THE SCRIBE AS INTERPRETER: A NEW LOOK AT NEW TESTAMENT
TEXTUAL CRITICISM ACCORDING TO READER RECEPTION THEORY

by

PHILIP WESLEY COMFORT

submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY

in the subject

THEORY OF LITERATURE

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROMOTER: PROF R C GRÄBE

JOINT PROMOTER: DR J H PETZER

NOVEMBER 1996

Contents

Chapter Seven

Preface

The purpose of this thesis is to show that reader-
reception aesthetics can be applied to the field of study
called New Testament textual criticism, inasmuch as
reception theory provides a different approach to
explaining textual variants. The reception theory I have
implemented focuses on the interaction between the scribe
and the text, as the scribe engaged with the written text
as an active reader and thereby became a co-producer of a
new, personalized text. For normal readers, this
interaction would usually have only been a mental
interchange——that is, nothing of the interaction would
have been recorded. But for scribes, who produced
manuscript copies as they read, this interaction was often
recorded in the form of singular textual variants (i.e.,
variant readings found only in one manuscript). These
scribes left a written record of how they had actually
"read" the text differently from any one before them or
after them.

Literary theorists tell us that the written words as
interpreted by an actual reader or readers is the literary
text. In other words, while the words on the page remain
constant, the aesthetic object (which is the concretized
literary text) is subject to change. For printed literary
works, it is true that the words on the page remain
constant; but this is not so for ancient literary works
(in manuscript form) because the wording was also changed
as the concretization changed. As such, ancient
manuscripts provide an excellent source for studying
individual concretizations in a historical context. By
studying the singular variants in these manuscripts, we
can attempt to understand the producer of that text——the
scribe——as an actual reader. This is where the literary

theories of Jauss are so helpful, for Jauss focused on actual historical readers who brought with them their own "horizon of expectations" to the text, which also has its own horizon. The process of reading brings a meeting of the two horizons, which can result in frustration or fusion. When scribes were frustrated by the text they read, they could adjust their horizon of expectations to that of the text or they could change the text to satisfy their expectations. These changes often involved the filling in of perceived gaps or blanks in the narrative. The literary theorist, Wolfgang Iser, helps us understand how the text itself prompts such blank-filling. These blanks were often filled in with creative, individualized readings.

In this thesis I implement the theories of Jauss and Iser (which are detailed in the opening chapters of this thesis) in an effort to determine whether literary theory might be useful in providing an additional or perhaps an alternative means of analyzing and understanding textual variants. To accomplish this goal, my thesis is divided into two sections: the first section deals with the literary theory of reader reception as it pertains to Christian Egyptian scribes living in the second and third centuries A.D.; the second section provides a detailed analysis of the actual receptions and textual variants produced by three Christian Egyptian scribes—i.e., those who produced the Gospel papyrus manuscripts known as P45, P66, and P75.

The first chapter of the first section provides a rationale for utilizing the literary theories of Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser in the study of New Testament textual criticism. In the second chapter I apply their theoretical paradigms to New Testament textual criticism—especially of the Gospels, which are the main focus of my study. In the third chapter, I have attempted

to describe the horizon of expectations of Christian
Egyptian scribes living in the second and third centuries.
This chapter provides a general sketch of what constituted
their literary lives as Christian scribes living in Egypt.
This generalized picture serves me well in my attempt to
reconstruct the specific portfolio of each of the three
scribes (analyzed in chapters four through six), which
should then furnish some details for adjusting the
generalized picture or coloring it in.

The second section is devoted entirely to the study
of the reader receptions of three specific scribes as
manifest in singular variants (i.e., these are variant
readings that appear in no other manuscripts and therefore
must be the creation of the scribe). The fourth chapter
deals with the individual receptions of the scribe of P45,
who produced a codex containing all four Gospels and Acts
somewhere around 200 A.D. The fifth chapter focuses on the
singular variants of the second-century scribe of P66, a
codex containing the Gospel of John. (In this chapter I
also analyze the work of another scribe who worked on this
manuscript—the corrector. But his role is minor.) The
sixth chapter presents an analysis of the singular
variants of the scribe of P75, a codex written around 200
A.D., containing Luke and John. The purpose of analyzing
the individual receptions of these three scribes is to
formulate specific observations about each of their
concretizations and thereby gain knowledge about each of
their transcriptional idiosyncrasies. Furthermore, the
analysis could shed some light on what aspects of reader
reception these scribes may have shared in common. This
final analysis constitutes the final part of this thesis—
chapter seven.

Section One

Reader Reception Theory and New Testament Textual
Criticism

Chapter One

Literary Theory and New Testament Textual Criticism

This thesis involves a merging of two disciplines rarely
associated and not easily combined. The disciplines are
reader-reception criticism and New Testament textual
criticism. The very essence of textual criticism would
seem to defy any appropriation of reader-reception
criticism, but that is because textual criticism is usually
perceived as dealing only with the text and not the reader.
However, textual criticism could benefit from the same
kind of influence that has happened recently in literary
studies. As many literary critics have shifted their focus
from the text itself to the readers of the text in an attempt to
comprehend plurality of interpretation, so textual critics
could analyze variant readings in the textual tradition as
being the products of different "readings" of the text
created by the scribes who produced them. Reader-
reception theory can serve as a balance to textual
criticism because it adds a new perspective--the reader's.
And in the case of New Testament textual studies, it
provides a tool for studying the activity of scribes as actual
readers.

Reader reception theories have come to the fore in the
past thirty years. The change of focus in literary theory to
the reader exhibits a significant shift from text-oriented
studies (as presented in formalism and structuralism) to
studies concerned with the dynamic relationship between

the reader and the text. The focus has shifted from the autonomy of the text to the interaction between the text and the reader. Such studies concentrate on how the text affects the reader and how the reader makes a new contribution in the process of concretizing a literary text. Reader reception theories were given a proper theoretical foundation by the literary theorists, Wolfgang Iser and Hans Robert Jauss, both of the University of Constance in Germany. Iser developed the concept of the implied reader to study the interaction between the text and reader, whereas Jauss developed the theory of the aesthetics of reception according to diachronic shifts in the horizon of expectations of historical readers. These two theories are very pertinent to my study of variant readings created throughout the course of the textual transmission of the New Testament text because they provide the theoretical constructs for an investigation of actual reader receptions.

The purpose of Jauss' work, in particular, is to provide theories that facilitate the empirical study of the reception of literary works. According to Jauss (1989:123-124), the Constance school was completely oriented at first on problems of reception or effect, then evolved more and more into a theory of literary communication. In his own words, Jauss' evolution of their theory was as follows:

> Foremost for me was the question concerning the experience of art, or what could be called aesthetic praxis, which underlies all manifestations of art as productive activity (poiesis), receptive activity (aisthesis), and communicative activity (katharsis). From this it followed that the analysis of the implied reader had to be supplemented by the analysis of the historical reader, and the reconstruction of the immanent horizon of expectations, which the work implies or anticipates, had to be supplemented by the reconstruction of the social horizon of experience, which the reader supplies or brings from his or her

own historical "Lebenswelt" (life world). The classical
dichotomy of fiction and reality resolved into the
dialectical relationship of theme and horizon.

Jauss' observation seems to indicate that the school first
developed the notion of the implied reader (in Iser's
paradigm), and then the real, historical reader (in Jauss'
paradigm). Real readers are historical, flesh and blood
readers. They are not the same as the "implied reader,"
who is the reader envisaged in the mind of the author and
evoked to respond to the work by a succession of literary
clues. Actual readers grasp the intended perception of
the text from the clues given, and actual readers
concretize the physical artefact as an aesthetic object.
Actual readers can be described on the basis of
documents constructed from social and historical
knowledge, as well as from literary conventions of the
time.

In my forthcoming analysis of three Egyptian Christian
scribes (P45, P66, P75) I will attempt to reconstruct their
horizon of expectation by treating them as actual historical
readers in Jauss's sense of the term. I will attempt to
explain their textual practices by abstracting the process
of reading underlying their decisions to introduce
variants. This means that I will be illustrating a process of
reading whereby the variants may be interpreted as
indications that actual readers were trying their best to
comply with textual constraints in an attempt to determine
textual meaning. As such, these scribes can be viewed as
actual readers who were trying to comply with the
instruction of Iser's implied reader (in the sense of both
textual construct and structured act) as being that reader
that would ideally meet all textual requirements and that
would exhaust textual meaning.

The scribes of P45, P66, and P75 were actual readers,

who have left for us a legacy of some of their reactions to the written text of the New Testament by changes they made in the text as they read it. For modern literary works (since the time of printing), the words on the page remain constant; but this is not so for ancient literary works (in manuscript form) because the wording was also changed as the concretization changed and scribes sought to fill in perceived gaps. These documents provide an excellent source for studying ancient reader reception of the New Testament text.

Iser's Textual Indeterminacy

Wolfgang Iser's observations about reader-reception are applicable to scribal-reception, inasmuch as scribes actively participated in textual meaning through concretization. Textual critics can gain great understanding about textual variants by studying this concretization process, especially as it applies to textual indeterminacy and the filling of textual gaps.

But before I launch into a discussion about Iser's concept of textual indeterminacy it must be noted that Iser was indebted to Roman Ingarden, a Polish philosopher who did intensive studies in the cognition of literary works. Ingarden's view was that a literary work was not autonomous but was an intensional object that depended on the cognition of the reader. As an intensional object, a literary work cannot fill in all the details; the reader is required to do this. During the reading process, the reader must concretize the gaps by using his or her imagination to give substance to textual omission and/or indefiniteness. Since this substantiation is a subjective and creative act, the concretization will assume many variations for different readers.

For example, the Gospel of Luke says that the crowds who had watched Jesus' crucifixion "returned home, beating their breasts." Although it would seem that most readers are given enough text to visualize this scene, the imagination of various scribes was sparked to consider how extensive their grief was or to recreate what they might have been saying to one another as they walked home. A few scribes, imagining a more intense reaction, added, "they returned home, beating their breasts <u>and foreheads</u>." Other scribes took the liberty to provide some dialogue by making this addition: "they returned home beating their breasts, <u>and saying 'woe to us for the sins we have committed this day, for the destruction of Jerusalem is imminent!'</u>"

Wolfgang Iser's theory of reader reception builds upon Ingarden's, but has its own special features. Iser considered that Ingarden's model reduced reader activity to a mere filling in of gaps in the literary text. In Iser's view the interaction between text and reader should be seen as an ongoing dialectic. Throughout this process, every image perceived by a reader is subject to change because it is seen against the background of previous images; at the same time these past images are responsible for the creation of a new, modified image. In the reading-process, certain perspectives will be foregrounded against the horizon of others. This continual remodification produces a coherent pattern, which "reconciles not only old and new, but also all of the diverse thematic levels of the text" (Ray 1984:35).

Iser, like Ingarden, considers the text to have gaps or indeterminate passages which demand that the reader respond in a communicative process. Iser's conception of the "gap" (or what he calls a "blank") differs from Ingarden's in the scope of what is required of the reader.

According to Ingarden, the reader is called upon to fill in unnarrated portions of history or imperfectly represented objects. Iser, by contrast, thinks readers need to perform global gap-filling--that is, they are called upon to fill the gaps between textual segments, because the text often contains lapses in meaning which require filling. This requires constant revision and reflective imaging.

In this regard, Iser is concerned not just with the question of what a literary text makes its readers do but with how readers participate in creating meaning. In other words, the meaning of a text is not inherent in the text but must be actualized by the reader. It is from this perspective that Iser speaks of the "implied reader." According to Iser (1978:34), the implied reader

> embodies all those predispositions necessary for a literary work to exercise its effect--predispositions laid down, not by an empirical outside reality, but by the text itself. Consequently, the implied reader as a concept has his roots firmly planted in the structure of the text; he is a construct and in no way to be identified with any real reader.

As such, the implied reader is a textual structure anticipating the interaction of a recipient without actually defining him or her. In other words, the implied reader designates a network of response-inviting structures, which impel the reader to grasp the text.

In Iser's model, the implied reader "incorporates both the prestructuring of the potential meaning of the text, and the reader's actualization of this potential through the reading process" (1974:xii). The "implied reader" is the envisaged reader evoked by the entirety of textual clues; he is the reader the author envisages and assumes but is not the actual reader who picks up the book and reads it. Thus the "implied reader" differs from the "actual reader"

in that the actual reader is a real person who actualizes
the physical artefact (the literary text) as an aesthetic
object. The implied reader is a construct that invites
participation from the real reader and even provides
instruction to the reader as to how to go about interpreting
the text. Of course, there is no way that it can dictate one
reading of the text. There will be several independent
actualizations of the text.

Thus, Iser (1978:37-38) connects the "implied reader"
with the real reader by allowing for individual
concretizations of the text. Iser recognizes that real
readers bring to the text their own predispositions
inherent in their own historical and individual
circumstances:

> Clearly, then, the process of actualization is a
> selective one, and any one actualization can be
> judged against the background of others potentially
> present in the textual sctructure of the reader's role.
> Each actualization therefore represents a selective
> realization of the implied reader, whose own
> structure provides a frame of reference within
> which individual responses to a text can be
> communicated to others. This is the vital function of
> the whole concept of the implied reader: it
> provides a link between all the historical and
> individual actualizations of the text and makes them
> accessible to analysis.

Iser's continuing focus, however, has not been on
individual, historical reception but on the effects of the
textual structure on the implied reader. Nevertheless, he
has decribed reading concretization in terms that are
helpful to understanding the phenomenon of scribal
reception. Since readers actively participate in the
production of textual meaning, the literary work is
actualized or concretized through a convergence of
reader and text. Thus, a reader must act as co-creator of

the text by supplying that portion of it which is not written
but only implied. Each reader uses his or her imagination
to fill in the unwritten portions of the text, its "gaps" or
areas of "indeterminacy" (Tompkins 1980:15). In other
words, as the reader adopts the perspectives thrust on
him or her by the text, experiences it sequentially, has
expectations frustrated or modified, relates one part of the
text to the other, imagines and fills in all that the text leaves
blank, its meaning is gradually actualized. The reader's
reflection on the thwarting of his or her expectations, the
negations of familiar values, the causes of their failure,
and whatever potential solutions the text offers require the
reader to take an active part in formulating the meaning of
the narrative.

Scribes as Readers

I would like to argue a new position, never before
presented in New Testament textual studies (to my
knowledge): scribes were just as much "readers" of the
text as they were copyists of it. Scribes read the text--both
at the functionary level for the sake of copying and at the
literary level for the sake of personal appropriation. It is
the latter involvement that often interfered with the former,
for when the scribe became engaged in actualizing the
meaning of the text, he often forgot his task of copying it
word for word. For some scribes (such as the one who
penned P45), it didn't even matter that he copied all the
text verbatim; he was often content to provide a digested
version. Other scribes, such as the man who produced
P66, also became involved with reading the text--to the
extent that he forgot that he was a copyist and
subsequently made errors and/or interpolations, and then
corrected them when he came back to his copying task.

Whereas readers do blank-filling in their imaginations only, it could be argued that scribes sometimes took the liberty to fill the unwritten gaps with written words. In other words, some scribes went beyond just imagining how the blanks and gaps should be filled and actually filled them. This is a theory that can have significant import in the area of New Testament textual criticism that has focused on the study of individual documents and scribal habits; it can help to advance the studies of scholars such as Hort, Colwell, and Royse.

One of the most important contributions to New Testament textual criticism in this century has come from E. Colwell's insistence that textual critics must adhere to Hort's dictum that "knowledge of documents must precede judgments on readings." He argued that the way to achieve a thorough knowledge of documents is to study the singular variants of each manuscript, for it is in the singular variants that we can detect the individual scribal habits. Colwell did some preliminary study of the early papyri, which was then continued by Royse in his dissertation entitled "Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri."

These scholars did much to advance our knowledge of scribal habits. However, their focus was on the activity of scribes-as copyists, not as readers. Thus, Colwell and Royse noticed particular scribal habits which were responsible for the creation of textual variants. However, they did not pay attention to how the scribes acted as readers and consequently introduced other changes into the text. Textual critics, such as Colwell and Royse, use traditional means to explain textual variants. Thus, variants are explained as being unintentional (i.e., the result of scribal error) or intentional (i.e., the result of scribal emendation). With respect to intentional changes, textual

critics often state that a change was initiated by a scribe for the sake of harmonizing a word, phrase, or verse to the immediate context. This is the closest text critics come to saying that the scribe created a variant reading because he was responding to the textual structure in supplying a particular textual meaning. As such, there will be some overlap between the way traditional textual criticism explains textual variants and the way reader-response criticism would explain textual variants. However, reader-response criticism can provide reasons why a particular scribe produced a particular reading, by looking at the scribe's horizon of expectations and by looking at how the text itself could have prompted that particular interpretation. (For more on this, see the introduction to chapter four.)

Literary theorists who specialize in reader-reception theory have examined how readers have interacted with the text and become co-creators in the production of meaning. Readers have no choice but to fill in textual gaps and blanks. For modern readers, this all takes place in the mind; so also for ancient readers--but with one exception: scribes who read the works which they were copying sometimes left a written record of their interaction with the text in the form of interpolations, glosses, transpositions, orthographic notations, and lexical alterations. These provide the material for studying a particular scribe's reception of the text as an actual reader.

The historical evidence shows that each scribe who made a text created a newly written one because all of the early manuscripts have singular readings. Although there are many factors that could have contributed to the making of this new text, I will argue that one major factor is that the text constantly demands the reader to fill in the gaps and blanks.

According to Ingarden (1973a), a literary work is an intensional object composed of several interacting strata compromising a schematic structure that has to be completed by the reader. Since objects cannot be depicted in full detail in literary works, the reader has to fill in the gaps by providing an imaginative portrayal of the things lacking definition. This indeterminacy shows that literary works are intensional, autonomous objects; their substance depends on the concretization of the reader. Thus, the gaps function as a kind of pivot on which the whole text-reader relationship revolves.

Building on Ingarden's view of textual indeterminacy, Iser (1978:175) said,

> The function of the reader is to fill in textual indeterminacies because it is these that denote the openness of the intentional object and must therefore be made to disappear in the act of concretization if a determinate aesthetic object is to be produced.

Iser calls the gaps "blanks"; each blank is a nothing that propels communication because the blank requires an act of ideation in order to be filled. Iser (1978:189) wrote,

> Blanks suspend connectibility of textual patterns, the resultant break in good continuation intensifies the acts of ideation on the reader's part, and in this respect the blank functions as an elementary function of communication.

According to Iser, the central factor in literary communication concerns the reader's filling in of these textual blanks. His theory of textual blanks is useful for understanding scribal reader-reception. Of course, his perception of blanks is far bigger and more demanding on the reader's imaginative powers than can usually be applied to New Testament scribes. Nonetheless, I will

argue that scribes were confronted with gaps or blanks that begged for imaginative filling. It appears that many scribes, when confronted with such textual blanks, took the liberty to fill in those blanks by adding extra words or changing the wording for the sake of providing what they thought would be a more communicative text. Indeed, one may argue that the entire history of New Testament textual transmission is one of the text getting bigger and bigger due to textual interpolations--i.e., the filling in of perceived blanks.

According to Iser, the reader takes on the thoughts of another person during the reading process. At first, these thoughts are unfamiliar and then they become familiar and accessible. Through gestalt forming (which is a hermeneutical resolve and the closure of the gap), the reader actually participates in the text and gets caught up in it--such that as he reads he lives another life (Iser 1978:156-157). This is the effect of the "implied reader" (as a textual construct) on the real reader.

The reader's involvement creates the illusion that he has left his own world behind and entered into another. Yet the illusion is not complete because there is a tension that leaves the reader suspended between total entanglement and latent detachment (Iser 1978:127). The role of the author-created "reader" (i.e., the implied reader) cannot always be assumed by the real reader because actual readers drift in and out of these two realms. This is evidently what happened with a scribe as he read the New Testament text. But there is one distinction. Whereas readers may or may not assume the role of the implied reader, the actual wording of the printed text remains unchanged; scribes had the opportunity to attempt a reading that would approximate the ideal and exhaustive interpretation of textual meaning

as represented by Iser's concept of the "implied reader."
For example, if a scribe had become accustomed to Paul
repeatedly using the expression "in Christ Jesus," he may
not allow Paul himself to vary and say "in Jesus Christ";
therefore, whenever the scribe encountered the
expression "in Jesus Christ" (as a true authorial variation),
he would change it to "in Christ Jesus."

    I would also argue that scribes expanded the text if
they believed the textual construct did not coincide with
the way they thought the text should read. For example,
Jesus told the perplexed disciples, who had failed to cast
out some demons, that this required much prayer.
Scribes, who associated "prayer" with fasting, extended
the expression in Mark 9:29 to "this kind [of demon] can
only come out by prayer _and fasting_." This also happened
in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, where he
encouraged married couples to devote some time to
prayer. Again, various scribes could not resist an addition:
"devote yourselves to prayer _and fasting_" (1 Cor. 7:5). Of
course, these examples could also be used to show the
tension between the readers' horizon of expectations and
the horizon of the text (which is discussed in detail
below), but these examples also characterize a scribe's
ability to superimpose his reading of the text on the
author's textual construct.

Jauss's Literary Historiography

Hans Robert Jauss' essay, "Literary History as a Challenge
to Literary Theory," has had a seminal impact on literary
criticism since the 1970s. This address was structured as
a manifesto that first enumerated "the inadequacies of
contemporary critical approaches and then outlined in
seven programmatic theses a sweeping methodological

reorientation. It precipitated an avalanche of debate, and critical consensus has since enshrined it as the origin of modern reception theory" (Schmidt 1979:158).

In his essay Jauss proposes the rewriting of literary history as a history of readers' reactions to literature, a history of the interaction between text and reader, especially as the text is transformed by the reader. Jauss believes that the traditional historical approach to literature must be replaced by an aesthetics of reception. The historical relevance of literature should not be based on an organization of literary works which is established post factum, but on the reader's past experience of the literature (Tompkins 1980:249-250). He urges literary critics to stop considering literary works as historical objects whose context needs to be restored and, instead, study the historical reader and the horizon of expectations he brought to the texts.

In Jauss' view, the historical essence of a work of literature can be determined only by studying the dialectical process of production and reception, which calls for a consideration of both the producing subject (author) and the consuming subject (reader). The interaction between the author and the reading public can be reflected in historiography. Jauss' (1970:8) unique emphasis is on the role that the reader plays in this dialectical process:

> In the triangle of author, work, and reading public the
> latter is no passive part, no chain of mere reactions,
> but even history-making energy. The historical life of a
> literary work is unthinkable without the active
> participation of its audience. For it is only through the
> process of its communication that the work reaches
> the changing horizon of experience in a continuity in
> which the continual change occurs from simple
> reaction to critical understanding, from passive to
> active reception, from recognized aesthetic norms to

a new production that surpasses them.

The dialectical process is ongoing for each generation who encounters the literary work and judges its aesthetic value. Jauss (1970:8-9) explains:

> The first reception of a work by the author includes a test of its aesthetic value in comparison with works which he has already read. The obvious historical implication of this is that the appreciation of the first reader will be continued and enriched through further "receptions" from generation to generation; in this the historical significance of a work will be determined and its aesthetic value revealed. In this process of the history of reception . . . the repossession of past works occurs simultaneously with the continued mediation of past and present art and of traditional evaluation and current literary attempts.

In this light each reading or reception of the text affects the next reading of the text. Our present reading of any text is affected by previous receptions, thereby creating an ongoing dialectical exhange. This dialectical exchange needs a mediating instance which makes the exchange possible. This mediating factor is reading. This exchange and mediation also needs to be objectively visible so that it can be described empirically. The empirical, objective material that makes the dialectical exchange through reading visible is the real reception of books by real readers as documented in real reviews, letters, comments, debates, and procedures of canonization. This can be taken one step further for ancient literature, because I would propose that real reader reception can be analyzed in the ancient manuscripts themselves because each manuscript reveals an individualized reception of the text.

When Jauss describes the historical reception of a literary work, he uses the term Erwartungshorizont

(horizon of expectation) to describe the reaction of
readers to a text in the present as well as the reaction of
readers to the same text in the past. It places the text in a
relationship between past readings and present readings.
For Jauss, the horizon of expectations signifies a
subjective structure of expectation or a certain mental
attunement brought to the text from previous literary
experiences and freshly acquired in the course of
reading, which can both be applied toward
comprehending new texts. "The new text evokes for the
reader (listener) the horizon of expectations and rules
familiar from earlier texts, which are then varied,
corrected, changed or just reproduced . . . . The
interpretative reception of a text always presupposes the
context of experience of aesthetic reception" (Jauss
1970:13).

The horizon of expectations for any literary work is
formed by the familiar standards and by implicit
relationships to familiar works of the literary-historical
context. The way in which a work of literature satisfies,
surpasses, disappoints, or disproves the expectations of
its first readers provides a criterion for the determination
of its aesthetic value. The more the readers' horizon is
expanded, the greater the aesthetic impact. However, this
expanded horizon can disappear for successive readers
by becoming a familiar expectation and thus part of the
horizon of future aesthetic experience (Jauss 1970:14-15).

According to Jauss, the reconstruction of the horizon of
expectations enables us to discover how the reader of
that day viewed and understood the work. Furthermore, it
brings out the hermeneutical difference between the past
and present ways of understanding a work and helps us
understand the history of its reception. This
reconstruction is essential for understanding an ancient

work, especially those whose author is unknown,
because we do not know the author's intent or his exact
use of sources. To understand the text according to its
intention and time, the text must be considered in contrast
to the background of the work which the author could
expect his contemporary readers to have known (Jauss
1970:19). Furthermore, one must seek to understand the
horizon of each successive generation that read the
ancient work because the horizon always involves the
context of the reader's present horizon.

Jauss' horizon of expectation--a development of Hans-Georg Gadamer's fusion of horizons

Jauss implictly states (1982a:xxxvi) that his views about
Erwartungshorizont are indebted to Hans-Georg
Gadamer's:

> Gadamer's theory of hermeneutic experience, its
> historical unfolding in the history of humanistic
> guiding concepts, his principle of seeing in historical
> impact the access to all historical understanding, and
> the clarification of the controllable process of the
> "fusion of horizons" are the indisputable
> methodological presuppositions without which my
> undertaking would have been unthinkable.

Gadamer posited the view that the prejudices and
preconceived opinions of the reader form his horizon.
This horizon arises from the historical nature of man's
being. Gadamer said (1975:245), "History does not belong
to us, but we belong to it. . . That is why the prejudices of
the individual, far more than his judgments, constitute the
historical reality of his being." When Gadamer (1975:240)
speaks of prejudice he is not speaking of unfair
discrimination or unjust bias, he is speaking of an intrinsic
predisposition. This predisposition or pre-understanding

is at work when one ascribes meaning to any given text; it is that which constitutes the reader's horizon--i.e., his place in the historical tradition.

Everyone has this kind of prejudice because everyone is born in a certain historical context with its traditions. Thus, when anyone reads a written text from a different era, the reader brings his own predispositions to that readings. **In recent years Bible scholars have exhibited their indebtedness to Gadamer's views by seriously taking into account the horizon of the reader as contributing significantly to the interpretation of any given biblical text. This is nowhere more evident than in Thistleton's seminal work,** Two Horizons. In this volume Thistleton said, "the modern interpreter, no less than the text, stands in a given historical context and tradition" (1980:11). Thus, to every reader of a text written in a different milieu with a different history there is a sense of strangeness, as well as a sense of familiarity. Gadamer said, "The place between strangeness and familiarity that a transmitted text has for us is that intermediate place between an historically intended separate object and being part of tradition. The true home of hermeneutics is in this intermediate area" (1975:262-263).

The lesser the gap (both in time and culture) between the historicity of the text and the historicity of the reader the greater the chance for the fusion of horizons. A text written by authors living in the Greco-Roman world in the first century is more likely to be understood by scribes living in Greco-Roman world during the second and third centuries than by twentieth-century scholars living in the Western world. Nonetheless, Gadamer contends that no one can escape his or her situation in history. We cannot suspend all of our prejudices in order to apprehend the text in all its purity. A consciousness that is defined by

"actively effected history" (<u>Wirkungsgeschichte</u>) is part of the process of understanding, and a literary historicism that forgets its own historicality is naive (McKnight 1978:59). We always bring our present reality and present consciousness into our reading of a text. **Thus, I must admit at the onset of this thesis that I, as a twentieth-century reader, will have certain difficulties in completely understanding the horizon of expectation of second and third-century Christian Egyptian scribes. Nonetheless, I hope to overcome these barriers by attempting to understand the forces and milieu that shaped the horizons of these Christian scribes who lived in Egypt during the height of the Hellenistic era.**

In arguing for the reality of prejudices Gadamer does not conclude that there can be no fusion of horizons. Rather, he believed that the prejudices can provide the reader with an entrance into the text because they provide the provisional knowledge a reader brings to an object. A reader comes to a text with prejudices that are eventually revised by interaction with the text. What a reader brings to the text both opens up and closes off possibilities of understanding. If a reader is open to the text's newness, the reader's inadequate and false prejudices can be shaped by the tradition and thus transformed into productive elements of understanding. Gadamer (1975:236) elaborates:

> A person who is trying to understand a text is always performing an act of projection. He projects before himself a meaning for the text as a whole as soon as some initial meaning emerges in the text. Again, the latter emerges only because he is reading the text with particular expectations in regard to a certain meaning. The working out of this fore-projection, which is constantly revised in terms of what emerges as he penetrates into the meaning, is understanding what is there.

This constant revision of fore-projections Gadamer calls a "fusion of horizons." With the fusion comes the merging of two horizons and communication is accomplished. Thus, the historicity of the interpreter is not an obstacle to understanding, but a necessary component of the hermeneutic process as undertaken by the interpreter.

The task of the interpreter is to remain open to the newness of the text and to be willing to revise and correct preunderstandings. At the same time, the interpreter must be aware of his prejudices which have formed through tradition and his acceptance of certain values, attitudes, and institutions as authoritative. Understanding is not to be thought of so much as an action of one's subjectivity but as the placing of one's self in a process of tradition in which past and present are constantly fused. Thus, tradition is a horizon within which we do our thinking. Genuine understanding takes place when there occurs a fusion of horizons between the past and the present, or between the text and the interpreter (Thistleton 1980:304-307).

Gadamer's "fusion of horizons" is perhaps a more tempered paradigm for analyzing ancient texts than Jauss' "horizon of expectations" because Gadamer takes into consideration the subjectiveness of the reader, whereas Jauss purports empirical objectification. Holub (1984:60) is especially critical of Jauss' objectivist model:

> Although Jauss at times endeavors to retain the
> transcendental nature of the horizon by positing its
> objectifiability, he suggests an empirical procedure.
> Moreover, the method he indicates for objectifying the
> category presupposes a neutral position from which
> the observation can be made. The "familiar"
> standards for a given era are verifiable only by
> assuming that from a present perspective we can
> make objective judgments of what these standards

actually were. In contradistinction to Gadamer's insistence on historicity, we are asked here to ignore or abstract our own historical situatedness.

Holub's critique is insightful; it reminds us that we are all subjects of our own history and could never be fully objective in our assessment of how previous generations received a text. Since our own horizon colors our view of the horizon of ancient readers, we have to make every effort to admit our own historicality and yet still attempt (in Gadamerian fashion) to reconstruct as objectively as possible the horizon of expectation of the early readers of the New Testament text.

But Holub's criticism is not fully warranted. Schmidt (1979:158), for example, has a different review of Jauss' theory. He correctly perceives (in my estimation) that Jauss calls upon readers to view themselves as historical subjects, "whose function it is to gain insight into the traditions and contexts that affect their subjective response. In other words, Jauss means to provoke a sense of historical self-consciousness within the critic." Applauding Jauss, Schmidt (1979:159) went on to say: "Jauss in Gadamer's wake helped overturn the classical principle of artistic autonomy by demonstrating that readers are affected not by a text alone but also by its reception history."

Schmidt, however, has his own criticisms of Jauss' theory. Siding with the Marxist critics, Schmidt cautioned against Jauss' preoccupation with aesthetic expectations because this can "obscure the social basis of literary communication processes and the material conditions of distribution." Indeed, Jauss does not complement the Marxian approach because he regards the major premise that "literature is an expression of reality" to be an obsolete approach to historiography. In addition, Schmidt

(1979:158-159) says that Jauss "disregards the psychological aspects of reception, and he adheres to a concept of audience that fails to differentiate according to social standing, education, sex . . . [and] reading preferences." **This is helpful criticism because the approach I will take in analyzing the reading receptions of Christian Egyptian scribes must take into account their education and reading experiences because they were important factors that shaped their horizon of expectations.**

In any event, Jauss' theory of reader-reception as both a "diachronic" and "synchronic" event is extremely helpful for understanding the continual reception of the New Testament text. The diachronic aspect takes into account the reality that a literary work is not "an object that stands by itself and that offers the same view to each reader in each period . . . It is much more like an orchestration that strikes ever new resonances among its readers and that frees the text from the material of the words and brings it into a contemporary existence" (Jauss 1982c:21). The synchronic aspect supposes the historical reality that every literary work exists simultaneously with other contemporary literary works that would have been known by the readers and would thereby have influenced their Erwartungshorizont. As Jauss (1982c:37) puts it, "the historicity of literature comes to light at the intersections of diachrony and synchrony." Where the two intersect, one can study the history of influence on reader reception.

Finally, it should be noted that Jauss' historicism is not the same as classical historicism. Jauss (1985:147) explains:

> The recent trend towards historical knowledge, provoked by the success of the structural method, can be distinguished from classical historicism mainly

through a methodological consideration of the historicity of understanding. Such an understanding requires that the horizons of the past and present assert themselves as the central problem and achieve once more the complete hermeneutical triad of understanding, explanation, and application. Such a requirement has established the notion of horizon as a fundamental concept in both literary and historical hermeneutics. It poses the problem of understanding what is alien by insisting on the distinctness of the horizons not only of past and present experience, but also of familiar and culturally different worlds.

The purpose of my study is to explore how the hermenuetical triad was operative in early Christian scribes by examining the forces that shaped their horizon of expectation. In my estimation, Jauss' "horizon of expectations" is a valid instrument for measuring literary value. With Jauss, I believe that the aesthetic distance or discrepancy between the structure of the text and the horizon of expectations of a reader (or group of readers) at the time when the text is published is a viable measure of the literary value of a text. Therefore, the more a text expands the readers' horizon of expectations the greater its literary value. The less a text stretches the readers' horizon of expectations the more it is likely to be perceived as trivial, common literature. Of course, this kind of literariness is not that easy to assess because it is difficult to determine whether a particular work has expanded the horizon of expectations or complied with it. Furthermore, Jauss' view is open to the criticism that anything new must have literary value because it expands the horizon of expectations.

These criticisms aside, Jauss' theory can still provide a yardstick for measuring how the Gospels were first received (soon after their publication) as compared to how they were received several centuries later. My position is that each Gospel was a novel work that

expanded the horizon of expectations of many first and
second century readers. In the next chapter, I will explore
the matter of whether or not the Gospels were indeed
perceived as "literature" from a first and second-century
Hellenistic perspective. Without going into detail here, I
would posit that the Gospels were generally identified
with other literary works of the times which fit in the
category of biography or memoir. However, the Gospels
were uniquely different from other literature in that they
were written to support the Christian faith and propagate
it. Thus, they were just as much Christian propaganda as
they were biography.

In the early period (100--300 A.D.), we see various
scribes with a plethora of horizons, responding to the text
in individual ways. In my opinion, some of the variety can
be attributed to each scribe's attitude about the
literariness of the text. Hypothetically, Alexandrian scribes
would apply greater acumen to the copying of a literary
work if it was perceived as such. But this wasn't
always so because Christian scribes interacted
subjectively with a text that was more or less fluid. They
were prone to insert their own interpolations or make
other adjustments in the text with a view to conforming the
content of the Gospels with their own theological
expectations. Hence, the early period displayed the
greatest variety of reading responses to each of the
Gospels, as evidenced in the creation of multiple variant
readings. As the four Gospels became more and more
consolidated into one document and were simultaneously
canonized, they became familiar works--the common
ecclesiastical text. As such, a different horizon of
expectations was imposed on them, which mandated
more control of scribal freedom.

The Effect of Reader-Response Theory and Criticism on Biblical Studies

Although few Bible scholars have attempted to implement the literary theories of Iser and Jauss (more on this below), some have adapted the work of American literary theorists, such as Holland, Bleich, and Fish to reader-response criticism of the Bible.[1] Norman Holland (1980:70-100) argues that reader-response involves a merger between author and reader as the latter mingles his or her basic self with the text. David Bleich (1980:134-163) posits the view that the response unites the reader with the text in a subjective act; it is a process wherein the whole community of interpreters produce meaning via a dialogue concerning the text. Stanley Fish (1980a:177) defines meaning ontologically. Understanding comes from an ontological union between reader and text as the text disappears and then creates meaning. Formal features such as style and authorial intent penetrate the reader's awareness, leading to Fish' thesis "that the form of the reader's experience, formal units, and the structure of intention are one, that they come into view simultaneously, and that therefore the questions of priority and independence do not arise."

Fish's major question is how one begins. If the text has no existence apart from interpretation, what does one interpret? Fish answers the dilemma by pointing to the prior existence of "interpretive strategies" that stem from the community of interpreters. The reading strategy, developed within an interpretive community, unites with the text and produces meaning. For Fish (1980b:11-14), the reading strategy is the sole component in the

production of meaning. The text supplies only potential
meanings, and these are then actualized by the readers,
who select those meanings that correspond with their
reading strategies. It is not a text's intention but the
reader's performing acts that produce meaning.
According to Fish, the text as a formal entity does not exist
apart from the reader's interpretive act.

Such views have had both a negative and positive
reception from Bible scholars. The negative response has
come from scholars who oppose the view held by many
literary critics that the text as an entity is completely
independent from the author as soon as it is written down
and therefore cannot be restricted to the original author or
readers. The Bible scholars who hold to a traditional,
grammatical-historical approach to exegesis are the ones
most opposed to reader-response criticism. They have
often used the writings of E. D. Hirsch to argue that the
author, not the reader, is the determiner of the meaning of
the text. Hirsch (1967:5-6) says, "To banish the original
author as the determiner of meaning is to reject the only
compelling normative principle that could lend validity to
an interpretation." He goes on to say, "For if the meaning
of the text is not the author's, then no interpretation can
possibly correspond to the meaning of the text, since the
text can have no determinate or determinable meaning."
Thus, according to Hirsch, it is the task of the reader to try
to recover authorial intention.

Other Bible scholars find a mediating position between
that of Fish's ("the reader determines all meaning") and
Hirsch's ("the author determines meaning") by
recognizing that reader-response theory helps us
understand how modern readers give meaning to an
ancient text. They would generally concur with the
perception of McKnight (1988:107) who writes, "a literary

approach to the Bible in the context of contemporary literary study, . . . allows--even requires--a view of the text as both an ancient document with original meaning and a living message with contemporary significance." McKnight thereby considers there to have been a continuity between the message for the original readers and for modern readers. However, he does not think there is necessarily any link between those meanings; the modern reader can appropriate any meaning he or she imagines, apart from considerations of historical or original meaning.

In this light, it would seem that many modern Bible scholars would be more comfortable with Iser's paradigm than with Holland's, Bleich's, and Fish's, because the latter place more emphasis on the reader's role in determining meaning than in the notion that the text guides the reader in determining meaning. Only a few Bible scholars have attempted to adapt Iser's theory of reader-reception to literary studies. One such scholar is Culpepper, who claims to have used Iser's model of the implied reader, but then adjusts this model to what Culpepper calls the "intended readers." The intended readers are nearly one and the same with the authorial audience--the audience for whom the author thinks he was writing. The author, as he writes his text, cannot help but have certain assumptions about what his readers will and won't know, understand, believe, or expect.

Culpepper was able to sketch the general character of John's intended readers by what information (or lack thereof) the author supplied in the narrative concerning characters, events, language, cultural practices, and so forth. According to Culpepper's study (1983:206-223), John's intended readers are expected to already know most of the characters in the book (with the exception of

the beloved disciple, Lazarus, Nicodemus, Caiaphas, and Annas). The readers should know the general regions where the stories take place but are unfamiliar with the specific locations--for which the author supplies some details. Thus, the readers are not from Palestine. As would be expected, the readers knew Greek but not Hebrew or Aramaic. The author assumed that his readers used a Roman (not a Jewish) system of keeping time, and that the readers had little knowledge of Jewish festivals and rituals. However, the readers were expected to know the Old Testament Scriptures and to understand messianic expectations. On the whole, it seems that the readers were not Jewish but Hellenistic Christians who already would have been familiar with many parts of the gospel story.

According to Stanley Porter (1990:282), Culpepper's work "goes the farthest in appreciating the theoretical stance of reader-response criticism toward the implied reader." But I would argue that Culpepper did not really appropriate Iser's paradigm of the implied reader. Iser is not interested with the identity that the reader is required to assume in reading the narrative. Iser is interested in observing what the narrative text makes its actual readers do. Culpepper's study doesn't deal with textual blanks or gap-filling. Thus, there is little my study can glean from his efforts.

In conclusion, I would have to agree with Porter (1990:278), who lamentingly wrote, "reader-response criticism has failed to excite the imagination of most Biblical scholars. If it has caught their attention it is often only to disparage it for failing to fulfill their expectations for an interpretative strategy." Porter, with great insight, provides several reasons for this lack of effect. The primary cause is that many Bible scholars are not certain

what reader-response criticism is. The term "reader-response criticism" is often used quite loosely to cover all of the post-formalist interpretive models. Furthermore, many Bible scholars consider reader-response criticism to deal only with modern readers' reception of the text. This troubles most Bible scholars, who are not willing to abandon historical literary research. They "feel compelled to justify in some form the historicity of the biblical documents and are unwilling to free themselves of historical concerns" (Porter 1990:283).

Consequently, most biblical studies of the reader-response type seek to blend reader-response with historical-critical perspectives and study how "the author of the gospel has undertaken to direct and control the reader's experience and reading" (Fowler 1981:149). And this is where Jauss' theory of diachronically-changing horizons could be helpful in historical-critical studies of ancient Gospel texts and ancient Gospel readers.

Studies have been done on the various historical-sociological components that made up the various reading communities of each of the Gospels but few--if any--studies have been done that focus on the components that determined the Gospels' changing interpretive horizons from one era to the next. Concerning this prospect, Jeffrey Staley (1988:25) said,

> Many students of the New Testament have sought to delineate the history of the oral and reading communities which preserved, transformed, and transmitted the traditions of Jesus in the Fourth Gospel. Yet few if any studies have been undertaken which seek to continue this type of investigation on down through the history of the church. In this latter regard, the reception theories of Hans Robert Jauss could open up interesting new areas of research for historians of the church, and might make contemporary students of biblical literature more sensitive to the conventions implicit in their own

Interpretive communities.

Whereas most studies focus on the phenomenon that
shaped each Gospel in its final redacted, published form,
my task is to show how scribes made further changes in
the written text as they transmitted it because each scribe
acted (in greater or lesser degree) as an interpreter. Since
the most significant changes occured during the first two
hundred years of textual transmission, I will be exploring
the work of the earliest Christian scribes in Egypt in an
effort to ascertain what factors effected their reception of
the text. In the next chapter I will present how the reading-
reception theories of Iser and Jauss can be adapted to
scribal reception of the Gospels.

Chapter Two

Application of the Theoretical Paradigm

There are two aspects of reader-reception criticism that can be applied to New Testament textual criticism. The first pertains to Jauss' position that critics can analyze the horizon of expectations in reader reception of a particular concrete artefact. The second pertains to a modified version of Iser's notion of blank-filling, as applied to scribal reception and interpolation. To my knowledge, these aspects of literary theory have not been used in New Testament textual criticism. I would argue that they could be used in order to demonstrate how various textual variants arose. The textual variants that I will analyze in this thesis are from manuscripts presumed to have been produced in Egypt (see chpt. 3). I have limited my study to Egypt because we can identify many manuscripts that are most likely indigenous to Egypt; this is not possible for other regions, where manuscripts have not survived that are any earlier than the fourth century.

Furthermore, my study will be limited to the Gospels. The other sections of the New Testament--Acts, the Epistles, and Revelation--have their own unique textual histories. My analysis will not encompass these sections of the New Testament. And I will be examining actual Greek manuscripts, not the evidence of the early versions or the church fathers, both of which are important but do not fall within the scope of this study because the versions are themselves interpretive translations (by the very nature of translation work) and patristic citations present multiple difficulties--not the least of which is the fact that the extant copies of the fathers' writings could be textually corrupt themselves (see Metzger 1968:86-92).

The Applicaton of Jauss' Theory: The Horizon of
Expectation in Scribal Reception and Textual
Transmission

A promiment New Testament textual critic and church
historian, Kurt Aland, has stressed the need for textual
critics to understand the history of the early church (and
the formation of the New Testament canon) in order to
clearly understand the early history of New Testament
textual transmission. He said, "New Testament textual
criticism has traditionally neglected the findings of early
Church history, but only to its own injury, because the
transmission of the New Testament text is certainly an
integral part of that history" (1988:49). Furthermore, New
Testament textual critics have often studied New
Testament documents detached from their historical
milieu and from the scribes who produced them. Their
New Testament documents are faceless, and yet many
manuscripts display a personalized reading of the text.
New Testament textual criticism could benefit from a fresh
approach based on a reader-reception theory that
accounts for the scribe's reception of the text in the
process of reading it.

Literary historiography based on the theory of the
horizon of expectations and the subsequent fusion of
horizons provides the means for describing the real
effects and reactions to a work of literature as reflected in
actual documents. Of course, literary critics conceive of
those documents as being writings about the literary text
(whether in the form of comments, reviews, or letters), yet
for ancient works it is possible to consider the
manuscripts themselves as providing documented
reaction to the original literary work through the variant

readings. This is especially true of the earliest manuscripts, where we can often see how scribes reacted to an early form of the text--as opposed to later manuscripts, where we usually see how scribes reacted to later copies. This does not automatically mean, however, that all textual variants were made in the second century; several variants arose in later centuries--especially Gospel harmonizations. But it is true that most other textual variants arose in the earliest period of textual transmission, because it is a period characterized as exhibiting individual scribal liberty.

The chief reason given to explain this freedom is that the books of the New Testament were not necessarily viewed as inspired "Scripture" on the same level as the Old Testament writings. The Alands (1988:290) said that second-century Christian scribes felt they had a direct relationship with God and therefore "regarded themselves as possessing inspiration equal to that of the New Testament writings which they read in the church meetings." The Alands (1988:69) declare that the New Testament text was a "living" text that developed freely until the beginning of the fourth century, unlike the Hebrew text that was subject to strict controls. The Alands affirm that the New Testament scribes felt free to make changes in the text, "improving it by their own standards of correctness, whether grammatically, stylistically, or more substantively." According to the Alands, this freedom was exhibited during "the early period, when the text had not yet attained canonical status, especially in the earliest period when Christians considered themselves filled with the Spirit."

During the early period manuscripts were produced with varying degrees of accuracy. Origen (In Matthew 15, 14) is often quoted as the one who exemplified this

diversity when he said,

> Nowadays, as is evident, there is a great diversity
> between the various manuscripts, either through the
> negligence of certain copyists, or the perverse
> audacity shown by some in correcting the text, or
> through the fault of those who, playing the part of
> correctors, lengthen or shorten it as they please.

This quote, cited so often in books about New Testament
textual criticism, has to be understood in its context.
Origen was making a complaint about the diversity of
manuscripts in the Synoptic Gospels concerning a
disharmony of wording between Matthew 19:19 (the verse
he was commenting on) and Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20.
Because Mark and Luke do not have the statement "love
your neighbor as yourself," while Matthew does, Origen
blamed the discrepancy on textual corruption. However,
among all the extant manuscripts there is no evidence of
textual corruption in any of these passages. Origen,
playing the part of a harmonist, was trying to blame scribal
tampering for the lack of harmony among the Gospels.

Celsus, a great critic of Christianity, condemned
Christians for just the opposite reason--harmonizing the
Gospels to avoid criticism from secular writers. In A.D.
178, Celsus (Contra Celsum 132.2.27) said,

> Some of the believers . . . have changed the original
> text of the Gospels three or four times or even more,
> with the intention of thus being able to destroy the
> arguments of their critics.

This quote, which Origen does not deny, shows that some
scribes were harmonizing the Gospels to make them free
from the criticism that the four writings had contradictory
accounts. Indeed, the date of this statement reveals that
such changes were occuring in the second century. But
note that Celsus says that only "some" believers were

doing this. Others were faithfully copying the words of each Gospel text. We have several examples of such fidelity. One such example, is the second-century manuscript, P75.

This manuscipt is eminently recognized as an extremely accurate copy. Concerning the scribe who made P75, Colwell (1965:121) said, "his impulse to improve style is for the most part defeated by the obligation to make an exact copy." Of course, P75 is not flawless. The scribe had to make several corrections (116 in Luke and John), but there was no attempt "to revise the text by a second exemplar, and indeed no systematic correction at all" (Royse 1981:538-539). The scribe of P75 shows a clear tendency to make grammatical and stylistic improvements in keeping with the Alexandrian scriptoral tradition, and the scribe had a tendency to shorten his text, particularly by dropping pronouns. However, his omissions of text hardly ever extended beyond a word or two--probably because he copied letter by letter and syllable by syllable. Furthermore, there are hardly any interpolations that he inserted into the text drawn from other Gospels. When the scribe harmonized, it was usually a harmonization to the immediate context (Royse 1981:548-550). Yet P75 is exceptional. There are only a few other early Gospel manuscripts that display the same kind of textual fidelity. Most of the early manuscripts exhibit scribal freedom to one degree or another--and, as we will see later, even the scribe of P75 exercised some freedom in interacting with the text.

What appears to have happened with the copying of the Gospel texts in the early period in Egypt has been poignantly characterized by Züntz (1953:280-282). He observed that when a book was immensely popular (such as Homer's Iliad and Odyssey, or Plato's writings), it was

copied with wild enthusiasm by novice and scholar alike.
But when grammarians and scribes got hold of it, they
rid it of textual corruption. In the process, however, they
may have obliterated some authentic readings, but not
many.

So in the earliest period of the church in Egypt, books
of the New Testament were copied with wild enthusiasm
by the uneducated and educated alike. The uneducated
often produced poor copies; the educated good copies.
When the Alexandrian scribes took control, they used
many good copies to make excellent copies. This
Alexandrian type-text was then transmitted century after
century in Egypt and beyond. The Alexandrian text was
modeled after excellent second-century manuscripts such
as $\mathfrak{P}$75, which was virtually reproduced in the fourth-
century manuscript, B. But other manuscripts were being
produced, even in Egypt during the same centuries,
which did not have the same kind of textual acumen.

According to the evidence we now have, the early
period of textual transmission displayed both freedom
and fidelity. This range of diversity is no better
characterized than in the Alands' classification of the New
Testament papyri (1988:93-95). The Alands have placed
the New Testament papyri in four categories, which they
call "normal," "free," "strict," and "at least normal."[1] They
say the "normal" text is found in manuscripts in which the
scribes transmitted the exemplar with a limited amount of
variation characteristic of the New Testament textual
tradition. The "normal" text is found in manuscripts such
as $\mathfrak{P}$4, $\mathfrak{P}$5, $\mathfrak{P}$12, $\mathfrak{P}$16, $\mathfrak{P}$18, $\mathfrak{P}$20, $\mathfrak{P}$28, $\mathfrak{P}$52, $\mathfrak{P}$66, $\mathfrak{P}$87. The
"strict" text is found in those manuscripts in which the
scribes reproduced the text of an exemplar with greater
fidelity than in the "normal" text--although still with certain
characteristic liberties. In short, the "strict" text exhibits far

less variation than the "normal" text. The "strict" text is found in manuscripts like P1, P23, P27, P35, P39, P64/67, P65, P70, and P75. Other papyri, however, display a very "free" rendition of the text--that is, they are characterized as having a greater degree of variation than the "normal" text. The "free" text is found in manuscripts like P9, P13, P37, P40, P45, P46, P69, and P78. The fourth category, called "at least normal," includes those manuscripts that are "normal" but also display a distinct tendency toward a "strict" text. The "at least normal" papyri are P15, P22, P30, P32, P72, and P77.

The diversity of readings in the early period provides the material for studying scribal reception of the text. Hypothetically, the "free" manuscripts will give the most variations for study, whereas the "strict" manuscripts will be more limited. However, all manuscripts should display a certain number of variant readings that reveal a scribe's individual reading of the text. These individual readings enable us to study his reading reception. In this thesis I will examine, in several papyri, the single variant units-- that is, variants which appear in only one Greek manuscript. The advantage to studying single variants is that these enable the scholar to look at readings that were probably created by the scribe himself, readings that are not carryovers from an examplar or a previous copy. A study of the singular variants will greatly help in analyzing individual scribal reception as he confronted textual indeterminacy.

The Application of Jauss' Theory of Synchrony to Textual Criticism of the Gospels

Jauss (1982c:37) proclaimed that "the historicity of literature comes to light at the intersections of diachrony

and synchrony." Indeed, as a diachronic analysis
enlightens the evolution of the New Testament text, so
does a synchronic analysis. A synchronic analysis helps
us understand what literary works (or oral traditions) the
first readers of a text knew which were like the text being
analyzed (in this case the Gospels), and this knowledge
aids our understanding of their horizon of expectations.
Jauss (1982c:28) underscores the necessity of this
method of study:

> The method of historical reception is indispensable
> for the understanding of literature from the distant
> past. When the author of the work is unknown, his
> intent undeclared, and his relationship to sources and
> models only indirectly accesible, the philological
> question of how the text is "properly"--that is, "from its
> intention and time"--to be understood can best be
> answered if one foregrounds it against those works
> that the author explictly or implicitly presupposed his
> contemporary audience to know.

Opinions differ about whether or not the Gospel was a
novel "literary" form in the first century. For example,
Ryken (1974:273) argues,

> The uniqueness of the form known as the gospel
> ("good news") is obvious at once when we reflect that
> the form has no real parallel outside of the New
> Testament writings. Furthermore, none of the usual
> literary categories does justice to the gospels,
> although of course they have affinities to a number of
> conventional forms.

Amos Wilder (1964:26) claims that the "Gospel was a
'speech-event,' the occasion for a new utterance and new
forms of utterance, and eventually new kinds of writing."
Wilder claims that the Gospels cannot be compared to
any kind of concurrent Jewish or Hellenistic literature. The
Gospels were the product of the spirit of early Christianity
and the utterances of Jesus Christ himself. Eric Auerbach

was of the same sentiment. After comparing the Gospels with other Hellenistic literature, he considered several aspects of the Gospels to be completely unlike the literature of the times. For example, after studying the scene in Mark that relates Peter's denial, Auerbach (1953:45) said,

> A scene like Peter's denial fits into no antique genre. It is too serious for comedy, too contemporary and everyday for tragedy, politically too insignificant for history--and the form which was given it is one of such immediacy that its like does not exist in the literature of antiquity.

In the final analysis, Auerbach considered the Gospels to be unpretentious and mimetic; it was the product of the followers of Jesus, who exemplified his concern for bringing the good news to common folk in ways they could understand and readily appreciate.

Many other literary critics of the Bible, disagreeing with the views of scholars like Ryken, Wilder, and Auerbach, contend that the formal literary features of the Gospels indicate that they were literary works from their inception. The four Gospels were very likely recognizable as fitting what was known as biography. Hellenistic readers, familiar with biographies of great men, would have likely recognized that the Gospels assumed a similar form.

J. A. T. Robinson (1985:92) posited that "Xenophon's Memorabilia and Plato's Dialogues correspond, one can say very broadly, to the approaches respectively of the Synoptists and the Fourth Gospel." Other biographies appeared in the Greco-Roman world that were more popular in nature, such as the Life of Aesop, the Life of Homer, the Jewish Lives of the Prophets, and the life of Secundus the Silent Philosopher. The four Gospels could be included in this category of biography on the basis of

structure and style. The Gospels and these popular lives
"exhibit a thoroughly chronological organization and avoid
topical exposition." Furthermore the Gospels "reflect the
popular literary culture of the lower classes. The linguistic
and rhetorical style and standards of educated authors
and orators of antiquity were attenuated and imitated in
popular literature" (Aune 1987:63-64).

Biography and Memoir

Many Hellenistic readers may have perceived the
Gospels to present a literary form that was quite like other
works of biographical literature. In his monograph, The
New Testament in Its Literary Environment, David Aune
(1987:29) described biography as follows:

> Biography is a specific genre of Greco-Roman
> historical literature with broad generic features.
> Biography may be defined as a discrete prose
> narrative devoted exclusively to the portrayal of the
> whole life of a particular individual perceived as
> historical. It never attained a fixed form but continued
> to develop from ancient to modern times.

Greek biography began in the fifth century B.C. with the
writings of Herodotus. Other works from the fourth century
have survived, such as Isocrates' Evagoras and
Xenophon's, Education of Cyrus, and Agesilaus. From the
first to the fourth centuries biographies have survived,
which were produced by writers such as Plutarch, Plato,
Suetonius, Lucian, and Porphyry. Most of these ancient
biographies display a high stylistic level in the use of
vocabulary, syntax, and complex sentences of the
periodic style. "The formal structure of Greco-Roman
biography consists of a fundamentally chronological
framework provided by a person's life (true of Suetonian

as well as Plutarch's Lives), amplified by anecdotes, maxims, speeches, and documents" (Aune 1987:34). Most of these biographies were didactic in that they presented the subject as a paradigm of virtue; as a result, they were encomia. Plutarch's Lives, written at the end of the first century, became very popular throughout the Greco-Roman world. His Lives are quite like the Gospels in that the general scheme was to give the birth, youth and character, achievements, and circumstances of death, interspersed with frequent ethical reflections and anecdotes. Plutarch never claimed to write history, but to produce edifying biography. Such could be said for the Gospels.

Some educated Christians of the early second century understood the Gospels and the traditions they contained in terms of Hellenistic rhetorical categories. Papias of Hierapolis was a scholarly historian who collected oral and written traditions about Jesus. He described the Gospel of Mark as containing ἀπομνημόνευματα (reminiscences or memoirs) drawn from Peter's sayings (Χρείαι--a term used to describe maxims illustrated by anecdotes) (Eusebius, Church History 3.39.15). Justin Martyr, a Christian philosopher by profession, also used the word ἀπομνημόνευματα to describe the Gospels. Significantly, the word ἀπομνημόνευματα was a recognized literary form. According to Aune (1987:66-67), the ἀπομνημόνευματα are "expanded chreiai, i.e., sayings and/or actions of or about specific individuals, set in narrative framework and transmitted by memory (hence 'reliable')." Justin's description of the Gospels as ἀπομνημόνευματα would place them in the same literary category as Xenophon's Memorabilia (in Greek called ἀπομνημόνευματα).

I would also argue that ἀπομνημόνευματα is the best

literary description for the Gospels. They are not full-
fledged biographies; only Luke comes closest to
presenting a full life-story of Jesus Christ, from birth to
death. But even so, Luke is ultimately more concerned
with presenting what Jesus did and said, than in
producing a biography. In fact, when commenting on his
his own Gospel, Luke told Theophilus, "In the former
book I wrote about all that Jesus began to do and teach,
until the day he was taken up into heaven" (Acts 1:1-2).
The fourth Gospel concludes with the same emphasis:
"Jesus did many other signs in the presence of his
disciples, which are not recorded in this book. But these
are written that you keep believing that Jesus is the Christ,
the Son of God" (John 20:30-31).

The primary importance of the Gospels is that they are
written records of Jesus' speech and actions. Of course,
each Gospel is not just a chronological display of what
Jesus did and said, as if it were some kind of diary. No,
each Gospel is a story with a crafted narrative produced
to be a work of literature. Gamble (1995:101) elaborates:

> It can be seen more clearly today than in the heyday
> of form criticism that the Gospels were written in a
> literary context with literary skills and a literary view to
> readership. . . . Each of these authors [Matthew, Mark,
> Luke, John] was self-consciously engaged in literary
> composition and therefore sensible not only of his
> own compositional techniques and theological aims,
> but also of the prospects for valuation, circulation, and
> use of his work.

Each of the Gospel writers used different literary
techniques to give their portrayal of Jesus Christ. Matthew
used prophetic fulfillment to move his narrative along;
Mark's used high-paced, dramatic action; Luke employed
historical details to frame the narrative; and John
specialized in eye-witness accounts and monologue.

What made these Gospels different from any other ἀπομνημόνευματα was that they were about Jesus Christ, who was stupendously different from all other men--he claimed to be the Son of God come from heaven. And Jesus' message was radically different from other men's. For example, his beatitudes (though similar in form to the Old Testament beatitudes found in the Psalms and Proverbs) promise eschatalogical (not temporal) benefits to those who are meek, pure, and poor. Furthermore, the story of Jesus' life is unique: he came from heaven to be born of a virgin; he proclaimed salvation and eternal life for all who believed in him as the Messiah and Son of God; he was crucified as a criminal; he was raised from the dead and appeared to his disciples; and then he ascended back to heaven. This story would certainly expand the horizon of expectations for those who read one of the Gospels for the first time.

The content of the gospel is what I would call the "story" of the gospel. This term conicides with Genette's histoire. The telling of the story, whether in oral form or written text, is called the "narration," which is equivalent to Genette's term, récit (1980:25-27). The gospel was first presented orally, and then in writing. Thus, the events of the story about Jesus were transformed into a spoken narrative, followed by a written one. When Luke mentioned the written accounts about Jesus' life that were current in the first century, he called them "narratives" (διήγησιν--see Luke 1:1). In the middle of the second century, the word εὐαγγελίον (good news or gospel) began to be used to describe written gospels (Justin, Dialogue with Trypho 10.2; 100.1; Irenaeus, Against Heresies 3.1.1; Clement of Alexandria, Stromateis 1.21). Thus, the written narratives about Jesus' gospel eventually were called Gospels.

The first-century Christians first received an oral presentation of the gospel from the apostles who had been with Jesus (see Acts 2:42) and then written documents to preserve the oral and perpetuate the apostolic tradition (see Luke 1:1-4). After the death of the apostles and those who were their immediate associates, the written text became more important. Second-generation Christians (and later ones) would have probably received the Gospel for the first time via one of the written Gospels. Thus, the written text would have been the medium that initially expanded their horizon of expectations.

One Gospel Creates a Horizon for the Others

Once a Gospel was read by someone, it shaped the horizon of expectations for the reading of the next Gospel; in essence, it formed the horizon by which a scribe read another Gospel, and which prompted a multitude of changes. In other words, the reading (or memorization) of one Gospel created a horizon of expectation for the reading of the next, which prompted scribes to make changes that demonstrate the effect of reading another Gospel. The first Gospel they read or memorized was the standard by which they measured the next. When a second and third and even a fourth Gospel was read, the reader would expect certain stories and particular wording--only to have his horizon challenged by new stories or new wording in the same or similar pericopes he read before in another Gospel. The reader could allow his horizon to be expanded, or, refusing to do so, change the wording of the second gospel he read to make it conform to the first. Such changes could happen--and did happen--almost unconsciously. But others bear the mark

of deliberate recension, because the changed wording is too precisely like the wording of another Gospel to be otherwise.

Thus, for Christian readers it was not the Hellenistic biographies or memoirs that shaped one's horizon as much as it was one Gospel text competing with the others. Because there were four accounts of the same story, there were four competing texts, each of which, when embedded in the mind of a scribe, would create conflict when another Gospel was read. Some early Christians sought to resolve the problem of discrepancies among the Gospels by condensing all four Gospel accounts into one Gospel narrative. The most eminent example of this is Tatian's Diatessaron. In the middle of the second century, Tatian, a Syrian from Mesopotamia, produced a harmony of the Gospels by weaving together the four narratives into one. This is not the same as harmonization of one gospel account to another, wherein each Gospel is left intact but emended to appear like the others. In modern terminology, the Diatessaron is "a cut and paste job," where all four Gospels were used to create one interwoven narrative.

The Diatessaron had a tremendous effect in Syria and in the East. Christians in Syria from the third to the fifth century generally read the Diatessaron as their Gospel text. (Ephraem's commentary in Syriac has been preserved, in part, in a fifth-century manuscript of the Chester Beatty collection, 709.) As late as A.D. 423, Theodoret (a bishop in Syria) found that many copies of the Diatessaron were being used in his diocese. Because Tatian had become heretical later in life and because Theodoret believed his congregations were in danger of being corrupted by Tatian's work, he destroyed all the copies he could find (about 200 of them) and replaced

them with copies of the four separate gospels. "As a result of the zeal of Bishop Theodoret, and doubtless of others like him, no complete copy of Tatian's Diatessaron is extant today" (Metzger 1968:89-90). Only one small fragment discovered from Dura-Europas has been unearthed--namely, 0212.

The Diatessaron was unique because the usual way for scribes to resolve the conflict between the Gospels was to harmonize one Gospel account to another. These changes began in the early centuries of the church and increased with time, as more and more Christians became accustomed to reading all four Gospels. The harmonization grew from individual isolated incidents-- one scribe conforming one verse in one Gospel to another--to far-reaching conformity, such that most manuscripts after the fifth century display full-scale harmonization among the Gospels.

The Application of Reader-Reception Theory to Scribal Reception

Ancient Reading and Modern Reading

From the onset, it should be acknowledged that there are some fundamental differences between ancient reading and modern reading. The first and most important is that ancient readers of Greek had to read scriptio continua (uncial letters with no breaks between words). John 1:1, for example, would be written as follows:

ΕΝΑΡΧΗΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΣΚΑΙΟΛΟΓΟΣΗΝΠΡΟΣΤΟΝΘΝΚΑΙΘΣΗΝΟΛΟΓΟΣ.

This meant that the reading process was unquestionably slower than it is for modern readers who have the

advantage of reading individually printed words. Of course, ancient readers were accustomed to their format, so they could read it more quickly than moderns can. Nonetheless, it made for slower reading.

Second, ancient readers of Greek did not have punctuated texts as we know it. Some manuscripts had no punctuation, and others had some; but rarely was it thoroughgoing or consistent. This forced the reader to make adjustments and readjustments to the syntax and to reformulate meaning accordingly. For example, a person reading John's prologue, could attach the phrase δ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\text{ov}\epsilon\nu$ at the end of John 1:3 with the previous words ($\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\text{to}$ $\text{ov}\delta\epsilon\epsilon\nu$) or the following words ($\epsilon\nu$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ $\zeta\omega\eta$ $\eta\nu$). The meaning is quite different (see comments in chapter five). The same is true for other difficult places in the text: the placement of $\eta\delta\eta$ in John 4:35-36 (at the end of John 4:35? or the beginning of John 4:36?) Joined with the end of 4:35, it gives the rendering "Look on the fields, that they are already white for harvest." Joined with the beginning of 4:36, it gives the rendering, "Look on the fields, that they are white for harvest. He who reaps is already receiving wages."

Third, the primary difference between ancient reading and modern reading is that in ancient times most reading was done out loud, while in modern times most reading is done silently. The oral/aural environment for reading was pervasive in ancient times. This is no better argued than in Achtemeier's (1990:3-27) article, "Omne verbum sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity." Achtemeier demonstrates that writings were made to be read out loud, whether for public reading or for private. In the former, the text would be loudly vocalized, while in the latter it would be quietly vocalized. There were some exceptions to this, as was

48

pointed out by Slusser (1992:449) and Gilliard (1993:689-694), inasmuch as great men such as Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar, as well as others, were observed reading silently. However, there are far more instances in antiquity of reading being done out loud than silently.

In both settings, public and private, the Scriptures were usually read aloud. In ancient times, written material was read aloud--i.e. it was audibly vocalized. People would read to themselves out loud, or have some one else read to them. Wealthy people would often have their slaves read to them while they took baths or traveled. The word was heard. Thus, the phrase "read and hear" had become idiomatic, and the act of reading was considered a healthy exercise (Achtemeier 1990:16). Even when people read by themselves, they read out loud. For example, the Ethiopian eunuch was approached by Philip the evangelist who heard him reading the book of Isaiah out loud (Acts 8:28).

Reading by Christian Scribes

According to Burtchaell (1992:272-338), Christians adopted many of the Jewish synagogal practices in their church meetings. This was only natural because many of the early Christians were Jews. In the early Christian meetings, Christians read the Septuagint (which was very likely the translation work of Alexandrian Jews), as well as various books of the New Testament. In the church meetings, the Scriptures were read aloud to the congregation by the lector or reader. This church practice was modeled after that of the synagogue, wherein the Old Testament Scriptures were read aloud every sabbath by a reader to the congregation. "Public recitation of scripture which was part of Temple worship became the essential

feature of synagogal worship in pre-Christian times and appears in the New Testament as a well-established custom" (Vermes 1970:201). Gamble (1995:151-152) reasoned that the practice of the liturgical reading of Scripture began in the first century and was an established custom of the churches by the early second century. As such, each church community would have had a collection of Old Testament and New Testament books with a number of readers. These readers would have kept various books in their possession because public reading would have required study of the texts in advance.

With respect to the oral reading of Scriptures, early Christian meetings greatly resembled the Jewish synagogue. In church meetings, Christians were encouraged to recite the Scriptures to one another and sing the psalms (1 Cor. 14:26; Eph. 5:18-19; Col. 3:16). Church leaders were exhorted to read the Scriptures out loud to their congregation (see 1 Tim. 4:13). Whereas the Jews would read the Law and then the Prophets, the Christians would read the Prophets (with special emphasis on messianic fulfillment) and the Gospels.

The Gospels had a close connection with early Christian liturgy and worship. Indeed, the preliterary, oral form was used in church meetings. Paul, for example, quotes Jesus' words for the eucharist in providing instructions to the Corinthians about how to celebrate the Lord's Supper properly (1 Cor. 15:23-25; see Luke 22:17-20). After the first century, the written Gospels were regularly read in church meetings. Writing around A.D. 155, Justin Martyr indicated that when all the believers would assemble on the Lord's Day for worship and communion, "the memoirs of the apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read as long as time permits"

(Apology 1.67).

As in the synagogue, so in the church: one person was usually given the task to be the reader. There are allusions and clear references to this "reader" in the New Testament itself. This "reader" is probably referred to in Matthew 24:15 and Mark 13:14 by way of a paranthetical expression: "let the reader understand." (The use of the singular ὁ ἀναγινώσκων points to one reader--the one who read the Gospel to the congregation.) Other passages clearly point to the one who read the Scriptures out loud to an assembly of believers. In 1 Timothy 4:13, Paul urged Timothy to "give attention to the public reading of Scripture." Revelation 1:3 promises a blessing "to the one who reads the prophecy of this book"--speaking specifically of each of the readers who would read aloud the book of Revelation to each of the seven churches addressed in the book.

As with the synagogues, so in the churches, it is possible that the readers were also the scribes. If not, the readers relied upon the work of the scribes to produce the manuscripts for oral reading. These Christian scribes would often have the same training as the sopherim--in reading, copying, translating, and interpreting, or they could have been former sopherim who converted to Christianity. Either way, they would have been among the most educated in the Christian congregations and therefore the most qualified to not only produce written copies of Scripture, but read them and interpret them. Nonetheless, even if they weren't the lectors, they had a significant input in shaping or reshaping a text according to their reception of it. The congregation, for the most part, would be dependent on them for the oral dissemination of Scripture.

The lectors were trained to read the texts in Greek and

to perhaps provide interpretations. In the early days of the church, the reader was simply a member of the church who knew Greek well enough to read it (as well as to write it). In the third century lectors were appointed to this function but not ordained. The Apostolic Tradition (1.12) says, "The reader is appointed by the bishop's handing to him the book, for he does not have hands laid upon him." One such reader was Procopius (martyred in A.D. 303). Eusebius said he had rendered a great service to the church both as reader and as translator from Greek into Aramaic (Martyrs of Palestine 1.1). Other lectors were Pachomius and his companion Theodore, who both read the Scriptures to their fellow monks (see discussion above). After the fourth century, the lector was generally a minor church office. According to the Apostolic Church Order, the reader must also be able to instruct and to narrate. And according to Basil, in the fourth century lectors read from the Law, the Prophets, the Epistles, Acts, and the Gospels (Apostolic Constitutions 8.5.5).

The congregations' reception of the text was filtered through the lector's reception. We have no way of knowing how the congregation received the text, for we have no written documentation of their reception. But we do have a way to understand the lector's reception of the text, if he functioned as the scribe who produced new copies. Any significant variants in these copies would signal the lector's personalized reading and dissemination of a personalized interpretation. And if a lector relied upon a scribe's written text, he would often be relying upon the scribe's "reading" of it. A scribe could imprint his interpretation on the written text without ever changing any words. Because all the early Greek documents were written in scriptora continua, scribes could express their individual "readings" of the text by

using punctuation to designate perceived semantic breaks, paragraph breaks to indicate larger semantic breaks, and various manipulations of <u>nomina sacra</u> (or the resistance thereof) to highlight divine names, special religious words (such as cross and crucify), and distinctive words (such as spirit [versus Spirit] and lord or sir [versus Lord]).2 These options available to the scribe permitted him to fill textual blanks (in the Iserian sense) and thereby create an individualized reading of the text.

Thus I would posit that scribes were not just unimaginative copiers of a text but the shapers of a narrative reflecting their own personalized reception. At the primary level, they gave the text a personalized shape so as to help them read it aloud. Ultimately, most scribes would have been thinking of their audience, who could benefit from their structuring. This structuring of the text was especially important for its oral reading because the books of the New Testament would not have been read in total to the congregation. Rather, in keeping with Jewish tradition, only certain portions were read out loud. Thus, the scribes, who were also usually the readers, invented ways to mark narrative units. Many of the early scribes did this by leaving space between paragraphs or running the new line of each section into the left margin (converse to the modern paragraph notation by indentation).

Scribes could also change the text by adding or deleting words. One common feature in the early papyri was for scribes to shorten the text for the sake of readability. This is clearly evident, for example, in the Johannine manuscripts 𝔓5, 𝔓45, 𝔓66, and 𝔓75. By contrast, the tendency of later scribes was to lengthen the text by adding harmonized material from other Gospels, supplying connectives, and substituting nouns for pronouns. Of course, these same scribes also added to

the text in reponse to perceived textual blanks. Either
way--whether shortening or lenghtening--they creatively
interacted with the text.

Thus, Christian scribes are prime candidates for
studying Iserian and Jaussian conceptions of reader-
reception. Many of them functioned as gap-fillers,
supplying actual words where readers/listeners would
have normally just used their imaginations. And all of them
were the "real" readers that theorists like Jauss require for
actual study. Of course, they were not first-time readers of
a nouveau literature but trained readers of a sacred text;
they were what could be called "second-time" or
"experienced" readers of the text (in the Iserian sense--
see below). For them, there was more at stake than just an
intellectually satisfying reading experience. The text they
read and interpreted was the foundation for faith and
Christian living.

Private reading

Though the majority of Egyptians could not read, the
literacy rate in Greco-Roman Egypt was significant. Many
males, as well as a few females, had been educated to
the extent that they could both read and write. A number
of excavated documents signed with an "X" designate that
there were many illiterates in Egypt who depended upon
scribes, but other documents show that there were many
people trained to read and write for themselves (Bowman
1986:158-160).

Some Christians, of course, could read the Scriptures
for themselves. They were educated and they could afford
copies of the Scriptures; so they also read the Scriptures
in private. Some of the more wealthy Christians had Bibles
copied at their own expense and then gave them to

poorer brothers and sisters. For example, Pamphilus had Bibles copied to keep in stock for distribution to those in need (Jerome, Against Rufinus 1.9). And some of the writings of several early church fathers indicate Christians were encouraged to read the Scriptures in private. For example, Irenaeus encouraged the unrestricted use of Scripture (Against Heresies 5.20.2). Clement of Alexandria exhorted married couples to read the Scriptures together (Paedagogus 2.10.96), promoted personal study of Scripture (Paedagogus 3.12.87), and said that such reading should be done before the chief meal of the day (Stromata 7.7.49). Origen, who believed the Scriptures were accesible to all, spoke frequently of individuals reading Scriptures at home, as well as at church (Homily on Genesis 2.8), and recommended Christians to read the Old Testament Apocrypha, Psalms, Gospels, and Epistles (Homily on Numbers 27.10).

The abundance of papyrus discoveries, of all sorts of written material, in the rural areas of Egypt is a sure indication that several people were both writing and reading, not just the wealthy. However, it was the wealthy who could afford libraries. These were the men who could afford to pay scribes to make books for them. Quite interestingly, we are certain that some such wealthy bibliophiles from Oxyrhynchus had private copies of various books of the New Testament. These are valuable for studying a manuscript that was probably produced by a professional scribe who may not have been a Christian and therefore would have had no vested interest in the message of the text per se.

Grenfell and Hunt went to Oxyrhynchus (now called El-Bahnasa) because they knew that the Christian church had become established in Oxyrhynchus both before and after the Diocletian persecution (c. 303), and it was

supposed that the citizens would be able to afford libraries of literary texts. In the second excavation (1902-1903) they dug two mounds; both "were strewn with literary fragments from libraries of classical and theological writings" (Grenfell and Hunt 1902-1903:6). Among these papyri were a second Logia or the Gospel according to Thomas (P. Oxy. 654), a third-century fragment of Genesis (P. Oxy. 656), and 𝔓13 (P. Oxy. 657) containing a large portion of the book of Hebrews.

Their fifth season at Oxyrhynchus was also extremely fortuitous because they discovered the literary remains of two scholars' libraries. Among the classical works discovered in this basketful of papyri were pieces of unknown classical works: an extensive manuscript of Pindar's Paeans; a history of the fourth century B.C. written by Cratippus, "The Oxyrhynchus Historian" (so called by Grenfell and Hunt); Plato's Symposium, and the Panegyricus of Isocrates (Grenfell and Hunt 1906:10). Near the end of the season they discovered the literary remains of another scholar who was quite interested in the writings of the lyric poets. Among the manuscripts found in this lot were an hexameter hymn to Hermes, a fragment of a lost comedy by Menander, fragments of Sophocles' Antigone, Euripides' Hecuba, and the Argonautica of Appolonius Rhodius. Among the classical works of both libraries were found several New Testament fragments (Grenfell and Hunt 1906:12).

According to what Grenfell and Hunt wrote in the forewords to volumes 5-13 of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri concerning the provenance of the manuscripts published in these volumes, it can be ascertained that the New Testament fragments 𝔓15/𝔓16, 𝔓28, 𝔓29, and 𝔓30 came from the first library, and that 𝔓17, 𝔓18, 𝔓20, 𝔓21, 𝔓22, 𝔓23, 𝔓24, and 𝔓27 came from the second library. The presence

of these fragments (each representing a full New
Testament book) among classical works suggests that the
scholars were Christians who appreciated the Bible and
Greek literature. Such scholars in Oxyrhynchus usually
obtained their works from the Alexandrian scriptorium or
Oxyrhynchus scriptorium. It is not unlikely that some of the
New Testament portions were produced by professional
scribes.

Turner (1956:141-146) was able to identify ten specific
scribes in Oxyrhynchus who worked on making copies of
literary texts in the second century. It is possible that
some Christian manuscripts were also produced by these
scribes or in the same scriptorium--or, even in a separate
scriptorium serving the church in Oxyrhynchus. It appears
that some of the same scribes worked on various
religious documents. The same scribe produced $P20$ and
$P27$; another scribe, $P22$ and P. Oxy. 654 (the Gospel
according to Thomas); another scribe, $P90$ and P. Oxy.
656 (Genesis); and yet another scribe, $P17$ and P. Oxy.
850 (the Acts of John).

Fortunately, the Oxyrhynchus manuscripts have some
specific historical character because we know the city in
which they were discovered and (for some of the papyri)
the actual library collection in which they were found.
Thus, it is possible to ascertain the sitz im leben (so to
speak) of these manuscripts. Of the early, Johannine
manuscripts it can be said that $P5$ came from the first find
in 1897; $P22$ came from the second literary find of 1906
and was copied by the same scribe who produced $P27$;
$P28$ came from the first literary find of 1906; $P39$ came from
a later find; and $P90$ was produced by the same scribe
who made P. Oxy. 656 (Genesis), which was part of the
literary finds of 1903. Thus, we know that $P22$ and $P28$
came from scholars' libraries and that $P39$ (written in large

beautiful uncials) was used for church reading.

It would be interesting to determine any differences between those manuscripts that were made for public reading and those that were copied for personal use. One significant difference might be the size of print (larger for eccesiastical oration), as well as the presence or absense of lectoral marks. These are usually slash marks--often inserted by a later hand--to designate stichoi or a kind of versification. For example, these slash marks are present in the books of Romans and Hebrews in 𝔓46 and in chapter 13 of John in 𝔓66. These are telltale signs that such manuscripts were read out loud in church. All other markings--whether punctuation, paragraphing, or accents (usually only rough breathing marks)--could have been made for the sake of public reading or private reading inasmuch as the purpose for making the marks would have been the same: to help the receiver of the text (whether single or plural) understand it.

Scribes as Readers

So far, I have been speaking about scribes as if they were readers just like any other readers. But it should be noted that scribal reception of a Gospel text is not exactly the same as a normal reader's reception of a literary text because the former had the task of copying a text, while the latter had the leisure to enjoy an aesthetic appropriation of a text. The scribes were often the scholars of the day; as they copied texts, they could take the time to study them in minute detail. Thus, their sensitivity to a textual blank was often more acute than other readers. For example, the presence or absense of a definite article attached to one of the divine names (such as God, Christ, or Spirit)--while not important to most

casual readers--would be important to scholary readers
for exegetical reasons. Of course, the rote task of copying
a text word by word or letter by letter could keep any
scribe so occupied with the work at hand that he could
lose track of what he was reading in the process. But it is
safe to assume that many scribes became engaged in the
concretization process--if not during the whole copying
process, at least for part of it.

     We know that ancient readers had to become
somewhat involved with the text because they read it out
loud as they copied it. Although copying can take place
without any concretization, oral reading usually aids
comprehension and actively involves the reader in the
concretization of the text. In ancient times writing almost
always involved vocalization of the text. A written
document was first produced by an author who usually
dictated the material to an amanuensis. The author would
then read the text and make editorial adjustments. If the
author wrote the document himself, it was also vocalized
by the author himself. According to Achtemeier (1990:15),

> the oral environment was so pervasive that <u>no</u> writing
> occured that was not vocalized. That is obvious in the
> case of dictation, but it was also true in the case of
> writing in one's own hand. Even in that endeavor, the
> words were simultaneously spoken as they were
> committed to writing, whether one wrote one's own
> words or copied those of another.

Thus, the original writers spoke as they wrote, as did
those who made manuscript copies of the original work
and/or successive exemplars.

     Metzger (1968:16) basically understood this
vocalization process when he presented the four
fundamental operations that take place in the act of
making a manuscript copy:

1. the reading to oneself (in antiquity no doubt
reading half-aloud) of a line or a clause of the text to
be copied
2. the retaining of this material in one's memory
3. the dictating of this material to oneself (either
silently or half-aloud)
4. the movement of the hand in executing the copy.

There are two important factors to note in this depiction of
scribal transcription. First, it must be realized that scribes
could not help but read in semantic chunks (a line or a
clause), even though they--by necessity--had to copy the
text word for word or even letter for letter. Thus, these two
processes would sometimes conflict with one another. As
a result, the semantic unit was not always reduplicated
with exact verbal equivalence because some scribes
would copy the sense, not the exact words. Second, it is
important to note that a scribe usually vocalized the text
twice--once in reading it and then when writing it.

Although these four steps would eventually become
automatic with the scribe, there was enough opportunity
for the cognition of the scribe to interfere with the
"automaticness" of the copying process because the
entire process involves a dynamic (versus automatic)
interaction between text and reader, reader and text. A
scribe would have a difficult time both reading and
copying a text at the same time because his tendency
would be to read ahead of himself (on a chunk by chunk
basis), when his task called for word by word copying.
This could often lead to faulty processing that produced
all kinds of transcriptional errors, the most common being
parablepsis--the skipping over of an entire semantic unit.
The scribe's eyes would shift to the same word he had
just finished copying on one line to two or three lines later
to the same word, where he would begin again. The

resultant haplography would create an omission, often left unfixed if the scribe (or corrector) did not reread the portion.3

The other difficulty scribes faced was that in the reading process decoding also proceeds in chunks rather than in units of single words, yet the scribe was obligated to copy single words. Some scribes were able to maintain control as they worked; others allowed themselves freedom; and still others were frustrated by the conflict that came from trying to perform their duty as a copyist and their desire to interact with the text as a reader. This is illustrated time and again by the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$66 (see chapter five).

Sometimes scribes' minds would wander or their previous reading of an earlier portion in the book would be superimposed on their present reading, thereby leading to faulty copying. Again, this happened to the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$66 when he was copying John 5:28. The passage reads, "an hour is coming when all who are in the graves will hear his voice." For a moment the scribe's mind wandered and he wrote "an hour is coming when all who are in the wilderness will hear his voice." Something in the phrase about "hearing his voice" must have made the scribe think of an earlier verse (1:23), where John the Baptist spoke of himself as "a voice crying in the wilderness." As such, the scribe projected his previous reading on his present reading and then realized that he made a mistake in the transciption process. So he immediately corrected τῇ ἐρήμῳ (the wilderness) to τοῖς μνημείοις (the graves).

Textual critics have frequently pointed out that scribes were prone to harmonize readings to the immediate context. Some of these changes can be as simple as changes in verb tense carried over from previous verses.

Others are more complex, as in John 8:57. Here the text says Πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὔπω ἔχεις καὶ 'Αβραὰμ ἑώρακας; (You are not yet fifty years old, and you have seen Abraham?)-- according to $\mathfrak{P}66$ $\aleph^C$ A B C D L W f^{1,13}. But a variant reading is Πεντήκοντα ἔτη οὔπω ἔχεις καὶ 'Αβραὰμ ἑώρακεν σε ;(You are not yet fifty years old, and Abraham has seen you?--according to $\mathfrak{P}75$ $\aleph^*$ 0124. Typically, commentators say that the variant reading appears to be an assimilation to the preceding verse in which Jesus indicated that Abraham rejoiced to see his day (Metzger 1971:226-227). It is argued that Jesus had not claimed to be a contemporary with Abraham or that he had seen Abraham; he had said that Abraham had seen his day. As such, Abraham had prophetic foresight about the coming of the Messiah.

Such changes are often labeled as "scribal assimilation" by textual critics, who view the change as if it were a deliberate editoralization. Although this could be true, it is just as likely that the assimilation occured unintentionally during the act of reading. Assimilation is often a phenomenon generated by one's own reading of the text; it is not a calculated emendation. The scribe, functioning as a reader, simply carries over previously concretized lexical information and superimposes this reception onto the next segment of written information and therefore fails to appropriate the new information correctly.

The dynamics of the reading process allows for a

personalized interaction between the reader and the text. This kind of dynamic interaction is similar to what Iser (1978:107) perceived in the reading act:

> Textual structures and structured acts of comprehension are therefore the two poles in the act of communication, whose success will depend on the degree to which the text establishes itself as a correlative in the reader's consciousness. This 'transfer' of text to reader is often regarded as being brought about solely by the text. Any successful transfer however--though initiated by the text--depends on the extent to which this text can activate the individual reader's faculties of perceiving and processing . . . . Reading is not a direct 'internalization,' because it is not a one way process, and our concern will be to find means of describing the reading process as a dynamic interaction between the text and reader.

Iser (1978:108) then explains that the linguistic signs and structures of the text instigate the comprehension but do not control it. A New Testament scribe (as with any scribe), ideally speaking, should have been completely controled by the text in the reading process so that he could produce an exact copy of the exemplar. However, the evidence of the extant manuscripts shows that the scribes were engaged in the creative act of reading and were not completely controled by the linguistic signs and structures of the text. Scribes became active, creative readers and interpreters of the text they were copying. This freedom, rather than being looked upon as reckless disregard for the integrity of the original text, should be viewed as normal processing.

The more a scribe subjectively interacted with a text, the greater the probability that the transcription would differ from the exemplar. The changes created therein could have happened for a number of reasons: (1) the scribe corrected a text he knew or thought was faulty, (2)

he harmonized the text to another written or oral tradition,
(3) he restructured and/or reworded a passage to make it
more expressive of what he thought the original writer was
trying to say, or (4) he changed the text for theological
reasons. Most importantly, the text itself could have
prompted some kind of gap-filling. Most scribes would
not have considered that they were tampering with the
text but "re-presenting" the text as an improved
expression of the original work. These improvements then
became accumulative throughout the centuries of textual
transmission, each scribe improving on the work of the
previous ones and/or correcting obvious textual
accretions or omissions.

Finally, it must be noted that New Testament scribes
differed from normal readers in the sense that they usually
were copying a text they already knew. In most reading
situations, the reader is reading the text for the first time,
chunk by chunk. Thus, such readers never see the whole
text at any given time. Commenting on this, Iser (1978:108)
said, "In our attempt to describe the intersubjecive
structure of the process through which a text is transferred
and translated, our first problem is that the whole text can
never be perceived at any time." However, this applies
only to first-time readers of literary texts. Most New
Testament scribes had already read the text they were
copying--and if it was one of the four Gospels, the other
three. As such, these scribes, exercising their knowledge
of the narrative and/or of other Gospels, would change
the wording to make it conform with later information or to
harmonize it with another Gospel. These are the kind of
readers that Iser (1989:10) would identify as those who,
having read the text more than once, had considerable
knowledge of the text:

On a second reading, one has considerable more
knowledge of the text, especially if the first reading
took place only a short time ago. This additional
information will affect and condition the meaning-
projection, so that now the gaps between the
different segments as well as the spectrum of their
possible connections can be applied in a different,
or perhaps more intensive, way. The increased
information that now overshadows the text provides
possibilities of combination which were obscured
in the first reading. Familiar occurences now tend
to appear in a new light and seem to be at times
corrected, at times enriched. But for all that,
nothing is formulated in the text itself; rather, the
reader himself produces these innovative readings.

Of course, scribes did not just think of these innovative
readings, they actually inserted them into the text and
thereby transformed the written text. These singular
interpolations will be the object of my study.

Application to the Study of Textual Variants

In analyzing how scribes dealt with textual indeterminacy,
I will apply a modified version of Ingarden's gap-filling
and Iser's blank-filling.4 Ingarden (1973a:50) observed
that "each object, person, event, etc., portrayed in the
literary work of art contains a great number of places of
indeterminacy, especially the descriptions of what
happens to people and things." Often, writers leave out
biographical information about a particular character, or
they allow great stretches of time to go by without saying
what a person did or said. The same is true about certain
places or events that are not described by the writer. The
reader, therefore, must use his own imagination to fill out
the various places of indeterminacy. The scribe, on
occasion, did this fill-in with a gloss. This corresponds
with Ingarden's (1973b:331-342) notion that a literary work

contains gaps or "spots of indeterminacy" which demand filling through concretization. Iser would urge that the text itself would give the reader the directive to make this blank-filling. These notions help textual critics understand why many glosses are borrowed from the immediate context. But if there was nothing in the immediate context to draw from, scribes often drew from other sources or from their own imaginations to fill in a textual blank.

Thus, in my study I will focus on three kinds of scribal blank-filling. The first kind of blank-filling has to do with those blanks that are anticipated or prompted by the text. I call these "contextual" fillers. These blanks arise when (1) a character's previous life is left undescribed, (2) historical and geographical information is incomplete, (3) the wording is incomplete, terse, or anacoluthic, and (4) promises, prophecies, or expectations prompted by the text are left unfulfilled in the written narrative. All these need to be filled in by the reader.

The last point is nowhere better illustrated than in the ending to the Gospel of Mark. According to the earliest manuscripts (א B), the Gospel of Mark abruptly ends with verse 8: "So they went out and fled from the tomb, seized with terror and amazement; and they said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid." Mark's Gospel may have purposely ended here or an original longer ending may have been lost. Either way, many ancient readers were baffled by this abrupt conclusion, probably because they, having read the other Gospels, had a different horizon of expectation for Mark. Why conclude with merely an announcement of Jesus' resurrection and a description of the women's fear and bewilderment? In the Gospel of Mark, a pattern is set in which everyone of Jesus' predictions is actually fulfilled in narrative form. Thus, since Jesus announced that he would see his disciples in

Galilee, the narrative should have depicted an actual appearance of the risen Christ to his disciples in Galilee. With this expectation, several ancient scribes created various extended endings for Mark's Gospel--and five different endings are extant.5 These are probably the product of scribes being prompted by both the text and their horizon of expectation to provide a satisfying conclusion to the Gospel.

The second kind of blank-filling has to do with interpolations that were prompted by remote parallel passages. This occured quite frequently in the transmission of the four Gospels, which have many parallel accounts of Jesus' life and teachings. As was explained earlier, one Gospel provided a horizon of expectations for the other which, in turn, prompted harmonization. Sometimes, this harmonization seems to have been intentional; other times, it was unintentional--in the sense that the scribe, so familar with one Gospel text, would almost unconsciously conform the wording of one Gospel to another. **This appears to be the case with the scribe of 𝔓45, who seems to have known Matthew very well and therefore conformed the other Gospels to it here and there--without having to refer to the actual text of Matthew. In other words, he drew from his memory.** However these harmonizations occured, I call them "paratextual."

The third kind of blank-filling has to do with interpolations that don't seem to have been prompted by the text. Rather, such interpolations were inserted in the Gospel narrative for the sake of their intrinsic value irrespective of their jarring intrusion into the text. Such interpolations are often drawn from oral traditions or extra-biblical sources--or perhaps even ecclesiastical practices. I call these "extra-textual" fillers.

A prime example of an extra-textual filler is the insertion of the pericope of the adulteress (usually appearing as John 7:53--8:11), which is an interpolation derived from an oral tradition. This passage is not found in any of the earliest manuscripts ($\mathfrak{P}$66 $\mathfrak{P}$75 $\aleph$ A^{vid} B C^{vid} L T W); its first appearance in a Greek manuscript is in D, but it is not contained in other Greek manuscripts until the ninth century. When this story is inserted in later manuscripts, it appears in different places: after John 7:52, after Luke 21:38, at the end of John; and when it does appear it is often marked off by asterisks or obeli to signal its probable spuriousness.

According to Ehrman (1988:24-44), this story was extant in written form as early as the fourth century in three different versions: (1) as a story where the religious leaders were trying to trap Jesus as to whether or not he would uphold the Mosaic law and where he freely pardons a sinful woman--a story known to Papias and the author of the Didascalia; (2) the story of Jesus' intervention in an execution--an episode preserved in the Gospel according to the Hebrews and retold by Didymus in his commentary on Ecclesiastes; (3) the popular version found in most of the later manuscripts of John, "a version which represents a conflation of the two earlier stories" (Ehrman 1988:37).6

Blank-filling is not just limited to glosses; it also involves textual changes. As the scribe adopted the perspectives thrust on him by the text and had his horizon of expectations challenged, he either cooperated with the text to concretize its meaning or he reworded the text to harmonize it with his own prejudices. The wording of the text could have violated his theological sensitivities or his ecclesiastical practices. Thus, instead of the scribe accommodating his horizon to the text's horizon, he

accommodated the wording of the text to his own horizon. This is similar to the normal reading process where the reader must reflect on the thwarting of his or her expectations and then take an active part in formulating the meaning of the narrative. However, in the case of the scribe, he had the opportunity to resist any thwarting by changing an offensive reading to an inoffensive one and a difficult reading to an easier one.

Finally, my analysis will appropriate Iser's conception of the implied reader. The implied reader involves two components relevant to the communication process. The first component is a textual construct--it is the reader the Gospel text implicates; it is the reader the textual construct assumes. The second component of the implied reader is that it is a structured act which provides incentive to actual concretization. Iser does not think of the implied reader as being an actual entity who is capable of eliciting reactions from an actual reader. However, Iser (1978:37-38) eventually connects the "implied reader" with the real reader by allowing for individual concretizations of the text:

> Each actualization therefore represents a selective
> realization of the implied reader, whose own
> structure provides a frame of reference within
> which individual responses to a text can be
> communicated to others. This is the vital function of
> the whole concept of the implied reader: it
> provides a link between all the historical and
> individual actualizations of the text and makes them
> accessible to analysis.

The singular readings produced by the various scribes allow us to see actual, individualized reader receptions, for each single variant is the result of a co-creation between reader and text. This singularity corresponds with Iser's conception of individualistic concretizations of

literary texts. Iser (1989:5) recognized that "meanings in literary texts are generated in the act of reading; they are the product of a complex interaction between text and reader. . . . If the individual reader generates the meaning of the text, then it follows that these meanings will always appear individualistic."

In Iser's conception, the implied reader is the reader whom the text creates for itself; it amounts to a network of response-inviting structures which predispose readers to read in certain ways. The actual reader is the reader who makes various concretizations in response to the textual structure. In this regard there will be some give-and-take between reader and text. According to Selden's view of Iser's model (1985:113-114), the reader cannot, at will, fill up the blanks in whatever fashion he chooses. But the text itself is not the ultimate arbiter of the reader's actualisations. While texts set the terms on which the reader actualises meanings, the reader's own 'store of experience' will take some part in the process.

Here we see a vital link between Iser's model and the one proposed by Jauss, who placed great emphasis on the reader's horizon of expectations which he inevitably brings to his reading of the text. In my analysis of the variant readings created by various New Testament scribes my aim will be two-fold: (1) to examine what textual clues prompted the variant, and (2) to ascertain (if at all possible) what elements of the scribe's horizon of expectations contributed to the creative process of blank-filling and/or textual alteration. Admittedly, this is not an easy task because it demands a certain degree of speculation on my part and an honest admission that I am subject to my own twentieth-century horizon of expectations.

Endnotes

1I assume the Alands are speaking of textual fidelity to an
exemplar and not to the original, for no one could know
for certain how close a manuscript copy is to the original.
And regarding textual fidelity to an exemplar--how can one
know for sure if a scribe has produced a "strict" copy of
his exemplar? Thus, the Alands' designations must be
taken with caution.

2The early papyri show that most of the early Christians
used special abbreviations to designate divine titles
(nomina sacra). The first divine names to be abbreviated
were $Iησους$ (Jesus), written as $\overline{IC}$, with a suprascript line
over the abbreviation, and $κυριος$ (Lord), written as $\overline{KC}$--
perhaps first used in the Septuagint wherein the divine
name YHWH was written as $κυριος$. Two other divine
names were also always abbreviated: $Xριστος$ (Christ) as
$\overline{XC}$, and $θεος$ (God) as $\overline{ΘC}$. Three other words were also
written as nomina sacra: $πννεμα$ (Spirit) as $\overline{ΠNA}$, $πατηρ$ (Father)
as $\overline{ΠTP}$, and $σταυρος$ (cross) as $\overline{ΣTPC}$. Scribes could differentiate
between "Lord" and "lord/master" by writing $\overline{KC}$ or $κυριος$,
and between "Spirit" (the divine Spirit) and "spirit" (the
human spirit) by writing $\overline{ΠNA}$ and $πνευμα$.

3A good example of this is found in Rev. 13:7 of $P47$,
which in many manuscripts reads, [$και εδοθη αυτ\tilde{ω}$
$ποιησαι πολεμον μετα των αγιων και νικησαι$
$αυτους,$] $και εδοθη αυτ\tilde{ω} εξουσια επι πασαν$
$φυλην και λαον και γλωσσαν και εθνος$ ([also it [[the
beast]] was allowed to war against the saints and to
conquer them,] and it was given authority over every tribe
and people and language and nation). But in $P47$ the
bracketed portion is missing--probably because the

scribe's eyes passed over the first καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ to
the second καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ and therefore he did not
copy the first clause. Of course, it is also possible that the
scribe of 𝔓47 deleted the phrase because he was
repulsed by the thought of the saints being defeated by
the beast. But parablepsis seems more likely.

4Throughout the course of this study, I will occasionally
use the term "blank-filling" to include both the notions of
Ingardenian "gap-filling" and Iserian "blank-filling," as
there is undeniable overlap between the two concepts as
applied to scribal reader reception.

5The Gospel of Mark concludes in five ways:

(1) It stops at 16:8, which says, καὶ ἐξελθοῦσαι ἔφυγον
ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου, εἶχεν γὰρ αὐτὰς τρόμος καὶ
ἔκστασις· καὶ οὐδενὶ οὐδὲν εἶπαν· ἐφοβοῦντο
γάρ. (So they went out and fled from the tomb, seized
with terror and amazement; and they said nothing to
anyone, for they were afraid.)
ℵ B 304 syr^s it^avid arm geo Clement Origen MSS^according
to Eusebius MSS^according to Jerome

(2) Shorter Ending
Πάντα δὲ τὰ παρηγγελμένα τοῖς περὶ τὸν Πέτρον
συντόμως ἐξήγγειλαν. ετὰ δὲ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ
Ἰησοῦς ἀπὸ ἀνατολῆς καὶ ἄχρι δύσεως
ἐξαπέστειλεν δι' αὐτῶν τὸ ἱερὸν καὶ ἄφθαρτον
κήρυγμα τῆς αἰωνίου σωτηρίας. ἀμήν. (And all
that had been commanded them they told briefly to those
with Peter. And afterward Jesus himself sent out through
them, from the east and as far as the west, the holy and
imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation. Amen.)

(see MSS supporting 5 below) it^k syr^{hmg} cop^{sa} cop^{bo}

(3) Traditional Longer Ending

See Mark 16:9-20

A C D K X Δ Θ f^{13} 33 𝔐 Diatessaron Irenaeus

(4) Traditional Longer Ending with Addition after 16:14, as Verse 14 reads, "Later he appeared to the eleven themselves as they were sitting at the table; and he upbraided them for their lack of faith and stubbornness, because they had not believed those who saw him after he had risen." To this is added: "And they excused themselves, saying, 'This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who does not allow the truth and power of God to prevail over the unclean things of the spirits. Therefore reveal your righteousness now'--thus they spoke to Christ. And Christ replied to them, 'The term of years of Satan's power has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near. And for those who have sinned I was handed over to death, that they may return to the truth and sin no more, that they may inherit the spiritual and imperishable glory of righteousness that is in heaven'" (from NRSVmg).

W (MSS$^{according to Jerome}$)

(5) Both Shorter Ending and Traditional Longer Ending

L 099 0112 274^{mg} 579

6The only way to describe the pericope of the adulteress as an example of blank-filling is to surmise that a scribe imagined that John's declaration that Jesus had not come to judge this world (John 3:17) called for a specific illustrative example. Thus, the story of Jesus' non-judgment could provide such an illustration. But the fact

that the pericope was added in various places in the
Gospels shows that its insertion was somewhat arbitrary.

Chapter Three

The Horizon of Expectations of Christian Egyptian Scribes

In this chapter I will attempt to provide a general portrayal of the horizon of Christian Egyptian scribes in the second and third centuries. This sketch will be based primarily on observations made by a number of twentieth-century scholars with respect to the milieu affecting Christian scribes and readers at this time. Then I hope to provide a more specific characterization of three Egyptian Christian scribes (those of 𝔓45, 𝔓66, and 𝔓75) in the following chapters (4-6). This will allow me the opportunity to compare the generalized picture with a specific one and thereby provide a more accurate, even individualized, description of the horizon of expectation of Christian Egyptian scribes. But for now it is helpful to get the big picture so that we can take note of the forces that shaped their literary and scriptoral traditions. We need to be aware of those values, attitudes, and institutions that influenced the early Egyptian Christian scribes, who were among the most educated and well-read members of Egyptian society. As Jauss (1989:124) indicated, the critic's task is to reconstruct the social horizon of experience, which the reader supplies or brings from his or her own historical Lebenswelt.

Though we do not know any of these scribes by name, we can attempt to reconstruct their literary and religious sitz im leben. The literary and scriptoral influences of their times would have informed their scribal practices, and the religious influences of their Christian communities would have shaped their views about making copies of sacred texts. In this chapter I will explore the two prime forces that formed the horizon of Egyptian Christian scribes: the

influence of Alexandrian scriptoral practices **(or lack thereof)** on New Testament textual transmission, and the influence of Judeo-Christian scriptoral practices on New Testament manuscript production. This is what Jauss (1982c:39) calls a study of "the history of influence: that 'which results from the event' and which from the perspective of the present constitutes the coherence of literature as the prehistory of its present manifestation."

Hypothetically, the Alexandrian and Judeo-Christian scriptoral factors would have usually served as strong controling influences in the production of accurate copies. Thus, a study of these influences will help illuminate how certain scribes were governed by these influences and how other scribes broke free from such restraints. It is in the breaking free that we see individual scribal reception.

The influence of Alexandrian scriptoral practices on New Testament textual transmission

Alexandrian scriptoral practices had become influential throughout the entire Hellenized world by the time the church first began. By the third century B.C., the Alexandrian library had over 500,000 volumes and had become a center of learning--like a modern university. Kenyon (1951:27) elaborates:

> Besides being a library, it was an Academy of Letters and Learning. Eminent men of letters and scholars, such as Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and Aristarchus, were placed in succession at its head; students gathered around it; a corps of copyists was employed to multiply manuscripts; and Alexandria became the centre of the literary life of the Hellenistic world.

The Alexandrians were concerned with preserving the

original text of works of literature. Textual criticism was applied to Homer's _Iliad_ and the _Odyssey_ because these were ancient texts existing in many manuscripts. They would make text-critical decisions from among many different manuscripts concerning the original wording and then produce an archetype. The archetype was the manuscript produced officially and deposited in the library. From this were copied, and with it were collated, further manuscripts as required (Birdsall 1970:312).

Aristotle of Alexandria classified manuscripts as to their date and value. His work was continued on by men such as Zenodotus, Aristophanes of Byzantium, and Aristarchus of Samothrace--all librarians in the great library in Alexandria. Zenodotus initiated the first scientific attempt to get back to the original text of the Homeric poems. Aristophanes produced much-improved critical editions of Homer and other poets. Aristarchus is said to have been the founder of accurate literary scholarship. These learned men of Alexandria were the creators of scholarly philological criticism and textual criticism. Michael Grant (1982:259) said, "Their methods became canonical in determining the forms of book-production and literary analysis in all Hellenistic centres, and the earlier writings they had so carefully preserved and studied were handed down to the Romans, and thus to ourselves."

Soon after Christianity spread to Alexandria, the Christians in that city began a catechetical school called the Didaskelion, where there arose trained philologists, grammarians, and textual critics. No doubt, this school would have been extremely influenced by the library in Alexandria (with its scriptorium) in the matters of making copies of literature. At first, the Christians were quite occupied with the Old Testament text. The Jews in Alexandria had produced the Septuagint for this great

library. The Christians adopted this text as their own and used it to prove the veracity of Jesus' claim to being the Messiah. The Christian exposition of the Septuagint caused the Jews to abandon the Septuagint and make new translations of the Hebrew text. The Christians in the Alexandrian church continued to use the Septuagint as the basis of their apologetics and exposition. At the same time, they also used various New Testament books for instruction and exposition.

Were the Christians in Alexandria in the second and third centuries making careful copies of the New Testament books? Or do we have a situation in the early centuries wherein the copying of the New Testament text was left to the vagaries of the scribes who made them-- whether for good or for ill? We know that scriptoral practices in rural Egypt (i.e., the Fayum, Oxyrhynchus, etc.) beginning in the second century were influenced by the work of the professional scribes working in the scriptorium for the great library at Alexandria (Turner 1956:141-146). Could it be that there was also a Christian scriptorium founded in Alexandria (in association with the catechetical school) in the second century? Eusebius (Ecclesiastical History 5.10.1.) implies that the school began well before the time Pantaenus became in charge of it (160-180). But we have no record that Pantaneus did anything with New Testament textual criticism. That brings us to his succesor, Origen. But Origen did not engage in any full-scale textual criticism of the Greek New Testament because he was afraid to tamper with the word of God. Instead, he applied his textual criticism to the Septuagint because he felt it was safer to work with what was only a translation of the sacred text (see his Commentary of Matthew 15.14). Consequently, he became entirely involved with his Hexpala project, and made only a few

comments about variant readings in the New Testament text (see Metzger 1963:78-95).

Thus, we have no direct evidence that there was a Christian scriptorium in Alexandria in the second and third centuries. And if there wasn't a scriptorium in Alexandria, could there have been one anywhere else in Egypt? Some have surmised that there must have been a scriptorium in Oxyrhynchus before the third century. The papyrologist, C. H. Roberts believed that Oxyrhynchus was probably an intellectual center for Christianity in rural Egypt. This is suggested by the presence of an autograph manuscript of an anti-Jewish dialogue (P. Oxy. 2070), dated in the third century. This is also suggested by the number of Christian manuscripts discovered in Oxyrhynchus. Thus, Roberts (1979:24) posited the existence of a Christian scriptorium in Oxyrhynchus as early as the late second century. But can we conclude this from the extant documents?

Of all the manuscripts discovered in Oxyrhynchus many are nonliterary documents (i.e., letters, legal documents, business transactions); they were written by common folk--"tradesmen, farmers, minor government officials to whom knowledge of and writing in Greek was an essential skill, but who had few or no literary interests" (Roberts 1979:21). Other manuscripts were literary--such as the works of Homer, Pindar, and Philo. Copies of these literary works were often produced by professionals and/or those acquainted with professional scriptoral practices.

In total, thirty-six papyrus manuscripts containing portions of the New Testament have been discovered at Oxyrhynchus. Almost all of these manuscripts date between 200 and 400, and a few have been dated in the second century: $\mathfrak{P}$32 (c. 175), $\mathfrak{P}$52 (115-125), $\mathfrak{P}$77 (c. 150),

and 𝔓90 (c. 175). A few other papyri have been dated at the end of the second century (c. 200): 𝔓1, 𝔓13, 𝔓27. There is evidence that some of these manuscripts were produced by the same scribes (𝔓15 and 𝔓16; 𝔓20 and 𝔓27), but there are no other prominent, common textual features that would suggest that these manuscripts were produced in one local scriptorium. Rather, most of these manuscripts display that they were the work of local scribes writing with a documentary hand (see below).

The most likely scenario is that intellectuals at Oxyrhychus obtained most of their books from Alexandria. Indeed, Oxyrhynchus had many significant connections with Alexandria, especially with regard to scholarship and scriptoral practices. According to the paleographer, E. G. Turner (1956:141-146), there were a number of Alexandrians who owned property in Oxyrhynchus, several of whom were professors of the famous Alexandrian Museum. Some of these professors, while living in Oxyrhynchus, corresponded with certain Alexandrians about obtaining copies of various works of literature. These copies would have been produced by the Alexandrian scriptorium and then sent to Oxyrhyhnchus. Thus, certain manuscripts found in Oxyrhynchus would likely have been produced in Alexandria. As such, the finds at Oxyrhynchus indirectly bear witness to the presence of a scriptorium in Alexandria, but not necessarily a Christian scriptorium.

There is yet one more possibility of linking some New Testament manuscripts to Alexandria. 𝔓66 and 𝔓75 are manuscripts that came from Jabal Abu Manna and probably once belonged to a Christian monastery established by Pachomius in the early fourth century. In the 1950s several early biblical manuscripts were discovered in cliffs near this monastery (Robinson 1990:1-

8). These manuscripts, technically called the Dishna
Papers, are more commonly known as the Bodmer
biblical papyri because they were purchased by Martin
Bodmer (founder of the Bodmer Library of World
Literature in Cologny, a suburb of Geneva) from a dealer
in Cairo, Egypt in the 1950s and 1960s. However, the
dealer never revealed where the manuscripts came from.
For over twenty years, scholars were guessing that the
discovery of the ancient manuscripts was in the vicinity
between Panopolis (modern Akmim) and Thebes
(Kilpatrick 1963:34).

In recent years James Robinson, an expert in the Nag
Hammadi manuscripts, was able to pinpoint the place of
discovery while attempting to find out where the Nag
Hammadi manuscripts came from. The Bodmer biblical
papyri (or Dishna Papers) were discovered seven years
after the Nag Hammadi codices in close proximity (in the
Dishna plain, east of the Nile River). (Dishna is midway
between Panopolis and Thebes.) In 1945 the Nag
Hammadi manuscripts were found in Jabal al-Tarif (just
north of Chenoboskion--near Nag Hammadi, the city
where the discovery was first reported). In 1952 the
Bodmer papyri were found in Jabal Abu Manna, which is
also located just north of the Dishna plain, 12 kilometers
east of Jabal al-Tarif (Robinson 1986:4-5).

According to Robinson (1990:1-6), it is quite likely that
these manuscripts were part of a library of a Pachomian
monastery. Within a few kilometers of Jabal Abu Manna
lies the ruins of the ancient basillica of Pachomius (in Faw
Qibli). Pachomius (287-346) brought monasticism to this
area around A.D. 320. By the time of his death, there were
thousands of monks in eleven monasteries in a radius of
sixty miles along the Nile River. A century later there were
nearly 50,000 monks in the area. As part of their daily

regimen, these monks read and memorized the Scriptures--especially the New Testament and Psalms. Pachomius himself took an active role in this practice in that he read the Scriptures aloud to his first congregation (i.e., he was the lector). As Pachomius knew both Coptic and Greek (as did other monks in his monasteries), some of the monks must have read the Scriptures in both languages. Of course, more monks read Coptic than Greek, and with the passing of time (beginning in the fifth century) almost all read only Coptic.

Because the library in the Pachomian monastery could not have started until after 320, all earlier manuscripts--especially the New Testament papyri--must have been produced in other scriptorium and given to the library. The manuscripts dated in the fourth and fifth centuries are of two types: those that were the result of poor craftmanship and those that appear to have been done professionally. It is therefore quite likely that the poor monks produced some of their own poorly-made books and that they were given professionally-made manuscripts from an outside scriptorium--very likely from Alexandria, inasmuch as Athanasius from Alexandria often visited Pachomius' monastery.

Even if the link with Alexandria cannot be established with certainty, scholars are certain that 𝔓66 was the product of a scriptorium. The first copyist of this manuscript had his work thoroughly checked by a diorthotes, according to a different exemplar--just the way it would happen in a scriptorium (see the discussion on this in chpt. 5). The scribe of 𝔓75 was also a professional scribe. The professionalism shows through in his tight calligraphy and controled copying. According to Martin (1961:13), "The writing is an attractive vertical uncial--elegant and well-crafted, of the type represented by the

Oxyrhynchus Papyri 2293, 2322, 2362, 2363, 2370."

Other early papyrus manuscripts display the features of having been produced by professional scribes. This is nowhere more apparent than in the manuscript 𝔓46. The scribe who produced 𝔓46 was a professional scribe because there are stichoi notations at the end of several books (see the conclusion of Romans, 2 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians). The stichoi were used by professionals to note how many lines had been copied for commensurate pay. Most likely, an officer of the scriptorium (perhaps connected wth a church library) paginated the codex and indicated the stichoi. The scribe himself made a few corrections as he went, and then several other readers made corrections here and there (Kim 1988:254-255).

The three manuscripts, 𝔓46, 𝔓66, and 𝔓75, indicate that there must have been some kind of Christian scriptorium in Egypt in the second century. This scriptorium may have been nothing more than "a writing center where texts were copied by more than a single scribe" (Gamble 1995:121). It is doubtful, however, that there were any full-scale Christian scriptoria--that is, "those that would be operating . . . in a specially designed and designated location; employing particular methods of transcription; producing certain types of manuscripts; or multiplying copies on a significant scale" (Gamble 1995:121). Origin's scriptorium fits this description, but his operation was involved with producing Old Testament texts and his own writings.

The manuscript 𝔓66 could have been produced in a small-scale Christian scriptorium, and 𝔓46 and 𝔓66 could have been produced by scribes working on their own. Either way, their work demonstrates that they had been influenced by Alexandrian scriptoral practices. This does

not mean, however, that such professional scribes did not
freely interact with the text. They did. And this interaction
produced the individual variants which allow us to study
their reception process. The original scribe of 𝔓66--
presumably working in a scriptorium--is responsible for
creating innumerable singular variants. And the scribe of
𝔓75--the most felicitous of them all--also produced some
very interesting singular readings.

It cannot be said with certainty that any other of the
early New Testament manuscripts were produced by
professionals. However, several of the manuscripts
appear to have been produced by men of letters--such as
𝔓1, 𝔓4/𝔓64/𝔓67, 𝔓20, 𝔓27, 𝔓38, 𝔓39, and 𝔓70. Many of
these early papyri were written in what is called "the
reformed documentary hand" (i.e., the scribe knew he
was working on a manuscript that was not just a legal
document but a literary work). In The Birth of the Codex,
Roberts and Skeat (1987:46) wrote,

> The Christian manuscripts of the second century,
> although not reaching a high standard of calligraphy,
> generally exhibit a competent style of writing which
> has been called 'reformed documentary' and which is
> likely to be the work of experienced scribes, whether
> Christian or not. . . . And it is therefore a reasonable
> assumption that the scribes of the Christian texts
> -received pay for their work.

The papyrologist, C. H. Roberts (1979:23), has affirmed
the professional quality of 𝔓4/𝔓64/𝔓67 and 𝔓70.
Concerning the manuscript 𝔓4/𝔓64/𝔓67, Roberts
(1979:23) indicated that the text was divided into sections
according to a system also found in 𝔓75, that also recurs
in some great fourth century manuscripts (א and B)--a
system that was clearly not created by the scribe.
Furthermore, this manuscript, written in handsome script,
displays three different positions for punctuation.

Therefore, Roberts (1979:23) remarked, "Once again we find in a manuscript of this early period a characteristic that appears to be not specifically Egyptian but of wider application." ℙ77, also a literary production written in a elegant hand, has "what was or became a standard system of chapter division, as well as punctuation and breathing marks."

Thus, from a scriptoral perspective, one would think that these Christian scribes would have done their best to preserve the original integrity of the text. However, this did not mean that they were always bent on preserving the exact wording of the text that they were copying. According to Alexandrian practice, they would feel free to edit the text for mechanical errors or to correct perceived errors of previous copyists. It also meant that such scribes would often compare one manuscript against another to see if the new copy had any errors, and then make adjustments accordingly. Indeed, it was a common practise, even among bibliophiles, to compare a newly copied book against an older copy and then make corrections or notations in the margin.

Other manuscripts (such as ℙ37, ℙ40, ℙ45, and ℙ78) display even more freedom--in the direction of paraphrase. And others display careless copying. For example, we see the hand of a schoolboy practising his lettering using the book of Romans (ℙ10), the careless hand of one barely literate in Greek (ℙ9), and some scrawled amulets (such as ℙ78). We also see scribes who were greatly influenced by the profuse "Western" expansions in the book of Acts (ℙ29 ℙ38 ℙ48). Thus, the exant manuscripts give us a variagated picture of the Egyptian scriptoral attitude toward making copies of the New Testament text. Nonetheless, the picture helps us understand their horizon of expectations, which is so

essential to understanding the dynamics of textual transmission. The kind of mental attunement Christian scribes had about the text effected the way they read the text and participated in its production.

The influence of Jewish scriptoral practices on New Testament manuscript production

Early Christianity in Egypt was very closely tied to Judaism, for both had Alexandrian roots. There was a large population of Jews living in Alexandria from third century B.C. to A.D. 115-117 (the time of the Jewish revolt under Trajan). The early church in Alexandria must have been comprised of many Jewish converts. According to Philo (In Flaccum 55), two out of five wards in Alexandria are said to have been Jewish in population. Philo also indicated that there must have been a million Jews living in all of Egypt during the middle of the first century (In Flaccum 43). Although this may be an exaggeration, it suggests that a great number of Jews were living in Egypt then.

Archaeological evidence suggests that the earliest Christian communities in Alexandria occupied the same section of the city as inhabited by the Jews. Pearson elaborates (1986:150):

> The earliest Christians in Alexandria doubtless lived in
> the same areas of the city as the other Jews there,
> and can be presumed to have participated in the life
> of the synagogues. They would also have worshiped
> In house churches, such as are known elsewhere
> from New Testament sources. The final split between
> church and synagogue in Alexandria was late in
> coming, and was probably not complete until the time
> of the Jewish revolt under Trajan (115-117 C.E.), as a
> result of which the Jewish community, probably even
> including some Christians, was virtually exterminated.

This connection is critical to our understanding of Christian scribal attitudes toward the biblical text, if it can be assumed that Christian attitudes about copying the New Testament text were in any way shaped by Jewish attitudes toward copying the Old Testament text.

At the time Christians and Jews were sharing meeting places in Alexandria, the Jews were very cautious in making copies of the Old Testament text. But it was not always that way. Prior to the second century B.C., the Old Testament text was transmitted with varying degrees of fidelity. During the earliest period of textual transmission, it is almost certain that the autographs were subject to editorial adjustments soon after they were originally composed. Indeed, the earliest scribes seemed to have functioned as editors or redactors, who thought it their function to improve the original work by adding minor details and other interpolations. According to Tov (1992:189), this was a kind of intermediary stage between the original composition and the copying of the book. It is a stage one could call "compositional-transmissional" or "editorial-scribal." Thus, the period of textual unity reflected in the assumed pristine texts of the biblical books was brief at best. Tov believed that most of the textual changes in the Hebrew Bible were created by editors during the "compositional-transmissional" stage, and not by later scribes in the textual-transmission stage. In this regard, Tov (1992:265-266) wrote:

> The amount of deliberate changes inserted by scribes
> was probably smaller than believed . . . [because]
> many of the pervasive changes in the biblical text,
> pertaining to whole sentences, sections and books
> should not, according to our description, be ascribed
> to copyists, but to earlier generations of editors who
> allowed themselves such massive changes in the
> formative stage of the biblical literature.

This period of scribal freedom would have allowed Jewish scribes to have interacted more creatively with the text, in the Iserian sense. Undoubtedly, many scribes attempted to fill perceived blanks. This is why many Old Testament scholars are inclined to hypothesize that the Old Testament text, as we now have it, was greatly redacted.

After several centuries of textual plurality in the books of the Hebrew Bible, a period of uniformity and stability can be discerned, which began as early as the third century B.C. and was firmly fixed by the end of the first century A.D. This text has been called the Proto-Masoretic text because it anticipates the Masoretic text of Medieval times. During this period (200 B.C.--A.D. 100), the Hebrew text did not change much because it was copied with painstaking accuracy. It is known that scribes would count the number of letters on the new copy and compare it with the exemplar in an attempt to find even one letter difference between the two. If the copy was in error, it would be corrected or destroyed. This practice continued generation after generation and century after century. Beginning in the sixth century and into the tenth century A.D., certain European Jewish scribes called the Masoretes worked carefully to preserve the Old Testament text as they transmitted it from copy to copy. Thus, it is evident that the period of textual stability greatly curbed scribal creativity, which means scribes had to keep themselves from interacting with the text.

The picture for New Testament textual transmission parallels that of the Old Testament in that it also went through a period of freedom and then control. Of course, to a limited degree, the influences of control may have already been operative in Alexandria (and other parts of

Egypt) at an early stage because educated Christians would have been influenced by Alexandrian scriptoral practices, as well as by Jewish scriptoral practices-- especially if they themselves had been Jews. A few Christian scribes may have had the same attitude to the New Testament Scriptures that the Jews had for the Old Testament. However, this attitude was not universal; most Christian scribes would have deemed various books of the New Testament as "inspired Scripture" and therefore worthy of scribal acumen--but not necessarily other books. It took awhile for various books of the New Testament to reach the same canonical status as had all the books of the Old Testament. Thus, the early period of textual transmission allowed scribes the freedom to interact with the text as co-participants of meaning.

Furthermore, though Egyptian Christians may have been influenced by Jewish scribal practices, they did not want to be their carbon-copy imitators. This is exhibited in two significant ways: (1) Christians consistently wrote nomina sacra as a counterpart to the tetragrammaton, and (2) Christians used the codex instead of the scroll (Roberts and Skeat 1989).

The early New Testament papyri show that nearly all the early Christians who made copies of the text used special abbreviations to designate divine titles (nomina sacra). The first divine names to be abbreviated were $I\eta\sigma o\upsilon\varsigma$ (Jesus), written as $\overline{IC}$, with a suprascript line over the abbreviation, and $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota o\varsigma$ (Lord), written as KC--perhaps first used in the Septuagint wherein the divine name YHWH was written as $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota o\varsigma$. Two other divine names were always abbreviated: $X\rho\iota\sigma\tau o\varsigma$ (Christ) as $\overline{XC}$, and $\theta\epsilon o\varsigma$ (God) as $\overline{\theta C}$. Three other words were also written as nomina sacra: $\pi\nu\upsilon\epsilon\mu\alpha$ (Spirit) as $\overline{\Pi NA}$, $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$ (Father) as $\overline{\Pi TP}$, and $\sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho o\varsigma$ (cross) as $\overline{\Sigma TPC}$. Though the creation of the nomina

sacra may reflect the Jewish influence of the tetragrammaton (YHWH written for Yahweh), it is an entirely new creation found exclusively in Christian documents. According to C. H. Roberts (1979:45-46), the creation of this kind of writing system "presupposes a degree of control and organization. . . . The establishment of the practice would not have been left to the whims of a single community, still less to that of an individual scribe. . . . . The system was too complex for the ordinary scribe to operate without rules or an authoritative exemplar." Thus, it seems quite clear that Christian scribes were following an established pattern, an "authorized" exemplar.

Accompanying the phenomemon of the formation of nomina sacra in Christian documents is the phenomenon of the use of the codex by all the early Christians. Prior to the middle of the first century, all the Scriptures and other writings were written on scrolls. For example, Jesus used a scroll to read from when he delivered his address from Isaiah 61 in the Nazarene synagogue (Luke 4:18ff). Jews used scrolls and non-Jews used scrolls; everyone in the Graeco-Roman world used scrolls.

Then the codex (a book formed by folding pages and stitching them at the spine) appeared--probably first modeled after parchment notebooks. According to Roberts' and Skeat's hypothesis (1987:54-60), John Mark, while living in Rome, used such a parchment notebook to record the sayings of Jesus (via Peter's preaching). The entire Gospel of Mark, then, was first published as a codex. Turner (1968:11) said, "A gospel circulating in this format determined, partly by way of authority, partly by way of sentiment and symbol, that the proper form for the Christian scriptures was a codex, not a roll." Thereafter, nearly all portions of the New Testament were written on codices. The codex was unique to Christianity until the

end of the second century. Kenyon (1951:111) wrote,
"Among all the papyri discovered in Egypt which can be
assigned to the second century, . . . no single pagan [i.e.,
non-Christian] MS is in codex form." This practice (which
began either in Rome or Antioch) was a clear break with
Judaism and shows a kind of uniformity in the formation
and dissemination of the early text. The codex book-form
enabled Christians to place several books together in one
volume, which was an impossiblity with respect to the
scroll. As such, the Pauline Epistles were put into one
codex (as in $P46$ and probably $P15/16$), two or more
Gospels (as in $P4/64/67$, which had Matthew and Luke,
and $P75$, which had Luke and John), or the Gospels and
Acts (as in $P45$).

Conclusion

The two-fold influence of Alexandrian scriptoral practices
and Jewish scriptoral practices could not but have
created a milieu in which Egyptian Christian scribes
worked. This does not automatically mean that these
Christian scribes always conformed their scribal and
reading habits to that of the Alexandrians and Jews; what
it says is that these were forces to be reckoned with.
Where we see Christian scribes breaking free from these
forces is in their perception of the texts they were
copying. The New Testament books had not yet attained
the universal canonical status ascribed to the books of the
Old Testament, nor were the New Testament books
considered to be great literary works on the par with
works like Homer's poetry or Euripides' dramas.

Not all scribes shared the sentiment that every single
word of the New Testament Scripture was "God-inspired."
Perhaps they believed that it was the message behind the

words that was sacred and inviolable. Therefore, to change the wording in the interest of making better reading, was deemed acceptable. This sort of freedom, which the Alands call "normal," is displayed in many New Testament manuscripts, including some of those having been done by professionals and/or trained scribes.

Furthermore, scribes could not help but become subjectively involved in the reception process and thereby create changes. The fact that they were Christians creating copies of Christian texts involved them in the process even more. For it would be natural for them to want the text say more than it said in certain parts, or to say it differently. And when the text did not correspond with their horizon of expectations, this triggered changes. And so Egyptian Christian scribes were more than mere objective copyists as they copied the text; they interacted with the text as vested readers. They had a stake in what it said and how it said it. And they frequently helped the text say it in a way that corresponded with their horizon of expectations and in ways that were prompted by response-inviting clues coming from the text itself. Thus, no two early New Testament manuscripts are identical. Each one bears the imprint of a scribe who transgressed the boundaries of his copying duties to interact with the text as an involved reader.

Section Two

Analysis of Gospel Manuscripts From Egypt

Introduction

For the purpose of my study I decided to limit the
manuscripts to those that are from Egypt and that contain
enough text to warrant substantial study.[1] Of course, it
cannot be proved absolutely that these manuscripts were
produced in Egypt; they may have been transported there
from other countries. But their physical and textual
characteristics strongly suggest Egyptian provenance.

The advantage to limiting the documents to one
geographical location is that it permits a study of a local
text. This control should help in determining if scribes in
certain eras exhibit similar reader reception tendencies--
or if, contrarily, scribes display their own idiosyncracies
irrespective of the age and locale in which they lived.

My intention in the following analysis is to demonstrate
individual reader receptions of the Gospels in the late-
second to early-third century (150-225). I will examine the
receptions of three scribes in three manuscripts: the
Aphroditopolis Gospel manuscript P45, and the Jabal Abu
Manna Gospel manuscripts, P66 and P75. My primary
focus will be to explore the singular readings in each of
these manuscripts in an effort to ascertain their reception
tendencies.

In a lengthy, thorough dissertation, entitled "Scribal
Habits of Early New Testament Papyri," James Royse
(1981) characterized the scribal habits exhibited in several
early manuscripts (P45, P46, P47, P66, P72, P75) by
studying each manuscript's singular readings (i.e.,
readings found in that manuscript only, independent of all

other extant documents). His rationale for focusing on the
singular readings is based on the same rationale that
Colwell proposed (1965:370-389). Colwell believed that
the singular readings of a manuscript were the textual
creations of the scribe, and that an analysis of the patterns
found within these singular readings would reveal the
habits of the scribe.[2] I will make use of the work of
Colwell and Royse in my description of the papyrus
manuscripts. However, my analysis will not be limited to
studying scribal habits. Rather, I will apply the reader-
reception methodology explained previously to ascertain
the response of the scribe to the text as a reader, as
opposed to a mere copier. I will attempt to explain the
creation of certain variants as being the result of scribal
interaction with the text.

Singular readings provide the best means of studying a
scribe's reception of the text because they are
individualized readings. Other variation units cannot be
used for this study because it is always possible that the
scribe was simply copying a reading from a previous
exemplar. Since we are fairly certain that singular
readings weren't copied from other manuscripts, they
must have been prompted by the text itself--or, should I
say, by the scribe's interaction with the text as an informed
reader. This is where we will see the confluence of Iser's
"implied reader" with Jauss' "real reader"--in the
individual concretizations of the text.

According to Iser, the implied reader is a textual
prerequisite because it is regarded as a role of the reader
that is written into the text. And it is a prerequisite for the
production of meaning in that it is the composite of all the
textual clues that are provided for the guidance of the
actual reader in his interpretation of the text. The implied
reader is therefore a sign-like, text-immanent to which

actual readers could react in many different ways. The actual reader's reactions depend upon what horizon of expectations the reader brings to the text. This is Jauss' position. When we combine these theories, it becomes clear that scribes who functioned as readers produced some very creative responses to the gaps (or lapses of meaning) they encountered in the text. These responses have been preserved for us in the form of singular variants.

Colwell and Tune (1964:259-261) defined a textual variation unit as that length of the text (1) where the Greek New Testament manuscripts present at least two variant forms and (2) where each variant form is supported by at least two Greek manuscripts. When there is a variant reading supported by only one Greek New Testament manuscript, this is called a singular variant--as understood by many textual critics today (see Epp and Fee 1993:50-57). It is important to note that the definition of a singular variant does not include any mention of versional or patristic support, only of Greek manuscripts. Versions (as translations) have their own history of textual appropriation and transformation, which may have coincidentally matched what occured in a Greek textual alteration without having been directly influenced by that Greek manuscript. Patristic citations are also problematic and cannot be counted toward excluding a Greek reading from being a singular variant if they happen to line up with the singular variant.

My criteria for a singular variant will generally accord with Royse's (1981:45-46), who said that a singular reading is any variant reading which is found in only one of the continuous-text Greek manuscripts--that is, it is a reading found in one of the New Testament papyri, uncials, or minuscules. This categorization excludes

lectionaries, patristic sources, and ancient versions because of the well-known difficulties of studying the evidence of such witnesses. If these materials were included, my list of singular readings would contain a large element of arbitrariness, because of the number of cases of partial or doubtful support from a version or a church father. Therefore, exclusion of this material not only facilitates the task of constructing a list of singulars easier, it also helps to enhance the objectivity of the list.

My criteria for a singular variant will also include Colwell's observation that there are such things as identical singular readings--that is, two scribes of two completely different eras and regions may have created the same reading coincidentally. Colwell (1969:123) said, "since corruption was universal, identical singular readings with only minor scattered support elsewhere should be assumed to be coincidental in these agreements--unless other external evidence establishes relationship."

Not all singular readings are significant. Some must be categorically eliminated from a study of scribal reception. These include obvious transcriptional errors, meaningless transpositions, itacisms, and nonsense readings. A few other kinds of singular readings may or may not be noteworthy; these are minor lexical substitutions and grammatical adjustments. Of course, both of these changes could have been prompted by some kind of perceived lack in the text, but not in the Iserian sense of a blank. I will have to be judicial in dealing with such variants. Most of the other singular readings are worthy of analysis. Therefore, in the end I will not have covered all of the singular variants listed by Royse,[3] only those that could possibly be explained as being the product of reader-reception at a cognitive level. Finally, it should be

noted that I have discovered singular variants in P45, P66,
and P75 not noted by Royse--especially in P66.

For the sake of this thesis it is important to note that
Colwell and Royse describe only the habits of particular
scribes as copyists; they do not describe the receptions
of scribes as readers. Thus, Colwell and Royse analyze
the results of their copying and attempt to explain all
singular variants in the traditional terms of textual criticism.
They both speak of spelling errors and grammatical
emendations or flaws. They both speak of
homoeoteleuton and homoeoarchton causing
parablepsis or scribal leaps. They both speak of
harmonization to the immediate context and
harmonization to remote parallels. However, neither of
them focus on the activity of the scribe as a reader, who
brings his own horizon of expectations to the text and who
is also impelled by various textual constructs to produce
individualized interpolations or ingenious modifications.
Such singular readings are not a display of abberant
copying as much as they are a reflection of how the
scribe became involved with the reading process. True,
many singular variants can be identified as having been
created by the immediate context, which is a traditional
canon in textual criticism. So, admittedly, there will be
some overlap between internal criticism based on
immediate context and an analysis of reader-reception
because both look to the context as providing the textual
clues for reader reception. However, Colwell and Royse
did not analyze what structured act in the text (in the
Iserian sense) prompted the scribes as readers to make
various changes. Nor did Colwell and Royse consider the
scribe's horizon of expectation as a motivating factor in
stimulating some textual change. My task is to see how
the scribes, functioning as readers, reacted to the

network of response-inviting structures in the text and filled in various blanks by drawing upon their repository of reading experience and life experience (Lebenswelt).

When Colwell (1965:108) asks the question, "why singular variants?" he furnishes the answer from a textual transmission perspective, not from a reader-text interaction perspective. Thus, his characterization of individual scribes is based on his observation of them as copyists, not as interactive readers. This is evident in the following comment: "one scribe is liable to dittography; another to omission of lines of text; one reads well; another remembers poorly" (1965:114). In context, Colwell's definition of "reading" describes nothing more than the act of rote reading for the sake of copying. In Royse's final analysis of the scribal tendencies of $\mathfrak{P}$45, $\mathfrak{P}$66, and $\mathfrak{P}$75, he provides an illuminating profile of each of the scribes (1981:156-157, 423, 560). However, not one of these profiles describes the scribes as indivualized, interactive readers. I do not say these things to criticize Colwell's methodology or Royse's analysis, for both scholars presented results which were consistent with what they set out to do. Rather, my purpose is to point out that I am attempting to analyze what Colwell and Royse did not analyze--namely, the interactive process of reading, and how this was responsible for the creation of several significant variant readings.

As was stated in chapter two, I will be examining the creative interaction between the reader and the text. This dynamic interaction is similar to what Iser (1978:107) perceived in the reading act:

> Textual structures and structured acts of comprehension are therefore the two poles in the act of communication, whose success will depend on the degree to which the text establishes itself as

a correlative in the reader's consciousness. This 'transfer' of text to reader is often regarded as being brought about solely by the text. Any successful transfer however--though initiated by the text--depends on the extent to which this text can activate the individual reader's faculties of perceiving and processing.

For the investigation that follows I will generally follow a particular line of questioning. When I see a significant singular variant, I will ask, (1) What was it in the context that prompted the creative blank-filling of the scribe? If this is not discoverable, I will ask, (2) What was it in the scribe's reading repertoire, Lebenswelt (life-world), and milieu (forming his horizon of expectations) that generated the blank-filling. If this is not discoverable, I will ask, (3) What other influences and forces initiated the change? These could come from the scribe's sensitivities to his perceived audience and/or his own theological predilections.

One final note: the next three chapters of this section are formatted in the same way. Each chapter deals with the singular readings produced by one scribe--$\mathfrak{P}$45 in chapter four, $\mathfrak{P}$66 in chapter five, and $\mathfrak{P}$75 in chapter six. A general discussion about the scribe and the manuscript prepares the way for a detailed analysis of singular variants on a verse-by-verse basis. Following this detailed analysis, I draw some conclusions about the scribe's reception tendencies. In the final chapter (seven), I make some global statements about all three scribes.

Endnotes

[1]Unfortunately, this excludes the Oxyrhynchus Papyri, none of which have more than one or two extant leaves.

[2]Other scholars prior to Colwell, such as Fenton Hort, also examined singular readings of codex manuscripts such as ℵ, A, and B to define scribal tendencies in these documents.

[3]I thought it unnecessary to provide a written justification for excluding certain singular variants from my analysis. Suffice it to say, the variants I selected are significant for my thesis; all other variants listed by Royse are not pertinent. Furthermore, I have included some variants not noted by Royse and/or not discussed by him.

Chapter Four

An Examination of Scribal Reception through an Analysis
of Significant Singular Readings of 𝔓45, a Gospel
Manuscript from Aphroditopolis, Egypt

Provenance and Date

The exact provenance of 𝔓45 is unknown since the
manuscript came through the hands of native dealers by a
purchase made in 1930-31. Quite possibly 𝔓45 came from
the ruins of the library of some church or library of a
Christian scholar or monastery--perhaps in the Fayum or
the east bank of the Nile about Atfih, the ancient
Aphroditopolis, from which Antony, the founder of
Egyptian monasticism, came (Schofield 1936:315).
Frederic Kenyon (1937b:112-113), the scholar who was
responsible for publishing all the Chester Beatty
manuscripts, wrote:

> The circumstances of the find have never been fully
> revealed; indeed they are known only to the natives
> who made it, and their statements, for obvious
> reasons, are not very dependable. The first reports
> spoke of the district of the Fayum, to the west of the
> Nile; but information given to Dr. Carl Schmidt was to
> the effect that the actual site was on the opposite side
> of the river, near the remains of the ancient city
> Aphroditopolis.

Thus, it is believed that the manuscripts came from the
ruins of an ancient church or monastery--perhaps in
Aphroditopolis (modern Atfih). According to Colin H.
Roberts (1979:7), "Carl Schmidt was told in 1934 that the
Chester Beatty Papyri had been found in a pitcher in the
ruins of a church or monastery near Atfih." Furthermore,
Schmidt's trusted Egyptian contact person indicated that
these papyri could not have come from Upper Egypt, in

view of the group of dealers from which they came (see
Schmidt 1931:292-293; 1933:225).

Jews were known to put scrolls containing Scripture in
pitchers or jars in order to preserve them. The Dead Sea
scrolls found in jars in the Qumran caves are a celebrated
example of this. The Beatty Papyri were very likely a part of
a Christian library, which were hidden in jars to be
preserved from confiscation during the Diocletian
persecution. Several years after the intitial publication of
these manuscripts, Kenyon (1958:116) wrote,

> The find, which is said to have come from the region
> of Aphroditopolis, on the right bank of the Nile, about
> thirty miles above Memphis, and presumably
> represents the library of some early Christian church,
> comprised portions of seven manuscripts of the Old
> Testament, three of the New.

Kilpatrick (1963:38) believed that the Beatty
manuscripts constituted a church library (somewhere in
the Fayum) that survived the Diocletian persecution. This
library of Greek biblical codices "may be said to date
before the persecution of Diocletian, when the Roman
government required Christians to surrender their
Scriptures. Somehow or other this Christian biblical library
came through the storm intact or almost intact."

𝔓45 was one among twelve manuscripts discovered.
There are eight manuscripts containing portions of the
Greek Old Testament: two manuscripts of Genesis (one
from the third century, another from the fourth); one of
Numbers and Deuteronomy (second century); one of
Ezekiel and Esther (third century); one of Isaiah (third
century); one of Jeremiah (late second century); one of
Daniel (third century), and one of Ecclesiasticus (fourth
century). The three Greek New Testament manuscripts

said to be found in the coptic graveyard were the earliest manuscripts to contain large portions of the New Testament text. The first manuscript, 𝔓45 (late second/early third), is a codex of the four Gospels and Acts; the second, 𝔓46 (late first/early second), is a codex of the Pauline Epistles; and the third, 𝔓47 (third century) is a codex of Revelation. The twelfth manuscript preserved Enoch, Melito, and Apocryphal Ezekiel.

The manuscripts, both of the Old Testament and the New Testament, were produced by Christians because all the manuscripts are codices (as opposed to rolls) and all display nomina sacra. This Christian library of Greek biblical texts was quite full: Genesis (2 copies), Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther, Ecclesiasticus, Gospels and Acts, Pauline Epistles, and Revelation. Not one of the manuscripts was written in Coptic (although there are a few Old Fayyumic Coptic glosses written in the margin of the Isaiah manuscript).

Several scribes were responsible for producing the manuscripts, and there is no paleographic indication that one particular scribe worked on more than one manuscipt. Some of the manuscripts are the work of professional scribes--namely, the Numbers/Deuteronomy manuscript, 𝔓46 (the Pauline Epistles), the Isaiah manuscript, and the Jeremiah fragment. The Daniel manuscript and 𝔓45 (Gospels and Acts) may have also been done by professionals--at least, they display the reformed documentary hand (Kenyon 1933a:13-14).

This manuscript was dated by Kenyon (1933b:x) to the early third century, a date which was confirmed by the papyrologists W. Schubart and H. I. Bell. This continues to be the date assigned to this manuscript in modern handbooks on textual criticism and critical editions of the Greek New Testament.

The Scribe and the Manuscript

$\mathfrak{P}$45 contains Matthew 20:24-32; 21:13-19; 25:41--26:39; Mark 4:36--9:31; 11:27--12:28; Luke 6:31--7:7; 9:26--14:33; John 4:51--5:2, 21-25; 10:7-25; 10:30--11:10, 18-36, 42-57; Acts 4:27--17:17 (with many lacunae). According to Kenyon (1933b:viii), the order of books in the original intact manuscript was probably as follows: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark, Acts (the so-called Western order). Since the manuscript came to London from Egypt in separate portions, this cannot be fully affirmed; however, since Mark and Acts arrived together, it is a fair assumption. The editio princeps was published by Frederic G. Kenyon in Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri II/1: The Gospels and Acts, Text (1933); the photographs appear in II/2: The Gospels and Acts, Plates (1934). Another leaf of the same manuscript was published by Züntz: "Reconstruction of one Leaf of the Chester Beatty Papyrus of the Gospels and Acts (Mt 25:41-26:39)," Chronique d'Egypte 26 (1951), 191-211. Yet another reconstruction of John 4:51--5:2, 21-25 was provided by T. C. Skeat and B. C. McGing in "Notes on Chester Beatty Papyrus I (Gospels and Acts)" in Hermathena 150 (1991), 21-25.

The text of $\mathfrak{P}$45 varies with each book. According to Kenyon (1933b:xii-xx), $\mathfrak{P}$45 in Mark shows a strong affinity with those manuscripts which used to be called Caesarean (i.e., W f^1 f^{13} 565 700). In Matthew, Luke, and John $\mathfrak{P}$45 stands midway between the "Alexandrian" manuscripts and so-called "Western" manuscripts. In Acts, $\mathfrak{P}$45 shows the greatest affinity with the Alexandrian uncials ($\aleph$ A B C)--as over against the manuscripts with a D-text.

According to a study done by Colwell (1965:114-121),
the scribe of P45 worked "without any intention of exactly
reproducing his source." He wrote with a great amount of
freedom--"harmonizing, smoothing out, substituting
almost whimsically." In short, "the scribe does not actually
copy words. He sees through the language to its idea-
content, and copies that--often in words of his own
choosing, or in words rearranged as to order."

It was apparent to Colwell that the scribe of P45 copied
his exemplar phrase by phrase and clause by clause (as
opposed to more careful copyists who transcribe the text
letter by letter, as in P75). While copying phrases and
clauses, he worked at reproducing what he imagined to
be the thought of each phrase. Thus, he transposed and
omitted many words and deleted several phrases. Colwell
(1965:118-119) said, "The most striking aspect of his style
is its conciseness. The dispensable word is dispensed
with. He omits adverbs, adjectives, nouns, participles,
verbs, personal pronouns--without any compensating
habit of addition."

Another study on P45 done by Royse affirms Colwell's
observations about the scribe's penchant for brevity.
Royse (1981:156) comments, "the scribe has a marked
tendency to omit portions of text, often (as it seems)
accidentally but perhaps also by deliberate pruning." The
result of this pruning is that the scribe produced a very
readable text, with very little need of correction.

A Study of Singular Variants in P45

My intent is to examine what horizons of expectation the
scribe brought with him to this text and to ascertain what
was in the text itself that prompted his own individual
readings. Thus, as I explore the significant singular

variants created by this scribe, I will try to uncover his
reader-reception tendencies.

  The format for the study of the variants in 𝔓45 is
straightforward. The text is listed first, followed by one or
two variants. The text is that which is printed in the Nestle-
Aland 27th edition of <u>Novum Testamentum Graece</u>. The
variants are usually singular readings in 𝔓45. Deviations
from this format are self-explanatory.

The Gospel of Matthew

Matthew 20:31

text

οἱ δὲ ⟨μεῖζον ἔκραξαν⟩ λέγοντες,᾽Ελέησον ἡμᾶς,
κύριε, υἱὸς Δαυίδ.

but ⟨they cried out the more⟩, saying, "Have mercy on us,
Lord, son of David."

ℵ B D L Z

variant 1

μεῖζον ἔκραζον

they were crying out the more

C W f¹ 33 𝔐

variant 2

μεῖζον ἐκραύγαζον

they were crying out the more

Θ f¹³

variant 3

πολλῷ ἐκραύγασαν

they cried out much

𝔓45ᵛⁱᵈ

The first and second variants present shifts in verb tense
to the imperfect (in two forms); the change helps to depict
the ongoing action. The third variant is the focus of our
attention. The change from μεῖζον to πολλῷ is
remarkable because there is nothing in the context that
would have prompted this substitution of terms. The
prompting must have come from the scribe's knowledge
of the other synoptic Gospels, where the parallel
passages (Mark 10:48 and Luke 18:39) say that the blind
men "cried out much" (πολλῷ ἐκραύγασαν) after being
reprimanded by the crowd. There is no other wording in
all of the Gospels which combines πολλῷ with the verb
κράξω. This change reveals that the Synoptic Gospels
formed a horizon of expectation for the scribe's reading of
Matthew. This indicates that the scribe must have known
the four Gospels very well--to the extent that singular
verbage mattered to the scribe.

Matthew 26:6

text

Τοῦ δὲ 'Ιησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν οἰκίᾳ
Σίμωνος τοῦ λεπροῦ.

And Jesus was in Bethany in the house of Simon the
leper.

all other Greek MSS

variant

Τοῦ δὲ 'Ιησοῦ γενομένου ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐν οἰκίᾳ
Σίμωνος ‹λεγομένου› τοῦ λεπροῦ.

And Jesus was in Bethany in the house of Simon ‹who is
called› the leper.

𝔓45

Jesus ate this last meal during his final week on earth in
the house one known as "Simon the leper." This presents
a "blank" in the text because it does not tell if this Simon
still had leprosy or not. The Gospels themselves provide
the textual clue for filling the blank inasmuch as they
indicate that Jesus had healed all lepers who had come
to him for healing. Thus, the reader is to assume that
Jesus is now in the house of one who was formerly a
leper, and thus is prompted to imagine that Simon was
not really a leper but was simply "called" or "named" one
as a marked distinction of his previous condition before
coming to Jesus for healing. The scribe of 𝔓45 filled in the
"blank" with the additional word, λεγομένου.

The Gospel of Mark

Mark 6:22

Herod's daughter, by her dancing, is said to have pleased
"Herod" (ὀρχησαμένης ἤρεσεν τῷ 'Ηρῴδῃ). All Greek
manuscripts then go on to say that "the king" (ὁ βασιλεὺς)
granted the girl a wish. Only the scribe of 𝔓45 wrote the
name "Herod" instead of "the king." Then, he corrected
himself superlinearly. The initial duplication of "Herod,"
however, displays a natural superimposition stemming
from the act of reading. This kind of assimilation would not
have been a conscious editorialization.

Mark 6:40

text
καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ ‹κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ
πεντήκοντα›
and they reclined group by group ‹in hundreds and

fifties>
all other Greek MSS

variant
καὶ ἀνέπεσαν πρασιαὶ πρασιαὶ
and they reclined group by group
𝔓45

It is possible that the phrase κατὰ ἑκατὸν καὶ κατὰ
πεντήκοντα was accidentally deleted due to
haplography and homoeoteluton--the eye of the scribe
passing from παρασαι to καὶ (the first word of the next
verse). It is also possible that the scribe purposely
deleted the phrase as being extraneous. But it is more
likely that he deleted it to bring Mark's account into
harmony with Matthew's (see 14:19) or John's (see 6:10),
neither of which mentions anything about specific
groupings. As such, the change in 𝔓45 displays the
phenomenon of the scribe's knowledge of one Gospel
creating a horizon of expectation for the other.

Mark 6:41
text
καὶ λαβὼν τοὺς <πέντε> ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς <δύο>
ἰχθύας ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εὐλόγησεν
καὶ κατέκλασεν τοὺς ἄρτους καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς
μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ
τοὺς <δύο> ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.
And taking the <five> loaves and the <two> fish, he looked
up to heaven, blessed and broke the bread and gave it to
his disciples that they might set it before them, and the
<two> fish he divided to all.
all other Greek MSS

variant

κal λaβὼν τoὺς ἄprouς κal τoὺς lΧθὐaς ἀναβλἐψaς
εlς τὸν oὐpaνὸν εὐλὀγησεν κal κaτἐκλaσεν τoὺς
ἄprouς κal ἐδίδoυ τoῖς μaθηταῖς aὐτoῦ ἵνa
πaρaτιθῶσιν aὐτoῖς, κal τoὺς lΧθὐaς ἐμἐρισεν
πᾶσιν.

And taking the loaves and the fish, he looked up to
heaven, blessed and broke the bread and gave it to his
disciples that they might set it before them, and the fish he
divided to all.

𝔓45

The scribe did not include the number of fish and loaves
because the number had already been noted in 6:38. This
shows that the scribe's intent was to keep the narrative
streamlined, uncluttered with unnecessary repetition.
However, the purpose of repeating the number of loaves
and fish is to magnify the significance of the miraculous
multiplication. **This was a famous story, occuring in all four
Gospels, all of which have the same details about the two
loaves and five fishes. Either the scribe of 𝔓45 assumed
that his readers would know this detail, or he presumed
upon their ignorance. If the latter, this may indicate that his
reading audience was quite isolated from the rest of the
Christian community in the Greco-Roman world and
therefore would not have known about these details.**

Mark 6:48a

text

περl τετάprην φυλaκὴν <τῆς νυκτὸς> ἐρΧεται πρὸς
aὐτoὺς

about the fourth watch <of the night> he came to them

all other Greek MSS

variant

περὶ τετάρτην φυλακὴν ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς

about the fourth watch he came to them

𝔓45vid

The scribe of 𝔓45 did not bother to include that it was the
fourth watch "of the night," since the previous verse
mentioned it was evening. This shows the scribe's desire
to streamline the narrative.

Mark 6:48b

text

ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης·
καὶ ἤθελεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.

he came to them, walking on the sea; and <he wanted> to
pass them

all other Greek MSS (D ηθελησεν)

variant

ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτοὺς περιπατῶν ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης·
καὶ ἤλθεν παρελθεῖν αὐτούς.

he came to them, walking on the sea; and <he began> to
pass them

𝔓45

It is possible that the scribe mistook ηθελεν for ηλθεν;
however, it is more likely he made a conscious change,
which was prompted by what he expected the text to say
but was then disappointed with what it did say. The entire
narrative leads the reader to believe that Jesus has seen
the distress of his disciples in the seastorm and that he
has miraculously come to rescue them. Perplexed with
why Jesus would <u>want</u> to pass by his disciples when he

had purposely gone out to rescue them, the scribe of 𝔓45 changed the volitional verb to a motion verb: "he began to pass them." This change displays that the scribe expected a direct and kind action from Jesus, not an enigmatic one.

But it is likely that the scribe misread the Marcan text, because there is an element of surprise therein. Jesus intended to "pass by" the disciples because it was a kind of epiphanic display of deity. According to Guelich (1989:350), the language "pass them by" has its significance in the similar language used in an epiphany of God to Moses (Exod. 33:19-23; 34:6) and Elijah (1 Kings 19:11) as the one who passed them by in a moment of self-revleation. Thus, this is an epiphany story about Jesus' self-revelation to his own disciples. He first displayed his glory and then he rescued them from the storm. However, it seems evident that the scribe of 𝔓45 did not grasp the epiphanic surprise in this story, nor had he been prepared for it.

Mark 7:5

text

Διὰ τί οὐ περιπατοῦσιν οἱ μαθηταί σου κατὰ τὴν παράδοσιν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀλλὰ <κοιναῖς χερσὶν> ἐσθίουσιν τὸν ἄρτον;

Why do your disciples not observe the traditions of the elders, but eat bread <with impure hands>?

ℵ* B (D W) Θ f¹ 33 it cop

variant 1

ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν

with unwashed hands

ℵ² A L 𝔐 it syr

variant 2

κοιναῖς χερσὶν καὶ ἀνίπτοις

with impure hands, that is, unwashed

𝔓45

The first variant is the result of harmonization to a parallel passage, Matt. 15:2. The second variant in 𝔓45 could reflect conscious harmonization to Matthew, but the variation in wording from Matthew seems to show the scribe's desire to help his readers understand Jewish tradition. Thus, he keeps the traditional terminology (κοιναῖς χερσὶν--common hands) with an added explanation (καὶ ἀνίπτοις--that is, unwashed). This change shows that the scribe of 𝔓45 was influenced by the usual textual construction in Mark, wherein the Gospel writer presented a Jewish tradition, followed by a short gloss for the sake of his Roman readers (see 7:2; 14:12; 15:42). It also shows that he was prompted by the wording in 7:2, which has the same kind of gloss, to add the gloss here.

Mark 8:10

text

Ἦλθεν εἰς τὰ μέρη <Δαλμανουθά>.

He came into the region of <Dalmanoutha>.

א A (B) C L 0274 𝔐

variant 1

Δαλμανουθαι

Dalmounai

W

variant 2

Μαγαδά

Magada

D^c it^{c,k} syr^s

variant 3

Μαγδαλά

Magdala

Θ f^{1,13}

variant 4

Μαγαδέν

Magaden

𝔓45^{vid}

The uncertainty of the location "Dalmanoutha," which is
mentioned only here in all of Greek literature led to many
textual variants. The first is a spelling variant, the second
variant represents scribal conformity to the text of Matt.
15:39, the third variant displays scribal conformity to a
variant of Matt. 15:39, and the fourth also represents
scribal conformity to the text of Matt. 15:39 (though with a
different spelling). The change in 𝔓45 displays the
phenomenon of the scribe's knowledge of one Gospel
creating a horizon of expectation for the other. Indeed, the
Gospel of Matthew, as the first Gospel, was quite
influential in the mind of the scribe of 𝔓45 because nearly
all Gospel harmonization in 𝔓45 is to Matthew. In this
case, we know it was Matthew's text that provided the
impetus for change and not some other independent
nonbiblical document, because "Magaden" (or
"Magadan") in no way helps to identify the location; it is
just as obscure as "Dalmanutha." This obscurity drove
scribes in both Matt. 15:39 and Mark 8:10 to substitute the
name "Magdala," which was a well-known city on the
coast of the Sea of Galilee.

Mark 8:12

text

Τί ἡ γενεὰ αὕτη <ζητεῖ> σημεῖον;

Why does this generation <seek> a sign?

א B C D L Δ Θ f¹ 33

variant 1

ἐπιζητεῖ

seek after

A W f¹³ 𝔐

variant 2

αἰτεῖ

ask

𝔓45

The first variant is the result of scribal conformity to Matt. 16:4, a parallel verse. The second variant may exhibit the scribe of 𝔓45's propensity to conform his text to Matthew's (see variant in 16:4, a parallel verse), or it could display scribal harmonization to 1 Cor. 1:22, a parallel passage. This, again, may show how the scribe's reading of Matthew formed a horizon of expectation for his reading of other Gospels--even to the extent that he knew exact wording. But if this wasn't a case of harmonization, the change could exhibit his tendency to lower the diction level in his rendition of the Gospels.

Mark 9:31

text

Ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται <εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων>

the Son of man is betrayed <into the hands of men>

all other Greek MSS

variant

'Ο υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται ⟨ἀνθρώπων⟩

the Son of man is betrayed ⟨by/to men⟩

𝔓45

The scribe of 𝔓45 herein displays his Hellenistic prejudices by eliminating a Hebraism, "into the hands of men." This also shows his sensitivities to his readers' Hellenistic <u>sitz im leben</u>.

The Gospel of Luke

Luke 9:30

text

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο ⟨συνελάλουν⟩ αὐτῷ οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας

and behold, two men ⟨were talking with⟩ him, who were Moses and Elijah

all other Greek MSS

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο ⟨συνλάλουντες⟩ αὐτῷ οἵτινες ἦσαν Μωϋσῆς καὶ Ἠλίας

and behold, two men ⟨were speaking with⟩ him, who were Moses and Elijah

𝔓45

The change of verb in 𝔓45, though not remarkably significant, is significant enough to show that the scribe conformed this verse to one of the parallel passages, Matt. 17:3 and Mark 9:4 (which is extant in 𝔓45). This reveals that one reading of a gospel created a horizon of expectation for reading another--to the extent that it

affected a single word substitution.

Luke 9:31

text

ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ. ἣν ⟨ἤμελλεν⟩ πληροῦν ἐν
'Ιερουσαλήμ

they were speaking of his exodus which ⟨he was about⟩
to fulfill in Jerusalem
all other Greek MSS

variant

ἔλεγον τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ. ἣν ⟨ἤμελλον⟩ πληροῦν ἐν
'Ιερουσαλήμ

they were speaking of his exodus which ⟨they were
about⟩ to fulfill in Jerusalem
𝔓45

There are three options for this unusual variant. (1) It was
simply a scribal mistake. If not, the plural "they" must refer
to (2) the disciples (James, Peter, John especially), or (3)
to Moses and Elijah with Jesus. The second option is
quite a stretch because the contextual focus is on Jesus'
imminent death and resurrection, by which he would
make an exodus back to the Father in heaven. Thus, the
disciples are not in view. The third option is extremely
interesting for it presents the idea that Moses and Elijah
were somehow going to participate in Jesus' "exodus"--
that is, his departure from Jerusalem to heaven via the
cross, resurrection, and ascension. But how could they
participate? In Judaism and in the early church there were
widespread traditions about how Moses was Jesus'
predecessor and Elijah was Jesus' precursor. As fellow
servants in God's mission, they appeared with the one
who would finish their work (ISBE 2:67). They had gone

before him--both were assumed to have ascended
straight into heaven--and each accomplished their
exodus. But the ultimate exodus, the one that goes
through death, could be accomplished only by Jesus.
Thus, Moses and Elijah saw themselves as united with
Jesus in this ultimate exodus. If this analysis is correct, it
may reveal the workings of the scribe's Judeo-Christian
prejudices.

Luke 9:37
text
'Εγένετο δὲ <τῇ ἐξῆς ἡμέρᾳ> κατελθόντων αὐτῶν
ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς.
And it came about <on the following day> when he came
down from the mountain that a great crowd met him.
𝔓75 ℵ A B C 𝔐

variant 1
διὰ τῆς ἡμέρας
after the day
D it

variant 2
τῆς ἡμέρας
on the day
𝔓45

The scribe of 𝔓45 made this event (the exorcism) happen
on the same day as Jesus' descent from the mountain of
his transfiguration. Most likely, he was influenced by the
previous parallel passages in Matthew (17:9) and Mark
(9:9), which say nothing about an intervening day. This
shows that the scribe's reading of one Gospel created a
horizon of expectation for another.

Luke 9:48

text

ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός
ἐστιν μέγας

for the one who is least among you all is great

all other Greek MSS

variant

ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτός
ἐστιν ‹ὁ μέγας›

for the one who is least among you all is ‹the great one›

𝔓45 cop

The insertion of the definite article by the scribe of 𝔓45
could be nothing more than an attempt to achieve
parallelism between *ὁ μικρότερος* (the least) and *ὁ*
μέγας (the great[est]). But the insertion could signal that
the scribe was thinking that Jesus was refering to himself
when he made this statement. Most modern scholars
don't think so (see Nolland 1993:520), but at least one
does (see Leaney 1954:91-92). And, apparently, the
scribe thought the text invited this interpolation. The scribe
thought that Jesus, who had assumed the lowest position,
was "the great One." Since this is a title ascribed to deity
(see BAGD 498) and since Luke had previously referred to
God as "the great one" (1:49; cf. 9:43), the scribe of 𝔓45
may have been taking the occasion to promote Jesus'
divinity. This intensifies the irony because the comparison
is not between men and men but between deity and men.

text

εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἢ κωλύετε·
<ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν.>
But Jesus said to him, "Do not stop him. <For whoever is
not against you is for you.>
𝔓75[vid] ℵ B C D W 565 700

variant 1

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν καθ ὑμῶν. ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ
ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν.
for he is not against you. For whoever is not against you is
for you.
L B 33 syr[hxx] cop[bo]

variant 2

οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν καθ ὑμῶν οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.
for he is not against you neither for you
𝔓45

The context of this passage helps us understand why the
scribe of 𝔓45 made the change noted above. The disciple
John had just reported to Jesus that he and some other
disciples had tried to stop an exorcist who used Jesus'
name for his exorcism because this particular exorcist
was not a follower of Jesus in their company. Jesus told
John, "Don't stop him. He who is not against us is for us."
The second sentence of this response is a conundrum.
How can one who is not opposed to Jesus be <u>for</u> Jesus?
The issue seems to be one of neutrality or indifference. At
least, this is what the scribe of 𝔓45 expected. When the
wording in his exemplar frustrated this expectation, he
proceeded to change the wording to "he who is not
against you neither for you." This alteration makes the
exorcist neutral, in Jesus' mind, and therefore not worthy

of concern.

Luke 10:11

text

τὸν κονιορτὸν ⟨τὸν κολληθέντα⟩ ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς
πόλεως ὑμῶν εἰς τοὺς πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν
the dust from your city ⟨clinging⟩ to us--we wipe off our
feet against you
all other Greek MSS

variant

τὸν κονιορτὸν ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν εἰς τοὺς
πόδας ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν
the dust from your city on us we wipe off our feet against
you
𝔓45

The dropping of τὸν κολληθέντα in 𝔓45 cannot be
explained as a transciptional error. It is likely that the
change came about as the result of the scribe's previous
reading of Matt. 10:14, a parallel passage, which does not
include τὸν κολληθέντα. This again shows how the
scribes' reading of Matthew created a horizon of
expectation for his reading of Luke.

Luke 10:21

text
Ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ
⟨καὶ τῆς γῆς⟩.
I praise you, Father, Lord of heaven ⟨and earth⟩.
all other Greek MSS

variant

text

'Εξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

I praise you, Father, Lord of heaven.

𝔓45 Marcion

According to Tertullian and Eusebius (see textual apparatus of NA[27]), Marcion abbreviated the title to "Lord of heaven." I can surmise two reasons for this adjustment. First, Marcion would have purposely tried to avoid including in Luke's Gospel any titular expressions that were reminiscent of the Old Testament, especially as coming from the mouth of Jesus. And there are many Old Testament expressions that are quite similar to this, each of which recognizes God as creator of both heaven and earth (see Gen. 14:19, 22; 24:3; Ps. 121:2; 124:8; 134:3). Second, Marcion was sympathetic with a gnosticism that made God aloof from all that is physical and earthly. Thus, God was only the Lord of heaven, not the Lord of the earth.

Since the scribe of 𝔓45 was not prone to deviate from Matthew, the only other Gospel to have this parallel account and to have the full phrase "Lord of heaven and earth" (see Matt. 11:25), it stands to reason that the Marcionite Gospel could have influenced the scribe of 𝔓45 in this instance.

Luke 11:12

text

ἢ καὶ αἰτήσει <ᾠόν>, ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον;

or even if he will ask for <an egg>, will he give him a scorpion?

all other Greek MSS

variant

ἢ καὶ αἰτήσει ἀρτὸν, ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ
σκορπίον;
or even if he will ask for <bread>, will he give him a
scorpion?
𝔓45

Luke 11:11-12 is a parallel passage to Matt. 7:7-9.
According to Luke's original writing, which has excellent
documentary support, there are two pairs mentioned in
Jesus' analogy: fish/serpent and egg/scorpion.
According to Matthew's account, there are also two pairs,
which are different: bread/stone and fish/serpent. In
inferior manuscripts in Luke 11:11 there is evidence of
harmonization with Matt. 7:9; it expands the text to three
pairs: fish/serpent, bread/stone, and egg/scorpion. Two
pairs are enough (in either Gospel) to make the point, but
Luke's pairs especially contrast two beneficial gifts (fish
and egg) with two harmful ones (serpent and scorpion).
The scribe of 𝔓45 resisted making any change in 11:11,
but not so in 11:12, where he changed "egg" to "bread."
This reveals his knowledge of the parallel account in
Matthew, and shows how his reading of that gospel
created a horizon of expectation for his reading of Luke,
which he conformed to Matthew.

Luke 11:14
text
ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος
ἐλάλησεν <ὁ κωφὸς> καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι
and when the demon came out, <the mute person> spoke
and the crowds were amazed
all other Greek MSS

variant

ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος
ἐλάλησεν καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι
and when the demon came out, he spoke and the crowds
were amazed
𝔓45

The deletion of ὁ κωφός cannot be easily explained as a
transcriptional error. Rather, it is likely that the scribe's
concretization of the text prompted him to delete ὁ κωφός
because it is illogical to indicate that a mute person can
speak. It is more appropriate to say that the one who was
formerly mute was now speaking--as a result of being
healed by Jesus. But the Gospel writers rarely said it that
way; all formerly disabled, diseased, amd even dead
people are still said to be what they were even after they
experienced a miracle. A healed leper is still called a
leper (Matt. 26:6), a healed blind man is still called a blind
man (John 9:17), and even a resuscitated man is still
called a dead man (John 11:44). But in this instance the
scribe of 𝔓45 broke stride for the sake of providing his
audience with a more readable text. This, again, suggests
that his audience did not have recourse to another source
to verify the scribe's rendition.

Luke 11:22a
text
ἐπὰν δὲ ἰσχυρότερος αὐτοῦ ⟨ἐπελθὼν⟩ νικήσῃ
αὐτόν
when a stronger one than he ⟨having come⟩, he
conquers him
most Greek MSS

variant 1
ἐλθὼν

having come

𝔓75 1241

variant 2

ἐπανελθών

having returned

𝔓45

The verb in the text is used to speak of any enemy attack
(see BAGD 285). The verb choice in 𝔓75 is a simpler
surrogate. The verb choice in 𝔓45 could have been
influenced by Lucan style, for the verb appears nowhere
else in the New Testament but in Luke (10:35; 19:15).
Furthermore, it shows the influence of the master-now-
returned-home motif which is so common in the Gospel
parables. And since most of these parables point to
Christ's second coming, the change in 𝔓45 also reveals a
Christo-centric influence. In other words, instead of
leaving the parable generic, the substitution of the verb
ἐπανελθών provides the parable with a Christological
interpretation. When Christ (the stronger man) returns, he
will overpower the strong man (perhaps Satan). Such a
change probably shows the scribe's sensitivity to his
Christian audience who would have given this parable this
interpretation anyway. But the verb switch provides
affirmation.

Luke 11:22b
As a matter of course, the scribe of 𝔓45 substituted a
simpler, more common verb, δίδωσιν, for the rarer verb
διαδίδωσιν. This shows the scribe's tendency to move
the text in the direction of having a slightly lower level of
diction. He made such changes in the interest of his
Egyptian audience, many of whom would have had Coptic

as their native language and Greek as a second language.

Luke 11:36

text

ει ουν το σωμα σου ολον φωτεινον. μη εχον ‹μερος›
τι σκοτεινον. εσται φωτεινον ολον

if therefore your whole body is full of light, not having any
‹part› dark, it will all be full of light
all other Greek MSS

variant

ει ουν το σωμα σου ολον φωτεινον. μη εχον ‹μελος›
τι σκοτεινον. εσται φωτεινον ολον

if therefore your whole body is full of light, not having any
‹member› dark, it will all be full of light
𝔓45

It could be argued that the change in 𝔓45 is the result of a
scribal error--there is only a one-letter difference (ρ/λ)
between μερος and μελος. But it is more likely that the
scribe of 𝔓45 was simply responding to the textual clues,
which would cause a reader to think of a body part, not
just any part. The word μελος is used strictly for body
parts, whereas μερος is broader in scope--being used to
designate portions, parts, regions, shares, or affairs.

Luke 12:1

Again, the scribe of 𝔓45 substituted the more commom
word συναχθεισων for the rarer one, επισυναχθεισων
(which occurs only five times in the New Testament),
though both mean the same thing. This shows the
scribe's tendency to move the text in the direction of
having slightly lower diction.

Luke 12:2

text

οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ
ἀποκαλυφθήσεται <καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται>
and there is nothing concealed which will not be revealed
<and hidden which will not be made known>
all other Greek MSS

variant

οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ
ἀποκαλυφθήσεται
and there is nothing concealed which will not be revealed
𝔓45

It is possible that the second clause in 𝔓45 was
accidentally deleted due to homoeoteleuton:
αποκαλυφ<u>θησεται</u> . . . γνωσ<u>θησεται</u>. However, if it was not
accidental, it is possible that the scribe considered the
second clause to be tautologous. But it is
characteristically Hebraic to emphasize a point by using a
parallelism, wherein the second clause presents the
same truth as the first but with different words. Luke's
Gospel is full of such imported Hebraisms (cf. 8:17),
which effectively reflect the language of Jesus and his
milieu. But such Hebraisms were probably odd to this
Egyptian scribe with an Alexandrian mentality.

Luke 12:7

It is possible that the word *ἠριθμημέναι* (to count),
appearing only in 𝔓45 (without *εἰσίν*), was adopted
from Matt. 10:30, a parallel passage. If so, this shows that
the scribe of 𝔓45 had an intimate knowledge of Matthew,
which created his horizon of expectation for his reading of
the other Gospels.

Luke 12:9

text

ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων
ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ

but the person denying me before men will be denined
before the angels of God

all other Greek MSS

variant
omit verse
𝔓45 itᵉ syrˢ

The omission in 𝔓45 may have been accidental, due to
haplography--the eye of a scribe passing from the last
four words of 12:8 (which are the same at the end of 12:9)
to the beginning of 12:10. But it is possible that he
purposely excised the verse because it incriminates Peter
who denied Jesus before men (see Luke 22:57, 61). If so,
it shows the scribe's favoritism of Peter, a growing
phenomenon in the early centuries of the church.

Luke 12:24a

text

κατανοήσατε ⟨τοὺς κόρακας⟩ ὅτι οὐ σπείρουσιν
οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν, οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ταμεῖον οὐδὲ
ἀποθήκη, καὶ ὁ θεὸς τρέφει αὐτούς· πόσῳ
μᾶλλον ὑμεῖς διαφέρετε τῶν πετεινῶν.

Consider ⟨the ravens⟩ that they do not sow neither reap,
and they have neither storerooms or barns, but God feeds
them. How much greater are you than the birds?
most Greek MSS

variant 1

τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

the birds of heaven

D it^{d,e,l}

variant 2

τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοὺς κόρακας

the birds of heaven and the ravens

𝔓45

Two things could account for the change in 𝔓45. Jesus'
mention of "birds" in the second part of the verse could
have caused the scribe to look back and then make an
insertion in the first part. But it is more likely that the
change in 𝔓45 was prompted by the scribe's reading of
the Gospel of Matthew, which formed a horizon of
expectation for his reading of Luke. So he added "birds of
heaven" from the parallel passage, Matt. 6:26.

Luke 12:24b

text

οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ταμεῖον οὐδὲ ‹ἀποθήκη›

for which [there is] not a storeroom or ‹a barn›

all other Greek MSS

οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ταμεῖον οὐδὲ ‹ἀποθῆκαι›

for which [there is] not storeroom or ‹barns›

𝔓45

The change to the plural in 𝔓45 could show, again, that the
scribe was again thinking of Matt. 6:26 for this part of this
verse, for Matt. 6:26 reads συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας
(gather into barns).

Luke 12:47

text

ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ

‹καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας ἢ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα

αὐτοῦ› δαρήσεται πολλάς

the slave, knowing the will of his master ‹and not

preparing [for it] or doing his will›, will be beaten with

many blows

𝔓75 ℵ B   070 33

variant 1

καὶ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ

and doing his own will

𝔓45

variant 2

καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ

and not being prepared for his will

L W f¹³ it syrc.s

variant 3

καὶ μὴ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ

and not doing his will

D Marcion Irenaeus Origen Cyril

variant 4

καὶ μὴ ἑτοιμάσας μηδὲ ποιήσας πρὸς τὸ θέλημα

αὐτοῦ

and not preparing [for it] or even doing his will

A Θ f¹ 𝔐

The text has solid documentary support and makes

perfectly good sense. The second and third variants are

truncations of the text, and the fourth has but a slight

alteration. The first variant in 𝔓45 cannot be easily

explained as a scribal error because though either μη
ετοιμασας or η ποιησας could have dropped out due to
homoeoteleuton—not so for μη ετοιμασας η. Thus, if the
change was intentional, it is possible that the scribe of 𝔓45
was thinking that the servant's sin was that of conspiring
against the master's will (see Fitzmyer 1985:992). This
means the servant knew the master's will and yet went
ahead to do his own will (cf. James 4:17). The last part of
the verse--"he will receive many blows"--may have
prompted this adjustment, inasmuch as nothing short of
rebellion could have called for such severe punishment.

Luke 12:55

text

καὶ ὅταν νὁτον πνέοντα, λέγετε ὅτι Καὑσων ἔσται

and when a south wind [is] blowing, you say, "It will be
hot."

all other Greek MSS

variant

καὶ ὅταν νὁτον πνέοντα ⟨ἴδητε⟩, λέγετε ὅτι Καὑσων
ἔσται

and when ⟨you see⟩ a south wind blowing, you say, "It
will be hot."

𝔓45 it

This is an example of basic gap filling (in the Ingardenian
sense), which was initiated by the implicit message of the
text. Indeed, the very same verb is used in the previous
verse.

Luke 13:30

The omission of the second εἰσίν in this verse was
probably influenced by the scribe's experience of copying

Matt. 19:30 and Mark 10:31, parallel passages. If this was
not a researched change (i.e., one the scribe actually
looked up), it displays that the scribe had an intimate
knowledge of the Gospels (especially Matthew) which
created a kind of exemplar in the scribe's cognition and
which he automatically brought with him to his reading of
other Gospels.

Luke 13:32

text

ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ⟨ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ
σήμερον καὶ αὔριον⟩ καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι.
I cast out demons and ⟨I accomplish cures today and
tomorrow⟩ and on the third day I finish [my work].
𝔓75 ℵ B L 33

variant 1

ἰάσεις ἐπιτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον
I complete cures today and tomorrow
A W Θ f^{1,13} 𝔐

variant 2

ἰάσεις ἀποτελοῦμαι σήμερον καὶ αὔριον
I will complete cures today and tomorrow
D

variant 3

ἰάσεις ποιοῦμαι καὶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον
I do cures both today and tomorrow
𝔓45

A number of verbal substitutions occured in the first part of
this verse--all in the interest of changing a rare verb into a
more common one. The most common is that found in

P45, whose scribe seemed to have had a propensity for substituting common verbs for rare ones. Perhaps this gives us a window into his horizon of expectations and/or reveals his interest in providing his readers with a kind of digested or vulgate version.

Luke 14:5

text

Τίνος ὑμῶν <υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς> εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;

Which of you having <a son or an ox> falling into a well, will not immediately pull him out on the sabbath?

P75 (A) B W 𝔐 it[e] syr[h,p] cop[sa]

variant 1

ὄνος ἢ βοῦς

a donkey or an ox

ℵ L f[1,13] 33 cop[sa]

variant 2

βοῦς ἢ ὄνος

an ox or a donkey

syr[s]

variant 3

υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς ἢ ὄνος

a son or an ox or a donkey

syr[c]

variant 4

ὄνος υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς

foal of a donkey or an ox

θ

variant 5

πρόβατον ἢ βοῦς

a sheep or an ox

D it^d

variant 6

ἢ υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς

the(?) son or an ox

𝔓45

The reading of the text is preferred because it has the best documentary support and is the reading that explains the origin of all the variants. This reading cannot be explained as a transcriptional error, wherein *ὄνος* was mistaken for *υἱὸς*. In fact, in 𝔓75 the word *υἱὸς* is abbreviated as *υς*; as such, the scribe clearly knew he was writing the word for "son." And it is very unlikely that *υἱὸς* (son) is a corruption of *ὄϊς* (sheep), as was conjectured by Mill (1723:44), because *ὄϊς* is a poetic word that rarely appears in Greek prose.

The fifth variant is the result of assimilation to Matt. 12:11. The second, third, and fourth variants are poorly attested conflations of the reading of the text or of the first variant. The first variant (and all those that follow) is the result of scribes fixing what appeared to be an incongruous collocation of two words: "son" and "ox." It would be natural to change this to "a donkey or an ox" in light of the Old Testament texts such as Exod. 21:33; 22:4; 23:5; Deut. 22:4. But there was Rabbinic and Qumranic teaching around the time of Christ that stipulated rules pertaining to the rescue of people and of animals on the sabbath day (Marshall 1978:580). Thus, Jesus' combination of "son and ox" would not have sounded

incongruous to his Pharasaic listeners.

The variant in 𝔓45 reveals that the scribe may have had the first variant in his exemplar or at least he knew of the reading, because the feminine article ἡ does not coincide with masculine υἱός; rather, it presupposes βοῦς, which--with the feminine article--designates a female donkey (cf. Matt. 21:2). Perhaps he first intended to write η βους, but he wrote η υιος in the end--leaving the η uncorrected. This duplicity shows that both readings were quite early, and that the scribe of 𝔓45 was in the position to make a choice, one which was influenced by his reading of Matthew.

Luke 14:20

Luke used the unusual form of the verb γαμέω in the statement Γυναῖκα ἔγημα (I married a woman). This was changed in 𝔓45 to the more common form, ἠγαμήσα. Again, this shows the scribe's tendency to provide a more ordinary reading for his readers.

Luke 14:23

text

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον, Ἐξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς καὶ <ἀνάγκασον> εἰσελθεῖν, ἵνα γεμισθῇ μου ὁ οἶκος

And the master said to the servant, "Go out into the roads and lanes and <compel> them to come in, so that my house may be filled."

all other Greek MSS

variant

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος πρὸς τὸν δοῦλον,, Ἐξελθε εἰς τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ φραγμοὺς καὶ <πόησον> εἰσελθεῖν, ἵνα γεμισθῇ μου ὁ οἶκος

And the master said to the servant, "Go out into the roads
and lanes and <make> them come in, so that my house
may be filled."
𝔓45 syr[c,s]

The change in 𝔓45 is not the result of harmonization to a
remote parallel inasmuch as the parallel passage (Matt.
21:1-10) does not have a comparable command from the
master to his servant. Thus, the reason for the change is
likely due to the scribe's habit of substituting simpler
words for more complex. The verb ἀνάγκαζω (to
compel) appears only seven times in the New Testament
(three times in the Gospels), compared to ποιῶ, which
appears hundreds of times. This editing in the direction of
a lower   reading level suggests that the scribe perceived
his audience required a lowering of the lexical level.

The Gospel of John

John 10:14-15
text
γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ <καὶ γινώσκουσί με τὰ ἐμά, καθὼς
γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα>
I know my own <and my own know me--just as the Father
knows me and I know the Father>
𝔓45* 𝔓66 𝔓75 ℵ B D L W

variant 1
καὶ γινώσκομαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ
πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα
and I am known by my own--just as the Father knows me
and I know the Father
A Θ f[1,13] 33 𝔐

variant 2

*καὶ γινώσκει με τὰ ἐμά· καὶ καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ
πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα*

and he knows my own; and as the Father knows me, I
also know the Father

$\mathfrak{P}45^C$ (incorrectly listed in NA[27])

The pronominal reference in $\mathfrak{P}45$ must be to the Father.
Thus, in the corrected text of $\mathfrak{P}45$ the Lord knows the
sheep and the Father knows the sheep. This correction (a
rare phenomenon in $\mathfrak{P}45$), which is in the same hand as
the original scribe's (see photograph 1 in the Appendix) ,
eliminates the matter of mutual knowledge between the
sheep and the shepherd. The change was probably
prompted by a perceived discontinuity with the clause
that follows. In other words, the scribe must have thought
it difficult, if not impossible, for Jesus and the believers to
have the same kind of mutual intimacy as exists between
the Father and the Son. Indeed, there is nothing in the text
of John so far (up to chapter ten) that prepares the reader
for this statement. It is not until the upper room discourse
(chapters 13-17) that we hear of Jesus preparing the
disciples for their new relationship with the Father via the
Spirit of the Son.

John 10:34-36
text

*Οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι Ἐγὼ
εἶπα, Θεοί ἐστε; εἰ θεοὺς <πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τοῦ
θεοῦ ἐγένετο>, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι <ἡ
γραφή> ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς
τὸν κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον,
Υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι;*

Is it not written in your Law, "I said you are gods." If he

called them 'gods,' <to whom the word of God came>--
and <the Scripture> cannot be broken--what about the
one whom the Father set apart and sent into the world?
Why then do you accuse me of blasphemy because I
said, "I am God's Son"?
all other Greek MSS

variant
Οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ ὑμῶν ὅτι 'Εγὼ
εἶπα, Θεοί ἐστε; εἰ θεοὺς, καὶ οὐ δύναται λυθῆναι,
ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν
κόσμον ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι Βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον, Υἱὸς
τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι;
Is it not written in your Law, "I said you are gods." If he
called them 'gods'--and it [= the Law] cannot be broken--
what about the one whom the Father set apart and sent
into the world? Why then do you accuse me of blasphemy
because I said, "I am God's Son"?
𝔓45

This is a cumbersome verse, loaded with layers of
interconnected propositions. According to the reading of
the text, Jesus first cited Ps. 82:6 to counter the Jews'
charge of blasphemy. In Ps. 82 the supreme God is said
to rise in judgment against those whom he calls "gods"
(Hebrew, elohim), even "sons of the Most High," because
they had failed to extend justice and equity to the helpless
and oppressed. These "gods" were those who were the
official representatives of God; they were the judges
executing judgment for God. Jesus then argued that it was
not blasphemous to call himself the Son of God when, in
fact, he was the one the Father sanctified and sent into the
world. The judges of Israel, to whom the word of God
came, represented God and therefore were called

"gods." The Jews could not argue against this because it stands written in the irrefragable Scriptures (i.e., the Scriptures are an entity from which no one can remove any portion). But Jesus was greater than those men who received messages from God, for he himself was the very message from God to men. And whereas they were earthly men selected by God to represent him, the Son of God came from heaven as the sanctified one (i.e., set apart from all earthly things) to fully represent the heavenly God.

The scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$45 wanted to unencumber the text. He did so by eliminating the statement that "the word of God came" to the ones called "gods" (i.e., the judges) and by eliminating the phrase, "the Scriptures," because his readers might not know that "the Law" and "the Scriptures" are synonyms. The scribe realized that these ideas distract from Jesus' main proposition: if God calls mortals "gods," then Jesus can call himself the Son of God because he is heavenly. Furthermore, there is nothing in Ps. 82 which suggests that these judges received the word of God.

I would surmise that we see the scribe operating here according to his preconceived intention to trim the text of excess verbage for the sake of his reading audience; at the same time, his deletions obfuscate any potential problems with the reference to Ps. 82. This underscores my earlier hypothesis that the horizon of expectations of Christian scribes was shaped by their perceptions of how their audience would receive the text. Since these scribes probably would have also been the church lectors, it was their task to both make copies and read them. This double role effected the way they read the text in the process of copying it. In other words, they read it both for themselves and their audience.

John 11:2

text

ἦν δὲ Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον μύρῳ καὶ
ἐκμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς.
ἧς ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λάζαρος ἠσθένει.
And Mary was the one who anointed the Lord with
perfume and wiped his feet with her hair; it was her
brother Lazarus who was sick.
all other Greek MSS

variant

ἦν δὲ <αὐτὴ ἡ> Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον
μύρῳ καὶ ἐκμάξασα τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ταῖς
θριξὶν αὐτῆς. ἧς ὁ ἀδελφὸς Λάζαρος ἠσθένει.
And <this woman> was <the> Mary who anointed the Lord
with perfume and wiped his feet with her hair; it was her
brother Lazarus who was sick.
𝔓45 it^e syr^p,s cop

In keeping with Jesus' prediction (Matt. 26:13), this Mary
was well known in the Christian community because of
her display of love and devotion to Christ (Matt. 26:6-13;
Mark 14:3-9). Therefore, John identified her with this event
even before he described it (12:1-7). John's original
readers would have known of this woman and of the
event. But the scribe of 𝔓45 (as well as subsequent
translators) wanted to help the readers of his own
generation with this identification; so he added a deictic
pronoun and an article for added specificity.

John 11:4

text

Αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς θάνατον ἀλλ ὑπὲρ
τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα δοξασθῇ <ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ

θεοῦ> δὶ αὐτῆς.

This sickness is not leading to death but for the glory of God, that <the Son of God> might be glorified through it.
all other Greek MSS

variant 1
ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ
his Son
𝔓45 it^c syr^s cop^{sa} cop^{ac2}

variant 2
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρωπθοῦ
the Son of Man
0250

variant 3
ὁ υἱὸς
the Son
𝔓66

Apparently, it seemed strange to several scribes (including the scribe of 𝔓45) and translators that Jesus would refer to himself as "the Son of God" in this particular context. Such a feeling was promoted by the text of John itself in that Jesus almost always refers to himself as "the Son of Man," or "the Son," or "his Son" (with reference to God the Father)--each of which are reflected in the above variants. The only occasion in John where he calls himself "God's Son" is in 10:36, where he presents a defense of his deity.

John 11:25a
text
Ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις <καὶ ἡ ζωή>.

I am the resurrection <and the life>.

𝔓66 𝔓75 ℵ A B C D L W Δ Θ 0250 f[1.13] 33 it syr cop

variant

'Εγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις.

I am the resurrection.

𝔓45 it[l] syr[s] Cyprian

According to superior documentation, Jesus revealed that
he is "the resurrection and the life." Life that is really life (1
Tim. 6:19) is by its very nature resurrection-life because it
can stand the trial of death. Only one kind of life--the life of
God (Eph. 4:18), the indissoluble life (Heb. 7:16),
designated ζωή in the New Testament--is truly life. All
else that is called "life" eventually dies. Jesus is this life;
therefore, he is also the resurrection (cf. Rev. 1:18). Thus,
in making the statement 'Εγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ
ζωή he was saying "I am the resurrection because I am
the life."

In context, however, it is not necessary for Jesus to
declare that he is both the resurrection and the life. Jesus
was speaking with Martha about how he would raise
Lazarus from the dead (11:23). But Martha thought Jesus
was speaking of an event--the eschatological resurrection
(11:24). Jesus revealed that he, a person, is the
resurrection. To the mind of the scribe of 𝔓45, it may have
seemed extraneous or tautological to add "and the life" to
"I am the resurrection," because the latter is a poignant
response to Martha's belief in the final resurrection and
Lazarus' participation in it. Thus, the scribe of 𝔓45 was
prompted by his pereeption of the implications of the
text to abbreviate Jesus' self-declaration.

John 11:25b

text

ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ <ζήσεται>

the one believing in me, even if he should die, <will live>

all other Greek MSS

variant

ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ <ζήσει>

the one believing in me, even if he should die, <lives>

𝔓45

This change in verb tense accords with the previous
change made the scribe of 𝔓45 (see note on 11:25a). His
reading of the text called for a de-emphasis of the future
resurrection and a shifting of focus to Christ being the
present resurrection. As such, those who believe in him,
though they have physically died, still live. The
significance of this statement in the context of chapter 11
is remarkable: Lazarus, though he had died, had not
actually died--because his faith in Jesus kept him alive.
This change may have been prompted by 11:11, where
Jesus declares that "Lazarus is sleeping; I am going to
wake him up."

John 11:44

text

ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ <περιεδέδετο>

his face <was bound around> with a cloth

all other Greek MSS

variant

ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ <ἐδέδετο>

his face <was bound> with a cloth

𝔓45

The verb περιεδέδετο (from περιδέω) is a hapaxlegomenon in the New Testament. As frequently happened, the scribe of 𝔓45 changed a rare word to a more common one. This could reflect his motive to provide his readers with an easy-to-read version.

John 11:51

text

τοῦτο δὲ ἀφ ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ <ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου> ἐπροφήτευσεν ὅτι ἔμελλεν Ἰησοῦς ἀποθνῄσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους

He did not say this on his own, but <being high priest that year> he prophesied that Jesus was about to die for the [Jewish] nation

most Greek MSS

variant 1

ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ

being high priest of the year

𝔓66 D

variant 2

ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν

being high priest

𝔓45 it^[e, l] syr^[s]

Some scholars, such as Bultmann (1971:314), pointed out that the author of this Gospel must not have known about Jewish customs, because high priests were appointed to a life-long term, not an annual one. But the expression "that year" probably refers to that one momentous year in which Jesus was crucified. It does not mean that Caiaphas served as a high priest for only one year, because he served for eighteen years (from A.D. 18 to 36).

However, the scribe of 𝔓45 wanted to remove any possible mistaken presentation in the text, so he deleted "that year." This change reveals both his knowledge of history and his sensitivity to the accurateness of the text of the Gospel text--an accuracy which superseded any kind of allegiance to copying the exact wording of the text if he thought it was in error or could be perceived by readers as being mistaken.

John 11:57

text

δεδώκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἀρΧιερεῖς καὶ ⟨οἱ Φαρισαῖοι⟩ ἐντολὰς ἵνα ἐάν τις γνῷ ποῦ ἐστιν μηνύσῃ, ὅπως πιάσωσιν αὐτόν

the chief priests and ⟨the Pharisees⟩ had given a command that if anyone knew where he was, he should make it known so they could arrest him

all other Greek MSS

variant

δεδώκεισαν δὲ οἱ ἀρΧιερεῖς καὶ ⟨οἱ πρεσβυτεροῖ⟩ ἐντολὰς ἵνα ἐάν τις γνῷ ποῦ ἐστιν μηνύσῃ, ὅπως πιάσωσιν αὐτόν

the chief priests and ⟨the elders⟩ had given a command that if anyone knew where he was, he should make it known so they could arrest him

𝔓45ᵛⁱᵈ

The scribe of 𝔓45 conformed John's account of the Jewish leaders' plot to kill Jesus to Matthew's account, who states that οἱ ἀρΧιερεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβυτεροῖ (the chief priests and the elders) were those who plotted Jesus' death (see Matt. 26:3-4). This, again, shows that the reading of one Gospel (Matthew's) created a horizon

of expectation for the scribe's reading of John. When John didn't coincide with Matthew, he fixed John accordingly.

Observations

The Scribe's Horizon of Expectations

The copyist of 𝔓45 may or may not have been a professional scribe. The professionalism shows in the consistently good handwriting and in the sparsity of transcriptional errors. The nonprofessionalism shows in the number of omissions he made. Of course, some of these omissions could be attributed to an Alexandrian penchant for brevity (see, for example, the note above on Luke 12:2). Other omissions could be attributed to haste-- unless the scribe was purposely trying to produce a digested version. This latter proposition has some credence in that the scribe seems to have purposely dispensed with the dispensable word and excised what he considered to be superfluous. All this shows that he may have had an audience in mind whom he thought would appreciate a trimmed-down version and a toned-down version. The toning-down is most evident at the diction level. More often than not, the scribe substituted a more common word for a rarer one. This is evident in his change of $\zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ (seek) to $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\hat{\iota}$ (ask) in Mark 8:12, of $\delta\iota\alpha\delta\iota\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ (distribute) to $\delta\iota\delta\omega\sigma\iota\nu$ (give) in Luke 11:22, of $\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\hat{\omega}$ (accomplish) to $\pi\sigma\iota\sigma\hat{\nu}\mu\alpha\iota$ (do) in Luke 13:31, and of $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\epsilon\delta\dot{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\tau\sigma$ (was bound around) to $\dot{\epsilon}\delta\dot{\epsilon}\delta\epsilon\tau\sigma$ (was bound) in John 11:44. This lowering of the diction level could be attributed to the scribe's awareness that some in his audience were native Coptic-speakers and therefore would know Greek as a second

language.

Presumably the scribe's readers were Christians, with whom he would have probably shared the same beliefs. Interestingly, the scribe must have assumed that his readers would have readily received his digested text and not questioned its fidelity. If his audience had recourse to other copies of the Gospels (such as $\mathfrak{P}66$ and $\mathfrak{P}75$), they would have seen how different this text was from theirs. As such, I would assume that the scribe was writing for an isolated community of Christians. To him--and presumably to them--it was the message of the Gospels that counted, not necessarily the exact wording. Colwell was on the same track when he said that the textual corruption of the text in $\mathfrak{P}45$ reveals an uncontroled, local tradition. Colwell (1965:123) said, "It occurs where Greek sophistication is in short supply--in the backwoods where few knew Greek--and results in the making of an independent translation. In these areas appeal to a 'standard' text was impossible, for the very idea did not exist."

However, this freedom rarely changed the theological substance of the text. I could find only one instance where the scribe may have been influenced by Marcion--in Luke 10:21, where the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}45$ wrote "Lord of heaven" instead of "Lord of heaven and earth" (see note above). Most of the other changes are subtle. At times, the scribe felt free to change the wording to affirm a Christological interpretation. This is evident in Luke 11:22, where he made a verb substitution which suggests that Christ is the strong man who, when he returns, will defeat the enemy. In two other instances, the scribe made changes that showed his sensitivity to his Christian readers. In John 11:2, he made sure his readers understood that the "Mary" in this chapter is the same well-known Mary who anointed Jesus, and in John 11:49 the scribe removed

verbage that might have caused his readers to question John's historical reliability.

The scribe's use of nomina sacra indicates he was a Christian. In addition to the usual abbreviations found in the early New Testament papyri, he abbreviated $\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\rho\sigma\nu$ (cross) as $\overline{\sigma\rho\nu}$ and $X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\nu\sigma\nu\varsigma$ (Christians) as $\overline{X\rho\alpha\nu\sigma\nu\varsigma}$. These are telltale, esoteric signs of scribes who belonged to the Christian community. But there is an even stronger indication of his Christianity--his intimate knowledge of the four Gospels. This knowledge is displayed in his Gospel harmonizations--some of which are quite sophisticated and therefore display an unconscious harmonization of one Gospel to another. In other words, one Gospel version (that of Matthew's) had become so engrained in his horizon of expectation, that he refused to see a new wording in another version of the Gospel. The resultant harmonization is displayed in the following passages:

1. Matt. 20:31 to Mark 10:48; Luke 18:39
2. Mark 6:40 to Matt. 14:19; John 6:10
3. Mark 8:10 to Matt. 15:39
4. Mark 8:12 to Matt. 16:4
5. Luke 9:30 to Matt. 17:3; Mark 9:4
6. Luke 9:37 to Matt. 17:9; Mark 9:9
7. Luke 10:11 to Matt. 10:14
8. Luke 11:12 to Matt. 7:9
9. Luke 12:24a to Matt. 6:26; Luke 12:24
10. Luke 13:30 to Matt. 19:30; Mark 10:31
11. John 11:57 to Matt. 26:3-4

This list is significant inasmuch as it shows that, had there been more text of $\mathfrak{P}$45 available, we would see more harmonizations. Furthermore, this list makes it evidently clear that the Gospel of Matthew was predominant in the

scribe's thinking; it formed his horizon of expectation--a horizon by which he read all the other Gospels. Of course, it is possible that the scribe looked up all the parallel passages in the text of Matthew and made rote harmonizations, but this seems unlikely because the harmonization was not thorough-going at all. Rather, the more likely scenario is that the scribe had most of Matthew memorized, so that it formed a literary repertoirein his mind. It became a kind of cognitive exemplar by which he read other Gospels. Thus, even though the scribe wanted to shorten the text for the sake of his readership, he rarely did so at the cost of making one Gospel disharmonize with others--especially Matthew.

In a culture where the oral tradition was prominent, it was not unusual for serious Christians to have entire books of the Bible commited to memory. We know, for example, that the requirement for entrance into various monasteries was that the applicant needed to have memorized all of the Psalms and at least one Gospel (The Life of Pachomius 94-95). Furthermore, we know that Matthew was the most popular of the synoptic Gospels among the early Christians. Far more manuscripts of Matthew have been recovered in Egypt than Mark and Luke combined. (Of the eleven second and third-century manuscripts containing portions of Matthew, Mark, or Luke, eight contain Matthew, one contains Mark, and three contain Luke.) Thus, it should not surprise us that Matthew formed the horizon of expectation for the reading of other Gospels. The reading receptions of $\mathfrak{P}$45's scribe affirm Jauss' position that a reader cannot help but be prejudiced by what he or she has already read.

A few other singular variants could reveal that the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$45, while being Christian, was also familiar with

Jewish traditions. In Luke 9:31 he made some changes which perhaps show that he was aware of the Jewish traditions about Elijah's interaction with the Messiah, and in John 11:49 his change reveals that he knew the Jewish traditions about the length of tenure for the high priest.

The Scribe's Interaction with the Text as a Reader

The scribe of P45 has been characterized as producing a "free" text (Alands 1988:99), a text wherein he provided an abbreviated yet readable rendition of his vorlage. Colwell (1965:119) pointed out several striking examples of omissions made by the scribe of P45. I will mention three of Colwell's examples. In P45's rendition of the multiplication of the loaves (Mark 6:40), the scribe of P45 excluded the details about the 5,000 sitting down "by hundreds and by fifties," as well as the details about how many loaves and fishes there were. In John 11:25, he abbreviated Jesus' statement "I am the resurrection and the life" to simply "I am the resurrection." And in John 11:49 the expression "being high priest that year" was reduced to "being high priest."

These omissions, and many more that I have noted above, were not simply the result of scribal excision for the sake of trimming. In Mark 6:40 the scribe of P45 made a deletion to bring Mark's account into harmony with Matthew's (see 14:19) or John's (see 6:10). In John 11:25 the scribe of P45 thought it tautological to add "and the life" to "I am the resurrection," because the latter is Jesus' poignant rejoinder to Martha who believed in the final resurrection as being nothing more than an event. And in John 11:49 the change reveals the scribe's knowledge of history and his sensitivity to the accurateness of the historicity of the text.

In these instances and in many more, the scribe demonstrated that he noticed various blanks in the text and then responded to the response-inviting textual clues by providing some of his own solutions. This is evident in a verse like Matt. 26:6, where the reader is to assume that Jesus is now in the house of one who was formerly a leper, and thus is prompted to imagine that Simon was not really a leper but was simply "called" or "named" one as a marked distinction of his previous condition before coming to Jesus for healing. It is also evident in the scribe's reaction to a verse like Mark 6:48, where the reader is led to believe that Jesus was coming to rescue the disciples, not by-pass them. The scribe's change in Luke 9:48 seems to indicate that he followed the dictates of Luke's theology as previously presented and subsequently identified the least one as being the great one--the Lord God (not just a generic "great one").

The scribe's reaction to other response-inviting situtations is evident in portions such as Luke 11:36, wherein the text could prompt a reader to think of a body part, not just any part. Hence, the scribe substituted μέλος (which is used strictly for body parts) for μέρος (which designates portions, parts, regions, shares, or affairs in general). In John 10:14-15, a change was probably prompted by a perceived discontinuity with the previous text of John. There is nothing in the text of John prior to chapter ten that prepares the reader for a statement about the intimacy between Jesus and his followers paralleling that of Jesus and his Father. And in John 10:34-36 the scribe deleted phrases about the scriptures--not for any apparent theological reasons--but because they distracted from Jesus' main proposition: if God calls mortals "gods," then Jesus can call himself the Son of God because he is heavenly.

Other examples, noted above, reveal that the scribe was not just arbitrarily pruning the text. Often, the text seems to have led him in this direction. And though we do not see any large portions added to the text, the few additions he made were also initiated by his interaction with the text. The changes that were not omissions or additions were often subtle substitutions of one or two words. In many instances this kind of substitution was influenced by his motive to provide his readership with lower-level diction. At other times, the scribe was prompted by a perceived blank in understanding which he took the liberty to fill with his own creative interpolations.

In conclusion, I think it could be posited that the work of the scribe of 𝔓45, on one hand, exhibits a preconceived design to produce a digested text, yet on the other hand, it shows that he interacted with the response-inviting elements immanent in the text. As such, his unique production affirms Jauss' theory that the reader's horizon of expectations effects his reading, and it also affirms Iser's theory that the text itself, providing a structured act, prompts individualized receptions.

Chapter Five

An Examination of Scribal Reception through an Analysis
of Significant Singular Readings of 𝔓66, a Johannine
Manuscript from Jabal Abu Manna, Egypt

Provenance and Date

One of the most significant discoveries of biblical
manuscripts since the Dead Sea Scrolls is that of the
Bodmer Papyri. These papyri were purchased by Martin
Bodmer (founder of the Bodmer Library of World
Literature in Cologny, a suburb of Geneva) from a dealer
in Cairo, Egypt in the 1950s and 1960s. The Bodmer
collection includes four Greek biblical codices: (1) II,
Gospel of John (𝔓66); (2) VII-IX, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude (𝔓72)
and Psalms 33 and 34; (3) XIV-XV Luke and John (𝔓75); (4)
XVII, Acts, James, 1 and 2 Peter, Jude (𝔓74, seventh
century). It also has six Coptic biblical codices: (1) III,
John and Genesis; (2) VI, Proverbs; (3) XVI, Exodus; (4)
XVIII, Deuteronomy; (5) XIX, Matthew and Romans; (6) XXI,
Joshua (a collection divided with Beatty). The Bodmer
collection has some Greek literature (I, Homer's Iliad; IV,
Menander's Le Dyscolos; XX, Martyrium) and Greek
Christian writings: (1) V, the Nativity of Mary; (2) X-XII, the
Apocryphal Correspondence of Paul to the Corinthians,
and (3) XIII, Homily of Melitus. At least eleven of
Pachomius' letters in Coptic Sahidic have been
preserved, as well as two of Theodore's letters and two of
Horiesios' letters (Robinson 1990).

According to James Robinson (1986:4-5), an expert in
Nag Hammadi manuscripts, the Bodmer biblical papyri
were discovered seven years after the Nag Hammadi
codices in close proximity (in the Dishna plain, east of the

Nile River). (Dishna is midway between Panopolis and
Thebes.) In 1945 the Nag Hammadi manuscripts were
found in Jabal al-Tarif (just north of Chenoboskion--near
Nag Hammadi, the city where the discovery was first
reported). In 1952 the Bodmer papyri were found in Jabal
Abu Manna, which is also located just north of the Dishna
plain, 12 kilometers east of Jabal al-Tarif.

The following description of the Bodmer discovery is
adapted from the story told by James Robinson (1986:11-
25), who did an extensive, firsthand investigation of both
the Nag Hammadi and Bodmer discoveries:

> In broad daylight a Muslim peasant named Hsan
> (presumably from Abu Manna Bahari) went out near
> the cliffs beyond the limits of arable land looking for
> sabakh (fertilizer), but this may have been an excuse
> for seeking treasure. While digging with a mattock,
> Hsan found some ancient books, but he was not
> particularly impressed with his find. He gave some of
> the books away to some bystanders, and took the rest
> home (presumably in a jar). The villagers knew of the
> discovery which occured around the time of the fall of
> King Faruk (July 23, 1952). Not knowing the value of
> these ancient Greek and Coptic manuscripts, Hsan
> burned some of the leaves--to light a waterpipe or just
> to smell the fragrance of burning papyrus. Hsan
> attempted to barter the papyri codices for cigarettes
> or oranges, but the villagers were not interested--
> deeming the books as worthless.

Word of the discovery soon reached communication and
trade centers outside of the village. Middlemen emerged
who wanted to sell the papyri to antiquity dealers in
Alexandria or Cairo. The first purchaser of the Bodmer
papyri was a goldsmith from Dishna. The goldsmith's son
was a teacher at the same parochial school as the former
owner of Codex III in the Nag Hammadi manuscripts,
which had been sold to the Coptic Museum. When the
goldsmith's son showed his father's papyrus to the Coptic

Museum, it was nearly confiscated. From then on, the goldsmith was virtually under house arrest. But the papyri were safe from police search because they had been put in the house of a Coptic priest, who then became a co-conspirator in the clandestine operation to traffic the manuscripts to Cairo. It took the goldsmith three years to sell off the papyri--at a very good price (due to the good market of the Nag Hammadi manuscripts). A Cairo dealer, Phocion Tano, bought and sold both Nag Hammadi manuscripts and Bodmer manuscripts--the latter to Martin Bodmer of Geneva, Switzerland.

As was mentioned previously, Robinson (1990) believes that the Bodmer biblical papyri belonged to Christian monks in monasteries established by Pachomius. Within a few kilometers of Jabal Abu Manna lies the ruins of the ancient basillica of Pachomius (in Faw Qibli). Pachomius (287-346) brought monasticism to this area around A.D. 320. By the time of his death, there were thousands of monks in eleven monasteries in a radius of sixty miles along the Nile River. A century later there were nearly 50,000 monks in the area. As part of their daily regimen, these monks read and memorized the Scriptures. Pachomius himself took an active role in this practice--it is said that he read the Scriptures aloud to his first congregation (i.e., he was the lector). As Pachomius knew both Coptic and Greek (as did other monks in his monasteries), the monks must have read the Scriptures in both languages. Thus, it could be conjectured that these monks were served by a scriptorium that produced both Coptic and Greek biblical manuscripts. The Bodmer collection, which has both Greek and Coptic biblical codices, could have come from such a scriptorium.

But the codices dated earlier than 325 would not have been produced in this fourth-century scriptorium; they

would have been transported there from elsewhere. It is likely that some of the Greek manuscripts may have come from Alexandria, perhaps brought there by Theodore, a lector who had come to Pachomius from the church in Alexandria, or by other Alexandrians. Theodore was well-received by Pachomius (and even inspired Pachomius to learn Greek) and made steward of all those who came to the monastery from Alexandria and other regions where Greek was spoken (The Life of Pachomius 94-95). It is not unreasonable to conjecture that this Theodore used copies of the Scriptures from Alexandria to read to his Greek-speaking brothers.

It is also possible that the Bodmer collection was the library of a third-century local church or the library of a lector of a local church. This library was richly stocked with Greek biblical codices, Coptic biblical codices, and Greek classical and Christian literature. Some of the Greek biblical codices, which could have been produced in Alexandria, were clearly written for use in church (as $\mathfrak{P}$66, and $\mathfrak{P}$75). It is not difficult to imagine that this collection could have been the library of a well-read Christian lector (who knew both Greek and Coptic) or the depository of many manuscripts from several persons-- put away for safe-keeping during the Diocletian persecution or some other persecution. (All manuscripts dated later than the early fourth century, such as the seventh-century manuscript $\mathfrak{P}$74, were not part of the original find but a later one--from the excavation instigated by Tano. $\mathfrak{P}$72, clearly written for personal use, may have also come from a later find.)

Whether the Bodmer papyri were originally the possession of some Pachomian monastery or some early local church in the same area, the Bodmer collection contains some Greek manuscripts that were either actual

productions of the Alexandrian scriptorium or copies of
the kind of manuscripts that were produced by
Alexandrian scriptoral practices.

Some of the Greek manuscripts discussed above are
dated in the second century (P66, P75, Bodmer Papyri X-
XII), but most of the Greek manuscripts are third and fourth
century. The Coptic manuscripts date from the fourth
century to the seventh century. The complete collection
shows that the monks used Greek biblical texts and other
Christian writings (dated from the second to fourth
centuries), then Coptic biblical texts (dated from the fourth
and fifth centuries), then Coptic writings (dated from the
fourth to seventh centuries)--especially the letters of their
founding Abbots, Pachomius and Theodore. These
manuscripts were buried during the seventh century near
the cliffs of Jabal Abu Manna, a place used by the monks
for the burial of their dead (Robinson 1990:2-6, 19-21).

P66 was dated to c. 200 by Martin (1956), but Herbert
Hunger (1960:12-23), director of papyrological collections
in the National Library at Vienna, dated it c. 125-150 on the
grounds that many of the ligatures in P66 are comparable
to several other manuscripts of the early second century.

The Scribe and the Manuscript

P66 contains John 1:1-6:11; 6:35-14:26, 29-30; 15:2-26;
16:2-4, 6-7; 16:10-20:20, 22-23; 20:25-21:9. Because of its
construction, we are certain that P66 originally contained
only the Gospel of John. With a practiced caligraphic
hand, the scribe of P66 wrote in larger print as he went
along in order to fill out the codex. The large print
throughout indicates that it was written to be read aloud to
a Christian congregation (Turner 1977:84-86).

The scribe produced a manuscript that required at least

500 corrections. This gives the impression that the manuscript was initially copied with haste and then was corrected. To complicate matters, Martin's editio princeps (1956, 1958) of P66 is also full of errors and in great need of correction. I performed this task in conjunction with proofreading I did on a new transcription of P66 for the International Greek New Testament project. At the same, I completely checked all the notations of Fee (1968a:57-97) and of Royse (1981:373-449, 643-679) on P66, and I did a thorough check of all the corrections in P66--adding several more beyond what were recognized by Fee or Royse. (The results of this work were published by Elliott and Parker, 1995.)

Through the course of this study, it became clear to me that neither Fee nor Royse were fully correct concerning their analysis of how P66 was produced because both these scholars imagined that the original scribe made most of the corrections. Gordon Fee believed (probably correctly) that two exemplars were used in the making of P66--the second exemplar was not used for the original preparation of the manuscript, but for corrections only. However, Fee imagined that the scribe himself functioned as the corrector, making corrections in smaller print and with haste. Fee (1965:253-254) wrote:

> The scribe had recourse to another manuscript (or manuscripts) with which he compared his own completed manuscript and made some changes accordingly. . . . The scribe of P66, after copying from one manuscript, had opportunity at a later time to check his copy against another manuscript, with the result, that in a number of instances he chose one reading over another and changed his manuscript.

Royse (1981:404) also believed that the scribe corrected the manuscript himself, which prompted Royse to argue that "the total activity [of P66] is indeed rather careful, and

this care is shown clearly by the fact that the papyrus, when it left the scribe's hands, contained a fairly low percentage of nonsense readings." The one instance which substantiates the view of Royse and Fee is found in John 16:19, where it appears that the original scribe may have used two exemplars in creating a reading (see comments on this verse). But this is not apparent in any other verse.

Other scholars suspected that there might have been another person working on the manuscript after the original scribe finished his work. Colwell (1965:118) reveals this in a later evaluation of the manuscript:

> $\mathcal{P}$66 seems to reflect a scribe working with the intention of making a good copy, falling into careless errors, particularly the error of dropping a letter, a syllable, a word, or even a phrase where it is doubled, but also under the control of some other person, or second standard, so that the corrections that are made are usually corrections to a reading by a number of other witnesses. Nine out of the ten nonsense readings are corrected, and two out of three of all his singular readings were corrected. In short, $\mathcal{P}$66 gives the impression of being the product of a scriptorium, i.e., a publishing house. It shows the supervision of a foreman, or of a scribe turned proofreader.

After making a study of the corrections in $\mathcal{P}$66, another scholar, Erroll Rhodes (1968:280-281) proposed a similar, yet more elaborate scenario. He said $\mathcal{P}$66 was emended in three stages:

> 1. The scribe of $\mathcal{P}$66 made some immediate corrections as he was producing his copy.
> 2. After the transcription of $\mathcal{P}$66 was completed, a preliminary check of the manuscript was made (either by the scribe himself or a more experienced colleague) by someone who was concerned with orthography, but also with an interest in seeing that the sentences should read sensibly. This is like

proofreading a printed text before it goes to press to
be printed.
3. A second review of the manuscript was made with
a greater concern for transcriptional accuracy. An
exemplar (different from the first exemplar) was
employed at this stage. Corrections were made in the
direction of producing a text that is quite similar to
Nestle[25].

Of all the scholars, Rhodes' scenario is probably closest
to the truth. However, he is still hesitant about the
identification of the second corrector. In fact, not one
scholar has been able to definitely say that a second hand
was involved in the corrections, although both Colwell
and Rhodes suspected this. This hesitation can now be
eliminated because a paleographic study of the second
corrector's handwriting reveals that the first paginator is
the same as the second corrector because the ligatures
line up exactly. (See appendix for a chart demonstrating
this, and see the work of Berner 1993.) As noted by Fee
(1968a:71-75), many of these corrections bring the
manuscript into line with an Alexandrian-type text. This
corrector could have been the ex-officio proofreader in
the scriptorium who used a different exemplar to make his
emendations.

Thus, it is relatively certain that the manuscript was
produced in three stages:

1. The original scribe copied the entire text of John,
making corrections as he wrote--primarily to emend any
transcriptional mistakes he noticed. Most of these
corrections involved fixing nonsense readings.
2. The paginator of the first part of the manuscript (pages
1-99) made many corrections, both grammatical and
substantive. These corrections often brought the

manuscript into line with an Alexandrian-type text. Most likely, this corrector used a different exemplar for his emendations. This corrector can properly be called the <u>diorthotes</u>.

3. Another corrector is probably one and the same as the second paginator. He made a few changes, especially in chapter 13, for the purpose of preparing the text for a lectionary reading. This scribe or lector marked up this portion with extensive breathing marks and punctuation in preparation for oral reading.

The significance of this discovery about the correctors is that 𝔓66 is really the work of two scribes. As such, it can be studied as two receptions of the text. The original scribe provides the best view of a scribe interacting with a text as a reader, for he seems to have not been constrained to follow his exemplar meticulously. Rather, we see him shift back and forth from his scribal task of copying letters to being an engaged reader. The corrector, like a proofreader in a publishing house, was only reading for errors. He provides little for the study of creative reader reception. Nevertheless, his reception serves as a control against which we can read the receptions of the original scribe.

𝔓66 is an excellent manuscript for a case study on scribal-reader reception because it has preserved the work of two scribes: the original scribe and a thorough-going corrector. The original scribe was quite free in his interaction with the text; he produced several singular readings which reveal his independent interpretation of the text. The corrector's work was "strict"; working against an exemplar, he made several corrections in the manuscript that brought it into line with an Alexandrian type text. The resultant text, in Aland's terminology, is

"normal."

A Study of Singular Variants in 𝔓66

My task in the following pages is to focus on how the scribe of 𝔓66 functioned as a receptor of the text as he read it, and to show how the second corrector operated according to a different horizon of expectation. For this purpose, I have focused on the singular readings of 𝔓66 which have significance for reception study. (This excludes most nonsense readings, which were corrected anyway; it also excludes itacisms and transpositions.) I have also included readings where it is clear that the corrector adjusted the original scribe's wording to a different exemplar. Singular readings are readings in which 𝔓66 has no other continuous Greek manuscript support. This means that if an ancient version also has the same reading or a very few late Greek manuscripts (tenth century and beyond) have the same reading, then it is still quite likely that the reading is the creation of the scribe of 𝔓66 (or the corrector). I have explored far more singular readings than Royse did because he considered only the end product of the manuscript--i.e., after it was corrected. I have looked at all the singular readings of 𝔓66, even those that were corrected to an attested text.

In the following discussion, I have used the following notations:

𝔓66 = original scribe

𝔓66* = original scribe prior to some kind of correction

𝔓66ᶜ¹ = correction made by original scribe

$\mathcal{P}66^{c2}$ = correction made by an official <u>diorthotes</u>, the second hand

$\mathcal{P}66^{c3}$ = correction made by another scribe

$\mathcal{P}66^{c}$ = correction made by an undetermined hand

In most instances where ligatures are involved, the particular corrector can be determined. When there is a deletion, the original scribe scraped out a letter or word and often wrote over it or next to it. The <u>diorthotes</u> made deletions using dots over letters and hooks. He also made a number of transpositions by using transposition markings (// /), and multiple word insertions by using an insertion marks (./.) and anchor marks (⋂ ⋃) accompanied by a marginal insertion.

The format for the study of the variants in $\mathcal{P}66$ and the corrections in $\mathcal{P}66$ is fairly straightforward. The text is listed first, followed by one or two variants. The text is that which is printed in the Nestle-Aland 27th edition of <u>Novum Testamentum Graece</u>. The variants (or variant) are usually singular readings in $\mathcal{P}66$ or one of the corrections to $\mathcal{P}66$. Deviations from this format are self-explanatory.

John 1:3-4

text

³Πάντα δι αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο. καὶ Χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἕν<. ὃ γέγονεν ⁴ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν,> καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

³All things came into being through him, and without him not one thing came into being. <What has come into being ⁴in him> was life, and the life was the light of men.

$\mathcal{P}75^{c}$ C D L W^{s} 050*

variant 1

³Πάντα δι αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ
ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν <ὃ γέγονεν. ⁴Ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν,>
καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

³All things came into being through him, and without him
not one thing came into being <that has come into being.
⁴In him was life,> and the life was the light of men.
ℵᶜ 050ᶜ 33 𝔐

variant 2

³Πάντα δι αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ
ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν<. ὃ γέγονεν ⁴αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν,> καὶ
ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

³All things came into being through him, and without him
not one thing came into being. <What has come into
being ⁴by him> was life, and the life was the light of men.
𝔓66

Before we explore the creation of the singular variant in
𝔓66, it should be noted that the last phrase of 1:3 (ὃ
γέγονεν--"that which has come into being") has been
connected with 1:3 or with 1:4 by various ancient scribes
and modern translators, by means of punctuation. The
earliest manuscripts (𝔓66 𝔓75* ℵ* A B) do not have any
punctuation in these verses. If John had read the passage
out loud or added punctuation marks, the hearers would
have known how he punctuated the text. Lacking his
notations, all readers--from ancient to modern--have had
to make conjectures about the syntax.

   The majority of the early church fathers interpreted
John 1:3-4 according to the phrasing in the text. The
statement was somehow supposed to affirm that the Word
not only created the universe, he presently sustains it--all
things are alive with his life. But exegesis changed after

certain Gnostics used the passage to say that the Holy
Spirit was a created thing. Then exegetes separated 1:4
from 1:3, as in the first variant, and simply took ὃ
γέγονεν as an intensifier.

Because of its early age, it is reasonable to assume that
the scribe of 𝔓66 would have also joined ὃ γέγονεν with
1:4. In other words, this is the pre-understanding the
scribe of 𝔓66 brought with him to the text. But this must
have created a difficulty for the scribe, who may have
found it hard to understand how all created things were
"life" by virtue of being _in_ the Word--especially when ἐν
αὐτῷ is read as a locative. Furthermore, the implication
of 1:3 is that all things came into being _through_ the Word
(i.e., through his agency). Consequently, the scribe made
a simple but significant change: he deleted ἐν (in). With
ἐν gone, the phrase is clearly dative, which therefore
points to agency: "What has come into being by him was
life (or, was made life), and the life was the light of men."
Of course, it could be argued that the omission of ἐν was
accidental, due to homoeoteleuton: γέγον_εν_ _εν_. However,
since this was left uncorrected, it is just as likely that it was
an intentional omission intended to rectify an exegetical
problem.

John 1:17
text
ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ Χάρις καὶ ἡ
ἀλήθεια διὰ'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.
because the law was given through Moses, grace and
truth came though Jesus Christ
all MSS

variant

ὅτι ὁ νόμος διὰ Μωϋσέως ἐδόθη, ἡ Χάρις ⟨δὲ⟩ καὶ ἡ
ἀλήθεια διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο.
because the law was given through Moses, ⟨but⟩ grace
and truth came though Jesus Christ
𝔓66 it syr^{h**}

By adding the contrastive δέ (but), the scribe of 𝔓66 was
signaling a contrast between the two dispensations: the
law (given by Moses) and grace and truth (given by
Jesus). Though there is no implication thus far in John's
prologue (1:1-18) of any contrast between the law
and grace, this contrast is constantly made throughout the
book of John and in many other books of the New
Testament, especially in the Epistles of Paul, where grace
is presented as superceding the law.

It is apparent the scribe brought this knowledge with
him to his reading of the text. In other words, one may
deduce that this conception formed part of his horizon of
expectation--so that when he read a statement placing
Moses' giving of the law next to Jesus' giving of grace, he
wanted to show that Jesus had superceded Moses. He
also wanted to show the contrast as foreshadowing the
tension yet to come in this book. The Jewish religionists
were obsessed with keeping the minute legalities of the
ceremonial laws; they opposed Jesus because he did not
precisely keep the ceremonial laws (e.g., he broke their
rules on how one should observe the Sabbath). To make
sure the reader noticed this tension, the scribe added the
conjunction δέ: "the law was given through Moses, but
grace and truth came through Jesus Christ."

The insertion signals contrast, not continuity between
law and grace. Theologically speaking, it promotes a
dispensational perspective, rather than a covenantal one.
As such, it heightens the distinction between Judaism and

Christianity. Ancient translators (it syrh**) made the same
distinction by inserting the contrastive conjunction, and so
have various English translators (KJV TEV REB). Thus, in
this textual variant--seemingly so insignificant--we see
how theological prejudices, in the Gadamerian sense,
can affect changes in the text.

John 1:21
text
καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν, <Τί οὖν; Σὺ 'Ηλίας εἶ;>
and they asked him, <"What then? Are you Elijah?">
𝔓75 C* (Wˢ) 33 Origen

variant 1
Τί οὖν;'Ηλίας εἶ σύ;
What then? Are you Elijah?
A C³ Θ 063 0234 f¹·¹³ 𝔐

variant 2
Τί οὖν; 'Ηλίας εἶ;
What then? Are you Elijah?
ℵ L

variant 3
Σὺ οὖν τί;'Ηλίας εἶ;
What then are you? Are you Elijah?
B

variant 4
Τίς οὖν;'Ηλίας εἶ σύ;
Who then? Are you Elijah?
𝔓66

The reading of the text appears in a number of different

word orders in other Greek manuscripts--none of which
effect the meaning of the text. The scribe of 𝔓66, however,
wrote τίς (who) instead of τί (what) because that is
what he expected the text to read, based on his previous
reading of 1:19 (where the question is, "who are you?"). In
other words, this change was prompted by his interaction
with the previous context. But the scribe missed the point
of John using τί in this verse as a way of emphasizing
that the questioners were asking John the Baptist about
his prophetic office (i.e., one like Elijah's), not his
personal identity. They had already asked who he was
(1:19); now they wanted to know what he was.

John 1:49
text
ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ, 'Ραββί, σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ
θεοῦ.
Nathaniel answered him, "You are the son of God."
𝔓66^c2 𝔓75 ℵ A B C D

variant
ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ, 'Ραββί, σὺ εἶ <ἀληθῶς>
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.
Nathaniel answered him, "You are <truly> the son of God."
𝔓66 1241

I think the variant in 𝔓66 is a legitimate singular reading
inasmuch as (1) it does not show up again until the twelfth
century, in only one manuscript, 1241, and (2) it
demonstrates the scribe's first reaction to the text (prior to
a correction). Having read that Jesus told Nathaniel that
he was a true Israelite (Ἴδε ἀληθῶς Ἰσραηλίτης--
"Look, a true Israelite"), the scribe expected a parallel
response from Nathaniel to Jesus. In other words, the text

implicates such a response from its readers. Nathaniel is a true Israelite because he recognizes the true Son of God. Thus, the scribe of P66 does a bit of contextual gap-filling by having Nathaniel respond, σὺ εἶ ἀληθῶς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ (you are truly the Son of God). Later, the second corrector of P66 deleted the word ἀληθῶς with hooks and dots, thereby bringing it into conformity with the standard text.

John 2:11

text

Ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ'Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας

This beginning of signs Jesus performed in Cana of Galilee.

P66^c2 <u>rell</u>

variant

Ταύτην <πρώτην> ἀρχὴν ἐποίησεν τῶν σημείων ὁ 'Ἰησοῦς ἐν Κανὰ τῇ Γαλιλαίας

This <first> beginning of signs Jesus performed in Cana of Galilee.

P66* it^f·q

The scribe of P66 may have added πρώτην (first) in anticipation of 4:54, where it speaks of the "second sign" (δεύτερον σημεῖον) occuring in Galilee. If so, it shows his knowledge of the narrative prior to the task of copying. This prior knowledge, forming a horizon of expectation, influenced his reading of this text and prompted an interpolation. The <u>diorthotes</u> eliminated the word with hooks and dots, and also made a transposition of ἀρχὴν ἐποίησεν to ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν.

John 2:25

text

ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ ⟨τοῦ⟩
ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ
ἀνθρώπῳ

because he had no need that anyone should testify about
⟨the⟩ man, for he himself knew what was in the human
being.

𝔓66ᶜ² <u>rell</u>

variant

ὅτι οὐ χρείαν εἶχεν ἵνα τις μαρτυρήσῃ περὶ
ἀνθρώπου· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκεν τί ἦν ἐν τῷ
ἀνθρώπῳ

because he had no need that anyone should testify about
humanity, for he himself knew what was in the human
being.

𝔓66*

It is possible that the reading in 𝔓66* is the result of a
scribal error, due to homoeoteleuton--the eye of the
scribe passing over τον to ανθρωπον. But it is also
possible that the omission of the article was initiated by
the scribe thinking that the text implicates that Jesus had
knowledge of human beings in general. Indeed, the
context does not specify any particular human being, but it
speaks of Jesus' reluctance to accept people's belief in
him based on seeing his miracles (2:23-24). In the mind of
the scribe of 𝔓66, it was best to convey this observation
about human beings by the anarthrous expression, περὶ
ἀνθρώπου. This shows that the scribe was interacting
with the meaning of the text, in contrast to the <u>diorthotes</u>
who simply changed it to the standard reading.

John 3:3

text

'Αμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι

Truly, truly I say to you [singular]

𝔓66ᶜ¹

variant

'Αμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν

Truly, truly I say to you [plural]

𝔓66*

The scribe of 𝔓66 first wrote 'Αμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν,
then scraped out the ὑμῖν and wrote σοι. There are two
reasons why he might have first written the plural
pronoun. First, in John's Gospel the plural ὑμῖν is the
usual object that follows the formulaic expression 'Αμὴν
ἀμὴν λέγω (see 1:51; 5:19, 24-25; 6:26, 32, 47, 53; 8:34,
51, 58; 10:1, 7; 12:24; 13:16, 20-21; 14:12; 16:20, 23). The
singular is only used in this chapter, when Jesus is
addressing Nicodemus personally (3:3, 5, 11), and in two
other instances where Jesus was addressing Peter alone
(13:38; 21:18). That the scribe automatically wrote the
plural ὑμῖν after 'Αμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω shows that the scribe
of 𝔓66 must have known the text of John quite well--such
that it shaped his horizon of expectation. Consequently,
he unconsciously allowed his memory of a particular
memorable phrase to interfere with his copying of the
exact wording in this context, and then corrected himself
when he realized what he had done.

The second reason the scribe initially wrote the plural
is that the context promotes a pluralization of Jesus'
audience. In other words, Jesus was not just talking to
Nicodemus but to all of Israel through Nicodemus, for
Nicodemus had set himself up--through his speech--as

being Israel's representative. This begins to occur in 3:2,
where Nicodemus says, "we know that you are a teacher
come from God." Since Nicodemus had come to Jesus
as if he (Nicodemus) were representing Israel, Jesus
spoke to Nicodemus as Israel's representative. What he
said to Nicodemus applied to all of Israel (see 3:7, 11, 12
where Jesus uses the plural: "you all must be born again,"
"you all do not receive our testimony," and "how . . . will
you all believe?"). As such, the text--even the previous
verse (3:2)--prompted a concretization that pluralized
Jesus' audience, even though he was speaking only with
one man, Nicodemus. This produced the initial writing of
a plural object, which was then corrected by the same
scribe to the singular.

John 3:6

Jesus told Nicodemus $\tau\grave{o}$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu o\nu$ $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$
$\sigma\alpha\rho\kappa\grave{o}\varsigma$ $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\xi$ $\grave{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\tau\grave{o}$ $\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\nu\nu\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu o\nu$ $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau o\tilde{\upsilon}$
$\pi\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau o\varsigma$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}$ $\grave{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ (lit. "that which is born of
the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is
spirit"). This enigmatic expression begs for concretization
because Jesus did not explain what he meant. The reader
could imagine that he might have been saying that human
beings (the "flesh") can produce only more human beings
("gives birth to flesh"); this answers Nicodemus' question
in 3:4. But in what sense does Spirit give birth to spirit?
Does this mean that the Spirit produces only its own kind?
Or does it mean that the divine Spirit generates the human
spirit?

   The scribe of 𝔓66 did not add any words to his
manuscript in an attempt to supply an explanation; rather,
he employed an orthographic technique to distinguish
one spirit ($\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$) from the other. In other words, he took
advantage of a system known to early scribes of using

special abbreviations for nomina sacra and used it to
display his own interpretation. Normally, scribes wrote $\overline{\text{ΠNA}}$,
an abbreviation of πνευμα, for "the Spirit." However, they
could choose to write out the word πνευμα to indicate the
human spirit. Thus, the scribe of 𝔓66 distinguished the
divine Spirit from the human spirit by making the first word
a nomen sacrum ($\overline{\text{ΠNA}}$) and by writing out the second
(πνευμα)--see photograph ˙2 in Appendix. This
orthography strongly suggests that the scribe was
indicating that the divine Spirit is that which generates and
the human spirit is that which is generated (Comfort
1984:130-133). A parallel to this is found in the English
language, where translators demonstrate their distinction
between the divine Spirit and the human spirit (or any
other kind of spirit) by capitalizing the former and not the
latter: Spirit/spirit.

John 3:19

text

αὕτη δὲ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι ⟨τὸ⟩ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν
εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον
τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς

and this is the judgment that ⟨the⟩ light has come into the
world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light
𝔓66ᶜ² rell

variant

αὕτη δὲ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς
τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ
σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς

and this is the judgment that light has come into the
world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light
𝔓66*

The original scribe of 𝔓66 wrote φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον (light has come into the world)--without the article τὸ before φῶς. It is possible that the scribe accidentally dropped the article, or that he did so intentionally because he wanted to emphasize the abstract quality of light rather than the personalization of it. Indeed, throughout most of John's Gospel, "light" is an abstraction for Christ, and of the 24 times it occurs in this Gospel it is articular 22 times. However, the two anarthrous occurences are in similar contexts--that is, both verses (9:5 and especially 12:46) speak of "light" having come into the world. The anarthrous expression emphasizes the quality of light, rather than the identity of it. Thus, my conjecture is that the total expression "light has come into the world" brought to mind the similar expressions in 9:5 ("when I am in the world, I am light of the world") and 12:46 ("I have come a light into the world"), and therefore prompted the omission of the article. The corrector came along afterwards and dutifully added the article, thereby conforming the manuscript to the standard text.

John 3:31-32

text

31'Ο ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστιν ⟨καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ⟩. ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· 32ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.

31The one coming from above is above all; the one being from earth is of the earth ⟨and speaks of the earth⟩. ⟨The one from heaven⟩ is above all. 32What he sees and hears this he testifies.

𝔓66c2 𝔓36vid ℵ2 B L Ws 083 086 33 𝔐 (add καὶ at

beginning of 3:32 A θ 063)

variant 1

'Ο ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· ὁ ὢν
ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστιν. ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· 32ὃ
ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ.

The one coming from above is above all; the one being
from earth is of the earth. The one being from heaven is
above all. 32What he sees and hears this he testifies.
𝔓66*

variant 2

'Ο ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν· ὁ ὢν
ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστιν καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς
λαλεῖ. ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος 32ὃ
ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ. 31The one
coming from above is above all; the one being from earth
is of the earth and speaks of the earth. The one coming
from heaven 32testifies that which he has seen and heard.
𝔓75 (ℵ* ὃ for ὃν)) copsa Origen (omit τοῦτο ℵ* D f1)

The first variant, found only in 𝔓66*, shows that the scribe
added ὢν (being) to make the second clause parallel
with the first: ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς / ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ
οὐρανοῦ. Then he omitted καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ
(and he speaks of the earth). This was either an
accidental omission of an entire line, or it was intentional.
If it was the latter, then it is possible that the scribe did not
want John the baptist's preaching to be labeled as
"speaking from the earth." Indeed, according to the
synoptic Gospels (Matt. 21:25; Mark 11:30; Luke 20:4),
Jesus had implied that John's ministry was from heaven.
This horizon of expectation--one shaped by his reading of

the other Gospels--may have prevented the scribe from
writing that John the baptist spoke "from the earth."

John 3:33

text

ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ἐσφράγισεν ὅτι ὁ
θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν

the one receiving his testimony has certified that God is
true

$\mathfrak{P}66^{*}$ <u>rell</u>

variant 1

ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ⟨τούτον⟩
ἐσφράγισεν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν

the one receiving his testimony--has certified ⟨this⟩: that
God is true

$\mathfrak{P}66^{c1}$

variant 2

ὁ λαβὼν αὐτοῦ τὴν μαρτυρίαν ⟨οὗτός⟩
ἐσφράγισεν, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἀληθής ἐστιν

the one receiving his testimony--⟨this one⟩ has certified
that God is true

$\mathfrak{P}66^{c2}$

This variant unit involves a two-step correction: (1) the
original scribe added *τούτον* ("this one"--neuter), but it
was perceived by the <u>diorthotes</u> to be the wrong
grammatical form, so (2) it was corrected by him to
οὗτός ("this one"--masculine). But the insertion of
τούτον by the original scribe of $\mathfrak{P}66$ was prompted by a
perceived lack in the text--namely, it needed a deictic
pronoun to introduce the testimony, "God is true." Indeed,
this insertion is exactly what the translators of the NRSV

did: "Whoever has accepted his testimony has certified
this, that God is true."

What is noteworthy about the second correction is that
the reading οὗτός is a variant found nowhere else in the
manuscript tradition. This indicates that the <u>diorthotes</u>
must have forgotten his exemplar for a moment and was
simply concentrating on fixing the original scribe's
mistake.

John 3:34

text

τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ. οὐ γὰρ <ἐκ μέτρου>
δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα
he speaks the words of God, for not <by measure> he
gives the Spirit
$P66^{c1}$ $P75$ ℵ B^2 C^* L W^s 083

variant

τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ. οὐ γὰρ <ἐκ μέρου>
δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα
he speaks the words of God, for not <in part> he gives the
Spirit
$P66^*$

This variant and the correction thereof shows that the
scribe of $P66$ was uncomfortable with writing the
expression οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου (not from a measure).
Indeed, this expression appears nowhere else in Greek
literature (BAGD 515). The scribe was far more
comfortable with writing οὐκ ἐκ μέρους, for this was a
common idiom in Greek and in the New Testament; it
means "not in part--i.e., fully." He would have especially
expected this idiom in a context wherein John the baptist
extols Jesus as the one who "is over all" and who was

"given all things" by the Father (see 3:31, 35). Thus, the scribe thought that John said Jesus was given the Spirit-- οὐκ ἐκ μέρους. However, this was not the expression in his exemplar, so he checked himself by (1) not writing out μέρους completely (he didn't write the final sigma) and (2) by immediately adding a tau (τ) superlinearly. This could show that the scribe, at first, allowed his repertoire of linguistic knowledge to interfere with his reception of the text, but then he corrected this midstream and became obedient to his exemplar, even though it must have been awkward to do so.

John 4:6

text

'Ιησοῦς κεκοπιακὼς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἐκαθέζετο
οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ
Jesus, weary from his journey, sat thus on the well
𝔓66ᶜ² rell

variant

'Ιησοῦς κεκοπιακὼς ἐκ τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἐκαθέζετο
οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ
Jesus, weary from his journey, sat thus on the ground
𝔓66*

The original scribe of 𝔓66 could have made an accidental omission, due to homoeoteleuton: τηπηγη. However, the change might have been intentional. The scribe may have considered it strange that Jesus would have sat "on a well"--which is the most literal translation of ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ. Being from Egypt, where wells are scarce--especially those with raised walls around them--he would find it difficult to imagine how anyone could sit on a well. This simply did not fit his social horizon of expectations. Thus,

he must have imagined Jesus sitting on the ground near
the well, which is another way to interpret ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ
(near the well). As such, the scribe solved the problem by
saying that Jesus sat on the ground.

John 4:21

text

Πίστευέ μοι, γύναι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ
<ὄρει> τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν ʽΙεροσολύμοις προσκυνήσετε
τῷ πατρί.

Believe me, woman, that an hour is coming when neither
in this <mountain> nor in Jerusalem will you worship the
Father.

𝔓66^{C1} <u>rell</u>

variant

Πίστευέ μοι, γύναι, ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα ὅτε οὔτε ἐν τῷ
<κόσμω> τούτῳ οὔτε ἐν ʽΙεροσολύμοις
προσκυνήσετε τῷ πατρί.

Believe me, woman, that an hour is coming when neither
in this <world> nor in Jerusalem will you worship the
Father.

𝔓66*

It is intriguing to conjecture what prompted the scribe to
originally write "in this world" instead of "in this
mountain." The word "world" did not come from the
immediate context; its last appearance was in 3:15-17. It is
possible that the word ὥρα (hour) stimulated thoughts
about the last hour, the eschaton (see 5:25, 28)--the time
when the believers would leave this world and go to the
Father, as Jesus did (16:32-33; 17:11). And it is possible
that the general tenor of John's "other-worldliness"
prompted thoughts of the world beyond--so that when

Jesus began to speak of the coming hour, the scribe
immediately thought of the next world, where there will be
worship in heaven. Of course, the scribe then caught
himself and corrected his manuscript.

John 4:39a

text

τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς <μαρτυροὐσης>
the word of the woman <testifying>
𝔓66^{c2} (ματυρουσης) <u>rell</u>

variant

τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς <ἐπιοὐσης>
the word of the woman <saying>
𝔓66*vid

The substitution of ἐπιοὐσης (saying) for μαρτυροὐσης
(testifying) may seem to be nothing more than a lexical
switch, but this change gives us some special insight into
the scribe's horizon of expectations because it strongly
suggests a Jewish prejudice against women testifying.
According to Jewish law, only male adults could testify
(Deut. 17:6-7). The witness of a woman was not an
acceptable testimony. Yet here in John's Gospel we have
the only record in all the Bible of a woman giving witness.
But the scribe of 𝔓66, who was either a Jew or was greatly
influenced by Judaism, could not allow the horizon of the
text to change his horizon; he conformed the text to his
own view. It was okay for the woman to <u>speak</u> about
Jesus, but not okay to <u>testify</u> about him. That was for men,
like John the Baptist, to do (see 1:7-8).

John 4:39b

text

εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα

he told me everything that I did

P75 ℵ B C*

variant 1

εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα

he told me everything whatsoever I did

P66ᶜ² A c³ D W

variant 2

εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα

he told me everything whatsoever

P66*

On one hand, it could be reasoned that ἐποίησα (I did)
was accidentally dropped due to homoeoteleuton: παντ<u>α</u>
ο<u>σα</u> εποιη<u>σα</u>. On the other hand, it could be reasoned that
the previous narrative (4:1-30) prompted the omission of
ἐποίησα because, in spite of what the Samaritan
woman here claims, Jesus did not tell her everything
about her life. Rather, he told her only about her past
relationships with five men. Of course, the reader infers
that the woman was exaggerating, but the scribe of P66
thought the exaggeration should be more inclusive--as if
she were saying, "here's a man who, like a prophet or
seer, knows about everything." This concurs with a
previous verse in this periciope: in 4:25 the woman had
told Jesus that a coming prophet "will tell us everything."
Thus, the scribe, influenced by this reading, has her
repeat it to her fellow townspeople.

John 5:28

text

ἔρχεται ὥρα ἐν ᾗ πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις

ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ

an hour is coming when all who are in the graves will hear
his voice

𝔓66ᶜ¹ rell

variant

ἔρχεται ὥρα ἐν ᾗ πάντες οἱ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ

an hour is coming when all who are in the wilderness will
hear his voice

𝔓66*

Here is clearly a case where the scribe was reading
ahead of himself (that is, his reading at the semantic level
preceded the actual words he was copying from his
exemplar), because the words ἀκούσουσιν τῆς
φωνῆς αὐτοῦ (will hear his voice), which appear after
πάντες οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις (all in the graves),
jogged the scribe's memory of any earlier, similar
passage, which reads "an hour is coming when all who
are in the wilderness will hear his voice." In other words,
the phrase "hearing his voice" prompted a distant but
similar textual association, which made the scribe think of
an earlier verse (1:23), where John the Baptist spoke of
himself as "a voice crying in the wilderness." As such, the
scribe projected his previous reading on his present
reading. Then he realized that he made a mistake in the
transciption process; so he immediately corrected τῇ
ἐρήμῳ (the wilderness) to τοῖς μνημείοις (the
graves).

John 6:63

Hearing Jesus' "bread-of-life" discourse, wherein he

proclaimed that he was the bread of life come down from
heaven for people to eat, his disciples were completely
baffled. In response to their mystification Jesus said, "The
Spirit gives life; the flesh counts for nothing. The words I
have spoken to you are spirit and they are life." But this is
just as mystifying--especially the first sentence, and called
for some kind of gap-filling. Was Jesus refering to the
divine Spirit as the life-giver? Or was he saying that it was
the spirit behind his words that mattered?

The scribe of 𝔓66 first started to write the word for
"spirit" (writing the first four letters πνυε for πνεῦμα) and
immediately corrected it to Π̅Ν̅Α̅, the abbreviation for the
nomen sacrum, the divine Spirit (see photograph ˙3 in
the Appendix). This probably shows that the scribe of 𝔓66
recognized that πνεῦμα required a different orthography
for a different sense here (i.e., the words Jesus spoke
were spiritual words with spiritual significance). However,
the scribe of 𝔓66 succumbed to the standard formula for
designating nomina sacra. (See comments on 3:8.)

John 6:64
text
ᾔδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ'Ιησοῦς ⟨τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ
πιστεύοντες καὶ⟩ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν
for Jesus knew from the beginning ⟨who are the ones not
believing and⟩ who is the one betraying him
𝔓66ᶜ² <u>rell</u>

variant
ᾔδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ'Ιησοῦς τίς ἐστιν ὁ
παραδώσων αὐτόν
for Jesus knew from the beginning who is the one
betraying him
𝔓66* itᵉ syrˢ˙ᶜ

It is possible that the phrase τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες καὶ was omitted accidentally--due to homoeoarchton (the eye passing from <u>τί</u>νες to τί), but the change is too exact to have been accidental. Thus, it is quite possible that the scribe of P66 wanted to obscure any notion of Jesus having foreknowledge of "the damned" (the unbelieving). Although this was an especially thorny theological issue during the Reformation, it could have perplexed Christians from the very beginning.

John 6:69

text

Καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ <ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ>.

And we have believed and have known that you are <the holy One of God>.

P75 ℵ B C* D L W it^d

variant 1

ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ

the Christ, the holy One of God

P66 cop^sa,bo,ach2

variant 2

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

he Son of God

it^b syr^c

variant 3

ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

the Christ, the Son of God

c³ θ* f¹ 33 itᵃ·ᶜ·ᵉ syrˢ

variant 4

$\delta\ X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\delta\varsigma\ \delta\ \upsilon\iota\delta\varsigma\ \tau o\widehat{\upsilon}\ \theta\epsilon o\widehat{\upsilon}\ \varsigma\widehat{\omega}\nu\tau o\varsigma$

the Christ, the Son of the living God

θᶜ 0250 f¹³ syrᵖ·ʰ·ᵖᵃˡ 𝔐

The reading $\delta\ \mathring{\alpha}\gamma\iota o\varsigma\ \tau o\widehat{\upsilon}\ \theta\epsilon o\widehat{\upsilon}$ (the Holy One of God) is decidely superior to all the other readings because of its excellent documentary support and because most of the other variant readings are obvious assimilations to Matt. 16:16 ("the Christ, the Son of the living God") or some derivation thereof. In each of the synoptic accounts, Peter's declaration is slightly different: "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matt. 16:16); "You are the Christ" (Mark 8:29); "[You are] the Christ of God" (Luke 9:20). Though the title "Holy One of God" is rare in the New Testament (the only other occurence is in Mark 1:24), Peter spoke of Jesus as being "the Holy One" on two other occasions (see Acts 2:27; 3:14).

ℙ66 and a few Coptic manuscripts display a conflated reading: "the Christ, the Holy One of God." This tells us that some manuscript prior to ℙ66 (perhaps its exemplar) had the reading $\delta\ \mathring{\alpha}\gamma\iota o\varsigma\ \tau o\widehat{\upsilon}\ \theta\epsilon o\widehat{\upsilon}$, but the scribe of ℙ66, who was aware of the other Gospels, wanted Peter also to say, "You are the Christ." This is one of the earliest, extant cases of Gospel harmonization. It shows that the scribe's reading of Matthew and Mark formed a horizon of expectation for his reading of John.

John 7:24

text

$\langle\mu\grave{\eta}\ \kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\rangle\ \kappa\alpha\tau\ \mathring{o}\psi\iota\nu,\ \mathring{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\grave{\eta}\nu\ \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\ \kappa\rho\iota\sigma\iota\nu$
$\kappa\rho\iota\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$

<you do not judge> according to appearance, but you
must judge with just judgment
𝔓75 B D L T W

variant

<μὴ κρίνει> κατ᾽ ὄψιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν δικαίαν κρίσιν
κρίνετε
<he does not judge> according to appearance, but you
must judge with just judgment
𝔓66

The change in 𝔓66, which does not appear to be
accidental, is significant. Of course, the reader has to
guess who the person is behind the third person singular
κρίνει (he judges). Most likely, Jesus was referring to
himself in the third person (as in his favorite appelation
"the Son of Man"). This is apparent in 7:18, where Jesus,
using the third person, speaks of the one who does not
seek his own glory but rather the glory of the one who
sent him and is therefore righteous for having done so. By
contrast, the Jewish leaders, in seeking their own glory,
could not judge things correctly.

     The alteration in 𝔓66 demonstrates that he was
interacting with the text at a semantic level. His change
alters the meaning of this verse (Jesus is no longer
commanding the religious leaders not to judge
superfically), but the scribe's change is consistent with
the import of the passage: self-seeking clouds correct
judgment.

John 7:52
text
ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας
<προφήτης> οὐκ ἐγείρεται

search and see that ⟨a prophet⟩ does not arise out of
Galilee
𝔓66ᶜ ℵ A B 𝔐

variant
ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ⟨ὁ
προφήτης⟩ οὐκ ἐγείρεται
search and see that ⟨the prophet⟩ does not arise out of
Galilee
𝔓66*

𝔓66* (not cited in NA²⁷), definitely reads ὁ προφήτης (the
prophet), which then may have been corrected to
προφήτης (a prophet). The article ὁ in 𝔓66 is either faded
due to age or faint due to erasure; it is difficult to tell which
(see photograph ˙4 in the Appendix). Either way, it is
certain that the original scribe wrote ὁ προφήτης and
thereby imprinted his interpretation of the text--that is, he
considered that the context called for nothing less than a
reference to the Prophet, the one predicted by Moses
(see Deut. 18:15, 18; John 1:21), who is one-in-the-same
as the Messiah. Many exegetes had affirmed this sense
even before the discovery of 𝔓66. They believed that the
religious leaders' retort to Nicodemus was tantamount to
saying, "If not even a prophet is said [in the Scriptures] to
come from Galilee, how much less the Christ?" Thus, the
Pharisees and religious rulers were confident that they
could reject Jesus as having any claim to the Messiahship
because of his Galilean origin. Of course, the text could
still convey nearly the same sense with the reading
προφήτης (a prophet) if we take it something like this: "If,
according to the Scriptures, not even a prophet comes
out of Galilee, how much less the Christ?" But the scribe
of 𝔓66, given his Christocentric inclinations, wanted to

make sure his readers understood the Christological
import in this verse.

John 8:25

text

$\epsilon \hat{\iota} \pi \epsilon \nu \ \alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau o \hat{\iota} \varsigma \ \dot{o}' I \eta \sigma o \hat{\upsilon} \varsigma. \ \langle T \dot{\eta} \nu \ \dot{\alpha} \rho X \dot{\eta} \nu \ \ddot{o} \tau \iota \ \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \ \lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega}$
$\dot{\upsilon} \mu \hat{\iota} \nu; \rangle$

Jesus said to them, <"Why do I speak to you at all?">

$\mathfrak{P}66$ א D L W T Θ $f^{1,13}$ 33

variant 1

$T \dot{\eta} \nu \ \dot{\alpha} \rho X \dot{\eta} \nu \ \ddot{o} \ \tau \iota \ \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \ \lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \ \dot{\upsilon} \mu \hat{\iota} \nu.$

[I am] principally that which I also speak to you
or "[I am] what I have been telling you from the beginning"

$\mathfrak{P}75$ B

variant 2

$\epsilon \hat{\iota} \pi o \nu \ \dot{\upsilon} \mu \hat{\iota} \nu \ \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \ \dot{\alpha} \rho X \dot{\eta} \nu \ \ddot{o} \tau \iota \ \kappa \alpha \dot{\iota} \ \lambda \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} \ \dot{\upsilon} \mu \hat{\iota} \nu.$

I told you in the beginning that which I also speak to you.

$\mathfrak{P}66^{c2}$

Because early Greek manuscripts did not usually leave
any spaces between words, it is difficult to determine if
the text is to be read as $\ddot{o} \ \tau \iota$ (that which) or $\ddot{o} \tau \iota$ (why).
Two early manuscripts, $\mathfrak{P}75$ and B, have a space between
$\ddot{o}$ and $\tau \iota$; another early manuscript, $\mathfrak{P}66$, does not.

In an attempt to clarify an opaque expression, the
corrector of $\mathfrak{P}66$ added $\epsilon \hat{\iota} \pi o \nu \ \dot{\upsilon} \mu \hat{\iota} \nu$ (I said) before the
phrase noted above. This yields the translation: "I told you
in the beginning that which I also speak to you." A few
scholars favor this singular reading, arguing that it is the
one that makes the best sense (for example, see Funk
1958:95-100). Thus, even though it is a scribal addition, it
demonstrates the corrector's desire to make the text make

sense.

John 8:36

text

ἐὰν οὖν ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ, ⟨ὄντως
ἐλεύθεροι ἔσεσθε⟩

if the Son sets you free, ⟨you will be truly free⟩

<u>rell</u>

variant

ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι ἔστε

you are truly free

𝔓66

variant 2

ὄντως ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε

you will become truly free

1241

The change made by the scribe of 𝔓66 was probably
made in the interest of his Christian readership who
would have already received from Christ this freedom.
Thus, it would be more appealing to say "you are free"
(allowing for both a present and proleptic sense) than to
say "you will be free."

John 9:17

text

Τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ ⟨αὐτοῦ ὅτι⟩ ἠνέῳξέν σου τοὺς
ὀφθαλμούς;

What do you say about ⟨him, because⟩ he opened your
eyes?

𝔓66ᶜ¹ <u>rell</u>

variant

Τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ <σεαυτοῦ ὅτι> ἠνέῳξέν σου
τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;
What do <you yourself say about the fact that> he opened
your eyes?
𝔓66*

As the former blind man was interrogated by the religious
leaders, a debate ensued about Jesus' identity--with
some saying that Jesus could not be a man of God
because he broke the sabbath and others wondering how
one who wasn't a man of God could cure a blind man. So
they turned to the former blind man and asked him what
he thought about Jesus. In the scribe's mind it was
perfectly natural for them to emphasize that they were
asking for his own personal opinion: "what do you
yourself say?" Hence, he made the change for emphasis,
which would be especially noticeable in oral reading. As
such, the scribe of 𝔓66 here demonstrates the same kind
of concern for his audience as did the scribe of 𝔓45 on a
number of occasions.

John 10:16
text
ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς
ταύτης· κἀκεῖνα δεῖ με <ἀγαγεῖν>
other sheep I have which are not of this fold; it is
necessary for me <to lead> these also
all other Greek MSS

variant

ἄλλα πρόβατα ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς
ταύτης· κἀκεῖνα δεῖ με <συναγαγεῖν>
other sheep I have which are not of this fold; it is

necessary for me <to gather together> these also
𝔓66 Didymus

In 10:3, Jesus spoke of how the shepherd calls each of
his own sheep by name and then "leads them out"
(ἐξάγει αὐτά). Most commentators understand this
verse to be about Jesus' call to his people within
Judaism. So, it is natural for Jesus to speak about the
shepherd leading them out of the fold. However, 10:16 is
understood by most commentators to speak about Jesus'
call to the Gentiles (the "other sheep"), who would be
joined to the Jewish believers. Thus, the scribe was
prompted by the text to think of Jesus as the one who
would gather together the scattered Gentiles. The scribe's
change was perhaps drawn from 11:52, where Jesus
speaks of "gathering together" many more believers from
among the nations of the Gentiles. Thus, the change
made by the scribe of 𝔓66 displays his concretization of
this particular passage and his knowledge of the entire
Gospel.

John 10:26-27
text
ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν
προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν. 27τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς
φωνῆς μου ἀκούουσιν, κἀγὼ γινώσκω αὐτὰ καὶ
ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι.
you do not believe me, because you are not my sheep.
27My sheep hear my voice and I know them and they
follow me.
𝔓66c2 𝔓75 B L W Θ

variant 1
ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν

προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν. <καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν>. [27]τὰ
πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούουσιν. κἀγὼ
γινώσκω αὐτά καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι.

you do not believe me, because you are not my sheep,
<as I said to you>. [27]My sheep hear my voice and I know
them and they follow me.
A D f[1,13] 𝔐 it syr

variant 2
ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν
προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν. <καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι.> [27]τὰ
πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούουσιν. κἀγὼ
γινώσκω αὐτά καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι.

you do not believe me, because you are not my sheep--
<as I said to you>, 'My sheep hear my voice and I know
them and they follow me.'
𝔓66*

Picking up on Jesus' previous words, the scribe of 𝔓66
turned 10:27 into a direct quote of 10:3 by adding καθὼς
εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι. (In this structure ὅτι signals that direct
speech follows.) The diorthotes then corrected the text of
𝔓66 by deleting these words. But the original wording of
𝔓66 demonstrates that the scribe wanted to help his
readers understand that Jesus had previously spoken
what follows.

     A similar--but not identical--insertion occured in several
other witnesses but the lack of the word ὅτι clearly
places καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν with the end of 10:26. Thus,
whoever inserted these words wanted to make it clear
that Jesus had previously told the religious leaders that
they were not his sheep. However, this is not explicitly
said anywhere earlier; nevertheless, the essence of this
was uttered by Jesus in 8:42-47; 9:40-41.

John 10:33

text

σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν ⟨θεὸν⟩

you being man make yourself ⟨deity⟩

𝔓66ᶜ

variant

σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν ⟨τὸν θεὸν⟩

you being man make yourself ⟨the very God⟩

𝔓66*

It is possible that the article was accidentally added due
to dittography (σεαυτ̲ο̲ν̲ τ̲ο̲ν̲); but if it was an intentional
addition, the scribe was trying to create a certain dramatic
effect wherein the religious leaders are appalled that
Jesus was claming to be the very God--not just that he
was claiming to be divine. The article gives the force of
personalization (literally, "you make yourself the God");
without the article, the rendering is "you being human
make yourself divine" or "you being human make yourself
deity." 𝔓66 was then corrected, probably by the
d̲i̲o̲r̲t̲h̲o̲t̲e̲s̲. Had the article remained, it would have left the
scribe's personal signature on this verse--one which is
characteristic of other changes he made to heighten
Jesus' divine, messianic identity (see 1:17; 7:52).

John 11:4

text

ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Αὕτη ἡ ἀσθένεια οὐκ ἔστιν πρὸς
θάνατον ἀλλ ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ, ἵνα
δοξασθῇ ⟨ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ⟩ δι αὐτῆς

Jesus said, "This sickness is not unto death but is for the
glory of God, that ⟨the Son of God⟩ may be glorified

through it."

all other Greek MSS

variant 1

ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ

his Son

𝔓45 it^c syr^s cop^{sa,ac2}

variant 2

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

the Son of Man

0250

variant 3

ὁ υἱὸς

the Son

𝔓66

Apparently, it seemed strange to several scribes
(including the scribe of 𝔓66) and translators that Jesus
would refer to himself as "the Son of God" in this
particular context. Such a feeling was promoted by the
text of John itself in that Jesus almost always refers to
himself as "the Son of Man," or "the Son," or "his Son"
(with reference to God the Father)--each of which are
reflected in the above variants. The only occasion in John
where he calls himself "God's Son" is in 10:36, where he
presents a defense of his deity. The scribe of 𝔓66 chose
the simplest titular identification, "the Son." The scribe of
𝔓45 made a different change (see previous on comments
on John 11:4 in chapter four).

text

λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναί κύριε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ

ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

She says to him, "Yes, Lord, I have believed that you are

the Christ, the Son of God."

all other Greek MSS

variant

λέγει αὐτῷ, Ναί κύριε <πιστεύω>. ἐγὼ

πεπίστευκα ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ

She says to him, "Yes, Lord, <I believe>. I have believed

that you are the Christ, the Son of God."

𝔓66

In context, Jesus has just been met by Martha, who
complains to Jesus that he could have prevented Lazarus'
death had he been there earlier. Jesus assures her that
Lazarus will rise again because he (Jesus) is "the
resurrection and the life" and then declares that whoever
believes in him will not die. Then, Jesus asks Martha if
she believes this. In her response, Martha does not
answer Jesus' question. Rather, she makes a confession
of her steadfast faith in Jesus (emphasized by the perfect
tense): "I have believed that you are the Christ, the Son of
God." She does not say anything--one way or the other--
about her faith in Jesus' ability to raise the dead. Thus, the
text leaves a blank that must be filled in by the reader--
either she believed in Jesus' power to raise Lazarus or
she didn't. The scribe of 𝔓66 filled in that blank by
supplying a direct answer ("I believe") to Jesus' question,
"Do you believe this?" Then the scribe continued with the
rest of Martha's confession. Curiously, the rest of the story
does not seem to confirm his choice, for Martha
demonstrates her resistance to any notion of resurrection

when Jesus asks for the stone on Lazarus' tomb to be
removed and she protests (see 11:38-39). Nonetheless,
the interpolation posited by the scribe shows that he was
responding to textual clues to fill in blanks, even if he
didn't make the best selection. If I were filling in the blank,
I might have Martha answer, "I am not sure, but I have
believed that you are the Christ, the Son of God."

John 12:2

text

⟨ἐποίησαν⟩ οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ

then ⟨they made⟩ him a supper there

all other Greek MSS

variant

text

⟨ἐποίησεν⟩ οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ

then ⟨she/he made⟩ him a supper there

𝔓66

Unless the tense change in 𝔓66 was an accident--and
there is no reasonable explanation for one--the scribe of
𝔓66 made an interesting alteration. Instead of the entire
family of Lazarus, Martha, and Mary preparing a meal for
Jesus, the scribe of 𝔓66 has only one of them doing this.
We would presume that the scribe was thinking of Mary,
since Martha and Lazarus are mentioned in the same
verse. But that doesn't fit with what Gospels tell us about
Mary and Martha--and the scribe of 𝔓66, as an
experienced Gospel reader, would have known this. Mary
was known as one who liked to be near Jesus and hear
his ministry, while Martha was known for her practical
service (see Luke 10:38-41). Thus, it is likely that the
scribe had Martha in mind and probably presumed that

his Christian readers, familiar with the Gospels, would have thought the same. This is further affirmed by the scribe's deletion of the article before Μάρθα in the next clause: καὶ Μάρθα διηκόνει. This allows for the translation: "then she--even Martha--made him a supper there and she served."

John 12:3

text

ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου

the house was filled with the fragrance of the perfume

$P66^{c2}$ <u>rell</u>

variant

ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρουτο ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου

the house was being filled with the fragrance of the perfume

$P66^{*}$

The scribe of $P66$ used a more colorful, dramatic verb tense--the imperfect--to depict that the house was gradually filled with the fragrance of the perfume. This slight change shows the scribe's penchant for good story-telling. The <u>diorthotes</u> came along and dutifully changed the imperfect to the aorist, as it stands in all other manuscripts.

John 12:11

text

ὅτι πολλοὶ δι αὐτὸν ὑπῆγον τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ
ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

because of him [Lazarus], many of the Jews left and were believing in Jesus

<u>rell</u>

variant 1

ὅτι πολλοὶ τῶν'Ιουδαίων δι αὐτὸν ὑπῆγον καὶ

ἐπίστευον εἰς τὸν'Ιησοῦν.

because many of the Jews, on account of him [Lazarus],

left and were believing in Jesus

D it

variant 2

ὅτι πολλοὶ δι αὐτὸν τῶν'Ιουδαίων ἐπίστευσαν

εἰς τὸν'Ιησοῦν.

because of him [Lazarus], many of the Jews believed in

Jesus

P66

According to the text, many Jews were "going over" or
"going away" (i.e., leaving their allegiance to Judaism and
to the Jewish religious leaders) and "were believing in
Jesus" (or, "were beginning to put their faith in him"). But
this abandonment of Judaism for Jesus is completely
absent in P66. Why? It would be tempting to answer that it
was never part of John's Gospel and that it was added
later in an attempt to emphasize the split between
Judaism and Christianity. But the words are present in
P75, which is not much older than P66 (fifty years or so);
therefore, I cannot be absolute about this. So, if the words
were in the exemplar for P66, I would conjecture that the
scribe deleted them because the scribe thought his
readers would not understand the expression ὑπῆγον
(were leaving) or because the scribe did not want to make
the schism between Judaism and Christianity a prominent
feature. However, it must be noted that the diorthotes
(who normally supplied accidental deletions) had no
problem with this omission, thereby revealing the

uniikeliness of these words being in the exemplar.

John 13:5

text

βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς <τὸν νιπτῆρα> καὶ ἤρξατο νίπτειν
τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν

he put water into <the basin> and began to wash the feet
of the disciples

rell

variant

βάλλει ὕδωρ εἰς <τὸν ποδονιπτῆρα> καὶ ἤρξατο
νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν

he put water into <the footbasin> and began to wash the
feet of the disciples

𝔓66 (cop^bo)

The scribe of 𝔓66 added some descriptive color to his text
by changing the generic word νιπτῆρα to the specific
ποδονιπτῆρα. The νιπτῆρα was used for all kinds of
washing; the ποδονιπτῆρα was used specifically to
describe a footpan or a basin for footwashing. The latter
word was in existence as early as the third century B.C.,
spelled as ποδανιπτῆρ (BAGD 680). The spelling used
by the scribe of 𝔓66 is a later form, appearing in works
dated in the first to third centuries A.D. (Liddell and Scott
1426). This change by the scribe of 𝔓66 provides a
window into the socio-lingo milieu and lexical repertoire of
the scribe.

John 13:24

text

νεύει οὖν τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος <πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν

εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει>

this one then nods to Simon Peter <to ask who it is he was

speaking about>

A (D) W (Θ) f^{1,13} 𝔐

variant 1

πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ εἶπεν

to ask who it is he spoke about

𝔓66^{c3}

variant 2

καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ τί ἐστίν περὶ οὗ λέγει

and he says to him who is the one he's speaking about

𝔓66^{*vid} B C L 068 33

The apparatus of NA^{27} indicates that 𝔓66* is illegible.
True, it is very difficult to read, but most likely it read κ/ (=
καί) λεγει αυτω ειπε (see Fee 1968a:96), which was then
corrected by the second corrector (see photograph ˙5 in
the Appendix). As such, the reading of 𝔓66* conforms to
that found in B C L etc. This reading has far better
documentary support and accords with Johannine style--
no where else does John use the optative mood or the
verb πυθέσθαι. Thus, it is curious why a corrector would
have adjusted this. However, this corrector was not the
diorthotes but another reader who made several notations
in chapter 13 for the sake of oral reading. These changes
could have happened any time--perhaps even at
Pachomius Monastery in the fourth century or thereafter.
This stands to reason because the change in 𝔓66^{c3}
reflects the testimony of later manuscripts. In this regard, it
provides a window into the history of the transmission of
the text.

John 14:17

Although this does not involve a singular variant, the textual phenomenon in 𝔓66 reveals something significaint about the character of the scribes of this manuscript. There is a significant textual difference in this verse concerning the tenses of the two verbs in the second clause:

Ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτό, ὅτι παρ' ὑμῖν μένει/μενεῖ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται/εστίν.

You know him [the Spirit of truth] because he abides/will abide with you and will be/is in you.

The first verb μένει is present tense when written as μένει, and future tense when written as μενεῖ. However, many of the earliest manuscripts do not exhibit accents marks, so the tense of this verb is uncertain. The second verb in 𝔓66ᶜ² 𝔓75 ℵ A D L Q W is ἔσται (will be), and in 𝔓66* B D* W is εστίν (is). There are three possible translations: (1) because he abides with you and will be in you; (2) because he will abide with you and will be in you; and (3) because he abides with you and is in you. 𝔓66ᶜ² 𝔓75 ℵ A D L Q W can support the first two renderings; 𝔓66* B D* W can support the third rendering. It is quite significant that the corrector of 𝔓66 changed the verb εστίν to ἔσται in order to produce a different meaning (either the first or the second). The third meaning, as conveyed by 𝔓66*, could be seen as the scribe's attempt to depict the Spirit's relationship with the Christians he was making his copy for. To them, the Spirit was both with them and in them; this would not have been true for the disciples on the eve of Jesus' crucifixion.

In context, Jesus was telling his disciples that he would send them the Spirit as the παράκλητος. Jesus added

that they should know who "the Paraclete" is because "he abides with you and will be (or, is) in you." If the text originally had two present tense verbs, this statement could be understood to describe, proleptically, the twofold location of the Spirit in relationship to the believer. In other words, the Spirit is viewed in its future state as present with and in the believer. (A text with both verbs in the future tense gives the same sense.) If the text originally had a present tense verb and a future tense verb, then Jesus probably meant that the Spirit as present with Jesus (then and there) was with the disciples, and, in the future, would be in the disciples.

In this regard it is important to note that the pronoun used in reference to τὸ πνεῦμα (the Spirit) is masculine, αὐτόν (both occurences) in 𝔓66* (also D L), when it should be neuter (αὐτό) according to proper grammar. The masculine pronoun emphasizes the Spirit's personal existence, as in 16:13-14, where the masculine ἐκεῖνος appears, when it should have been neuter for grammatical reasons. The grammar-conscious corrector, 𝔓66ᶜ², changed the masculine to the neuter, αὐτό. If John didn't write the masculine (as is the testimony of 𝔓66ᶜ² 𝔓75 ℵ B), then the scribe of 𝔓66 may have been making an exegetical point: the Spirit is a personal being just as Jesus is.

John 15:15
text
οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ
οἶδεν τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ <εἴρηκα>
φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου
ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν.
No longer I call you servants, because a servant does not
know what his master is doing, but <I have called> you

friends, because all things which I heard from my Father, I
made known to you.
all Greek MSS

variant
οὐκέτι λέγω ὑμᾶς δούλους, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλος οὐκ
οἶδεν τί ποιεῖ αὐτοῦ ὁ κύριος· ὑμᾶς δὲ ⟨λέγω⟩
φίλους, ὅτι πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου
ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν.
No longer I call you servants, because a servant does not
know what his master is doing, but ⟨I call⟩ you friends,
because all things which I heard from my Father, I made
known to you.
𝔓66

The change of verb in 𝔓66 could be the result of
assimilation to the previous verb, but it is just as likely the
result of the scribe's personal concretization of the text.
Nowhere prior in John's Gospel had Jesus told his
disciples that they were his friends; hence, the scribe
considered the perfect tense εἴρηκα to be inaccurate.
This declaration seems to be the first announcement of a
new relationship between Jesus and his disciples--one
that called for a present tense verb.

John 15:25
text
ἀλλ ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ⟨ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν
γεγραμμένος⟩ ὅτι 'Εμίσησάν με δωρεάν.
but that the word might be fulfilled, ⟨which in their law is
written⟩, "they hated me without cause."
𝔓66cvid 𝔓22vid ℵ B D L

variant 1

ὁ γεγραμμένος ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτῶν

which is written in their law

A Θ f¹³ 𝔐

variant 2

ὁ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γεγραμμένος

which is written in the law

𝔓66*

For Jesus to call the Scriptures "their law" can be
perceived to be a pejorative statement, wherein Jesus
was disassociating himself from the Jews and their
Scriptures. Indeed, Jesus had previously used the same
kind of language when he labeled the Scriptures as "your
law" when speaking to the Jewish leaders (see 8:17 and
10:34 where other scribes deleted "your"). It is possible
that the scribe of 𝔓66, having sympathies for the Jews, did
not want this distancing to be made between the Jews
and Christians (see note on 12:11.) In any event, the
single variant displays the scribe's liberty to interact with
the meaning of the text.

John 16:7

The scribe of 𝔓66 omitted ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω
αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς (but if I go, I will send him to you). The
omission could have been accidental, due to
homoeoteleuton (the previous clause ends with ὑμᾶς), or
intentional. If the latter, the scribe saw this expression as
superfluous and redundant; it hinders the syntactical flow:
"I tell you the truth: it is better for you that I go away. For if
do not go away, the Comforter will not come to you; [but if
I go, I will send him to you.] And when he comes, he will
judge the world." Thus, the deletion, if intentional, was
made for the ease of reading comprehension.

John 16:19

The scribe of 𝔓66 displayed a conflation of readings by
writing ἤμελλον καὶ ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾶν (they
intended and they wanted to ask him). The verb ἤμελλον
is found in ℵ W 579, and ἤθελον in all other Greek
manuscripts. This reveals that the scribe of 𝔓66 may have
had access to two exemplars; not being able to make a
decision between the two readings, he included both.
The <u>diorthotes</u> of 𝔓66 deleted καὶ ἤθελον.

John 16:32

The original scribe of 𝔓66 wrote σκορπισθῆτε πάντες
ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ἴδια κἀμὲ μόνον ἀφῆτε (all/each of
you will be scattered to his own place and will leave me
alone). The word πάντες was then deleted--perhaps by
the original scribe. But there is something to learn here
about how this scribe interacted with the text. His penning
the word "παντες" displays his knowledge of the other
Gospels. In Matt. 26:31 and Mark 14:27, both parallel
passages to John 16:32, Jesus speaks of <u>all</u> (πάντες)
forsaking him. Thus, this is what must have been in the
scribe's mind when he came to John; it formed his
horizon of expectation, to which he automatically
conformed the text of John. But then the horizon of the text
caused him to reform his view and make a proper
adjustment. John did not say σκορπισθῆτε πάντες but
σκορπισθῆτε ἕκαστος--pointing to each and every
disciple individually.

John 17:8

text
τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἔδωκάς μοι <δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, καὶ
αὐτοὶ> ἔλαβον

the words which you have given me <I gave to them and>
they received
𝔓66^{c2}

variant

τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἔδωκάς μοι ἔλαβον
the words which you have given me they received
𝔓66*

This is another case of the scribe of 𝔓66 shortening the
text for the sake of stylistic economy and/or ease of
readability. The words $\delta \acute{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \alpha \; \alpha \grave{\upsilon} \tau o \hat{\iota} \varsigma \; \kappa \alpha \grave{\iota} \; \alpha \grave{\upsilon} \tau o \grave{\iota}$ are
not needed to communicate the message that Jesus
conveyed to the disciples what he had heard from the
Father.

17:11 and 17:12
There is a common expression in both these verses,
where Jesus asks the Father, $\tau \acute{\eta} \rho \eta \sigma o \nu \; \alpha \grave{\upsilon} \tau o \grave{\upsilon} \varsigma \; \grave{\epsilon} \nu \; \tau \hat{\wp}$
$\grave{o} \nu \acute{o} \mu \alpha \tau \acute{\iota} \; \sigma o \upsilon \; \mathring{\wp} \; \delta \acute{\epsilon} \delta \omega \kappa \acute{\alpha} \varsigma \; \mu o \iota$ (keep them in your
name which you have given me). What is unusual about
this expression is that Jesus says he was given the
Father's name. One would think that Jesus would have
asked, "Father, preserve the disciples in <u>my</u> name which
you have given me." Indeed, the scribe of 𝔓66 must have
had the same expectation as prompted by his previous
reading of John (see 14:13, 14, 26; 15:16, 21; 16:23, 26),
for in both verses he wrote $\mu o \upsilon$ (my) after $\grave{o} \nu \acute{o} \mu \alpha \tau \acute{\iota}$
(name) instead of $\sigma o \upsilon$ (your), and then immediately
corrected it to $\sigma o \upsilon$--once he took a second look at his
exemplar. This shows that his previous reading created a
horizon of expectation for his present reading, which was
then challenged by the horizon of the text.

John 17:11b

text

ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς

that they may be one, even as we are

𝔓66^c2vid <u>rell</u>

variant

omit clause

𝔓66* it cop^ach2

𝔓66 shows that a corrector made an insert mark after ω
δεδωκας μοι and then very likely added the phrase ινα
ωσιν εν καθως ημεις on the bottom of the page, but the
correction is not extant (see photo ⁺6 in the Appendix). In
any event, it is possible that the original scribe omitted the
phrase for one of two reasons, both of which are related
to one another. The first reason he omitted the clause
would be to join 17:11a with 17:12 so as to preserve the
thematic unity: the divine preservation of the apostles. The
second reason he omitted the clause was to postpone
the mention of unity until 17:20-24, where this theme is
developed completely. In other words, according to the
scribe's way of thinking, the mention of the believers'
oneness as connected with the oneness between Father
and Son was not well placed in 17:11.

John 17:12

text

ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου <ᾦ>
δέδωκάς μοι

I was keeping them in your name <that> you have given
me

𝔓66^cvid B C* L W

variant 1

ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ⟨οὓς⟩

δέδωκάς μοι

I was keeping them in your name ⟨those⟩ whom you have

given me

A (C³) D 𝔐

variant 2

ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου

I was keeping them in my name

𝔓66*

The text has early and diverse textual support (𝔓66ᶜᵛⁱᵈ B
C* L W). 𝔓66 shows that a corrector made an insert mark
after τω ονοματι σου and then very likely added the
phrase ω δεδωκας μοι on the bottom of the page, but the
correction is not extant (see photo *6 in the Appendix).
The variant appears in later manuscripts for the same
reasons explained in 17:11 (see above).

John 17:14-18
There are several omissions in this section in 𝔓66, but the
first two are not singular variants. Nonetheless, they could
be instructive in this study:

(1) 𝔓66* D f¹³ it syrˢ omit καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ
κόσμου (as I am not of this world), in 17:14.
(2) 𝔓66ᶜ² 33 copᵇᵒ omit all of 17:16-- ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου
οὐκ εἰσὶν καθὼς ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου
(they are not of this world as I am not this world).
(3) 𝔓66 omits the second clause of καθὼς ἐμὲ
ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον, κἀγὼ ἀπέστειλα
αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον (as you have sent me into the
world, even so have I also sent them into the world.)

Each of the above omissions could have been accidental
due to homoeoteleuton; the endings of 17:14 and 17:16 are
similar and the endings of 17:18a and 17:18b are
identical. The second corrector of 𝔓66 added the phrase
$\kappa\alpha\theta\grave{\omega}\varsigma\ \grave{\epsilon}\gamma\grave{\omega}\ o\grave{\upsilon}\kappa\ \epsilon\grave{\iota}\mu\grave{\iota}\ \grave{\epsilon}\kappa\ \tau o\bar{\upsilon}\ \kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu o\upsilon$ back into 17:14,
and then another corrector deleted all of 17:16, perhaps
thinking that the original scribe had misplaced the
statement (17:14b and 17:16 say nearly the same thing). If
they were not accidental omissions, then it is possible
that the scribe(s) of 𝔓66 attempted to de-emphasize
Jesus' relationship to the world.

The omission in 17:18, if not accidental, could have
been made in the interest of preserving the thematic unity
of 17:17-19, which deals with sanctification--Jesus having
sanctified himself for the sake of the disciples'
sanctification.

John 18:5

text
$\epsilon\grave{\iota}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}\ 'I o\acute{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\varsigma\ \langle\acute{o}\ \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta o\grave{\upsilon}\varsigma\ \alpha\grave{\upsilon}\tau\grave{o}\nu\rangle\ \mu\epsilon\tau$
$\alpha\grave{\upsilon}\tau\bar{\omega}\nu.$
And Judas, <the one betraying him,> stood with them.
𝔓66^c2 rell

variant
$\epsilon\grave{\iota}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \delta\grave{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}\ 'I o\acute{\upsilon}\delta\alpha\varsigma\ \mu\epsilon\tau\ \alpha\grave{\upsilon}\tau\bar{\omega}\nu.$
And Judas stood with them.
𝔓66*

The omission in 𝔓66 cannot be explained as accidental.
Knowing that his readers had previously been introduced
to Judas as Jesus' betrayer (18:2), the scribe dropped this
from the text. The omission makes for a more artistic

narrative in the sense that it doesn't blatantly name Judas
as "the betrayer" right while he is culminating his betrayal.
Of course, in the original composition of John's Gospel
the writer may have added *ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν* to
distinguish this Judas from the other Judas (see 14:22),
but once was apparently enough in the opinion of the
scribe of 𝔓66.

John 18:15
text
ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ
and that disciple was known by the high priest
𝔓66^c2 rell

variant
omit
𝔓66*

There is no logical way to explain this omission as being a
scribal accident. Therefore, it must be assumed that the
scribe purposely omitted this expression. He did so
because he must have thought it was impossible for the
"other disciple," who is usually presumed to be "the
beloved disciple" (compare 13:23 with 20:2 for the
common identification), to have been known by the high
priest. How could this Galilean disciple, often identified as
the apostle John (son of Zebedee), be an acquaintance of
the high priest in Jerusalem? Some commentators have
conjectured that John, as a merchant for his father's
fishing business in Galilee, may have sold fish to the
priestly family in Jerusalem (Carson 1991:581-582).
Although this is not impossible, it is speculative. Most
commentators are baffled by the connection. Faced with
the same uncertainty, the scribe of 𝔓66 omitted it. His

resultant text, with the omission, reads as follows: "Simon
Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple. And he
entered with Jesus into the court of the high priest." (See
next note.)

John 18:16
text
ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ
ἀρχιερέως
therefore the disciple, the other one, the one known to the
high priest, came out
B C*vid L

variant 1
ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὃς ἦν γνωστὸς τοῦ
ἀρχιερέως
therefore the disciple, who was known by the high priest,
came out
𝔓66vid

variant 2
ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος ὃς ἦν γνωστὸς τῶ
ἀρχιερεί
therefore the disciple, the other one, who was the one
known to the high priest, came out
ℵ A C² D² W Θ f1.13 𝔐

As was mentioned in the previous note, the scribe of 𝔓66
did not want to identify "the other disciple" (who is the
same as "the beloved disciple") as being known to the
high priest. So in this verse the scribe of 𝔓66 omitted ὁ
ἄλλος (the other one). The resultant text indicates that
some disciple, who was not Peter and who was known by
the high priest, allowed Peter to enter the courtyard.

18:37

In this verse we see how the scribe of 𝔓66 became so accustomed to writing the Hebraic idiom, ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν (he answered and said), that he expanded ἀπεκρίθη ὁ'Ιησοῦς (Jesus answered) to 'Ιησοῦς ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν (Jesus answered and said)-- contrary to the Hellenistic tendency to shorten such idioms. This shows what kind of power verbal repetition can have over one's mind. (The expression ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν appears over 125 times in the Gospels.)

John 19:5

text

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς'Ιδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος

And he says to them, "Behold, the man."

𝔓66²ᶜᵛⁱᵈ rell

variant 1

Καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς'Ιδοὺ.

And he says to them, "Behold"

B

variant 2

omit

𝔓66*

The corrector of 𝔓66 probably intended to add these words into the text, for there is an insert symbol for where this sentence should go (see photograph ⁸8 in the Appendix). But the words themselves, probably written in the lower margin, are not extant. But why would the original scribe have omitted them? Since there are no obvious signs to account for a transcriptional error, this is

either a non-interpolation or a purposeful excision. If the
former, then P66* is original, B presents the shortest
interpolation, and all other manuscripts present a long
interpolation. If the latter, then it could be reasoned that
the scribe of P66* took exception to Jesus being
presented by Pilate to the world as one called "the man."
The scribe of B may have also felt the same. So, both
were protecting Jesus' divine identity--perhaps in
anticipation of 19:7, where the Jewish leaders say that
Jesus claimed to be the Son of God.

John 19:16b-17

text

Παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν. καὶ βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν
σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου Τόπον.
Then they took Jesus; and carrying the cross by himself,
he departed to the Place of the Skull.
B Dˢ L 33 it

variant 1

Παρέλαβον δε τὸν Ἰησοῦν και ηγαγον. καὶ βαστάζων
ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον
Κρανίου Τόπον.
And they took Jesus and led him away; and carrying the
cross by himself, he departed to the Place of the Skull.
A θ 054 065 𝕸

variant 2

Οι δε παραλαβοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπηγαγον. καὶ
βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν
λεγόμενον Κρανίου Τόπον
And the ones taking Jesus led him away. And carrying the
cross by himself, he departed to the Place of the Skull.
(א add αυτον) N W f¹ 565

variant 3

Παραλαβοντες αυτον απηγαγον εις τοπον λεγομεμον
Κρανιου.

Taking him they led him away to the place called the Skull.

P66*

variant 4

Παραλαβοντες αυτον απηγαγον καὶ βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν
σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εις τοπον λεγομεμον Κρανιου.

Taking him they led him away and carrying the cross by
himself he went out to the place called skull.

P66^c2

There are a host of other variants in this verse, but the
ones listed above represent the basic lexical forms. The
shorter reading in the text is the best, for it is the one that
accounts for the first two expansions. These expansions
are attempts to say that it was the Roman soldiers who led
Jesus away to be crucified, whereas the barer text is
ambiguous--the "they" could refer to the Jewish priests or
the Romans.

Strictly speaking, the pronoun αὐτοῖς (them) in the
first part of 19:16 (παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς--he
delivered him to them) refers to the "chief priests" in
19:15. But it was the Roman soldiers who actually carried
out the crucifixion. The ambiguity was probably
intentional. John wanted his readers to realize that it was
the Jewish leaders who were ultimately responsible for
Jesus' death, even though the Romans performed the
execution. This idea is captured in the NEB: "Then at last,
to satisfy them [the chief priests], he handed over Jesus
to be crucified." (The same idea is expressed in Luke
23:35--"he delivered Jesus to their will.")

The reading in 𝔓66* is the barest of all the variants. And since there is no way to explain the shortness as coming from a scribal error, it must be assumed that the short text was intentional. This reading still retains the ambiguity but also leaves out the fact that Jesus carried the cross by himself. This must be seen as a deletion that came about as the result of the scribe's knowledge of the other three Gospels, where it is made clear that Jesus himself did not carry his cross. According to the Synoptics, the Roman soldiers forced Simon of Cyrene to carry his cross (Matt. 27:32; Mark 15:21; Luke 23:26). Thus, bringing this horizon of expectation to the Johannine text prompted the scribe to change the text by his refusal to copy words which indicate that Jesus carried his own cross. Instead of there being a conflict of the two horizons, resulting in new understanding and a transformation of the scribe's horizon of expectations, he conformed the text to his horizon of expectation. However, the diorthotes noted the omission and dutifully filled it in.

John 19:28

text

εἰδὼς δ'Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται, ⟨ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή⟩, λέγει, Διψῶ.

Jesus, knowing that all things were already finished, ⟨that the Scripture might be fulfilled⟩, says, "I thirst."

𝔓66ᶜ² rell

variant

εἰδὼς δ'Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤδη πάντα τετέλεσται, λέγει, Διψῶ.

Jesus, knowing that all things were already finished, says, "I thirst."

𝔓66* copᵃᶜ²

Since the omission in 𝔓66* cannot be explained as being
accidental, the scribe must have had some reason for
deleting the words ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή (that the
Scriptures might be fulfilled). One reason for the deletion
could be that it is very difficult to find an Old Testament
Scripture which says "I thirst" in a Messianic context.
Scholars have pointed to Psalm 22:15 or Psalm 69:21, but
in neither of these verses is the predicted Messiah
explicitly said to be thirsty (although the implication is
there). If the scribe knew this, he may have deleted the
reference to the Scriptures so as to prevent his readers
from searching in vain or becoming confused. Or he may
have deleted the reference to the Scriptures because he
himself was disturbed that the words "I thirst" were not
part of any explicit messianic prophecy. Thus, John's
account disappointed his horizon of expectation.

John 19:38
text
καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν ὁ Πιλᾶτος
And Pilate gave permission.
all other Greek MSS

variant
omit
𝔓66ᵛⁱᵈ

It is helpful to see this short statement in context: "Joseph
of Arimathea (being a disciple of Jesus, but a secret one,
for fear of the Jewish leaders), asked that he might take
the body of Jesus. And Pilate gave permission. Then he
came and took the body of Jesus." There is no apparent
reason in the Greek text why the scribe would have

omitted this short sentence accidentally. Thus, we have to
look for other reasons for the omission, of which I can
think of two. First, he thought it was non-essential to the
meaning of the whole verse. Obviously, if Joseph had
asked Pilate for Jesus' body and then went to take Jesus'
body, it only follows that Pilate had given him permission.
Second, the scribe may have omitted the sentence so as
to harmonize this verse with Luke 23:52-53, a parallel text,
which says, "This man went to Pilate and asked for the
body of Jesus. Then he took it down." Given the scribe's
propensity to harmonize John with the Synoptic
Gospels, I would imagine that the second motivation was
more prominent than the first, although the two are closely
linked.

John 20:14

text

ταῦτα εἰποῦσα ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ
θεωρεῖ τὸν 'Ιησοῦν ἐστῶτα, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι
⟨Ιησοῦς⟩ ἐστιν.

Having said these things, she turned around, and saw
Jesus standing, and did not know that it was ⟨Jesus⟩.
𝔓66ᶜ rell

variant

ταῦτα εἰποῦσα ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω, καὶ
θεωρεῖ τὸν 'Ιησοῦν ἐστῶτα, καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει ὅτι
⟨κύριος⟩ ἐστιν.

Having said these things, she turned around, and saw
Jesus standing, and did not know that it was ⟨the Lord⟩.
𝔓66*

The scribe of 𝔓66 originally wrote κς (= κύριος), then
erased the kappa (κ) and changed it to an iota (ις =

Ἰησους). (See photograph •9 in the Appendix.) He made
the initial inscription "Lord" because he had been carried
along by the flow of the narrative, where Mary Magdalene
had twice said, "they have taken away my Lord" (20:2, 13).
Thus, it was only fitting for the text to say that she still
hadn't recognized <u>the Lord</u>.

John 21:6

text

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Βάλετε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ
πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εὑρήσετε.

And he said to them, "Throw [the net] to the right side of
the boat, and you will find [fish]."

ℵ* A B C D

variant 1

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Βάλετε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ
πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εὑρήσετε.
<οἱ δὲ εἶπον· δι ὅλης νυκτὸς ἐκοπιάσαμεν καὶ
οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ σῷ ὀνοματί
βαλοῦμεν.>

And he said to them, "Throw [the net] to the right side of
the boat, and you will find [fish]."
<But they said, "throughout the whole night we labored
and caught nothing, but at your designation we will cast
[the net]".>

𝔓66�vid

variant 2

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. Βάλετε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ
πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εὑρήσετε.
<οἱ δὲ εἶπον· δι ὅλης νυκτὸς ἐκοπιάσαμεν καὶ
οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ σῷ ῥήματί
βαλοῦμεν.>

And he said to them, "Throw [the net] to the right side of
the boat, and you will find [fish]."
<But they said, "throughout the whole night we labored
and caught nothing, but at your word we will cast [the
net]".>
($\aleph^1$ add $\tau\eta\varsigma$ before $\nu\upsilon\kappa\tau\upsilon\varsigma$) cop^{sa}

This story is so similar to the one where Jesus first
encountered Peter that it would be difficult for any reader
not to think of the two as paralleling each other. In Luke
5:1-11, as well as in John 21:1-19, the scene shows Peter
fishing, catching nothing, receiving a visitation from Jesus,
and then witnessing a miraculous catch of fish. When
Jesus appeared to Peter the first time, Peter fell on his
knees before him and, realizing he was a sinful man,
asked Jesus to depart from him. Jesus would not depart.
He had come to Peter to make him his disciple. In this
appearance, Peter is again exposed. But Jesus restores
him.

As often happened with parallel passages, scribes
could not resist the temptation to conform them verbally.
Thus, the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$66, who had a propensity for Gospel
harmonization, added a portion of Luke 5:5 to John 21:6.
As such, he allowed his previous horizon of expectation to
interfere with the horizon of the text. The narrative in John
21 does not need this insertion and is, in fact, hindered by
it. The disciples' response, "at your designation we will let
down the nets" presumes that they had recognized it was
Jesus who was speaking to them. But in John's narrative
this recognition does not come until after the fish are
caught--when the beloved disciple says, "it is the Lord!"
(21:7). Thus, the insertion spoils the timing of the
epiphany.

A few other scribes inserted this story as well, but their

insertion differs from 𝔓66's in that they quoted Luke 5:5
verbatim. They used the expression τῷ σῷ ῥήματί (at
your word) instead of τῷ σῷ ὀνοματί (at your
designation), an extremely unusual expression, which
literally means "at your name."

Observations

The Scribe's Horizon of Expectations

Royse (1981:407-409) considered the scribe of 𝔓66 to be
a Christian because of his use of standard nomina sacra,
and his special use of nomina sacra for the words "cross"
(which he writes as σ̅τ̅ρ̅ς for σταυρος) and "crucify" (which
he writes as σ̅τ̅ρ̅ο̅μ̅α̅ι for σταυρομαι). Affirming this as evidence
for his Christianity, I would also add that the scribe was a
well-read Christian. It appears that he knew the Old
Testament because in John 19:28 he deleted the
reference to the Scriptures because he was disturbed that
the words "I thirst" were not part of any explicit messianic
prophecy. He also knew the other three Gospels (besides
John) and displays this knowledge in various
harmonizations. He made five such harmonizations:

1. John 6:66 to Matt. 16:16
2. John 16:32 to Matt. 26:31 and Mark 14:27
3. John 19:16 to Matt. 27:32; Mark 15:21; Luke 23:26
4. John 19:38 to Luke 23:52-53
5. John 21:6 to Luke 5:5

He also had read the Gospel of John prior to making
the copy we now have. This is apparent in that some of
his singular readings exhibit his prior knowledge of the
narrative outcome of John. For example, in 2:11 he added

$\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\eta\nu$ (first) in anticipation of 4:54, where it speaks of the "second sign" occuring in Galilee. And in 3:3 the scribe changed the singular to the plural in the expression "truly, truly I say to you" because the plural is typically Johannine and because the context promotes a pluralization of Jesus' audience.

The singular readings also reveal some of the scribe's theological tendencies. Admittedly, these are not easy to discern or to prove; they require some imaginative re-creation. First, it would seem that the scribe had some knowledge of Judaism and/or sympathy for Judaism. In John 4:39 the scribe of P66 changed the wording so that the Samaritan woman was to <u>speak</u> about Jesus, not to <u>testify</u> about him--for according to Rabbinic practice only men could be witnesses. In John 12:11 the scribe omitted mention of anyone abandoning Judaism for Jesus. This change from the standard text could have been motivated by a desire not to drive a wedge between Judaism and Christianity. In John 15:25 the scribe changed "their law" to "the law" so as to avoid any pejorative statement coming out of Jesus' mouth against the Mosaic law.

But the scribe was not pro-Jewish. Contrarily, he was thoroughly Christian and took an opportunity to promote the distinction between Judaism and Christianity. For example, the scribe of P66 in 1:17 added the contrastive $\delta\epsilon$ (but) and thereby revealed his desire to show a clear contrast between the two dispensations: the law (given by Moses) and grace (given by Christ). Clearly, he saw Christ as superior to everyone important in Judaism, including Moses. This tendency was displayed subtly in two instances, where the scribe added an article. In 7:52, he added an article before "prophet" to designate <u>the</u> Prophet, the one predicted by Moses (see Deut. 18:15, 18; John 1:21) and who is one-in-the-same as the

Messiah. And in 10:33 the scribe added an article to heighten the reference to Jesus' deity: "you being man make yourself the very God."

Other aspects of the scribe's theological tendencies are manifest in some of his other singular readings. For example, a change in 6:64 could possibly display that the scribe was disturbed over an apparent reference to Jesus' foreknowledge of "the damned" and therefore deleted this part from the verse. The scribe also displays his pneumatology by distinguishing between the divine Spirit and the human spirit. This is done in 3:6 (with reference to the divine Spirit giving birth to the human spirit) and in 6:63 (with reference to distinguishing the Spirit that gives life and the words of Jesus which are characteristically "spirit"). Furthermore, in 14:17 the scribe changed the gender of the pronoun from neuter to masculine so as to personalize the Spirit.

Other changes display the scribe's personal horizon of expectation as formed, presumably, by his Egyptian milieu and nonbiblical reading experiences. I have a few examples in mind. In 3:34 (which speaks of the outpouring of the Spirit), he first wrote the more ordinary Greek expression οὐκ ἐκ μέρους (not in part) instead of the unique one, οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου (not by measure); then he corrected himself. This shows that the scribe allowed his repertoire of linguistic knowledge to interfere with his reception of the text. In 4:6 the scribe said that Jesus "sat on the ground" instead of saying "he sat on the well." It is very likely that such a change was motivated by the fact that within his own life-experience the scribe could not conceive of a person sitting on a well. In 13:5, he changed the word "basin" to "footbasin" because ποδονιπτῆρα was used specifically to describe a footpan or basin for footwashing. The fact that this was also the

word chosen by the Coptic Boharic translators suggests
that this change was influenced by Egyptian lexicography.
The word was also perfectly acceptable to the diothortes,
another Egyptian.

The Scribe's Interaction with the Text as a Reader

While the numerous scribal mistakes would seem to
indicate that the scribe was inattentive, many of the
singular readings--prior to correction--reveal that he was
not detached from the narrative of the text. Rather, it
seems that he became so absorbed in his reading that he
often forgot the exact words he was copying. His task as a
copyist was to duplicate the exemplar word for word, but
this was frustrated by the fact that he was reading the text
in logical semantic chunks. As a result, he continually had
to stop his reading and make many in-process
corrections. Of course, he left several places uncorrected,
which were later corrected by the diorthotes. But the
diorthotes was primarily concerned with correcting
matters of substance and adjusting the copy according to
a different exemplar. The only time the diorthotes seemed
to have deviated from his task of correcting was in 8:25,
where he added "I told you" to help readers understand
Jesus' enigmatic answer to the religious leaders' query
about his identity. Thus, the expression "what I have been
telling you from the beginning" became "I told you in the
beginning that which I also speak to you."

The singular readings of the original scribe reveal
much about his reader-reception processing. From these
readings, we can see some of his unique receptions. On
occasion, he read into a present text a previous text. This
is best illustrated in his copying of 5:28, where the phrase
"hearing his voice" prompted a distant but similar textual

association, which made the scribe think of an earlier
verse (1:23). So he wrote "all who are in the wilderness"
instead of "all who are in the graves." He also read ahead
of himself--and with his prior knowledge of John--read a
future text into a present one (chronologically speaking).
In 4:21, the scribe wrote "an hour is coming when neither
in this world nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father"
instead of "an hour is coming when neither in this
mountain nor in Jerusalem will you worship the Father."
This was evidently influenced by verses such as 16:32-33
and 17:11, where Jesus spoke of leaving "this world" to
go to the Father.

A host of other singular variants display the scribe's
interaction with the text. In several instances we see how
the whole notion of the implied reader (as a textual
construct) prompted some kind of blank-filling. Several
examples will illustrate this. In 1:49 the scribe of P66 has
Nathaniel telling Jesus "you are truly the Son of God"
because in the previous verse Jesus told Nathaniel he
was truly an Israelite. In 9:17 the scribe added an
intensive pronoun because the context called for a
personal opinion (in contrast to the opinions of others)
from the man who had been blind: "What do you yourself
say about the fact that he opened your eyes?" In 10:3 the
scribe responded to the implications of the text by
changing the words "I will lead my sheep out" to "I will
gather my sheep together"--which is the more expected
statement. In 11:27 the scribe makes Martha respond
directly to Jesus' query, "Do you believe this?", because
there is otherwise a gap between Jesus' question and
Martha's response. In 15:15 the scribe wrote "I call you
friends" instead of "I have called you friends" as a
reaction to following the lead of the textual clues.
Nowhere prior in John's Gospel had Jesus told his

disciples that they were his friends; hence, the scribe considered the perfect tense to be inappropriate. In 17:11 the scribe wrote "Father, preserve them in <u>my</u> name which you have given me" instead of "Father, preserve them in <u>your</u> name which you have given me" because the former fulfills the natural expectation mandated by the text. The same phenomenon occured in 20:14, where the natural object--as directed by the text--is "Lord," not "Jesus."

Some of the singular variants also show that the scribe was interested in helping his readers understand the text better. Though he did not engage in this activity as much as the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$45 did, he made slight adjustments here and there for the sake of improving readability. A few examples illustrate this. In 8:36, the scribe changed "you will be free" to "you are free" in the interest of his Christian readership who would have already received freedom in Christ. In another instance, the scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$66 turned 10:27 into a direct quote of 10:3 by adding "As I said to you, . . ." This shows that the scribe wanted to help his readers understand that Jesus had previously spoken what follows: "My sheep hear my voice and I know them and they follow me." In 11:39, the scribe made a deletion to alleviate a potentially confusing text, especially when read orally. In 13:33-34, the scribe made some changes to provide a better reading connection between verses. In 17:8 the scribe probably shortened the verse for the sake of readability, unless the shorter text is original--but this leads to another phenomonen in the manuscript $\mathfrak{P}$66, that of omissions.

Beginning with chapter seventeen and on to chapter nineteen, the manuscript $\mathfrak{P}$66 exhibits several omissions. These could be of three kinds: (1) careless omissions, (2) purposeful excisions, or (3) non-interpolations. If they

were careless omissions, it could be that the scribe was
experiencing fatigue near the end of the copying process
and consequenty made careless mistakes. However,
most of the omissions seem so sensible that it is difficult
to attribute their omission to fatigue. If these omissions
were non-interpolations, then it is possible that 𝔓66
preserved the original wording, which was later filled out
by other scribes. However, since none of these shorter
readings show up later in the textual tradition, it cannot be
ascertained with any certainty that 𝔓66 retains the original
wording. As the Alands noted (1988:69-70), most variant
readings endure; sooner or later, they will show up in the
textual stream. Thus, it is most likely that the shorter text in
𝔓66 is not original but redactional--the work of the scribe
interacting with the text and subsequently trimming what
was troublesome to his horizon of expectations or what
was perceived as burdensome to his perceived readers.

Some examples illustrate this. In 17:11 the scribe
omitted "that they may be one, even as we are" to
preserve the thematic unity of the Lord's final prayer. The
omission in 17:18, if not accidental, could have been
made also in the interest of preserving the thematic unity
of 17:17-19, which deals with sanctification. In 18:5 the
appositive "the one betraying him" was dropped after the
name "Judas" because the readers had previously been
introduced to Judas as Jesus' betrayer (18:2). In 18:15 the
scribe deleted the clause "and that disciple was known
by the high priest" perhaps because it didn't seem likely
that the "other disciple" (who is usually presumed to be
"the beloved disciple") could have been known by the
high priest. In 19:5 he omitted the whole sentence: "And
he says to them, 'Behold, the man.'" Perhaps the scribe of
𝔓66 took exception to Jesus being presented by Pilate to
the world as one called "the man." In 19:16, he omitted

the phrase "and carrying the cross by himself" so as to conform John to the Synoptic Gospels (see above). In 19:28 he omitted the phrase "that the Scriptures might be fulfilled" to obviate the problem of identifying any Scripture that says "I thirst." In 19:38, he deleted the words "and Pilate gave permission" so as to harmonize this verse with Luke 23:52-53, a parallel text (see above).

The corrector

The corrector or diorthotes functioned primarily as a proofreader looking for mistakes and fixing them. As such, he was usually not an engaged reader. But there are a few instances, however, which could reveal that he allowed himself to interact with the text. In John 8:25, the corrector added a few words to clarify an obtuse expression: "I told you in the beginning that which I also speak to you." This addition shows that he was interacting with a textual blank and filled it accordingly. In John 12:11, he did not correct the scribe's omission of the fact that the Jews were leaving Judasim to follow Jesus. This could have been an oversight, or it could mean that he thought the scribe got it right. If it wasn't either of these reasons, it could show that he agreed with the scribe's desire to not make a blatant schism between Judaism and Christianity.

Chapter Six

An Examination of Scribal Reception through an Analysis
of Significant Singular Readings of 𝔓75, a Gospel
Manuscript from Jabal Abu Manna, Egypt

Provenance and Date

The provenance of 𝔓75 was fully discussed in the
previous chapter because it shares the same
provenance   as 𝔓66, another Bodmer papyrus. As was
mentioned in that chapter, Robinson (1990) believes that
the Bodmer biblical papyri belonged to Christian monks in
monasteries established by Pachomius around A.D. 320.
But the codices dated earlier than 325 would not have
been produced in this fourth-century scriptorium; they
would have been transported there from elsewhere. It is
likely that some of the Greek manuscripts may have come
from Alexandria, perhaps brought there by Theodore, a
lector who had come to Pachomius from the church in
Alexandria, or by other Alexandrians. Theodore was well-
received by Pachomius (and even inspired Pachomius to
learn Greek), and Theodore was made steward of all
those who came to the monastery from Alexandria and
other regions where Greek was spoken (The Life of
Pachomius 94-95). It is not unreasonable to conjecture
that this Theodore used copies of the Scriptures from
Alexandria to read to his Greek-speaking brothers.

And there is another important link between Pachomius
and Alexandria. Pachomius greatly respected Athanasius,
the bishop of Alexandria, and maintained a good
relationship with him. Thus, the monasteries established
by Pachomius would have used the type of New
Testament text produced in Alexandria and authorized by

Athanasius, who was the first Egyptian bishop to exercise his authority over all the Egyptian churches. In this regard the Alands (1988:65) wrote,

> Athanasius, the powerful bishop of Alexandria, whose authority was felt far beyond the borders of Egypt as early as 328, governed his church with a tightly centralized administrative structure. We do not know precisely what manuscript he designated for use as a model, but it must have been of the type represented by Codex Vaticanus or P75.

Thus P75, found in Abu Manna, could have been transported there from Alexandria. Other manuscripts, much like P75, remaining in Alexandria, would have served as exemplars for Codex Vaticanus (a production of the Alexandrian scriptorium). It is unlikely that the scribe of Codex Vaticanus actually used P75 as his exemplar; it is more likely that he used a similar one which was probably a hundred years older--that is, a third-century exemplar of around A.D. 250.

P75 is late second-century or early third-century manuscript. Martin (1961:13) was the first to date P75; he assigned it to the Imperial era of A.D. 175--225. According to Martin, "The writing is an attractive vertical uncial-- elegant and well-crafted, of the type represented by the Oxyrhynchus Papyri 2293, 2322, 2362, 2363, 2370." The handwriting displayed in these Oxyrhynchus Papyri is typically called by paleographers "the common angular type of the late second to early third century." According to the editors' comments on each of these papyri in The Oxyrhynchus Papyri: 2293 is second century; 2322 with a common angular type of hand, is second or early third century; 2362, a common angular type, is late second/early third; 2363, a finely executed hand of common angular type, is late second/early third--the

same scribe did 2362 and 2363; 2370, a common angular
type, is dated around 200 A.D.

In a recent study, Barbara Aland (1989:55-70) has dated
the manuscript closer to 175. This concurs with a recent
trend in papyrological studies to ascribe an earlier date to
many of the New Testament papyri. But I think it is safer to
date it c. 200, given its calligraphic affinities with several
manuscripts of the same era.

The Scribe and the Manuscript

𝔓75 contains large portions of Luke and John (Luke 3:18--
4:2; 4:34--5:10; 5:37--18:18; 22:4--24:53; John 1:1--11:45,
48-57; 12:3--13:1, 8-9; 14:8-30; 15:7-8). The photographs
and complete transcription of the text were first published
by Victor Martin and Rudolf Kasser (1961) and Kurt Aland
(1976:375-396) published previously unidentified
fragments of the same manuscript.

As was discussed in chapter two, it seems likely that
𝔓75 is the work of a professional scribe who either
labored in a scriptorium in Alexandria or in another
scriptorium influenced by Alexandrian scriptoral practices.
This manuscript displays the penmanship of a
professional. The large typeface of the text indicates that
the manuscript was composed to be read aloud to a
Christian congregation. Furthermore, the scribe used a
system of sectional divisions that resembles that of
𝔓4/64/67 and reappears in ℵ and B.

As has been previously mentioned, 𝔓75 is eminently
recognized as an extremely accurate copy. Concerning
the scribe who made 𝔓75, Colwell (1965:121) said, "his
impulse to improve style is for the most part defeated by
the obligation to make an exact copy." And concerning
his work Colwell (1965:117) commented,

> In 𝔓75 the text that is produced can be explained in all its variants as the result of a single force, namely the disciplined scribe who writes with the intention of being careful and accurate. There is no evidence of revision of his work by anyone else, or in fact of any real revision, or check. . . .The control had been drilled into the scribe before he started writing.

Of course, 𝔓75 is not flawless. The scribe had to make several corrections (116 in Luke and John), but there was no attempt "to revise the text by a second exemplar, and indeed no systematic correction at all" (Royse 1981:538-539). The scribe of 𝔓75 shows a clear tendency to make grammatical and stylistic improvements in keeping with the Alexandrian scriptoral tradition, and the scribe had a tendency to shorten his text, particularly by dropping pronouns. However, his omissions of text hardly ever extend beyond a word or two--probably because he copied letter by letter and syllable by syllable. Furthermore, there are hardly any interpolations that he inserted into the text drawn from other Gospels. When the scribe harmonized, it was usually a harmonization to the immediate context (Royse 1981:548-550). From a reader-reception perspective, 𝔓75 does not offer as much to explore as does 𝔓66. However, he did allow himself to interact with the text and consequently created some significant variant readings. The analysis of these variants enables us to see the reception tendencies of the scribe of 𝔓75.

A Study of Singular Variants in 𝔓75

My task in the following pages is to focus on how the scribe of 𝔓75 functioned as a receptor of the text as he read it. For this purpose, I have focused on the singular

readings of 𝔓75 which have significance for reception
study. (This excludes most nonsense readings, which
were corrected anyway; it also excludes itacisms and
transpositions.) Singular readings are readings in which
𝔓75 has no other continuous Greek manuscript support.
This means that if an ancient version also has the same
reading or a very few late Greek manuscripts (tenth
century and beyond) have the same reading, then it is still
quite likely that the reading is the creation of the scribe of
𝔓75.

The Gospel of Luke

Luke 8:21
text
ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς <αὐτούς>, Μήτηρ μου καὶ
ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ
ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.
But answering, he [Jesus] said to <them>, "My mother
and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and
do it."
all other Greek MSS

variant
ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς <αὐτός>, Μήτηρ μου καὶ
ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ
ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες.
But answering, he [Jesus] said to <him>, "My mother and
my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do
it."
𝔓75 it[b]

In 18:20, a verbal statement was made in the passive
voice, "it was announced to Jesus, 'Your mother and your

brothers have been standing outside wanting to see you.'" According to the reading of the text, Jesus answers the crowd at large. But the scribe of 𝔓75 made a change which displays that his reading of the Gospel of Matthew had formed a horizon of expectation for his reading of Luke. In Matt. 12:46-50, a parallel passage, it is a man who informs Jesus that his mother and brothers want to speak with him--to whom Jesus gives the same response recorded above. With this in mind, the scribe--whether consciously or unconsciously--changed the direct object from αὐτούς (them) to αὐτός (him).

Luke 9:34

text

ταῦτα δὲ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἐγένετο νεφέλη καὶ
ἐπεσκίαζεν αὐτούς· ἐφοβήθησαν δὲ ἐν τῷ
<εἰσελθεῖν αὐτοὺς> εἰς τὴν νεφέλην.
while he [Peter] was saying these things, a cloud came
and overshadowed them, and they were afraid while
<they entered> into the cloud
ℵ B (C) L

variant 1
ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν
those ones entered
𝔓45 A D W θ f1,13 𝔐

variant 2
εἰσελθεῖν
entering
𝔓75

The text is ambiguous as to who entered the cloud: the three disciples (James, John, Peter), the three men

(Jesus, Moses, Elijah), or all six of them. The first variant relieves the ambiguity by saying it was "those ones" who entered the cloud--i.e., the three men (Jesus, Moses, Elijah). The uncertainty is clarifed in 𝔓75, which omits αὐτούς and thereby indicates that it was the disciples who entered the cloud. This last choice shows that the scribe followed the logical implication of the text inasmuch as the three disciples would have been terrified that the cloud was overtaking them. The change in 𝔓75 could also exhibit his knowledge of the parallel passages, which indicate it was the three disciples who were engulfed by the cloud (see Matt. 17:5; Mark 9:5).

Luke 10:31

The expression κατὰ συγκυρίαν, which occurs only here in the New Testament, means "by chance" or "by coincidence." The scribe of 𝔓75 first wrote this as κατα συγκυριαν (as it appears in all other manuscripts except D which reads κατα τυΧα), but then wrote it as κατα συγτυΧειαν (= κατα συντυΧειαν). (See photograph ⁰10 in the Appendix.) This expression, though nearly synonymous with κατα συγκυριαν, connotes "good fortune" (LS 1729) not just "coincidence." Furthermore, συντυΧειαν is found primarily in Greek lyric poets and the writings of Herodotus (BAGD 793). This switch probably reveals the scribe's knowledge of Greek literature and thereby helps us understand his reading repertoire, The change also shows that the scribe was anticipating the good outcome of the following story and thereby gave his readers a clue by choosing a word that would suggest a fortunate outcome for the victim who was rescued by the good Samaritan.

Luke 11:31

text

βασίλισσα ⟨νότου⟩ ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει

the queen ⟨of the South⟩ will be raised in the judgment

P75^C2 <u>rell</u>

variant

βασίλισσα ἐγερθήσεται ἐν τῇ κρίσει

the queen will be raised in the judgment

𝔓75*

The scribe of 𝔓75 omitted the word νότου (of the South);
it appears to have been added by another scribe because
it is a superlinear correction in another hand (see
photograph ˙11 in the Appendix.). Thus, it remains for us
to understand why the scribe left out νότου. The answer
may come from the strong possibility that the scribe knew
that "Queen of the South" is a Hebraism for "Queen of
Sheba" when he believed the well-known Jewish tradition
that this queen was the "Queen of Egypt and Ethiopia"
(see ISBE 4:9-10). This tradition, reported by Josephus
(<u>Antiquities</u> 8.6.5), ascribes an African origin for this
queen, not an Arabian one. If this was the motivation for
leaving out "South" (= "Sheba"), then it betrays the
scribe's prejudice in the Gadamerian sense. He didn't
take this prejudice to an extreme, so as to replace "Egypt"
for "South," but he opened up the possibility for this
queen to be an Egyptian queen.

Luke 12:42

text

καὶ εἶπεν ὁ κύριος, Τίς ἄρα ἐστὶν ὁ πιστὸς
οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος, ὃν καταστήσει ὁ κύριος
ἐπὶ τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοῦ τοῦ ⟨διδόναι⟩ ἐν
καιρῷ τὸ σιτομέτριον;

And the Lord said, "Who then is the faithful and wise
steward, whom the Lord will appoint the lord over his
servants--<to give out> provisions in the proper time?"
A B � N^C D

variant 1
δοῦναι
to give
N W Θ

variant 2
διαδοῦναι
to give
N*

variant 3
διαδίδουναι
to distribute
𝔓75

The scribe of 𝔓75 substituted a more accurate, more
naturally contextal infinitive, διαδίδουναι--a verb which
is characteristically used in the New Testament for
expressing the action of distribution (see Luke 11:22;
18:22; John 6:11; Acts 4:35; Rev 17:13). This shows that
the scribe was an experienced reader of the text.

Luke 13:34
text
ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου ὃν
τρόπον ὄρνις <τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν ὑπὸ τὰς
πτέρυγας>, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε.
How often I wanted to gather your children the way a hen
<gathers her brood under her wings>, but you were not

willing.

all other Greek MSS

variant

πσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου ὃν
τρόπον ὄρνις, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε.

How often I wanted to gather your children the way a hen
does, but you were not willing.

𝔓75

This omission does not appear to be a transcriptional
error. Furthermore, the shorter text makes perfectly good
sense. Therefore, the scribe of 𝔓75 either purposely
trimmed his text or he was faithfully copying a shorter
version in his exemplar. If the latter, then it is possible that
all other witnesses are copies of an ancient exemplar that
conformed Luke to Matt. 23:37. But unless and until
another witness turns up with the same reading as in 𝔓75,
the shorter text cannot be affirmed with absolute
confidence. Therefore, we must ask what prompted the
change? Had we been dealing with the scribe of 𝔓45 we
could say that this was nothing more than a case of the
scribal trimming for the sake of trimming. But the scribe of
𝔓75 had no such tendencies. The only possible
explanation is that the scribe thought it nonfactual for the
text to say that hens actually gather their chickens under
their wings; consequently, he rid the text of what he
perceived to be an error.

Luke 14:8

text

Ὅταν κληθῇς ὑπό τινος <εἰς γάμους>, μὴ
κατακλιθῇς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν,

Whenever you are invited by someone <to a wedding>,

you should not recline in the places of honor
all other Greek MSS

variant
Ὅταν κληθῇς ὑπό τινος, μὴ κατακλιθῇς εἰς τὴν
πρωτοκλισίαν,
Whenever you are invited by someone, you should not
recline in the places of honor
𝔓75 it^b cop^sa

𝔓75 has a shortened version of the introductory clause. All
other manuscripts fill out the clause with εἰς γάμους (to
a wedding celebration). It is possible that the shorter text
is original, and the longer is the result of scribal filling. But
it is also possible that the mention of a wedding festivity
was deleted by the scribe of 𝔓75 because the gathering
that occasioned Jesus' parable (Luke 14:7-14) was not a
wedding celebration. Thus, the narrative context
prompted this particular concretization.

Luke 14:32
text
ἐρωτᾷ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην
he asked for the terms of peace
א^2 A D L W Θ f^1,13 𝔐

variant 1
ἐρωτᾷ εἰρήνην
he requested peace
𝔓75

variant 2
ἐρωτᾷ εἰς εἰρήνην
he asked for peace

B

variant 3

ἐρωτᾷ πρὸς εἰρήνην

he asked for peace

ℵ*

Various scribes were troubled with the idiom τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην, which means something like "the things leading to peace." The scribes of ℵ* and B shortened the wording. But the shortest reading is found in 𝔓75. This redaction may be due to the influence of Acts 12:20 (Marshall 1978:594), thereby revealing the scribe's knowledge of Luke's sequel to his Gospel.

Luke 16:19

text

Ἄνθρωπος δὲ τις ἦν πλούσιος . . . πτωχὸς δὲ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος

There was a certain rich man . . . and a certain poor man named Lazarus.

all other Greek MSS

variant

Ἄνθρωπος δὲ τις ἦν πλούσιος ⟨ὀνόματι Νευης⟩ . . . πτωχὸς δὲ τις ὀνόματι Λάζαρος

There was a certain rich man ⟨named Nineveh⟩ . . . and a certain poor man named Lazarus.

𝔓75 (cop^sa Nineue)

This is the only parable told by Jesus in which one of the characters is given a name; the blind beggar is called Lazarus. Some witnesses provide testimony of scribal attempts (beginning as early as the second century) to

give the rich man a name. The scribe of 𝔓75 provided him a name, Νευης (which could be a misspelling of Νινευης); and one Coptic Sahidic manuscript reads Nineue. Both of these names may be synonyms for Nineveh, the wealthy city that came under God's judgment. According to a pseudo-Cyprianic text (third century), the rich man is called Finaeus. Priscillian also gave him the name Finees, which is probably an alternate to Phinehas, Elezar's companion (Exod. 6:25; Num. 25:7, 11). Peter of Riga called him Amonofis, which is a form of "Amenophis," a name held by many Pharaohs (see Metzger 1975:165-166). So pronounced was the lack that the Latin adjective dives (meaning "rich") was assumed to be the man's name. Since the time of Chaucer, the rich man was known as "Dives" in Latin and English literature.

Grobell (1964) has argued that the Coptic scribe adopted the name Nineue, meaning "Nobody," from an Egyptian folktale, written in Demotic, about Samte's descent into Amnte. He then conjectured that the scribe of 𝔓75 took his name from a Coptic Sahidic version. However, it is just as likely that the scribe of 𝔓75 also knew the story--or another similar story--and inserted a name.

In any event, these various namings all exemplify scribal gap-filling, precipitated by the text naming one party in the story and not the other. Scribes could not resist providing names to the nameless. For example, in one Old Latin manuscript (it^c) the two thieves crucified with Jesus are given names: Zoatham and Camma. The same scribe gave nearly the same names in Mark 15:27: Zoathan and Chammata. In Luke 23:32 the scribe of manuscript it^l gave them the names Joathas and Maggatras.

Luke 16:30

text

ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Οὐχί, πάτερ'Ἀβραάμ, ἀλλ ἐάν τις ἀπὸ
νεκρῶν ⟨πορευθῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς⟩ μετανοήσουσιν.

But he [the rich man] said, "No, father Abraham, but if
someone from the dead ⟨would go to them⟩, they would
repent."

all other Greek MSS

variant 1

ἐγερθῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς

is raised for them

𝔓75

variant 2

ἀναστῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς

would rise for them

ℵ

Both of the variant readings yield the sense: "if someone
would be raised [or rise] for them, they would repent."
The substitution of a verb expressing resurrection in place
of a verb expressing motion is natural for a Christian
scribe expecting the verse to speak of <u>resurrection</u> from
the dead, not a <u>journey</u> from the dead--for the former is a
New Testament motif, whereas the latter is a Hellenistic
motif. Thus, two Christian scribes--each in a different
way--allowed their horizon of expectation to interfere with
what is actually written in the text.

Luke 17:14

text

ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε
ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ
ὑπάγειν αὐτοὺς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν.

Seeing this he said to them, "Go, show yourselves to the priests." And it happened that, while they were going, they were cleansed.

𝔓75* <u>rell</u>

variant

ἰδὼν εἶπεν αὐτοῖς. θέλω καθαρίσθητε καὶ εὐθέως
ἐκαθαρίσθησαν. πορευθέντες ἐπιδείξατε ἑαυτοὺς
τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὑπάγειν
αὐτοὺς ἐκαθαρίσθησαν.

Seeing this he said to them, " I will. Be cleansed, and immediately they were cleansed. Go, show yourselves to the priests." And it happened that, while they were going, they were cleansed.

𝔓75ᶜ²

In the lower margin of 𝔓75, some scribe (beside the original scribe) made an insertion at the beginning of Jesus' speech to the ten men who had leprosy (see photograph ˚12 in the Appendix.) Perhaps it was a monk at Pachomius' monastery in the fourth century or thereafter who made the marginal gloss.) Apparently, this corrector or lector was attempting to do a bit of chronological gap-filling inasmuch as it seemed to him that the lepers should be healed <u>before</u> going to show themselves to the priests. But this change ruins the story, because it is only when the lepers are obedient to Jesus' command to go to priests (without having any physical proof yet that they are healed) that they actually receive the cleansing. In any event, this gloss was probably taken from Matt. 8:2-3, where Jesus is said to have expressed his willingness to cleanse a man from his leprosy when he beseeched Jesus for healing.

Luke 24:26

text

οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν
εἰς τὴν ⟨δόξαν⟩ αὐτοῦ;

Was it not necessary for Christ to suffer these things and
to enter into his ⟨glory⟩?

𝔓75ᶜ rell

variant

οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν
εἰς τὴν ⟨βασιλείαν⟩ αὐτοῦ;

Was it not necessary for Christ to suffer these things and
to enter into his ⟨kingdom⟩?

𝔓75*

This aberration reveals that the scribe of 𝔓75 was
anticipating the text to read, "enter into his kingdom,"
because this was the wording Luke had used previously,
when one of the thieves crucified with Jesus spoke to
him: "remember me when you enter into your kingdom"
(Luke 23:42). Thus, his previous reading experience
created a horizon of expectation for his present reading.
This scribe, however, quickly switched roles--from reader
to scribe--and made a correction in his copy.

Luke 24:27

text

Καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν
προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ⟨ἐν πάσαις ταῖς
γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ⟩.

And having begun from Moses and from all the Prophets
he explained to them ⟨in all the Scriptures the things
concerning himself⟩.

most Greek MSS (with a few minor variations)

variant

Καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν
προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ⟨τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ
ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς⟩.

And having begun from Moses and from all the Prophets
he explained to them ⟨the things concerning himself in all
the Scriptures⟩.

𝔓75

The reading of the text makes it sound like all the
Scriptures contain statements about the Messiah, which
called for Jesus' explanation of all those Scriptures to the
two disciples, Cleopas and his companion. By making a
transposition, the scribe of 𝔓75 provided what he thought
was the proper connotation: Jesus explained all the
Scriptures--from the Law (Moses) to the Prophets--that
pertained to him. There is a big difference: the former
could indicate that all Scripture is messianic, while the
latter indicates that Jesus used all those scriptures that
pertain to the messianic prophetic picture. The syntactical
alteration in 𝔓75 shows the scribe's desire to clarify the
message without changing any words.

The Gospel of John

John 3:8
text
⟨τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ⟩ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ
ἀκούεις
⟨the wind blows where it wishes⟩ and you hear the sound
of it
all other Greek MSS

variant
<τὸ πνα ὅπου θέλει πνει καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ
ἀκούεις
<the Spirit/wind spirits where it wishes> and you hear the
sound of it
𝔓75

The scribe of 𝔓75 wrote πνεῦμα as a nomen sacrum, πνα,
indicating the divine Spirit, and then abbreviated the noun
form as πνει. This could be an aberrant designation of
the dative form, πνευματι, which normally appears as
πνι. The resultant translation would be, "the Spirit desires
[to be] in spirit." However, this hardly suits a context in
which the Spirit is being likened to the wind. Thus, I would
imagine that the scribe, taking advantage of the fact that
both "wind" and "Spirit" are the same word in Greek
(πνεῦμα), wrote πνει to show that the wind's activity
symbolizes the Spirit's movements, just as the wind itself
symbolizes the Spirit.

John 4:37
text
ἐν γὰρ τούτῳ ὁ λόγος ἐστὶν ἀληθινὸς ὅτι ᾿Αλλος
ἐστὶν ὁ σπείρων καὶ ἄλλος ὁ θερίζων.
In this respect the saying "one sows and another reaps"
is true.
all other Greek MSS

variant
omit verse
𝔓75

The usual explanation for the omission of this verse in 𝔓75
is that it was accidental, due to homoeoteleuton--both

4:36 and 4:37 end with *ὁ θερίζων* (the one reaping). But the scribe of 𝔓75 is not known for carelessness; quite the contrary, he was a meticulous copyist. Thus, there could be another reason for the omission. Perhaps the scribe purposely deleted the verse because he knew that it is not a direct quotation of any known biblical passage. This saying is somewhat like Deut. 20:6; 28:30; Micah 6:15; Job 15:28 (LXX); 31:8, but not exactly. The saying could have come from some Greek literary sources, or it might have been a rural adage commonly quoted in the Galilean hill country. But in the Gospel context, the words "the saying is true" usually alludes to a biblical saying. Thus, the scribe may have deleted the statement to avoid the predicament of not being able to align it with a known text. Besides, the verse adds little to Jesus' thesis that sowers and reapers rejoice together over the fruits of their labor. It adds little support to say that "one sows and another reaps." Thus, the scribe cut a verse that is dispensable.

John 6:5

text

Πόθεν ⟨ἀγοράσωμεν⟩ ἄρτους ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι;

Where may ⟨we buy⟩ bread that these may eat?

all other Greek MSS

variant

Πόθεν ⟨ἀγοράσωσιν⟩ ἄρτους ἵνα φάγωσιν οὗτοι;

Where may ⟨they buy⟩ bread that these may eat?

𝔓75

This question, posed by Philip to Jesus, appears just prior to Jesus' miraculous feeding of the five thousand. This is the only miracle that appears in all four Gospels; it was evidently very popular among early Christians. The scribe

of 𝔓75 must have been intimately acquainted with this story, so much so that he conformed John's account of this story to that found in Matthew and Mark by changing the question "where may we buy bread?" to "where may they [the multitude] buy bread?" (see Matt. 14:15; Mark 6:36). This change may have even been done unconsciously, for it is very likely that Matthew and Mark formed a horizon of expectation for the scribe's reading of John; hence, it was what the scribe of 𝔓75 expected in John's account. (Had the parallel passage in Luke 9:13 been extant in 𝔓75, we would likely see a similar change.)

John 7:13

text

οὐδεὶς μέντοι παρρησίᾳ ἐλάλει <περὶ> αὐτοῦ
διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν ' Ιουδαίων

no one, however, was speaking boldly <about> him
because of their fear of the Jews
all other Greek MSS

variant

οὐδεὶς μέντοι παρρησίᾳ ἐλάλει <ὑπὲρ> αὐτοῦ
διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν ' Ιουδαίων

no one, however, was boldly speaking <for> him because
of their fear of the Jews
𝔓75

The change in 𝔓75 is minor (changing περί to ὑπέρ) but significant in that it reveals the scribe's individualized response to the implications of the text. In context, various people were speaking about Jesus--some for good and some for ill (see 7:15). But the point is: no one was about to speak up boldly for Jesus, to say anything "on his behalf" or "in his defense" (the meaning of ὑπέρ),

because the Jewish leaders threatened to
excommunicate (i.e., cut off from the synagogue) anyone
who confessed that Jesus was the Messiah (see 9:22).

John 7:34

text

<ζητήσετέ> με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ με, καὶ ὅπου

εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν

You <will seek> me and not find me; and where I am, you
cannot come.

all other Greek MSS

variant

<ζητήσατέ> με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ με, καὶ ὅπου

εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν

<Seek> me and you will not find me; and where I am, you
cannot come.

𝔓75

The scribe of 𝔓75 changed the first verb to an imperative
perhaps because he had a problem with Jesus predicting
that the Jews would seek him, when in fact, they didn't. In
other words, these words did not coincide with the
scribe's horizon of expectation; from his own historical
perspective the Jews had become enemies of Jesus, not
seekers. So the effect of Jesus' words in 𝔓75 is that they
comprise a dare: "I dare you to seek me, because you will
not find me." The Greek word ζητέω speaks of that
which "one desires somehow to bring into relation with
oneself or to obtain without knowing where it is to be
found" (BAGD). In this context, it has a double meaning:
(1) "Try to seek me and you will not find me because I will
not be here on earth"; (2) "Seek me and you will not find
me because of your unbelief" (see 8:21; 13:33).

John 8:24

text

ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ <πιστεύσητε> ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι,
ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν

for if you do not <believe> that I am [he], you will die in
your sins
all other Greek MSS

variant

ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ <πιστεύητε> ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι,
ἀποθανεῖσθε ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν

for if you do not <continue to believe> that I am [he], you
will die in your sins
𝔓75

According to the best textual evidence, Jesus tells the
religious leaders that they must come to believe in him or
else they would die in their sins. The force of the aorist
subjunctive *πιστεύσητε* is that it signals "one-time"
belief--i.e., initial faith. By contrast, the present subjunctive
signals ongoing belief, and is often used to characterize
the continuing faith of the believers. The reading in 𝔓75
presents the scribe's own concretization of Jesus'
statement, which he took to mean that perdition can only
be prevented by perpetual faith.

John 10:7

text
ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων
I am the gate for the sheep
all other Greek MSS

variant

ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμήν

I am the shepherd

𝔓75 cop

This verse follows a short allegory or similitude about a shepherd and his sheep (10:1-6); it is something like a parable but not exactly. In a parable all the items lead to one total meaning; each item in a parable may not have an equal significance. But it is relatively easy to give symbolic meaning to the figures used by Jesus in this story. The good shepherd is Christ, the sheep are the Jewish believers, the sheepfold is Judaism, the "other" sheep are the Gentile believers, the gatekeeper is the Father God, the stranger is a false Messiah, and the wolf is some kind of destructive pretender.

Beginning in 10:6, Jesus provides his explanation for the similitude. Some readers would have expected Jesus to first identify the main character of the story, the shepherd. This was so for the scribe of 𝔓75 and some other Coptic translator(s) (whose translation may go back to 𝔓75), who changed the text to read "I am the good shepherd." Thus, we see here the scribe of 𝔓75 breaking his rigid pattern of copying his exemplar verbatim--unless, of course, he thought his predecessor had made a mistake. If not, we see here a scribe whose own horizon of expectations led him to expect something different from the text. In a parable about Jesus being the shepherd of the sheep, he expected the text to say "I am the shepherd," not "I am the gate." Thus, he conformed the text to his own individualized concretization.

John 11:12

text

εἶπαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτῷ, Κύριε, εἰ κεκοίμηται

$\langle\sigma\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\rangle$.

Then the disciples said to him, "Lord, if he has fallen asleep <he will be saved> [from his sickness]."
all other Greek MSS

variant

$\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\alpha\nu$ $o\tilde{\vartheta}\nu$ $o\acute{\iota}$ $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\alpha\grave{\upsilon}\tau\tilde{\omega}$, $K\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\epsilon$, $\epsilon\grave{\iota}$ $\kappa\epsilon\kappa o\acute{\iota}\mu\eta\tau\alpha\iota$
$\langle\grave{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\rho\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\rangle$.

Then the disciples said to him, "Lord, if he has fallen asleep <he will be raised>."
𝔓75

The scribe of 𝔓75 made a change in the text for one of two reasons: (1) He may have been concerned that his readers would misunderstand the verb $\sigma\omega\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$, for it usually has soteriological significance. In this instance, however, it signifies nothing more than recovery from illness. (2) Knowing the outcome of the story, the scribe substituted a verb that has a double connotation: to rise from sleep and to rise from the dead. Either way, this change was prompted by the text, which promotes a resurrection motif in this chapter of John.

John 12:34

text

'$H\mu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ $\mathring{\eta}\kappa o\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\grave{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau o\tilde{\upsilon}$ $\nu\acute{o}\mu o\upsilon$ $\ddot{o}\tau\iota$ $\acute{o}$ $X\rho\iota\sigma\tau\grave{o}\varsigma$
$\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota$ $\epsilon\grave{\iota}\varsigma$ $\tau\grave{o}\nu$ $\alpha\grave{\iota}\tilde{\omega}\nu\alpha$, $\kappa\alpha\grave{\iota}$ $\pi\tilde{\omega}\varsigma$ $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\grave{\upsilon}$ $\ddot{o}\tau\iota$ $\delta\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$
$\grave{\upsilon}\psi\omega\theta\tilde{\eta}\nu\alpha\iota$ $\tau\grave{o}\nu$ $\upsilon\grave{\iota}\grave{o}\nu$ $\tau o\tilde{\upsilon}$ $\grave{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi o\upsilon$; $\langle\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\grave{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$
$o\tilde{\vartheta}\tau o\varsigma$ $\acute{o}$ $\upsilon\grave{\iota}\grave{o}\varsigma$ $\tau o\tilde{\upsilon}$ $\grave{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi o\upsilon$;$\rangle$
We have heard from the Law that the Christ will remain forever; so how can you say, "The Son of Man must be lifted up? <Who is this Son of Man?>"
all other Greek MSS

variant

'Ημεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς
μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ πῶς λέγεις σὺ ὅτι δεῖ
ὑψωθῆναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;

We have heard from the Law that the Christ will remain
forever; so how can you say, "The Son of Man must be
lifted up?"

P75 2211 cop^sa cop^ac2

The most plausible explanation for the omission in P75 is
that it was the result of a transcriptional error--due to
homoeoteleuton (the previous sentence ends with τὸν
υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου). However, if the omission was
intentional, it could be that it was prompted by the fact that
there is no answer from Jesus, in the following verses, to
the question, "Who is the Son of Man?" Of course, Jesus
didn't give a direct answer to the question about the Son
of Man being lifted up on the cross; however, he did
allude to the imminence of that event by saying "walk
while you have the light." So the scribe of P75 may have
thought this was a sufficient response to the first question,
which he retained, but not the second, which he deleted.

John 12:38

text

ἵνα ὁ λόγος 'Ησαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ, <ὃν
εἶπεν>, Κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ
ὁ βραχίων κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;

that the word of Isaiah the prophet may be fulfilled, <which
he said>, "Lord, who has believed our message? And to
whom has the arm of the Lord been revealed?"

all other Greek MSS

variant

ἵνα ὁ λόγος Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου πληρωθῇ. Κύριε.
τίς ἐπίστευσεν τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; καὶ ὁ βραχίων
κυρίου τίνι ἀπεκαλύφθη;
that the word of Isaiah the prophet may be fulfilled, "Lord,
who has believed our message? And to whom has the
arm of the Lord been revealed?"
𝔓75

This is but one of several other examples that could have
been given which shows the scribe's proclivity to trim
unnecessary verbage. This is a sure sign of his
Alexandrian scriptoral training.

John 14:21
text
ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτὰς ἐκεῖνός
ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με· ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με
⟨ἀγαπηθήσεται⟩ ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, κἀγὼ
ἀγαπήσω αὐτὸν καὶ ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν
The one having my commands and keeping them is the
one who loves me. And the one loving me ⟨will be loved⟩
by my Father, and I too will love him and will manifest
myself to him.
all other Greek MSS

variant
ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτὰς ἐκεῖνός
ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με· ὁ δὲ ἀγαπῶν με ⟨τηρηθήσεται⟩
ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός μου, κἀγὼ ἀγαπήσω αὐτὸν καὶ
ἐμφανίσω αὐτῷ ἐμαυτόν.
The one having my commands and keeping them is the
one who loves me. And the one loving me ⟨will be kept⟩
by my Father, and I too will love him and will manifest
myself to him.

The greater context of John could have prompted this change, inasmuch as Jesus' final prayer often speaks of the Father "keeping" or "protecting" the disciples from evil (see 17:11, 12, 15). However, it is just as likely that the change in Ᵽ75 presents an interesting word-play, in which τηρέω means both "observing" (Jesus' commands) and "being protected" (by the Father). If so, the scribe displayed some freedom in the interest of amusing himself and/or his readers.

Observations

The Scribe's Horizon of Expectations

The copyist of Ᵽ75 was a professional, Christian scribe. The professionalism shows through in his tight calligraphy and controled copying, and his Christianity shows in his abbreviations of the nomina sacra, as well as in his abbreviation of the word σταυρον (cross) as $\overline{\sigma\rho\nu}$. These are telltale signs of a scribe who belonged to the Christian community. Furthermore, the large typeface indicates that the manuscript was composed to be read aloud to a Christian congregation. The scribe even added a system of sectional divisions to aid any would-be lector. Thus, we have a manuscript written by a Christian for other Christians.

One of the clear indications of the scribe's Christianity was his knowledge of the other Gospels, especially Matthew. This knowledge is manifest in three subtle harmonizations:

1. Luke 8:21 to Matt. 12:46-50
2. Luke 10:24 to Matt. 13:17
3. John 6:5 to Matt. 14:15 and/or Mark 6:36

Because the scribe did not allow himself much liberty, his harmonizations are barely noticeable yet real. The important thing is that they reveal his detailed knowledge of the other Gospels. Perhaps P75 originally contained all four Gospels, as was conjectured by Bruce (1988:129); but if not, he still had knowledge of all four, which formed his horizon of expectation. In another instance, he borrowed from Acts 12:20 in making a change in Luke 14:32. This shows his knowledge of the two-volume work, Luke-Acts. His deletion of an entire verse (John 4:37) shows that he did not want his Gospel text to seemingly have a reference to an Old Testament scripture that is nowhere to be found.

There is solid evidence for stating that this work was read by Christians. Some scribe, in a fourth- or fifth-century hand, added a marginal gloss to Luke 17:14, taken from Matt. 8:2-3. It is not unreasonable to presume that this was the working of some Christian in Pachomius' monastery who wanted to harmonize Luke with Matthew. The leather cover placed on the codex is a sure indication that it was a valued document, and various marginal comments in Coptic show that it was read by a Coptic community of believers. Of course, these are not the audiences the scribe originally produced this manuscript for. I would think he produced them for an Alexandrian Christian community, a community who had come to expect textual fidelity.

There are several indications of the scribe's Alexandrian orientation. First and foremost is his scriptoral acumen. He is the best of all the early Christian scribes.

But when he did deviate from his exemplar, he did not go in the direction of simplifying the text (as did the scribe of 𝔓45); rather, he elevated it. For example, in Luke 10:31 he wrote κατὰ συντυχείαν for κατὰ συγκυρίαν because the scribe's surrogate connoted a good outcome, a connotation which would be readily understood by readers of classical literature.

The scribe's national prejudices may be revealed in his treatment of Luke 11:31, where his change allows for the possibility that the queen who visited Solomon may have come from Egypt, not Sheba. His Christian prejudices are evident in a few other singular readings. In Luke 16:30 he chose Christian terminology over Hellenistic in his description of how one goes to the living from the dead. In John 7:34 the scribe of 𝔓75 changed the verb "will seek" to an imperative because he may have had a problem with Jesus predicting that the Jews would seek him, when in fact, they didn't.

The Scribe's Interaction with the Text as a Reader

As has been repeatedly emphasized, the scribe of 𝔓75 rarely allowed himself to deviate from his task of producing an accurate copy of his exemplar. However, he did vary somewhat when he became an active, subjective participant in the reading process. This is nowhere more evident than in his treatment of Luke 16:19, where he could not resist the temptation to give the rich man a name. The text prompted this gap-filling when it gave the poor man a name, Lazarus. Why shouldn't the rich man also have one? So he gave him the name Νευης, which could mean "foolish."

The implications of the text prompted a number of other

scribal creations. In Luke 9:34 the scribe followed the logical implication of the text to make a lexical adjustment which indicates it was the three disciples who entered into the cloud. In Luke 14:8 the scribe deleted any mention of a wedding festivity because the gathering that occasioned Jesus' parable (Luke 14:7-14) was not a wedding celebration. In John 10:7, the scribe wrote "I am the shepherd" instead of "I am the door of the sheep" because readers would have expected Jesus to first identify the main character of the previous similitude (John 10:1-6), namely, the shepherd. Instead, there is a surprise in the text: Jesus first identifies himself as "the door." The scribe of $\mathfrak{P}$75 must have thought this strange or to be in error, so he changed it to what seemed to be required by the previous discourse.

Some of the singular readings also reveal that the scribe allowed previous readings to effect his reception of a present text. This occured in Luke 12:42, where his verb selection was influenced by 11:22; and it occured in Luke 24:26, where his selection of the word "kingdom" instead of "glory" was influenced by Luke 23:42. Just these two changes show that the scribe closely read the text and stored it in his memory. But this sometimes hindered his ability to concretize a new reading in a new context.

Nonetheless, he was an experienced reader of the text, who had an interest in how it would be read. On occasion, he attempted to adjust the text for the sake of clarity. This was done by the scribe in Luke 24:27 to make it clear that Luke was saying that Jesus used all the Scriptures which would aid in presenting the messianic prophetic picture--not that all Scripture is messianic. He also deleted an entire verse (John 4:37) because he did not want his Gospel text to seemingly have a reference to

an Old Testament scripture that is nowhere to be found.

Chapter Seven

Observations and Implications

Observations about ℙ45, ℙ66, ℙ75

In the three early Gospel papyri, ℙ45 ℙ66 ℙ75, we see
three different reading-receptions at work. As a copyist,
the scribe of ℙ75 exerted the most control by copying the
text letter by letter or even syllable by syllable. However,
even this careful scribe <u>read</u> the text and on several
ocassions responded to textual clues by filling textual
blanks. The scribe of ℙ45 seemed to be under no
obligation to produce a word-for-word copy; so he took
freedom to interact with the text at the semantic level or to
ignore the exact wording of the text in preference to his
own understanding. The scribe demonstrated that he was
a close reader of the text, a reader who often responded
to the implications of the text as he perceived it
and made changes accordingly. The scribe of ℙ66 was
caught in-between: he wanted to make an accurate copy
but could not help but interact with the text as a receptive,
captivated reader who consequently made significant
changes (Royse 1981:538-550). Of the three readers, he
was the one to become the most subjectively involved
with the text, as well as the one who most significantly
altered the text before it was corrected by the diorthotes.
 Though each one of these scribes had their own
individualized concretizations, one can detect some
common horizons of expectation and some similar
responses to textual blanks. I think it is safe to say that the
normal situation among these early Christian scribes was
that they respected the thought and meaning of the text to
a high degree but not necessarily the exact wording. In

other words, the message was probably sacred to them but not necessarily the actual wording. Often, they changed the wording to make a better lectionary text--in the same way that modern translators provide nouns (for pronouns), conjunctions, and glosses to fill out the meaning of the text and/or to avoid ambiguity. If the scribe thought the text could be improved grammatically or stylistically or if the scribe thought there was an error in his exemplar that needed correction, he would make improvements or emendations according to good Alexandrian scriptoral tradition.

These scribes also became subjectively involved with the work they were copying because they had a vested interest in it. For them, the New Testament was not just a work of literature; it was the book--the book of life. Hence, they were not just putting their craft into the copying but their own beliefs, as well. They could not help but subject the text to their own horizon of expectations. If they perceived the text was not "Christian" enough or pious enough or could be misunderstood by their intended readers, they would fix it. The scribe of 𝔓45 prepared a digested text for an audience that must have readily received it. The scribe of 𝔓66 heightened Jesus' divine identity in verses like John 1:17; 6:66; 7:52; 10:33. Though the scribe of 𝔓75 was more careful, he exercised some liberty in the interest of improving perceived deficiencies in the text.

We also see these scribes altering the text (or even omitting text) if they thought it presented a reference to an Old Testament passage that could not be found. The scribe of 𝔓45 omitted the phrase "to whom the word of God came" from John 10:34 because it is not explicitly stipulated in Ps. 82 (the passage Jesus refered to) that the judges of Israel received the word of God. In John 19:36,

the scribe of 𝔓66 omitted the words "that the Scripture might be fulfilled" because Jesus' words "I thirst" are difficult--if not impossible--to find in any Old Testament messianic prophecy. The scribe of 𝔓75 omitted an entire verse (John 4:37)--perhaps because there is no such saying in the Old Testament that "one sows and another reaps, and both rejoice together."

What is striking about all of these scribes is that they were well-read in the Gospels--so much so that they could not help but read one Gospel through the lenses of the other Gospels, each of which they knew quite well. It so happens that the three Gospel manuscripts of the early period with the most amount of text are 𝔓45 (portions of Matthew-John), 𝔓66 (almost all of John), and 𝔓75 (Luke 3--John 15). Among these three manuscripts, Colwell (1965:113) indicated that there are a few cases of harmonization to remote, parallel accounts. He counted ten cases of harmonizations to remote parallels in other Gospels which occur in the three major Gospel papyri-- namely, 𝔓45, 𝔓66, and 𝔓75:

> Although they are not frequent, harmonizations to remote parallels do occur. Ten occur in our [papyrus] manuscripts. Peter's confession in John (6:69, 𝔓66) is enriched by adding "the Christ" from Matthew 16:16. In Luke (11:12, 𝔓45) the hungry son asks for Matthew's bread, while Matthew's "birds of the air" (6:26) are added to Luke's ravens (12:24, 𝔓45). In both 𝔓66 and 𝔓75 the Baptist's statement of his unworthiness in John uses the language of the Synoptic Gospels.

Colwell's count is low. I have previously pointed out nineteen harmonizations to remote parallels among the three papyri, 𝔓45, 𝔓66, 𝔓75--with more in 𝔓45 (eleven), a third-century manuscript, than in the others. Some of these harmonizations are so miniscule that one cannot imagine that the scribe actually took the time to look up

the parallel passage in another Gospel; rather, it would seem that the wording in another Gospel had been so completely memorized that the scribe could not but bring this with him to the reading of another Gospel.

All three scribes seem to have been heavily influenced by their reading of Matthew's Gospel because most harmonizations are to Matthew, rather than to the other three. There are two good reasons why Matthew's Gospel would have been so influential. First, it became recognized by the early church as being the most catholic of the Gospels (in that it presented the gospel for both the Jews and Gentiles). As a result of this, it became the prominent Gospel which stood at the head of the four-fold Gospel collection (Bruce 1988:153). These scribes would have not only have copied Matthew first, it would have been the one Gospel among them all that they would have committed to memory.

Finally, it can be observed that a pronounced Alexandrian and Egyptian influence marks several of the singular variants in these manuscripts. It is quite apparent that these scribes had a proclivity for trimming and pruning--in accord with their Alexandrian/Egyptian tastes and training. Of course, they did make some interpolations, but--more often than not--the text was pruned not puffed up. This sharply contrasts with the tendency in later manuscripts which are known for scribal expansion.

The Implications of Reader–Reception Studies for New Testament Textual Criticism

In this study I have tried to add another tool for the work of New Testament textual critics who have sought to ascertain specific knowledge about the scribal tendencies manifest in particular manuscripts. My analysis, based on reader–reception theories posited by Jauss and Iser, probes the how and why of individualized concretizations from a reader–reception perspective. This differs from the approach taken by scholars such as Colwell and Royse. These scholars looked at the activity of scribes as copyists and as editors/redactors. I have looked at the activity of the scribes as if it was the activity of readers, who, by responding to various textual clues and having their horizon of expectations either disappointed or fulfilled, produced individualized concretizations of the text. Thus, the resultant singular readings are seen as the product of interacting with the text and responding to it.

Colwell and Royse also asked how and why a singular variant was created, and then they, here and there, provided explanations with traditional text–critical terminology. For example, Royse typically argued that most singular variants were the result of harmonization to the immediate context. But besides pointing to obvious lexical prompters (such as a particular word appearing earlier in the passage which then gets repeated by the scribe), Royse doesn't state what other textual clues in that context prompted a particular response from the scribe. This is especially noticeable in his treatment of some uniquely significant readings created by the scribes of P45, P66, and P75. Reader–reception theory allows us to take a closer look at what prompted the blank-filling or textual adjustment. Using this theory, I have been able to provide some additional and/or alternative

explanations for these readings, which I hope will be helpful to future scholars grappling with the phenomenon of the creation of textual variants.

All existing textual variants in the Greek New Testament—and there are thousands of them—began as a singular variant created by one scribe, which was then copied and recopied by several scribes throughout the course of textual transmission. As such, the study of singular variants according to reader-reception analysis can help us understand the two essential components of textual criticism: external criticism and internal criticism. External criticism focuses on the documents themselves—their age, their textual character, and their maker; it is also involved with the classification of manuscripts. Before this criticism can be applied, the critic must know the scribal tendencies of the maker of the document. This is where Jaussian theory is so helpful—especially his emphasis on the horizon of expectations. Internal criticism focuses on contextual influences in an effort to discover the one "original" reading from which all others deviated. The critic applying this method looks for words or phrases in the nearby context which might have influenced a scribe to alter the text. This is where Iserian theory is so helpful; it adds sophistication to this method in that it directs the critic to look specifically for those textual blanks which would have prompted some sort of blank-filling response from the scribe functioning as an interactive reader.

At a first assessment one might think that reception theory provides little more than new terminology for existing text-critical canons. For example, it could be argued that terms adapted from reception theory are, in fact, merely describing processes already identified and described in textual crticism—such that a blank-filler or gap-filler is nothing more than an interpolation. Or it could be argued that the effects of "the horizon of

expectations" have already been well documented in what is typically called harmonization. However, I would argue that the difference is in the process. I contend that what most scholars call interpolation and harmonization are intentional recensional acts--a scribe functioning as an editor of a text. By contrast, blank-filling and harmonizations are often the immediate, spontaneous acts of scribes interacting with the text as responsive readers. Furthermore, the notion of the horizon of expectations can help us understand why changes were made when the text frustrated the scribe's expectations.

One of the points of my study is that it could help textual critics consider variant readings from the vantage point of the scribe who interacted with the text as a reader. The very term "variant <u>reading</u>" is significant in that it points to the scribe who read and copied the text "differently" (i.e., at variance with an accepted printed edition assumed to represent the original), not to the modern reader who sees the variant reading (listed in the critical apparatus) as an alternative reading to the established text. Another point of my study is that an analysis of the reader-receptions of each particular scribe helps text critics understand what kind of variants the scribe was prone to make. This aids in the praxis of textual criticism.

Westcott and Hort (1882:17), followed by Colwell (1968:152), urged that knowledge of documents must precede all decisions about readings. This is imperative. I would also urge that the knowledge of the readers and their reading practise is equally important for decisions about readings, that a reconstruction of the reading activities of the scribes who produced the earliest extant documents should also precede all decisions about readings, and that a well-developed theory of scribal-reception could help us understand the dynamics that created changes in the New

Testament text during the stages of textual transmission. This does not call for a new canon, but it does call for a new awareness of the reception tendencies of each New Testament scribe. Of course, since these tendencies can be ascertained only through a study of individual variants, the variants themselves are usually not the original text. But the sum total of these variants for each manuscript displays the tendencies of the scribe who produced them. A textual critic can then take this knowledge and apply it to the task of textual criticism.

As the textual critic seeks to ascertain what it was in the text that stimulated variant readings, the textual critic may be prompted to ask the same questions a literary critic does: What horizon of expectations did the reader bring to the text, and was there a meeting or confrontation of the two horizons—that of the reader and that of the text? What textual clues prompted a particular concretization? And how did the textual blanks prompt the reader to fill in the blanks? It is to be hoped that this process of inquiry will aid in the ongoing study of New Testament textual criticism.

Bibliography

Abrams, M. H.

1971   A Glossary of Literary Terms; third edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

1979   "How to Do Things with Texts." Pp. 566-588 in Partisan Review 46.

Achtemeier, Paul J.

1990   "Omne verbum sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Enviornment of Late Western Antiquity." Pp. 3-27 in Journal of Biblical Literature 109.

Aland, Barbara

1989   "Die Münstereraner Arbeit am Text des Neuen Testaments und ihr Beitrag für die frühe Uberlieferung des 2. Jahrhunderts: Eine methodologische Betrachtung." Pp. 55-70 in Gospel Traditions in the Second Century. Edited by William J. Peterson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Aland, Kurt, and Barbara Aland

1988   The Text of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Aland, Kurt

1965   "The Significance of the Papyri for New Testament Research." Pp. 325-346 in The Bible in Modern Scholarship. Edited by J. P. Hyatt. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

1976   "Neue neutestamentliche Papyri III." Pp. 375-396 in

New Testament Studies 22.

1979   "The Twentieth-Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism in Text and Interpretation." Pp. 1-14 in Text and Interpretation: Studies in New Testament Presented to Matthew Black. Edited by Ernest Best and Robert M. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1986   "Der Text des Johannesevangeliums im 2. Jahrhundert." Pp. 1-10 in Studien zum Text und zur Ethik des Neuen Testaments. Edited by Wolfgang Schrage. Berlin: de Gruyter.

1987   "The Text of the Church?" Pp. 131-144 in Trinity Journal 8.

Auerbach, Eric
1953   Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature. Princeton: Princeton University Pres.

Aune, David
1987   The New Testament in Its Literary Enviornment. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Barrett, C. K.
1978   The Gospel according to St. John. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Barthes, Roland
1975   The Pleasure of the the Text. Translated by Richard Miller. New York: Hill and Wong.

Bell, Harold I.

1937   Recent Discoveries of Biblical Papyri. Oxford:
Clarendon Press, 1937.

1948   Egypt: From Alexander the Great to the Arab
Conquest. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

1953   Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt.
Liverpool: University Press.

Bengel, Johannes Albert
1855   Gnomon Novi Testamenti. Third edition, edited by
J. Steudel. Tübingen.

Berman, Art
1988   From the New Criticism to Deconstruction. Urbana:
University of Illinois Press.

Berner, Karyn
1993   "Papyrus Bodmer II, P66: A Reevaluation of the
Correctors and Corrections" (M.A. Thesis, Wheaton
College, under the supervision of Julius Scott and Philip
W. Comfort).

Birdsall, J. Neville
1960   The Bodmer Papyrus of the Gospel of John.
London: The Tyndale Press.

1970   "The New Testament Text." Pp. 308-377 in The
Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1, From the
Beginnings to Jerome. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and
Christopher F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.

Bleich, David

1980   "Epistemological Assumptions in the Study of Response." Pp. 134-163 in in <u>Reader-Response Criticism</u>, ed. Jane P. Thompkins. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Booth, Wayne
1971   <u>A Rhetoric of Irony</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bowman, Alan K.
1986   <u>Egypt after the Pharaohs</u>. Los Angeles: the University of California Press.

Brown, Raymond E.
1966   <u>The Gospel According to John</u> I-XII. New York: Doubleday.

1970   <u>The Gospel According to John</u>, XIII-XXI. New York: Doubleday.

Bruce, F. F.
1988   <u>The Canon of Scripture</u>. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bultmann, Rudolf
1971   <u>The Gospel of John: A Commentary</u>. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Burtchaell, James T.
1992   <u>From Synagogue to Church</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cadbury, H. J.
1962   "A Proper Name for Dives." Pp. 399-402 in <u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u> 81.

Carson, D. A.

1991   The Gospel According to John. Leicester:
InterVarsity Press.

Clark, Kenneth

1937   A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament
Manuscripts in America. Chicago: University of Chicago
Press.

1966   "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation of
the Greek New Testament." Pp. 1-16 in Journal of Biblical
Literature 85.

Clark, W. P.

1931   "Ancient Reading." Pp. 698-700 in Classical Journal
26.

Colwell, Ernest

1965   "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the
Corruption of the Text." Pp. 370-389 in The Bible in
Modern Scholarship. Edited by J. P. Hyatt. Nashville:
Abingdon, 1965. Reprinted as "Method in Evaluating
Scribal Habits: A Study of P45, P66, P75." Pp. 106-124 in
his Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New
Testament. New Testament Tools and Studies 9. Leiden:
E. J. Brill, 1969. (Reprint pages cited.)

1969   "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program" Pp. 131-
155 in Transitions in Biblical Scholarship. Edited by J.
Coert Rylaarsdam. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Reprinted on pp. 148-171 in his Studies in Methodology in
Textual Criticism of the New Testament. New Testament
Tools and Studies 9. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1969. (Reprint

pages cited.)

Colwell, Ernest and Ernst Tune
1964   "Variant Readings: Classification and Use." Pp. 253-261 in Journal of Biblical Literature 83.

Comfort, Philip W.
1984   "Light from the New Testament Papyri Concerning the Translation of pneuma." Pp. 130-133 in The Bible Translator 35.

1989   "The Pericope of the Adulteress (John 7:53--8:11)." Pp. 145-147 in The Bible Translator 40.

1990a   "The Greek Text of the Gospel of John According to the Early Papyri (As Compared to Nestle-Aland's Novum Testamentum Graece, 26th edition--NA[26])." Pp. 625-629 in New Testament Studies 36.

1990b   Early Manuscripts and Modern Translations of the New Testament. Wheaton: Tyndale House Publishers.

1992   The Quest for the Original Text of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Cox, Patricia
1983   Biography in Late Antiquity. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Culler, Jonathan.
1975   "The Frontier of Criticism." Pp. 606-612 in Yale Review 64.

Cullmann, Oscar

1975   The Johannine Circle. Translated by John Bowden.
Philadelphia: Westminster Press.

Culpepper, R. Allen
1975   The Johannine School. Missoula, Montana:
Scholars Press.

1983   Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel: A Study in Literary
Design. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Daube, D.
1950   "Jesus and the Samaritan Woman: The Meaning of
συνΧράομαι." Pp. 137-147 in Journal of Biblical Literature
69.

Duke, Paul D.
1985   Irony in the Fourth Gospel. Atlanta: John Knox
Press.

Edwards, Sarah Alexander
1974   "P75 and B: A Study in the History of the Text."
Ph.D. dissertation, Hartford Seminary.

Ehrman, Bart
1988   "Jesus and the Adulteress." Pp. 24-44 in New
Testament Studies 34.

1993   The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. Oxford:
Oxford University Press.

Elliott, W. J. and D. C. Parker
1995   The New Testament in Greek IV: The Gospel
according to St. John (vol.1, The Papyri). Leiden: E. J.
Brill. (In this volume acknowledged contributions were

made by P. W. Comfort.)

Epp, Eldon J.

1973   "The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pp. 386-414 in <u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u> 93.

1976   "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?" Pp. 212-257 in <u>Harvard Theological Review</u> 69.

1980   "A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?" Pp. 131-151 in <u>Harvard Theological Review</u> 73.

1989a   "The Significance of the Papyri for Determining The Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission." Pp. 71-103 in <u>Gospel Traditions in the Second Century</u>. Edited by William J. Peterson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

1989b   "Textual Criticism." Pp. 75-126 in <u>The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters</u>. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Epp, Eldon J. and Gordon Fee

1981   <u>New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis</u>. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

1993   <u>Studies in the Theory and Method of New Testament Textual Criticism</u>. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Fee, Gordon

1965   "The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early

Textual Transmission." Pp. 247-257 in <u>Novum Testamentum</u> 7.

1968a <u>Papyrus Bodmer II (P66): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics</u> in Studies and Documents 34. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

1968b "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships." Pp. 23-44 in <u>New Testament Studies</u> 15.

1974 "P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of the Early Textual Recension in Alexandria." Pp. 19-45 in <u>New Dimensions in New Testament Study</u>. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merril C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

1979 "The Textual Criticism of the New Testament." Pp. 419-433 in <u>The Expositor's Bible Commentary</u>, Vol. 1: <u>Introductory Articles</u>. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979.

Finegan, Jack
1974 <u>Encountering New Testament Manuscripts</u>. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Fish, Stanley E.
1980a "Interpreting the Variorum." Pp. 164-184 in <u>Reader-Response Criticism</u>. Edited by Jane P. Thompkins. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

1980b <u>Is There a Text in This Class? The Authority of Interpretive Communities</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fitzmyer, J. A.

1985   The Gospel according to Luke (2 vols.). New York:
Doubleday.

Fowler, Robert M.
1981   Loaves and Fishes: The Function of the Feeding
Stories in the Gospel of Mark. Chico, California: Scholars
Press.

1985   "Who Is 'The Reader' in Reader Response
Criticism?" Pp. 5-23 in Semeia 31.

Frend, William H. C.
1984   The Rise of Christianity. Philadelphia: Fortress
Press.

Funk, R. W.
1958   "Papyrus Bodmer II (P66) and John 8,25." Pp. 95-
100 in Harvard Theological Review 51.

Gabel, John B. and Charles B. Wheeler.
1990   The Bible as Literature. Oxford: Oxford University
Press.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg
1975   Truth and Method. Translated and edited by Garrett
Barden and John Cumming. New York: Crossroad-
Continuum.

1976   Philosophical Hermeneutics. Translated and edited
by David E. Linge. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Gamble, Harry Y
1995   Books and Readers in the Early Church. New
Haven: Yale University Press.

Genette, Gerard

1980   Narrative Discourse. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gilliard, Frank D.

1993   "More Silent Reading in Antiquity." P. 112 in Journal of Biblical Literature 4.

Glowinski, Michal

1979   "Reading, Interpretation, Reception." Translated by Wlad Godzich. Pp. 75-81 in New Literary History 11.

Grant, Michael

1982   From Alexander to Cleopatra. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Grant, Robert

1963   Historical Introduction to the New Testament. New York: Harper and Row.

Grenfell, Bernard P.

1897   "Oxyrhynchus and Its Papyri." Pp. 1-12 in Egypt Exploration Fund: Archaeological Report 1896-1897.

Grenfell, Bernard P., and Arthur S. Hunt

1898-- The Oxyrhynchus Papyri (61 volumes to date). London: Egypt Exploration Fund (later Egypt Exploration Society).

1902-1903   "Excavations at Hibeth, Cynopolis and Oxyrhynchus." Pp. 1-9 in Egypt Exploration Fund: Archaeological Report 1902-1903.

1906   "Excavations at Oxyrhynchus." Pp. 8-16 in Egypt

Exploration Fund: Archaeological Report 1905-1906.

Griggs, C. Wilfred

1990   Early Egyptian Christianity: From Its Origins to 451
C.E. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Grobel, K.

1964   "Whose Name Was Neves." Pp. 373-382 in New
Testament Studies 10.

Gros Louis, Kenneth R. R.

1974   Literary Interpretations of Biblical Narratives.
Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Guelich, Robert

1989   Mark 1--8:26 in the Word Biblical Commentary.
Waco, Texas: Word.

Haenchen, Ernst

1971   The Acts of the Apostles. Philadelphia: Westminster
Press.

Hanson, R. P. C.

1965   "The Provenance of the Interpolator in the 'Western'
Text of Acts and of Acts Itself." Pp. 211-230 in New
Testament Studies 12.

Harnack, Adolf

1912   Bible Reading in the Early Church. London:
Williams & Norgate.

Hatch, William H. P.

1939   The Principal Uncial Manuscripts of the New
Testament. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Henrickson, G. L.

1930   "Ancient Reading." Pp. 182-196 in Classical Journal
25.

Hirsch, E. D.

1967   Validity in Interpretation. New Haven: Yale University
Press.

Hohendahl, Peter

1977   "Introduction to Reception Aesthetics." Translated
by Marc Silberman. Pp. 29-63 in New German Critique 10.

Holland, Norman

1968   The Dynamics of Literary Response. New York:
Oxford University Press.

1980   "Unity Identity Text Self." Pp. 118-133 in Reader-
Response Criticism. Edited by Jane P. Thompkins.
Baltimore: JohnsHopkins University Press.

Holmes, Michael

1989   "New Testament Textual Criticism." Pp. 53-74 in
Introducing New Testament Interpretation. Edited by Scot
McKnight. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

Holub, Robert C.

1982   "The American Reception of Reception Theory."
Pp. 80-96 in The German Quarterly 55:1.

1984   Reception Theory. New York: Methuen.

Hunger, Herbert

1960   "Zur Datierung des Papyrus Bodmer II (P66)." Pp.

12-23 in <u>Anzieger der österreichischen Akademie der</u> <u>Wissenschaften</u>, philologisch-historischen Klasse 4.

Hunt, Arthur S.

1911   <u>Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands</u> <u>Library, Manchester</u>, vol. 1: <u>Literary Texts (nos.1-61)</u>. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ingarden, Roman

1973a   <u>The Cognition of the Literary Work of Art</u>. Translated by Ruth Ann Crowley and Kenneth R. Olson. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

1973b   <u>The Literary Work of Art</u>. Translated by George G. Grabowicz. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Iser, Wolfgang

1971   "Indeterminacy and the Reader's Response in Prose Fiction." Pp. 1-45 in <u>Aspects of Narrative</u>. Edited by J. Hillis Miller. New York: Columbia University Press.

1974   <u>The Implied Reader</u>. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

1978   <u>The Act of Reading</u>. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

1980a   "Interaction Between Text and Reader." Pp. 106-119 in <u>The Reader in the Text</u>. Edited by Suleiman and Crosman. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1980b   "The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach" Pp. 50-69 in <u>Reader-Response Criticism</u>. Edited by Jane P. Tompkins. Baltimore: John Hopkins

University Press.

1989   Prospecting: From Reader Response to Literary
Anthropology. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

1993   The Fictive and the Imaginary. Baltimore: Johns
Hopkins University Press.

Jauss, Hans Robert
1970   "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory"
Pp. 7-37 in New Literary History 2.

1978   "Theses on the Transition from the Aesthetics of
Literary Works to a Theory of Aesthetic Experience." Pp.
137-147 in Interpretation of Narrative. Edited by Mario J.
Valdes and Owen J. Miller. Toronto: University of Toronto
Press.

1982a   Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics.
Translated by Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of
Minnesota Press.

1982b   "Job's Questions and their Distant Reply: Goethe,
Nietzsche, Heidegger." Pp. 193-207 in Comparative
Literature 34.3.

1982c   Toward an Aesthetic of Reception. Translated by
Timothy Bahti. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota
Press.

1985   "The Identity of the Poetic Text in the Changing
Horizon of Understanding." Pp. 146-174 in Identity of the
Literary Text. Edited by Mario J. Valdes and Owen Miller.
Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

1989   "Historia Calamitatum et Fortunarum Mearum or: A
Paradigm Shift in Literary Study." Pp. 112-128 in <u>The
Future of Literary Theory</u>. Edited by Ralph Cohen. New
York: Routledge.

Kennedy, G. A.
1980   <u>Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular
Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times</u>. Chapel Hill:
University of North Carolina Press.

Kenyon, Frederic G.
1909   <u>The Codex Alexandrinus</u>. London: Longmans.

1912   <u>Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New
Testament</u>, second edition. London: MacMillan.

1933a   <u>The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions
and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek
Bible</u>, Fasciculus I. London: Emery Walker.

1933b   <u>The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions
and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek
Bible</u>, Fasciculus II: The Gospels and Acts. London:
Emery Walker.

1937a   <u>The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri</u> (Fasciculus III,
Supplement). London: Emery Walker Ltd.

1937b   <u>The Story of the Bible</u>. New York: E. P. Dutton.

1951   <u>Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome</u>.
Oxford: Clarendon Press.

1958   Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts. New York:
Harper and Row.

Kilpatrick, George D.
1963   "The Bodmer and Mississippi Collection of Biblical
and Christian Texts." Pp. 33-47 in Greek, Roman, and
Byzantine Studies 4.

Kim, Young-Kyu
1988   "Paleographic Dating of P46 to the Later First
Century." Pp. 248-257 in Biblica 69.

Kubo, Sakae
1965   𝔓72 and the Codex Vaticanus in Studies and
Documents 27. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.

Lamb, J. A.
1970   "The Place of the Bible in the Liturgy." Pp. 563-586
in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1, From the
Beginnings to Jerome. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and
Christopher F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University
Press.

Leaney, Robert
1954   "Jesus and the Symbol of the Child (Luke ix. 46-
48)." Pp. 91-92 in The Expository Times 66.

Lewis, Naphtali
1983   Life in Egypt under Roman Rule. Oxford: Clarendon
Press.

Liddell, Henry G. and Robert Scott
1968   Greek English Lexicon (originally printed in 1843;
revised, with supplement by Henry Jones and Roderick

McKenzie in 1968). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lieberman, Saul

1950   Hellenism in Jewish Palestine. New York: Jewish
Theological Seminary of America.

Longman, Tremper

1987   Literary Approaches to Biblical Interpretation.
Grand Rapids: Zondervan.

MacRae, George W.

1974   "Johannine Irony as a Key to the Author-Audience
Relationship in John's Gospel." Pp. 33-50 in The
American Academy of Religion: Biblical Literature.

Mailloux, Steven J.

1977   "Reader-Response Criticism?" Pp. 413-431 in
Genre 10.

1979   "Learning to Read: Interpretation and Reader-
Response Criticism." Pp. 93-108 in Studies in the Literary
Imagination 12.

Mann, Jacob

1971   The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old
Synagogue, vol. 1. New York: Ktav Publishing House.

Marshall, I. Howard.

1978   The Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Martin, Victor and Rudolf Kasser

1956   Papyrus Bodmer II: Evangile de Jean, 1-14.
Cologny/Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana.

1958   Papyrus Bodmer II: Supplément, Evangile de Jean, 14-21. Cologny/Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana.

1961   Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV, I: XIV: Luc chap. 3-24; II: XV: Jean chap. 1-15. Cologny/Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana.

McKnight, Edgar V.
1978   Meanings in Texts: The Historical Shaping of a Narrative Hermeneutics. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1985   The Bible and the Reader: An Introduction to Literary Criticism. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1988   Post-Modern Use of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon.

Metzger, Bruce
1963   "Explicit References in the Works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts." Pp. 78-95 in Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey; editors, J. N. Birdsall and R. W. Thompson. Frieburg: Herder.

1968   The Text of the New Testament. Oxford: Oxford University Press, second edition 1994.

1975   A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. New York: United Bible Societies.

1977   The Early Versions of the New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

1981   Manuscripts of the Greek Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mill, John

1723   Novum Testamentum Graecum, 2nd ed. Leipzig.

Milligan, George

1922   Here and There Among the Papyri. London:
Hodder and Stoughton Ltd.

Milne, H. J. M. and T. C. Skeat

1938   The Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus.
Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Moore, Stephen

1989   Literary Criticism and the Gospels: the Theoretical
Challenge. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Nolland, John

1993   Luke in the Word Biblical Commentary. Waco,
Texas: Word.

Osborne, Grant

1992   The Hermeneutical Spiral. Downers Grove, Illinois:
InterVarsity Press.

Pagels, Elaine H.

1972   The Johannine Gospel in Gnostic Exegesis:
Heracleon's Commentary on John. Atlanta: Scholars
Press.

Pearson, Birger A.

1986   "Earliest Christianity in Egypt: Some Observations."
Pp. 132-160 in The Roots of Egyptian Christianity. Edited
by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring.
Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Petzer, Jacobus H.

1994   "The History of the New Testament Text--Its Reconstruction, Significance and Use in New Testament Textual Criticism." Pp. 11-36 in <u>New Testament Textual Criticism, Exegesis, and Early Church History</u>. Kampen: Kok Pharos Publishing House.

Porter, Calvin

1962   "Papyrus Bodmer XV (P75) and the Text of Codex Vaticanus." Pp. 363-376 in <u>Journal of Biblical Literature</u> 81.

1967   "John IX. 38, 39a A Liturgical Addition to the Text." Pp. 387-394 in <u>New Testament Studies</u> 13.

Porter, Stanley E.

1990   "Why Hasn't Reader-Response Criticism Caught On In New Testament Studies?" Pp. 278-292 in <u>Journal of Literature and Theology</u> 4.

Ray, William

1984   <u>Literary Meaning: From Phenomenology to Deconstruction</u>. Oxford: Blackwell.

Rhodes, Erroll

1968   "The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II." Pp. 271-281 in <u>New Testament Studies</u> 14.

Ricoeur, Paul

1974   <u>The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics</u>. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

1980   <u>Essays on Biblical Interpretation</u>. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Roberts, Colin H.

1935   An Unpublished Fragment of the Fourth Gospel in the John Rylands Library. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

1953   "An Early Papyrus of the First Gospel." Pp. 233-237 in Harvard Theological Review 46.

1963   Buried Books in Antiquity. Letchworth: Garden City Press.

1970   "Books in the Graeco-Roman World and in the New Testament." Pp. 48-66 in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1, From the Beginnings to Jerome. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

1979   Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt. London: Oxford University Press.

Roberts, Colin H. and Theodore C. Skeat
1987   The Birth of the Codex. London: Oxford University Press.

Robinson, James M.
1986   "The Discovering and Marketing of Coptic Manuscripts: The Nag Hammadi Codices and the Bodmer Papyri." Pp. 2-25 in in The Roots of Egyptian Christianity. Edited by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring. Philadelphia: Fortress.

1990   The Pachomian Monastic Library at the Chester Beatty Library and Bibliotheque Bodmer. Occasional

Papers 19. Claremont, California: Institute for Antiquity and
Christianity.

Robinson, John A. T.
1985   The Priority of John. Oak Brook, Illinois: Meyer
Stone Books.

Ropes, J. H.
1926   The Acts of the Apostles; Part I in The Beginnings of
Christianity, eds. F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake.
London: MacMillan.

Royse, James Ronald
1981   "Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament
Papyri." Ph.D. dissertation, Graduate Theological Union.

1983   "The Treatment of Scribal Leaps in Metzger's Textual
Commentary." Pp. 539-551 in New Testament Studies 29.

Ryken, Leland
1974   The Literature of the Bible. Grand Rapids:
Zondervan.

1984   The New Testament in Literary Criticism. New York:
Frederick Unger Publishing Co.

1987a   Words of Delight: A Literary Introduction to the
Bible. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

1987b   Words of Life: A Literary Introduction to the New
Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House.

1992   "The Bible as Literature." Pp. 109-148 in The Origin
of the Bible. Edited by Philip Comfort. Wheaton: Tyndale

House Publishers.

Sanders, Henry A.

1912   The New Testament Manuscripts in the Freer
Collection. New York: MacMillan.

1935   A Third Century Papyrus Codex of the Epistles of
Paul. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Schleiermacher, F. D. E.

1977   Hermeneutics: The Handwritten Manuscripts.
Edited by Heinz Kimmerle; translated by James Duke and
Jack Forstman. Missoula, Missouri: Scholars Press.

Schmidt, Carl

1931   "Die neuesten Bibelfunde aus Ägypten." Pp. 285-
293 in Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
30.

1933   "Die Evangelienhandschrift des Chester Beatty--
Sammlung." Pp. 225-232 in Zeitschrift für die
Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 32.

Schmidt, Henry J.

1979   "'Text-Adequate Concretizations' and Real Readers:
Reception Theory and Its Applications." Pp. 157-169 in
New German Critique 17.

Schofield, Ellwood M.

1936   "The Papyrus Fragments of the Greek New
Testament." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist
Theological Seminary.

Scholes, Robert and Robert Kellogg

1966   The Nature of Narrative. Oxford: Oxford University
Press.

Segovia, Fernando F.
1991   "The Journeys of the Word of God: A Reading of the
Plot of the Fourth Gospel." Pp. 23-54 in Semeia 53.

Selden, Raman
1985   A Reader's Guide to Contemporary Literary Theory.
Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.

1989   Practicing Theory and Reading Literature.
Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.

Skeat, Theodore C. and B. C. McGing
1991   "Notes on Chester Beatty Papyrus I (Gospels and
Acts)." Pp. 21-25 in Hermathena 150.

Smith, Frank
1971   Understanding Reading: A Psycholinguistic
Analysis of Reading and Learning to Read. New York:
Holt, Rinehart, Winston.

Staley, Jeffrey L.
1988   The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of
the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel. Atlanta: Scholars
Press.

Stevenson, James
1957   A New Eusebius: Documents Illustrative of the
History of the Church to A.D. 337. New York: Macmillan.

Suleiman, Susan R. and Inge Crosman
1980   The Reader in the Text. Princeton: Princeton

University Press.

Talmon, Shemaryahu

1970   "The Old Testament Text." Pp. 159-199 in <u>The Cambridge History of the Bible</u>, vol. 1, <u>From the Beginnings to Jerome</u>. Edited by Peter R. Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tasker, R. V. G.

1964   "Notes on Variant Readings." Pp. 411-445 in <u>The Greek New Testament</u> (being the Text Translated in the New English Bible, 1961). London: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, Isaac

1859   <u>History of the Transmission of Ancient Books to Modern Times</u>. London: Jackson and Walford.

Testuz, Michael

1959   <u>Papyrus Bodmer VII-IX: L'Epitre de Jude, Les deux Epitres de Pierre, Les Psaumes 33 et 34</u>. Cologny/Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana.

Thistleton, Anthony C.

1980   <u>The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description</u>. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Thomas, R.

1992   <u>Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece</u>. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tompkins, Jane P.

1980   <u>Reader-Response Criticism</u>. Baltimore: John

Hopkins University Press.

Tov, Emanuel

1992   Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Minneapolis:
Fortress Press.

Turner, Eric G.

1956   "Scribes and Scholars of Oxyrhynchus." Pp. 141-
146 in Akten des VIII. Internationalen Kongresses für
Papyrologie: Wien 1955. Mitteilungen aus der
Papyrussammlung der Osterreichischen
Nationalbibliothek (Papyrus Erzherzog Rainer) 5. Vienna:
Rohrer.

1968   Greek Papyri: An Introduction. Princeton: Princeton
University Press, 1968.

1977   The Typology of the Early Codex. Philadelphia:
University of Pennsylvania Press.

1980   Greek Papyri: An Introduction. Paperback edition,
with supplementary notes. Oxford: Clarendon.

Vaganay, Leon and Christian-Bernard Amphoux

1991   An Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vermes, G.

1970   "Bible and Midrash: Early Old Testament Exegesis."
Pp. 199-231 in The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. 1,
From the Beginnings to Jerome. Edited by Peter R.
Ackroyd and Christopher F. Evans. Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Via, Dan Otto

1967   The Parables: Their Literary and Existential
Dimension. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

1975   Kerygma and Comedy in the New Testament.
Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Walhout, Clarence and Leland Ryken.
1991   Contemporary Literary Theory: A Christian
Appraisal. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Westcott, Brooke F.
1881   Gospel According to St. John. Reprint. Grand
Rapids: Zondervan, 1973.

Westcott, B. F. and Fenton Hort
1882   Introduction to the New Testament in the Original
Greek (with "Notes on Select Readings"). New York:
Harper and Brothers.

Wilder, Amos N.
1964   The Language of the Gospel. New York: Harper and
Row.

Williams, C. S. C.
1951   Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and
Acts. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Wimsatt, W. K. and Monroe C. Beardsley
1976   "The Intentional Fallacy." Pp. 1-13 in On Literary
Intention; editor David Newton-deMolina. Edinburgh: the
University Press.

Winter, John G.

1933   <u>Life and Letters in the Papyri</u>. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Wisse, Frederik
1989   "Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts." Pp. 39-54 in <u>Gospel Traditions in the Second Century</u>. Edited by William J. Peterson. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Würthwein, Ernst
1979   <u>The Text of the Old Testament</u>. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Yarrow, Ralph
1984   "Reading About Thinking About Reading." Pp. 285-293 in <u>Journal of European Studies</u> 14.

Zuntz, Günther
1953   <u>The Text of the Epistles</u>. London: Oxford,

Appendix

Identification of Scribal Hands in 𝔓66

As noted before, I was asked by the International New Testament Greek project to proofread a new transcription of 𝔓66. Throughout the course of this work, I began to realize that two scribes must have worked on this manuscript. Soon thereafter, I was called upon to be a supervisor of an M.A. thesis at Wheaton College Graduate School. This thesis, under my direction, involved a thorough analysis of the corrections in 𝔓66, whereby we came to the conclusion that at least three scribes worked on 𝔓66. The results of this study are published in Karyn Berner's thesis, "Papyrus Bodmer II, 𝔓66: A Reevaluation of the Correctors and Corrections" (1993). Much of what is presented below is described in more detail in that thesis.

The First Hand (𝔓66 and 𝔓66*)
This is the work of the original scribe who produced the complete text of John's Gospel.

The First Hand as Corrector (𝔓66^{c1})
This is the hand that made several in-process corrections.

The Second Hand as First Paginator and Corrector (𝔓66^{c2})
This is the hand that paginated the first 99 pages, and made several substantive corrections. He could be called the diorthotes.

The Third Hand as Second Paginator and Corrector (𝔓66^{c3})
This is the hand that paginated from 100 to the end, and

made small corrections. He may have also been a
<u>diorthotes</u> but did not function in that capacity hardly as
much as the other.

The following chart displays the chirographic differences
between these hands.

	FIRST HAND	SECOND HAND	THIRD HAND
α	*aaaaddd*	*ʎʎʎʎʎddʎ*	*ʎʎʎʎʎʎʎ*
δ	*ʒʒʒʒʒʒ*	*ʎʎʎʎʎʎʎ*	*ʎʎʎ*
ε	*εεεεεεεε*	*εεεεεεε*	*εεε*
ζ	*χχχχχχ*	*ʒʒʒʒʒʒ*	*ʒʒʒʒ*
κ	*κκκκκκκ*	*κκκκκκκκκ*	*κκ*
μ	*ᴜᴜᴜᴜᴜᴜ*	*ᴜᴜᴜᴜᴜᴜ*	*ΜΜΜΜΜ*
ξ	*ʒʒʒʒʒʒ*	*ʒʒʒʒʒʒʒ*	
ρ	*ρρρρρρρ*	*ρρρρρ*	*ρρρρρρρ*
υ	*ϒϒϒϒϒϒ*	*ϒϒϒϒϒϒϒ*	*ϒ*

Figure 1. CHART OF INDICATOR LETTERS

Figure 2.   SCRIBE, PAGINATORS AND CORRECTORS

PHOTO 1   P45
John 10:14-15

298

JOHN X, 7-25

PHOTO 2   P66
John 3:6

ΟΝΤΟΟΗΧΘΕΝΠΡΟΟΑΥΤΟΝΝΥΚΤΟC
ΚΑΙΕΙΠΕΝΑΥΤΩ· ΡΑΒΒΕΙ ΟΙΔΑΜΕΝΟ
ΤΙΑΠΟΘΥ ΕΛΗΛΥΘΑΟ ΔΙΔΑΟΚΑΛΟΟ ΟΥ
ΔΕΙC ΓΑΡ ΔΥΝΑΤΑΙ ΤΑΥΤΑ ΤΑ CΗΜΙΑ ΠΟΙ
ΕΙ Α CΥ ΠΟΙΕΙC ΕΑΝ ΜΗ Η Ο ΘC ΜΕΤ ΑΥΤΟΥ
ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ ΙC ΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΥΤΩ· ΑΜΗΝ
ΑΜΗΝ ΛΕΓΩ CΟΙ ΕΑΝ ΜΗ ΤΙC ΓΕ
ΝΗΘΗ ΑΝΩΘΕΝ ΟΥ ΔΥΝΑΤΑΙ ΙΔΕΙΝ ΤΗΝ
ΒΑCΙΛΕΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΛΕΓΙ ΠΡΟC ΑΥΤΟΝ
Ο ΝΙΚΟΔΗΜΟC ΠΩC ΔΥΝΑΤΑΙ ΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ
ΝΑΙ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟC ΓΕΡΩΝ ΩΝ ΜΗ ΔΥ
ΝΑΤΑΙ ΕΙC ΤΗΝ ΚΟΙΛΙΑΝ ΤΗC ΜΗΤΡΟC
ΑΥΤΟΥ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΝ ΕΙCΕΛΘΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΓΕΝ
ΝΗΘΗΝΑΙ· ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ ΙC ΑΜΗΝ ΑΜΗ
ΛΕΓΩ CΟΙ ΕΑΝ ΜΗ ΤΙC ΓΕΝΝΗΘΗ Ε
ΥΔΑΤΟC ΚΑΙ ΠΝC ΟΥ ΔΥΝΑΤΑΙ ΕΙCΕΛ
ΘΕΙΝ ΕΙC ΤΗΝ ΒΑCΙΛΙΑΝ ΤΟΥ ΘΥ ΤΟ ΓΕ
ΓΕΝΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΚ ΤΗC CΑΡΚΟC CΑΡΖ
ΕCΤΙΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟ ΓΕΓΕΝΝΗΜΕΝΟΝ ΕΚ
ΤΟΥ ΠΝC ΠΝ ΕΥΜΑ ΕCΤΙΝ ΜΗ ΘΑΥΜΑ

PHOTO 4   P66
John 7:52

ΝΒ

ΝΗϹΟΝΚΑΙΙΔΕΟΤΙΕΚΤΗϹΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑϹ
ΟΠΡΟΦΗΤΗϹΟΥΚΕΓΕΙΡΕΤΑΙ ΠΑΛΙΝ
ΟΥΝΑΥΤΟΙϹΕΛΑΛΗϹΕΝΟΙϹΛΕΓΩΝ
ΕΓΩΕΙΜΙΤΟΦΩϹΤΟΥΚΟϹΜΟΥΟΑΚΟ
ΛΟΥΘΩΝΕΜΟΙΟΥΜΗΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΗϹΗ
ΕΝΤΗϹΚΟΤΙΑΑΛΛΕΧΕΙΤΟΦΩϹΤΗϹ
ΖΩΗϹΕΙΠΟΝΟΥΝΑΥΤΩΟΙΦΑΡΙϹΑΙ
ΟΙ ϹΥΠΕΡΙϹΕΑΥΤΟΥΜΑΡΤΥΡΙϹΗΜΑΡ
ΤΥΡΙΑϹΟΥΟΥΚΕϹΤΙΝΑΛΗΘΗϹΑΠΕ
ΚΡΙΘΗ ΟΙϹΚΑΙΕΙΠΕΝΑΥΤΟΙϹΚΑΝΕΓΩ
ΜΑΡΤΥΡΩΠΕΡΙΕΜΑΥΤΟΥΑΛΗΘΗϹ
ΕϹΤΙΝΗΜΑΡΤΥΡΙΑΜΟΥ ΟΤΙΟΙΔΑΠΟ
ΘΕΝΗΛΘΟΝΚΑΙΠΟΥΥΠΑΓΩΥΜΕΙϹ
ΔΕΟΥΚΟΙΔΑΤΑΙΠΟΘΕΝΕΡΧΟΜΑΙ
ΗΠΟΥΥΠΑΓΩ ΥΜΕΙϹΚΑΤΑΤΗΝ
ϹΑΡΚΑΚΡΙΝΕΤΑΙΕΓΩΟΥΚΡΙΝΩΟΥ
ΔΕΝΑΚΑΙΕΑΝΚΡΙΝΩΔΕΕΓΩ
ΗΚΡΙϹΙϹΗΕΜΗΑΛΗΘΕϹΤΙΝΟΤΙ
ΜΟΝΟϹΟΥΚΕΙΜΙΑΛΛΕΓΩΚΑΙΟ

PHOTO 5   P66
John 13:20-
(lectoral markings.

ΚΑΙΤΟΝΑ̣ΨΑΝΤΑΜΕ · ΠΑΝΤΑΕΙ
ΠΩ̣ΝΙ̣ϹΕΤ̣ΗΡΑΧΘΗΤ̣ΩΤΠΝΙ̅ · ΚΑΙ
ΕΜΑΡΤΥΡΗϹΕΝΚΑΙ ΕΙΠΕΝ ΑΜΗ
ΛΗΝΛΕΓΩ ΥΜΙΝ ΟΤΙΕΙϹ ΕΞΥΜω
ΠΑΡΑ̣ΛΩϹΕΙ̣ΜΕΕΒΛΕΠΟΝΟΥΝ
ΕΙϹΑΛΛΗΛΟΥϹΟΙΜΑΘΗΤΑΙΑΠΟΡΟΥ
ΑΠΟΡΟΥΜΕΝΟΙΠΕΡΙΤΙΝΟϹΛΕΓΕΙ
ΗΝΔΕΑΝΑΚΕΙΜΕΝΟϹΕΙϹ ΕΚΤω
ΜΑΘΗΤωΝΑΥΤΟΥΕΝΤωΚΟΛΠω
ΤΟΥΙΥ̅ ΟΝΗΓΑΠΑΕΝΕΓΕΙΟΥΝΤΟΥ
ΤωϹΙΜωΝΠΕΤΡΟϹΠΥΘΕϹΘΗ
ΑΝΕΙΗΠΕΡΙΟΥ Ο̣ΘΕΙΠωΝ ΠΕϹω
ΟΥΝΕΚΕΙΝΟϹΟΥΤωϹΕΠΙΤΟϹΤΗ
ΘΟϹΤΟΥΙΥ̅ΛΕΓΕΙΑΥΤω · ΚΕ̅ΤΙϹΕϹΤΙ
ΑΠΟΚΡΙΝΕΤΑΙΟΙϹΕΚΕΙΝΟϹΕϹΤΙΝ
ΞΕΓωΒΑΨΑϹΤΟΨωΜΙΟΝΕΠΙ
ΛωϹω · ΚΑΙΨΑϹΤΟΨωΜΙΟΝ

XIII. 20-26

PHOTO 6   P66
John 17:11-12

XVII, 8–12

PHOTO 7   P66
John 17:14-16

XVII, 13–19

PHOTO 8   P66
John 19:5

XIX, 2–6

PHOTO 9   P66
John 20:14

XX, 12–17

PHOTO 10 P75
Luke 10:31

Luc X : 20-3..

PHOTO 11 P75
Luke 11:31

ΤΟΝ ΕΧΕΓΕΙ ΤΟCΤΡΕ ΕΙCΤΟΝΟΙΚΟΝ
ΑΠΟΘΕΝ ΞΗΛΘΟΝ ΚΑΙΕΛΘΟΝ ΕΥΡΙ
CΚΕΙCΕCΑΡΩΜΕΝΟΝ ΚΑΙΚΕΚΟCΜΗ
ΜΕΝΟΝ ΤΟΤΕΠΟΡΕΥΕΤΑΙΚΑΙΠΑΡΑ
ΛΑΜΒΑΝΕΙΕΤΕΡΑ ΠΝΑ ΠΟΝΗΡΟΤΕ
ΡΑΕΑΥΤΟΥ Ζ ΚΑΙΕΙCΕΛΘΟΝΤΑΚΑΤΟΙ
ΚΕΙΕΚΕΙ ΚΑΙΓΕΙΝΕΤΑΙΤΑΕCΧΑΤΑΤΟΥ
ΑΝΟΥΕΚΕΙΝΟΥ ΧΕΙΡΟΝΑΤΩΝΠΡΩ
ΤΩΝ ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΔΕΕΝΤΩΛΕΓΕΙΝ
ΑΥΤΟΝΕΠΑΡΑCΑΤΙCΦΩΝΗΝΓΥΝΗ
ΕΚΤΟΥΟΧΛΟΥΕΙΠΕΝΑΥΤΩ ΜΑΚΑΡΙΑ
ΗΚΟΙΛΙΑΗ ΒΑCΤΑCΑCΑCΕ ΚΑΙΜΑCΤΟΙ
ΟΥCΕΘΗΛΑCΑC ΑΥΤΟCΔΕΕΙΠΕΝΜΕΝ
ΟΥΝΜΑΚΑΡΙΟΙΟΙΑΚΟΥΟΝΤΕCΤΟΝ
ΛΟΓΟΝΤΟΥΘΥ ΚΑΙΦΥΛΑCCΟΝΤΕC
ΤΩΝΔΕΟΧΛΩΝΕΠΑΘΡΟΙΖΟΜΕΝΩΝ
ΗΡΞΑΤΟΛΕΓΕΙΝ ΗΓΕΝΕΑΑΥΤΗΙΕ
ΝΕΑΠΟΝΗΡΑΕCΤΙΝCΗΜΕΙΟΝΖΗ
ΤΕΙ ΚΑΙCΗΜΕΙΟΝΟΥΔΟΘΗCΕΤΑΙΑΥ
ΤΗ ΕΙΜΗΤΟCΗΜΕΙΟΝΙΩΝΑ ΚΑΘΩC
ΓΑΡΕΓΕΝΕΤΟ ΙΩΝΑCΤΟΙCΝΙΝΕΥΙ
ΤΑΙCCΗΜΕΙΟΝ ΟΥΤΩCΕCΤΑΙ
ΤΟΥ ΑΝΟΥ ΤΗΓΕΝΕΑΤΑΥΤΗ ΒΑCΙΛΙCCΑ
ΕΓΕΡΘΗCΕΤΑΙΕΝΤΗΚΡΙCΕΙΜΕΤΑ
ΤΩΝΑΝΔΡΩΝΤΗCΓΕΝΕΑCΤΑΥΤΗC
ΚΑΙΚΑΤΑΚΡΙΝΕΙΑΥΤΗΝ ΟΤΙΗΛΘΕΝ
ΕΚΤΩΝΠΕΡΑΤΩΝΤΗCΓΗCΑΚΟΥ
CΑΙΤΗΝCΟΦΙΑΝCΟΛΟΜΩΝΟC ΚΑΙΙΔΟΥ
ΠΛΕΙΟΝCΟΛΟΜΩΝΟCΩΔΕ ΑΝΔΡΕCΝΙ
ΝΕΥΕΙΤΑΙΑΝΑCΤΗCΟΝΤΑΙΕΝΤΗΚΡΙ
CΕΙΜΕΤΑΤΗCΓΕΝΕΑCΤΑΥΤΗCΚΑΙΚΑ
ΤΑΚΡΙΝΟΥCΙΝΑΥΤΗΝ ΟΤΙΜΕΤΕΝΟ
ΗCΑΝΕΙCΤΟΚΗΡΥΓΜΑΙΩΝΑ ΚΑΙΙΔΟΥ
ΠΛΕΙΟΝΙΩΝΑΩΔΕ ΟΥΔΕΙCΛΥΧΝΟ
ΑΨΑCΕΙCΚΡΥΠΤΗΝΤΙΘΗCΙΝΑΛΛΕ
ΠΙΤΗΝΛΥΧΝΙΑΝ ΙΝΑΟΙΕΙCΠΟ
ΡΕΥΟΜΕΝΟΙ ΤΟΦΩCΒΛΕΠΩCΙΝ
ΟΛΥΧΝΟCΤΟΥCΩΜΑΤΟCΕCΤΙΝΟΟ
ΦΘΑΛΜΟCCΟΥ ΟΤΑΝΟΟΦΘΑΛΜΟC
CΟΥΑΠΛΟΥC Η ΚΑΙΟΛΟΝΤΟCΩΜΑCΟΥ
ΦΩΤΕΙΝΟΝΕCΤΙΝ ΕΠΑΝΔΕΠΟΝΗΡΟC

PHOTO 12   P75
Luke 17:14