lacuna: Ξ, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 12:3 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οὐκ ἀνέγνωτε τί ἐποίησεν Δαυὶδ ὦτε 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 ὦτε χρείαν ἔσχεν καὶ ἐπείνασεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ __
NA28 Mark 2:26 πῶς εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ

omit πῶς: B, D
add ὁντες: D
add ἦσαν: Δ

The omission of ὁντες 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

BYZ Luke 6:4 ώς εἰςήλθεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοὺς ἁρτους τῆς προθέσεως ἔλαβεν καὶ ἔφαγεν καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ οὐκ οὐκ ἐξεστὶν 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 P4αδ(200 CE), B, L, W, Ψ, f1, 372, 1352, 1604, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-Palms, 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 οὐσίν;
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)
The so called "Cambridge pericope":

Eodem die videns quendam operantem sabbato et dixit illi: Homo, siquidem scis, quod facis, beatus es, si autem nescis, maledictus et trabaricatator legis.

"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 ὥφελεῖ ἐὰν νόμον πράσσης· ἐὰν δὲ παραβάτης νόμου ἦς, ἡ περιτομὴ σου ἀκροβυστία γέγονεν.
NA28 Romans 2:27 καὶ κρίνει ἡ έκ φύσεως ἀκροβυστία τόν νόμον τελοῦσα δε τὸν διὰ γράμματος καὶ περιτομής παραβάτην νόμου.
NA28 James 2:11 ὁ γὰρ εἰπὼν· μὴ μοιχεύσης, εἶπεν καὶ· μὴ φονεύσῃς· εἰ δὲ οὐ μοιχεύεις φονεύεις δὲ, 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:

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 80

32. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Luke 6:5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς:
κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ γίς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

BYZ Luke 6:5 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι
κύριός ἐστιν ὁ γίς 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, bo², goth, Marcion ε, WH²⁵, Gre, Trq

txt 01, B, W, 1241, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, bo², 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. Merell RB 47, 1938, 5-22) reads (letters in red doubtful):

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 ἐστιν 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, vgms, Sy-Pal, TR (!)

NA28 Mark 2:28 ὡστε
κύριος 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 ὡτί is not in the Matthean parallel (but there is a γάρ, and in verse 12:6 there is a ὡτί). There is no reason to omit the ὡτί in Lk. It was possibly added to separate κύριος from the preceding, because one could interpret the words as καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὁ κύριος ...
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 ἐστιν and τοῦ σαββάτου, without parallel. This is possibly the reading of P4 in Lk.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
Minority reading:

ἐν ὀργῇ  D, X, Θ, Λ, f1, 230 (=f13), 22, 1071, al, it(aur, b, c, d, ff², l, q, r¹), vgˢˢ, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, boˢˢ⁰ˢ⁰⁹, arm, arab⁸ˢ

μετ’ ὀργῆς  f13, 157, 2542

in ira  aur, b, d, ff², l, q, r¹, vgˢˢ

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· ἐκτεινον τὴν χειρά. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χείρ 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

BYZ Luke 6:10 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος πάντας αὐτοὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ὅκτεινον τὴν χειρά σου ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χείρ αὐτοῦ ὑψης ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

Byz A, D, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 892, 1071, Maj, it, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal

ὑψης ὡς ἡ ἄλλη  E, M, S, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, f13, 28, 700, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj, c

ὡς ἡ ἄλλη ὑψης  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

ὡς καὶ ἡ ἄλλη  D, f1, pc, f, r

ὑψης  W, 579

txt P4(200 CE), P75vid, 01, B, L, 33, pc, Lat(a, aur, e, ff, 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· ἔκτεινον σου τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἐξέτεινεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ὑψῆς ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.

ὡς ἡ ἄλλη.  it, Sy

ὑψης  01, C*, 892*
NA28 Mark 3:5 ἐκτείνον τὴν χεῖρα. καὶ ἔξετείνεν καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ.
BYZ Mark 3:5 Ἐκτείνον τὴν χεῖρα σου. καὶ ἔξετείνεν καὶ ἀποκατεστάθη ἡ χεῖρ αὐτοῦ ὡς ὁ ἄλλη.

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 Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνος,

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 Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνος,

Not in NA but in SQE!

Byz A, D, Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 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, Ξ

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 ἤκολούθησεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας

NA28 Matthew 4:25 καὶ ἤκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὄχλοι πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἰεροσολύμων καὶ Ἰουδαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου.

Compare:
NA28 Luke 5:29 Καὶ ἐποίησεν δοξὴν μεγάλην Δευτίς αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἦν ὄχλος πολὺς τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων οἱ ἦσαν μετ’ αὐτῶν κατακείμενοι.
The term ὄχλος (πολύς) μαθητῶν = crowd of disciples, appears nowhere else. But in Lk 5:29 appears ὄχλος πολύς τελωνών. It is possible that πολύς has been added as an enhancement or from 5:29. The support is not very good. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 132) thinks that πολύς 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 ἐστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ, καὶ ὁχλὸς πολὺς μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πλῆθος πολὺ τοῦ λαοῦ ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἱουδαίας καὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνως,

καὶ Πιραίας
καὶ Περαιάς
καὶ τῆς Περέας
_ et trans fretum

01* (corrected by 01\(^{52}\))
L150*, L299
W, ff\(^{2}\)

it (a, b, c, ff\(^{2}\), l, q, r\(^{1}\)), vg\(^{mss}\)

fretum = "sea, strait, channel"

Lacuna: C, Ξ

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 3:7-8 Καὶ ὁ Ἱησοῦς μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀνεχώρησεν πρὸς τὴν θάλασσαν, καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας [ἡκολούθησεν], καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἱουδαίας 8 καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰδουμαίας καὶ πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου καὶ περὶ Τύρου καὶ Σιδώνα πλῆθος πολὺ ἀκούοντες ὡς ἐποίει ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

Lat = et trans Iordanen

NA28 Matthew 4:25 καὶ ἡκολούθησαν αὐτῷ ὁχλοὶ πολλοὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας καὶ Δεκαπόλεως καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ Ἑοδαίας 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 Περαιάς, which must thus be regarded as Western."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 85

34. Difficult variant


Minority reading:


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, r², 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:

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:**


T&T #9

Byz (D), P, Q, R, W, X, Θ, Ξ, 0135, 0211, f1, f13, 22, 157, 700, 1241, Maj, NA, WH, Gre, Trg, Bal, SBL

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς υμῖν εἶποσιν D

ὅταν καλῶς υμῖν εἶποσιν 28, pc

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἶποσιν W, Δ, 2, 1424

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς ὑμᾶς εἶποσιν 472, 2287

ὑμῖν ὅταν καλῶς εἶποσιν 69

καλῶς εἶποσιν ὑμᾶς 01, A, H, L, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, (2542), al, Tis

txt P75, B, 2710

Acc. to T&T D reads καλῶς υμᾶς εἶποσιν. This is an error (checked at the facsimile). NA and Swanson have correctly καλῶς υμῖν εἶποσιν.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare context:


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)


T&T #10

Byz: D, L, Γ, Δ, 28, 157, 892*, Maj-part997, vgmiss, Sy-S, Sy-P, bopt, MarcionT

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, 892mg, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, Maj-part650, Lat, sa, bopt, goth

omit οἱ: W, f13, pc4 (f13: 69, 124, 174, 346 have it)
oἱ ἀνθρώπωι 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 μακάριοι ἔστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἀνθρώποι

πάντες οἱ ἀνθρώπωι 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:

**omit:** P75\textsuperscript{vid}, B, 700\textsuperscript{*}, 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\textsuperscript{c}, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, Marcion\textsuperscript{T}

700: The words are added in the margin by a later hand.
Lacuna: Sy-C
B: no umlaut

Compare:

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 ἀνθρώποι was the subject.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
TVU 89

Minority reading:

εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα 01*
εἰς τὴν σιαγόνα  D, P, W, Θ, 700, 892, 2542, pc, Cl, Or, Tis
ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα  E*, 28, 579, 983, 1241, 1424, 1675
txt + add σου:
  r¹, sa, arm

txt  P75vid, 01c², 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’ ὡστὶς σε ῥαπίζει εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα [σου], στρέψου αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην.
BYZ Matthew 5:39 ἀλλ’ ὡστὶς σε ῥαπίζει ἐπὶ τὴν δεξιὰν [σου] σιαγόνα στρέψου 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  01c², f1, 346 (=f13), 22, 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj-part, Or, Cyr
εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα 01*, W, 983, 1689 (=f13c), 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.
Fledermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα σου for Q.
Harnack (Sprüche Jesu, p. 89) has εἰς τὴν [δεξιὰν] σιαγόνα [σου].

Compare the discussion in Mt 5:39!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Luke 6:31

και καθὼς θέλετε ἶνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἀνθρώποι 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, WHmaj, Trg

ψηλέστε 565, e
καὶ ὑμεῖς ὁμοίως ποιεῖτε 892

txt P75vid, B, 579, 700, 1241, it(a, aur, ff², l), IrLat, Cl, WH, NA₂⁵

καλὰ ποιεῖτε r¹, vg₇⁵₇, 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 ὃσα ἐὰν θέλετε ἶνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἀνθρώποι, 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 ἑχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες:

μηδένα 01, W, Ξ, Π, 1071, pc, Sy-S, Sy-P, WH*
B: no umlaut

μηδέν accusative neuter singular
μηδένα accusative masculine singular

dανίζω "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 ἑχθροὺς which, then, requires the masculine.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 92

37. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

omit 01, B, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 579, 1071, pc, c, d, Sy-S, Co, Marcion\textsuperscript{T}, Cl,
Weiss, WH, NA\textsuperscript{25}, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt A, D, Θ, 1582\textsuperscript{c}, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Cyp, Bas, [Trg]

IGNTP adds for the omission P74\textsuperscript{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 ἐσεσθε οὖν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι ὥς ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ωφράνιος τέλειος ἐστιν.
add καὶ: 346, Chrys, Bas

Compare:
omit καὶ: 01\textsuperscript{c}, Δ, f1, 69, 700, pc
(corr. by 01\textsuperscript{c1})

omit καὶ: P75, B, D, Lat, sa, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, arm

It's only Luke who uses the construction καθώς 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· ἀδελφὲ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου,

BYZ Luke 6:42 ἡ πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου Ἄδελφὲ ἄφες ἐκβάλω 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, [Tρα]
txt B, e, ff², L1056, Sy-S, sa², bo²

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 ἡ 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 ἡ πῶς ἔρεις τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκός 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 δοκοῦ τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ σὺ 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· ἀδελφε, ἂφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὄφθαλμῷ σου, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὄφθαλμῷ σου δοκῶν οὐ βλέπων; ὑποκριτά, ἐκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὄφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.

D, it (a, aur, b, c, ff, l, q, r'), Sy-S:
(Sy-C has a lacuna here!)

ἡ πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἂφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἴδοι ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ σῷ ὄφθαλμῷ ὑποκεῖται ὑποκρεῖτα, ἐκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμοῦ σου καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

"subiacet? hypocrita" a, aur, b, c, ff, l, q
but (!):
"est? hypocrita" d, e

et ecce in oculo tuo trabes subiacet, hypocrita it
et ecce trabis in tuo oculo est, hypocrita d
et ecce in oculo tuo trabis est, hypocrita e
ipse in oculo tuo trabem non videns, hypocrita f, (r'), vg

B: no umlaut

ὑπόκειμαι "lie below"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 7:4-5 ἡ πῶς ἔρεις τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἂφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ ἴδοι ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὄφθαλμῷ σου;
5 ὑποκριτά, ἐκβαλε πρῶτον ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμοῦ σου τὴν δοκὸν, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὄφθαλμοῦ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.
Sy-C: καὶ ἴδοι ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ σῷ ὄφθαλμῷ ὑποκεῖται ὑποκρεῖτα.

The overall reading of D, it, Sy-S is clearly a harmonization to Mt. What is most interesting here are the two words ὑποκεῖται ὑποκρεῖτα. 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

BYZ Luke 6:43 Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαφρὸν οὔτε _____ δένδρον σαφρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλὸν

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 Cl (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 πάν δένδρον ἁγαθὸν καρποὺς καλοὺς ποιεῖ, τὸ δὲ σαφρὸν δένδρον καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖ. 18 οὐ δύναται δένδρον ἁγαθὸν καρποὺς πονηροὺς ποιεῖν οὔτε δένδρον σαφρὸν 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 καὶ νῆπιον 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 ἁγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας προφέρει τὸ ἁγαθὸν, καὶ ὁ πνευμὸς ἐκ τοῦ πνευμοῦ προφέρει τὸ πνευμόν· ἓ κ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 6:45 ὁ ἁγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ ἁγαθὸν καὶ ὁ πνευμὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πνευμοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ προφέρει τὸ πνευμόν· ἓ κ γὰρ τοῦ περισσεύματος τῆς καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ

ἄνθρωπος (Not in NA but in SQE)
Byz 01Δ, A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ξ, f13, 33, 157, 1071, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, e, f, ff², q, r¹), Sy, sa³, goth

txt P75, 01*, B, D, L, Ψ, f1, 579, 700, 892, 1342, pc, it(a, b, d, l), Co
B: no umlaut

θησαυρός τῆς καρδίας αὐτοῦ
Byz A, C, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, Maj, it, Sy, bo³

θησαυρός
θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ 69, 788, 828(=f13³), 1342, it(c, e, f, q, r¹), vg³, bo³

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 ἁγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει ἁγαθά, καὶ ὁ πνευμὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ πνευμοῦ θησαυροῦ ἐκβάλλει πνημά.

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 ὁμοιὸς ἐστίν ἀνθρώπω ὁ οἶκον ὃς ἐσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάζουν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης προσέρχετε ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἑκείνη, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυεσεν σαλέυσαι αὐτὴν 

**diā τὸ καλὸς οἰκοδομήθηκε αὐτήν.**

BYZ Luke 6:48 ὁμοιὸς ἐστίν ἀνθρώπω ὁ οἶκον ὃς ἐσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάζουν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης προσέρχετε ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἑκείνη καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυεσεν σαλέυσαι αὐτὴν 

**τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν.**

Byz  A, C, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 700c, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, arm, geo, goth

txt  P75vid, 01, B, L, W, Ξ, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, pc, Sy-Hmg, sa, bopt

**omit:** P45vid, 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 βροχή καὶ ἤλθον οἱ ποταμοὶ καὶ ἔπνευσαν οἱ ἀνεμοὶ καὶ προσέπεσαν τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἑκείνη, 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 (...αἱ αὐτῆν - ...αἱ αὐτῆν).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
39. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 7:3 ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὧπως ἐλθὼν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ.


7:3 omit: D, f13, 700, pc, it, bo
f13: 124, 174, 230, 346 have the words.
 f, vg have the words.

7:4 omit: D, it(a, c, d, e, ff, l, r)
pρὸς 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 Ιησοῦς ἦκει ἐκ τῆς Ιουδαίας εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν ἀπήλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἠρώτα ἵνα καταβῇ καὶ ἴάσηται αὐτοῦ τὸν υἱόν, ἦμελλεν γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκειν.


Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 99


Byz 01ε, (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 αὐτοὺς W

txt P75, 01*, B, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, pc, sa, geo
B: no umlaut

No parallel.
Compare context:
NA28 Luke 7:3 ἀκούσας δὲ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτὸν πρεσβυτέρους τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐρωτῶν αὐτὸν ὡς ἔλθῃν διασώσῃ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ.

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 ἦδη δὲ αὐτοῦ ὦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἔπεμψεν φίλους ὁ ἐκατοντάρχης λέγων αὐτῷ· κύριε, μὴ σκύλλου, οὐ γὰρ ἴκανός εἰμι ἵνα ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην μου εἰσέλθῃς·

NA28 Luke 7:7 διὸ οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἠξίωσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν· ἄλλα εἰπὲ 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 ἐκατόνταρχος ἔφη· κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἴκανός ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς, ____________ ἄλλα μόνον εἰπὲ 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)
Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 7:7 διὸ ὦδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἥξιωσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν· ἀλλὰ ἐιπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἵαθήτω ὁ παῖς μου.

BYZ Luke 7:7 διὸ ὦδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἥξιωσα πρὸς σὲ ἐλθεῖν· ἀλλ᾽ ἐιπὲ λόγῳ καὶ ἵαθήσεται 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

txt P75vid, B, L, 1241, sa, bo

μόνον C, Ψ, f13, pc, l, r’ Sy-H**

Lacuna: Ξ

B: no umlaut

εἰπὲ imperative aorist active 2nd person singular
ἵαθήτω imperative aorist passive 3rd person singular
ἵαθήσεται indicative future passive 3rd person singular

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 8:8 κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἴκανος ἵνα μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθης, ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἵαθήσεται ὁ παῖς μου.

It is possible that ἵαθήσεται is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss). On the other hand it is possible that ἵαθήτω is a harmonization to the immediate context to adjust the form to the imperative εἰπὲ. Note that C, Ψ et al. add μόνον as a further harmonization.

Rating: - (indecisive)
NA28 Luke 7:10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον οἱ πεμφθέντες εὕρον τὸν δοῦλον ὑγιαίνοντα.

BYZ Luke 7:10 καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ πεμφθέντες εἰς τὸν οἶκον εὕρον τὸν ἁσθενοῦντα δοῦλον ὑγιαίνοντα

Byz A, C, D, R, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 892mg, Maj, d, f, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, Gre, [Trgag]

txt P75, 01, B, L, W, f1, 157, 579, 700, 892*, 1241, 1342, 2786, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Co

892: ἁσθενοῦντα 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. ἁσθενοῦντα 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 ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναϊν καὶ συνεπορεύόμενον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁχλὸς πολύς.

ἐξῆς adv. "next in a series, in the next place"
ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς "soon afterward"

No txt in NA!

_________ ἰ

D, d, e, Sy-S

ἐγένετο ἰ

W, pc

ἐγένετο ἐν ἰ

01*, C, K, Π, 28, 124, 174 (=f13), 565, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj-part, WHmg, Trgmg, Bal

ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ


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: Ξ

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 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

BYZ Luke 9:37 Ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

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

tῇ ἡμέρᾳ P45

διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας D, it, Sy-S, sa

tῇ ἐξῆς 579

(Only the P45, D variant is in NA and SQE!)
Compare also:
NA28 Acts 21:1 εὐθυδρομήσαντες ἠλθομεν εἰς τὴν Κώ, τῇ δὲ ἐξῆς εἰς τὴν Ῥώδον κάκειθεν εἰς Πάταρα,
NA28 Acts 27:18 σφοδρῶς δὲ χειμαζομένων ἡμῶν τῇ ἐξῆς ἐκβολὴν ἔποιούντο

With ἐξῆς sometimes the subject must be supplied:
ἐν τῇ ἐξῆς - ἡμέρα
ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς - 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 ἐξῆς
    ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς
8:1 ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς
9:37 (ἐν) τῇ ἐξῆς

In Acts: τῇ ἐξῆς (three times)

Other similar occurrences:
ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ... appears 15 times in Lk.
ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ (ἡμέρᾳ) 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 ἐξῆς. Elsewhere most often ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ appears. Thus a certain decision is not possible from internal reasons.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 104

42. Difficult variant


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, [Tmg]a

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, 2220c, 2546, 2750

Δ: No Latin (like multi) is given for ἰκανοὶ.
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 ἰκανοὶ A, R, U, X, Λ, 69, 565, 892, pc
συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῶ ___ μαθηταὶ ___ ἰκανοὶ f1, pc
συνεπορεύοντο ___ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 157

B: umlaut! (1316 C 27 L) οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ χόλος

Note next verse:
NA28 Luke 7:12 καὶ ὁ χόλος τῆς πόλεως ἰκανός σὺν αὐτῇ

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 28:12 λαβόντες ἁργύρια ἰκανὰ
NA28 Mark 10:46 καὶ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ χόλος ἰκανοῦ
NA28 Luke 8:27 ἔχων δαιμόνια καὶ χρόνως ἰκανῶς οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἴματιον
NA28 Luke 8:32 ἢν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἰκανῶν
ἀκανθὸς here: "many, quite a few"

ἀκανθὸς 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:
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:
ΛΥΤΟΥΙΚΑΝΟΙΚΑΙΟΧΛΟΣ

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 ἐπέμψεν πρὸς τὸν κύριον λέγων· σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἡ ἄλλος προσδοκώμεν;

ἐτερον 01, B, L, R, W, X, Ξ, Ψ, 124, 983, 28, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, 2542, al, MarcionAdam, Trg, WH

txt A, D, Θ, f1, f13, 700, Maj, Trg

IGNTP and Hoskier’s collation have 157 correctly for ἐτερον, 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· Ἡμῶν ὁ βαπτιστὴς ἀπέστειλεν ἡμᾶς πρὸς σὲ λέγων· σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἡ ἄλλος προσδοκώμεν;

ἐτερον 01, D, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 983, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1342, pc
ἄλλος P75, A, B, Θ, f13, 28, 700, 1424, Maj, WH (!)

Evidence combined:
ἄλλος - ἄλλος A, Θ, f13, 700, Maj, NA
ἐτερον - ἐτερον 01, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, pc
ἄλλος - ἐτερον D, f1, pc
ἐτερον - ἄλλος B, 28, 1424, pc, WH

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 11:3 εἶπεν αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἡ ἐτερον προσδοκώμεν; safe!

ἐτερον is quite probably a harmonization to Mt (so also Weiss). There is no reason for a change to ἄλλος.
Interesting is the change by D, f1, pc from ἄλλος in verse 19 to ἐτερον 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 ἀλλός in Luke and comes to the conclusion that ἕτερος means "another one of a different kind" and ἀλλός means "another one of the same kind". From this she deduces that ἀλλός fits better here and that Luke changed his source to the more correct term, which also accords better with classical norms. Luke uses ἀλλός 11 times and ἕτερος 32 times.

In principal it is also possible that it was not Luke but some scribe who changed ἕτερος into ἀλλός 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 ἀλλός 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:

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 106
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 7:25 ἀλλὰ τί ἐξῆλθατε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἰματίοις ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδοὺ οἱ ἐν ἰματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ καὶ τρυφῇ ὑπάρχοντες ἐν τοῖς βασιλείοις εἰσίν.

ὑπάρχοντες D, K, Π, 565, pc¹², Cl

B: no umlaut

diάγω "spend ones life, live"
ὑπάρχω "to be", a widely used substitute in H. Gk. for εἰσίν.

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 ἐξῆλθατε ἰδεῖν; ἄνθρωπον ἐν μαλακοῖς ἠμφιεσμένον; ἰδοὺ οἱ τὰ μαλακὰ φοροῦντες ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις τῶν βασιλέων εἰσίν. qui mollibus vestiuntur

Compare:
NA28 Luke 8:41 Ίάιρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν.
omit: D, c, d

NA28 Luke 9:48
ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτος ἐστιν μέγας.
omit: D

NA28 Luke 11:13 εἰ οὖν ὑμεῖς ποιηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες
omit: 01, D, K, Π, M, X, 157, 472, 954, 1424, 1675, al

NA28 Luke 16:14 ... οἱ Φαρισαῖοι φιλάργυροι ὑπάρχοντες
omit: f13, 157, 2542, pc
υπάρχω is a Lukan favorite (15 times in Lk, 3 times in Mt). There are two different meanings:

a) substantivally as τὰ υπάρχοντα, with the meaning "possessions, property"

b) with the meaning "to be".

There is evidence that scribes felt uncomfortable with the occurrences of υπάρχω 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 οὐτὸς ἔστιν περὶ οὗ γέγραπται· ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου, ὡς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὀδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν σου.

omit: D, it(a, aur, d, l, r¹)

Lat(b, c, e, f, ff², q, vg), Marcionᵀ have the words.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Mark 1:2 ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὀδὸν σου·
BYZ Mark 1:2 ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὀδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν 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 ὀδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν 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 ὀδὸν σου ἐμπροσθέν 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)

BYZ Luke 7:28 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν μείζων ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν προφήτης Ὁ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ οὐδεὶς ἐστιν· ὁ δὲ μικρότερος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ μείζων αὐτοῦ ἐστιν.

Ὁ Ἰωάννου

P75, 01, B, L, W, Ξ, f1, 22, 157, 579, pc, Sy-Pal, sa, bopt, arm, geo, Or, Did

προφήτης Ὁ Ἰωάννου

Ψ, 700, pc, Sy-S, arm, Gre, [Trg]

Ὑπάννον προφήτης

892, 1342

προφήτης οὐκ ἐστιν

1241

Ὅ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ

K, Π, M, X, 33, 565, al, it(a, b, c, e, ff², l), vg⁴, Sy-H⁴, sa⁴

προφήτης Ὁ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ

A, D, (Δ), Θ, f13, Maj

Ὅ Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ προφήτης

1424, pc

one of these:

Lat(aur, f, q, r³, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, goth

Sy-S: There is a lacuna after Ὁ 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 ... ἐστιν at the end of verse 26.

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 11:11 Ἄμην λέγω ύμῖν· οὐκ ἐγήγερται ἐν γεννητοῖς γυναικῶν μείζων Ὁ 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 Φαρισαίοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλήν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοῦς μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ.

omit: 01, D, d, pc, sa
B: no umlaut

ἤθέτησαν ἄθετέω 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 ___ Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιόως τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ τίνι εἰσίν ὁμοιοί;

Εἴπεν δὲ ὁ Κύριος
Ait autem Dominus
Tunc ergo Jesus dixit
Tunc Jesus dixit

TR
vg
f (6th CE)
P (vgms, 6th CE) noted in the Stuttgart vg ed.

And the Lord said,
Aber der Herr sprach:
KJV
Luther (1545)

Tischendorf lists Mmg, 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, ἱδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ συνιᾶσαι 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, P75, B, L, T, 1241, 2542, 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 ἑδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

BYZ Luke 7:35 καὶ ἑδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς πάντων

οmit: (01\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{ma}, Gre, Tis, [Trg\textsuperscript{ma}]

txt (01\textsuperscript{*}), B, W, f13, 157, 579, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Co, WH, NA\textsuperscript{25}, Trg

απὸ παντὼν τῶν ζηρων αὐτῆς 01\textsuperscript{*}, Ambrose

απὸ ______ τῶν ζηρων αὐτῆς 01\textsuperscript{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 ἑδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ζηρων αὐτῆς.

BYZ Matthew 11:19 καὶ ἑδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς

Minority readings:

 απὸ παντῶν τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς 13, 346, 543, 826, 828, 983 (=f13)

 απὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς παντῶν pc

 απὸ παντῶν τῶν ζηρων αὐτῆς 124, 788 (=f13\textsuperscript{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 ἁμαρτιῶν σου οὐχ ἠμαρτεν καὶ ἐπλήθυνας τὰς ἁρμαίς σου ὑπὲρ αὐτᾶς (i.e. Σαμάρειαν and Σόδωμα) καὶ ἐδικαίωσας τὰς ἁδελφὰς σου (i.e. Σαμάρειαν and Σόδωμα) ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἁρμαίαις σου αἰς ἐποίησας.

The meaning is that Samaria by comparison has proved righteous in her sinful works. 23:4 Σαμάρεια ἢν Οολα καὶ Ιεροσαλήμ ἢν Οολίβα. 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 Σόδωμα 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 στάσασα ὄπισθεν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἐβρέχευ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ

ἐβρέχευν  D, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, MarcionE

rigabat  b, ff², l, q, r¹, vgms
inrigabat a
lavit  c
inplevit d
lababat  e

aur, f, vg read txt (coepit rigare).
Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

**Compare:**
NA28 Luke 7:44 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα τῇ Σίμωνι ἔφη· βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναῖκα; εἰσῆλθον σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὥσπερ μου ἐπὶ πόδας οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἐβρέχευν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς ἐξέμαξεν.

Possibly a harmonization to verse 44.
It is also possible that ἐβρέχευν is a stylistic improvement.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 113

 Minority reading:

 ὁ προφήτης  B*, Ξ, 205, 482, pc, Weiss  
 [NA25], [WH], [Trg] 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 ὀχλοὶ ἐλεγοῦν· οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ προφήτης Ἡσσοῦ ὁ ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ τῆς Γαλιλαίας.  
 NA28 John 1:11 καὶ λέγει· οὐκ εἰμί· ὁ προφήτης εἰ σὺ;  
 NA28 John 1:25 καὶ ἤρωτεσαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· τί σὺν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς οὓς Ἡλίας οὗδὲ ὁ προφήτης;  
 NA28 John 6:14 οὗτος ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.  
 NA28 John 7:40 οὗτος ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·  
 NA28 John 7:52 καὶ ἵδε 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 ἐβρεζέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξίν ὑπάνεται αὕτης ἐξέμαζεν.

BYZ Luke 7:44 αὕτη δὲ τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἐβρεζέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριξίν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὕτης ἐξέμαζεν

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, Χ, 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:

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 115

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 7:44 καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τὴν γυναίκα τῷ Σίμωνι ἔφη· βλέπεις ταύτην τὴν γυναίκα; εἰσῆλθον σου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, ὥσπερ μου ἐπὶ πόδας οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ τοὺς δάκρυσιν ἔβρεξέν μου τοὺς πόδας καὶ ταῖς θριήσεις αὐτῆς ἐξέμαζεν.
NA28 Luke 7:45 φίλημά μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὕτη δὲ ἄφ’ ἢς εἰσῆλθον σὺ διελίπεν καταφιλούσα μου τοὺς πόδας.

εἰσῆλθεν  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 εἰσῆλθεν secundis primae manus curis in o mutatum est. Fuerat igitur εἰσῆλθον." (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 εἰσῆλθον 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, εἰσῆλθον" 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:

a) ὦ κεφαλή μου οὐκ ἠλευψας, με Sy-S, Sy-C
ἐλαίῳ τοὺς πόδας μου οὐκ ἠλευψας: a, e, ff², l, Sy-P
"oleo pedes meos non unxisti"

b) omit τοὺς πόδας μου: D, W, 079, it (b, c, d, e, q), arm, geo
Lat(aur, f, ri, vg) have the words

ὁλευψεν τοὺς πόδας μου Α, B, P, Θ, 33, 700, 1071, 1424, 1675, 2766, al
ὁλευψεν μου τοὺς πόδας 01, R, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 579, 892, 1241 Maj
τοὺς πόδας μου ὦλευψεν Λ, Ξ, 1342, Sy-S, Sy-P

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 7:38 καὶ στᾶσα ὑπὸ σοῦ παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ κλαίουσα τοῖς δάκρυσιν ἤρεστο βρέχειν τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ταῖς θριξίν τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῆς ἔξεμασεν καὶ κατεφίλει τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλευψεν τῷ μύρῳ. omit τοὺς πόδας: 2766


NA28 John 11:2 ἦν δὲ Μαριάμ ἡ ἀλεύψασα τὸν κύριον μύρῳ καὶ ἔκμαξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς,

NA28 John 12:3 Ἄν ὦ του Μαριάμ λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου ἠλευψεν τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἔξεμαξεν ταῖς θριξίν αὐτῆς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.
a) τὴν κεφαλήν
The reading τὴν κεφαλήν 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 κεφαλήν here into τούς πόδας or to omit an object altogether as in Sy-S, Sy-C.

b) τούς 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 τούς 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 ἔλευφεν. One could of course use the previous τούς 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 τούς 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 oûk 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 _ 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. Weiβ "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:

D: οὗ καρπὸν δὲ λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αὐτῇ πολλά
d: Propter quod dico tibi: Dimittentur illi multa
e: οὗ καρπὸν δὲ λέγω σοι, ἀφέωνται αὐτῇ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὡς δὲ ὀλίγον ἀφίεται, ἄγαπᾷ ὀλίγον.
e: 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 sorgive her. The one who is sorgive little loves little.

POxy 4009: διὰ τοῦτο λέγω σοι, ὅτι ἀφείωνται αὐτῇ πολλαὶ ἁμαρτίαι.

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 48:

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 ἤγαπησεν 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 Χουζὰ ἐπιτρόπου Ἁρώδου καὶ Σουσάννα καὶ ἔτεραι πολλαί, αὐτίνες διηκόνουν αὑτῶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταίς.

αὐτῷ 01, A, L, M, X, Y, Π, Ψ, f1, 33, 565, 579, 1241, 1342, Maj-part, it(a, aur, b, l, q), vg
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, ff, r1, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, goth

IGNTP has Co for αὐτοῖς, NA, Horner and Tis for αὐτῷ.
Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

"who served for him/them"

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 27:55 Ἡσαν δὲ ἐκεὶ γυναῖκες πολλαί ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαν, αὐτίνες ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας διακονοῦσαν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Mark 15:40-41 Ἡσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες ἀπὸ μακρόθεν θεωροῦσαν, ἐν αἷς καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ιακώβου τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ Ἰωσήφου μήτηρ καὶ Σαλώμη, 41 αἱ ὄστε ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἠκολούθουσαν αὐτῷ καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαί αἱ συναναβάσαι αὐτῷ εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα.

And also:
NA28 Matthew 4:11 καὶ ἠγγέλοι προσήλθον καὶ διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Mark 1:13 καὶ οἱ ἠγγέλοι διηκόνουν αὐτῷ.

Elsewhere in the Gospels only διηκόνουν αὐτῷ occurs.
Possibly αὐτῷ is a harmonization to Mt (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 119

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 8:5 έξηλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπέιραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὅδὸν 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 ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὅδὸν, καὶ ἐλθόντα τὰ πετεινὰ κατέφαγεν αὐτά.
NA28 Mark 4:4 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ σπείρειν ὁ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὅδὸν, καὶ ἤλθεν τὰ πετεινὰ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

Compare:
NA28 Luke 9:58 τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
NA28 Luke 13:19 τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

Compare also verse 12:
NA28 Luke 8:12 οἱ δὲ παρὰ τὴν ὅδὸν εἶσαι οἱ ἀκούσαντες, εἴτε ἔρχεται ὁ διάβολος καὶ ἀφεῖ 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 γῇ, οὕτωι εἰσιν οὕτινες ἐν καρδίᾳ καὶ ἀγαθῇ άκούσκιτες τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν καὶ καρποφοροῦσιν ἐν ὑπομονῇ .

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

[πολλῇ] ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει ὁ ἔχων ὡτα άκούειν, άκουέτω
Ε, F, G, H, M, S, X, Y, Γ, Λ, 0211, 1, 22, 118, f13, 2, 579, 892, 1071, 1424, al
πολλῇ 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 ἔτερον ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν καὶ φυέν ἐποίησεν καρπὸν ἐκατονταπλασίονα. ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὡτα άκούειν άκουέτω.
omit: f13, 1071, Lect, Sy-Pal (not in NA but in SQE).

For πολλῇ compare:
NA28 2 Corinthians 6:4 ἀλλ’ ἐν παντὶ συνιστάντες ἑαυτοὺς ὡς θεοῖ διάκονοι, ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν θλίψεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενωχωρίαις,

579 has this addition at Lk 8:15, 12:21, 15:10 (with Θ), 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 8:16 Οὐδὲς δὲ λύχνον ἅψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν,
 latina: omi: οἱ εἰςπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

**omit**: P75, B

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 πάσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.
NA28 Mark 4:21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· μῆτι ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἕνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἕνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;

Compare:

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. (σω- σω)? 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)
44. **Difficult variant**


BYZ Luke 8:19 Παρεγένοντο δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἥδυναντο 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 Ὅτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος τοῖς ὀχλοῖς ἰδοὺ ἡ μήτηρ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰστήκειαν ἔξω ζητοῦντες αὐτῷ λαλῆσαι.

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, r'), vg

ἐρχονται 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.


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 ἄνεμῳ καὶ τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἐπαύσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη _.

Not in NA but in SQE!

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: Ξ
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:26 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί δειλοὶ ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; τότε ἐγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τοὺς ἄνεμους καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ, καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη μεγάλη.
NA28 Mark 4:39 καὶ διεγερθεὶς ἐπετίμησεν τῷ ἄνεμῳ καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θαλάσσῃ· 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 ἔθαυμασαν λέγοντες πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τίς ἁρα οὕτως ἔστιν ὦτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὑδάτι, καὶ ὑπακούοσιν αὐτῷ:

omit: P75, B, 700, aeth, Tert?, Bois, Weiss

Tert (Marc. 4:20) has the quote up to ὑδάτι, but it is not clear if the other words follow: τίς ἁρα οὕτως ἔστιν, ὦτι τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῇ θαλάσσῃ.
B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 26:
NA28 Luke 8:26 Καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν ...

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:27 οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἔθαυμασαν λέγοντες· ποταπὸς ἔστιν οὕτως ὦτι καὶ οἱ ἀνεμοί καὶ ἡ θάλασσα αὐτῷ ὑπακούωσιν;
NA28 Mark 4:41 καὶ ἔφοβηθησαν φόβον μέγαν καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τίς ἁρα οὕτως ἔστιν ὦτι καὶ ὦ ἀνεμος 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** Kai katepleusan eis tin χωραν twn Γερασηνων, ητις έστιν αντιπέρα tis Γαλιλαιας.

*BYZ Luke 8:26* Kai katepleusan eis tin χωραν twn Γαδαρηνων, ητις έστιν αντιπέρα tis Γαλιλαιας

NA28 Luke 8:37 και ἤρωτησαν αὐτόν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τον Περιχωρου Μεγανων ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.

**BYZ Luke 8:37** και ἤρωτησαν αὐτόν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τον Περιχωρου Μεγανων ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ’ αὐτῶν.

**Lk 8:26**

Γερασηνων P75, B, D, 0267, Latt, Sy-H\(mg\), sa, bo\(ms\)

Γαδαρηνων A, R, W, Δ\(gr\), Ψ, 0135, f13, 700\(^C\), 1071, 892, Maj, Sy, goth

Γεργεσηνων 01, L, X, Θ, Ξ, f1, 22, 33, 157, 579, 700\(^A\), 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)** των Γερασηνων, ητις έστιν αντιπέρα

**Lk 8:37**

Γερασηνων P75, B, C\(^*\), D, 0279, 579, pc, Latt, sa

Γαδαρηνων 01\(^C\), A, R, W, Δ\(gr\), Ψ, 124, 346(=f13), 700\(^C\), 892, Maj, Sy, goth

Γεργεσηνων 01\(^*\), C\(^C\), L, P, X, Θ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 157, 700\(^A\), 1071, 1241, 1342, al, bo, Sy-Pal, arm, geo, Gre

**B: no umlaut**

**Mt 8:28**

Γαδαρηνων 01\(^*\), B, C, M, Δ\(gr\), Θ, Σ, 174(=f13), 1010, pc, Sy, Epiph

Γεργεσηνων 01\(^C\), L, W, X, f1, f13, 22, 157, 700, 892, Maj, Sy-H\(mg\), Sy-Pal, bo, goth

Γερασηνων 892\(^C\), Latt, Sy-H\(mg\), sa, mae-1+2

**B: no umlaut**

**Mk 5:1**

Γερασηνων 01\(^*\), B, D, Latt

Γαδαρηνων A, C, f13, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

Γεργεσηνων 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

BYZ Luke 8:27 ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἀνὴρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὃς εἶχεν δαιμόνια ἐκ χρόνων ἵκαινῳ καὶ ἰμάτιον οὐκ ἐνεδιδυσκότα, 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 ἵκαινῳ δὲ D, (e)

txt P75vid, 01°C2b, B, L, Ε, (f1), 33, 157, 579, 1241, 1342, 1612, 1627, Sy-Hm3, Sy-Pal, Co, arm καὶ χρόνως πολλῷ 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 πολλοὶ 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 ἀνακράζας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐίπεν· τί ἔμοι καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦς ὑιὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου; δέομαι σου, μή με βασανίσῃς.

**omit Ἰησοῦς:** P75, D, R, f1, 69, 579, 1071, al, d, e, bo

**omit τοῦ θεοῦ:** D, Ξ, f1, 892, 954, 1424, 1675, 2542, pc, g1, d, l, vgms, geo

**B:** no umlaut

**WH** have τοῦ θεοῦ in brackets.

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 8:29 τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, ὑιὲ τοῦ θεοῦ;
BYZ Matthew 8:29 τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί Ἰησοῦς ὑιὲ τοῦ θεοῦ
  Byz: C, W, Θ, 1582(f1), f13, 579, 1424, Maj, it, Sy-P, Sy-H

NA28 Mark 5:7 τί ἐμοί καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦς ὑιὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου;
  **omit Ἰησοῦς:** f1, 700 (not in NA and SQE!)

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 16:16 σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζώντος.
NA28 Mark 3:11 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

NA28 Mark 10:47 καὶ λέγειν· ὑιὲ Δαυίδ Ἰησοῦς, ἐλεησοῦν με.
  Ἰησοῦ f13, 565
  Κύριε 28

NA28 Mark 10:48 μᾶλλον ἐκραζεῖν· ὑιὲ Δαυίδ, ἐλεησοῦν με.
  Ἰησοῦ f13
  Κύριε 28, 124, 1071

NA28 Luke 1:32 οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς υψίστου κληθήσεται
BYZ Luke 4:41 σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ
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 homoioarcton (τοῦ - τοῦ).

It is interesting to note that Mk has the fullest form here. The term νίκης 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:

παρήγγελλεν
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, NA28, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

παρήγγελλεν  txt
P75, B, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1241, 1424, 2542, Maj-part[F, M, Y, Λ], WH, Trg, Robinson

έλεγεν  D, e (from Mk)

B: no umlaut

παρήγγελλεν  indicative aorist  active 3rd person singular
παρήγγελλεν  indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular

Parallel:
NA28 Mark 5:8 έλεγεν γὰρ αὐτῷ· ἐξελθεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 6:8 καὶ παρήγγελλεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδὲν αἰρωσιν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰ μὴ ράβδου μόνον, μὴ ἄρτον, μὴ πήραν, μὴ εἰς τὴν ζύωνην χαλκῶν, παρήγγελλεν  E, F, G, U, W, Y, f13, 1071, 1424, al

NA28 Luke 8:56 καὶ ἐξέστησαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτῆς· ὃ δὲ παρήγγελλεν αὐτοῖς μηδὲν εἴπειν τὸ γεγονός.
παρήγγελλεν  K

NA28 Luke 9:21 ὃ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγελλεν μηδὲν λέγειν τούτο
παρήγγελλεν  M, S, X, Ω, pc

Previous verse 28:
NA28 Luke 8:28 ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράζας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνὴ μεγάλῃ ἐἶπεν· τί ἐμοί καὶ σοι, Ἰησοῦ νικὴ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου; δέομαι σου, μή με βασανίσῃς.
Robertson ("Wordpictures") notes: "For he commanded (παρηγγείλλεν γὰρ). Imperfect active, correct text, for he was commanding."

παρηγγείλλεν appears only here in the NT. παρηγγείλλεν appears 7 times (3 more times in Lk). At some points παρηγγείλλεν is a variant (see above). It is thus possible that παρηγγείλλεν is secondary here too. The support is divided.

Weiss (Com. Lk) argues that παρηγγείλλεν 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:

ἀπὸ B, Ξ, WH, Weiss, NA\(^{25}\), Trg\(^{ma}\)

txt P75, 01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, WH\(^{ma}\)
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 Luke 8:33 ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαίμονια 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 δαίμονίου 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:


_omit_ P75<sup>vid</sup>, 01<sup>*</sup>, B, P, S, 472, pc, _Weiss, WH, NA<sup>es</sup>, Gre, Tis, Bal_

_omit_ P75, B

_omit_ Lat

无比他 1342, pc

Β: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 9:18 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος αὐτοῖς, ἰδοὺ ἀρχὼν εἰς ἑλθὼν προσεκύνει αὐτῷ.

NA28 Mark 5:22 Καὶ ἔρχεται εἰς τῶν ἀρχισυναγωγῶν, ὄνοματι Ἰαίρος, καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.

Context:

NA28 Luke 7:38 καὶ στάσα ὅπλῳ παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ

_omit_ Τισσοῦ

A, K, P, Y, Θ, 565

NA28 Luke 8:35 ἔξηλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ εὗρον καθήμενον τὸν ἀνθρωπον ἀφʼ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἔξηλθεν ἰματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.


_omit_ Τισσοῦ

P75

The omission of the article could be idiomatic usage, but it is a little strange. The support is incoherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)
48. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:43 Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα, ἤτις [ιατροίς προσαναλώσασα ὄλον τὸν βίον] οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἀπ’ οὐδενός θεραπεύῃναι,_____

BYZ Luke 8:43 καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος ἀπὸ ἐτῶν δώδεκα ἤτις ἵατροίς προσαναλώσασα ὄλον τὸν βίον οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ύπ’ οὐδενός θεραπεύῃναι

**omit:** P75, B, D, 0279, Sy-S, Sy-Palmss, sa, arm, geo, Or, NA²⁵, WH, Weiss

D, d read for the final clause: ἦν οὐδὲ εἰς ἴσχυς θεραπεύονται.

**txt** 01, A, C, L, P, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, ΢, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Palm, bo, Bois

Sy-C adds at the end of the verse:

καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῇ λέγουσα ἐὰν ἀπελθοῦσα ἁψωμαι καὶ τῶν ἰματίων 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 / προσαναλέω "spend in addition, spend lavishly"
"having spent on physicians all her living"

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 5:25-26 Καὶ γυνὴ οὖσα ἐν ρύσει αἵματος δώδεκα ἔτη 26 καὶ πολλὰ παθοῦσα ὑπὸ πολλῶν ἱατρῶν καὶ δαπανήσασα τὰ παρ’ αὐτῆς πάντα καὶ μηδὲν ὄφεληθείσα ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸ χείρον ἐλθοῦσα,

δαπανάω "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 ἀψωμαι τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.
NA28 Mark 5:28 ἔλεγεν γὰρ ὅτι ἐὰν ἀψωμαι κἂν τῶν ἰματίων αὐτοῦ σωθήσομαι.

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 12:44 πάντες γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον, αὐτὴ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα ὃσα ἔχει ἔβαλεν ἅλον 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)
49. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 8:44 προσελθοῦσα ὁπισθεὶς ἦψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔστη ἡ ρύσις τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῆς.

**omit 1:** D, Ψ, 209*, 1071, pc

**omit 2:** D, it(a, b, d, ff², l, r²)

Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg) have the words.

ἡψατο ὁπισθεὶς Κ, Π, pc

**B: no umlaut**

omit 2: Western non-interpolation?

Minor agreement between Mt and Lk (see below)

ὁπισθεὶς = "from behind"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:20 ... προσελθοῦσα ὁπισθεὶς ἦψατο τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 5:27 ἐλθοῦσα ἐν τῷ ὄχλῳ ὁπισθεὶς ἦψατο τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ.

add τοῦ κρασπέδου: M, f1, 33, 579, 1071, pc, aeth

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 14:36 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μόνον ἀψωνται τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ καὶ ὅσοι ἦσαντο διεσώθησαν.
NA28 Mark 6:56 καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα κἀ̂ν τοῦ κρασπέδου τοῦ ἰματίου αὐτοῦ ἀψωνται καὶ ὅσοι ἀν ἦσαντο αὐτοῦ ἔσωζοντο.

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 homoioarcton (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 ὁπισθεν is not clear. It has been omitted neither in Mt nor in Mk.
Note that K, Π, pc have ἄψωκτο ὁπισθεν (not in NA and SQE).

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 133
50. Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου; ἀρνομένων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος.

BYZ Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου ἀρνομένων 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, C3, 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 μαθηταί αὐτοῦ· βλέπεις τὸν ὄχλον συνθλίβοντά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἡψατο;

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:36 καὶ κατεδίωξεν αὐτὸν Σίμων καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ.


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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>σὺν αὐτῷ</th>
<th>μετ’ αὐτοῦ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt, Mk, Jo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk, Act</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it is clear that Lk prefers σὺν αὐτῷ.

It is strange why so may 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 μαθηταί αὐτοῦ, but Weiss thinks so. The words
have probably been omitted as awkward. Note that the verb εἰπεῖν is in the singular.

The support for the omission not coherent (Π, 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 ἁψάμενός μου; ἀρνομένων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος· ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὁχλοὶ συνέχουσιν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.

BYZ Luke 8:45 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Τίς ὁ ἁψάμενός μου ἀρνομένων δὲ πάντων εἶπεν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ οἱ μετ’ αὐτοῦ· Ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὁχλοὶ συνέχουσιν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν καὶ λέγεις· Τίς ὁ ἁψάμενός 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 ἡψάτο

C*, D, Ψ, 0291, 28, 1071, pc,
      Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Ir

P75, 01, B, L, f1, 22, 157, 1241, pc, Sy-Pal

Note that D+it has 45a as: καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τίς μου ἡψάτο

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 ἡψάτο τῶν ῥυματίων;
NA28 Mark 5:31 καὶ ἔλεγον αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ· βλέπεις τὸν ὁχλὸν συνελιποῦσά σε καὶ λέγεις· τίς μου ἡψάτο;

Compare next verse 46:
NA28 Luke 8:46 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἡψάτο μοῦ τις, ἣν γὰρ ἐγὼν δύναμιν ἐξεληλυθοῦν 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: ἐτήσιον μου τις (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
   (after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 135

BYZ Luke 8:48 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Θάρσει, θύγατερ ἢ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε. πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην


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 imperactive 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· ἢ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

NA28 Mark 5:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ θυγάτηρ, ἢ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε· Ὅδε adds θάρσει

Probably a harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 136
NA28 Luke 8:54 αὐτὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔφωνησεν λέγων· ἥ παῖς, ἔγειρε.

BYZ Luke 8:54 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐκβαλὼν ἔξω πάντας, καὶ κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς ἔφωνησεν λέγων· Ἡ παῖς ἔγειρον.

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

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 ὁποῦ 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 ἐξῆβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω τῆς πόλεως
NA28 Luke 20:15 καὶ ἐκβαλόντες αὐτὸν ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελώνος
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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἑξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν

\[\text{ἀποστόλους}\]
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\textsuperscript{ ms}]

\[\text{μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ}\]
C\textsuperscript{ c}, E, F, H, U, 2, 157, al, it(b, ff\textsuperscript{ 2}, l, q, r\textsuperscript{ 1}), vg\textsuperscript{ ms}, Eus

txt
P75, A, B, D, K, Π, W, Δ, 047, 0211, f1, 22, 565, 700, 954, 2766, Maj, d, δ, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa, geo, Marcion\textsuperscript{ A}

\textbf{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 [οὗς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὡνόμασεν]

Compare:
NA28 Luke 6:13 καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὔς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὡνόμασεν·

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)
51. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

BYZ Luke 9:2 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰάσθαι τοὺς ἁσθενοῦντας

T&T #15

**omit:** B, 2206, Sy-S, Sy-C, NA\(^25\), WH, Weiss

In NA Marcion\(^4\) (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 ἁσθενείς 01, A, D, L, Ξ, Ψ, 070, 0202, f1, 33, 38, 157, 579, 1071, 1241, 1612, 2786, Bois, Gre, [Trg]

τοὺς ἁσθενοῦντας 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 ἁσθενοῦντας 2766, pc
νοσοῦντας 2542
καὶ ἁσθενοῦντας θεραπεῦν 1424 (omit ἰάσθαι)

ἁσθενείς adjective accusative masculine plural
ἁσθενοῦντας participle present active accusative masculine plural

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:7-8 πορευόμενοι δὲ κηρύσσετε λέγοντες ὅτι ἡγιασκεν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν. 8 ἁσθενοῦντας θεραπεῦες, νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε,

**Compare:**
NA28 Luke 9:1 Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεῦεν...

"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 ἰάωμαι, 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:

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, C3, D, K, Π, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 2786, Maj,
d, Sy-H, NA28, Weiss, [Trg]

Lat, Sy and other versions are not clear.

Mettzer: "... only d, Sy-H and goth express the force of ἀνὰ, 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

ἀνὰ here: "each"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:10 μὴ πήραν εἰς ὁδὸν μηδὲ δύο χιτώνας
NA28 Mark 6:9 καὶ μὴ ἐνδύσησθε δύο χιτώνας.

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.

ἀνὰ 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 ὄριων Δεκαπόλεως "into the (midst of the) district of Decapolis" Mk 7:31

2. distributive, with numbers: "each, apiece"
   ἀνὰ δηνάριον "a denarius apiece" Mt 20:9-10
   ἀπέστειλεν αὐτούς ἀνὰ δύο "he sent them out two by two" Lk 10:1
   κλισίας ὡσεὶ ἀνὰ πεντήκοντα "by fifties" Lk 9:14
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 μὴ τε without preposition appears.

A. Plummer (ICC Com. Lk 1922) writes: "In ἐχεῖν we have an anacoluthon; change from direct to oblique oration. For it is scarcely admissible to take ἐχεῖν as infinit. for imperat. The actual imperat. both precedes (ἀρέτε) and follows (μένετε)."

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong = prefer omission)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 140

Minority reading:

διήρχοντο κατὰ πόλεις καὶ κώμας 1071, it(b, c, ff², l, q), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa麻痹, arm, Marcion

διήρχοντο ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως ἑκείνης Λ

κατὰ πόλεις καὶ ἥρχοντο 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 ἥν δ’ ἂν πόλιν ἢ κώμην εἰσέλθητε,

Compare context:

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 8:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ καθεξῆς καὶ αὐτὸς διώδειεν κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην
NA28 Luke 8:4 Συνιόντος δὲ ὅχλου πολλοῦ καὶ τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευμένων 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 Ἡκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γευόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινών ὦτι Ἰωάννης ἤγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν,

BYZ Luke 9:7 Ἡκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετράρχης τὰ γευόμενα ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὦτι Ἰωάννης ἐγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν

Byz A, C, W, Χ, 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, Ξ, f13, 157, (579), 1241, 1342, 2542, pc, it (a, b, d, e, ff*, l, r*), Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, arm

D omits also πάντα καὶ and reads:
tὰ γευόμενα ήπορεῖτο διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι
B: no umlaut

ἡπορεῖτο 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 Ἔν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἠκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὴν ἀκοὴν Ἰησοῦ.
NA28 Mark 6:14 Καὶ ἠκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ...

NA28 Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβείτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνθρα δίκαιον καὶ ἄγιον, καὶ συνετήρει αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἠδὲς αὐτοῦ ἠκουσεν.
BYZ Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρώδης ἐφοβείτο τὸν Ἰωάννην εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνθρα δίκαιον καὶ ἄγιον καὶ συνετήρει αὐτὸν καὶ ἀκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἐποίει, καὶ ἠδὲς αὐτοῦ ἠκουσεν

Byz A, C, D, f1, f13, 33, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy
txt 01, B, L, (W), Θ, 27, Co
Compare:


ὑπ’ αὑτοῦ: There is no reason for an omission. It has probably been added remembering 13:17 or 23:8 to make the meaning more clear.

ἡπορεῖτο is possibly a partial conformation to Mk 6:20, but D reads ἐποίει here.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

ὁ Ἡρώδης
B, L, N, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1241, pc, TRI!, Weiss, [WH], NA²⁵, Gre, SBL

txt  P75vid, 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 Η can still be seen.

B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 Luke 9:7 Ἥκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τὰ γινόμενα πάντα καὶ διηπόρει διὰ τὸ λέγεσθαι ὑπὸ τινῶν ὅτι Ἰωάννης ἦγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν,

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:1-2 Ἔν ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἤκουσεν Ἡρώδης ὁ ἀρχηγὸς τὴν ἄκον Ἰησοῦ, 2 καὶ ἤπεν τοῖς παισίν αὐτοῦ· οὗτος ἦστιν Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς· αὐτὸς ἦγέρθη ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τούτο αἱ δυνάμεις ἐνεργοῦσιν ἐν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Mark 6:14 Καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης, φανερὸν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιζόμενος ἐγήγερται ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ διὰ τούτο ἐνεργοῦσιν αἱ δυνάμεις ἐν αὐτῷ.
Compare:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Εξουσίας τοῦ Ἦρωδου</th>
<th>579</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πρὸς τὸν Ἦρωδην</td>
<td>P75, B, T, Θ, pc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τῷ Ἦρωδη</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA28 Luke 23:12 ἐγένοντο δὲ φίλοι ὁ τε Ἦρωδης καὶ ὁ Πιλάτος ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετ’ ἀλλήλων’ προὐπήρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρα ὁντες πρὸς αὐτοὺς. ὁ τε Πιλάτος καὶ ὁ Ἦρωδης καὶ Ἦρωδης

| καὶ Ἦρωδης | 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

BYZ Luke 9:10 Καὶ ὑποστρέψαντες οἱ ἀπόστολοι διηγήσαντο αὐτῷ ὡς ἐποίησαν καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ὑπεχώρησεν κατʼ ἰδίαν εἰς τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλομένης Βηθσαϊδάν

πόλιν: P75, 01<sup>C1</sup>, B, L, X, Ξ<sup>ε</sup>, 33, pc, Sy-S, Co, WH, NA<sup>28</sup>
kόμην: D, d
tόπον

τόπον πόλεως: f1, 700, Sy-Pal, geo

tόπον ἔρημον: Lat, bo<sup>ms</sup>
locum desertum

omit καλομένης Βηθσαϊδάν:
tόπον ἔρημον: 01*, 157, Sy-C, arab<sup>ms</sup>
tόπον ἔρημον: 69, 788(=f13), 1241

πόλιν καλομένην Βηθσαϊδά τόπον ἔρημον 1342
kόμην καλομένην Βηθσαϊδά εἰς τόπον ἔρημον Θ, r'<sup>1</sup>

ἔρημον τόπον πόλεως: A, Ξ<sup>c</sup>, f13, 565, pc
tόπον ἔρημον πόλεως: C, W, K, Π, Δ, 892, 1424, Maj, (Sy-P), Sy-H, goth

Ξ: The reading of Ξ<sup>c</sup> 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 ἐπισιτισμὸν, ὦτι ὠδε ἐν ἔρημῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:13 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνεχώρησεν ἐκείθεν ἐν πλοίῳ εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κατʼ ἰδίαν· καὶ ἀκούσαντες οἱ ὀχλοὶ ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ πεζῇ ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων.
Strange collection of all thinkable variants.
It is possible that πόλις was the original reading and that scribes felt the discrepancy between the "deserted place" mentioned in verse 12 and the πόλις Βηθσαϊδᾶ. 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 καλομένης Βηθσαϊδᾶν ("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 πόλις 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 Ὡς δὲ ἡμέρα ἦρξατο κλίνειν· προσελθόντες δὲ οἱ δώδεκα εἶπαν αὐτῷ· ἀπόλυσον τὸν ὄχλον, ἵνα πορευθέντες εἰς τὰς κύκλους κώμας καὶ ἄγροις καταλύσωσιν καὶ εὑρωσίν ἐπιστικισμοῦν, ὅτι ὥδε ἐν ἐρήμῳ τόπῳ ἐσμέν.

τοὺς ὄχλους

P75, 01<sup>c2a</sup>, 047, 28, 157, 472, 565, 1424, 2766, 2786, pc, Lat(aur, c, d, ff<sup>2</sup>, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, sa<sup>mss</sup>, bo

toῦ ὄχλου

01*

txt

01<sup>c2b</sup>, 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 8:45 ἐπιστάτα, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσίν σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν.


τοῖς ὄχλοις D, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, bo<sup>mss</sup>

NA28 Luke 9:18 τίνα μὲ 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:

φαγεῖν ὑμεῖς    B, Weiss, WH, NA28, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt   01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, WH
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν αὐτοῖς    D

NA28 Mark 6:37 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν.

P45vid: ὑμεῖς 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 ὑμεῖς. This is supported by the fact that in both Mt and Mk one witness moves ὑμεῖς directly after δότε: δότε ὑμεῖς.
It is also possible that at some point in the transmission of the B text ὑμεῖς 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)
54. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:16 λαβὼν δὲ τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἴχθυας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν ...  

εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν

01, X, 1241, 2786, pc, Sy-P, arm

προσηφάσατο καὶ εὐλόγησεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς

D, d

εὐλόγησεν ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς καὶ κατέκλασεν

et benedixit super illos ...  

it(a, b, ff², l, q, Ῥ¹), vgᵐ, Sy-Ȼ, (Sy-SError), Marcion

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 ἴχθυας, ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν ...  

NA28 Mark 6:41 καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς πέντε ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς δύο ἴχθυας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν καὶ κατέκλασεν ...  

Compare:

NA28 Luke 2:34 καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεών  

NA28 Luke 24:30 λαβὼν τὸν ἄρτον εὐλόγησεν καὶ κλάσας ἐπεδίδου αὐτοῖς,  


ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς appears only 3 times in the Gospels, twice in Lk (and 7 times in Acts):

NA28 Mark 6:34 καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς, "on/for them"

NA28 Luke 9:5 ἀποτιμάσετε εἰς μαρτύριον ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς, "against them"

NA28 Luke 19:27 μὴ θελήσαντός με βασιλεύσαι ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς "over them"

The reading of 01 et al. is probably a harmonization to Mt, Mk.
There is no reason why įπ' should have been deleted so universally.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 147

 Minority reading:

 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)
55. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:


NA28 Luke 9:18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνήθησαν αὐτῶ οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτοὺς λέγων· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ὀχλοὶ εἶναι;

**συνήθησαν** 1424, 1675
**συνήπτησαν** 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 συνήπτησαν.

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

D has: Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς κατὰ μόνας συνήθησαν

"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

**συνήθησαν** σύνειμι indicative imperfect active 3rd person plural
"be with, come together, gather"

**συνήχθησαν** συνάγω indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural
"gather together"

**συνήπτησαν** συναντάω indicative aorist active 3rd person plural
"meet"


NA28 Mark 6:44-47 καὶ ἦσαν ὁι φαγόντες [τοὺς ἄρτους] πεντακισχίλιοι ἄνδρες. 45 Καὶ εὐθὺς ἦνακασεν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐμβήναι εἰς τὸ πλοῖον καὶ προάγειν εἰς τὸ πέραν πρὸς Βηθσαϊδᾶν, ἦως αὐτὸς ἀπολύει τὸν ὄχλον. 46 καὶ ἀποταξάμενος αὐτοῖς ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύξασθαι. 47 καὶ ὄψις 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 κόμις Καισάρειας τῆς Φιλίττου· καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἀνθρώποι εἶναι;

NA28 Matthew 16:13 Ἐλθὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὰ μέρη Καισάρειας τῆς Φιλίττου ἠρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων· τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἀνθρώποι 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 ἠσαν οἱ φαγόντες [τοὺς ἁρτους] πεντακίς ἄνδρες. 45 Καὶ ... 46 ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος προσεύχεσθαι. ... 47 καὶ αὐτὸς μόνος ...

8:27 καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐπηρώτα τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγων αὐτοῖς· τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἀνθρώποι 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 συνήντησαν 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 συνήντησαν 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 ἠντησαν = 'met'. συνήντησαν = '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, συνήσαν is a rare word (only three times in the NT, all in Lk/Acts: Lk 8:4; 9:18; Acts 22:11)

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 9:18 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτὸν προσευχόμενον κατὰ μόνας συνήσαν 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, 01c², C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 700, Maj, Trg²⁵

λέγουσιν οἱ ἀνθρώποι

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 ἀποκρίθηκε εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 16:13 ... ἡρῴτα 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 αὐτοὺς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκρίθηκε ο 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:

__ὑιὸν__ D, 2766, it(d, e, r'), bo² msc
__τὸν ὕιὸν__ 28, 892, 1675, pc, bo² msc

Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος  f*, l (Mt)
"Tu es Christus filius Dei vivi."

Origen: Mt Comm tom. 1
οἴ γον ἀναγράψαντες Μάρκος καὶ Δουκάς ἀποκριθέντα τὸν Πέτρον εἰρηκέναι: "Σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός." καὶ μὴ προσέθεντες τὸ παρὰ τῷ Μαθαῖῳ κείμενον "ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος".

**B:** no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.
NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτοὺς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός.

Compare:

add ὁ υἱός: P75, 070, f13, 157, 579, 1071, L844, pc, Sy-H, Co, Eus

ei ὁ υἱός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός  B
ei ὁ υἱός εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰ χριστός εἰ 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)

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)
"whoever is ashamed of me and the mine (my followers)"
"whoever is ashamed of me and of my words"

**omitted:** 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 òς γὰρ ἐὰν ἐπαισχυνθῇ με καὶ τοὺς ἐμοὺς λόγους ἐν τῇ γενεᾶς ταύτης τῇ μοιχαλίδι καὶ ἀμαρτωλῷ,

**omitted:** P45', 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 ἐμοὺς, 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:**


**Rating:** 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 153

BYZ Luke 9:27 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ἀληθῶς εἰσίν τινες τῶν ὡδε ἐστῶτων οἱ οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ἕως ἃν ἱδώσιν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ

Not in NA but in SQE!

Byz  A, C, D, K, Π, P, R, W, Χ, 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 εἰσίν τινες τῶν ὡδε ἐστῶτων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ...
NA28 Mark 9:1 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι εἰσίν τινες ὡδε τῶν ἐστηκότων οἵτινες οὐ μὴ γεύσωνται θανάτου ...

Byz: τῶν ὡδε ἐστηκότων

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:36 καθίσατε αὐτοῦ ἕως [οὗ] ἀπελθὼν ἐκεῖ προσεύξωμαι.

Leod 33, 700
ἐκεῖ 472
omit: 01, C*, pc

NA28 Mark 6:33 καὶ εἶδον αὐτούς ὑπάγοντας καὶ ἔπεγνωσαν πολλοὶ καὶ πεζὴ ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν πόλεων συνέδραμον ἐκεῖ καὶ προῆλθον αὐτούς.

D συνήλθον αὐτοῦ
565 ἠλθον αὐτοῦ
f1 ἠλθον ἐκεῖ

Clearly a harmonization to Mt, Mk.
Possibly the unusual use of αὐτοῦ has been changed to the more common and unequivocal ὡδε. Compare the similar cases above.
Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

**omit** P45vid, 01*, B, H, 28, 157, 579, pc,
it(a, b, ff², l, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, WH, Bal

txt 01cz, 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 poz, Tis καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν 124, 1071, TR ἡμέραν ἐξ ...

order Ιάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην
P45, P75, Cz, D, L, M, Ξ, 33, 157, 892, 1071, L844, pc,
d, r¹, vg c1, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa-mss, bo

The evidence of the Syriac here is doubtful, compare P. Williams:

**B**: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 17:1 Καὶ μεθ’ ἡμέρας ἐξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ιησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ Ιάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ψηλὸν κατ’ ἱδίαν.

NA28 Mark 9:2 Καὶ μετὰ ἡμέρας ἐξ παραλαμβάνει ὁ Ιησοῦς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τὸν Ιάκωβον καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ψηλὸν κατ’ ἱδίαν μόνους. καὶ μετεμορφώθη ἐμπροσθεν αὐτῶν,

Compare context:
Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 26:37 καὶ παραλαβὼν τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς δύο νίκους 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 ἐξ.
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 ὡκτὼ (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 υἱὸς μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.

BYZ Luke 9:35 καὶ φωνὴ ἐγένετο ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα
οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε

**Byz**
A, C*, D, P, R, W, X, Δ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj,
it(a, aur, d, ff₂, l), vg, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, goth, Marcion,
ό ἀγαπητός ἐν ὧ εὐδόκησα

**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-H₉, Co, arab

**B**: no umlaut

**Parallels:**
NA28 Matthew 17:5 καὶ ἵδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης λέγουσα·
oὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ὧ εὐδόκησα· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 9:7 καὶ ἐγένετο φωνὴ ἐκ τῆς νεφέλης·
oὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ.

**Add**: ἐν ὧ εὐδόκησα: 01c, Δ
add ὃν ἐξελεξάμην: 0131

**Compare:**

NA28 John 1:34 ὁὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
P106, 01, b, e, ff₂, Sy-S, Sy-C: ὁ ἐκλεκτός
a, sa: "electus filius"

NA28 1 Peter 2:4 πρὸς ὃν προσερχόμενοι λίθον ζωτα ὕπο ἀνθρώπων
μὲν ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον παρὰ δὲ θεῷ ἐκλεκτὸν ἐντιμον,

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:

Per diem

---

eo die

in illa die

---

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: Ξ
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 17:9 Ὑπείρωσεν καταβαίνοντων αὐτῶν ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους ἀνετείλατο αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
NA28 Mark 9:9 Ὑπείρωσεν καταβαίνοντων 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 ἡμέρα 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:

καὶ ῥάσσει 01, 157
καὶ ῥάσσει αὐτὸν 230(=f13), pc
καὶ ῥήσσει αὐτὸν 892
καὶ ῥήσσει (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 αὐτὸν ἔξαιφνης πνεῦμα καὶ ῥήσσει
(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: Ξ
B: no umlaut

ῥάσσει from ῥήγγυμι or ῥήσσω
"dash to the ground (in convulsions); break forth (of a shout)"

Parallel:
NA28 Mark 9:18 καὶ ὅπου ἔαν αὐτὸν καταλάβῃ ῥήσσει αὐτὸν, καὶ ἀφρίζει καὶ τρίζει τοὺς ὀδόντας καὶ ἐχθραίνεται καὶ εἶπα τοῖς μαθηταῖς σου ἵνα αὐτὸ ἑκβάλωσιν καὶ σύκο ἱσχύσαν.

Compare context:

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 αὐτὸν, 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 homoioarcton (KAI - KAI) or to improve style (remove redundancy).
A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes: "In several documents this is preceded by καὶ ῥῆσσει, which I believe to be right. It was probably omitted because ῥῆσσει 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 ἵδοι πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξαίφνης κράζει καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτὸν μετὰ ἀφροῦ καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ συντρίβον αὐτὸν’

μόγις B, R, W, Θ, 0211, f1pt, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, pc, Weiss, WH, Bois, NA28, Trgma

txt P75, 01, A, C, D, L, Ψ, 0115, f1pt, f13, 33, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Co

Swanson has f1 for txt, only 118 for μόγις.
IGNTP lists 1*, 118, 205, 209 for μόγις, so also Lake 1902.
I checked the film: I reads μόγις, I cannot see any correction. 1582 reads μόγις, too. I didn’t check the other manuscripts.
B: no umlaut

μόγις adverb: "hardly, scarcely"

Compare:
NA28 Mark 7:32 Καὶ φέρουσιν αὐτῷ κωφὸν καὶ μουγιλάλον καὶ παρακαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιθῇ αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα.

Lukan usage:
NA28 Acts 14:18 καὶ ταύτα λέγοντες μόλις κατέπαυσαν τοὺς ὄχλους τοῦ μὴ θύειν αὐτοῖς. μόγις D, 1175

NA28 Acts 27:7 ἐν ἰκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέρας βραδύπλοοντες καὶ μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κυίδου, μὴ προσεδώντος ἡμᾶς τοῦ ἀνέμου ὑπεπλεύσαμεν τὴν Κρήτην κατὰ Σαλμώνην,
μόγις 1175, 1270

NA28 Acts 27:8 μόλις τε παραλεγόμενοι αὐτὴν ἠλθομεν εἰς τόπον τινὰ καλούμενον Καλοὺς λιμένας ὃ ἐγγὺς πόλις ἡν Λασαία.
μόγις 1175

NA28 Acts 27:16 ὑπηρέτον δὲ τι ὑποδραμοῦντες καλούμενον Καύδα ἵσχυσαμεν μόλις περικρατεῖς γενέσθαι τῆς σκάφης,
μόγις 330, 1175, 1243
Compare also:
NA28 Romans 5:7 μόλις γὰρ ὑπὲρ δικαίου τις ἀποθανεῖται· ὑπὲρ γὰρ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ τάχα τις καὶ τολμᾷ ἀποθανεῖν.

mo,lij
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. μόλις 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:

omit 01*, B, NA28, WH, Tis, Bal

txt P45, P75, 01c2, 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: 2? (NA probably original)
58. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 9:50 εἴπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτῶν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ κωλύετε· δὲς 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·
δὲς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ὑμῶν,
焤πὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν .
L, Ξ, Ψ, 33, 892, 1342, pc, LectMSS, 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)

δὲς γὰρ ἐστιν καθ’ ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν Xtxt
( XCTxt reads txt)

txt + Mk 9:39b (οὔδεὶς 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
meθ' for καθ’ (sic!): 579, pc

B: no umlaut

For the ὑμῶν / ἴμμων variation, see next variant.

Parallels:
NA28 Mark 9:39 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· μὴ κωλύετε αὐτῶν. οὔδεὶς γὰρ ἐστιν δὲς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου καὶ δυνηθεται ταχύ κακολογήσαί με·
NA28 Mark 9:40 δὲς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν.

Note also:
NA28 Luke 11:23 Ὅ μὴ ὡν μετ’ ἔμοι κατ’ ἔμοι ἐστιν,
καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ’ ἔμοι 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’ ὑμων - καθ’ ὑμῶν). The scribe omitted the middle part, "but not making sense of this, the scribe then inserted οὐδὲ 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 = Ιοβ
349 = Ιοα
1194 = Ιορ
1654 = Ια
60 = Κχ
1630 = Κη

Rating: - (indecisive)
**TVU 161**


BYZ Luke 9:50 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς Μὴ κωλύετε· ὡς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ὑμῶν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν

Byz 01<sup>cl</sup>, f1, f13, 157, 579, Maj, geo

txt P45, P75, 01<sup>cl</sup>, B, C, D, Π, L, M, W, Ξ, Ψ, 124(=f13), 33, 565, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, 1424, 1675, pc, Latt, Sy, Co, arm, goth

阂么么 … 么么么 Θ, 2542, pc
么么么 … 么么么 01*, A, X, Δ, 69(=f13), pc

**B: no umlaut**

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 9:40 ὡς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ’ ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἔστιν.

BYZ Mark 9:40 ὡς 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<sup>mg</sup>, Co

阂么么 … 么么么 L, pc
么么么 … 么么么 X, 118, pc

*Compare previous verse 49:*


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 /阂么么 appears quite often.

It is possible that here in Lk we have a harmonization to the阂么么 of the previous verse 49.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 162
NA28 Luke 9:54 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ ᾿Ιάκωβος καὶ ᾿Ιωάννης εἶπαν· κύριε, θέλεις εἶπομεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς;

BYZ Luke 9:54 ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ᾿Ιάκωβος καὶ ᾿Ιωάννης εἶπον, Κύριε θέλεις εἶπομεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτοὺς ὥς καὶ ᾿Ηλίας ἐποίησεν

T&T #17
Byz A, C, D, K, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 700c, 892, Maj, it(a, b, c, d, f, q, ri), vgmass, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, goth, MarcionT, [Trgms]

txt P45, P75, 01, B, L, Σ, 157, 579, 700*, 1241, 1342, 1612, 1627, pc3, Lat(aur, e, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bopt, arm, geo2
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 αὐτοὺς; 55 στραφεὶς

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)
Difficult variant


BYZ Luke 9:55 στραφεὶς δὲ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν, Ὅψιν οἶδατε οἶου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς;

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\textsuperscript{mass} (IGNTP)

add both: K, Π, M, U, Y, Γ, Θ, Λ, f1, f13, 2, 579, 700, Maj-part\textsuperscript{1300}, Lat(a, aur, b, c, e, f, q, r\textsuperscript{1}, vg\textsuperscript{ww}), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, arm, goth, Marcion(2\textsuperscript{nd} CE), Tert?, Cl?, Diatess\textsuperscript{Arab}, Ambrose(4\textsuperscript{th} CE)

For Marcion 55b-56a is not directly documented, but it is probable that he read it, too (so Zahn and Harnack).

ποῖος instead of οἶος: D, f1, 579, 700, αλ\textsuperscript{240}

οἶος pronoun correlative genitive neuter singular
ποῖος adjective interrogative genitive masculine singular

579 has: καὶ εἶπεν, καὶ πορευομένων αὐτῶν εἶπεν τις πρὸς αὐτόν, Οὐκ οἶδατε οἶου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς· ὁ γὰρ ὤν τός ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἠλθεν ψυχὰς ἄνθρωπων ἀπολέσαι, ἀλλὰ σώσαι. ἀκολουθήσας σοι ὁποῦ ἔλα ἀπέρχῃ. (Probably mixed up. 579 omits verses 56b and 57a)

add 56a before 55b: pc\textsuperscript{33}

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-part\textsuperscript{430} [E, G, H, S, V, Ω], g\textsuperscript{1}, l, vg\textsuperscript{St}, Sy-S, sa, aeth\textsuperscript{mass}, Basil, Codex Fuldensis\textsuperscript{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· ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ.

Compare for 56a:
NA28 Matthew 5:17 Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἤλθον καταλῦσαι τὸν νόμον ἢ τοὺς προφήτας· οὐκ ἤλθον καταλῦσαι ἀλλὰ πληρώσαι.
BYZ Matthew 18:11 Ἡλθεν γὰρ ὁ ὦδις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός.
NA28 John 3:17 οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ’ ἵνα σωθῇ 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 ἐπέτιμησεν 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 καὶ ο κύριος προς τους ἀποστόλους εἶποντας εν πυρὶ κολασί τους μη δεξαμενους αυτους κατα τον ήλιαν' ουκ οἴδατε, φησι, ποιον πνεῦματος 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 οἴδατε οὗν πνεῦματος ἐστε is a genuine saying of Christ, although no part of this Gospel. The remainder ὁ γὰρ ὦλος ... 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:

ὑπάγης P45, D, 157, pc

Β: no umlaut

ἀπέρχῃ ἀπέρχομαι subjunctive present middle 2nd person singular "go away, leave"

ὑπάγεις ὑπάγω subjunctive present active 2nd person singular "go one’s way; go away, depart"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 8:19 καὶ προσελθὼν εἰς γραμματεύς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἀπέρχῃ.

Interesting difference.
ἀπέρχη could be a harmonization to Mt.

Usage:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ὑπάγω</th>
<th>ἀπέρχομαι</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lk uses ὑπάγω only rarely.

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 9:57 ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἀπέρχῃ ______.

(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>
kύριε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ... b

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 8:19 καὶ προσελθὼν εἷς γραμματεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
διδάσκαλε, ἀκολουθήσω σοι ὅπου ἔαν ἀπέρχῃ.
NA28 Matthew 8:21 ἔτερος δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ] εἶπεν αὐτῷ·
kύριε, ἐπίτρεψόν μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

Context:

NA28 Luke 9:59 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἠτέρως· ἀκολούθει μοι. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν·
[kύριε,] ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀπελθόντι πρῶτον θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.
omit: B*, D, V, pc, d, Sy-S, Or, NA<25>, Tis, WH, Gre, Bois, Weiss

NA28 Luke 9:61 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἠτέρως· ἀκολούθησο σοι, κύριε·

Compare:
omit: 01*, 2, it, Sy-P, Sy-P, arm, Or, Chr
NA28 Luke 12:41 κύριε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγεις ...
omit: f13, bo<ms>
omit: D, 205, 209, 726, 1071, e, c, d
omit: 063, 579, 1241, it
omit: K

NA28 Luke 19:20 κύριε, ἵδου ἥ μνᾶ σου ἢν εἶχον ...
omit: 1071, 2757, Sy-C

NA28 Luke 19:25 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ: κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς-
omit: B*

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)
62. **Difficult variant**

**Minority reading:**

**omit:** B*, D, pc, d, Sy-S, Or, NA28, 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.

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally κύριε in brackets in the margin.

**B (p. 1323 B 39):** Corrected by inserting the nomen sacrum (ΚΣ or ΚΕ, not clear) above the line, possibly before the enhancement, but this is not clear. The enhancer left the Ν 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, ἐπίτρεψον μοι πρῶτον ἀπελθεῖν καὶ θάψαι τὸν πατέρα μου.

**Compare context:**

NA28 Luke 9:57 ἀκολούθησον σοι ὅπου ἔχω ἀπέρχηκα ·


**Byz** A, C, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H

**txt** P45, P75, 01, B, D, L, E, f1, 157, 1071, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, co


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:

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 (=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

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 ἔτερος 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 ἐτερος· ἀκολούθησον σοι, κύριε· πρῶτον δὲ ἐπίτρεψόν μοι ἀποτάξασθαι τοῖς εἰς τὸν οἶκον 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**

**Difficult variant:**

NA28 Luke 10:1 Μετά δὲ ταύτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ___ ἐτέρους ἐβδομήκοντα [δύο]

BYZ Luke 10:1 Μετά δὲ ταύτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος καὶ ἐτέρους ἐβδομήκοντα

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 Μετά δὲ ταύτα ἀνέδειξεν καὶ ἐτέρους ... with καὶ abbreviated, and omitting ὁ κύριος.

*omit ὁ κύριος*: D, 1424, 1675, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, arab

*B*: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 9:61 Ἐίπεν δὲ καὶ ἐτερος ἀκολουθήσω σοι, κύριε

NA28 Luke 23:32 Ἡγούτο δὲ καὶ ἐτερος κακοὼργοι δύο

Metzger: "internal probabilities are indecisive (copyists may have omitted καὶ as superfluous or inserted it as explanatory)."

καὶ ἐτερος 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**


**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†, *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, boms, arm, geo, Marcion^4

**WH, NA28** both have δύο in brackets.

**Lacuna:** 33

**B:** umlaut! (1323 C 18 R) ἐβδομήκοντα [δύο] καὶ ἀπέστειλεν

Same in 10:17:

NA28 Luke 10:17 Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἐβδομήκοντα [δύο]

BYZ Luke 10:17 Ὑπέστρεψαν δὲ οἱ ἐβδομήκοντα

**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)

έβδομαμύκουτα [δύο] μετά χαρὰς

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 δυο δυο 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 δυο]
- 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)
65. **Difficult variant**


**Byz** 01, A, C, D, L, W, X, Δ, Ε, 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, Ψ, 0211, f13, 565, pc, L2211, Sy-H, Eus, **Bois**

**WH** have δύο in brackets.

omit 1582*

Lat has: "binos"

P75 has Κ (= 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.

P75vid, B, 0181, 579, 700, pc, e, Eus: **omit αὐτοὺς**.

**B**: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Mark 6:7 Καὶ προσκαλεῖται τοὺς δώδεκα καὶ ἠξῄσκε τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀποστέλλειν δύο δύο καὶ ἑδίκου αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων,

ἀνά δύο D, 565, ff², Sy-S

Context:


LXX:

LXX Genesis 7:3 καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πεπενωμένων τῶν μὴ καθαρῶν δύο δύο ἀρσεν καὶ θήλη διαθέσας σπέρμα ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν.
LXX Genesis 7:9 δύο δύο εἰσῆλθον πρὸς Νωe
LXX Genesis 7:15 εἰσῆλθον πρὸς Νωe εἰς τὴν κυβρώτον δύο δύο ἀπὸ πάσης σαρκάς

Compare:
NA28 John 2:6 ἦραν δὲ ἐκεῖ λίθιναι υδρίαι ἐξ κατὰ τὸν καθαρισμὸν τῶν ᾽Ιουδαίων κείμεναι, χωροῦσα ἀνά μετρητάς δύο ἥ τρεῖς.

BDAG (3rd ed.):
ἀνά 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 TWManson 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 αὐτοῦς by several witnesses:
αὐτοὺς ἀνά δύο δύο K, Y, Θ, Π, f13, 565, al, Sy-H, Eus
ἀνά δύο δύο B
αὐτοὺς ἀνά δύο 01, A, C, D, L, W, Ξ, Ψ, f1, 33, Maj
ἀνά δύο (P757), 0181, 579, 700, pc, Eus acc. to Tis

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

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


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, 157, pc, it, vg
εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἡμῶν A, C, Θ, K, π, L, M, U, W, Ψ, Ξ, 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 ἡμῖν, 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

ἀπομασσόμεθα "wipe off, wipe clean"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 10:14 καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ δέχηται ὑμᾶς μηδὲ ἀκούσῃ τοὺς λόγους ὑμῶν, ἐξερχόμενοι ἐξω τῆς οἰκίας ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κοινορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν.

Compare:
Probably a rather late omission within the Byzantine tradition. Either accidentally or to improve style.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
πλην τούτο γυμνόκετε ότι ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.

πλην τούτο γυμνόκετε ότι ἤγγικεν ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ


omit ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς: Γ, pc⁴, bo⁷


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)
66. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

**omit:**
P45, D, 472, 1009, 1241, d, e, l, geo<sup>2</sup>, arab<sup>MS</sup>, Bois

| ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως | f13, 1424, 1675, pc, r<sup>1</sup>, Sy-C, sa<sup>mss</sup>, goth (from Mt) |
| ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνη | Ψ, pc, Sy-S, geo<sup>mss</sup> (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 | f1 |
| **B:** no umlaut |

Compare previous verse 12:

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 11:22 πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, Τύρῳ καὶ Σιδῶνι ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται ἐν ἡμέρᾳ κρίσεως ἡ ὑμῖν.

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 12:41 ἄνδρες Νινευίται ἀναστήσουται ἐν τῇ κρίσει
NA28 Luke 11:32 ἄνδρες Νινευίται ἀναστήσουται 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)
67. **Difficult variant**


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

mm. οὐρανοῦ ψυωθήσα C, 157, 2542, pc, [Trg]

1582

Tis, Weiss (see below)

**txt** P45, P75, 01, B*, D, (L, Ξ, 579, 700, 1071), pc, it (a, b, d, r'), Sy-C, Sy-S, Co

mm. οὐρανοῦ ψυωθήσῃ; L, Ξ, 579, 700, 1071, Gre (in Mt: txt)

1582 (p. 175r): Swanson has 1582 erroneously for μὴ, but it clearly reads ἡ. It then reads ψυωθήσης. The only question is if there is a correction after the Sigma of ψυωθήσης, 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: no umlaut

B (p. 1324 B 4): The corrections in B are not entirely clear. NA and Tis have Η for B3 (Tis: "B3?"). Swanson has ΜΗ. The Μ is there, but it is not clear if it is enhanced or not. The Μ is not canceled. It’s slightly less dark than the previous Μ, difficult to judge. An Υ 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 Η.
The ΤΟΥ has been written above the line in dark uncial script. It is not clear by what corrector. Tis thinks by B³. BЄ also reads υποθήσει with the ГΙ written above the unenhanced Η. Weiss, following Tis thinks that the Η has been canceled by a corrector. It is possible that there is a stroke from top left to bottom right through the Η. This then has subsequently been changed into ГΙ.
Tischendorf thinks that B³ canceled the Μ from ΜΗ (and added a rough breathing above the Η) and canceled the final Η from υποθήσει, but later restored it back to ΜΗ (erasing the rough breathing) and υποθήσει.

For the discussion, see Mt 11:23

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 175

68. **Difficult variant**


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, Gre, Bois, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt  P75, B, D, 579, 1342, pc, d, Sy-S, Sy-C, arm, WH, NA28, Weiss

Same in Mt:

NA28 Matthew 11:23 καὶ σὺ, Καφαρναοῦμ, μὴ ἔως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; ἐῶς ἄδου καταβήσῃ.

BYZ Matthew 11:23 καὶ σὺ Καπερναοῦμ, ἢ ἔως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθεῖσα, ἐῶς 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

B: no umlaut

See discussion in Mt 11:23.

IQP’s Crit. ed. has καταβήσῃ as safe for Q.

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:

"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 ἐμοὶ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.
D, it(d, i, l), Justin
Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg) read txt.

ὁ δὲ ἔμε ἄθετῶν ἄθετεί τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με καὶ ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.
E, 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 ἐμοὶ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἔμε ἄθετεί· ὁ δὲ ἔμε ἄθετῶν ἄθετεί τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.
0115, 2766, pc, DiatessArab

Apostolic Constitutions 8:46 I
ἀν ὑμῶν γὰρ ἀκούσων ἔμοι ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.
καὶ ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.
καὶ ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός με.

Pseudo-Ignatius, Ephesians 5
ἀν ὑμῶν ἀκούσων ἔμοι ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἐμοὶ ἀκούσῃ τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός ὁ ὑμᾶς ἀθετῶν ἔμε ἄθετεί· ὁ δὲ ἔμε ἄθετῶν ἄθετεί 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 Ὅ δεχόμενος ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ δέχεται, καὶ ὃ ἐμὲ δεχόμενος δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Compare:
NA28 John 5:24 ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων καὶ πιστεῦων τῷ πέμψαντί με ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον
NA28 John 13:20 ὁ λαμβάνων ἄν τινα πέμψω ἐμὲ λαμβάνει, ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ λαμβάνων λαμβάνει τὸν πέμψαντά με.
NA28 John 14:24 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ πιστεύει· καὶ ὁ λόγος ὅν 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)
Difficult variant:
Minority reading:

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, WHma

B: no umlaut

ἀδικήσῃ 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)
**Difficult variant**

NA28 Luke 10:21

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἡγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν'

BYZ Luke 10:21

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἡγαλλιάσατο τῷ πνεύματι ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ εἶπεν

T&T #20

"At that same hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit"

---

**add ὁ Ἰησοῦς:**

1. before [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι
   - A, W, Δ, Ψ, 69, 124, 28, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, Bois
   - P45 vid, 0115, f13, 157, 892, 2542, pc, Cl

2. after [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι
   - P75, B, C, K, Π, Θ, f1, 579, 1071, al 100
   - NA25, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, SBL
   - 01, D, L, X, Ε, 33, 1241, pc, Tis, Bal

3. no addition
   - P45 vid, P75, 01, B, D, Ε, 157, 1241, 1612, pc 9
   - Lat, Sy, Co, arm

---

**Combined (the better witnesses labeled):**

- τῷ πνεύματι
  - 1612, pc 9
  - P45, 157

- ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ
  - 01, D, Ε, 1241

- τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ
  - P75, B

- ὁ Ἰησοῦς
  - pc 8

- ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι
  - A, W, Ψ, 0211, 565, 700, 1342, 1424, Maj
  - N, f13, 2780, al 27

- ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ
  - 0115, 892, 2309, 2542

- ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ
  - L, X, 33

- ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ
  - Θ, 579, 1071

- τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
  - C, K, Π, f1
B: umlaut! (1324 B 35 L) τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν.

Diatessaron:
Arabic (Giasca 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 ἑκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν·

Compare previous verse:

Compare:
NA28 Mark 2:8 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπιγνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ ὅτι
NA28 Mark 8:12 καὶ ἀναστενάξας 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 ἤλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν·
NA28 Luke 4:1 καὶ ἤγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
NA28 John 11:33 ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἔταραξεν ἑαυτὸν
   he was greatly disturbed in spirit and deeply moved.
NA28 John 13:21 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐταραχθῆ 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 ἵδου οἱ δουλεύοντες μοι ἀγαλλιάσωνται 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 τῶν ἀγίων 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 ἀγίων to πνεῦματ. 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 Ἄν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἤγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν ...

**omit:** P45, 27*, Marcion*, E, Pseudo-Cl

Marcion additionally omits πάτερ and reads tendentiously: κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἄτιμα ἡ κρυπτὰ 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 Ἅν ἐκείνῳ τῷ καιρῷ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ ἡπόποις.

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 ύπο τοῦ πατρός μου,

BYZ Luke 10:22 καὶ στραφεῖς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶπεν Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ύπο 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, r), 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, αi130, Lat(a, aur, b, d, e, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, arm, geo, goth

B: umlaut! (1324 C 3 L) πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ύπο

Compare next verse 23:

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 11:27 Πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ύπο τοῦ πατρός μου, ...

καὶ στραφεῖς 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 στραφεῖς, 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:

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’ ἑστάντας, 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’ ἑστάντας with στραφεῖς or with εἶπεν.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 182
Minority reading:

omit: D, it(a, d, e, ff², i, l), vgms, Marcion
καὶ δίκαιοι b, q, r¹, vgms ("et iusti")
καὶ δίκαιοι καὶ βασιλεῖς 1424

Marcion has: ὅτι οἱ προφήται οὐκ ἴδαν ἃ ὑμείς 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 προφήται καὶ δίκαιοι ἐπεθύμησαν ἵδειν ἃ βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκούσαί ἃ ἀκούσετε καὶ οὐκ ἠκούσαν.
omit καὶ δίκαιοι: B* (added by B²)

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)
Difficult variant:
Minority reading:


**omit**  P75, B, Ξ, 070, (f1), 472, L844, (L2211), pc, WH
ἐν ὅλῃ __ καρδίας  f1, L2211

txt  01, A, C, (D), L, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, WH<sup>ma</sup>, [Trg]
ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ καρδίᾳ  D, 157

**B: no umlaut**

See complete discussion at Mt 22:37

Rating: - (indecisive)
**TVU 184**

74. **Difficult variant**


BYZ Luke 10:30 ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἰμιθανή **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, Ε, 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 ἱερεὺς τις ("by chance", τύχη)
P75c:  10:31 κατὰ συγτυχεῖαν ἱερεὺς τις ("by chance", συντυχία)
txt, P75* 10:31 κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερεὺς 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:

**omit γενόμενος** P75, 01, B, L, X, Ξ, 070, 0190, f1, 33, 372, 700, 892, 1241, 1342, pc, NA, 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, Pi, 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:

Compare:
NA28 Acts 27:7 ἐν ἱκαναῖς δὲ ἡμέραις βραδυπλοοῦσι ταῖς μόλις γενόμενοι κατὰ τὴν Κνίδου

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 ἐλθὼν was present originally, then there is no reason for adding γενόμενος. It is possible that scribes missed a verb with κατὰ (in verse 31 κατέβαλλεν and in 33 ἡλθεν 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)
One of the last two: Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co

B: no umlaut

έπι τὴν αὔριον "the next day"

No parallel.
The word order of the txt reading is very awkward.
To the contrary the reading ἐκβάλων 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 ἐκβάλων 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 ἐξελθόν 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.

ἐξελθόν 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 ἐκβάλων.
The combination of P45 and P75 curious.
Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
76. **Difficult variant**


**T&T #22**

Byz A, B, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, WH, Gre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν</th>
<th>P3vid (6th CE), 01*, C*, L, Ξ, 33, 579, pc, NA25, WH, Trg, Tis, Bal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτῆς</td>
<td>01*, C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἐαυτῆς</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὸν οἶκον ἐαυτῆς</td>
<td>Trg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὸν οἶκον</td>
<td>Weiss (no manuscripts support)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**P3 reads:** (from the edition of Porter, NT Greek papyri, 2008)

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 Ἐμείνεν δὲ Μαριὰμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡς μήνας τρεῖς, καὶ ὑπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτῆς.

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. (οὖ - οὖ). For the omission of αὐτῆς manuscripts 01, 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:**


txt P45, P75, 01, B2, D, (W), Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 579, 700, 892, 1241, α[ F, U, Y, Π], Bas, TR!

ένκατέληπεν W
ένκατέληπεν 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

κατέληπεν indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
κατέλειπεν indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular

Compare:

NA28 Luke 7:45 φίλημα μοι οὐκ ἔδωκας· αὐτῇ δὲ ἀφ’ ἓς εἰσῆλθον οὐ διέληπεν καταφίλουσα μοι τοὺς πόδας.

διέληπεν 01, A, L, W, Ξ, 079, f13, 33, 565, 892, 1241, 1424, L844, Maj-part[K, Π, M, Δ, Λ]

διέληπεν B, D, P, Θ, Ψ, f1, 157, 579, 700, L2211, Maj-part[F, H, S, U, Γ]


κατέληπεν A, H, L, P, 33, pc
κατέλειπεν P74vid, 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)
78. Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 10:41 Μάρθα Μάρθα, μεριμνᾷς καὶ θορυβάζῃ περὶ πολλά,  
NA28 Luke 10:42 ἐνὸς δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία: Μαριὰμ γὰρ τὴν ἁγαθὴν μερίδα  
ἐξελέξατο ἣτις οὐκ ἀφαίρεθησέται αὐτής.

**omit** (see next variant): D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², i, l, r²), Sy-S

**όλιγων δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία** Sy-Pal, arm, geo, bo²ms, arab²ms

**όλιγων δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία ἢ ἐνὸς** P3(6th CE), 01²s, B, C²s, L, 070, f1, 33, 579,  
1342, pc, Sy-Hᵐᵃ, bo, aeth, Or, Cyrᴬˡᵉˢ, NA²ˢ, WH, Gre, SBL

**όλιγων δὲ ἐστὶν** η ἐνὸς  01*  
**όλιγων δὲ χρεία ἐστὶν ἢ ἐνὸς**  B, Weiss

**txt ἐνὸς δὲ ἐστὶν 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: Ξ
**B:** no umlaut

Basically this is a choice between:

**όλιγων δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία ἢ ἐνὸς**  01, B, Or ...

and:

**ἐνὸς δὲ ἐστὶν 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 ἦ ἐνδ.;

Possibly the complete omission by D is just another attempt to avoid the difficult ὀλίγων δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία ἦ ἐνδ.; (see next variant).

A. Pallis (Notes, 1928) writes: "A locus desparatus. Part of the corruption is ἦ ἐνδ.; which probably represents a marginal comment referring to ὀλίγων and meaning 'or write ἐνδ.;'."

So also C.H. Turner ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158).

Compare:


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 θορυβάζῃς περὶ πολλά. 10:42 ἐνὸς δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία· Μαριὰμ γὰρ τὴν ἁγαθὴν μερίδα ἐξελέξατο ἣτις οὐκ ἀφαιρεθήσεται αὐτής.

for the labeled part:

θορυβάζῃ Μαριὰ D, WH

Μαρία it (a, b, e, ff², i, l, r¹), Sy-S

Lat(aur, f, q, vg) have txt

omits only 42a:

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
homoioarcton (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 δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία ἡ ἐνὸς (see previous variant).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
NA28 Luke 11:2 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς: ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε: Πάτερ, ἀγιασθῆτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἔλθετω ἡ βασιλεία σου·

BYZ Luke 11:2 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς ὅταν προσεύχησθε λέγετε Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ἀγιασθῆτω τὸ ὄνομά σου· ἔλθετω ἡ βασιλεία σου· γεννηθῆτω τὸ θελημά 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, 33vid, 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, MarcionΤ, Or

B: umlaut! (1325 B 41 L) λέγετε· Πάτερ, ἀγιασθῇ τω

b) γεννηθῆτω τὸ θελημά σου...
Byz 01, A, C, D, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f13, 33vid, 157, 579, 700, 892, Maj, it, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo
only γεννηθῆτω τὸ θελημά σου a, vgms, sa, bomss
txt P75, B, L, f1, 22, 1342, pc, vg, Sy-S, Sy-C, arm, MarcionΤ, 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: Ξ

B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 6:9 οὕτως οὖν προσεύχεσθε ὑμεῖς· Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς· ἀγιασθῆτω τὸ ὄνομά σου·
NA28 Matthew 6:10 ἔλθετω ἡ βασιλεία σου· γεννηθῆτω τὸ θελημά 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:

70011th CE, Tert (c. 200), Greg-Nyss (4th CE), Maximus Conf. (5th CE)
ἐλθέτω τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἄγιον ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

16212th CE:
ἐλθέτω σου τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

MarcionT (2nd CE) or some other early Western text used by Tert:
ἐλθέτω τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα σου, ἐλθέτω ἡ βασιλεία σου

D, d:
ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς ἐλθέτω σου ἡ βασιλεία

Gregory from Nyssa cites the passage three times:
ἐλθέτω τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα σου ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς
ἐλθέτω τὸ ἄγιον πνεῦμα σου καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς
ἐλθέτω ἐφ’ ἡμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἄγιον καὶ καθαρισάτω ἡμᾶς

B: no umlaut
"Thy holy spirit come upon us and cleanse us"

Compare:

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:

ἐλθέ τὸ ἁγιόν πνεύμα 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 ἀφές ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν,
kai γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν·
kai μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν.

BYZ Luke 11:4 καὶ ἀφές ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν
kai γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν·
kai μὴ εἰσενέγκης ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν
ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ.

Byz  Ο1°, A, C, D, P, Rvid, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, it, vgmas, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, boatt
txt P75, 01*, B, L, f1, 22, 700, 1342, pc, vg, Sy-S, sa, boatt, arm, geo, Marcion7, 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 … πονηροῦ

Lacuna: Ξ

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 ἰχθύν, καὶ ἃντι ἰχθύος ὁφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει;
NA28 Luke 11:12 ἢ καὶ αἰτήσει φῶν [egg], ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκorpion;

BYZ Luke 11:11 τίνα ἰχθύν, καὶ ἃντι ἰχθύος ὁφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ:
BYZ Luke 11:12 ἢ καὶ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ φῶν μὴ ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκorpion

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, Trg, Tis
omit ὁ ιδὸς 01, L, 157, 1342, pc, vg
omit καὶ 01, L, 28, 33, 157, 700, 892, pc

txt P45, P75, B, 1241, pc, ffs, i, l, Sy-S, sa, arm, Or, Marcion, Bois, Weiss
ἰχθύν, μὴ 1241, Or, NA, WH, Gre, Bal
omit ὁ ιδὸς 1241

omit ἢ καὶ ἰχθύν μὴ ... αὐτῷ 174, 788 (=f13) (h.t.?)

579 reads Byz, but has ἢ καὶ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃ φῶν μίαν from 12a for ἢ καὶ ἰχθύν due to parablepsis.

892: ὁ ιδὸς 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 [ἀρτον ...ἵ καὶ] in brackets in the margin.

Or Mt Comm. tom. 14:25
τίς δὲ ἐξ ὕμων τὸν πατέρα οἶδα αἰτήσει ἰχθύν, μὴ ἀντὶ ἰχθύος ὁφιν ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ
Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

in particular:
αἰτήσει τὸν πατέρα ὁ ιδὸς ἰχθύν καὶ B
αἰτήσει __ πατέρα ὁ ιδὸς ἰχθύν καὶ P75
__ πατέρα αἰτήσει __ οἶδα ἰχθύν καὶ P45
αἰτήσει τὸν πατέρα ___ ἰχθύν μή 1241
Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 7:9-10 ἥ τίς ἐστιν ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος, ὃν αἰτήσει ὁ νίκος αὐτοῦ ἄρτον, μὴ λίθον ἐπιδώσῃ αὐτῷ; 10 ἥ καὶ ἵθην αἰτήσει, μὴ ὁφιν ἐπιδώσῃ 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:

πνεῦμα ἄγιον δόμα D, it(α, b, c, d, ff, i, l, r) "bonum datum"

Lake gives δόματα ἄγαθὰ in his collation, but 1241 reads txt, checked at the film.

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 ποιηροὶ ὑπάρχοντες οἴδατε δόματα ἄγαθὰ διδώναι τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, πόσω μᾶλλον ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς δώσει ἄγαθα τοῖς αἰτοῦσιν αὐτῶν.

Compare also:
LXX Nehemiah 9:20 καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἄγαθὸν ἔδωκας
LXX Psalm 142:10 τὸ πνεῦμά σου τὸ ἄγαθὸν ὀδηγήσει με ἐν γῇ εὐθείᾳ

Probably the changes to ἄγαθὰς are conformations to immediate context δόματα ἄγαθὰ in the same verse.

IQP has for Q the Matthean δώσει ἄγαθα. So also Harnack.
Compare:

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
Minority reading:

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 A², C, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 1342, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, NA²⁵

D, d has:
ταύτα δὲ εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ προσφέρετε αὐτῷ δαμαχόνιζόμενος κωφὸς καὶ ἐκβαλόντος αὐτοῦ πάντες ἔθαυμαζον.

Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 9:33 καὶ ἐκβληθέντος τοῦ δαμαχόνιον ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός, καὶ ἔθαυμασαν οἱ ὃχλοι λέγοντες· οὐδέποτε ἐφάνη οὕτως ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ.
NA28 Matthew 12:22 Τότε προσηνέχθη αὐτῷ δαμαχόνιζόμενος τυφλὸς καὶ κωφὸς, καὶ ἔθεράπευσεν αὐτὸν, ὡστε τὸν κωφὸν λαλεῖν καὶ βλέπειν.

Compare:
NA28 Luke 5:1 καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἔστώς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ
NA28 Luke 5:17 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν διδάσκων,
NA28 Luke 7:12 μονογενῆς γίός τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτῆ ἦν χήρα,
NA28 Luke 19:2 Ζακχαῖος, καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν ἄρχιτελώνης

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 δαμώνιον 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 δαμωνίου 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."


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 Βεέλζεβουλ τῷ ἄρχοντι
tῶν δαίμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαίμονια:

 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 δαίμονίου ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφός.
 καὶ ἔθαψαν 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 ὀχυροὶ λέγοντες (: Mt)
 ὀχυρὸς "strong, firm; substantivally bold persons"

 It has been suggested that this is a mishearing of ὄχλοι.
 Perhaps a marginal note that slipped into the text?

 Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 198

Minority reading:

σκορπίζει με 01*, 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 0152 (dots above it).
P45 omits μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ.
Lacuna: Ξ
B: no umlaut

σκορπίζω "scatter, disperse"

Same in Mt:
NA28 Matthew 12:30 ὁ μὴ ὃν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἔστιν, καὶ ὁ μὴ συνάγων μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ σκορπίζει.

σκορπίζει με
01, 33, 1582*, pc, Sy-Hmg, 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 ἐξέλθη 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 ἐξέλθη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου διέρχεται δι’ ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ μὴ εὐρίσκον· [*τότε*] 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\(^{1/2}\), NA\(^{26}\), Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

WH have it in brackets

txt P75, 01\(^{2}\), B, L, X, Θ, Ξ, 070, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 1342, pc, b, l, Sy-H, Co, Or\(^{1/2}\), [Trg\(^{ma}\)]

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 ἐξέλθη ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, διέρχεται δι’ ἀνύδρων τόπων ζητοῦν ἀνάπαυσιν καὶ σύχει. 44 τότε λέγει· εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου ἐπιστρέψω ὅθεν ἐξῆλθον· καὶ ἔλθων εὐρίσκει σχολάζοντα σεαρωμένοι καὶ κεκοσμημένοι.

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)
 Minority reading:

"it finds it [empty], swept, and put in order."

σχολάζουντα σεσαρωμένου καὶ

01c2, B, C, (L), R, Γ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 22, 33, 579, 892, 1342, pc, f, l, ri, Sy-H**, bo, Or L omits καὶ, Sy-H** has ο, καὶ ο.

WH, [Trg25], both with σχολάζουντα 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 οἶκον μου ἐπιστρέψω ὁθεν ἔξηλθον· καὶ ἐλθὼν εὑρίσκει σχολάζουντα σεσαρωμένου καὶ κεκοσμημένου.

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

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, 892ε, 1342, Maj, it(e, f, q, r¹), vg¹⁴, 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 Νινεύταις 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 ο̣ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλὶς σημεῖον ἔπιζητεί, 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 καθώς γὰρ ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινεύταις σημεῖον, οὕτως ἦσται καὶ ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῇ γενεᾷ ταύτῃ.

ὁ Ἰωνᾶς  B, Λ, 472, pc, Weiss, [WH], [NA²⁵]

txt  P75, 01, Α, 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:

αὐτήν P45, P75, 1424, pc, d, vgns

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 ἐγερθῆσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτήν, ὅτι ἠλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκοῦσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἵδοι πλείον Σολομώνος ὄδη.

Compare next verse:

Clearly a harmonization to Mt or to the next verse.
The meaning is basically the same. In the txt reading the αὐτὸν 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:

omit verse  D, d
B: no umlaut

previous verse 31:

Compare parallel:
NA28 Luke 11:31-32
31 βασιλίσσα νότου ἑγερθῆται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινεῖ αὐτούς, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἐκ τῶν περάτων τῆς γῆς ἀκούσαι τὴν σοφίαν Σολομῶνος, καὶ ἱδοὺ πλείον Σολομῶνος ὠδε.
32 ἀνδρὲς Νινεῦται ἀναστήσονται ἐν τῇ κρίσει μετὰ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ κατακρινοῦσιν αὐτήν, ὅτι μετενόησαν εἰς τὸ κήρυγμα Ἰωνᾶ, καὶ ἱδοὺ πλείον Ἰωνᾶ ὠδε.

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 lead accidentally to complete omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 205

81. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:


**omit:** P45, P75, L, Γ, Ξ, 070, f1, 69, 788(=f13), 22, 700, 1241, pc, Sy-S, sa, arm, geo, Or?, Bois


Οὐδεὶς λύχνων ἀψας τίθησιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πάσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ. 579 (Mt !)

Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνων ἀψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκέψει ἢ εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον 28 (Lk 8:16 !)

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 5:15 οὐδὲ καίουσιν λύχνων καὶ τιθέασιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πάσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

NA28 Mark 4:21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· μὴ τί ἔρχεται ὁ λύχνος ἵνα ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τεθῇ ἢ ὑπὸ τὴν κλίνην; οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν τεθῇ;

Compare:


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 μόδιον?
IQP’s Crit. ed. has: καὶ τίθησιν αὐτῶν [[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 τῶν μόδιον here (so also Fleddermann).

In “Die Spruchquelle Q” (WBG, Darmstadt, 2007, p. 127) Paul Hoffmann says that the IQP editors consider οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τῶν μόδιον in Lk secondary. The committee was undecided also, if ὑπὸ τῶν μόδιον (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**


BYZ Luke 11:33 Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνου ἁψας εἰς κρύπτην τίθησιν οὐδὲ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι τὸ φέγγος βλέπωσιν

*From here on Ζ is not extant anymore!*

**Byz** P45, A, K, Π, L, W, Γ, Δ, Ψ, 124, 565, 700, Maj-part, NA28, Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

**txt** P75, 01, Β, 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 λύχνου καὶ τιθέσιν αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν, καὶ λάμπει πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:16 Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνου ἁψας καλύπτει αὐτὸν σκεύει ἢ ὑποκάτω κλίνης τίθησιν, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ λυχνίας τίθησιν, ἵνα οἱ εἰσπορευόμενοι βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς.

Gospel of Peter 9:

μεγάλη φωνὴ εγενετο ἐν τω οὐρανῳ και ειδον ανοικθεντας τους ουρανους και δυο ανδρας κατελθοντας εκειθεν πολυ φεγγος εχουτας 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**

BYZ Luke 11:34 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός ___

Not in NA but in SQE (070 not noted!)

Byz 01C², L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, 33, 157, 892, 1342, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa

σου Θ

txt P45, P75, 01*, A, B, C, D, M, W, f13, 1241, pc, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, geo

σου D, Lat, Sy-P, bo

B: no umlaut

Note also the similar addition later in the verse:
NA28 Luke 11:34 ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἄπλοος ἦ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σώμα σου

φωτεινὸν ἔστιν ἐπάν δὲ πονηρὸς ἦ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σώμα σου σκοτεινὸν.

ὁλον 01C², f1, 28, pc, Sy-C, Co (not in NA but in SQE)

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 6:22 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός _, ἐὰν οὖν

ἡ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἄπλοος, ὅλον τὸ σώμα σου φωτεινὸν ἔσται·

σου B, it, vg

NA28 Matthew 6:23 ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρὸς ἦ, ὅλον τὸ σώμα

σου σκοτεινὸν ἔσται.

Compare verse 34b:
NA28 Luke 11:34 ... ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἄπλοος ἦ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σώμα

σου φωτεινὸν ἔστιν ἐπάν δὲ πονηρὸς ἦ, καὶ τὸ σώμα σου σκοτεινὸν.

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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 11:34 'Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου. ὃταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς ἦ, χαὶ ὁλον τὸ σώμα σου φωτεινόν ἐστιν· ἐπάν δὲ ἕτοι πονηρός ἦ, καὶ τὸ σώμα σου σκοτεινόν.

Not in NA!

ὀ ὀφθαλμός σου  P75?, X, pc⁶, a, vg⁶, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo⁶, arm, geo⁶
pc = 213, 343, 713⁶, 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 πονηρός."
Aland (collation of P75 Lk in NTS 10, 1963/64, p. 10) writes: "Zusatz von P²⁷ über der Zeile (+ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου = Sy-S,C, sa, bo⁶ ?) 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 σὺν ἦ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου ἀπλοῦς, ὁλον τὸ σώμα σου φωτεινόν ἐσται; 6:23 ἐὰν δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου πονηρός ἦ, ὁλον τὸ σώμα σου σκοτεινόν ἐσται.

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 11:36 εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμα σου ὄλον φωτείνων, μὴ ἔχον μέρος τί σκοτεινών, ἔσται φωτεινὸν ὄλον ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστράπῃ 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

eἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος, τὸ σκότος ποσὸν
Si ergo lumen, quod in te est, tenebrae sunt, ipsae tenebrae quantae sunt.
D, it(a, b, d, e, ff, i, l, q, r'), WHms
Lat(aur, c, f, vg) read txt.

11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.
eἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος ποσὸν
Sy-C

11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.
eἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος ποσὸν
11:36 εἰ δὲ τὸ σῶμα σου ὄλον φωτείνων, μὴ ἔχον μέρος τί σκοτεινών, ἔσται φωτεινὸν ὄλον ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστράπῃ φωτίζῃ σε.
1241

11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.
eἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμα τὸν ἐν σοὶ λύχνον μὴ ἔχον φωτεινὸν σκοτεινὸν ἐστίν, πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὅταν ὁ λύχνος [σοւ] ἀστράπῃ φωτίζει σε.
f, q (Greek reconstruction by WH, see below)
f: Si enim corpus, quod in te est, lucernam non habuerit lucidam, tibi tenebrosa est, quanto magis autem lucerna tua fulgens lucent biti.
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 ποιημὸς ἢ, ὄλον τὸ σῶμα σου σκοτεινῶν ἔσται. εἰ οὖν τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν, τὸ σκότος ποσὸν.
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:

**Κράτος διακρίνομενος εὖ ἑαυτῷ λέγειν διὰ τί**
coepit intra se reputans dicere: Quare ...
D, pc, Lat, Sy-C, Marcion

Of the Latins only f reads txt.
**B**: no umlaut

diakrίνω "evaluate, judge; recognize, discern"

Parallel:

An interesting variation. There is no apparent reason for it.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 211
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 11:43 Οὐαὶ ἦμιν τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς \(^1\) καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἁγοραῖς \(^2\).

\(^1\) καὶ τὴν πρωτοκλησίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις \(f13\) (not 174, 230)

\(^2\) καὶ τὰς πρωτοκλησίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις
et primos discubitos in conviviis \(C, D, 1071, pc, b, d, l, q, r', aeth\)\(^{\text{mss}}\)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 23:6 φιλούσιν δὲ τὴν πρωτοκλησίαν ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις καὶ τὰς πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς
NA28 Mark 12:39 καὶ πρωτοκαθεδρίας ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ πρωτοκλησίας ἐν τοῖς δείπνοις.

Clearly a harmonization to the parallels.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 212

BYZ Luke 11:44 οὐαὶ ὑμῖν γραμματεῖς καὶ φαρισαῖοι, ὑποκρίται, ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἁδηλα καὶ οἱ ἅνθρωποι περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἴδασιν

Byz  A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 892, Maj,
   it(b, d, f, i, q, r), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo
   omit ὑποκρίται D, d, i, r

txt P45, P75, 01, B, C, L, f1, 33, 1241, pc,
   Lat(a, aur, c, e, ff, l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo,
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
Matt. 23:13, 15, 23, 25, 27, 29

Compare:
NA28 Luke 11:39 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτῶν· νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι __ ὑποκρίται D, b, d

NA28 Luke 11:42 ἄλλα 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)


T&T #24

Byz A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj, f, q, bopt, [Trgma]

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, 579, 1241, 2766, pc^2,

it(a, b, d, e, i, l, ri), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bopt, Or

pc = 1446, 1593

τοὺς τάφους αὐτῶν f1, f13, 157, 1612, 1627, aur, c, vg

B: no umlaut

tάφος "grave, tomb"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 23:29 Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, γραμματεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοι ὑποκριταί, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τοὺς τάφους τῶν προφητῶν καὶ κοσμεῖτε τὰ μνημεία τῶν δικαίων,

Compare previous verse 47:

In the Gospels οἰκοδομεῖω is almost always used transitively with an object. The two exceptions are:

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 τῶν υἱῶν by f1, f13 is from Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 214

Minority reading:

Ζαχαρίου νίοις Βαραχίου δὲ ἐφόνευσαν ἀνὰ μέσον

D, pc (a, d, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa<sup>med</sup>, bo<sup>pt</sup>, geo)

Zacchariae fili Barachiae quem occiderunt inter medium altaris  
Zachariae  quem occiderunt inter  

ναοῦ for οἶκου:  D, pc, d, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, arm, geo

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

From Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Difficult variant

NA28 Luke 11:53 Κάκείθεν εξελθόντος αὐτοῦ

BYZ Luke 11:53 λέγοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτοὺς,

Καὶ. 69, 788 (=f13)

λέγοντος δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον πάντως τοῦ λαοῦ

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: Κάκείθεν εξελθόντος ἦρξαντο οἱ γραμματεῖς

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, click here.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Mark 9:30 Κάκείθεν εξελθόντες παρεπορεύοντο διὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας,

Compare for the D variant:


NA28 Acts 6:5 καὶ ἦρεσεν ὁ λόγος ἐνώπιον παντὸς τοῦ πλῆθους

NA28 Acts 19:19 συνενέγκαντες τὰς βιβλίους κατέκαισαν ἐνώπιον πάντων.

NA28 Acts 27:35 λαβὼν ἀρτὸν εὐχαριστήσειν 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 παντῶς 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 ἑνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν ______ θηρεύσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ _________________.

BYZ Luke 11:54 ἑνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν ζητοῦντες θηρεύσαι τι ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ,

a) ζητοῦντες

Byz  A, C, (D), W, X, Δ, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 892, Maj, it, Sy, [Trg]
txt  P45\

b) ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ

Byz  A, C, (D), W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892mg, Maj, Latt, vg, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Gre, [Trg]
txt  P45, P75, 01, B, L, Θ, f1, 579, 1241, aur, vg, Co, geo

D, (Sy-S), Sy-C read: omitting ἑνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν ζητοῦντες ἀφορμὴν τινὰ λαβεῖν αὐτοῦ ἵνα εὑρωσιν κατηγορήσαι αὐτοῦ

Old Latin reads: (omitting ἑνεδρεύοντες αὐτὸν) ζητοῦντες 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"
ἀφορμή "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 ἔπραν. καὶ ἐπηράτησαν αὐτὸν λέγουτες· εἰ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσαι; ὣνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Mark 3:2 καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσει αὐτὸν, ὣνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτοῦ.

Lukan parallel has here:


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 ζητούντες. But Θ also omits αὐτὸν, 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 ζητούντες.

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.

ἀφορμή 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 ἐπισυναγεθεὶσιν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἄλληλους.

πολλῶν δὲ ὄχλων συνπεριεχόντων κύκλω. ὥστε ἄλληλους συνπνίγειν

D, (Lat, Sy)

Lat: "Multis autem turbis circumstantibus ita ut se invicem conculcarent, ..."

**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:

πτοηθῆτε P45, 700
B: no umlaut

πτοεόμαι subjunctive aorist passive 2nd person plural
"be terrified or startled"

Compare:
NA28 Luke 21:9 ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσητε πολέμους καὶ ἀκαταστασίας, μὴ πτοηθῆτε· δεὶ γὰρ ταύτα γενέσθαι πρῶτον, ἀλλ’ οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος. φοβηθῆτε D, q

φοβηθέντες 01, W
θροηθέντες P75, B, 1241 (θροέομαι "be alarmed or startled")

Compare next verse 5:

A rare word. πτοεόμαι 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 ὁς ἂν ὀμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐμπρόσθεν τῶν ἄνθρωπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὀμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπρόσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ:

ὀμολογήσει: A, B*, D, 13, 983, 157, 472, 579, 1241, 1342, 1424, al[5, Π, Δ, 028, 047, 0211], Trg, WH

txt P45, P75, 01, B, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, Maj, Cl

2nd ὀμολογήσει:
ὀμολογήσει P45, P75, 01, A, B, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj

ὀμολογήση F, G, M, V, Λ, 69, 124, 1071, al
(Swanson notes B² here, but this is in error.)

B p. 1328 A 31: There are some dots visible above the ΕΙ, but these do not look like an ΙΗ.
B: no umlaut

ὀμολογήση subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular
ὀμολογήσει indicative future active 3rd person singular

Parallel:

Compare:
NA28 John 9:22 ταῦτα εἶπαν οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἐφοβοῦντο τοὺς Ἰουδαίους; ἢ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνυψεθεὶς οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἢ ἦν ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὁμολογήσει χριστῶν: ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται.

ὀμολογήσει 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 ὅμολογήσῃ is the correct reading.

Weiss (Com: Lk) argues that the first ὅμολογήσει is a conformation to the second.

IQP has the ἐι of ὅμολογήσει in double square brackets, indicating text that is "probable but uncertain".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 220

Minority reading:

omit: 01* vid, 259, Marcion T.(E)

01* has an unclear correction in verse 8 for τῶν ἄγγελων τοῦ θεοῦ. According to Tischendorf, Swanson and NA 01* omits τῶν ἄγγελων. According to IGNTP 01* omits τοῦ θεοῦ.

Tischendorf writes: "τῶν ἄγγελων τοῦ θεοῦ: haec omnia videtur A scripsisse, prioribus litteris τῶν ἀγ 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 ἄγγελων 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 'τῶν ἄγγελων τοῦ θεοῦ' are written by the first hand over an erasure. What the first hand originally wrote and then erased is not clear. The 'τοῦ θεοῦ' 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 Myshrall is the other transcriber in the Codex Sinaiticus Project. She has independently concludes 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, ba*ms (h.t.)

B: no umlaut
Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 10:32-33 Πάντα οὖν ὡς τις ὀμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὀμολογήσει κἀκεῖ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς 33 ὡς τις δὲ ἀρνήσεται ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι κἀκεῖ ἐν αὐτῷ ἐμπροσθεν 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· ἀνθρωπε, τίς με κατέστησεν κρίτην ή μεριστήν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς;

BYZ Luke 12:14 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Ἀνθρωπε τίς με κατέστησεν δικαστήν ή μεριστήν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς

T&T #25

Byz A, Q, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 124, 174, 230 (=f13), 1424, Maj
μεριστήν ή δικαστήν 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

κριτήν D, a?, c, d, Sy-S, Sy-C, Tert
 δικαστήν 28, pc10
 μεριστήν 1291, sa ms
κριτήν ή δικαστήν 69
ἀρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν 157, pc2
ἀρχοντα καὶ μεριστήν pc16
ἀρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν ή μεριστήν 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 σὲ κατέστησεν ἀρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν ἐφ' ἡμῶν
NA28 Acts 7:27 ὁ δὲ ἀδικῶν τὸν πλησίον ἀπώσατο αὐτὸν εἰπὼν· τίς σὲ κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν ἐφ' ἡμῶν;
NA28 Acts 7:35 Τούτων τὸν Μωϋσῆν ὃν ἦρμησαντο εἰπόντες· τίς σὲ κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν;
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 note 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)


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)
89. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Luke 12:18 καὶ εἶπεν· τοῦτο ποιήσω, καθελώ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω καὶ συνάξω ἐκεὶ πάντα τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὰ ἄγαθά μου

BYZ Luke 12:18 καὶ εἶπεν· Τοῦτο ποιήσω καθελώ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω καὶ συνάξω ἐκεὶ πάντα τὰ γενήματά μου καὶ τὰ ἄγαθά μου

**Byz** A, Q, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33	extsuperscript{rd}, Maj, aur, f, vg, Sy-P, Sy-H, **Tis, Bal**

**tὰ γενήματά μου** 01	extsuperscript{a}, D, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, **Gre**

**txt** P45	extsuperscript{rd}, P75, 01	extsuperscript{c2}, B, L, X, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Sy-Pal, Co

**tὸν σῖτον μου...** P75	extsuperscript{a}, 01	extsuperscript{c2}, f13

**tὸν σῖτον μου καὶ τὰ γενήματά μου καὶ τὰ ἄγαθά μου** 346

P45 reads πάντα τὸν [... lacuna. So probably σῖτον follows.]

**B**: no umlaut

σῖτος "grain, wheat"

γενήμα "product, harvest"

No parallel.

Compare LXX:

LXX Exodus 23:10 έτη σπέρματι τὴν γῆν σου καὶ συνάξεις τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς

LXX Leviticus 25:20 ἐὰν δὲ λέγητε τι φαγόμεθα ἐν τῷ ἔτει τῷ ἔβδομῳ τούτῳ ἐὰν μὴ σπέρρωμεν μηδὲ συναγάγωμεν τὰ γενήματα ἡμῶν

LXX Isaiah 29:1 οὐαὶ πόλις Αριηλ· ἦν Δαυὶδ ἐπολέμησεν συναγάγετε γενήματα ἐνιαυτὸν ἐπ’ ἐνιαυτὸν φάγεσθε γὰρ σὺν Μωαβ

LXX Jeremiah 8:13 καὶ συνάξουσιν τὰ γενήματα αὐτῶν λέγει κύριος

The unusual τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὰ ἄγαθά 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 μοῦ - ..α μοῦ).

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 26) notes that τὸν σίτου has been replaced by the more general τὰ γενήματα by scribes overlooking that with τὰ ἀγαθά already a general term follows.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
   (after weighting the witnesses)
**TVU 224**

**90. Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

*omit: D, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff²)*
Lat(aur, f, q, vg) read txt.
**WH** have the term in brackets

**ἐὰς ἐνπλά:** *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: ἀφρων, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχήν σου ἀπειτοῦσιν ἀπὸ σοῦ· ἀ δὲ ἦτοιμασας, τίνι ἔσται;

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

ἀπαίτεω  "demand in return; demand"

αἰτεω  "ask, request, require, demand"

No parallel.

**Context:**


Compare:


NA28 1 Peter 3:15 κύριον δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀγιάσατε ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ὑμῶν, ἔτομοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν παντὶ τῷ ἀιτοῦντι ὑμᾶς λόγον περὶ τῆς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐλπίδος,

The 3rd person plural is interesting. Robertson notes: "The rabbis used 'they' to avoid saying 'God'."

It is possible that ἀπαίτοῦσιν has been changed into αἰτοῦσιν to avoid a double preposition ἀπ... ἀπό (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


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

οὗτως ὁ θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς βεθν 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 οὕτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούετω

Ε	extsuperscript{c}, F	extsuperscript{c}, H, (S), U, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω, 118	extsuperscript{c}, f13, 2, 579, 892	extsuperscript{c}, 1071, al	extsuperscript{35}

579 has this addition at Lk 8:15, 12:21, 15:10 (with Θ	extsuperscript{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:

**omit αὐτοῦ:** P45vid, 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:

τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν
P45, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 1241, Maj, a, e, vg\(^{ci}\), 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], [NA\(^{25}\)]

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 ὑμῖν. 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 NA\(^{25}\) have ὑμῶν after σώματι in brackets.
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 6:25 Διὰ τούτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ ὑμῶν τί φάγητε [ἡ τί πίητε], μηδὲ τῷ σώματι ὑμῶν τί ἐνδύσησθε. οὐχὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πλεῖὸν ἐστὶν 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 ψυχῆ, too.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 229
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 12:27
κατανόησε τὰ κρίνα πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὖδε νήθειν·
"how they grow: they neither toil nor spin"

οὔτε νήθειν οὔτε ψάμαιν
D, a, d, (it), Sy-S, Sy-C, aeth, Cl(!),
Diatess
Ephrem
Marcion
NA28
Tis
Weiss

d: ... neque neunt, neque texunt.
a: ... non texunt, neque neunt.
... non texunt, nec neunt. (Marcion, via Tert)
b, c, ff
Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 6:28 πῶς αὐξάνουσιν· οὐ κοπιῶσιν οὖδε νήθουσιν·
BYZ Matthew 6:28 πῶς αὐξάνει· οὐ κοπιᾷ, οὒδε νήθειν·
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.

Ephrem commentary (Mc Carthy): "they neither spin nor weave"
The Arabic translation of the Diattessaron 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 οὖδε νήθουσιν·
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

BYZ Luke 12:31 πλήν ζητείτε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ταῦτα πάντα προστεθήσεται ὑμῖν

Byz P45, A, Dcai, 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 ζητείτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν [τοῦ Θεοῦ]
omit: 01, (B), pc⁶, (k), l, sa, bo, Eus, NAες, WH

Compare previous verse:

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

BYZ Luke 12:38 καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ δεύτερῃ φυλακῇ καὶ ἐὰν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὑρήσῃ οὕτως μακάριοι εἰσίν ὁι δοῦλοι ἐκέινοι

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, Trgm
kai ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ
157 omits ἔλθῃ

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 ὁι δοῦλοι
1241 omits καὶ ἐὰν ἐν τῇ δεύτερῃ (h.t.?)
omit ἐκέινοι: 01*, b, Tis, Bal

D, d, c:
kαὶ ἐὰν ἔλθῃ τῇ ἐσπερινῇ φυλακῇ καὶ εὑρήσῃ οὕτως ποιήσει καὶ ἐὰν ἐν τῇ δεύτερῃ καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ μακάριοι εἰσίν ἐκέινοι.

f1, it, Sy-C, Inlat:
kαὶ ἐὰν ἔλθῃ τῇ ἐσπερινῇ φυλακῇ καὶ εὑρήσῃ οὕτως ποιοῦντας μακάριοι εἰσίν ὦτι ἀνακλίνει αὐτοῦς καὶ διακονήσει αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐὰν ἐν τῇ δεύτερῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὑρήσῃ οὕτως μακάριοι εἰσίν ὁι δοῦλοι ἐκέινοι

Tregelles has ἔλθῃ and φυλακῇ in brackets in the margin, but ὁι δοῦλοι in brackets in the text.

B: no umlaut

ἡ ἐσπερινὴ φυλακὴ "the first watch of the night"

Compare previous verse 37:

The variants are probably attempts to expand the rather condensed style. Words are borrowed from the previous verse. The ἐσπερινὴ φυλακὴ is strange, though. Possibly a common term.
Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
94. **Difficult variant**

NA28 Luke 12:39 τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται,

____________________

οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυχθῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 12:39 τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται,

ἐγρηγόρησεν ἄν καὶ ὦκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν διορυγῆναι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ

Byz 01c1, A, B, L, P, Q, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 33, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa™, bo, WH, Trg

txt P75, 01*, (D, d), e, i, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, arm, Marcion†, WH™, NA25

D, d leave οὐκ ἂν but omit the following ἄφηκεν ... αὐτοῦ:

39 τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα ὥρα ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, οὐκ ἂν 40 καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοὶ, ὅτι ἢ ὥρα οὐ δοκείτε ὁ νύμφη τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

Tregelles has additionally [ἐγρηγόρησεν ἄν καὶ] in brackets in the margin.

B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

ἐγρηγόρησεν γρηγορέω "be or keep awake; watch, be alert"

dιορυχθῆναι / διορυγῆναι "dig through, break in"

dιορύσσω

both: infinitive aorist passive

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:43 Ἡκεῖνο δὲ γινώσκετε ὅτι εἰ ἦδει ὁ οἰκοδεσπότης ποῖα φυλακὴ ὁ κλέπτης ἔρχεται, ἐγρηγόρησεν ἄν καὶ ὦκ 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 01c1 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:

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 τούτῳ καὶ ὑμεῖς γίνεσθε ἑτοιμοὶ, ὅτι ἡ οὔ δοκεῖτε ὥρα ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἔρχεται.

Previous verse 39:

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:

ο̊ ἁγαθός D, 157, c, d, e, Sy-C
et bonus
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:45 Τίς ἄρα ἔστιν ὁ πιστὸς δοῦλος καὶ φρόνιμος ὃν κατέστησεν ὁ κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ δοῦναι αὐτοῖς τὴν τροφὴν ἐν καιρῷ;

Possibly a natural addition. In Mt the words are safe.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 235
Minority reading:

μὴ ἐτοιμάσας L, W, f13, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, arm
ποιήσας P45
μὴ ποιήσας D, 69, 2766, pc, d, Marcion², InLat, Or, Bas, Amb

aur, f, vg read txt.
B: no umlaut

"and not having prepared, nor having done according to his will"

Compare context:

Probably one or the other word have been omitted because it was considered superfluous.
C.H. Turner thinks that ἦ ποιήσας was a marginal gloss ("A textual commentary on Mark 1" JTS 28 (1927) 145-158).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 236


BYZ Luke 12:53 Διαμερισθοῦται πατήρ ἐπὶ γίγνος, καὶ γίγνος ἐπὶ πατρί· μήτηρ ἐπὶ θυγατρί, καὶ θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ μητρί· πενθερά ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς, καὶ νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν αὐτῆς.

| θυγατέρα | 01, B, D, Weiss, WH, NA28, 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, Ευσ |

ἐπὶ μητρὶ 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 διακόσιον ἀνθρώπων κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ θυγατέρα κατὰ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτῆς καὶ νύμφην κατὰ τῆς πενθερᾶς 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 dative to conform them to the preceding words. Θ even changed νύμφην and πενθεράν into the datives.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 237

95. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 12:54: "Ἐλεγεν δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις· ὅταν ἴδητε [τὴν] νεφέλην ἀνατέλλουσαν ἐπὶ δυσμῶν, εὐθέως λέγετε ὅτι ὃμβρος 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 ἀποκριθέλεις εἶπεν αὐτοίς· ὥσπερ γενομένης λέγετε· εὐδίᾳ, πυρράζει γὰρ ὁ ὕψιστος· 3 καὶ πρωί· σήμερον χεμών, 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 ὑποκρίται, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τούτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν:

BYZ Luke 12:56 ὑποκρίται τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν τὸν δὲ καιρὸν τούτον 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**<sup>ma</sup>, **Tis, Bal**

ou δοκιμάζετε D, 515, 1505, it, Sy-S, Sy-C
(IGNTP adds: sa<sup>ms</sup>, bo<sup>ms</sup>, Marcion<sup>T</sup>)

txt P75, 01, B, L, Χ, Θ, 070, 33, 892, 1241, 2786, pc<sup>4</sup>, ff<sup>2</sup>, I, Sy-H<sup>mg</sup>, 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:


**μετανοήστε**

01*, C2, A, D, L, Θ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 1241, 1424, al[M, U, X], Weiss, WH, NA28, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt P75, 01, B, W, Ψ, 33, 892, Maj, WH*mg, Trg*mg

B: no umlaut

μετανοήστε subjunctive present active 2nd person plural
μετανοήσητε subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural

Compare verse 3:


**μετανοήσητε** A, D, Θ, f1, (f13), 157, (579), 892*mg, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2542, al[M, X, Γ]

**μετανοήστε** P75, 01, B, L, W, Ψ, 33, Maj, WH

twice **μετανοήστε:** P75, 01, B, W, Ψ, 33, Maj

twice **μετανοήσητε:** A, D, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 1241, 1424

3 **μετανοήστε** 5 **μετανοήσητε:** 01*, C2, L

3 **μετανοήσητε** 5 **μετανοήστε:** 1071, pc

These two variations must be considered together.

A similar variation occurs with ὦσαύτως/ὕμοιως in the same verses. Many witnesses read ὦμοιῶς in verse 5. It is thus probable that a conformation to verse 3 appeared.

The support for μετανοήστε 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 μετανοήστε 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 μετανοεῖω twice before (10:13 and 11:32).
It should also be noted that ἐὰν μὴ is normally followed by the aorist.

Rating: - or 2? (= indecisive or NA probably original)
(slight preference for the txt reading)
TVU 240


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

άφ’ οὖς  157

IGNTP does not have Sy-C and bo, Hoskier has Sy-S for txt, Burkitt for Byz.

B: no umlaut

No parallels.

άφ’ οὖ 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)
Difficult variant:
NA28 Luke 13:7 εἰπεν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἄμπελουργὸν· ἰδοὺ τρία ἔτη ἀφ' οὗ ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκω. ἔκκοψον [οὖν] αὐτήν, ἵνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεί;

BYZ Luke 13:7 Εἴπεν δὲ πρὸς τὸν ἄμπελουργὸν, Ἰδοὺ, τρία ἔτη ἔρχομαι ζητῶν καρπὸν ἐν τῇ συκῇ ταύτῃ, καὶ οὐχ εὑρίσκω· ἔκκοψον ___ αὐτήν· ἵνα τί καὶ τὴν γῆν καταργεί;

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:

| Omit οὖν: | 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* |

| Add οὖν: | 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 δὲ 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:


**φέρε τὴν ἀξίνην**, D
dafters 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 ἢδη δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀξίνη πρὸς τὴν ρίζαν τῶν δένδρων κεῖται

TVU 243

Minority reading:


κόφινον κοπρίων, D
cophrinum stercoris it(a, aur, b, c, e, ff², i, l, q, r¹), vg
quam 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 κἂν μὲν ποιήσῃ 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

BYZ Luke 13:9 καν μην ποιησῃ καρπὸν · εἰ δὲ μὴ γει, εἰς τὸ μέλλον, ἐκκοψεὶς αὐτήν

Byz P45vid, A, D, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, Maj, Latt, Sy, Trgma

txt P75, 01, B, L, 070, 69(=f13), 33vid, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Co
εἰς τὸ μέλλον· ἀφήσεις· εἰ δὲ μὴ 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 ἐἶπεν· ὑποκριταί," ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει;

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἀπαγάγων 01*, B*, Θ, f1, pc, WH

txt  P45, P75, 01CZ, A, B27, D, W, Ψ, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, WHmg, Trgm

Swanson adds erroneously Ψ for ἀπαγάγων 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: ΑΓΓ ι is written above the line. Difficult to judge. Tischendorf writes: "B² ut vdtr et B³m. B² would be B2 and B³ the enhancer (= B2m). 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 ἀναγαγὼν αὐτὸν ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμενίης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου   safe!
NA28 Luke 15:13 καὶ μετ’ οὖ πολλὰς ἡμέρας συναγαγὼν πάντα ὁ νεώτερος υἱὸς ἀπεδήμησεν εἰς χώραν μακρὰν

συνάγων  P75!

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 21:18 Πρῶτο δὲ ἐπανάγων εἰς τὴν πόλιν ἐπείνασεν.

ἐπαναγαγὼν 01*, B*, L
Possibly at least in part accidental. Either erroneous duplication or omission.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 246

101. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

**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 ____________________ κατηχοῦντο ______ οἱ ἀντικείμενοι αὐτῶ,  
**B:** no umlaut

No parallel.
Possibly changed to improve style?

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 247


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, bopt, [Trg²²]

txt P75, 01, B, D, L, 070, 892, 1241, 2542, pc⁶,
it(a, a², b, d, e, ff², i, l, r), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, sa, bopt, arm, geo
pc = 251, 794, 1229, 2437, 2487, 2790

ὦς ὁρος μέγα 2660

ὦς for εἰς: 892, 1424, al⁶⁰
no ως / εἰς: D, f1, al³³

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:32 ὁ μικρότερον μὲν ἐστὶν πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων, ὅταν δὲ αὐξηθῇ μείζον τῶν λαχάνων ἐστὶν καὶ γίνεται δένδρον, ...

λάχανον "garden-plant, vegetable"
μέγα Sy-Pms, sa, aeth, geo⁸

NA28 Mark 4:32 καὶ ὅταν σπαρῇ, ἀναβαίνει καὶ γίνεται μείζον πάντων τῶν λαχάνων καὶ ποιεῖ κλάδους μεγάλους, ὡστε 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:

éκρυψεν

B, L, 047, 0303, 157, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, 2542, al[K, Π, N, U, 118, 124, 2\*], WH, NA28, 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 éκρυψεν.
Comfort/Barrett also have ἔκρυψεν.
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 Ἀλλὴν παραβολὴν ἐλάλησεν αὐτοίς· ὅμοια ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ζῦμη, ἢν λαβοῦσα γυνὴ ἔνεκρυψεν εἰς ἀλεύρου σάτα τρία ἕως οὐ ἐξημώθη ὅλον.

éκρυψεν G, L, N, f1, 346, 2, 28, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, al

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 13:44 Ὅμοια ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν θησαυρῷ κεκρυμμένῳ ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ, ὃν εὐρὼν ἀνθρώπως ἔκρυψεν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ὑπάγει καὶ πωλεῖ πάντα ὅσα ἔχει καὶ ἄγοράζει τὸν ἀγρὸν ἐκείνον.

NA28 Matthew 25:18 ο ὃ δὲ τὸ ἐν λαβὼν ἀπελθὼν ὤρυξεν γῆν καὶ ἔκρυψεν τὸ ἀργύριον τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ.

ἀπέκρυψεν W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj
It is quite possible that ἐνέκρυψεν is a harmonization to Mt. Interestingly a lot of MSS have ἐκρύψεν 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


T&T #29

ἐρεῖ 01, 579, 1627, al19, Lat, Sy-P, sa, bopt

ἐρεῖ λέγων 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, bopt, Gre, Trg

ἐρεῖ λέγων P75c, 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.

ἐρῶ Justin(2nd CE), Or(3rd CE), 2. Clement 4:5 (in a mixture of quotes)
   Justin1/2: καὶ τότε ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς·
   Justin1/2, Origen: καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτοῖς·

The assignment of the Sy and Co versions is rather questionable (taken from NA).

B: no umlaut

ἐρεῖ 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:

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 7:23 καὶ τότε ὁμολογῆσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἔγνων ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.
Compare:
NA28 Matthew 25:12 ο δε 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 ἐρεὶς θεὸς εἰμί ἐγώ.
LXX 1 Samuel 20:21 ἐὰν εἴπω λέγων τῷ παιδαρίῳ ὡδε ἡ σχίζα ἀπὸ σοῦ
LXX Numbers 11:27 ἀπῆγγειλεν Μωυσῆ 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 ἔρει could be a harmonization to verse 25. Or the λέγω has been omitted as being redundant.
The ἔρει λέγω could be a partial conformation to Mt 25:12 (so Weiss).

IQP’s Crit. ed. has καὶ ἔρει λέγων as safe for Q.
Fledermann ("Q - A reconstruction", 2005) has καὶ ἔρω λέγων !

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 250

103. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:


**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 ἐστε:** Justin (2 times), Origen (once)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

Immediate context:


Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 7:23 καὶ τότε ὦμολογήσω αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἐγνών ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν.

Compare also (the parable of the ten Bridesmaids):

NA28 Matthew 25:12 ο δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἂμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς.

2. Clement 4:5
καὶ ἐρῶ ὑμῖν· ὑπάγετε ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, πόθεν ἐστε, ἐργάται ἀνομίας.

LXX 1 Samuel 25:11 καὶ δῶσω αὐτὰ ἀνδράσιν οἷς οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν εἰςίν.

NA28 John 20:13 καὶ οὐκ οἶδα ποῦ ἔθηκαν αὐτῶν.
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 ὑποχρεωθήν τινὲς Φαρισαῖοι
BYZ Luke 13:31 Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσήλθον τινὲς Φαρισαῖοι
Byz Bc1, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, 157, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, sam, bo, Trg
txt P75, 01, A, B*, D, L, R, X, f1, f13, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 2766, pc, d, Sy-Hmg, sa, Trgms

B: no umlaut
In B (p. 1331 B 31) the Ο is cancelled by a slash and ΗΜΕ is written above it. The Ο is left unenhanced and the letters ΗΜΕ are enhanced. The slash through the Ο looks old/unenhanced, but Tischendorf thinks the correction is by B3 (= enhancer). NA disagrees with Tischendorf and assigns this correction to Bc1. I agree with NA. 33 has a lacuna here.

No parallel.
A typical variation. In this case ΗΜΕρα 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 D, N, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 13, 346, 828, 983 (=f13), 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj-part, Lectpt, it(a, b, c, d, f, l, q, r'), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt, Irlat ἔρημος ὑμῖν 157


B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 23:38 ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος.
omit: B, L, ff2, Sy-S, sa, bopt, NA28, WH, Weiss

LXX:
LXX Jeremiah 22:5 εἶν ἰν δὴ μὴ ποιήσητε τοὺς λόγους τούτους κατ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ὁμοσα λέγει κύριος ὅτι εἰς ἔρημωσιν ἐσται 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 ἔρημωσιν ἐσται 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:
λέγω [δὲ] ύμίν, οὐ μὴ ἵσητε με ἐξῶς [ἡξελ ὀτὲ] εἶπήτε·
εὐλογημένος ὁ ἔρχομενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου.

BYZ Luke 13:35 ίδου ἀφίεται ύμιν ὁ οἶκος ύμων ἔρημος·
λέγω δὲ ύμίν ὦτι οὐ μὴ ἵσητε ἐξῶς ἔν ἕξελ ὀτέ εἶπήτε·
Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἔρχομενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου

B: no umlaut

ἐξῶς P75, B, L, R, 892, WH

ἐξῶς ἄν P45, 01, M, N, X, (Δ, Θ), f1, f13, 157, 788(=f13), 1071, (1241), pc, e, i, Sy-P, arm, geo

ἀπ’ ἄρτι ἐς ἄν Δ, Θ, 1241, saᵇˢˢ, bo (∶ Mt)

one of the above: Co

ἐξῶς ὦτε K, Π, pc

ἐξῶς ἕξελ ὀτέ A, W, Ψ, 124, 174, 230, 346(=f13), 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, Lat

ἀπ’ ἄρτι ἐς ἀν ἕξελ ὀτέ Δ (Mt)

... ὦτι Η

... ὦταν 579

ἕξελ A, W, 28, 579, 1424, pm

ἕξετ Ψ, 565, 700, f13-part, pm

ἐξῶς ἕξελ ὀτέ D, 047, 2487, NA²⁵, Gre, Bois, Weiss

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.
indicative future active 3rd person singular
subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular
"have come, be present, come"

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 23:39 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ με ἵδητε ἀπ' ἄρτι ἔως ἄν εἴπητε· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὅνόματι κυρίου.

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 15:4 καὶ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τὸ ἀπολλωλός ἔως εὑρῇ 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"

ότε with subjunctive (ότε εἴπητε) is a very rare construction. There is no other example in the Greek Bible. There are attempts to change that to οτι or οταν.
The construction with οταν is common (66 times in the NT).
Therefore it is very improbable that οτε is a secondary insertion.

The construction with άν with a future ήζει 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 ... ἔως εὑρῇ αὐτό. Here the subjunctive is used.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 152) thinks the omission of ήζει οτε is a harmonization to Mt 23:39.

IQP’s Crit. ed. has ήζει οτε 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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 14:5 καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐἶπεν· τίνος ὑμῶν υἱός ἦ βοῦς [= ox] εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται,

"donkey" Lat("asinus"), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, bo

"son" Θ, 2174, (Sy-C: υἱός ἦ βοῦς ἦ ὁνος)

D, d ("ovis", from Mt)

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 ό δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τίς ἔσται εἷς ὑμῶν ἀνθρώπος δὲ ἔξει πρόβατον ἐν καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τούτῳ τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσει αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ;

Compare:
NA28 Luke 13:15 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος καὶ εἶπεν· ὑποκριταί, ἐκαστός ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὁνον 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. υἱός 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 υἱός is a corruption of ὅις = 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 υἱος 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 ινος which has the same letters; others will read the equivalent of ὀνος. Finally ovis has been taken over into the Greek and has produced the well-known reading τινος 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  
tóte ἡσταί σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι.

BYZ Luke 14:10  
tóte ἡσταί σοι δόξα ἐνώπιον τῶν συνανακειμένων σοι

Byz  P97$^{vid}(6/7^{th} CE)$, 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 ΕΧΤΑΙ ΣΟΙ ΑΞΙΑ ΕΝΩΠΙΟΝ ΤΩΝ 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 ...τῶν τῶν lead to confusion.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

BYZ Luke 14:15 Ἄκουσας δὲ τις τῶν συνανακειμένων ταύτα εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μακάριος ὡς φάγεται ἄριστον ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ

Byz A*, K, Π, W, 047, 0211, f13, 700, 954, 1424, 1675, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-C, goth


33 has a lacuna.

B: umlaut! (1332 B 15 L) μακάριος ὡστὶς φάγεται ἄρτον ἐν

ἄριστον "meal, noon meal, feast"

Compare context:
NA28 Luke 14:12 ὅταν ποιῆς ἄριστον ἦ δείπνον, ...

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**


BYZ Luke 14:17 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ τῇ ὥρᾳ τοῦ δείπνου εἶπεν τοῖς κεκλημένοις Ὡρχεσθε ὅτι ἢδη ἔτοιμα ἔστων πάντα.

T&T #30

**B: no umlaut**

ἐστιν πάντα A, (D), P, W, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat(a, aur, d, e, f, r, vg), Sy, Co, goth, [Trg]

ἐλοswith: 01<sup>cf</sup>

P75, 01<sup>ε</sup>, L, R, Θ, 579, pc, WH<sup>mg</sup>, Gre

one of these two: P45

T&T note L, R, Θ wrongly as follows:

ἐστιν B, L, R, Θ, 192

ἐλοswith: P75, 01<sup>ε</sup>, 579

P45 is not noted in NA. According to the Editio Princeps and Swanson it reads:

... ἔστιν πάντα ... [τὸν και ἠφανὶ ἀπὸ 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 ἐστιν or ἐλεισίν. 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 ἐλοswith. 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 ἴδοι τὸ ἄριστὸν μου ἠτοίμακα, οἱ ταύροι μου καὶ τὰ σιτιστὰ τεθυμένα καὶ πάντα ἔτοιμα· δεύτε 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 ἐστιν or ἐίσιν. 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 ἔτοιμα ἐστιν as safe for Q.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) for πάντα
Rating: - (indecisive) for ἐστιν or ἐίσιν
TVU 258

Minority reading:

BYZ Luke 14:24 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κεκλημένων γεύσεται μου τοῦ δείπνου πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσίν κλητοί ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ

support:  E, F, G, H, M*, S, X, Y, Γ, Λ, Ψ, Ω, 0211, 1, 118, f13, 713, 2, 28, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 2766, Maj-part, Sy-Pal, geo

Ψ: πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσίν has been added in the margin (INTF image 970).
B: uumlaut! (1332 C 20 L) γεύσεται μου τοῦ δείπνου

From:
NA28 Matthew 22:14 πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσίν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοὶ.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 20:16 οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἕσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἕσχατοι.
BYZ Matthew 20:16 οὕτως ἔσονται οἱ ἕσχατοι πρῶτοι καὶ οἱ πρῶτοι ἕσχατοι πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσίν κλητοί, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί.

A natural addition, probably from lectionary usage.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 259

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 14:32  \[\text{εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, ἢτι αὐτοῦ πόρρω ὄντος πρεσβεῖαν ἀποστείλας} \text{ἐρωτᾷ} \tauὰ \text{πρὸς εἰρήνην.} \]

\[
\[
\text{εἰρήνη} \quad \text{P75, it}
\]
\[
\text{εἰς εἰρήνη} \quad \text{B, 482, pc, WH\textsuperscript{mol}}
\]
\[
\tauὰ \text{εἰς εἰρήνη} \quad \text{K, Π, pc\textsuperscript{II}}
\]
\[
\text{πρὸς εἰρήνη} \quad 01\textsuperscript{*, Γ, 788 (=f13), 1241, pc\textsuperscript{5}, WH}
\]

\[
\tauὰ \text{πρὸς εἰρήνη} \quad 01\textsuperscript{c2, A, D, L, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1424, Maj, aur, f, vg, Sy-H, WH\textsuperscript{mol}, NA\textsuperscript{25}}
\]

The (other) versional evidence is not definite.
The omission of \(\tauὰ\) 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 \(\tauῇ \text{τῇ} \) ἐπιούσῃ ἡμέρᾳ ὡφθη αὐτοῖς μαχομένους καὶ συνήλλασσεν αὐτοὺς εἰς εἰρήνην εἰπὼν ἄνδρες, ἀδελφοὶ ἐστε ἵνατι ἀδικεῖτε ἀλλήλους;

The omission of \(\tauὰ\) is probably a confusion over a presumed dittography:

\(\varepsilonρώταταπρὸς\)

It is possible that also the P75 omission is caused by such a confusion:

\(\varepsilonἰςεἰρηνὴν\)

That this is the main cause of the variation can be seen from Lk 19:42, where only one \(\tauὰ\) 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 ἐἰς in verse 32.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 260

Minority reading:

omit: W, pc, Lat(aur, b, c, l, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa\textsuperscript{mass}, aeth

πάντες ἐγγίζοντες L, R, 1071, pc

it(a, d, e, f, ff\textsuperscript{2}, i, r\textsuperscript{i}) 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


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

al = 251, 343, 494, 589, 609, 695, 716, 794, 809, 827, 1220, 1229, 1396, 1446, 1557, 1593, 1604, 2487, 2546, 2661

txt but with ὑπὸ: 69, 1241, pc⁵

γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν καὶ χορτασθῆναι ἀπὸ W, a

γεμίσαι 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"

γεμίσαι γεμίζω infinitive aorist active
"fill"

γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ = "fill his belly"

No parallel.
Compare:

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


BYZ Luke 15:17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἔλθὼν εἶπεν Πόσοι μίσθιοί τοῦ πατρὸς μου περισσεύουσιν ἄρτων ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ ὅδε ἀπόλλυμαι

Byz λιμῷ ___ A, P, Q, W, X, Δ, 69, 174, 230(=f13), 157, 1071, Maj, sa*, goth

txt λιμῷ ὅδε P75, 01, B, L, Ψ, 579, 892, 2542, pc, e, ff², Sy-H, Sy-Pal, [Trg*]

้อย λιμῷ 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 αὐτῷ· βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἰκοδομὰς; οὐ μὴ ἁφεθῇ ὅδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθον οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.

omit ὅδε: A, K, Π, Μ, 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 ὅδε separates λιμῷ 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 ὅδε.

Burgon suggests that the D reading could have originated from a misinterpretation of ἐγὼ δὲ = ἐγὼ ὅδε. Perhaps some scribe reduplicated the three last letters ὅδε and got ἐγὼ δὲ ὅδε.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original) (after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 263

109. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

T&T #32

ποίησον μὲ ως ἐνα τῶν μισθίων σου

01, B, D, U, X, 983, 1689(=f13), 33, 700, 1241, 2680, al200, some Lect°, 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-Δ, Sy-Π, Sy-Pal, Co, goth, NA25

R: omits due to h.t. (vs 19 υἱός σου - 21 υἱός σου)
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare verse 19:
ποίησον μὲ ως ἐνα 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 πατήρ πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ: ταχὺ ἔξενέγκατε στολὴν τὴν πρώτην

BYZ Luke 15:22 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ πατήρ πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ ἔξενέγκατε τὴν στολὴν τὴν πρώτην

Byz  A, P, Q, R, W, Δ, Θ, ψ, f1, 69, 124, 174, 230, 788 (=f13), Maj, Sy-P, sa<sup>mss</sup>

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<sup>mss</sup>, bo, arm, goth, [Trg]

ταχέως...  D, f13, 157

... τὴν πρώτην στολὴν 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 / 15 L) αὐτοῦ· ταχὺ ἔξενέγκατε στολὴν

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: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 265

111. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

αὐτῶν 01, B, N, P, R, X, Ψ, 070, 124, 157, 579, 1071, pc,
*Weiss, WH, NA²⁵, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL*

txt P75, A, D, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, Maj. *Trg*²⁵

Lacuna: 33

**B:** no umlaut

A typical variation. Impossible to judge on internal grounds. Externally the support is also divided.

Rating: - (indecisive)
and if in the other’s you became not faithful, your own, who shall give to you?"

"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 16:11 εἴ τιν ἐν τῷ ἀδικῷ μικρῷ πιστὸς ὁκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἄληθινὸν τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύει;

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 25:21+23 ἐπὶ ὀλίγα ἡς πιστῶς, ἐπὶ πολλῶν σε καταστῆσω.

2. Clement 8:5
λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ·
εἰ τὸ μικρὸν ὁκ ἐτηρήσατε, τὸ μέγα τίς ὑμῖν δώσει;
λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστὸς ἐν ἑλαχίστῳ καὶ ἐν πολλῷ πιστός ἐστιν,

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 ἩΜ - UM scribal errors. On the other hand the ὑμέτερον could be a conformation to the immediately following ὑμῖν (so Weiss). ὑμέτερον 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 ἄλλοτρὶ πιστοὶ οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ὑμέτερον τίς ὑμῖν δώσει;

δώσει ὑμῖν

01, D, L, R, Θ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, 2542, pc,
Ir<sup>lat</sup>, Weiss, WH, NA<sup>25</sup>, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

No parallel.
Compare immediate context:
NA28 Luke 16:11 εἰ ὁ ὁ δική μαμωνᾶ 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)
"But it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one stroke of a letter in the law to be dropped."

Markion

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)
ΤVU 269
NA28 Luke 16:18
Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἐτέραν μοιχεύει, καὶ ἐτέραν ἐτέραν μοιχεύει.

BYZ Luke 16:18
Πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμῶν ἐτέραν μοιχεύει καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀπολυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει.

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 5:32 ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγον πορνείας ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχεύθηκε, καὶ ὅτι ἐὰν ἀπολυμένην γαμήσῃ, μοιχάται.
NA28 Matthew 19:9 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνεία καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται.
NA28 Mark 10:11-12 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς: ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ καὶ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην μοιχάται ἐπί αὐτὴν. 12 καὶ ἐὰν αὐτὴ ἀπολύσασα τὸν ἄνδρα αὐτῆς γαμήσῃ ἄλλον μοιχάται.

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 _Άνθρωπος δέ τις ἦν πλούσιος, καὶ ἐνεδιδύσκετο πορφύραν καὶ βύσσον εὐφραίνομενος καθ’ ἡμέραν λαμπρώς._

_Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ ἔτεραν παραβολήν D, M mag, d, Sy-C, vg ms, Diatess Aph_  
_And he began to say_  
_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)**
Minority reading:

ονόματι Νινεχ P75
ονόματι Νινεχ σα, aeth"ms, arab"ms ("Niniveh")

Ninnech 36"mg
Ninnech 37"mg
The gloss in manuscript 36 reads in full: τον ἰπποσιον εν τισιν αντιγραφος ευρομεν τουτομα Νινεχης. 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

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 Ἐλεαζαρ ὁ τοῦ Ααρων ἐλαβεν τῶν θυγατέρων Φουτιηλ αὐτῷ γυναῖκα καὶ ἐτεκν αὐτῷ τὸν Φίνεες αὐταὶ αἰ ἀρχαὶ πατριᾶς Λευιτῶν κατὰ γενέσεις αὐτῶν
LXX Numbers 25:7 καὶ ἰδὼν Φίνεες νῦν Ἐλεαζαρ νῦν Ααρων τοῦ ἴερεως ἔξαινεσθι ἐκ μέσου τῆς συναγωγῆς καὶ λαβῶν σειρομάστην ἐν τῇ χειρὶ

Compare next verses:
NA28 Luke 16:20 πτωχὸς δέ τις ὁνόματι Λάζαρος
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 ΝΙΝΙΕΥΗ, possibly as a haplography ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙΝΙΝΕΥΗΗ.

In the LXX Aaron's son Eleazar has a son named Phinehas, ΦΙΝΕΗΣ. 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 ΝΕΥΕΣ.

Amenofis is an Egyptian kings name.

Cyril notes an early Jewish tradition (ως ή Ἐβραίων 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 πιπόντων 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
- 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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
NA28 Luke 16:21 καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι
ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου.
ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἐλκὴ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ Luke 16:21 καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν χορτασθῆναι
ἀπὸ τῶν ψιχίων τῶν πιπτόντων ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τοῦ πλουσίου.
ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ κύνες ἐρχόμενοι ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἐλκὴ αὐτοῦ

T&T #35

Byz 01\textsuperscript{cz}, 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\textsuperscript{pt}, goth, [Trg]
ἀπὸ τῶν πιπτόντων ψιχίων f1

txt P75, 01*, B, L, 79*,
it(b, c, e, ff\textsuperscript{2}, i, l, q, r\textsuperscript{1}), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, Cl
B: no umlaut

ψιχίον "small crumb, scrap (of food)"
pιπτόντων πίπτω participle present active genitive neuter plural

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 15:27 ἢ 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:

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."

άναστῇ καὶ ἀπελθῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πιστεύσουσιν
άναστῇ καὶ ἀπελθῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς πιστεύσουσιν αὐτῷ
άναστῇ καὶ ἀπελθῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀκούουσιν αὐτοῦ

άναστῃ πιστεύσωσιν
άναστῃ πιστεύσωσιν αὐτῷ
157, Lat(aur, f, vg), arm

ἀπελθῇ πιστεύσουσιν
ἀπελθῇ πιστεύσουσιν αὐτῷ
W, it(a, b, e, ff², q)

ἀπελθῇ ἀκούουσιν αὐτοῦ
Marcion^

ἐγερθῇ πιστεύσονται

B: no umlaut

πείθω "persuade, convince"

No parallel.
Compare previous verse 30:
NA28 Luke 16:30 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· οὐχί, πάτερ Ἦβραϊμ, ἀλλ’ ἐάν τις ἀπὸ νεκρῶν πορευθῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς μετανοήσουσιν.

and also:
NA28 Luke 16:11 εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ πιστὸς οὐκ ἐγένεσθε, τὸ ἄληθινὸν 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 πιστεύσωσιν is either a misreading of πιστεύσοιται 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 ἣφες αὐτῷ.

BYZ Luke 17:3 προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμάρτη ἢς ἀδελφός σου ἐπιτίμησον αὐτῷ καὶ Ἐὰν μετανοήσῃ ἢφες αὐτῷ.

B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 4:

omitted: 1424, 1675, L859, Sy-S, bo

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 18:15 Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμαρτήσῃ ἢς ἀδελφός σου,
BYZ Matthew 18:15 Ἐὰν δὲ ἀμαρτῇ ἢς ἀδελφός σου

omitted: 01, B, 0281, f1, 579, pc, sa, bo, (Or) WH, NA

NA28 Matthew 18:21 κύριε, ποσάκις ἀμαρτήσει ἢς ἐμὲ ἢ ἀδελφός μου καὶ ἀφήσεις αὐτῶν; ἐως ἐπτάκις;

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context, verse 4.

IQP’s Crit. ed. has ἢς ἀδελφός 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

BYZ Luke 17:4 καὶ ἐὰν ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἀμαρτήσῃ εἰς σὲ καὶ ἑπτάκις τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιστρέψῃ λέγων Metanow 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, bopt, goth f1: ἐπὶ σὲ

ἐπιστρέψῃ πρὸς σὲ 01, B, D, L, X, Ψ, 892, 1241, (2542), pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, bopt, arm, geo, Cl 2542: ἐπὶ σὲ

B: umlaut! (1336 A 8 L) ἑπτάκις 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 ἔχειν χάριν τῷ δουλῷ ὁτι ἐποίησεν τὰ διαταχθέντα;


T&T #36

Byz  A, (D, f13), W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 892, Maj, Lat, (Sy-P), Sy-H, Weiss, [Trg²]

αὕτῳ; 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

pc = 17, 501, 554, 594, 740, 1208, 1210, 1416, 2127

αὕτῳ:  X, 213, 765, 1612

ἐκείνῳ  214, 2522 (for τὰ διαταχθέντα)

B: no umlaut

οὐ δοκῶ = "I think not"

tὰ διαταχθέντα = "what was commanded"

No parallel.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 17:10 αὕτως 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 αὕτως of verse 10.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 277

114. **Difficult variant**


BYZ Luke 17:11 Καὶ ἔγενετο ἐν τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ αὐτός διήρχετο διὰ μέσου Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας

Byz A, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj
txt P75\textsuperscript{vid}, 01, B, L, 579, pc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>μέσου</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀνὰ μέσου</td>
<td>f1, f13, Titus Bostrensis (4\textsuperscript{th} CE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

διήρχετο ἣν Ἰεριχώ 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 μέσου 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:


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 ὄριων Τύρου ἤλθεν διὰ Σιδώνος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἀνὰ μέσου τῶν ὄριων Δεκαπόλεως.

Again safe. It’s the only occurrence of ἀνὰ μέσου in the Gospels.

ἀνὰ μέσου is a typical LXX term. It appears there 370 times, but only 4 times in the NT.


"in the midst"
Is it possible that the reading of D is the original (so Zahn, Einleitung)?

For the 28 et al. Ἰεριχώ variant compare:

Possibly a scribe read διηρύχετο and remembered the verse 19:1 and added τὴν Ἰεριχώ.

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 κάμην ἀπήντησαν [αὐτῷ] δέκα λεπροὶ ἄνδρες, ὀλὴ ἐστήσαν πόρρῳν

*omit* P75, B, (D), L, pc, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, q), Weiss, WH, NA²⁸, Gre, SBL

... κάμην ὁποῦ 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 ἀπαντήσει ὑμῖν ἄνθρωπος κεράμον ὑδάτως βαστάζων· ἀκολουθήσατε αὐτῷ safe!

NA28 Luke 8:27 ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν ἀνήρ 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 ὑπήντησεν 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 ὑπήντησεν is very good.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
**TVU 279**

116. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

No txt in NA!

 ánésthsan  B, F, 157, 579, pc

txt  P75, 01c2, A, D, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, Maj, WHmg καὶ ἔστησαν  D

*omit οὐ ἔστησαν 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**

 ánísthmi  "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 ἔστησαν the meaning is clear and normal. There would be no reason for a change. On the other hand, why should one change ánésthsan?

Perhaps ánésthsan has been inspired by the previous ἀπήμνησαν?

The support by F is strange and suggests an error.

Rating: - (= indecisive)
TVU 280

 Minority reading:

 ἀφεθεὶς D Curati estis d

 θέλω, καθαρισθῆτε· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθησαν

 Compare:
 NA28 Matthew 8:3 θέλω, καθαρίσθητε· καὶ εὐθέως ἐκαθαρίσθη αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα.
 NA28 Mark 1:41-42 θέλω, καθαρίσθητε· 42 καὶ εὐθὺς ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ ἡ λέπρα, καὶ ἐκαθαρίσθη.

 Compare Egerton 2, line 40-41:
 ο̲ δῆ κύριος ἐφ’ αὐτῷ· θέλω καθαρισθῆτε· 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)
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 oἱ δὲ οὗτοι A, Π, 0211, 157, pc
οὐχ oἱ δὲ οὗτοι W

Lacuna: 33
B: umlaut! (p. 1336 B 27 L)
ἐννέα ποῦ; 18 οὐχ εὑρέθησαν

οὐχί emphatic form of οὐχ

Compare next verse 18:
NA28 Luke 17:18 εὑρέθησαν ὑποστρέψαντες δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ εἰ μὴ ὁ ἄλλογενής οὗτος;

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 4:22 οὐχὶ γεγος ἔστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος;
οὐχ A, Θ, f1, 33, Maj

NA28 Luke 15:8 οὐχὶ ἄπτει λύχνου καὶ σαρξ τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ ζητεῖ ἑπιμελῶς ἑώς οὗ εὕρη;
οὐχ f13

NA28 Luke 17:8 ἄλλο ὁ οὗχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ:
οὐχ P75, Ἀ, (f1), 579

οὐχ D, Κ, 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 οὐχὶ is not coherent. As can be seen from the examples, a change from οὐχὶ 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 ἀναστάς πορεύου· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.
NA28 Luke 17:20 Ἐπερωτηθείς δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν Φαρισαίων

 omit: B, sa<sup>mass7</sup>

sa<sup>mass3</sup> 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:

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


P75, 01, B, L, 157, 1241, 2542, pc, it(e, ff², i, l, s), Sy-S, sa, arm, geo

Θ (sic!)

Minority readings:


BYZ Luke 17:23 καὶ ἔρούσιν ὑμῖν· ἴδοὺ ὁ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰδοὺ ἔκει· μὴ ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ διώξητε

P75, B, 579, WH, Bois

L, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C, NA²⁸, WHmas, Tis, Gre, Weiss, Bal, SBL

D, H, W, X, 69(-f13), 28, 33, al, Lat(e, q, vg), Sy-P

K, Π, S, 2542, pc

A, R, Δ, Θ, Ψ, (f1, f13), 157, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj, itpt(a, aur, c, d), vgmas, Sy-H, bo, goth

f13, l, sa

Minority readings:

Tregelles has additionally ἥ [ἴδοὺ] ἔκει in the margin.

IGNTP has 892* for the Π* reading.

33 has a lacuna here.

B: no umlaut

Minority readings:


BYZ Luke 17:23 καὶ ἔρούσιν ὑμῖν· ἴδοὺ ὁ ἰδοὺ ὁ ἰδοὺ ἔκει· μὴ ἀπέλθητε μηδὲ διώξητε

P75, B, 579, WH, Bois

L, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C, NA²⁸, WHmas, Tis, Gre, Weiss, Bal, SBL

D, H, W, X, 69(-f13), 28, 33, al, Lat(e, q, vg), Sy-P

K, Π, S, 2542, pc

A, R, Δ, Θ, Ψ, (f1, f13), 157, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj, itpt(a, aur, c, d), vgmas, Sy-H, bo, goth

f13, l, sa

Minority readings:
Support for omission of η: 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:

\textit{ἐδοὺ ὁδὲ, ἡ ἐδοὺ ὁδὲ} \hspace{1cm} 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 \( ω \)e priore correctum est \( ἐκεῖ \), a B\(^{3}\) demum ut \( υδτ\)."

Parallels:

\begin{itemize}
  \item NA28 Matthew 24:23 Τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη: \( ἐδοὺ ὁδὲ ὁ χριστός, ἡ ὁδὲ, μὴ πιστεύσετε. \)
  \item NA28 Mark 13:21 Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις ὑμῖν εἴπη: \( ἐδε ὁδὲ ὁ χριστός, ἐδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύσετε. \)
\end{itemize}

The support for the omission of η in verse 23 is not very good, mainly Western. When compared with the addition of \( ἐδοὺ \) in verse 21, the support is similar. But in verse 21 the committee did not add \( ἐδοὺ \) (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 \( ω \) - \( ἐκεῖ \) 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 ἔροῦσιν υμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ, [ἡ'] ἰδοὺ ὀδε· 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 ἔξελθητε 157, pc, Sy-P, geo

μὴ ἔξελθητε μηδὲ διώξητε 579

μηδὲ διώξητε ἦ· ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ ὁ χριστός μὴ πιστεύσητε
f1, Sy-Hm (Mt)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:23 Τότε ἐάν τις υμῖν εἶπη· ἰδοὺ ὄδε ὁ χριστός, ἦ· ὄδε, μὴ πιστεύσητε.
NA28 Matthew 24:26 ἐάν οὖν εἶποσιν υμῖν· ἰδοὺ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἑστίν, μὴ ἔξελθητε· ἰδοὺ ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις, μὴ πιστεύσητε.
NA28 Mark 13:21 Καὶ τότε ἐάν τις υμῖν εἶπη· ἴδε ὄδε ὁ χριστός, ἴδε ἐκεῖ, μὴ πιστεύσητε·

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. (..ΗΤΕ - ..ΗΤΕ).
The f1 reading is a partial harmonization to Mt.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
119. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 17:24 ὁσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν εἰς τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανῶν λάμπει, οὕτως ἔσται ὁ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ αὐτοῦ].

BYZ Luke 17:24 ὁσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἡ ἀστράπτουσα ἐκ τῆς ὑπ’ οὐρανῶν εἰς τὴν ὑπ’ οὐρανῶν λάμπει οὕτως ἔσται ὁ νῦς 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, WH₄¹, NA₂⁸, Bois

B: no umlaut

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 24:27 ὁσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἐξέρχεται ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ φαίνεται ἕως δυσμῶν, οὕτως ἔσται ἡ παρουσία τοῦ νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ___________: safe!

Compare verse 22:


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)
Brakets ok.

BYZ Luke 17:33 ὃς ἔαν θητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσας ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν καὶ ὃς ἔαν ἀπολέσῃ αὐτὴν ἠψωγονήσει αὐτὴν

περιπολέομαι "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, ff, l, r, vg), Sy-H

τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ f13, 28, 1071, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa

σώσας for ἠψωγονήσει f1, 69, 788 (=f13b), pc, it

ὃς ἄν θελήσῃ ἠψωγονήσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν, ...

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 εὗρὼν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἓμοι ἠψρήσει αὐτὴν.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 16:25 ὃς γὰρ ἔαν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσας ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἓμοι ἠψρήσει αὐτὴν.

NA28 Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἔαν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσας ἀπολέσει αὐτὴν ὃς δ’ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἔνεκεν ἓμοι καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτὴν.


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 σώσας, 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:

ἀπολέσει

01?, A, L, 13, 788, 983, 157, 579, 1071, 1342, a[N, R, S, Γ, Δ, Α, 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, ΠΓ, 047, 28, 1241, 1424, pc

01: NA notes: "01 incert." 01 reads ἈΠΟΛΕΣΙΖΩΓΟΝΗ... The question is if the Iota stands for ει or η. IGNTP does not note 01. For the first ἀπολέσει 01 also has ἀπολέσαι. 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 ἀπολέσει for ἀπολέση. So, 01 never reads ἀπολέσει for ἀπολέση, but twice for ἀπολέσει.

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 10:39 ὁ εὐρωπὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἑνεκεν ἐμοὶ εὐρήσει αὐτήν. safe!

NA28 Matthew 16:25 ὃς γὰρ ἔαν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ σώσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν. ὃς δ’ ἄν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἑνεκεν ἐμοὶ εὐρήσει αὐτήν.

ἀπολέσει: ἀπολέση 28
ἀπολέση: ἀπολέσει D, H, L, W, Δ, 33, 346, 1071, 1424, pc

NA28 Mark 8:35 ὃς γὰρ ἔαν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σώσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν. ὃς δ’ ἄν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἑνεκεν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου σώσει αὐτήν.

ἀπολέσει: ἀπολέσῃ A, L, W, 33, 579, 892, 1342, Maj ( || Mt)

Compare also:


NA28 John 12:25 ὁ φίλων τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἀπολλύει αὐτὴν, καὶ ὁ μισωῦν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον φυλάξει αὐτὴν.

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 ἐσονται ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ· οἱ εἰς παραληψθῆσθαι, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθῆσεται.

add verse: D, U, f13, 579, 700, 1071, 2766, al, Latt, Sy, arm, arab

D reads: δύο ἐν ἄγρῳ· εἰς παραληψθῆσθαι, καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθῆσεται.

69, 788(=f13b) omit.
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 24:40 τότε δύο ἐσονται ἐν τῷ ἄγρῳ, εἰς παραλαμβάνεται καὶ εἰς ἀφίεται.
NA28 Matthew 24:41 δύο ἀλήθουσαι ἐν τῷ μύλῳ, μία παραλαμβάνεται καὶ μία ἀφίεται.

Previous verses 35-36:
NA28 Luke 17:34 ἐσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς, οἱ εἰς παραληψθῆσθαι καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἀφεθῆσεται.

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 preceeding 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, NA28, 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 ἐβδομήκοντα [δύο]

omit δὲ: U, pc

Compare:
NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἤρωτησεν τὸν Πιλάτον Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἄρμαθαίας


NA28 Acts 18:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα χωρισθεὶς ἐκ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν ἠλθεν 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:


No txt in NA and SQE!

**omit** B, D, R, T, X, pc, Trg, WH

εἰς Φαρισαίος καὶ εἰς τελώνης D

**txt** P75, 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, WH

ὁ εἰς αὕτων 070 (acc. to Ford, 1799)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:
NA28 Luke 7:41 δύο χρεοφειλεῖται ἧπαν δανιστῇ τίνι, ὁ εἰς ὄψειλεν δημάρια πεντακόσια, ὁ δὲ ἄλλος πεντήκοντα. safe!

NA28 Luke 17:34 λέγω ὑμῖν, ταύτη τῇ νυκτὶ ἔσονται δύο ἐπὶ κλίνης μιᾶς, ὁ εἰς παραλημφθῆσαι καὶ ὁ ἄλλος ἀφεθῆσαι.

**omit ὁ:** 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 ὁ:** 700, 1342, pc

It is possible that the addition of ὁ is a conformation to the following ὁ ἄλλος. (D conforms the second part to the first.)

The omission of the second ὁ is not recorded.

A similar construction appears in the previous context at 17:34 where three of the five witnesses omit ὁ, too (T has a lacuna).

Difficult!

Weiss (Com. Lk) argues that the ὁ has been omitted because the εἰς has been combined thoughtlessly with Φαρισαίος.

Rating: - (indecisive)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 18:11 ὁ Φαρισαίος σταθεὶς πρὸς ἐαυτὸν ταῦτα προσήχετο·

T&T #37

ταῦτα πρὸς ἐαυτὸν
P75, 01\textsuperscript{c2}, B, T, Θ, Ψ, f1, 131, 579, 892, 1241, 2766, 2786, pc\textsuperscript{17}, Lat(a, aur, e, vg), Sy-Pal, NA\textsuperscript{25}, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg

ταῦτα πρὸς ἄυτὸν
L

ταῦτα
01*, 828\textsuperscript{c}, pc\textsuperscript{2} (=1481, 1563*), it, sa, geo\textsuperscript{1}, Tis, Bal

πρὸς ἐαυτὸν ταῦτα
A, Q, W, X, Δ, f13, 157, 700, 1424, Maj, Sy, WH\textsuperscript{ma}, Trg\textsuperscript{ma}

καθ’ ἐαυτὸν ταῦτα
D, 2542, geo\textsuperscript{2}

omit:
828*, 1071, pc\textsuperscript{2} (=2605, 2788)

bo reads one of the long readings.

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:
he went home

LXX 2 Maccabees 11:13 πρὸς ἐαυτὸν ἀντιβάλλων τὸ γεγονός περὶ αὐτὸν
by himself he pondered what happened to him ... 

The question here is to what πρὸς ἐαυτὸν 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 01 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:

ἀποδεκατεύω
P75, 01*, B, T, Weiss, WH, NA25, Tis, Bal

txt 01cz, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

ἀποδεκατώ 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 ηστεύω. An orthographic question. One should go with txt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 293

123. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 18:13 ὅ δὲ τελώνης μακρόθεν ἐστῶς οὐκ ἐθελεν οὐδὲ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐπάραε εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀλλ’ ἔτυπτεν τὸ στήθος αὐτοῦ λέγων· ὁ θεὸς, ἴλασθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ.

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἐαυτοῦ 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 ἐαυτοῦ often (11 times) compared to Mt (once) and Mk (none).
Impossible to judge.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 294

124. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

T&T #38

omit: 01, B, L, f1, 157, 579, 1241, 1541, 1612, 2542, Sy-Pal, Co, geo, arab<sup>Ms</sup>
NA<sup>25</sup>, WH, Gre, Weiss, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt A, (D), R, W, Χ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 078, f13, 33, 700, 892, 2786, Maj.
Latt, Sy, goth, Bois

ἵδων δὲ αὐτὸν περίλυπον γενόμενον εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς D, pc<sup>6</sup>, it
ἵδων δὲ περίλυπον αὐτὸν γενόμενον ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν 1424, pc<sup>4</sup>

B: no umlaut

περίλυπος "very sad, deeply distressed"
"And Jesus, having seen him become very sorrowful, said"

Compare previous verse 23:

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**


Byz τρυμαλίας ραφίδος A, K, P, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj

truph,matos belonhs A, K, P, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 700, 892, 1071, 1424, Maj

txt τρήματος βελόνης 01, B, D

truph,matos belonhs 01*

truph,matos ραφίδος R

truph,matos belonhs L, 22c, 157, 1241, pc

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 10:25 εὐκοπώτερον ἐστὶν κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλίας τῆς ραφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

truph,matos belonhs f13, pc

truph,matos ραφίδος 01*

NA28 Matthew 19:24 πάλιν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, εὐκοπώτερον ἐστὶν κάμηλον διὰ τρυμαλίας ραφίδος διελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

truph,matos 01c2, D, L, W, Z, Π, Δ, f1, 13, 2, 28, 33, 579, 892, 1010, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj-part (Robinson)

truph,matos C, K, M, U, Θ, 124(f13), 157, 565, 700, Maj-part

truph,matos 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 ἰὸνη was the surgical needle and ῥήμα the great medical word for a perforation of any kind."

Rating: - (indecisive)


**TVU 296**


Byz 01*, A, P, R, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 33, 579, 700, 1241, Maj, Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt 01ετ, B, D, L, 157, 892, 2542, pc, itpt(b, ff2, r1), Sy-Hmg, Co

τὰ ἱδία καὶ 157

τὰ ἱδία ἀφέντες D

πάντα τὰ ἱδία Θ, f1, f13, itpt(a, c, e, l, q), Sy-S, Sy-C, sams, arm, geo

πάντα τὰ ἱδία ἀφέντες f1

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:27 ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφηκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἡκολουθήσαμεν σοι.
NA28 Mark 10:28 ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφηκαμεν πάντα καὶ ἡκολουθήκαμεν 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 ἔστιν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ γυναῖκα ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ γονεῖς ἢ τέκνα ἔνεκεν τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ,

ἡ ἀδελφὰς D, X, Δ, Ψ, 579, 1071, 1241, pc, d, sa

579 and 1071 omit ἡ ἀδελφοῦς, probably due to homoioarcton.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 19:29 καὶ πάς ὅστις ἀφήκεν οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγορὰς ἔνεκεν τοῦ ἰδίου τῆς ἐπωνύμιας μου, ἐκατονταπλασίωνα λήψεται καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει.
NA28 Mark 10:29 ἔφη ὁ Ἰησοῦς: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐδεὶς ἔστιν ὃς ἀφήκεν οἰκίαν ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφὰς ἢ μητέρα ἢ πατέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἀγορὰς ἔνεκεν ἐμοῦ καὶ ἔνεκεν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,

Compare:


txt A, D, 124, 700, 954, [E, F, H, M, S, U, Γ, Ω] Maj-part, it(a, b, c, d, f, ff, q), vg, Sy-H, NA

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 **δς οὐχὶ μὴ ἀπολάβῃ** πολλαπλασίονα ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ αἰώνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ζωῆν αἰώνιον.

ἀπολαμβάνω "receive, get back, recover"

**δς οὐχὶ μὴ λάβῃ** B, NA²⁵, WH, Weiss

**δς οὕ ἀπολάβῃ** M, 2, 472, 1071, pc

ἔαν μὴ λάβῃ ἐπταπλασίονα D, it

txt 01, A, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, WH dmg, Bois

οὐχὶ μὴ 01, L, f1, 124, 579, 892, 1241


B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 19:29 ἐκατονταπλασίονα ὑμεῖς καὶ ζωῆν αἰώνιον κληρονομῆσει.

NA28 Mark 10:30 ἔαν μὴ λάβῃ ἐκατονταπλασίονα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ ἀπολάβη 01, f1, pc

Compare:

NA28 Luke 6:34 καὶ ἔαν δανίσητε παρ’ ὠν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν,


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):

ἀπολήψεται ἐκατονταπλασίονα 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)
Minority reading:

ἐπταπλασίωνα  D, it, sa_ms, Sy-H mg, Cypr, Diatess Ephrem-Armenian septies tantum

ἐκατονταπλασίωνα  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 ὁστὶς ἀφήκεν οἰκίας ἢ ἀδελφοὺς ἢ ἀδελφᾶς ἢ πατέρα ἢ μητέρα ἢ τέκνα ἢ ἄγροις ἐνεκεν τοῦ ὁνόματός μου, ἐκατονταπλασίωνα λήμπεται καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κηρυχωμήσει.

τοῦ πολλαπλασίωνα  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 ἐκατονταπλασίωνα νῦν ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ

Compare:

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 ἐμπαιχθῆσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυθῆσεται

omit καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται D, L, 828, 700, 1241, 2766, pc6, it(a, b, d, e, ff2, i, q), vgms, Sy-P

omit καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυθῆσεται pc, l1, r1, arm

omit καὶ ἐμπτυθῆσεται P, R, pc3

ἐμπτυθῆσεται 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 ררה, 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 ἐμπαίξαι καὶ μαστιγώσαι καὶ σταυρώσαι, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται.

NA28 Mark 10:34 καὶ ἐμπαίξουσιν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐμπύθουσιν 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)
Difficult variant:
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 18:40 σταθείς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτὸν. ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν·

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 ἐίπεν 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, Wsup, 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)
Minority reading:

omit: D, f1, 22, pc7, it(a, d, e, ff2, i, l, s), Sy-S, Sy-C, Marcion

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 στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐφώνησεν αὐτοὺς καὶ εἶπεν· τί θέλετε ποιήσω υμῖν;
NA28 Mark 10:49 καὶ στὰς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· φωνήσατε αὐτόν. καὶ φωνοῦσιν τὸν τυφλὸν λέγοντες αὐτῷ· θάρσει, ἐγειρέ, φωνεῖ σε.

Compare:
NA28 Acts 5:21 καὶ ἀπέστειλαν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἀχθῆναι αὐτούς.
NA28 Acts 25:17 ἐκέλευσα ἀχθῆναι τὸν ἄνδρα·

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 ὁίκῳ σου δεί με μείναι.

BYZ Luke 19:5 καὶ ὡς ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον ἀναβλέψας ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶδεν αὐτὸν· καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, Ζακχαῖε σπεύσας κατάβηθι σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ ὁίκῳ σου δεί με μείναι.

**Byz**

A, D, Q, R, W, Δ, Ψ, f13, 33vid, 157, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy-H, goth, [Trg\textsuperscript{mag}]

καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν

Ψ

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διέρχεσθαι αὐτόν εἶδεν καὶ D

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ διέρχεσθαι τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἶδεν αὐτὸν 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:*


*Compare also:*

NA28 Luke 21:1

"Ἀναβλέψας δὲ εἶδεν τοὺς βάλλοντας εἰς τὸ γαζοφυλάκιον"

The words could have been omitted due to homoioarcton (εἶ... - εἶ...) 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:

πραγματεύσασθαι
01, A, L, R, 13, 346, 828, 1071, 1342, al[E, Y, Γ, 047, 063], WH
πραγματεύσθαι D, W, Θ, 131, 205, 472, 579, pc

txt B, Ψ, f13, 157, 892, 1241, Maj, WHmaj
πραγματεύσθε U, Λ, f1, pc

U actually reads πραγματεύσθε according to Swanson.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

πραγματεύσασθε imperative aorist middle 2nd person plural
πραγματεύσθε imperative present middle 2nd person plural
πραγματεύσασθαι infinitive aorist middle
πραγματεύσθαι 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 αὑτοὺς 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 συναλληλογονός παρῆγγειλεν αὐτοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰεροσολύμων μὴ χωρίζεσθαι ἀλλὰ περιμένειν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς ἡν ἤκουσατε 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 (oratiō ariata)."
IQP has πραγματεύσασθε in double square brackets, indicating text that is "probable but uncertain".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 305


T&T #39

Byz A, W, Θ, 047, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 700, 892, 1424, Maj,
Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, NA²⁸, Gre, Weiss, Bal
tίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο Δ
tίς τί ἐπραγματεύσατο 0233, 954, 1071, 1675, 2680, al⁷⁸
tίς πεπραγματεύσατο W (error for τί ἐπ..)
txt 01, B, D, L, Ψ, 157, 579, 1241, 1612, 2542, pc¹⁰, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, Or, WH
tίς ἐπραγματεύσατο 157, 179, 1612, 2542
τίς διεπραγματεύσατο 1241, pc⁸
(IGNTP does not list 1241 for ..σαυτό)

τίς τί διεπραγματεύσατο R

Origen: Mt Comm. tom 14:13
B: no umlaut

txt "what any one had gained by trading"
txt "what they had gained by trading"

Compare:


τίς requires the singular, but without it the plural is needed.
tίς 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 ἀρατε 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, ff⁵, Sy-S, Sy-C, bo
pc = 16, 60*, 282, 690, 930⁰, 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 ἀρατε οὖν ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ
tὸ τάλαντον καὶ δότε τῷ ἔχοντι τὰ δέκα τάλαντα·
NA28 Matthew 25:29
tῷ 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  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)
131. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 Luke 19:30 λέγων· ὑπάγετε εἰς τὴν κατέναντι κώμην, ἐν ἧν ἐσπορευόμενοι εὑρήσετε πώλην δεδεμένον, ἐφ᾽ ὅν οὐδὲς πώποτε ἄνθρωπων ἐκάθισεν, καὶ λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε.

NA28 Luke 19:31 καὶ ἐὰν τις ὑμᾶς ἔρωτα· διὰ τί λύσετε; οὕτως ἔρειτε· ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει.


NA28 Luke 19:33 λυόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πώλην εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς· τί λύσετε τὸν πώλην;


**omit δεδεμένον ... ἀγάγετε** D*, d*

**omit διὰ τί λύσετε:** 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 χρείαν ἔχει - ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει)

g₁ omits verse 33 due to h.t. (it reads ἐστώτα τὸν πώλην in verse 32)

B: umlaut! (1339 C 25 R) αὐτῶν τὸν πώλην εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι
(Compare also previous variant!)

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 21:2 λέγων αὐτοῖς· πορεύεσθε εἰς τὴν κώμην τὴν κατέναντι ὑμῶν, καὶ εὐθέως εὑρήσετε ὅνον δεδεμένην καὶ πώλην μετ᾽ αὐτῆς· λύσαντες ἀγάγετε μοι.

NA28 Matthew 21:3 καὶ ἔαν τις ὑμῖν εἶπῃ τι, ἔρειτε ὅτι ὁ κύριος αὐτῶν χρείαν ἔχει· εὐθὺς δὲ ἀποστελεῖ αὐτούς.

[Mt inserts LXX quote here, verses 4-5]

NA28 Matthew 21:6 πορευθέντες δὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ποιήσαντες καθὼς συνέταξαν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
NA28 Mark 11:3-6 καὶ ἐὰν τις ὑμῖν ἐἴπη: τί ποιεῖτε τοῦτο; εἶπατε· ὁ κύριος αὐτοῦ χρείαν ἔχει, καὶ εὐθὺς αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὡδε. 4 καὶ ἀπήλθον καὶ εὗρον πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θύραν ἐξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου καὶ λύουσιν αὐτόν. 5 καὶ τινὲς τῶν ἐκεί ἑστηκότων ἐλεγον αὐτοῖς· τί ποιεῖτε λύουτες τὸν πῶλον; 6 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς καθὼς εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ ἀφῆκαν αὐτοὺς.

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 εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς __.
NA28 Luke 19:33 λύόντων δὲ αὐτῶν τὸν πῶλον εἶπαν οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ πρὸς αὐτούς· τί λύετε τὸν πῶλον;

Not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

| τὸν πῶλον   | U  |
|______________|____|
| ἔστώτα τὸν πῶλον | 157, 1071, 2766, al¹⁴,  
Lat(t), arm, aeth, Sy-H, Sy-Pal²², arm, Or  
157 omits τὸν  
D, d omit v. 32, 33. |

1071 omits 33a: λύόντων ... πῶλον

Or: Mt Comm. tom. 16:18
καὶ ὁ Λουκᾶς δὲ τοιαύτα φησιν· "ἀπελθόντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι εὗρον καθὼς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἔστώτα 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 συνέταξαν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
NA28 Mark 11:4 καὶ ἀπῆλθον καὶ εὗρον πῶλον δεδεμένον πρὸς θύραν ἔξω ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀμφόδου 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:

αὐτῶν A, B, R, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, 124, al[K, Π, N, U], Weiss, WH, NA[^25], Gre, Trg, SBL

**txt** 01, D, L, f13, 157, 579, 892, Maj

**omit** 1241, pc

IGNTP and Swanson have f1 correctly for αὐτῶν against NA and Lake. Checked 1 and 1582 at the film.

**B:** no umlaut

Compare Lk 16:4 above.

Rating: - (indecisive)
133. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:


BYZ Luke 19:38 λέγοντες Εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς ἐν ὑμῶν ὑμῖν ἱερήμεν 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\(^{ma1}\), Gre, Trg, SBL

**βασιλεὺς**

H, 063, pc

---

**ὁ ἐρχόμενος**

W, Λ\(^{*}\), pc, vg\(^{mss}\), bo\(^{mss}\)

---

**ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ ἐρχόμενος**

579 (sic!)

---

**ὁ βασιλεὺς**

01\(^{*}\), 69\(^{vid}\), pc, Or, WH\(^{ma2}\), Tis, Bal

**ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεὺς**

B, 372, WH, NA\(^{ed}\)

---

**ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὑμῶν ὑμῖν εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλεὺς**

D, it

---

**ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς**

157, r\(^{1}\), Sy-H\(^{**}\)

**εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ ἐρχόμενος**

ἐν ὑμῶν ὑμῖν Co

---

69 reads: εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος 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

---

**Parallels:**

NA28 Matthew 21:9 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὑμῶν ὑμῖν·

NA28 Mark 11:9 εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὑμῶν ὑμῖν·


---

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 01 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 01* 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
εἶ ἐγνώς ________ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην·
νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου.

BYZ Luke 19:42 λέγων ὅτι
Εἴ ἐγνώς καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ____ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην·
νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου.

T&T #41

B: no umlaut

καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ σου ταύτῃ
καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ
καὶ σὺ______ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ
καὶ σὺ______ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἡρώτησας ἃν
καὶ σὺ______ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ

καὶ γε limiting "at least"
intensifying "even; though"

after εἰρήνην:

--- σου --- A, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13αε, Maj, Sy, bo
--- σοι --- D, f13β, 157, pc, Lat
txt 01, B, L, Θ, 579, pc, sa, bo²

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)
NA28 Luke 19:45 Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας


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 πωλοῦντων τὰς περιστερὰς,
NA28 Mark 11:15 Καὶ ἔρχονται εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα. Καὶ εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν ἤρξατο ἐκβάλλειν τοὺς πωλοῦντας καὶ τοὺς ἀγοράζοντας ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας τῶν κολλυβιστῶν καὶ τὰς καθέδρας τῶν πωλοῦντων τὰς περιστερὰς 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 λαόν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβύτεροις

BYZ Luke 20:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν ἐκείνων, διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸν λαόν ἐν τῷ ιερῷ καὶ εὐαγγελιζομένου ἐπέστησαν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς σὺν τοῖς πρεσβύτεροις

Byz A, K, Π, Δ6r, 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 ἱερεῖς f13

add ἐκείνων: A, C, W, Δ, Θ, f13, 33, Maj
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:23 Καὶ ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ιερόν προσήλθον αὐτῷ διδάσκοντι οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι τοῦ λαοῦ
NA28 Mark 11:27 καὶ ἐν τῷ ιερῷ περιπατοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι

Compare also:
NA28 Acts 4:1 Δαλοῦντων δὲ αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸν λαόν ἐπέστησαν αὐτοῖς οἱ ἱερεῖς καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ιεροῦ καὶ οἱ Σαδδουκαίοι,

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 ἱερεῖς is a harmonization to Mt/Mk. Especially the combination with γραμματεῖς and πρεσβύτεροι makes a change to ἱερεῖς likely.
οἱ ἱερεῖς 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 ἱερεῖς (Mk 1:44 by f13, 33, 892mg, 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 ἀρχεῖεις 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.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 315

135. Difficult variant:

BYZ Luke 20:9 Ἡράτω δὲ πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην: ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν χρόνους ἰκανοὺς:

Byz 01, B, (C, D), L, R, Ψ, f1, 33, 579, 892, 1424, Maj, it, vgww
Weiss, WH, NA25, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
ἀμπελῶνα ἐφύτευσεν ἄνθρωπος D
ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος C

txt A, W, Θ, f13, 157, 1071, 1241, 2542, al, r1, vgSteph, vgSext, vgStutt, Sy, TR

it: homo quidam
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:33 Ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε. ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδοστός ὡστὶς ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα ...
ἄνθρωπος τὶς C3, X, Θε, 124, 346, 788, 28, 157, 1071, Maj-part

NA28 Mark 12:1 Καὶ Ἡράτω αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν ἀμπελῶνα ἄνθρωπος ἐφύτευσεν καὶ περιέθηκεν φραγμὸν ...
ἄνθρωπος τὶς W, Θ, f13, 565

Compare:

Lukan usage:
NA28 Luke 10:25 Καὶ ἵδον νομικός τὶς ἀνέστη
omit τὶς: 0211*

NA28 Luke 10:30 ἄνθρωπος τὶς κατέβαινεν ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων
omit τὶς: 1195, 1510
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 ἄνθρωπος 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 ἀμπελώνος· τί ποιήσω; πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἁγαπητὸν· ἵσως τούτον ἑντραπήσονται.

BYZ Luke 20:13 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελώνος Τί ποιήσω πέμψω τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἁγαπητὸν· ἵσως τούτον ιδόντες ἑντραπήσονται

Byz A, R, W, Δ, Θ, f13, Maj, Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, [Trg]

txt 01, B, C, D, L, Q, Ψ, 0211, f1, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo

B: no umlaut

ἵσως adv. "perhaps, it may be"
ἐντραπήσονται ἑντρέπω indicative future passive 3rd person plural pass. "respect, regard; be ashamed, be made ashamed"

Compare next verse 14:
NA28 Luke 20:14 ιδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γεωργοὶ ...

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:37-38 ὕστερον δὲ ἀπέστειλεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸν υἱόν αὐτοῦ λέγων· ἑντραπήσονται τὸν υἱόν μου. 38 οἱ δὲ γεωργοὶ ιδόντες τὸν υἱὸν εἴπον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς·
NA28 Mark 12:6-7 ἐτί ἔνα εἴχεν υἱὸν ἁγαπητὸν· ἀπέστειλεν αὐτὸν ἐσχάτον πρὸς αὐτοὺς λέγων ὦτι ἑντραπήσονται τὸν υἱὸν μου. 7 ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοὶ πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἴπαν

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 ιδόντες).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 317

BYZ Luke 20:19 καὶ ἑφοβήθησαν τὸν λαὸν ἐγνωσαν 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, 700c, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj-part, Latt, Sy, Co, goth
tὸν ὅχλον  N, W, Ψ, 0117, 22, pc
tοὺς ὅχλους  Sy-H

700: The words have been added in the margin by a later hand.
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 21:46 ἑφοβήθησαν τοὺς ὅχλους.

NA28 Mark 12:12 καὶ ἑφοβήθησαν τὸν ὅχλον.

Probably an accidental omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 318

Minority reading:

ἄποστελλόμενοι D, Θ, it, aeth, goth
ὕποστελλόμενες W
μετὰ ταύτα Sy-S, Sy-C
omit: Sy-P

recessissent it, vgms
discessissent a
redissent c
recedentes d
secresserunt e

aur, vg read txt.
B: no umlaut

παρατηρέω "watch closely; observe, keep"
ἄποχωρέω / 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 ἑξήτησαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ ἁρχιερεῖς ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ’ αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν λαὸν, 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 Ἡρῴδιαν ὀνόματος:
NA28 Mark 12:13 Καὶ ἀποστέλλουσιν πρὸς αὐτὸν τινὰς τῶν Φαρισαίων καὶ τῶν Ἡρῴδιαν ἵνα αὐτὸν ἀγρεύσωσιν λόγῳ.
Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:2 καὶ παρετήρουν αὐτὸν εἰ τοῖς σάββασιν θεραπεύσει αὐτὸν, ἵνα κατηγορήσωσιν αὐτὸν.
NA28 Luke 6:7 παρετηροῦντο δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 12:12 Καὶ ἐξῆτον αὐτὸν κρατῆσαι, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν τὸν ὄχλον, ἐγνώσαν γὰρ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τῇ παραβολῇ εἶπεν. καὶ ἀφένετε αὐτὸν ἀπῆλθον. "So they left him and went away."

WH: "the absolute use of παρατηρήσαντες was evidently a stumbling block."
In Lk 6:7 παρατηρεῖω is combined with transitive with αὐτὸν: "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 μέ πειράζετε

Byz A, C, D, P, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, [Trgμα]
tί μέ πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί C, 0211, 1071, pc, l

txt 01, B, L, f1, 0266 νδ, 230(=f13), 157, 579, 892, 1241, 1424, pc, e, Co, arm, arabμς
B: no umlaut
Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:18 γνοὺς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τὴν πονηρίαν αὐτῶν εἶπεν·
tί μέ πειράζετε, ὑποκριταί;
NA28 Mark 1 ὁ δὲ εἶδος αὐτῶν τὴν ὑπόκρισιν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς·
tί με πειράζετε; φέρετε μου 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:

_οἱ δὲ ἔδειξαν αὐτῷ καὶ εἶπεν_
01, C, L, N, 0211, 0266<sup>vid</sup>, f1, f13, 33, 157, (579), 892, 1071, 1241, 2766, al, Sy-H, Co, arm

_οἱ δὲ ἤνεγκαν πρὸς αὐτὸν δηνάριον καὶ εἶπεν_ 579, c
et et ostenderunt denarium. Et dixit eis

Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, goth

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:19 ἐπιδείξατε μοι τὸ νόμισμα τοῦ κήπου. οἱ δὲ προσήγκαν αὐτῷ δηνάριον.

NA28 Mark 1 τί με πειράζετε; φέρετέ μοι δηνάριον ήνα ἱδώ.

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


Byz A, C, D, W, Γ, Θ, f1, Ψ, f13, 157, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, f, Sy-H
omit οἷς: 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-Hng, Co
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
λέγουσιν A, 579, 1342, pc

Compare context:
NA28 Luke 20:23 εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦ. ...
NA28 Luke 20:25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦ. ...

Compare also:
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 οἷς δὲ εἶπαν has been changed into ἀποκριθέντες δὲ εἶπον, to avoid repetition and to improve style: οἷς δὲ εἶπαν. Kaisaartos. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοῦς 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
Mk 7:6    P45, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Latt, Sy-H
Mk 8:28   A, f1, Maj, Sy-H
Mk 9:12   A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H
Mk 9:38   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, Lat, Sy-H
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
Mk 12:24  A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 565, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H
Mk 13:2   A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H
Mk 13:5   A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-H
Mk 14:20  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
Lk 20:34  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:


**τοῦ** 01, B, L, 892, 1241, pc, Gre, Trg, WH, SBL

txt A, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj

**τοῦ** ρήματος αὐτοῦ Ἐ, 579

B: no umlaut

"and they were not able to take hold on his/the saying before the people"

Compare immediate context, verse 20:


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 (Α Ι - Α 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 δὲ τινες τῶν Σαδδουκαίων, 
"οἱ [ἀντι]λέγοντες" ἀνάστασιν μὴ εἶναι, ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν

BYZ Luke 20:27 Προσελθόντες δὲ 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, NA28, 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 ἑκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ προσήλθον αὐτῷ Σαδδουκαίοι, 
"λέγοντες" μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν, καὶ ἐπηρώτησαν αὐτὸν

BYZ Matthew 22:23 
"οὓς" λέγοντες μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν ...

NA28 Mark 12:18 Καὶ ἔρχονται Σαδδουκαίοι πρὸς αὐτὸν, 
"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).
μὴ/οὐκ sometimes appears after verbs which have a negative sense, but is left untranslated. Compare:
NA28 1 John 2:22 ὁ ἁρμονεμένος ὃτι 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 01, 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


BYZ Luke 20:28 λέγοντες Διδάσκαλε Μωσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν εάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνη ἔχων γυναῖκα καὶ οὗτος ἀτεκνὸς ἀποθάνη ἵνα λάβῃ ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν γυναίκα καὶ ἐξαναστήσῃ σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ

Byz A, W, Δ, Θ, f13, Maj, it07(a, f, c, i), Sy-H, goth
txt 01c1, B, L, P, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 372, 579, 892, 1071, pc7, Lat(aur, e, ff1, l, q, r1, vg), Co, arm, geo

ἡ 01c1, 579 (01* omits due to h.t. γυναίκα - γυναῖκα)

ἀποθάνη ἀτεκνὸς ἔχων γυναῖκα D, d, e

1241 has ἀποθάνη μὴ ἔχων τέκνα ἵνα λάβῃ
for ἀποθάνη ... ἵνα λάβῃ (cp. Mk)

B: no umlaut

ἡ εἰμί subjunctive present active 3rd person singular

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:24 εάν τις ἀποθάνη μὴ ἔχων τέκνα, ἐπιγαμβρεύσει ...
NA28 Mark 12:19 διδάσκαλε, Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν ὅτι εάν τινος ἀδελφὸς ἀποθάνη καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναίκα καὶ μὴ ἀφῇ τέκνον.

The Byzantine reading is probably a harmonization to immediate context. It removes the one-letter word ἧ, which might cause trouble for the reader.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 325

NA28 Luke 20:30 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος


Byz  A, P, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, [Trg\textsuperscript{mg}]
καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν ... Θ, 579
omit καὶ ἔλαβεν ὁ δεύτερος τὴν γυναῖκα: 2766

txt  01, B, D, L, 0266\textsuperscript{vd}, 157, 892, 1241, pc, d, e, Co, geo
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 Luke 20:29 ἐπτά οὖν ἀδελφοὶ ἦσαν· καὶ ὁ πρῶτος λαβὼν γυναῖκα ἀπέθανεν ἀτεκνος·

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:26 ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ δεύτερος καὶ ὁ τρίτος ἕως τῶν ἐπτά.
NA28 Mark 12:21 καὶ ὁ δεύτερος ἔλαβεν αὐτήν καὶ ἀπέθανεν μὴ καταλιπών 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

BYZ Luke 20:32 ὑστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνὴ

Byz A, P, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, sa\textsuperscript{mss}, goth, \textsuperscript{Trg}\textsuperscript{mss}
kαὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν δὲ πάντων 33

txt 01, B, D, L, 0266\textsuperscript{vid}, f1, 157, 579, 892, pc,
c, d, i, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa\textsuperscript{mss}, bo

ὑστερον δὲ πάντων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν 1241

omit δὲ: 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\textsuperscript{**}, sa\textsuperscript{mss}, bo\textsuperscript{mss}
01: corrected by 01\textsuperscript{C2}

omit πάντων: it(a, c, d, ff\textsuperscript{2}, i, l, r\textsuperscript{1})
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:27 ὑστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν ἡ γυνὴ.
BYZ Matthew 22:27 ὑστερον δὲ πάντων ἀπέθανεν καὶ ἡ γυνὴ

NA28 Mark 12:22 καὶ οἱ ἐπτὰ οὐκ ἀφήκαν σπέρμα. ἔσχατον πάντων καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἀπέθανεν.

Clearly a harmonization to Mt/Mk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
138. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 20:34 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς: οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γεννώσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται,

**γεννώσιν καὶ γεννώσιν**
D, it\(^p\)(a, d, r\(^1\)), vg\(^mss\),
"are begotten and beget"
Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-H\(^mg\), Or

**γεννώσιν καὶ γεννώσιν**
but omit γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται:
it\(^p\)(c, e, ff\(^2\), i, l, q)

generantur et generant
ff\(^2\), i, q

generant et generantur
c, e, l

generantur et generant nubunt et nubuntur
vg\(^mss\) (Book of Kells)

generant et generantur nubunt et nubuntur
a

nascuntur et generant nubunt et nubuntur
r\(^1\)

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, ἀναγράφαντα τὸν σωτῆρα εἰρηκέναι: "οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου γεννώσιν καὶ γεννώσιν γαμοῦσιν καὶ γαμίσκονται,"

**B:** no umlaut

No parallel.
Weiss (Lk Com.): [the addition is] "not unskillful".
Zahn (Comm. Lk) considers the words original: "appropriateness immediately evident".

Rating: - (indecisive)
Minority reading:

μέλλουσιν  D, W, Θ, it, Sy-Hmg, Cyp, Marcion

**ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἶσιν τῷ θεῷ**  
nam sunt similes angelis Dei  
D, pc, it(a, c, d, e, ff², gat, i, l), vg

**ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἶσιν**  
r¹, vg, Sy-S

**ἄλλ’ ὡς ἄγγελοι εἰσιν θεοὶ καὶ**  
157

**ἰσάγγελοι ἐσονται, 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 νικὸς ὄντες. 37 οτι δὲ ἐγείρονται

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 22:30 ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀναστάσει οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἄλλ’ ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ εἰσιν.
NA28 Mark 12:25 ὅταν γὰρ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῶσιν οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται, ἄλλ’ εἰσιν ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Probably attempts to avoid the difficult νικὸς εἰσιν θεοὶ.

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 ἐστὶν;

αὐτὸν κύριον

_A, B, L, Q, (R), 0211, 33, (1241), al[K, Π, M, U], 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 βιβλίῳ ψαλμῶν· εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθως ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 22:45 εἶ οὖν Δαυὶδ καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον, πῶς υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν;
NA28 Mark 12:37 αὐτὸς Δαυὶδ λέγει αὐτὸν κύριον, καὶ πόθεν αὐτοῦ ἐστιν υἱός; Καὶ [ό] πολὺς ὀχλὸς ἦκουεν αὐτοῦ ἡδέως.

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 'Ακούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ].

**omit** B, D, 2542, d, l, Weiss, WH, NA²⁸, 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 ἡμᾶς Q
toῖς 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*


**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 Ναίν καὶ συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁχλὸς πολὺς.

**omit αὐτοῦ:** f1, pc


**omit αὐτοῦ:** W, 700
NA28 Luke 9:14 ἤςαν γὰρ ὠσεὶ ἀνδρεῖς πεντακισχίλιοι. εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ: ... 
omit αὐτοῦ: 579, 700, 2542, 2766

ad add αὐτοῦ: L, R, Ξ, f13, 33, 892, 1071, pc (not in NA and SQE!)

add αὐτοῦ: Μ, Ν, Ο, Ψ, Υ, Θ, f1, 22, f13, 579, 892, 1071, 1424, 2542, 2766, al\textsuperscript{26}

NA28 Luke 9:43 ἐξεπλήσσοντο δὲ πάντες ἐπὶ τῇ μεγαλειώτητι τοῦ θεοῦ. Πάντων δὲ θαυμαζόντων ἐπὶ πᾶσιν οἷς ἐποίει εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ: 
omit αὐτοῦ: 0115

NA28 Luke 10:23 Καὶ στραφεῖς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ’ ιδίαν εἶπεν· 
add αὐτοῦ: U, 1424, pc\textsuperscript{3}

NA28 Luke 12:1 Ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεῖσιν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὀχλοῦ, ὅστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, ἦρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ πρῶτον; 
omit αὐτοῦ: D

omit αὐτοῦ: P45\textsuperscript{rd}, P75, B, 1241 
ad add αὐτοῦ: 01, A, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj

NA28 Luke 16:1 Ἐλεγέν δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς: 
omit αὐτοῦ: P75, 01, B, D, L, R, 69, 788, 579, 1071, 1241, 2542, pc 
ad add αὐτοῦ: A, P, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, Maj

NA28 Luke 17:1 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ: ἀνένδεκτον ἔστιν τοῦ τὰ σκάνδαλα μὴ ἑλθεῖν, 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!) 
ad add αὐτοῦ: P75, 01, A, B, D, L, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, 2766,
NA28 Luke 17:22 Ἐξέπευ τῷ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς:

add αὐτοῦ: A, X, al


add αὐτοῦ: Μ, Υ, Π, 346, al

NA28 Luke 19:29 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθαφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν ἑνῷ τῷ ὀρῷς τῷ ἐλαὶῳ, 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 ἢδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαίων ἠρέματο ἄπαν τὸ πλήθος τῶν μαθητῶν χαίροντες αἰνεῖν τὸν θεὸν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ περὶ πασῶν ὧν εἶδον δυνάμεων,

add αὐτοῦ: Θ, 179

NA28 Luke 20:45 Ἀκούοντος δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ ἔπευ 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


omit αὐτοῦ: P75, 01, A, B, D, L, Q, T, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 118*, f1, f13, 892, 1241, 2542, pc

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 ἀναστάς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εὐθέως κοιμώμενους αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς λύπης,

add αὐτοῦ: f1, TR

At the following verses the pronoun is safe: 6:13, 6:17, 7:18-2, 8:22, 11:1-2
At the following verses the words without pronoun are safe: None!

At the following verses the Byzantine text adds the pronoun:
At the following verses the Byzantine text omits the pronoun:
17:1

At the following verses a minority adds the pronoun:

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:

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 ἐδίδω τοῖς μαθηταίς [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 μαθηταίς τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταί 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** Εἴπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς [αὐτοῦ]: διὰ τούτο λέγω ὑμῖν· μὴ μεριμνᾶτε τῇ ψυχῇ τί φάγητε, μηδὲ τῷ σώματι τί ἐνδύσησθε.

- **omit αὐτοῦ:** P45, P75, B, 1241, Weiss
- **add αὐτοῦ:** 01, A, D, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1342, Maj

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 ως ἦγγισεν εἰς Βηθαβάγη καὶ Βηθανίᾳ[ν] πρὸς τὸ ὄρος τὸ καλοῦμεν Καλαμών, ἀπέστειλεν δύο τῶν μαθητῶν

**Luke 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 αὑτοῖς
tῶν 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 Ἀκούσων δὲ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ:
omit αὐτοῦ: B, D, 2542, WH, Weiss, Bois, NA28, 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 ὀχλοῖς 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


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, ἀυτὴ δὲ ἐκ τῆς ὑστερήσεως αὐτῆς πάντα ὃσα ἔχειν ἔβαλεν ὁλὸν τὸν βίον αὐτῆς.

Compare context:

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 οὖτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὗτοίς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς πάντα τὸν βίον ὀν εἰχεν ἔβαλεν _.

_ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνη, ὁ ἔχων ὡτα ἀκούειν, ἀκούέτω_  
Ε⁵, G, H, M⁶, S, Γ, Λ, 063, 0211, f13, 892mg, 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 Θ⁶), 16:18 (alone) and 18:8 (alone)!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 333

141. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

T&T #43

1 ὁδε X, f1, 22, 33, 131, 579, 1241, pc10, e, s, Sy-C, (Sy-S)

2 ὁδε 01, B, (D), L, f13, 892, 2542, pc2, it, Co, WH ἐν τοῖχῳ ὁδε D, it(a, c, d, ff1, i, q, r1), s (τοῖχος ”wall”)

txt A, K, Π, Q, W, Γ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, Lat(aur, f, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, sa\textsuperscript{ns}, bo\textsuperscript{ms}, NA\textsuperscript{25}

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:2 ο ὃ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς: οὐ βλέπετε ταύτα πάντα; ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὁδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθου ὃς οὐ καταλυθήσεται.

W* omits ὁδε, otherwise save.

NA28 Mark 13:2 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ: βλέπεις ταύτας τὰς μεγάλας οἴκοδομάς; οὐ μὴ ἀφεθῇ ὁδε λίθος ἐπὶ λίθου ὃς οὐ μὴ καταλυθῇ.

omit ὁδε: A, K, Π, Γ, 69, 157, Maj-part, Lat, NA\textsuperscript{25}, Gre, Bois, Weiss

Compare also:

BYZ Luke 15:17 ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῳ ὁδε ἀπόλλυμαι

Byz A, P, Q, W, 69, 174, 230(=f13), 157, 1071, Maj, sa\textsuperscript{ns}
txt λιμῳ ὁδε P75, 01, B, L, Ψ, 579, 892, 2542, pc, e, ff2, Sy-H, Sy-Pal

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 ὁδε at a different position, but this is rather improbable.
On the other hand it could be argued that the 01, B reading is original and that the omission (of the ωδε in position 2) is a harmonization to Mt/Mk (improbable, too). Or it has been omitted to improve style. The ωδε at position 2 does not appear in the parallels and it seems rather out of place. Note the omission of ωδε 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 01, B reading

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
   (after weighting the witnesses)
If one enlarges the length of the variation unit, B has a singular reading:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kai</th>
<th>kattά</th>
<th>topous</th>
<th>lomoi</th>
<th>kai</th>
<th>limoi</th>
<th>esontai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kattά</td>
<td>topous</td>
<td>lomoi</td>
<td>kai</td>
<td>lomoi</td>
<td>esontai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>0211</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A,</td>
<td>D,</td>
<td>W,</td>
<td>Θ,</td>
<td>Ψ,</td>
<td>f1,</td>
<td>f13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q,</td>
<td>Y,</td>
<td>f1,</td>
<td>f13,</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td>Maj</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trg</td>
<td>Gre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:7 ἐγέρθησεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἐσονται λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους.
NA28 Mark 13:8 ἐγέρθησεται γὰρ ἔθνος ἐπὶ ἔθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἐσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἐσονται λιμοὶ ἀρχῇ ὀδίνων ταῦτα.

The meaning is different regarding the position of kai.

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 kai has been moved after τόπους as a harmonization to the parallels. The evidence of 0102, 892 and 1241 regarding kai is indecisive, because it is not clear at what point in the sentence kai 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:

λημοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ
B, 157, 1241, pc, Lat, (Sy-S), Sy-C, Weiss, WH, NA28, Trg
txt 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f1, f13, 33, 579, 892, Maj, e, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co?, WHmg, Trgmg

omit καὶ λοιμοὶ 13, 230
omit καὶ λοιμοὶ Yc, 69, pc2
B: no umlaut

"famines and plagues"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 24:7 ἐγερθῆσεται γὰρ ἐθνος ἐπὶ ἑθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν καὶ ἔσονται λημοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους·
λημοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ C, K, Π, Θ, f1, f13, 579, 700, 1424, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, mae-1
λοιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ 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 ἐγερθῆσεται γὰρ ἑθνος ἐπὶ ἑθνος καὶ βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν, ἔσονται σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους, ἔσονται λημοὶ· ἀρχὴ ὁδίνων ταύτα.

Compare:

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)
You will be hated by all because of my name.
But not a hair of your head will perish.
By your endurance you will gain your souls.

Parallel:

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:

κτήσασθε

A, B, Θ, f13, 33, pc, Lat(c, f, ff², l, s, vg), sa, bo², Weiss, WH, NA²⁸, Trg

tax 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

κτήσεθαι A, 13, 828ε

σώσετε Marcion⁵ (from Mt, Mk?)

B: umlaut! (p. 1342 C 7 L) κτήσασθε τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν.

κτήσασθε imperative aorist middle 2nd person plural
κτήσεθε indicative future middle 2nd person plural
κτήσασθαι infinitive aorist middle
κτήσεθαι infinitive present middle/passive
κτάομαι "acquire, gain"

Context:

ἐπιβάλωσιν indicative future active 3rd person plural
διώκουσιν indicative future active 3rd person plural
ἀποβήστησαν indicative future middle 3rd person singular
dῶσω indicative future active 1st person singular
dυνήσονται indicative future middle 3rd person plural
παραδοθήσθε indicative future passive 2nd person plural
θανατώσουσιν indicative future active 3rd person plural
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 αι 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:


No txt in NA!

καὶ ἔσονται καίροι  B, D?, [WH], Weiss
καίροι καὶ ἔσονται καίροι  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] καίροι ἐθνῶν (parablepsis from B reading? see next verse!)
Tischendorf adds Sy-Hmg cod for the L reading.

**B:** no umlaut

Compare next verse:

NA28 Luke 21:25 Καὶ ἔσονται σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἀστροῖς,
BYZ Luke 21:25 Καὶ ἔσται σημεῖα

ἔσονται  01, B, D, pc
ἔσται  A, C, L, W, Δ, 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" (ἀχρὶ ὄν πληρωθῶσιν καίροι ἐθνῶν). First aorist passive subjunctive with αχρὶ ὃν like ἐως ὃν. 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 αχρὶ ὃν 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 homoioarcton 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:

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 Ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς συκῆς μάθετε τὴν παραβολὴν ὅταν ἑδή 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 προβάλλωσιν, 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 ("leafs").

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 340

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 21:34 Προσέχετε δὲ ἑαυτοῖς μὴ ποτε βαρηθῶσιν ὑμῶν αἱ καρδίαι ἐν κρατήλῃ καὶ μέθῃ καὶ μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς καὶ ἐπιστῆ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς αἰφνίδιος ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκεῖνη

αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν
A, B, T, W, X, f13, 579, 1424, 2542, al, IrLat, Trg, WH

txt 01, C, D, L, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare context:

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 αἱ καρδίαι ὑμῶν is incoherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
**TVU 341**

**143. Difficult variant**


**BYZ**

ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη: 35 ὡς παγίς γὰρ ἐπεισελεύσεται

**Byz**  A, C, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat(aur, f, q, r, vg), Sy

**txt**  01, B, D, L, 070, 0179, 157, 579, pc, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff, 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)
**Difficult variant**


Byz A, C, D, R, Δ, Θ, f13, 700, Maj, Latt, Sy, Trg

txt 01, B, L, T, W, X, Ψ, 070, f1, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc, Co

κατασκυάσητε κατασκύασει subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural
"be able, have strength, overcome, prevail"

καταξιωθῆτε καταξιωθῆσαι 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 Matthew 16:18 κἀγὼ δὲ σοι λέγω ὅτι σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ πέτρᾳ οἰκοδομήσω μου τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ πύλαι ξόδου οὐ κατασκύασον αὐτής.

It is possibly at least in part a misreading of the similar looking words:

κατακτισθήτε
καταξιωθῆτε

Both are rather rare words (καταξιώ  two times in Lk, κατασκύα 3 times, twice in Lk, once in Mt).

It is possible that καταξιώ has been adopted from 20:35. κατασκύα 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:

___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:

omit: 01*, C, N, L48, L150*, L292, L1599, it(b, ff², i, l, q), Sy-S, Eus
01: corrected by 01ći
N: καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἔζητε (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 παραδῶσω αὐτὸν; οἱ δὲ ἔστησαν αὐτῷ τριάκοντα ἄργυρία. 16 καὶ ἀπὸ τότε ἔζητε εὐκαιρίαν ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδώ.
NA28 Mark 14:11 οἱ δὲ ἀκούσαντες ἔχαρησαν καὶ ἐπηγγείλαντο αὐτῷ ἄργυριον δοῦναι. καὶ ἔζητε 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 ἔχαρησαν 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:**


**omit** P75, B, C, D, L, Ψ, 579, 892, 1241, pc,

Weiss, Trg, WH, NA₂₈, 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 προσήλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Ἰησοῦ λέγοντες ποῦ θέλεις ἐτοιμάσωμὲν σοι φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα;

NA28 Mark 14:12 Καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων, ὅτε τὸ πάσχα ἔθνον,

**Compare:**


omit ἐν αἷς: B* (corr. by B clot)

NA28 Acts 4:12 καὶ οὐκ ἔστω ἐν ἀλλῷ οὐδεὶς ἡ σωτηρία, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομα ἐστὶν ἔτερον ὑπὸ τῶν οὐρανῶν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ὦ δεὶ 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


Byz 01\textsuperscript{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\textsuperscript{E}

txt P75, 01\textsuperscript{*}, B, D, 157, pc, it, Sy-C, sa

οἱ ἐνδέκα ἀπόστολοι 348

οἱ δώδεκα 01\textsuperscript{C1}, L, X, 1071, 1241, pc\textsuperscript{5}, sa\textsuperscript{mss}

οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ Sy-S

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:20 ὘ψίας δὲ γενομένης ἀνέκειτο μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

οἱ μαθηταὶ: 01, A, L, W, Δ, Θ, 33, 892, 1424, pm, Lat, Sy-H, Co

NA28 Mark 14:17 Καὶ ὁψίας γενομένης ἔρχεται μετὰ τῶν δώδεκα.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 11:1 Καὶ ἐγένετο ὁτε ἔτελεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς διατάσσον τοῖς δώδεκα μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, μετέβη ἐκείθεν 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\textsuperscript{C2}, D, L, (W), Θ, f1, (f13), 33, 892, Maj, Latt, Sy, bo, arm, geo, Gre, Bois
txt 01, B, C\textsuperscript{*}, Δ, 565, 579, 1342, pc\textsuperscript{1}, sa\textsuperscript{mss}, WH, NA\textsuperscript{25}, Weiss

dώδεκα is a natural expansion probably derived from Mt/Mk. Note the similar expansion in Mt.
On the other hand it has been suggested that δωδεκά 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 αὐτό
ἐὼς ὦτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

BYZ Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ,
ἐὼς ὦτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ

οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ C2, P, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 157, 700, Maj, NA25, Gre
οὐκέτι μὴ φάγομαι ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ D, d, pc
οὐκέτι μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ Ψ
οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ f13

οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ A, H, Θ
οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ C*, f1, 22, 1071, Lat, Sy, Or,
Weiss, [Trg], Bal

txt οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ 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 ὤτι scriptsit B. Ante defuit οὐκέτι. Praeterea non assequor an quid aliter habuerit; conjecerim quidem pro εἰς ΛΥΤΟΥ fuisse ΛΥΤΟ." 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 πίω ἐκ τοῦ
gενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἐὼς τής ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω
καὶνὸν 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
On the one hand ὤψετι could have been added to soften the abrupt saying: "I will not eat until..." - "No more will I eat until..."

On the other hand ὤψετι 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 ὤψετι could have been omitted accidentally in front of οὔ. If ὤψετι 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 αὐτό, for it is intelligible that αὐτό should be substituted in accordance with the foregoing τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν, whereas I do not see that any one would think of altering αὐτό 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:

omit: P75vid, 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 πίω D, G, f1, 157, pc

ότι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ 1604 (Mk)

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Context:
omit οτι: C*, D, N, X, pc

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:29 λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπ' ἁρτί ἐκ τοῦ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου
omit οτι: P45, 01, B, D, Z, Θ, 0281, f1, f13, 33, 892, 1071, pc
add οτι: A, C, L, W, 579, 700, 1424, Maj

NA28 Mark 14:25 ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν οτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἐκ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου

It is possible that the omission of οτι 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 οτι 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


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, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, [Trg]

omit ὅτι: P75, B, C, D, L, f1, 157

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 14:25 ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἐως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω καὶ νῦν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.


BYZ Luke 22:16 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὃτι οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἐως 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>verse 16</th>
<th>verse 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Byz</td>
<td>οὐκέτι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txt</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 Οὐκὲτι of Mk.

ὁτι: 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 λαβὼν ἅρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τούτῳ ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τούτῳ ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. 20 καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων· τούτῳ τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.

omit: D, it, (Sy-C), Weiss
it = a, b, d, e, ff, i, l
NA28, WH both have the words in double brackets.
omit verses 17+18: L32, Sy-P, bo, Marcion(probably, Harnack)
verse 17, 18 after 19a: b, e
verse 17, 18 after 19b: Sy-C (omits verse 20), Trg (l)

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, r, vg) read txt. Compare Wordsworth White.
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἅρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἐκλασεν καὶ δοῦσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν· λάβετε φάγετε, τούτῳ ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 27 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες,

NA28 Mark 14:22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἅρτον εὐλογήσας ἐκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· λάβετε, τούτῳ ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. 23 καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες.
Compare:
NA28 1 Corinthians 11:24 καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἐκλαθεν καὶ εἶπεν· τοῦτο μοῦ ἔστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.
NA28 1 Corinthians 11:25 ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ κατοικία διαθήκη ἔστιν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

Compare also Didache 9:2-3:
2 πρώτον περὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι πατέρι ἡμῶν υπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας αμπελους δαυιδ τοῦ παιδός σου τῆς εὐγνωρίας ημίν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου σοι τῇ δόξῃ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
3 περὶ δὲ τοῦ κλασμάτως εὐχαριστοῦμεν σοι πατέρι ἡμῶν υπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως τῆς εὐγνωρίας ημίν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου σοι τῇ δόξῃ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας
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 adaption 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 Πληθυν ιδου ... 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: τούτο ἐστίν τὸ σῶμά μου ὑμῖν: τούτο 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
- P. Benoit "Le recit de la cene dans Lk 2-20" RB 48 (1939) 357-93
- H. Schürmann "Lk 22, 19b-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung" in "Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien", Düsseldorf 1968, p. 159 - 192
- Ehrman, Orthodox Corruption, p. 198 - 209.
- DC Parker, Living Text, p. 151 - 157

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 351
Minority reading:

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 ἄνθρωπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ δι’ οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπου παραδίδοται· καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκεῖνος.
NA28 Mark 14:21 ὅτι ὁ µὲν υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπου ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται περὶ αὐτοῦ, οὐαὶ δὲ τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ ἐκεῖνῳ δι’ οὗ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπου 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

BYZ Luke 22:30 ἵνα ἔσθητε 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!


txt P75, 01, A, B, (D), K, Π, L, M, N, Q, U, T, W, Χ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, al, Latt, Sy, Co, TR
omit μου: D, d, e, gat, g¹, l, vg₇₉, Sy-C
βασιλείᾳ 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 ἤνα ἐσθητε καὶ πύνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου, καὶ καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

κάθησθε B*, (c1), T, Δ, (892), pc, Trg, WH
καθείσθη 892

καθήσεσθε 01, A, B, L, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700, 1241, Maj-part[N, S, Π*, Ω, 047, 0211], WH

καθίσεσθε 124, 983, 579, 1424, 2542, L844, Maj-part[E, F, K, Π, Γ, Μ, U, V, X, Y, Γ, Λ, 2], Robinson

καθίσησθε H, al, TR

καθέζησθε D

Lacuna: 33
IGNTP alone has P75vc, 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 ΚΛΘΗΣΘΕ has been written.

Two corrections took place: ΚΛΘΗΣΘΕ ΑΙ
CE has been added above HC and ΑΙ has been added above the C.
The CE has probably been written by the reinforcer (so also Tischendorf). The ΑΙ appears to be written by the first hand corrector Bc1. The end-CE and the ΑΙ 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
ἐσθητε/πύνητε subjunctive present active 2nd person plural
Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 19:28 ο δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὃτι ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντες μοι ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ, ὅταν καθίσῃ ὁ οἶος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐπὶ θρόνον δόξης αὐτοῦ, καθήσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους κρίνουσε τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
καθίσησθε   C, D*, 33, 700, 892, 1241, Maj-part
καθῆσθε   Z, f1, 579, pc
txt     01, B, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, 0281, f13, Maj-part

It is possible that the καθήσθε reading is a conformation to the present forms ἔσθητε/πίνυτε earlier in the verse (so Weiss).
On the other hand καθῆσθε could be a harmonization to Mt.
If the original reading of B has already been corrected by B¹, the value of B as a witness for καθησθε 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


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<sup>ms</sup>, [Trg]

txt P75, B, L, T, 1241, 2542<sup>c</sup>, 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


BYZ Luke 22:34 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· λέγω σοι, Πέτρε οὐ μὴ φωνήσῃ σήμερον ἀλέκτωρ πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ 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 μὴ A, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 157, 565, Maj (not in NA, but in SQE)

μὴ ² by: A, D, W, Δ, 118, 1582(=f1), f13, 565, 700, 892, 1241, 2542, Maj,

πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με A, W, Δ, 565, 700, 1424, Maj
πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι 118, 1582

πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὲ εἰδέναι Ψ, 1
πρὶν ἢ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὲ εἰδέναι Q sic

ἐως τοῦ τρίς μὲ ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με D, pc
ἐως οὐ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι με K, al
ἐως τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι 892, Bal
ἐως τρίς μὲ ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ εἰδέναι f13, 2542, NA²⁸, Weiss

ἐως οὐ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι με M, X, Π, pc

ἐως τρίς μὲ ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι P75oth, 01, B, L, T, Θ, 579, WH
ἐως τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ μὲ εἰδέναι 157

ἐως οὐ ἀπαρνήσῃ μὴ τρίς 1241 (:: Jo)

Lacuna: 33

B: no umlaut

ἀπαρνέομαι "reject, disown"
Compare:

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:34 ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι τρῖς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.
NA28 Mark 14:30 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν λέγω σοι ὅτι σὺ σήμερον ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτί πρὶν ἢ δῖς ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι τρῖς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.
NA28 John 13:38 ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ψυχὴν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἑως οὐ ἀρνηθῇ 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 ἑως has been changed into πρὶν ἢ from (Mt)/Mk. The μὴ has been omitted accidentally after ἀπαρνήσῃ 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)
150. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:


Not in NA but in SQE!

**ἀρεῖ** D, d

**πωλήσει** 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, Υ, 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 ἄλλα προφητείαν προλέγουσι 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 πωλήσω 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

BYZ Luke 22:37 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν οτι έτι τότο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεὶ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί τὸ Καὶ μετὰ ἀνώμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει

Byz  Κ, 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, 2542c, L844, pc8, b, d, f, r1, Co

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:17 καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί διαλογίζεσθε ὃτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὐπώ νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε; πεπωρώμενην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν;

BYZ Mark 8:17 καὶ γνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὃτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε οὐπώ νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε· έτι πεπωρώμενην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν

Byz  Α, Κ, Π, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, f, l, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H

txt  P45vid, 01, B, C, D, L, N, W, Δ, (Θ), 0143vid, f1, f13, 28, 33, (565), 579, 892*, 1241, pc, it, Co

NA28 John 4:35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὃτι έτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται;
omit:  P75, D, L, S, Π, Ω, 086vid, 118, f13, 28, 1241, L844*, pm, Sy-C

NA28 Romans 5:8 συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὃτι έτι ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν.
omit:  131, 460, 618, 1836*, 2147

It is possible that έτι fell out accidentally after ὅτι, or that it has been omitted for stylistic reasons to avoid the awkward ὅτι έτι. 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 ἐτί at Mk 8:17 with similar support.

Usage ἐτί: 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 [ἰδρωμενος ευ αγνωστος αυτων. 44 καὶ εγενετο ο ιδρωμος αυτων ωσει θρομμοι οιματος καταβαίνουτες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.]]

T&T #45

omit completely:

P75, 01Cl, A, B, N, R, T, W, 0211, 13*, 579, 1071*, pc4, f, Sy-S, sa, bo, Hiermss, arm, geo, Cl?, Or?, Weiss
 pc = 158, 512*, 552, 1128

P69 also omits v. 42 and 45a (see below)

01Cl: 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:

01C2, D, K, Π, L, Q, Χ, Δ*, Θ, Ψ, 0171, f1, 13mg, 174, 230(=f13), 157, 565, 700, 892*, 1071mg, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Hmss, Sy-Pal, bo**mss, Diatess, Jus, Ir, Julian, Chrys, Did, Hipp, Eus, Hiermss, Bois, Tργ

with obeli: Δc, Πc, 230(=f13), 0171, 892mg, 1424, pc34, bomss

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, Mmg, S, V, Γ, Π, Ω, 118c, 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 evangelii apud Alexandrinos."

Lacuna: C, 33

B: no umlaut
Variants in the text:

43 [[ὁφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ¹ ἀπ' ἕως ² οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. 44 καὶ γευόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηχέτο· καὶ ἐγένετο ³ ὁ ἱδρώς αὐτοῦ ὑσεὶ ἡρμῆ, θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.]]

1. _κυρίου_ 1424, pc, c, Sy-H
2. _ἀπὸ τοῦ_ D, Q, U, Θ, Ψ, 828, 983, 1071c, 1241, pc (compare next TVU!)
1. _ἐγένετο δὲ_ D, L, Δ, Θ, (f13), 1241, Maj, Sy-H
txt: 01*, V, X, Ψ, f1, 157, pc, Lat
1. _ὡς_ D, 2542
2. _καταβαίνοντος_ 01*, Χc, 346, pc, Lat, Sy-P
2. _τῆς γῆς_ Q, Uc, 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 ὡφθη 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 (13ma, 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: ... [Δ]ὐκάκα κφ. σπγ' ὡφθι δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ... καὶ αναστὰς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐρχετε' ζτλ. ἢ κφ. μαθ. 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:

```
 tokaiogeneto) o i`a
 [wcauytowywce)] e`o
 [boiaimato] ckaatabai
 nontec e) µi thngn
```

new column:

```
45 kaianactacap[o ...
```

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:**

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 ἀναστάς .... 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:

ΠΑΣΘΕΝΑΠΑΥΤΩΝΩΣΕΙΛΙΘΘΟΥΒΟΛΗΝ
ΚΑΙΘΕΙΣΤΑΓΩΝΑΤΤΑΠΟΣΗΝΥΧΕΤΟ
ΚΑΙΑΝΑΣΤΑΚΑΛΟΠΗΣΠΟΣΕΥΧΗΣ
ΕΛΘΩΝΠΡΟΣΩΥΣΜΑΘΗΣΑΚΟΙ
ΜΩΜΕΝΟΥΣΚΑΛΟΠΗΣΚΛΥΠΗςΚΑΙ
ΕΙΠΕΝΑΥΤΟΙΚ.Xml

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]εἰ[λίθου β]ο[λῆν καὶ θεῖς τὰ
γόνατα προο]νύχετο
42 λέγων: πάτερ, εἶ βούλει παρένεγκε τούτο τὸ ποτήριον ἀπ’
ἐμοῦ· πλὴν μὴ τὸ θέλημα μου ἄλλα τὸ σὸν γινέσθω.
43 ὁφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἀγγέλος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχύων αὐτόν. 44 καὶ
γενόμενος ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηνύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ
ιδρὼς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.
45 [καὶ ἀναστάς ἀπὸ τῆς προσευχῆς ἐλθὼν πρὸς τοὺς] μαθητὰς
κοι[μωμένους ἀπὸ τῆς]ς λύπης. 46 καὶ [καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς:] τί
καθεύδε[τε; ἀναστάντες προο]εὔχεσθε, [ίνα μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς
πειρα]σμόν.

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

"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 (οὐδὲς αὐτὸς ὄρος ἔχει ὀδηγήθηκεν τῇ αὐτῇ σαρκί, αὐτῷ οὐδὲς ἤχει ἐκείνῳ ἔρχεται; 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):

"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 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 scribtum 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 infirnum 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 sanguinem ad corporis veritatem."

"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):

"Alla kai "eklausen" keita en tâ Loukávn evaggelíw ev tois ádiorhthòis ántigraφhìs, kai kekrhetai tì marturìa ó ágioi Eirnhmaíos en tâ kata áirèseow proç toud dòkhi se ton Xristou pefhneinai légonc. òrhthòdoxoi de áfeilantò to òrhto fothevntes kai mp nohsantes autó tou to telos kai to ischuróttaton.

"kai genómenos en ágwnia idrwsen, kai égeneto ò idrów autów òs thômboi aímatos kai òfhtè òngelos ènyschwn autón." 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 ἄγωνίᾳ ἐκτενέστερον προσηύχετο· καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἱδρώς αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος καταβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.
43 ὥθην δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος ἀπὸ 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):
...
᾽Ακούοντες δὲ, ὦτι ἐκλαυσεν, Ἰδρος, πέπονθεν,...

'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):
κατῆλθε ὁ ἱδρώς ἐκ τῆς ὄψεως 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 Cyril († 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):

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 ὁφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος κυρίου … ὁφθ* appears 10 times in Lk/Act, but only once in Mk (9:4) and once in the parallel Mt (17:3).

Hapax legomena: ἀγωνία, ἱδρώς, 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 ἱδρώς αὐτοῦ might be medical language, at least language typical for Luke. Compare:
NA28 Acts 10:4 ἐμφοβὸς γενόμενος "becoming afraid" (again 24:25)
NA28 Acts 12:11 ἐν ἑαυτῷ γενόμενος "came to himself"
NA28 Acts 16:27 ἐξυπνος δὲ γενόμενος "having come out of sleep"
NA28 Acts 16:29 ἐντρομος γενόμενος "trembling"
NA28 Acts 15:25 γενομένοις ὀμοθυμαδόν "come together with one accord"
NA28 Acts 28:8 ἐγένετο δὲ ... πυρετοὶς 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 (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 εὐθυμήσετε οὐρανοῖ, ἀμα αὐτῷ καὶ προσκυνήσασαι αὐτῷ πάντες νῦν θεοῦ εὐθυμήσετε ἔθη μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνισχυσάσουν αὐτῷ πάντες ἅγγελοι θεοῦ ὅτι τὸ αἷμα τῶν νῦν αὐτοῦ ἔκδικάται καὶ ἐκδικήσει καὶ ἀνταποδώσει δίκην τοῖς ἐχθροῖς καὶ τοῖς μισοῦσιν ἄνταποδώσει καὶ ἐκκαθαρίζῃ 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 (αγωνία 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\textsuperscript{cl}, A, B, R, T, W, 579, Sy-S, sa, bo.

But the support in favor of the words is also not bad:
01\textsuperscript{*\textsuperscript{c2}}, D, L, Q, 0171\textsuperscript{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:

- 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.]
- Claire Clivaz " 'A Sweat like Drops of Blood' - at the crossing of Intertextual reading and textual criticism", SBL contribution 2004.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
in single brackets in the text.
TVU 359

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 22:43
[[ὢφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἀγγέλος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐνισχὺν αὐτόν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

D, Q, U, Θ, Ψ, 0233, 828, 983, 1071c, 1241, pc, Trg, WH

txt 01*, L, f1, 157, 565, 700, 892, 1424, Maj, WH

omit verse:
P69(3rd CE), P75, 01c1, A, B, N, R, T, W, 0211, 579, 1071*, pc, 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 ἐξετάσει πῦρ καταβήναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλώσαι
αὐτούς;
ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ Ξ, L, 124, 579, 1071, pc

NA28 Luke 17:29 ἢ δὲ ἡμέρα ἐξῆλθεν Λῶτ ἀπὸ Σωδόμων, ἔβρεξεν πῦρ
καὶ θείον 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 σημεία 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:

τοῦτο γὰρ σημεῖον δεδώκει αὐτοῖς· διὸ ἂν φιλῆσω αὐτὸς ἔστων

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, Lectmss

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 παραδίδοις αὐτὸν ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς σημεῖον λέγων· ἃν ἂν φιλῆσω αὐτὸς ἔστων, κρατήσατε αὐτόν.

NA28 Mark 14:44 δεδώκει δὲ ὁ παραδίδοις αὐτὸν σὺσσημον αὐτοῖς λέγων· ἃν ἂν φιλῆσω αὐτὸς ἔστων, 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:

D, it(a, d, e, f, ff², r¹), armαs:
kαὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἡμᾶτο αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεκατεστάθη τὸ ὄψις 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
Marcion omitted 22:49-51 according to Epiphanius: Παρέκοψεν ὁ ἐποίησε Πέτρος, ὡτε ἐπάταξε καὶ ἀφείλετο τὸ οὖς τοῦ δούλου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως.

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

ἐκτείνω "stretch out, extend"

Compare previous verse 50:

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 26:51 Καὶ ἵνα εἰς τῶν μετὰ Ἰησοῦ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἀπέσπασεν τὴν μάχαιραν αὐτοῦ καὶ πατάξας τὸν δούλον τοῦ ἁρχιερέως ἀφείλεν αὐτοῦ τὸ ὀτίον.

Compare also:
NA28 Luke 5:13 καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα ἡμᾶτο αὐτοῦ λέγων· θέλω, καθαρίσθητι· καὶ εὐθέως ἡ λέπρα ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ' 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)
Difficult variant


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, UBS

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**


BYZ Luke 22:61 Πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι ______ ἀπαρνήσῃ με τρίς

Byz A, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, 565, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, sa

txt P69(3rd CE), 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

**δις** Sy-C

Lacuna: 33

**B:** no umlaut

**σήμερον** "today"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:75 ὃτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι ______ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.
NA28 Mark 14:72 πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι δις ________ τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:34 ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι ______ τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με.
NA28 Mark 14:30 οὐ **σήμερον** ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ πρὶν ἡ δις ἀλέκτορα φωνῆσαι τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ.

**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:

omit verse: 0171"d, it (a, b, e, ff², i, l, r')

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 ρήματος Ἰησοῦ εἰρηκότος ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι τρίς ἀπαρνήσῃ με· καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς.

NA28 Mark 14:72 καὶ εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησεν. καὶ ἀνεμνήσθη ὁ Πέτρος τὸ ρήμα ὡς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι πρὶν ἀλέκτορα φωνήσαι δίς τρίς με ἀπαρνήσῃ καὶ ἐπιβαλὼν ἐκλαυσεν.

Compare next verse 63:
NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχουσες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέρουντες,

BYZ Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχουσες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέρουντες

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:

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


BYZ Luke 22:64 καὶ περικαλύψαντες αὐτὸν ἔτυπτον αὐτὸ τὸ πρόσωπον, καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν, λέγοντες Προφήτευσον τίς ἔστιν ὁ παίσας 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 λέγοντες:
Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 26:67-68 Τότε ἐνέπτυσαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκολάφισαν αὐτὸν, οἱ δὲ ἔραπταν 68 λέγοντες: προφήτευσον ἡμῖν, χριστὲ, τίς ἔστιν ὁ παίσας σε;

NA28 Mark 14:65 Καὶ ἠρέσατο τινες ἐμπτύειν αὐτῷ καὶ περικαλύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ κολαφίζειν αὐτόν καὶ λέγειν αὐτῷ: προφήτευσον, καὶ οἱ υπηρέται ραπίσμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον.

Compare previous verse 63:
NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ δέρουντες, 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 παίσας.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 366

155. **Difficult variant**


T&T #46

Byz  A, D, N, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 0211, f13, 700, 1278, 2786, Maj, Latt, Sy, **Weiss, [Trg]**

ἡ ἀπολύσητε 892, pc39
ἡ ἀπολύσητε μοι/με pc5, a ἐὰν 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:

1 καὶ καταλύοντα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας
et solventem legem nostrum et prophetas

2 καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα
et filios nostros et uxores avertit a nobis;
non enim baptizantur sicut et nos, nec se mundant.

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: τούτον οἶδαμεν ὄντα υἱὸν Ἰωσήφ τοῦ τέκτονος ἀπὸ Μαρίας γεννηθέντα, καὶ λέγει έαυτόν υἱὸν θεοῦ καὶ βασιλέα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σάββατα βεβηλοῦν 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 ἤλθον καταλύσαι τὸν νόμον ἡ 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 Πιλάτος δὲ ἀκούσας ἔπηρώτησεν εἰ ὁ ἀνθρώπος Γαλιλαίος 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

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

BYZ Luke 23:8 ὁ δὲ Ἡρῴδης ἴδων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἑχάρη λίαν ἦν γὰρ θέλων εξ ἰκανοῦ ἴδειν αὐτὸν διὰ τὸ ἁκούειν πολλὰ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠλπιζέν τι σημείον ἴδειν ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ γινόμενον

Byz A, W, R, X, Δ, Ψ, f13, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H
peρί 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 ἐκείνω τῷ καιρῷ ἠκούσεν Ἡρῴδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὴν ἁκοὴν Ἰησοῦ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην, εἰδὼς αὐτὸν ἄνδρα δικαιοῦν καὶ ἄγιον, καὶ συνετήρηκεν αὐτὸν, καὶ ἁκούσας αὐτοῦ πολλὰ ἠπόρει, καὶ ἠδέως αὐτοῦ ἠκούεν.

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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
156. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

αὐτὸν ὁ A, B, D, K, Π, R, Δ, Θ, f1, 174, 230, 983, 1689 (=f13), 157, 892, 2542, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, sa, WH, NA\textsuperscript{25}, 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\textsuperscript{mg}, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, WH\textsuperscript{mg}, Bois, Tis, Bal, Gre

καὶ αὐτὸν ὁ 070

**omit 2\textsuperscript{nd} καὶ**: P75

NA has 2542 wrongly for the W reading. It reads αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰηρώνης. Checked at the film.

13: The reading has been checked at the film.

**Lacuna**: 33

**B**: no umlaut

ἐξουθενήω "despise, treat with contempt"

**Compare**:
NA28 Luke 22:63 Καὶ οἱ ἁνδρεῖς οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτὸν ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῶ 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:


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 ἐμπαίζεις) in retrospect at verse 22:63.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original = tendency to omit brackets) (after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 371

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 23:12
ēγένοντο δὲ φίλοι ὦ τε
Ἦρωδὲς καὶ ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ μετ’ ἀλλήλων
προὐπήρχον γὰρ ἐν ἔχθρᾳ ὦντες πρὸς αὐτούς.

ὁντες δὲ ἐν ἄρειδι ὦ
Πιλᾶτος καὶ Ὁ Ἦρωδὲς 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:

Ἦρωδὲς καὶ ὁ Πιλᾶτος
Πιλᾶτος καὶ Ὁ Ἦρωδὲς

Lacuna: 33
B: no umlaut

προὐπάρχω = "be or exist previously"
ἔχθρα = "hostility, ill will, hatred"

ὁντες ἐν ἄρειδι = "being at odds"

No parallel.

Strange variation.
The D reading contains the rare word ἄρειδι 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)
Neither has Herod [found this man guilty]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>txt</td>
<td>&quot;for he sent him back to us&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>&quot;for they sent him back to us&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byz</td>
<td>&quot;for I sent you back to him&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f13</td>
<td>&quot;for he sent him back to you&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>&quot;for I sent him back to you&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy</td>
<td>&quot;for I sent him back to him&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compare verse 7 and 11:

NA28 Luke 23:7  [Πιλάτος] ἀνέπεμψεν αὐτὸν πρὸς Ἰησοῦν,

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


**T&T #47**

Byz 01, (D), W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 131, 157, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo	extsuperscript{21}, [Trg	extsuperscript{mg}]

ἀνάγκην δὲ εἶχεν κατὰ ἔορτὴν ἀπολύειν αὐτοῖς ἕνα.

D, Θ, Ψ, 579, 892	extsuperscript{mg}, 1424, 1675, pc	extsuperscript{14}

*add ἕνα δέσμιον:*

al

**συνήθειαν** for **ἀνάγκην**

N, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa	extsuperscript{mas} (from Jo)

*add after verse 19*

D, pc	extsuperscript{2}, d, Sy-S, Sy-C, aeth

(not noted in T&T)!

**txt**

P75, A, B, K, II, L, T, 070, 0211, 892*, 1241, pc	extsuperscript{23},

a, vg	extsuperscript{ms}, sa, bo	extsuperscript{21}, Diatess	extsubscript{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 Ἔορτην ἐιώθει ὁ ἡγεμὼν ἀπολύειν ἕνα τῷ ὄχλῳ δέσμιον ὧν ἤθελον.

NA28 Mark 15:6 Ἐορτήν ἀπέλυεν αὐτοῖς ἕνα δέσμιον ὧν παρετύνει.

NA28 John 18:39 ἔστιν δὲ συνήθεια ὅμιν ἕνα ἐνα ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ πάσχα:

*Compare next verse:*

NA28 Luke 23:18 Ἀνέκραγον δὲ παμπληθεὶς λέγουτες ...

It is possible that the verse has been omitted very early due to homoioarcton (ἀνάγκην δὲ - 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


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 ἀρχιερέων 1253
καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων 1424
καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων 2680

txt  P75, 01, B, L, 070, 130, 755, 1241, Lat, Co, arab

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:


No noted in NA, but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz C, K, P, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 700c, 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, ff, g, l, vg), Co, arm

καὶ 69, 579, c

omit 01, L, r1

but L reads αἱ κόπτοντο for αἱ ἔκόπτοντο

700: The words have been added in the margin by a later hand.

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 15:41 αἱ ὁτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ ἡκολούθουν αὐτῷ
BYZ Mark 15:41 αἱ καὶ, ὁτε ἦν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ, ἡκολούθουν αὐτῷ, αἱ καὶ 01, B, Ψ, 083, 33, 892, 1424, pc, it, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co
καὶ A, C, L, W, Δ, L844c, al, l, vg

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 καὶ for txt's αἱ, the outside possibility that S or P were produced from a text reading αἱ καὶ as D Θ f. should not be overlooked, when full consideration is made of the tendency of Syriac translations to overlook καὶ in the meaning of 'also'."

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 αἷ καί could already be the original reading with this meaning.

The support for καί without αἷ is just too slim, otherwise one could presume that αἷ καί is a conflation.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 23:28 στραφείς δὲ πρὸς αὐτὰς Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· θυγατέρες Ἰερουσαλήμ, μὴ κλαίετε ἐπ’ ἐμὲ· πλὴν ἐφ’ ἑαυτὰς κλαίετε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν,

omit P75, 01*, C2, B, L, Trg, WH, NA28, Tis, Bal
txt 01*, 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 ἐσῃ ζωγρῶν.
omit ὁ: B, L, WH Rating: - (indecisive)

omit ὁ: 01*, B, WH Rating: 2½ (NA probably original)

NA28 Luke 18:40 σταθείς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτὸν. ἐγγίσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτὸν·
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 ψυχῷ ζῶντα ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται;

omit B, C, 070, 1675, pc, Weiss, WH, NA

txt P75, 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψf1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, WHmg, [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)
Luke 23:32 "And two others, criminals, were led with him."

Tischendorfius wrote in the corrections: "text eodem modo voluit Tischendorfius κακοήργοι δύο". Byz: no umlaut

The text version could be read as describing Jesus as a criminal.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
TVU 379

Minority reading:

1 Ioathas et Maggatras
2 ... et Capnatas

B: no umlaut

Codex Rehdigerianus, l (8th CE) reads in full:
"ducebantur autem et alii duo latrones cum illo Ioathas et Maggatras crucifigerentur

Codex Usserianus, r (7th CE) reads in full:
"duceba]ntur autem et alii duo m[aligni] cum illo
ut crucigere[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 λῃσταὶ,
eἰς ἐκ δεξιῶν ᾦν καὶ εἰς ἐξ εὐωνύμων.

1 nomine Zoatham
c
2 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 λῃστάς,
ἐνα ἐκ δεξιῶν καὶ ἑνα ἐξ εὐωνύμων ᾦν αὐτοῦ.

1 nomine Zoathan
c
2 nomine Chammatha
c

See "Names for the Nameless in the NT"

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 380
161. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

T&T #49

**omit:** P75, 01\(^{Cl}\), B, D\(^*\), W, Θ, 070, 579, 1241, pc\(^7\), a, b\(^C\), d, Sy-S, sa, bo,
Marcion, Weiss
pc = 31\(^*\), 38, 435, 597\(^*\), 1808\(^*\), 2622\(^\mid\), 2633

**NA\(^{28}\)** and **WH** both have the words in double brackets.

txt 01\(^{C2}\), A, C, D\(^C2\), K, Π, L, Q, Χ, 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, al\(^{100}\)

01\(^{Cl}\): The words are deleted by curved marks, similar to 22:43-44

D\(^C2\): Scrivener: "not earlier than the 9\(^{th}\) 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 miserus 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 οἴδασιν 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, dimite 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 ούκ ἤπειλεν, ἀλλ’ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐχθρῶν προσηύχετο: "Πάτερ ἂφες αὐτοῖς οὐκ οὗδεισιν ὅ 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 ἠλθόντες εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον Κρανίον τόπος, ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτὸν 34 καὶ διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἰμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐβαλον κλήρους, 45 καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἡλιος.
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 Ὀρθοδόξασται καλούμενοι ἔργοις προσφέρονται καλοῖς οὐκ εἰδότες ἢ 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 evangeliiis, 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.

> Ἡ γὰρ θύσις γίνεται ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ... καὶ σκότῳ τεθλυμμένῳ, ἥτις ἔστιν ἄγνοια. Καὶ οἱ ὑπὸ τὴν τούτου ἀρχήν τοῦ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀρχοντας ἐν πολλῇ ἄγνοιᾳ τυφλώσεός εἰσι, ... Ἡ γὰρ τούτου θύσις ή δι’ αὐτῶν ἐν ἄγνοιᾳ ἐγίνετο, διὰ τὸ μὴ αὐτοὺς γινώσκειν ὃ ποιοῦσιν· ἔθεν καὶ ἁφίεται αὐτοῖς· καλὸν γὰρ ἐνα ἀνθρώπου ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ ὅλου τοῦ λαοῦ. οὐ γὰρ ἔξων προφήτην ἔξω Ἰερούσαλημ ἀποθανεῖν, τούτ' ἐστιν τῶν ἐπὶ εἰρήνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη ἐνοικεῖν πειρωμένως.

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 ἐθνεσιν

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 τας εὐλογιας του Ἰακωβ), p. 38: τὸ οὖν κατανυγήμα τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ τὸ ἐπισπλαγχνισθήναι τὸν λόγον ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ λαοῦ παραπτώματι. καὶ γὰρ ὁ σωτὴρ δεόμενος ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἔλεγεν: "πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ αὐδάσιν ὁ 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 οἴδασιν τί 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 οἴδασιν ὅ 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-Basilius of Caesarea (4th CE), Adversus Eunomium IV, PG 29, 697.26
Ἐπὶ τῶν οὗν εἰς αὐτόν ἀμαρτάνειν μελλόντων, ἵνα μὴ ἀμαρτώσωι, καὶ οὐκ ἔπι αὐτοῦ τούτο δεκτέον. ὑπὲρ ὧν καὶ σταυρωθεῖς ἔλεγε· Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασιν 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 conuiciabantibus 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 ταύτα ποιοῦντων ἢ ἀμυνα; Πάτερ, 

συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι 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.' Epiphanius 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 Μαρίαμνη διεκώλυον αὐτὸν (i.e. Philip) λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ διδάσκαλος ἦμων ἐραπίσθη, ἐματίχθη, ἐξετάθη, χολήν καὶ οξύς ἐποίησε, καὶ ἐλεγεν· Πάτερ ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν 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 προσηλώθης ἥχετο τῷ πατρὶ τοῖς αὐτῶν ἀναιροῦσιν ἀφεθήναι τὸ ἀμάρτημα εἰπὼν. "Πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν, οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν ἄ 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 Phariseis, dicens: Pater, ignosce eis, quoniam nesciant 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:

Kaì metà tò staurwthíasai, tì fhsì, Páter, āfìes āwtoīs- òu gār oìdásiν ó poïouσi. Kaì prò toútò kakhìs pàsthìn, kaì metà tauta kakhìs pàsthìn, méχrìs ēsaxhtí ònánwnoìs peri āwtoìn pánta ἔπραττεν, ùpér āwtoùn êdeîto.

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 [peri āwthìs toû prágmatos tìs oikonomías].

**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.

ποτè μèn λέγων ὁ κύριος· πάτερ ἄφες ἀυτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἰδασι 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 στήσῃς αὐτῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ταύτην· οὐ γὰρ οἰδασιν, 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 cam, 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):


Philagathus (10th CE) Homily 3 section 12 (found in TLG)
Προδότης ὁ μαθητής, φυγάδες οἱ φοιτηταί, ἔξαρνος ὁ Πέτρος, μάχαιραι καὶ δάδες καὶ ἡμίλα καὶ φάσανα, σιαγόνες ματιζόμεναι, πρόσωπαν ἔμπτυομενον, νῦτος πληγαῖς ἐκδιδόμενος, μάρτυρες ψευδεῖς, κριτήριον ἀσεβῶς, ἀπόφασις ἀπηνῆς, στρατιῶται κατατρυφώντες τῆς σκυθρωπῆς ἀποφάσεως ἐν χλεεσμοὶς καὶ εἰρωνείας καὶ ὑβρεῖς καὶ ταῖς ἐκ καλάμου πληγαῖς, ἥλιοι καὶ χόλη καὶ ἄξος, καὶ τελευταίον Σταυρός. Τίς οὖν κατὰ τῶν ταύτα ποιοῦντων ἡ ἄμυνα, Πάτερ, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσιν. Οὕτω καὶ τὴν λύπην μακροθυμία, νικήτας καταστρατηγεῖ τὸν ἀντίπαλον, τῆς κατ' αὐτοῦ νίκης τὸν τρόπον ὀδοποιῆσαι ἢμῖν.

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 ἐκείνος ἀνένθησεν, οὕτω γὰρ ἦν τὰ κατὰ τῶν σταυρῶν θεασάμενος θεάματα, ἐκ τῶν λόγων ἵσως ὁ περ ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς παρρησίᾳ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ὡς πρὸς Πατέρα, ἐφθέγξατο λέγων, "Πάτερ, ἀφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσιν." ὡς γὰρ ἵσος ἵσω διαλεγόμενος καὶ πατέρα ἐκάλει, καὶ, "ἀφες", σὺν πολλῇ παρρησίᾳ ἔλεγεν. Οὐ γὰρ εἴπε, Κύριε, παρακαλῶ σε, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς, δεικνύει ὅτι τὰ εἰς αὐτὸν ἐφ’ ὑβρι μεγάλη, εἰς βλασφημίαν τοῦ Πατρὸς ἀνατρέχοντι, 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 ἐφράγμασαν καὶ οἱ τάφοι ἀνεφύγησαν, Εἰ οὖκ ἦν σάρξ, Θεὸς μου, Θεοῖ μου, ἵνατι με ἐγκατέλιπτες, τίς ἐκράζῃ, Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦν Θεός, Πάτερ, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς, τίς εἶπεν, Εἰ οὖκ ἦν σάρξ, ἐν τῷ σταυρῷ μετὰ τῶν λῃστῶν τίς ἐκρέματο, Καὶ εἰ μὴ ἦν Θεός, τῷ λῃ στῇ πῶς ἔληλυ, σήμερον μετὰ ἐμοῦ ἔσθη ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, Εἰ οὖκ ἦν σάρξ, ὄρες καὶ χολῆν τίνι προσήμενεν, ...

Compare also: The Stoning of Stephen

NA28 Acts 7:60 Θείς δὲ τὰ γόνατα ἐκράξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ· κύριε, μὴ στήσῃς αὐτοῖς ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν· καὶ τοῦτο εἶπὼν 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, ἔπει καταβληθείς οὐκ ἀπέθανεν· ἀλλὰ στραφεὶς ἐπεξετείνα τὰ γόνατα λέγων· παρακαλῶ, κύριε Θεέ πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οὕδασιν 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 ύπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν ρυημένων, καὶ φάσκων, συγχώρησον αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ οὕδασι 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' 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,

**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,

**Lk**

33 When they came to the place that is called The Skull,
34 Then two bandits were crucified with him, one on his right and one on his left.
35 And they divided his clothes among themselves by casting lots;
36 And they cast lots to divide his clothing.

K. Haines-Eitzen notes that there may a reminiscence to Isa 53:12:

LXX Isaiah 53:12 καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρέδοθη
"and for their sins he was given over"


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 ἁγνοιαν ἐπράξατε
"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 πάτερ 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\textsuperscript{cl}, B, D\textsuperscript{*}, W, Θ, 579, 1241, Sy-S, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}
txt 01\textsuperscript{*2}, A, C, D\textsuperscript{C2}, K, Π, L, Q, X, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo\textsuperscript{pt}, Diatess

22:43-44:

omit: P75, 01\textsuperscript{cl}, A, B, N, R, W, 579, 1071*, pc\textsuperscript{4}, f, Sy-S, sa, bo\textsuperscript{pt}
txt 01\textsuperscript{*2}, D, K, Π, L, Q, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, 174, 230(=f13), 892*, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H**, bo\textsuperscript{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 ("recessional 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 lead 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 συγχωρήσουν ("grant to, permit them") instead of ἀφες 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 συγχωρήσουν found its way into the text as a gloss of ἀφες."

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
- 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

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 [[ό δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἠλέησεν· πάτερ, ἂφες αὐτοῖς, οὐ γὰρ ὁδιασύν τί ποιοῦσιν.]]

diαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἵματια αὐτοῦ ἔβαλον κλήρους.


Διαμεριζόμενοι δὲ τὰ ἵματια αὐτοῦ, ἔβαλον κλήρου.

**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*<sup>mass</sup>

**B:** no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:35 Σταυρώσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἵματια αὐτοῦ βάλλοντες κλήρους. **safe!**

NA28 Mark 15:24 Καὶ σταυρώσαν αὐτὸν καὶ διαμερίζονται τὰ ἵματια αὐτοῦ, βάλλοντες κλήρου ἐπ’ αὐτὰ τίς τί ἄρη.

βάλλοντες κλήρους H, f13<sup>5</sup>

NA28 John 19:24 ἣνα ἡ γραφή πληρωθῇ [ἡ λέγουσα]: διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἵματια μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἰματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλήρου. **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)
Kai ei̇stí̇kei̇ ó lȧdos thẹorọ́n. ex̣emukṭhri̇zi̇oun dẹ kai̇ oi̇ ̣áṛχonteṣ lēgoṇteṣ:

Byz Luke 23:35 kai eι'στηκει ο λαδος θεωρων. εξεμικτηριζουν δε και οι άρχουντες ουν αυτοις, λεγοντες

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 (= f13b), 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, pc, it, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co

D: καὶ εἰστήκει ὁ λαὸς ὁρών. ἐμικτηρίζουν αὐτόν καὶ ἔλεγαν αὐτῷ·
B: no umlaut

ἐκμικτηρίζω "make fun of, ridicule"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:41 ὀμοίως καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντές μετὰ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ πρεσβύτερων ἔλεγον·
NA28 Mark 15:31 ὀμοίως καὶ οἱ ἄρχιερεῖς ἐμπαίζοντές 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 εἰστήκη ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν, ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες λέγοντες· ἄλλος ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν,

εἶ οὔτος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός.

**BYZ Luke 23:35** καὶ εἰστήκη ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες σὺν αὐτοῖς, λέγοντες· Ἀλλος ἔσωσεν σωσάτω ἑαυτὸν

εἶ οὔτος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός

Only incomplete in NA and SQE!

**B:** no umlaut

**Byz** εἶ οὔτος ἐστὶν 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*: εἶ οὔτος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός

**txt** εἶ οὔτος ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός.

01ći, L, W, f1, WH, NA25, Trgmg

εἶ οὔτος ἐστὶν 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**

εἶ οὔτος ἐστὶν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός

579, geo†

εἶ υἱὸς ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός

εἶ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, εἶ χριστὸς εἶ ὁ ἐκλεκτός

**B**

**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 Mark 15:30 σώσον σεαυτόν καταβάς ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ.
NA28 Mark 15:32 ὁ χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραήλ καταβάτω νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ,

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ χώντος.
NA28 Matthew 26:63 καὶ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἔξωρκίζω σε κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ χώντος ἵνα ἡμῖν εἴπης εἰ σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ.
NA28 Mark 14:61 σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ νῦς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ;

NA28 Luke 4:34 ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἡλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; σιδά σε τίς εἰ, ὁ ἄγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.

579

NA28 Luke 9:20 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

D, it, ba ms 28, 892, pc


NA28 John 11:27 ἔγω πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἰ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.

NA28 John 20:31 ταῦτα δὲ γεγραπται ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ.

Clearly ὁ νῦς τοῦ θεοῦ is secondary, a well known phrase from Gospel context.
Is it possible that the B reading is a misreading/hearing of οὗτος / νῦς?

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·
ei sù ei ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σώσου σεαυτόν.

λέγοντες· χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, περιτιθέντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκάνθινον στέφανον

Dicentes: Habe Rex Iudaorum, imponentes illi et de spinis coronam. d
Et dicentes: Ave Rex Iudaorum, libera te, imposuerunt autem illi et spineam coronam. c

B, c, d

λέγοντες· χαῖρε· ei sù ei ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σώσου σεαυτόν, περιτιθέντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκάνθινον στέφανον

Sy-S, Sy-C

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:29 καὶ πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκάνθων ἐπέθηκαν ἐπὶ τὴς κεφαλῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ κάλαμον ἐν τῇ δεξίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ γονυπετήσαντες ἐμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ ἐνέπαιξαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες· χαῖρε, βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
NA28 Mark 15:17-18 καὶ ἔνθισαν αὐτὸν πορφυρὰν καὶ περιτιθέασιν αὐτῷ πλέξαντες ἀκάνθινον στέφανον· 18 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀσπάζοντας αὐτὸν· χαῖρε, βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.
NA28 John 19:2-3 καὶ οἱ στρατιώται πλέξαντες στέφανον ἐξ ἀκάνθων ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τῇ κεφαλῇ καὶ ἰμάτιον πορφυρὸν περιέβαλον αὐτὸν 3 καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον· χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ ἔδιδοσαν 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)
NA28 Luke 23:38 ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ ἔπ’ αὐτῷ:
ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὕτος.

BYZ Luke 23:38 ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ γεγραμμένη ἔπ’ αὐτῷ
gράμμασιν Ἕλληνικοῖς, καὶ Ρωμαίοις καὶ Ἑβραίοις. οὕτος ἔστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

Byz 01*, C2, A, C3, D, Q, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo†, Gre, [Trg]**
ἔπ’ αὐτῷ γράμμασιν...
και. ἐπιγραφή γεγραμμένη ἔπ’ αὐτῷ...
και. γεγραμμένη...

... Εὐλήνικοῖς, καὶ Ἑβραίοις, καὶ Ἑβραίοις... 157, pc³
... Εὐλήνικοῖς, καὶ Ρωμαίοις... 69*, 346

txt P75, 01**, B, L, 070, 1241, a, sa, bo†, arab**

--- ἔπ’ αὐτῷ γεγραμμένη C*, a, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa**

--- αὐτῇ γεγραμμένη 579*

--- [ἐπιγεγραμμένη] ἔπ’ αὐτῷ Trg (no manuscript support)

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Mark 15:26 καὶ ὁ ἐπιγραφὴ τῆς αἰτίας αὐτοῦ ἐπιγεγραμμένη: ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

NA28 John 19:20 καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστὶ, Ῥωμαϊστὶ, Ἕλληνιστὶ.

BYZ John 19:20 καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστὶ, Ἕλληνιστὶ, Ῥωμαϊστὶ.

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· ἢν δὲ γεγραμμένον ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραίος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

Ἐβραϊστι, Ῥωμαϊστι, Ἐλληνιστι f13
Ἐβραϊστι, Ἐλληνιστι, Ῥωμαϊστι 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:

**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 Mark 15:29-30 Καὶ οἱ παραπομεομενοι ἐβλασφήμουν αὐτὸν κυνοῦντες τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν καὶ λέγοντες: οὐαὶ ὁ καταλύων τὸν ναὸν καὶ οἰκοδομῶν ἐν τρισίν 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:

A punctuation issue!

Bε reads: λέγωσχμερον_μετεμεω

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, σήμερον  L, 892, L1627, b, c, Co, Sy

μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ σήμερον  AM 118 Ps 8, 11 (1.8)

D: ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν τῷ ἐπιπλήσοντι, Θάρσει σήμερον 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
"And he said to him: 'Today I tell you the truth, that I should have you in Paradise with me.'"

καὶ εὐθὺς εἶπεν μοι ὅτι ἀμὴν ἀμὴν σήμερον λέγω σοι, μετ’ εμοῦ εἰς τὸ παραδείσου. (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 ἡ υποσχέσις τοῦ Κυρίου προς τὸν λῃστὴν πεπληρωται, στὶ Σήμερον μετ’ εμοῦ εἰς τὸν παραδείσου; Μετὰ γὰρ τὸν σταυρὸν ὁ Χριστὸς εἰς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ έλευθερία τῶν νεκρῶν παραγίνεται. Εἶδε δὲ καὶ τὸν λῃστήν, ὑπευθύνον οὐτά τῶν νομῶν τῆς φύσεως. Τινὲς μὲν οὗτοι ἀναγινωσκοῦν Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι σήμερον, καὶ ὑποστίζουσιν εἰτὰ εἰπερφοροῦν, στὶ εἰ’ εμοῦ εἰς τὸ παραδείσου. [“Some indeed read this way: ‘Truly I tell you today,’ and put a comma; then they add: ‘You will be with me in Paradise.’”] Ὡς αὖ εἰποί τις, στὶ Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι σήμερον εἰς τὸ σταυρὸν ὧν, Εἰς μετ’ εμοῦ εἰς τὸν παραδείσου. Εἶ δὲ καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν δεῖ, ὡς τὴ συνθεσία δοκεῖ, οὐδὲν ἐναντιούται τοῖς Σωτηρίων ἡμῶν, τῇ απεριγρατίᾳ αὐτοῦ θεσπίτη, οὐκ εἰν αὐτῇ μονον παραγεγονότος, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰν παραδείσου ἀμα τῷ λῃστῇ, καὶ εἰν αὐτῷ, καὶ μετὰ Πατρὸς, καὶ εἰν τῷ ταφῷ αὖ τὰ παντὰ πληροῦντος.

Ἄλλοι δὲ εκβιαζοῦνται τὸ ῥημά, στιζοῦτες εἰς τὸ Σήμερον ὡς ἐν τῷ λεγομένῳ τοιούτῳ. Ἀμὴν εἰς σοι σήμερον εἰτα τῷ μετ’ εμοῦ εἰς τὸ παραδείσου εἰπερφοροῦντες.
"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 δεν 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 ὅτε, 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)
Difficult variant


BYZ Luke 23:45 καὶ ἑσκοτίσθη ὁ ἡλιος, καὶ ἑσχίσθη τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ μέσον

T&T 50

Byz  A, C<sup>c3</sup>, D, Q, R, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj, Latt, Sy, Or<sup>mss</sup>, Marcion<sup>E</sup>, Trq

txt  P75, 01, B, C*, L, 070, 579, 2542, pc<sup>7</sup>, Sy-H<sup>mg</sup>, Co, Or<sup>mss</sup>

P75 and B have ἐκλιπόντος, which can be present tense or an itacism.

2542 has ἐκλίμποντος

pc = 597, 968, 1012, 1451, 1626, 2528, 2705

τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος καὶ ἑσκοτίσθη ὁ ἡλιος  22, pc<sup>18</sup>

omit:  C<sup>c2</sup>, 33, pc<sup>5</sup>, vg<sup>mss</sup> (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".
evklipo,ntoj evklei,pw participle aorist active genitive masculine singular
"fail, give out; cease, end"

ěskotísth  skoτίζομαι indicative aorist passive 3rd person singular
"be or become darkened"

No parallel.

Compare:
LXX Job 31:26 ἢ οὕχ ὀρῶ μὲν ἥλιον τὸν ἐπιφαύσκοντα ἐκλείποντα σελήνην δὲ φθινοῦσαν οὐ γὰρ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς ἦστιν
"do we not see the shining sun eclipsed, and the moon waning?"

LXX Isaiah 60:20 οὐ γὰρ δύσεται ὁ ἡλίος 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 Ὄριων καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸ φῶς οὐ δώσουσι καὶ σκοτισθήσεται τοῦ ἥλιου 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 ἑκέίνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός καὶ δύσεται ὁ ἥλιος μεσημβρίας καὶ συσκότασει 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 ἥλιον καὶ τούτο ἐκλείψει
"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 prophesies of Isa 13:10 and Amos 8:9 provide a basis for reading the verb skotizomai.

33 omits probably due to homoioarcton (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:


**T&T 50**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>Codices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλιπόντος</td>
<td>P75, B, C*?, pc (597, 968, 1012, 1451, 2528), <em>WH</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>txt ἐκλιπόντος</td>
<td>P75*, 01, C*?, L, 070, 579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλάμποντος</td>
<td>2542 (&quot;shine&quot;, sic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλείψαντος</td>
<td>1626, 2705</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

καὶ ἔσκοτισθη ὁ ἡλιος  22, pc

καὶ ἔσκοτισθη ὁ ἡλιος  A, C3, (D), W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 892, 1241, Maj

**omit** τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος  C2, 33, pc

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 εναθής statuo primitus scriptum fuisse τοῦ ἡλιος ἐκλείποντος. Τὶ litteram primam tantopere perspexi ut ederem. Restant alia quoque antiquae scripturae indicia. C corrrecti ΚΑΙ ἔκςοτισθη ὁ ἡλιος 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 consuerit eradere, quum manus tertia eradat raro) non ad manum tertiam auctorem refert. "Τὸ illud quidem non potest non primae manus esse."

Robert Lyon agrees with this, but has τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντες.

**B:** no umlaut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participle</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλιπόντος</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκλείποντος</td>
<td>participle</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔσκοτισθη</td>
<td>indicative</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔσχισθη</td>
<td>indicative</td>
<td>aorist</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Context:
NA28 Luke 23:44 Καὶ ἦν ἡ δημή ὡρα ἐκτῆ καὶ σκότος ἐγένετο ἐφ’ ὀλην τὴν γῆν ἕως ὡρας ἑνάτης

τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος: Genitive absolute "the sun was darkened".
One could assign this to the typical ι - 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:
"the wives who followed him"

tῶν 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:**

BYZ Luke 23:50 Καὶ ἰδοὺ, ἀνήρ ὄνοματι Ἰωσήφ, βουλευτής ὑπάρχων, _____ ἀνήρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος-

Byz  A, (B), W, Θ, Ψ, 070, f1, f13, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Weiss, WH, NA₂₅, Trg, SBL, _____ ἀνήρ ἀγαθὸς ____ δίκαιος  B, WHᵐ²

txt  P75, 01, (C), L, X, 33, pc, c  καὶ ὁ ἀνήρ  C

omit  D, Γ, it  B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:57 Ὁψίας δὲ γενομένης ἤλθεν ἀνθρωπος 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 προσιδόθηκεν τῇ βασιλείᾳ του θεοῦ , τολμήσας εἰσῆλθεν πρὸς τὸν Πιλᾶτον καὶ ἤτρισε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.
NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἤρωτησεν τὸν Πιλᾶτον Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, ὃς καὶ αὐτὸς ἦν προσιδόθηκεν τῇ βασιλείᾳ του τοῦ Ἰουδαίων, ἢν ἅρη τὸ σῶμα του τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· καὶ ἔπετρεψεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος. ἤλθεν οὖν καὶ ἤρεν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ.

Compare:
NA28 Luke 8:41 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἤλθεν ἀνήρ ὃ ὄνομα Ἰαίρος καὶ οὗτος ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπήρχεν, καὶ πεσὼν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας [τοῦ] Ἰησοῦ


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:

βουλευτής ὑπάρχων καὶ ἀνήρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος
"a counselor being and a man good and righteous"

βουλευτής ὑπάρχων __ ἀνήρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος
"a counselor, being a man good and righteous"
or:
"a counselor being, a man good and righteous"

Rating: - (indecisive)
But Pilatus, when he heard that he had expired, he praised the Lord and granted Joseph the body.

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.

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:

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)
Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 23:53 καὶ καθελὼν ἐνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ συνόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι λαξευτῷ οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὔπω κείμενος \textsuperscript{1,2}.

\textsuperscript{1} καὶ προσεκύλισεν λίθον μέγαν ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν τοῦ μνημείου.
U, f13, 700, al, vg\textsuperscript{ms}, bo\textsuperscript{ms}, aeth
f13: 69, 788 don’t have the addition

\textsuperscript{2} D, 070, (1071), c, d, sa
D: καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἔπεθηκεν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον ὑμὸς εἴκοσι εκκλίσιον

1071: καὶ τῇ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἔπεθηκεν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον
070(=0124): καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἔπεθηκαν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον μέγαν ὑμὸς εἴκοσι ξύνδρας εκκλίσιον

d: "et posito eo inposuit in monumento lapidem quem vix viginti movebant"
c: "et cum positus esset in monumento, posuerunt lapidem quem vix viginti volvebant"
vg\textsuperscript{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 Μαγδαληνή ἔρχεται πρῶι σκοτίας ἔτι οὖσῃς εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἢρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου.
Context:
NA28 Luke 24:2 εὕρον 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:

 utfila evpexihe ke thureo megen ypise aeira obrimos. 
But then he put a door-stone large high lift up strong, 
ouk ana ton ge duo kai ekosi axatai esthlai tetrapykloloi 
Not up it at least two and twenty wagons good four-wheeled 
about oudeo olxiosiaw tassun hlibaton evpexihe ke thurhoun. 
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, litum ut discernet 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)
NA28 Luke 23:55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ ἀλ γυναίκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλοθοῦσαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ;

BYZ Luke 23:55 Κατακολουθήσασαι δὲ γυναίκες αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλοθοῦσαι αὐτῷ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἐθεάσαντο τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ ὡς ἔτεθη 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), vgms, Trgca

**B**: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:61 Ὅτε δὲ ἐκεῖ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ ἡ ἄλλη Μαρία καθήμεναι ἀπέναντι τοῦ τάφου.
NA28 Mark 15:47 ἢ δὲ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ αἱ λοιπὰν σὺν αὐταῖς. ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα,

Compare:
NA28 Luke 23:49 καὶ γυναίκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ
NA28 Luke 24:10 ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνή Μαρία καὶ Ἰωάννα καὶ Μαρία ἡ Ἰακώβου καὶ αἱ λοιπὰ σὺν αὐταῖς. ἔλεγον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ταῦτα,

It is possible that αἱ 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


BYZ Luke 24:1 τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων ὁρθροῦ βαθέος ἡλθον ἐπὶ τὸ μνήμα φέρουσαι ἂ ἡτοίμασαν ἀρώματα καὶ τινὲς σὺν αὐταῖς

Byz A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj, f, q, r, Sy, sa, bo

txt P75, 01, B, C, L, 124*, (=f13), 33, Lat, Sy-Pal, bo

καὶ τινὲς σὺν αὐταῖς ἐλογίζοντο δε ἐν ἑαυταῖς· τί ἢρα ἀποκυλίσει τὸν λίθον
Cogitabant autem inter se, quismam esset, qui revolveret lapidem c
Cogitabant autem intra se, quis utique revolveret lapidem d
D, c, d, sa
(they omit ἀρώματα)

Ἀρώματα. καὶ τινὲς σὺν αὐταῖς ἐλογίζοντο δε ἐν ἑαυταίς· τί ἢρα 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:

Compare:
Lk 23:53 _ D, 070, (1071), c, sa
καὶ θέντος αὐτοῦ ἐπέθηκεν τῷ μνημείῳ λίθον ὄν μόγις ἐκκοσι εκυλίον

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:

τοῦ Ἰησοῦ  579, 1071, 1241, pc², Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, bo

omit:  D, it(a, b, d, e, ff, l, r²), 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 ἤτησατο τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ 53 καὶ
καθελὼν ἔνετύλιξεν αὐτὸ συνδόνι καὶ ἔθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐν μνήματι
λαξευτῷ οὗ οὐκ ἦν οὐδεὶς οὕπω κείμενος.

  for αὐτό: τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ  D, d

NA28 Mark 16:19 Ὁ μὲν οὖν κύριος Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτοῖς
ἀνελήμφθη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν 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 ἐστὶν ὅδε, ἄλλα ἡγέρθη. μηδενείπτε ὡς ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν ἔτι ὃν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ

omit: ήγέρθη ήγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν oὐκ ἐστὶν ὅδε, ήγέρθη oὐκ ἐστὶν ὅδε, ἄλλα ἀνέστη

D, it, arm massa, geo II, Bois, Weiss
Marcion E
Marcion E
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 ἐστὶν ὅδε, ἡγέρθη γὰρ καθὼς εἶπεν
NA28 Mark 16:6 ήγέρθη, οὐκ ἐστὶν ὅδε· ἰδέ ὁ τόπος ὑπὸ τὴν ζηθήκας αὐτῶν.

It is difficult to imagine why the words would have been deleted. Aland (NT Papyri II) suggests that οὐκ ἐστὶν ὅδε 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 ἐστὶν ὅδε 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:


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 ζώντα μετὰ τῶν νεκρῶν.
verse 6: ἡγέρθη ἐκ νεκρῶν. μνησθεὶς ως ἐλάλησεν ...

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 398

Minority reading:

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 ἀπελθοῦσαν ταχύ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾷ μεγάλης ἑδραμον ἀπαγγέλας τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 16:8 καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαν ἐφύγον ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ ἐκστάσεις καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ.

Compare verse 2:

The words could be a harmonization to Mt/Mk, but it is more probable that they are an accidental omission due to homoioarcton (AP.. - AP..). It is also possible that the words are omitted as superfluous (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
The sentence ήσαν δὲ ... αὐταῖς breaks the continuation from verse 9 to the following ἔλεγον ... It looks like an editorial gloss. Note especially the double καὶ πάσιν τοῖς λοιποῖς - καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς.

By omission of the ήσαν 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 ή Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία though. In that case a αἱ is not allowed before ἔλεγον.

ήσαν δὲ without a αἱ could mean that a new sentence starts with καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ. In that case the curious situation is that it were the unnamed αἱ λοιπαὶ who report the events to the disciples. To avoid that interpretation a αἱ was added.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Difficult variant

Minority reading:

**omitted verse:** D, it (a, b, d, e, l, r³), 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 Ἀξείλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. 4 ἕτερον δὲ οἱ δύο ὄμοι· καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής προεδραμεν τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ ἤλθεν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, 5 καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ θόντια, οὔ μέντοι εἰσήλθεν. 6 ἔρχεται οὖν καὶ Σίμων Πέτρος ἀκολουθών αὐτῷ καὶ εἰσήλθεν εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ θεωρεῖ τὰ θόντια κείμενα. NA28 John 20:10 ἀπήλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἱ μαθηταί.

Luke John

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ὅ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς</td>
<td>3 ὁ Πέτρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔδραμεν</td>
<td>4 προεδραμεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον</td>
<td>3 εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει</td>
<td>5 καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὰ θόντια μόνα,</td>
<td>5/6 τὰ θόντια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν</td>
<td>10 ἀπήλθον οὖν πάλιν πρὸς αὐτοὺς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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, ὠθόνια, ἀπῆλθεν 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.

Neirynck: "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 ἀναστάς
4. modified the term προέδραμεν, in which πρὸ must clearly refer to the race between Peter and the other disciple, τὸ 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 Neirynck 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 εξ αὐτῶν of verse 13 refers back directly to verses 10/11 (αὐτῶν).

Compare:

12 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστάς ἐδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ ὀνόματα μόνα, καὶ ἀπήλθεν πρὸς ἐαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός.
13 Καὶ ἴδον δύο ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἢσαν πορευόμενοι εἰς κώμην ἀπέχοισαν σταδίους ἐξήκουντα ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ 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:


"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:

Rating: - (indecisive)
**TVU 401**


BYZ Luke 24:12 'Ο δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστάς ἔδραμεν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει τὰ θόντια κείμενα μόνα καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν θαυμάζων τὸ γεγονός

| keίμενα μόνα | X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 700, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, ff², vgms), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Palm, bo ms |
| μόνα κείμενα | L |
| keίμενα | A, K, Π, 063, 69(=f13), 579, 2542, al, vg |
| μόνα | P75, 01c², 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, r) omit whole verse (see previous variant).

B: no umlaut

**Parallel:**

NA28 John 20:5 καὶ παρακύψας βλέπει κείμενα τὰ θόντια,

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 κόμην ἀπέχουσαν σταδίους ἐκατὸν ἐκατὸν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἣ ὄνομα ᾧ Ἐμμαοῦς,

ἐκατὸν ἐκατὸν 01, K*, Π, N*, Θ, 079

"100 + 60"

επτά 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: "ἐκατὸν is deleted by the original author. NA includes this manuscript (N) with 01, K*, Θ, 079 as reading ἐκατὸν 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.

tό 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 'Αμμαοῦς in Jos. (Bell. 7, 217, where a v.l. has ἔζηκοντα 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 Peschittal).
Compare:

- 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:

Οὐλαμμαῦς D
Ulammaus d
"Cleofas et Ammaus" b, e, ff², r¹

B: no umlaut

No parallel.

For the Οὐλαμμαῦς compare:
LXX Genesis 28:19 καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ἰακώβ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ τόπου ἐκείνου Ὁικὸς θεοῦ καὶ Οὐλαμλῶς ἢν ὄνομα τῇ πόλει τῷ πρῶτῳ
A: Οὐλαμμαῦς
"And Jacob called that place "house of God"; and the name of the city was Oulamlous at the first."

The Hebrew reads "Luz" for "Oulamlous": "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 (Οὐλαμμαῦς) 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 Onomaticon translation: "porro quod quidam putant secundum errorem Graecorum volumnum Ulammaus antiquitus nuncupatam, uphementer errant."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 404

173. **Difficult variant**


BYZ Luke 24:17 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· τίνες οἱ λόγοι οὗτοι οὓς ἀντιβάλλετε πρὸς ἀλλήλους περιπατοῦντες καὶ ἔστε σκυθρωποί;

Byz A\(^c\), P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, Trg\(^ms\)

καὶ ἔσταται A\(^c\), P, W, Γ, Ω

txt P75, 01, A\(^*\), B, L, 070, 579, Sy-Pal\(^ms\)\(^s\), Co

καὶ ἔστησαν L

et steterunt e

**omit:** D, Cyr

καὶ εἰς τί ἔστε Bal (conj.)

**B:** no umlaut

σκυθρωποί "looking sad, gloomy, sullen, sour"

ἔστε indicative present active 2nd person plural from εἰμί

ἔσταθησαν indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural from ἔστημι

ἔστησαν indicative aorist active 3rd person plural from ἔστημι

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 ἐστᾶθησαν:
Originally, formally, ἐστᾶθησαν 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 ἐστάθην etc. came to assume active meaning. The form ἐστᾶθησαν 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 στῆναι are twice as frequent as the forms from στάθηναι. 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 ἔστῆσαν wasn’t adopted (except in a singular reading of L).

2. The style of καὶ ἐστᾶθησαν and καὶ ἔστε:
Some commentators consider the καὶ ἐστᾶθησαν 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 ἔς τι ἔστε (with ἔς for ἔς and ἔς τι = "why"). In the footnote he writes:


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 ἐστᾶθησαν. 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 ἔστε and not adding a τι or διατι.
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 ἔστε 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 ἀποκριθῆς 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 εἶς ὄνοματι Κλεοπᾶς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν· σὺ μόνος παροικεῖς Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ οὐκ ἔγνως τὰ γενόμενα ἐν αὐτῇ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις;

ἐξ αὐτῶν  P, Θ, f13, 28, 33, 157, 579, 1071, 1241, 2542*, pc,
it(a, b, d, f, ff², l, r¹), Sy, sa, bo, arm, geo, aeth
ex ipsis  b, f, ff², l
ex eis  a, d, r¹

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


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 ἤγει
D*, Lat pt ἡμέρα ἤγει

txt P75, 01 C2, B, D C2, L, 070, f1, 579, vg ms 2, 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:

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

ως εἶπον αἱ γυναῖκες D, c, e
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 Luke 24:22 ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναίκες τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενόμεναι ὁρθριαὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον,

A similar phrase appears in immediate context, verse 22: "but also women". The phrase καθως 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**

BYZ Luke 24:29 καὶ παρεβιάσαντο αὐτῶν λέγοντες Μεῖνον μεθ’ ἡμῶν ὅτι πρὸς ἑσπέραν ἦστιν καὶ κέκλικεν ἡ ἡμέρα καὶ εἰσῆλθεν τοῦ μεῖναι 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 [ἡμέρα] in brackets in the margin.

**B**: no umlaut

No parallel.
It is probable that ἡμέρα has been omitted because of confusion over the many Eta's, either accidentally or deliberately to make reading easier.

**ΗΗΗΗΗΗΕΡΑ**
**ΗΗΗΗΗΗΕΡΑ**

On the doubtful Syriac attestation compare P. Williams:


Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 409

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 24:32 καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους·
οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἡμῶν κεκαλυμμένη ἦν [ἐν ἡμῖν] ὡς ἐλάλει ἡμῖν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, ὡς διήμοηγεν ἡμῖν τὰς γραφάς;

οὐχὶ ἡ καρδία ἦν ἡμῶν κεκαλυμμένη ὡς ἐλάλει … D, d, sa

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, DiatessArab, sa

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:

**omit:** P75, B, D, 1203, (it, Sy-S, Sy-C), geo\(^{1}\), (Or), **WH**

**omit** ὡς ἐλάλησε ἡμῖν a, b, ff\(^{2}\), l, r\(^{1}\), Or (probably h.t. ἡμῖν ...)

**omit** ἐν ἡμῖν ὡς ἐλάλησε 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\(^{ma}\)**, **NA\(^{20}\)**

**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: ...ἐν ἡμῖν ἐν ἡμῖν.

Rating: - (indecisive)
TVU 411

Minority reading:
NA28 Luke 24:33 Καὶ ἀναστάντες αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ εὗρον ἁθροισμένους τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς,

λέγοντες D, 1200, Sy-S, (Sy-C?, Sy-P?), bo

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:

 omit: D, it (a, b, e, ff, l, ρ), NA28, 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", arm, geo
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν, ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθαι· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.
καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν· μὴ φοβεῖσθαι· ἐγώ εἰμι.

WH have the verse in double brackets.

 Parallel:
NA28 John 20:19 ἦλθεν ὁ Ιησοῦς καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.
NA28 John 20:26 καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἶπεν· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.
Compare:
NA28 Matthew 14:27 θαρσεῖτε, ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.
NA28 Mark 6:50 θαρσεῖτε, ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.
NA28 John 6:20 ὁ δὲ λέγει αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι· μὴ φοβεῖσθε.

 Compare following verse 37:
"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 πνεύμα θεωρεῖν

φάντασμα D, d, Marcion

fantasma

B: no umlaut

No parallel, but compare:
NA28 Matthew 14:26 οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἔταραχθοσαν λέγοντες ὅτι φάντασμά ἐστιν, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ φόβου ἔκραξαν.
NA28 Mark 6:49 οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης περιπατοῦντα ἐδοξαν ὅτι φάντασμα ἐστιν, 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: [Ἰησοῦς] ἐφη αὐτοῖς· λάβετε, ἡσαλῆσατε με καὶ ἰδεῖτε, ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ δαμόνιον ἀσώματον.
From an apocryphal source, either GHebrew (Jerome) or Doctrina Petri (Origen)?

Compare:

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
Minority reading:


**omit verse:** D, it (a, b, d, e, ff², l, r'), Sy-S, Sy-C, Marcion, \( \text{NA}^{25} \), 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 τὸ τοῦτο εἶπὼν ἔδειξεν τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν αὐτοῖς.

BYZ John 20:20 καὶ τὸ τοῦτο εἶπὼν 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 ὁπτοῦ μέρος:

BYZ Luke 24:42 οἱ δὲ ἐπέδωκαν αὐτῷ ἰχθύος ὁπτοῦ 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, bopt, Justin, Tert, Cyr-Jer, Epiph, Jerome, [Trg]

txt P75, 01, A, B, D, L, W, Π, 579, pc3, d, e, Sy-S, sa, bopt, Cl, DiatessArab-1/2

pc = 1079, 1377*, 2411

B: no umlaut

Justin (2nd CE): καὶ ἐφαγεν κηρίου καὶ ἰχθύν (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 ὁπτοῦ 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:

Compare:
NA28 John 21:9 ὡς οὖν ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν βλέπουσιν ἀνθρακίαν κειμένην καὶ ὄψαριον 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 τὸ τούτος οὐδὲ τραγημάτων (καὶ) κηρίων αμοίρους περιορεῖται τούς δειπνοῦντας κατὰ Λόγον.

Compare also the story of Joseph and Aseneth 16. Here the angelic visitor says:

τὸ μὲλὶ τοῦτο πεποιήκασιν αἱ μέλισσαι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς, καὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ ἔστι αὐτοῦ ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ πᾶς ὁς φάγεται ἔστι 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

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(after weighting the witnesses)
TVU 416

 Minority reading:
 NA28 Luke 24:43 καὶ λαβὼν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν ἐφαγεν _.

 add:
 K, Π*, Θ, f13, L844, L2211, pc,
 Lat(aur, c, r¹, vg), Sy-C, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, bopt, arm, geo†, aeth

 καὶ τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς
 καὶ πᾶσιν λαβὼν ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς
 λαβὼν τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς
 καὶ φάγων ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν λαβὼν
 τὰ ἐπίλοιπα ἐδωκεν αὐτοῖς

 Et accipiens coram illis manducavit et reliqua accepit et dedit illis
 Et cum manducasset coram eis summens reliquias dedit eis.
 Accepit coram illis summens reliquias dedit eis.

 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 ὄψαριον ὀμοίως.

 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 Ἐιπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὗς ἔλαλησα

BYZ Luke 24:44 Ἐιπεν δὲ ἀυτοῖς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι οὗς ἔλαλησα

Not in NA but in SQE (Byz only)!

Byz    01, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, bopt
txt     P75, A, B, D, K, Π, L, N, X, Ψ, 33, 157, 579, pc, d, r¹, sa, bopt, C1
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)
NA28 Luke 24:46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι
οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν
καὶ ἀναστήναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

BYZ Luke 24:46 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι
οὕτως γέγραπται καὶ οὕτως ἔδει
παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν
καὶ ἀναστήναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

Byz A, C, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, f, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa

ou̱tw̱s ἔ̱dei W

579

txt P75, 01, B, C*, D, L, pc, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff, l, r), vg, Sy-Pal, Co, ln

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 ταύτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς

Compare next verse 47:
NA28 Luke 24:47 καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς

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

BYZ Luke 24:47 καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν καὶ ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἐθνη

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 mg, 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-Palms

Sy-C has a lacuna.
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:28 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.
NA28 Mark 1:4 ἐγένετο Ἰωάννης [ὁ] βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἀφεσιν 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 [ίδοὺ] 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 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ύμᾶς ὡς πρόβατα
NA28 Matthew 11:10 ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου
NA28 Matthew 23:34 Διὰ τούτο ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω πρὸς ύμᾶς 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 [ιδοὺ] ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρός μου ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς:

εξαποστέλλω 01², 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 Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς
NA28 Matthew 11:10 Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου
NA28 Matthew 23:34 Διὰ τούτο 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,

ἐξαποστέλλω 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 ἐξαποστέλλω is not coherent.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
TVU 422

BYZ Luke 24:49 ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει Ἰερούσαλήμ, ἕως ὦν ἐνδύσησθε δύναμιν ἐξ ὑψους

Byz A, C², W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, bopt

txt P75, 01, B, C*, D, L, Lat, Sy-S, sa, bopt

Sy-C has a lacuna.
B: no umlaut

No parallel.
Compare:
NA28 Luke 24:47 καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἂφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀφέσαμεν αὐτῷ Ἰερούσαλήμ

There is no reason for an omission. The addition is only natural.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)
TVU 423

179. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

**ἐως πρὸς** P75, 01, B, C*, L, f1, 33, 579, pc, L2211
a, Sy-S, Sy-P, arm, geo,
NA28, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

**ἐως εἰς** 157

**ἐκ** W*, pc

**ἐκ** D, pc, Lat

**ἐκ** e ("quasi")

**ἐκ** txt (no support!), NA26ff.

Sy-C has a lacuna.
B: no umlaut

No parallel.

Compare:
LXX Genesis 15:5 ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐκκαὶ ἐπεν αὐτῷ
LXX Judges 19:25 καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐκ
LXX 2 Samuel 13:18 καὶ ἐξήγαγεν αὐτὴν ὁ λειτουργὸς αὐτοῦ ἐκ

ἐκ is superfluous: Ἐξήγαγεν ... ἐκ. 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 εξω has been deleted as unnecessary.

NA26-27 take εξω εως as one variant and προς 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. εξω belongs to εξηγαγειν and could be taken as one variant. The other variant then would be εως προς. I think this would be a more natural separation.

In that case the distribution of witnesses would be:

- **omitting** εξω: P75, 01, B, C*, L, f1, 33, 579, pc
- **have** εξω: A, C3, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj

- εως προς: P75, 01, B, C*, L, f1, 33, 579, pc
- εως εις: A, 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 αὐτῶν διέστη ἀπ’ αὐτῶν καὶ ἀνεφέρετο ἐς τὸν οὐρανόν. 52 Καὶ αὐτοὶ ...

omit: 01*, D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l), geo¹, NA²⁸, 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 01²²
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, ὁ Θεόφιλε, δῶν ἡρξατο ὁ Ἱησοῦς ποιεῖν τε καὶ διδάσκειν, 2 ἀρχὴ ἢς ἡμέρας ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἀγίου οὗς ἐξελέζατο ἀνελημφθη.
Codex Gigas: 1:2 ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἀγίου κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, οὓς ἐξελέξατο (similar also Augustinus).
and Codex D: 1:2 ἀρχὴ ἢς ἡμέρας ἀνελημφθη ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ πνεύματος ἀγίου, οὓς ἐξελέξατο, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ...

The ascension in Acts:
NA28 Acts 1:9 Καὶ ταύτα εἰπὼν βλεπόντων αὐτῶν ἐπήρθη καὶ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.
Codex D: Καὶ ταύτα εἰπόντος αὐτοῦ νεφέλη ὑπέλαβεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπήρθη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτῶν.
Compare also:
NA28 Mark 16:19 ‘Ο μὲν οὖν κύριος Ἰησοῦς μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι 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 (..Ν ΚΑΙ Α.. - ..Ν ΚΑΙ Α..). This is possibly the case for the omission in 01*. 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 [ἀνελήμφθη] when he was taken up ..."

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.
The word 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 ἀναφέρω 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 αὐτῶν 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 Schlussskapiteln des Lukasevangeliums" TSK 69 (1896) 245-81
- G. Lohfink "Die Himmelfahrt Jesu" StANT 26, München, 1971, p. 171-4
- A.W. Zwiep "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 Ἱερουσαλήμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης

omit: D, it(a, b, d, e, ff², l), Sy-S, NA²⁸, 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 ἵδοι Ἰησοῦς ὑπήντησαν αὐταῖς λέγων· χαίρετε. αἱ δὲ προσελθοῦσαι ἐκράτησαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς πόδας καὶ προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ.
NA28 Matthew 28:17 καὶ ἵδοντες 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. Zwiep "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

αἰνοῦντες  D, it(a, b, d, e, ff, l, r), vg, Trg, Tis, Bal

αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες  A, C, W, Χ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, [Trg]

laudantes et benedicentes

Sy-C has a lacuna.
B: no umlaut

αἰνοῦντες αἰνέω participle present active nominative masculine plural
"praise"

Compare:
NA28 Luke 24:50-51 Ἐξῆγαγεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐξ ἐκείνης ἦς πρὸς Βηθανίαν, καὶ ἐπάρας τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς. 51 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εὐλογείν 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).
εὐλογεῖω 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 εὐλογεῖω has been changed to αἰνέω, because in the two previous verses 50 and 51 εὐλογεῖω 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:

insert PA: 1333c
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 ... ΓΛΩΝΑΙΚΟΣ’, part of which was not decipherable."