A Textual Commentary

on the

Greek Gospels

Vol. 4
<u>John</u>

BY
WIELAND WILLKER

Textual variants
in the
Gospel of John

- Note that 01 is Western from 1:1 to 8:38 !
- 565 is f1 in John!
- According to Fee and my own studies, P66 has distinct Western properties from ch. 6 on to the end. Fee notes a strong Western element in ch. 6-7 and scattered Western readings throughout ch. 8-21.

Results from the variant evaluation:

The best manuscripts of Jo:
1. Primary (=best) witnesses for Jo are: $P66^{1-5}$, $P75$, B, C, L, W, T, 083

2. Secondary (= good) witnesses for Jo are:
$P5, P66^{6-21}$, 01, D^{Byz}, [X, 213, 865], 070, 086, 33, 849, Co, Sy-C^{Byz}

3. Tertiary, mixed Byzantine: Ψ, [0141/821], 397, 579, 597, 1241, 2786 ✍ all weak
579 has a Byz block from about 6:52 - 9:4
1241 is Byz from ch. 16-21, somewhat better in ch. 1-15 (62% Byz). My data are limited, probably it's even better. T&T get 50% Byzantinity for Jo 1-10 based on 153 readings.

"Western": ($P66^{6-21}$), 01^{1-8}, D, Lat/it, Sy-S, Sy-C
Byzantine: A, N, Θ, (f1), f13, 28, 157, 565, 700, 892, (1071), 1424, vg, Sy^{P,H}

Detailed Analysis of Jo 1-5:
A more detailed analysis of Jo ch. 1-5 which took into account all variants from Swanson gave the following results:

1. Prime Alexandrian: P66, P75, B
2. Secondary Alexandrians: C, L, W^{sub}
3. Tertiary Alexandrians: Ψ, 33, 579

4. Western: 01, D

5. Caesarean: (distinguishable, but basically Byzantine)
       group 1:   Θ, f13, 1071
       group 2:   f1, 565

Results from Text & Textwert John 1-10

The analyses of the T&T collations (based on 153 readings in John 1-10) confirm the above results. The (comparatively) good quality of X/033 in John might be worth mentioning, because it is not very widely known. T&T also confirm that 565 is a member of f1 in John, it is very close to 1/1582 (95%).

The almost complete analysis of the minuscules by T&T revealed the following interesting minuscules with good text: "2" readings are txt readings against Byz.

	"2"	"Special"	
849	58%	20%	(excellent, but fragmentary)
397	41%	16%	(similar to 33 in quality)
597	31%	12%	(slightly worse than 33 in quality)

Pair 0141/821:

0141	30%	13%	
821	33%	13%	(95% agreement, very close!)

Group X/033:

033	35%	18%	(similar to 33 in quality)
865	31%	18%	
213	29%	15%	
(799	25%	8%)	

These four manuscripts form a group:
Agreement:

	033	865	213	799
033		93%	89%	81%
865	93%		82%	79%
213	89%	82%		82%
799	81%	79%	82%	

N/Ψ:

Additionally T&T found that N and Ψ are quite close in John: They agree 81%.

1241:

The only manuscript for which the evaluation in T&T gave significantly different results compared to mine, was 1241. In my analysis it was about 62% Byz in Jo 1-15 (afterwards it is pure Byz). In T&T it is only about 50% Byz. This is probably due to the fact that my data for 1241 are incomplete. I do not have the complete text of 1241, but only the Lake collation and the notations from NA.

So, whenever 1241 does not show up, it is counted as Byz in my commentary, which is probably not correct in every case. I think T&T is therefore probably nearer to the truth here.

Some information on the above manuscripts:

849 is a 17th CE manuscript written on paper! It rests in the Vatican library (Barb. gr. 495) and contains John only. It is fragmentary (Jo 7:25 - 10:18) and extant only for 45 out of 153 Teststellen. It omits the PA. The manuscript has the commentary from Cyril Alex. added (book 5 and 6). Scrivener: 730, Soden: Ki60
Gregory notes: "copied from 850?" Unfortunately 850 has not been collated for T&T (due to a misinterpretation of the manuscript), but it will be given as an addendum in the next volume. Should be interesting. Textually 849 is closest to L (80% agreement, only 60% with B).
850 is a 12th CE manuscript, parchment, also in the Vatican (Barb. gr. 504). It contains Jo 1:1 - 10:17. Also with Cyril commentary (Book 1-6). Scrivener 729, Soden: Ki20

397 is a 10/11th manuscript in Rome (Bibl. Vallicell. E40). Contains John only. Text with catena. Scrivener 397, Soden Ci10. It omits the PA.

597 is a 13th CE manuscript in Venice (Bibl. Naz. Marc., Gr. I, 59, 1277). It's written on parchment and contains the Gospels. Gregory: "has good readings". Scrivener 464, Soden: ε340. It's rather close to group X, (73% agreement with X).

0141 is a 10th CE codex in Paris (Bib. Nat. Gr 209), Contains John only. Text with catena. Gregory 314 (p. 178, he notes: "compare with X") Soden Ci13 (I-text, p. 1506)
821 is a 16th CE manuscript again written on paper! Contains John only. Text with catena, at the beginning a catena on Genesis. It rests in the National Library of Madrid (4673, fol. 262-542). Soden Ci60 (I-text). It omits the PA. Is it a direct copy?

Group X: All four manuscripts omit the PA.
X/033: Codex Monacensis, 9/10th CE, Munich, Univ. lib. (2º Cod. ms. 30), came in the 16th CE from Rome, text in uncials, commentary in early minuscule, chiefly Chrysostom. Extant in John: 1:1-3:8, 7:1-13:5, 13:20-15:25, 16:23-fin., Jo 4:6-5:42 is supplied on paper, 12th CE. Soden: A3 (p. 249, 564ff., 1506)

<u>865</u>: 15th CE codex on paper! Vatican library (Vat. *gr.* 1472), Contains John only. Text with *Chrysostom* commentary. Soden: A502 (von Soden already notes that 865 is a "dublette" or copy of 033, p. 565). 865 is very close to X. Is it possible that the Gospel of John has been copied from 033, before the manuscripts left Rome?

<u>213</u>: 11th CE codex, parchment, Venice, Bib. Naz. Marc. (*Gr. Z.* 542, 409), Jo 19:6-fin. is a 14/15th CE suppl., 213 is Byz in Mt and Mk and has 13% "2" readings in Lk. Soden: ε129

<u>799</u>: 11th CE (Gregory: 12th) codex, parchment, Athen, Nat. Lib. (no. 117), the manuscript is Byz in Mt-Lk, Soden: ε196. 799 is only a loose member of this group.

It shows von Soden's failure that he assigned the four codices different groups: 033: none, 865: A^{C}, 213: I^{O}, 799: K^{X} (Soden found it irrelevant to analyze 033 more closely, but he notes that 033 is closer to 01/B in John, p. 565)

The basically completely unknown manuscripts 397 and 849/850 deserve a detailed study.

manuscripts with lacunae:

<u>P45 extant:</u>
4:51, 54	10:7-25	11:18-36
5:21, 24	10:30-11:10	11:42-57

<u>P66 lacunae:</u>
6:12-34	14:31-15:1	16:5, 8-9	21:10-end
14:27-28	15:27-16:1	20:21.24	

<u>P75 lacunae:</u>
11:46-47	11:58-12:2	13:11-14:7	15:11-end

<u>A lacuna:</u>
6:50-8:52

<u>C lacunae:</u>
1:1-3	5:17-6:38	9:11-11:7	14:8-16:21
1:41-3:33	7:3-8:34	11:47-13:7	18:36-20:25

<u>D lacuna:</u>
1:16-3:26

<u>L lacuna:</u>
21:15-end

<u>N lacunae:</u>
1:1-21	5:3-10	9:33-14:2	20:23-25
1:39-2:6	5:19-26	14:11-15:14	20:28-30
3:30-4:5	6:49-57	15:22-16:15	21:20-end

<u>T extant:</u>
1:24-32	4:52-5:7	7:6-8:31
3:10-17	6:28-67	

<u>W lacuna:</u> 1:1-5:11 supplement
14:26-16:7a missing

<u>X/033 is extant:</u>
1:1-3:8	7:1-13:5	13:20-15:25	16:23-end

(plus a late suppl. 4:6-5:42)

070 extant:

3:23-26	7:3-12	11:50-56	16:33-17:1
5:22-31	8:13-22	12:33-34	
5:38-39	8:33-9:39	12:46-13:4	

565 lacunae:

11:26-48	13:2-23

579 lacuna:

20:15-end

892 lacunae:

10:6-12:18	14:23-end Byz supplement

Sy-S lacunae:

1:1-25	4:38-5:6	14:10-11
1:47-2:15	5:25-46	18:31-19:40

Sy-C lacunae:

1:42-3:5	14:12-15	14:24-26
8:19-14:10	14:19-21	14:29-end

124 of the 273 variants (45%) are difficult to evaluate (Rating either "-" or "1?").
Jo has 878 verses. This means that we have
- one significant variant every 3rd verse, and
- one difficult variant every 9th verse.
About 28 variants (10%) should be reconsidered in NA (Mt: 20, Mk: 13, Lk: 20).

Of the variants noted only 22 (8%) have an umlaut in B. There are 49 umlauts overall in Jo. This means that 27 of the 49 umlauts indicate rather minor (or unknown!) stuff.

TVU 1

1. <u>Difficult variant</u>
NA28 John 1:3-1:4 πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο
οὐδὲ <u>ἕν.</u>
<u>ὃ γέγονεν 4 ἐν</u> αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων·

BYZ John 1:3-1:4 πάντα δι᾽ αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο
οὐδὲ <u>ἕν ὃ γέγονεν.</u>
<u>4 ἐν</u> αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων·

A question of punctuation:

οὐδὲ ἕν ὃ γέγον<u>εν.</u>   01^C, Θ?, 050^C, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Cyp
                           NA^{25}, WH^{mg}, Weiss, Tis, Bal

οὐδὲ <u>ἕν.</u> ὃ γέγονεν   P75^C, C, D, L, W^S, Θ?, 050*, 0141*^{vid}, 850,
                            b, vg, Sy-C, Sy-P, sa, Ir^{Lat}, Tert, Cl, Or, Aug, WH

<u>no Interpunction:</u>   P66, P75*, A, B, Δ, al

καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ <u>ἕν ὃ γέγονεν 4 ἐν αὐτῷ.</u> ζωὴ ἦν, καὶ
ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων·
by Epiph (4th CE) and Greg Nys (4th CE)

Acc. to NA has Θ both punctuations!

Note also for οὐδὲ ἕν: <u>οὐδὲν</u> P66, 01*, D, f1, pc, Cl, Heracleon^{Or} (170 CE!)
B: no umlaut

3 All things came into being through him, and without him happened not even one thing that has
happened.
4 In him was life, and the life was the light of all people.

3 All things came into being through him, and without him happened not even one thing.
<u>**What has happened 4 in him was life,**</u> and the life was the light of all people.
<u>**That which has come into being 4 in him was life**</u> …

Augustine (early 5th CE):
Non ergo ita pronunciari oportet *quod factum est in illo vita est* ut subdistinguamus *quod factum
est in illo* et deinde inferamus *vita est* … distinguit de quali *vita* loquatur cum addit *et vita erat
lux hominum.* Sic ergo distinguendum est ut cum dixerimus *quod factum est* deinde inferamus *in
illo vita est* … nec praetermittendum est quod emendatiores codices habent *quod factum est in
illo vita erat* ut sic intellegatur *vita erat.* (De Genesi ad litteram libri 5.14/157.3, from Houghton)

Metzger notes that there is a "consensus of ante-Nicene writers (orthodox and heretical alike) who took ὃ γέγονεν with what follows."

But Metzger argues in a minority vote, that the Byzantine form is more consistent with Johannine repetitive style. He also writes: "Despite valiant attempts of commentators to bring sense out of taking ὃ γέγονεν with what follows, the passage remains intolerably clumsy and opaque. On the difficulties that stands in the way of ranging the clause with ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ ἦν is that the perfect tense of ὃ γέγονεν would require ἐστιν instead of ἦν."

This ἐστιν has actually been replaced here by 01 and D. See next variant.

The Byzantine punctuation is called by Ps. Ambrosius (4ᵗʰ CE) "that by the Alexandrians and Egyptians". Hort: "[the Byz punctuation] has high claims to acceptance on internal grounds."

Note also the reading οὐδὲν for οὐδὲ ἕν.

Compare:
- F.C. Burkitt "The Syriac interpretation of S. John 1:3, 4" JTS 4 (1903) 436-38
- Theodor Zahn, Commentary on John, Excursus 1. (argues for Byz)
- E. Nestle "Zur Interpunktion von Joh 1:3-4" ZNW 10 (1909) 262-4
- K. Aland "Eine Untersuchung zu Joh 1:3,4 – Über die Bedeutung eines Punktes" ZNW 59 (1968) 174-209
- E.L. Miller "P66 and P75 on John 1:3,4" TZ 41 (1985) 440-43
- G. Korting "Joh 1:3" BZ 33 (1989) 97-104

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 2

Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:4 ἐν αὐτῷ ζωὴ <u>ἦν</u>, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ <u>ἦν</u> τὸ φῶς τῶν ἀνθρώπων·

T&T #1

<u>ἐστιν</u>   01, D, it(all), vg^{mss}, Ir^{Lat}, Cl^{pt}, Or^{pt}, Aug, Heracleon^{Or}, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

est   Heracleon: Rome, ca. 170 CE!

             vg reads txt ("erat")

<u>omit:</u>   W^s

Normally Origen uses ἦν (13 times), but twice he uses ἐστιν in his commentary on John (labeled "adaptions" in Ehrman, which means "a quotation that has been somewhat modified"):
1. ει γε ζωη εστι το φως των ανθρωπων (Com. Jo 2, 19, 130)
2. τινα μεντοι γε των αντιγραφων εχει, και ταχα ουκ απιθανως· ο γεγονεν εν αυτω ζωη εστιν (Com. Jo 2, 19, 132)

Clement uses twice ἐστιν (Paed. 1.27.1, Exc. 19.2) and once ἦν (Paed. 2.79.3).
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 1:1 Ἐν ἀρχῇ <u>ἦν</u> ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος <u>ἦν</u> πρὸς τὸν θεόν, καὶ θεὸς <u>ἦν</u> ὁ λόγος. 2 οὗτος <u>ἦν</u> ἐν ἀρχῇ πρὸς τὸν θεόν.

Probably a correction to express clearly, that there still IS life in him. If the preceding ὃ γέγονεν is taken with the following, ἐστιν is required here. But the second ἦν in the καὶ ἡ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς seems to require the first.
Origen regarded it with some favor: τάχα οὐκ ἀπιθάνως = "perhaps not implausible".
It is possible that the ἐστιν has been conformed to immediate context: the directly following ἦν and 4 times in verses 1-2.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 3

2. Difficult variant
Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:13 <u>οἳ</u> οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ θεοῦ <u>ἐγεννήθησαν.</u>

<u>ὃς</u> ...   ... <u>ἐγεννήθη</u>   b, **9A***, Tert, Ir^{Lat}, Or^{Lat-pt}, Aug^{pt}, **Epistula Apostolorum**
qui non   ...   natus est   A. Pallin

__ οὐκ ... <u>ἐγεννήθησαν</u>   D* (οἳ added above the line)

<u>οἳ</u> ...   ... <u>ἐγεννήθη</u>   Sy-C, Sy-P^{mss6}

Lacuna: Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Minor variants:
ἐγε**νν**ήθησαν γεννάω   indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural
01, B^{C2}, C, D^{sup}, L, W^S, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj

ἐγε**ν**ήθησαν γίνομαι   indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural
P75, A, B*, S, Δ, Θ, 346, 28, 1071, pc
B: (p. 1349 C 39) The second N is written above the line (Tis: B³).

B*, pc   omit οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς (h.t.)
E*, 983, pc omit οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς (h.t.)

Augustine (ca. 400 CE):
"Non ex carne, non ex sanguine, non ex voluntate, viri neque ex voluntate carnis sed ex deo **natus est.**" (Confessionum libri 7.9.20 and Contra Secundinum Manichaeum 5) But elsewhere Augustine also is citing the plural. Compare Houghton.

Compare previous verse:
NA28 John 1:12 <u>ὅσοι</u> δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν, ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν τέκνα θεοῦ γενέσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν <u>εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ,</u>

In this reading the ὃς is not referring to ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν as does οἳ, but to Jesus.
Tertullian, who has this reading, wrote that the Valentinians have made the change (de carne Christi, 19 + 24). Irenaeus: Adv. Haer. III, 16:2, 19:2

B. Ehrman: "what we have here is not a heretical tampering with the text, but an orthodox one. The corruption serves to locate the orthodox notion of Jesus' birth in a passage that otherwise lacked it."

The following eminent scholars have argued for the singular: Blass, Boismard, Burney, (Harnack), Loisy, Menge[1st ed.], Resch, Zahn and others.

It is also possible that the singular arose from the influence of the immediately preceding αὐτοῦ. There is no real explanation as to why somebody should have changed the singular to the plural.

Harnack thinks that the complete verse 13 is secondary, probably an early gloss on καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο from the Johannine community. He notes:

1. The otherwise rather succinct prolog is here quite detailed. There is no real need to elaborate any further about the ὅσοι δὲ ἔλαβον αὐτόν.
2. It is not clear to what the οἳ refers: πιστεύουσιν or τέκνα θεοῦ ? The addition is uncertain and awkward.
3. the Aorist ἐγεννήθησαν is problematic. Expected is either Present or Perfect. Isn't the sentence almost without sense: " he gave them power to become children of God, who <u>were born</u> not of blood but of God."
4. The meaning is unclear (Harnack: "dark"). Why the polemics? Who pretends that children of God are born of blood and flesh? There is even a tautology here: "Children of God are born of God."
5. the following καὶ (καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο…) is strange, because is takes for granted that immediately before the λόγος has been mentioned.
6. A peculiar problem arises from the contrast in verse 13 of those ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν and in verse 14 of the one μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός.

Harnack thinks that all the problems with this sentence can only be solved by declaring it secondary. It has a Johannine flavor, but it does not fit into the text. Thus it must have come into existence in the Johannine circle, probably as an early marginal gloss, either to create conformity with Mt/Lk or to explain the short term σὰρξ ἐγένετο. Harnack thinks that this original gloss was without relativum (see D* and b) and with the Singular.

J. Schmid agrees with Harnack that the words are a secondary insertion by the author into an original early Hymn.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "The true position is represented by ὃς ... ἐγεννήθη, by which in accordance with sense it is to Jesus alone that an immaculate birth is attributed. The relative ὃς refers to τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, which is a periphrastic equivalent of αὐτόν; cf. 2:23 ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ = εἰς αὐτόν, etc."

Compare:
- Theodor Zahn, Commentary on John, Excursus 2.
- Harnack "Zur NT Textkritik", 1931, p. 155 ff.
- J. Schmid "Joh 1:13" BZ 1 (1957) 118-25

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 4

3. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 1:15 Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέκραγεν λέγων· οὗτος ἦν **ὃν εἶπον·** ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.

No txt in NA!

	ὁ εἰπών	01^C1, B*, C*, Or, <u>WH</u>
txt	**ὃν εἶπον**	P66, P75, 01^C2, A, B^C2, D*, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0153, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, 850, Maj, <u>WH^mg</u>
	ὃν ἔλεγον	C^C3
	ὃν εἶπον ὑμῖν	D^c, W^s, X
	εἶπον	0211
	omit	01* (adding ὅς after ἐρχόμενος)

ὃν εἶπον   "of whom I said"
ὁ εἰπών   "the one who said"

B: p. 1350 A 7: A very small N is written above the OЄ. An O is written above the unenhanced ⲱ with a bar (Nu ephelkustikon).

An interesting variant.
The B* reading is the more difficult reading, a parenthetical explanation about the Baptist, not the words of the Baptist about Christ.
On the other hand it is possible that the rather unusual ὃν εἶπον caused confusion (one would have expected ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον). This is supported by the fact that some witnesses added a ὑμῖν for clarity.
So argues also Metzger in his commentary: "The awkwardness of the reading ... as well as the absence of a previous mention of John's testimony, prompted more than one copyist to make adjustments in the text. ... Several other witnesses (01^C1, B*, C*, Or) [were] less successful in their adjustment of the text."
The idea that the extremely curious B* reading caused the confusion is not noted or considered by Metzger.

Zahn (Comm. Jo): "[the B reading] makes no sense".

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 5

4. Difficult variant
NA28 John 1:18 Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· μονογενὴς θεὸς
ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.

BYZ John 1:18 Θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακεν πώποτε· ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός,
ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο

T&T #2

D has a lacuna from verse 16b on down to 3:26!

Byz   A, C^C3, W^S, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, Ω, 063, 0141, f1, f13, 157, 397, 579, 700, 1071,
1424, Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, arm, geo, Tert, Hipp, Cl^pt, Chrys,
Bois, Tis, Bal

εἰ μὴ ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός	W
unicus filius solus	a (but Jülicher: "suus?")
μονογενὴς υἱός	111, 2479, 2528
ὁ μονογενὴς ὁ υἱός	2546
ὁ μονογενὴς γὰρ υἱός	1116

txt   P66, P75, 01*, B, C*, L, 33, 850, Sy-P, Sy-H^mg, bo, Ir^Lat, Or
add ὁ   P75, 01^C1, 33, 850, Cl^pt, Or
no ὁ   P66, 01*, B, C*, L

ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ	2192, q, sa
ὁ μονογενὴς	vg^mss2, Sy-Pal, Diatess^Ephrem
μονογενὴς θεοῦ	cj. (Burney)

Ephrem (McCarthy): "No one has ever seen God. The Only-Begotten One, who is from the bossom of the father …"
Preuschen has for the Arabic Diatessaron: "der eingeborene Gott" (=txt)

Eusebius knows both readings.
Details on the Patristic evidence can be found in Hort's "dissertation".
a: Hugh Houghton writes: "The line is quite obscured on our photographs, and "s--us" is legible. There is space for either 'solus' or 'suus'. Gasquet has 'solus' from his inspection of the manuscript, as does the edition of Irico."
Lacuna: D, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 John 1:14 Καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ ἐθεασάμεθα τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, δόξαν ὡς <u>μονογενοῦς παρὰ πατρός</u>, πλήρης χάριτος καὶ ἀληθείας.

NA28 John 3:16 οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε <u>τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ</u> ἔδωκεν, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

NA28 John 3:18 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα <u>τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>   "the approved son"   Sy-S (sic!)

NA28 1 John 4:9 ἐν τούτῳ ἐφανερώθη ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν ἡμῖν, ὅτι <u>τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ</u> ἀπέσταλκεν ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα ζήσωμεν δι' αὐτοῦ.

Note also:

NA28 John 1:34 κἀγὼ ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>
        <u>ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός</u>   Sy-Pal^{ms}

NA28 John 5:44 πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ <u>τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ</u> οὐ ζητεῖτε;
        <u>τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ</u> N, 1071 (not in NA and SQE!)

μονογενὴς θεὸς is a unique phrase, certainly the harder reading. It is more difficult to understand in context. υἱός conforms to Johannine usage and fits perfectly. It is possible that it originates from the Latin.
The words could easily be mixed up because they are both nomina sacra: ΘC or ΥC. This is what A. Wikgren argues in a minority vote. θεὸς appears 7 times before in the passage. But this cannot be the (full) explanation since besides the ΘC/ΥC variation also an article has been added to μονογενής.

The combination μονογενής with υἱός appears two more times in John (both are safe). υἱός also contrasts well with πατρὸς later in the verse.
It is interesting that the quite obvious conjecture by Charles F. Burney (μονογενὴς θεοῦ) never appeared as a correction in a manuscript.
Note that N and 1071 read μονογενοῦς θεοῦ in John 5:44. N has a lacuna here at 1:18, but 1071 reads υἱός.

Hort: "μονογενὴς by its own primary meaning directly suggested υἱός. The converse substitution is inexplicable by any ordinary motive likely to affect transcribers."

Ehrman argues in his "Orthodox Corruption" (1993, p. 78-82) that "the variant reading of the Alexandrian tradition, which substitutes 'God' for 'Son', represents an orthodox corruption of the text in which the complete deity of Christ is affirmed" (so also Boismard). Ehrman argues further that the main interest in creating the θεὸς variant was to create a "high Christology" against the adoptionists.

Note also the curious reading of Sy-S in 3:18 of which Burkitt comments (Evangelion Intro, p. 311): "not improbable that Sy-S has preserved the true reading of this passage". But Pete Williams notes (private communication): "This could be a case of inner-Syriac corruption: 'one and only' yHyd'; 'approved' 'bHyr': d and r are only distinguished by a dot (and this is not used consistently in the earliest writing, which leaves only a b and y to be confused (H = heth)."

Normally θεὸς is said to be an apposition to μονογενὴς: "an only-begotten one, God". B. Weiss writes that one should understand μονογενὴς θεὸς as "an only begotten one of godly character/nature" (ein eingeborener göttlichen Wesens). Some prefer to regard μονογενὴς as somewhat heightened in meaning in Jo and 1.Jo to only-begotten or begotten of the Only One, in view of the emphasis on γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ θεοῦ (Jo 1:13 al.); in this case it would be analogous to πρωτότοκος (Ro 8:29; Col 1:15 al.).
Metzger notes that some commentators punctuate as follows: μονογενὴς, θεὸς, ὁ ὢν εἰς κόλπον ...

It is also clear that the missing article was a problem. The Byzantine tradition added it unanimously. In the txt reading P75, 01[C1], 33 added it, too.

See:
- "Two dissertations" by F.J.A. Hort, Cambridge 1877, p. 1-72
- Theodor Zahn, Commentary on John, Excursus 3.
- Boismard RB 59 (1952) 23 -39
- "Joh 1:18 in Textual Variation ..." by P.R. McReynolds in "NT TC - Essays in Honour of B.M. Metzger, 1981, p. 105 ff. (good collection of the evidence)
- "John 1:18 ..." by D.A. Fennema NTS 31 (1985) 124-35

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 6

NA28 John 1:19 Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου, ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν **[πρὸς αὐτὸν]** οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ² ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας ³ ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτόν· σὺ τίς εἶ;

BYZ John 1:19 Καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ μαρτυρία τοῦ Ἰωάννου ὅτε ἀπέστειλαν _____ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων ἱερεῖς καὶ Λευίτας ἵνα ἐρωτήσωσιν αὐτὸν Σὺ τίς εἶ

<u>**omit:**</u> P66*, P75, 01, C^{C3}, L, W^{S}, 0141, f1, 565, 892*, Maj, Or, Gre, SBL

txt position 1:   B, C*, 33, 397, 892^{C}, 1071, al, it(a, aur, b, c), Sy-C, Sy-P, Co
  position 2:   1424
  position 3:   P66^{Cvid}, A, X, Θ, Π, Ψ, 2193^{C}, f13, 157, 579, al,
        Lat(e, f, ff², l, q, r¹, vg), Sy-H

In P66 there is an insertion mark (‹ or ./.) after Λευείτας above the line. The addition itself is not visible, but was probably in the left margin, which is broken off.
Lacuna: D, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

No parallel.
Compare:
NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω στήκοντες <u>ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν</u> καλοῦντες αὐτόν.

NA28 John 5:33 ὑμεῖς <u>ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην</u>, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ·
NA28 John 7:32 ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ ὄχλου γογγύζοντος περὶ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα, καὶ <u>ἀπέστειλαν</u> οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὑπηρέτας ἵνα πιάσωσιν αὐτόν.
NA28 John 11:3 <u>ἀπέστειλαν</u> οὖν αἱ ἀδελφαὶ <u>πρὸς αὐτὸν</u> λέγουσαι·

Addition at various places is generally an indication of a secondary addition. Why should it have been omitted? As John 7:32 indicates, ἀπέστειλαν is not always followed by πρὸς. There the text is safe.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 177) notes that the words have been omitted, because they so inconveniently separate the verb from the subject. This also explains the move to other positions.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
          = slight preference for omission
     (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 7

NA28 John 1:21 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν· <u>τί οὖν; σὺ Ἠλίας εἶ;</u> καὶ λέγει· οὐκ εἰμί. ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη· οὔ.

BYZ John 1:21 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν <u>Τί οὖν Ἠλίας εἶ σύ</u> καὶ λέγει Οὐκ εἰμί Ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ καὶ ἀπεκρίθη Οὔ

Byz   A, C^{C3}, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 397, 565, 579, 700, 1424, Maj,
      Lat, Sy-H, <u>**NA**</u>^{25}, <u>Gre</u>

txt   P66, P75, C*, Ψ, 33, pc, ff², l, Or
      <u>WH</u> have σὺ in brackets, and the marginal punctuation:
                                        τί οὖν σὺ; Ἠλίας

<u>τί οὖν   Ἠλίας εἶ</u>   01, L, 0141, 850, a, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u>σὺ οὖν τί Ἠλίας εἶ</u>   B, <u>Weiss</u>
<u>τί οὖν σὺ εἶ Ἠλίας</u>   W^S
<u>σὺ τίς εἶ Ἠλίας εἶ</u>   1071

Sy-C omits the words. It reads:
καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ὁ προφήτης εἶ σύ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη· οὔ.
C: IGNTP lists C for omitting συ (= 01, L reading). They do not note a correction.
Tischendorf, NA and Swanson give the evidence as above.
Lacuna: D, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

A question of punctuation and word-order. The meaning is basically the same for all. Impossible to judge internally.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 138) notes for the B reading: The συ has been omitted, because it seemed not to fit to the τι, or it has been connected with the Ἠλίας. The origin of the B reading is just inexplicable.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 8

NA28 John 1:24 Καὶ ___ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων.

BYZ John 1:24 Καὶ οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι ἦσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων

Byz 01^C2, A^C, C^C3, W^S, X, Δ, Θ, 0141, 0234, f1, f13, 33, 397, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
    Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^ms, arm, Weiss^earlier

txt P66, P75, 01*, A*, B, C*, L, T, Ψ, 086, 850, pc, Sy-C, Co, Or, Weiss^later

Weiss: In his John-Com. (1893) he opts for the Byzantine reading, but in his NT
edition (1905) he has the txt reading.
Lacuna: D, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 3:1 Ἦν δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων, Νικόδημος
NA28 John 7:48 μή τις ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπίστευσεν εἰς αὐτὸν
           ἢ ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων;
NA28 John 9:16 ἔλεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινές·
NA28 John 9:40 ἤκουσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ταῦτα οἱ μετ' αὐτοῦ ὄντες
NA28 John 18:3 ὁ οὖν Ἰούδας λαβὼν τὴν σπεῖραν καὶ ἐκ τῶν
ἀρχιερέων καὶ ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ὑπηρέτας

The question here is if those sent <u>are themselves</u> Pharisees or if they are only
<u>sent by</u> the Pharisees. The txt reading is more equivocal in this respect. It could
mean: "And they were sent by the Pharisees."
The Johannine usage is clear: ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων means "a Pharisee".
It is possible that the Byzantine reading is a correction to make this explicit:
"And those sent where Pharisees."
The versional evidence is not of much value here, because the translation
depends on the interpretation.
Weiss in his Jo Com. thinks that the οἱ has probably been omitted accidentally.
He notes the possibility that it could have been omitted because scribes
assumed a second legation, different from that mentioned in 1:19.

Carl Conrad commented on B-greek (08. Dec. 2003):
"EK TWN FARISAIWN as partitive subject of APESTALMENOI HSAN"
[The addition of οἱ] "means no more, I think, than that later scribes failed to
understand the partitive usage in the construction and so altered the text so
that it would suit their grammatical expectations."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 9

7. <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 1:26 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰωάννης λέγων· ἐγὼ βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι· μέσος ὑμῶν <u>**ἔστηκεν**</u> ὃν ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε,

<u>στήκει</u>   B, G, L, 083?, 0141, f1, pc, Or[pt], Heracleon[Or],
        <u>NA</u>[25], <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, A, C, T[vid], W[sup], X, Θ, Ψ, 0211, f13, 33, 397, Maj, Or[pt], <u>Trg[mg]</u>

<u>εἱστήκει</u>   ἱστήκει P75, 1071, pc
        ἑστήκει 01
        εἱστήκει 22, pc

083: Tischendorf and NA have it for στήκει, IGNTP for ἔστηκεν. The film (VMR) is quite bad at this position. στήκει appears to be more probable, though. There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Heracleon: Rome, ca. 170 CE!

Lacuna: D

B: no umlaut

ἔστηκεν   indicative perfect   active 3rd person singular
στήκει   indicative present   active 3rd person singular
εἱστήκει   indicative pluperfect active 3rd person singular

Compare context:

NA28 John 1:35 Τῇ ἐπαύριον πάλιν <u>εἱστήκει</u> ὁ Ἰωάννης καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 3:31 Καὶ ἔρχεται ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔξω <u>στήκοντες</u> ἀπέστειλαν πρὸς αὐτὸν καλοῦντες αὐτόν.

    <u>στήκοντες</u> B, C*, Δ, 28
    <u>στάντες</u>   01
    <u>ἑστῶτες</u>   A, D, W, Θ, 565, f13, 33, Maj
    <u>ἑστηκότες</u> C[c2], G, L, f1, 124, 700, 892, 2542, pc

NA28 Mark 11:25 Καὶ ὅταν <u>στήκετε</u> προσευχόμενοι, ἀφίετε εἴ τι ἔχετε κατά τινος, ἵνα καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀφῇ ὑμῖν τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.

<u>στήκετε</u>	A, B, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
<u>στῆτε</u>	01
<u>ἑστήκετε</u>	L, Δ, 892

John uses εἱστήκει 5 times, all safe. He uses ἕστηκεν one more time in Jo 8:44 also safe. He uses ἵστημι (or στήκω) 8 times in the perfect tense, 7 times in the pluperfect tense and 4 times in the aorist, but never in the present tense. Since those readings are all safe, it is difficult to understand why it caused such a variation here.

A present tense form appears only twice in the Gospels, both in Mark. In both cases there is a variation to the perfect tense. Is it thus possible that the unusual present form is original and has been changed to the more commonly used perfect tense.

It is possible that the variation is in part accidental. For example the reading of 01 ἑστήκει could be interpreted by changing one letter as εἱστήκει or ἕστηκεν. It is also possible that ἱστήκει (P75) has been accidentally changed into στήκει (B).

The incoherent support by f1 is strange.

Metzger: "The perfect tense, so frequently employed with theological overtones by the Fourth Evangelist, conveys a special force here (something like 'there is One who has taken his stand in your midst'), a force that was unappreciated by several Greek witnesses, as well as by a variety of Latin, Syriac and Coptic witnesses, all of which preferred the more syntactically appropriate present tense."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 10

NA28 John 1:27 _____ ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος,
_____ οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ [ἐγὼ] ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ
τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος.

BYZ John 1:27 <u>αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ</u> ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος
<u>ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν·</u> οὗ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ
τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος

T&T #3

<u>a)</u> αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ
Byz   A, C^{C3}, N, X, Δ, Ψ, f13, 397, 565, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H
        <u>οὗτός...</u>   G, Ψ, pc[20]

txt   P5^{vid}(3rd CE), P66, P75, P119^{vid}(3rd CE), P120(4th CE), 01^{C2}, C*, L, T, W^{S},
        Θ, 083, 0141, f1, 22, 33, 579, 1071, 1241, pc[19], a, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co

<u>omit:</u> 01*, B, pc[3], Or
        pc = 63, 372(!), 1026

Tregelles reads txt, but has ὁ in brackets.

P5: from space considerations almost certain. A possible reconstruction runs:
ΟΥΔΕ Ο ΠΡΟ[ΦΗΤΗΣ ΑΠΕΚΡΙΘΗ ΑΥΤΟΙΣ Ο
ΙΩΑΝΝ[ΗΣ ΛΕΓΩΝ ΕΓΩ ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩ ΕΝ Υ
ΔΑΤΙ Μ[ΕΣΟΣ ΥΜΩΝ ΕΣΤΗΚΕΝ ΟΝ ΥΜΕΙΣ
ΟΥΚ ΟΙΔΑ[ΤΕ <u>ο οπισω μου</u> ΕΡΧΟΜΕ
<u>Ν</u>]ΟΣ [<u>Ο</u>]Υ Ο[ΥΚ ΕΙΜΙ ΑΞΙΟΣ ΙΝΑ ΛΥΣΩ ΑΥ
ΤΟΥ ΤΟΝ [ΙΜΑΝΤΑ ΤΟΥ ΥΠΟΔΗΜΑΤΟΣ

P119 (POxy 4803): same as with P5, from space considerations almost certain:
ΕΓΩ ΜΕΝ ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩ ΥΜΑΣ Ε]Ν ΥΔΑΤΙ[ΜΕΣΟΣ ΔΕ
ΥΜΩΝ ΕΣΤΗΚΕΝ ΟΝ ΥΜΕΙΣ Ο]ΥΚ ΟΙΔΑΤ[Ε <u>ο οπισω</u>
<u>μου ερχομενος ου ουκ ει</u>]ΜΙ ΕΓΩ Α[ΞΙΟΣ ΙΝΑ ΛΥ
ΣΩ ΑΥΤΟΥ ΤΟΝ ΙΜΑΝΤΑ ΤΟ]Υ ΥΠΟ[ΔΗΜΑΤΟΣ ΤΑΥΤΑ

P120 (POxy 4804):
ΠΤΙΖΩ ΥΜΑΣ ΕΝ ΥΔΑΤΙ ΜΕ]ΣΟΣ ΥΜΩΝ Ι
ΣΤΗΚΕΝ ΟΝ ΥΜΕΙΣ ΟΥΚ ΟΙΔ]ΑΤΕ <u>Ο ΟΠΙΣΩ</u>
<u>μου ερχομενος ου ουκ ει</u>]ΜΙ ΑΞΙΟΣ ΙΝΑ

<u>N</u>: T&T and NA note N wrongly. Swanson reads it correctly. This has been confirmed by Klaus Witte from Muenster from the film:

N* = αὐτός ἐστιν μου ἐρχόμενος

N^c = αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος = Byz

T&T note N wrongly for the 01*, B reading. NA has N for txt!

0141: T&T have it for txt. IGNTP have it for the 01*, B reading.

Lacuna: D

B: no umlaut

b) ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν

Byz   A, C^{C3}, X, Δ, (Θ), f13, 565, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{mss}

    ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν   Θ

    ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν ὅτι πρῶτος μου ἦν   28

txt   P5(3rd CE), P66, P75, P119^{vid}(3rd CE), P120^{vid}(4th CE), 01, B, C*, L, N*, T,
    W^s, Ψ, 083, 0141, f1, 22, 33, 397, 579, 1071, 1241, al,
    b, l, Sy-S, Sy-C, Co, Or

ὃς   063

Lacuna: D

B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 3:11 Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι·

NA28 Luke 3:16 ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ·

Compare context:

NA28 John 1:15 Ἰωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέκραγεν λέγων· οὗτος ἦν ὃν εἶπον· ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος <u>ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν</u>, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.

NA28 John 1:30 <u>οὗτός ἐστιν</u> ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον· ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεται ἀνὴρ <u>ὃς ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν</u>, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context. There is no reason for an omission.
The omission of the ὁ by 01*, B is probably accidental (OOPISW).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 11

Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:27 ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ [ἐγὼ] ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος.

T&T #4

ἱκανὸς   P66, P75, 472, 850, al[56], Heracleon[Or]

omit ἐγὼ: P66*, P75, P120(4th CE), 01, C, L, 063, 346, 826, 983, 33,
                565, 1071, al[145], aur*, q, Or[citing Heracleon], SBL
οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ   P66[C], P119[vid](3rd CE), B, N, T[vid], W[S], X, Ψ, 083, 0141, 118, 205,
                209, f13, 579, 1010, 2786, pc[25], Or
ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ   A, Δ, Θ, f1, 124, 157, 892, 1241, Maj

T reads: οὗ ο[ὐκ εἰμὶ ἐ]
                γὼ ἄξιος ἵνα

Heracleon: Rome, ca. 170 CE!

P5: is cited for omitting εγω in NA[25] and IGNTP. But the word is within a large
    lacuna and space considerations are ambiguous.
P119: The line in question reads in the ed. pr.:
    ΜΟΥ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟC ΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΙ] ṂỊ ΕΓω Α̣[ΞΙΟC ΙΝΑ ΛΥ
    On the published image nothing can be seen of the Α, since some fibres
    obscure it at the broken edge. The editor writes: "The Alpha in the
    papyrus is damaged, but the remains of a curve rule out Iota."
P120: The line in question reads in the ed. pr.:
    ΜΟΥ ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟC ΟΥ ΟΥΚ ΕΙ]ṂỊ ΑΞ̣ΙΟC ΙΝΑ̣
    From the image this is certain.
N: According to IGNTP 022 omits ἐγὼ. According to NA and Swanson it has the
    word. There is a correction involved though (acc. to Swanson). Should be
    checked.
Lacuna: D
B: no umlaut

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 3:11 Ἐγὼ μὲν ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω ἐν ὕδατι εἰς μετάνοιαν, ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ <u>ἱκανὸς</u> τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι·

NA28 Mark 1:7 Καὶ ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων· ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου ὀπίσω μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ <u>ἱκανὸς</u> κύψας λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ.

NA28 Luke 3:16 ἐγὼ μὲν ὕδατι βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς· ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ <u>ἱκανὸς</u> λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ·

Compare:
NA28 Acts 13:25 ... ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμὲ οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ <u>ἄξιος</u> τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν λῦσαι.   <u>ἱκανὸς</u> Ψ, pc[7]

Rare harmonization error of P66, P75 to Mt, Lk.
Note the same variation at Acts 13:25 (observed by Royse, Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 537)!

The omission of the ἐγὼ is probably at least in part due to harmonization, too.

For Heracleon compare B. Ehrman:
- "Heracleon and the 'Western' Textual Tradition," New Testament Studies, vol. 40 (1994) 161-179.
- "Heracleon, Origen, and the Text of the Fourth Gospel," Vigiliae Christianae, vol. 47 (1993) 105-18.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 12

Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:27 ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ [ἐγὼ] ἄξιος ἵνα λύσω αὐτοῦ τὸν ἱμάντα τοῦ ὑποδήματος __.

T&T #5

 ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·
E, F, G, H, 2*, al¹⁴⁰
 αὐτὸς   ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·
N, pc⁴

Lacuna: D
B: umlaut! (1350 B 18 R)
27 ... τοῦ ὑποδή<u>ματος.</u> 28 <u>ταῦτα ἐν Bηθ</u>ανίᾳ
It is not clear if this umlaut indicates this variant or the next one (Bηθανίᾳ).

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 3:11 ὁ δὲ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἰσχυρότερός μού ἐστιν, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς τὰ ὑποδήματα βαστάσαι· <u>αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·</u>

NA28 Mark 1:8 ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς ὕδατι, <u>αὐτὸς δὲ βαπτίσει ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.</u>   add <u>καὶ πυρί·</u>   P, 1241, pc, Sy-H**, sa^mss

NA28 Luke 3:16 ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου, οὗ οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς λῦσαι τὸν ἱμάντα τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ· <u>αὐτὸς ὑμᾶς βαπτίσει ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί·</u>

Compare also verse 33:
NA28 John 1:33 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βαπτίζων <u>ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.</u>
           add <u>καὶ πυρί·</u>   P75^Cvid, C*, sa

Probably a harmonization to Mt/Lk.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 13

Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:28 ταῦτα ἐν <u>Βηθανίᾳ</u> ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων.

<u>Βηθανίᾳ</u>   P66, P75, 01*, A, B, C*, L, N, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ*, Wˢ, 047, 0211, 2*,
22ᵐᵍ, 28, 118, 124, 157, 397, 565, 579, 700, 892*, 1071, 1241,
1424, 2193ᵐᵍ, Maj-part[E, F, G, H, M, S, V, Y, Δ, Ω, Robinson],
Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Palᵐˢˢ, bo, Orᵗˣᵗ, Eus, Heracleonᴼʳ
ἐγένετο ἐν <u>Βηθανίᾳ</u>   P66, 01*, Hᶜ

<u>Βηθαβαρᾶ</u>   Cᶜ², K, Π, T, Ψᶜ, 083, 0141, f1, f13, 2ᶜ, 22ᵗˣᵗ, 33, 850, 2193ᵗˣᵗ,
Maj-part[U, Γ, Λ],
Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Palᵐˢ, sa, arm, geo, Orᵉᵐᵉⁿᵈ·, Eusᴼⁿᵒᵐ,
Madaba-map, KJV

ἐγένετο ἐν <u>Βηθαραβᾶ</u>   01ᶜ², 892ᵐᵍ, pc, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, saᵐˢ

Lacuna: D
T: NA has T correctly for Βηθαβαρᾶ, Amelineau (ed.pr.) has it wrongly for Βηθανίᾳ. U. Schmid (IGNTP John) confirms the reading ΒΗΘΑΒΑ𝈁[Α].

B: umlaut! (1350 B 18 R)
27 ... τοῦ ὑποδή<u>ματος.</u> 28 <u>ταῦτα ἐν Βηθ</u>ανίᾳ
It is not clear if this umlaut indicates this variant or the previous one (insertion after ὑποδήματος).

Βηθαβαρᾶ appears on the Madaba mosaic map (ca. 560 CE), which is located on the floor of the Greek Orthodox church in Madaba near Amman. It mentions the St. John monastery τὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ βαπτίσματος and above it (next to the Western bank of the Jordan) in smaller letters: Βηθαβαρᾶ.
It is noteworthy that the excellent manuscripts 029 and 083 support Βηθαβαρᾶ.

Eusebius writes in his Onomastikon (58:18):
Βηθααβαρά (sic!): "ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων", "πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου". Καὶ δείκνυται ὁ τόπος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ πλείους τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἰς ἔτι νῦν τὸ λουτρὸν φιλοτιμοῦνται λαμβάνειν. (possibly the double α represents the semitic ʿayin, ע.)

Jerome repeats this with the following words:
"Bethabara trans Iordanem, ubi Ioannis in paenitentiam baptizabat, unde et usque hodie plurimi de fratribus, hoc est de numero credentium, ibi renasci cupientes vitali gurgite baptizantur." (De situ et nominibus), but Jerome leaves Βηθανίᾳ in his Vulgate.

Chrysostom notes that Βηθαβαρᾶ is found in "the more accurate of the copies" (in Ioann Hom XVIII, 1).

Compare:
LXX Judges 7:24 καὶ ἀγγέλους ἀπέστειλεν Γεδεων ἐν παντὶ ὄρει Εφραιμ λέγων κατάβητε εἰς συνάντησιν Μαδιαμ καὶ καταλάβετε ἑαυτοῖς τὸ ὕδωρ ἕως Βαιθηρα καὶ τὸν Ιορδάνην καὶ ἐβόησεν πᾶς ἀνὴρ Εφραιμ καὶ προκατελάβοντο τὸ ὕδωρ ἕως Βαιθηρα καὶ τὸν Ιορδάνην

LXX Joshua 13:27 καὶ ἐν Εμεκ Βαιθαραμ καὶ Βαιθαναβρα καὶ Σοκχωθα καὶ Σαφαν καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν βασιλείαν Σηων βασιλέως Εσεβων καὶ ὁ Ιορδάνης ὁριεῖ ἕως μέρους τῆς θαλάσσης Χενερεθ πέραν τοῦ Ιορδάνου ἀπ' ἀνατολῶν
LXX Joshua 15:6 ἐπιβαίνει τὰ ὅρια ἐπὶ Βαιθαγλα καὶ παραπορεύεται ἀπὸ βορρᾶ ἐπὶ Βαιθαραβα καὶ προσαναβαίνει τὰ ὅρια ἐπὶ λίθον Βαιων υἱοῦ Ρουβην
LXX Joshua (A) 15:61 Βαδδαργις καὶ Βηθαραβα καὶ Μαδων καὶ Σοχοχα
LXX Joshua 18:18 καὶ διελεύσεται κατὰ νώτου Βαιθαραβα ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ καταβήσεται
LXX Joshua 18:22 καὶ Βαιθαβαρα καὶ Σαρα καὶ Βησανα
LXX Joshua 19:11 Γωλα ὅρια αὐτῶν ἡ θάλασσα καὶ Μαραγελλα καὶ συνάψει ἐπὶ Βαιθαραβα εἰς τὴν φάραγγα ἥ ἐστιν κατὰ πρόσωπον Ιεκμαν

Compare also:
NA28 John 3:23 Ἦν δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ, ὅτι ὕδατα πολλὰ ἦν ἐκεῖ, καὶ παρεγίνοντο καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο·

NA28 John 10:40 Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ.

Origen (Jo Comm. book 6), who was under the probably mistaken notion that the only Bethany was that near Jerusalem (he couldn't find a Bethany near the Jordan in his travels), opted for Βηθαβαρᾶ which he apparently found in some copies (Βηθανίᾳ is found in "nearly all the manuscripts"). He explained it (wrongly) allegorically as οἶκος κατασκευῆς ("house of the preparation"), but it actually means "house of passing over". It has been suggested that Origen actually created this reading, but this is not clear. Note that Origen once writes the curious τὰ Βηθαβαρᾶ. He writes:

> "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." We are aware of the reading which is found <u>in almost all the copies</u>, "These things were done in Bethany." This appears, moreover, to have been the reading at an earlier time; and in Heracleon we read "Bethany." We are convinced, however, that we should not read "Bethany," but "Bethabara." We have visited the places to enquire as to the footsteps of Jesus and His disciples, and of the prophets. Now, Bethany, as the same evangelist tells us, was the town of Lazarus, and of Martha and Mary; it is fifteen stadia from Jerusalem, anti the river Jordan is about a hundred and eighty stadia distant from it. Nor is there any other place of the same name in the neighborhood of the Jordan, <u>but they say</u> that Bethabara (τὰ Βηθαβαρᾶ) is pointed out on the banks of the Jordan, and that John is said to have baptized there.
> The etymology of the name, too, corresponds with the baptism of him who made ready for the Lord a people prepared for Him; for it yields the meaning "House of preparation," (οἶκος κατασκευῆς) while Bethany means "House of obedience" (οἶκος ὑπακοῆς). Where else was it fitting that he should baptize, who was sent as a messenger before the face of the Christ, to pre pare His way before Him, but at the House of preparation (κατασκευάσαι)? And what more fitting home for Mary, who chose the good part, which was not taken away from her, and for Martha, who was cumbered for the reception of Jesus, and for their brother, who is called the friend of the Saviour, than Bethany, the House of obedience? Thus we see that he who aims at a complete understanding of the Holy Scriptures must not neglect the careful examination of the proper names in it. In the matter of proper names the Greek copies are often incorrect, and in the Gospels one might be misled by their authority."

It is interesting though that nowhere in the early sources and also not in any of the pilgrims reports a Bethany "beyond the Jordan" is mentioned. On the other hand there is no reason to consider Bethany simply a corruption. It is explicitly labeled as the Bethany "beyond the Jordan", to distinguish it from the Bethany near Jerusalem. John is quite exact regarding John the Baptist's places, compare Jo 3:23 and 10:40.

External arguments: More, more better and more diverse manuscripts support Bethany, Bethabara also has some good and diverse support, but not as much as Bethany.
Internal arguments: Bethany is clearly the harder reading and was a stumbling block, not only for Origen, but also for other church fathers.

If Βηθαβαρᾶ was original, there would have been no reason for a change. It is not clear if Origen made this reading up, it is possible. The "but they say" seems to point to a local tradition, which Origen ascertains.

It should be noted that Origen based his solution to the Bethany problem on hearsay only. It should also be noted that the Βηθαβαρᾶ on the Madaba map is west of the Jordan.

It is also interesting to note that Livias, the place of Herod Antipas' summer residence, which is across the Jordan, has originally been called Βηθαραμαθά (Josephus, Bell II 59, Ant XVII 277, XVIII 27).

Weiss (Lk Com.) suggests Judges 7:24 (Βαιθηρα) as a possible reference, but marks it with a question-mark. Note that in the manuscripts of Origen's commentary the spelling varies and Βηθαρᾷ and Βαθαρᾷ are also found.

Burkitt thinks that because both Sy-S and Origen have Βηθαβαρᾶ, this indicates a common source: "This source seems to have been not documentary evidence, but local identification. [...] We cannot doubt that the author of the Fourth Gospel wrote 'Bethany beyond Jordan.' On the other hand we have the cult of 'Bethabara', developed before the time of Origen, perhaps at a pre-Christian holy place. The cult led to the identification of 'Bethany' with 'Bethabara' and finally it influenced some texts of the Gospels." (Evangelion Intro, p. 308-9).

Pierson Parker suggests that πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου does not refer to Βηθανίᾳ, but to ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων and gives the translation: "These things took place in Bethany, which is across from the point of the Jordan where John had been baptizing." (This has already been suggested by E.G. Paulus in 1828!) It is quite unlikely that John would have described Bethany this way though.

R. Riesner suggests that the place "beyt ᵃbarah" originally indicated the crossing of the Jordan by the Israelites and also the crossing of the Jordan by Eliah and Elisha, so two crossings have been remembered here. This could explain Origen's plural τὰ Βηθαβαρα, a place of several fords.
Rainer Riesner argues for Βηθανίᾳ = Βατανέα, Βαταναία (the region Batanaea). This identification is as early as J. Lightfoot (1658). There are two places that are relevant. One, called Βηθαβαρᾶ, is the place of Jesus' baptism, which is at the traditional place. The other is the place where John is questioned by the Pharisees in Jo 1:19-28. This is the Batanaea in the north. Here John worked, too. The problem arose (according to Riesner) due to the misunderstanding that in the following verses Jesus' baptism is reported. This is not the case, John only gives an account of what happened at an unknown time earlier. The time table and circumstances in Jo 1 fit much better if everything

happens in the north (compare Riesner, Bethanien, p. 73ff.). It also fits good to the time table of Jo 11 (p. 71 ff.).

Furthermore the region of Batanaea is known in Arabic as *el-Betheneyeh*, which comes nearest to the Evangelist's Bethania (compare Brownlee).

Against this view is the fact that representatives of the Pharisees and others from Jerusalem came to investigate John's baptizing, apparently in great numbers. Although it would have been possible for them to find John in Batanaea in the north, a location closer to Jerusalem seems more likely.

S.G. Brown notes that the most common position today is Wadi Kharrar/Gharrar (Tell el-Kharrar), "a site in Jordan across from Jericho, where four springs merge into a stream that flows into the Jordan river." [...] "a site opposite (and just over 1 km south of) Jericho, 7.3 km north of the Dead Sea and 1.5 km east of the river. It is between the two fords across from Jericho, a little closer to the Makhadat Hajla ford. The ongoing excavation of the site has 'uncovered a 1st CE settlement with plastered pools and water systems that were used almost certainly for baptism, and a 5th-6th CE late Byzantine settlement with churches, a monastery, and other structures probably catering to religious pilgrims.' This site has been the traditional location of Jesus' baptism since at least the early 4th CE (the pilgrim of Bordeaux, 333 CE)."

Starting 1997, excavations took place for several years in the region of the Jordan north of the Dead Sea. The Jordanian team has identified nearly 20 related sites within an area stretching some four kilometers east of the Jordan River, mostly along the south bank of Wadi el-Kharrar, including the above mentioned 1st CE settlement. More sites remain to be discovered through systematic surveying. The excavators believe that the village of Bethany beyond the Jordan was located at or around the natural hill at Tell el-Kharrar. The main complex, still being excavated and investigated, comprises structures on and around a small natural hill located two kilometers east of the Jordan River, adjacent to the spring and small oasis at the head of the Wadi Kharrar. The recent excavations have identified a settlement that was inhabited from the time of Christ and John the Baptist (early Roman era), throughout most of the Byzantine period, into the early Islamic era, and again in Ottoman centuries.

"Bethany/Bethabara may also have referred to a region, rather than only a specific settlement. Western travelers to the region at the turn of the century reported that the Greek Orthodox clerics and monks who lived in the south Jordan Valley, and the native valley residents themselves, referred to the whole area around the river and east along the Wadi el-Kharrar as Bethabara. Thus the original settlement was known as Bethany beyond the Jordan during and immediately following the days of Jesus and John the Baptist in the 1st Century AD; after the 3rd Century AD it was more commonly known as Bethabara, and by the 6th Century AD it had become known as Aenon and Safsafa. The general area from the river eastwards associated with the

ministry of John the Baptist and the baptism of Jesus is known as el-Maghtas today in Arabic." (Jordanian Department of Antiquities)

In the end there are several good arguments, but none is so far completely convincing. A settlement and baptism site has been found beyond the Jordan, and it makes perfectly good sense that this was the main area where John was baptizing, but we don't know (from external sources) if this site was named "Bethany".

Wherever Bethany was located, both external arguments and internal arguments favor the reading Bethany at Jo 1:28.

Compare also Jo 5:2, where a similar confusion occurred over a place name.

Literature:
- Pierson Parker "Bethany beyond Jordan" JBL 74 (1955) 257-61
- W. Wiefel "Bethabara jenseits des Jordan (Jo 1:28)" ZDPV 83 (1967) 72-81 [who also notes the spelling differences for Bethabara.]
- W.H. Brownlee "Whence the gospel according to John?" in John and Qumran (ed. J.H. Charlesworth, London 1972), p. 166-94
- J. Carl Laney "The Identification of Bethany Beyond the Jordan", from "Selective Geographical Problems in the Life of Christ", doctoral dissertation (Dallas Theological Seminary, 1977)
- R. Riesner "Bethany beyond the Jordan (John 1:28): Topography, theology and History in the fourth Gospel" Tyndale Bulletin 38 (1987) 34-43
- B. Byron "Bethany across the Jordan or simply Across the Jordan" Australian Biblical Review 46 (1998) 36-54
- book: R. Riesner "Bethanien jenseits des Jordan" Brunnen, Giessen, 2002
- S.G. Brown "Bethany beyond the Jordan: John 1:28 and the Longer Gospel of Mark" RB 110 (2003) 497-516 [analyzes the references in Secret Mark].
- J.M. Hutton "Bethany beyond the Jordan in Text, Tradition, and Historical Geography" Biblica 89 (2008) 305-328 [accepts Bethany as original reading, but dismisses both Bethany and Bethabara as historical on redaction-critical grounds]
- D.S. Earl "(Bethany) beyond the Jordan: The Significance of a Johannine Motif" NTS 55 (2009) 279-294 [argues for Batanaea, like Riesner]
- link: http://www.bibleplaces.com/bethanybeyondjordan.htm
- link: http://www.asor.org/outreach/Features/bethany.htm

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 14

Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:28 ταῦτα ἐν Βηθανίᾳ ἐγένετο πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰωάννης <u>βαπτίζων.</u>

Not in NA but in SQE!

<u> πρῶτον βαπτίζων</u>	f13[a, c], 1071
<u>τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων</u>	1241
<u> βαπτίζων τὸ πρῶτον</u>	C

f13[b] omits πρῶτον.
Lacuna: D
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 10:40 Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης <u>τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων</u> καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ.

Probably a harmonization to 10:40.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 15

8. <u>Difficult variant</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:34
κἀγὼ ἑώρακα καὶ μεμαρτύρηκα ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>

T&T #7

<u>ὁ ἐκλεκτός τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>   P106^{vid}(3rd CE), 01*, 187, 218, 228, 1784,
   <u>electus Dei</u>   b*, e, 11A, ff²*, Sy-S, Sy-C,
                         Ambrose(4th CE), Aug, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Blass</u>, <u>SBL</u>
                         01* is corrected by 01^{C2}

   <u>electus filius Dei</u>   a, 35*, 48, vg^{mss}, Sy-Pal^{mss}, sa

P75: a correction appears here, see below.
Tischendorf adds: 77, 218 (repeated by Harnack, Ehrman and also Fee "01 in John")
Lat(aur, b^c, c, f, ff^{2C}, l, q, r¹, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: D
B: no umlaut

<u>D:</u> Since 01 is Western (and very close to D) in the beginning of Jo and D has a lacuna here, it is quite probable that D had this reading, too.
<u>P5</u> has been claimed to have this reading. but only ...]Ϲ ΤΟΥ Θ͞Υ is visible. Space considerations clearly prefer υἱός. ἐκλεκτός appears too long. NA now also considers P5 to be "too doubtful" to be listed. B. Aland: "Die Angabe P5^{vid} aus früheren Auflagen des Novum Testamentum Graece muss als eine zu unsichere Lesung gestrichen werden" ("has to be canceled as too insecure", reference see below). Reconstruction:

```
†ΑϹΜΕΒΑΠΤΙΖΕΙΝΕΝΥΔΑΤΙΕΚΕΙ
ΝΟϹΜΟΙΕΙΠΕΝΕΦΟΝΑΝΙΔΗϹΤΟΠ͞ΝΑ
ΚΑΤΑΒΑΙΝΟΝΚΑΙΜΕΝΟΝΕΠΑΥΤΟΝ
ΟΥΤΟϹΕϹΤΙΝΟΒΑΠΤΙΖΩΝΕΝΠ͞ΝΙΑ
ΓΙΩΚΑΓΩΕΩΡΑΚΑΚΑΙΜΕΜΑΡΤΥΡΗΚΑΟ
ΤΙΟΥΤΟϹΕϹΤΙΝΟΥ͞ϹΤΟΥΘ͞Υ   ΤΗΕ
ΤΙΟΥΤΟϹΕϹΤΙΝΟΥΙΟϹΤΟΥΘ͞Υ   ΤΗΕ
ΤΙΟΥΤΟϹΕϹΤΙΝΟΕΚΛΕΚΤΟϹΤΟΥΘ͞Υ   ΤΗΕ
ΠΑΥΡΙΟΝΕΙϹΤΗΚΕΙΟΙΩΑΝΝΗϹΚΑΙΕΚ
ΤΩΝΜΑΘΗΤΩΝΑΥΤΟΥΔΥΟΚΑΙΕΜ
```

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>click here</u>.

[P106](#) (POxy 4445) has more value. The editor W.E.H. Cockle reconstructs:

ϵανιⲇⲏⲥⲧⲟⲡⲛⲁ̄ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲃⲁ[ⲓⲛⲟⲛ]
[ⲕ]ⲁⲓⲙⲉⲛⲟⲛⲉⲡⲁⲩ̣ ⲧⲟⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲥ[ⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛ]
[ⲟ]ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓⲍⲱⲛ[ⲉ]ⲛ ⲡⲛ̄ⲧ̄ ⲁⲅⲓⲱ[ⲕⲁⲅⲱ]
ϵⲟ̣ⲣ ⲁ ⲕ ⲁⲕⲁⲓ[ⲙⲉ]ⲙⲁⲣ ⲧⲩⲣⲏ[ⲕⲁⲟⲧⲓ]
ⲟⲩ̣ ⲧⲟⲥⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛⲟ̣[ⲉ]ⲕ̣ⲗⲉⲕ̣[ⲧⲟⲥⲧⲟⲩⲑⲩ̄]
ⲧ̣ⲏⲉⲡⲁⲩ̣ ⲣ ⲓ[ⲟⲛ]

The (online) image is not very good. Nevertheless one can say that the above reconstruction is probably correct, but rather optimistic. Whenever there are the slightest remains of ink, they are given as letters (with a dot). Judging from the image alone, only the following can be made out:

.ⲁⲛⲓⲇⲏⲥⲧⲟⲡⲛ̣ⲁ̄ ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲃⲁ̣[ⲓⲛⲟⲛ]
[ⲕ]ⲁⲓⲙⲉⲛ̣ . . . . ⲩ̣ ⲧⲟⲛⲟⲩⲧⲟⲥ̣[ⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛ]
[ⲟ]ⲃⲁⲡⲧⲓ . . [ⲉ]ⲛ̣ ⲡⲛ̄ⲧ̄ ⲁⲅⲓⲱ[ⲕⲁⲅⲱ]
.ⲟⲣ ⲁ ⲕ ⲁ . . . [ⲙⲉ]ⲙⲁⲣ ⲧⲩⲣ̣ . [ⲕⲁⲟⲧⲓ]
. . ⲧⲟⲥⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛ̣ . [ⲉ] . .ⲉ̣ . [ⲧⲟⲥⲧⲟⲩⲑⲩ̄]
ⲧ̣ . ⲉⲡⲁⲩ̣ ⲣ ⲓ[ⲟⲛ]

Of ἐκλεκτός in the second last line only an ϵ can be seen. It is pretty clearly visible, but I have placed a dot under it, because it could be a θ also (of Θ̄Ῡ). But it looks more like an ϵ. Compare with the θ 10 lines above. With a θ, theoretically the line could also be reconstructed as:

. . ⲧⲟⲥⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛⲟⲩ̄ⲥ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲑⲩ̄

But, clearly, this line is too short, and ⲩ̄ⲥ̄ⲧⲟⲩ is slightly too long to fit the space. So, the reconstruction with ἐκλεκτός fits best. It is not completely sure though. It could be possible that the line ended short, because a new pericope begins. B. Aland accepts the ἐκλεκτός reading.

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

[P75:](#) An unidentifiable correction appears here. The reading was first noted in the online "NT transcripts" from Münster (Nov. 2008). They note that P75* had ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἐκλεκτός for ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Timo Flink mentions it in his article (see below). This is very doubtful though. After discussion, Klaus Wachtel confirmed that it is too unsecure and that they will simply indicate the number of letters [4-5] for P75*.

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

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 3:17 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν ᾧ εὐδόκησα.
NA28 Mark 1:11 σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.

NA28 Luke 3:22 <u>σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.</u>
<u>ὁ υἱός μου εἶ σὺ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε</u>
D, it, Justin, (Cl), Meth, Hil, Aug

NA28 Luke 9:35 οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος</u>, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε.
BYZ Luke 9:35 Οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητὸς</u>, αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε
Byz A, C, D, R, W, Ψ, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj,
it, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, Marcion^{T, E}
txt   P45, P75, 01, B, L, Θ, Ξ, f1, 579, 892, 1241, pc,
some Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, Co
<u>ὁ ἐκλεκτός</u> Θ, f1, 22*, pc

NA28 Luke 23:35 Καὶ εἱστήκει ὁ λαὸς θεωρῶν. ἐξεμυκτήριζον δὲ καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες λέγοντες· ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός.</u>
omit ὁ ἐκλεκτός: 047, e

The support is rather diverse, but limited. The reading is certainly the more difficult reading. It is possible that it has been changed to standard Johannine usage to avoid adoptionistic thoughts. Blass and Boismard have ὁ ἐκλεκτός in their texts! Barrett, Boismard, R. Brown, Fee, Harnack, Lagrange, Nestle, D. Wallace and Zahn argue in favor of it. The NET Bible and TNIV have the variant in their English translations.
ὁ ἐκλεκτός appears nowhere else in the NT, except in Lk 9:35 and 23:35.

Overall it is difficult to imagine that someone changed ὁ υἱὸς into ὁ ἐκλεκτός. Why? In an adoptionistic climate? The only reason could be that it is a conformation to Lk 23:35. Especially if Jo was copied after Lk.

It is interesting to note that the Latin e omits omit ὁ ἐκλεκτός in Lk 23:35.

Harnack thinks that the reading ὁ υἱὸς arose as a harmonization to the Synoptics:
NA28 Matthew 3:17 οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ὁ υἱός μου</u> ὁ ἀγαπητός,
NA28 Mark 1:11 σὺ εἶ <u>ὁ υἱός μου</u> ὁ ἀγαπητός
NA28 Luke 3:22 σὺ εἶ <u>ὁ υἱός μου</u> ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα.
Later in anti-adoptionistic struggles it became widely accepted.

The expression ὁ ἐκλεκτός for Christ is very rare in the earliest literature. It can be found with Clement I, 64: ὁ ἐκλεξάμενος τόν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν καὶ ἡμᾶς δι᾽ αὐτοῦ·

Also with Hermas, Sim. V, 2,2: ἐκλεξάμενος δοῦλόν τινα πιστὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον, ἔντιμον προσεκαλέσατο αὐτὸν …

Another suggestion is that John is alluding to Isaiah:
LXX Isaiah 42:1 Ιακωβ ὁ παῖς μου ἀντιλήμψομαι αὐτοῦ <u>Ισραηλ ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου</u> προσεδέξατο αὐτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου ἔδωκα τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν κρίσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐξοίσει

"Jacob is my servant, I will help him: Israel is my chosen, my soul has accepted him; I have put my Spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgement to the Gentiles."
This parallels quite closely the Spirit descending on Jesus.

It is interesting that the T&T analyses found four Byzantine minuscules (187[91%], 218[92%], 228[87%], 1784[87%]), which read ὁ ἐκλεκτός, too. 187 and 218 form a group, they agree 91%.
187 is a 12th CE manuscript in Florence, 218 is a 13th CE manuscript in Vienna, Gregory notes: "unusual readings, probably written in Italy".
Perhaps some Byzantine scribes, through a subconscious slip, changed the word.
The combination of (P106, 01) and (187, 218, 228, 1784) is incoherent support.

Compare:
- B. Aland "Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium", in: Recent Developments in Textual Criticism. hrsg. von W. Weren und D.-A. Koch, Assen 2003, 19-38.
- Timo Flink "Son and Chosen. A text-critical study of John 1:34." Filologia Neotestamentaria 18 (2005) 87-111. He actually argues for ὁ υἱὸς ὁ ἐκλεκτός without τοῦ θεοῦ as the original reading.
- T.-M. Quek "A text-critical study of Jo 1:34" NTS 55 (2009) 22-34

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 16

Minority reading:

NA28 John 1:35 Τῇ ἐπαύριον πάλιν εἱστήκει <u>ὁ</u> Ἰωάννης καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>omit</u>   P75, B, L, 28, pc, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>
txt   P66, 01, A, C, P, W^s, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, 850, Maj
Lacuna: D

NA28 John 3:23 Ἦν δὲ καὶ <u>ὁ</u> Ἰωάννης βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ
<u>omit</u>   P75, 01, A, L, Ψ, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 28, 33, 397, 579, Maj,
        <u>**NA**</u>^{**25**}, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>
txt   P66, B, N, W^s, Θ, pc, [<u>WH</u>]
D, 070 have lacunae.

NA28 John 3:24 οὔπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακὴν <u>ὁ</u> Ἰωάννης.

<u>omit</u>   01*, B, 070, pc, <u>**NA**</u>^{**25**}, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>
txt   P66, P75, 01^{C2}, A, L, W^{sup}, Θ, Ψ, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, Maj, [<u>Trg</u>]
Lacuna: D, X
(the best witnesses are labeled)
B: no umlaut

There is no clear preference in the usage with or without the article in John.
P75, B are known to omit articles and pronouns at times.
The support is divided in all three cases. The strong support for the omission of the article in 3:23 is noteworthy, especially the support from the Byzantine text.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 17

Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:36 καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει· ἴδε <u>¹</u> ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ <u>²</u>

<u>¹</u> ὁ Χριστὸς   G, Λ, f13ᵇ, pc, Sy-C, sa, arm, Epiph (not in NA, but in SQE!)

T&T #8

<u>² ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου</u>
P66*, C*, Wˢ, 892*, 1241, 1819, 2129, al³¹, a, aur, ff², **11A, Codex Fuldensis**
        Wˢ has <u>τὰς ἁμαρτίας</u>

Sy-S is "illegible" acc. to Burkitt.
Lacuna: D
B: no umlaut

Compare immediate context:
NA28 John 1:29 Τῇ ἐπαύριον βλέπει τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει· ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ <u>ὁ αἴρων τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.</u>

A clear conformation to immediate context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 18

10. <u>Difficult variant</u>

NA28 John 1:37 καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u> λαλοῦντος καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

BYZ John 1:37 καὶ ἤκουσαν <u>αὐτοῦ</u> οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ λαλοῦντος καὶ ἠκολούθησαν τῷ Ἰησοῦ

T&T #9

<u>αὐτοῦ</u> οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ	A, C^{C3}, N, P, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, <u>Trg</u>
οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u>	P55(6th CE), 01, B, 397, 1071, 2718, pc^{21}, b, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA^{25}</u>**
οἱ δύο <u>αὐτοῦ</u> μαθηταὶ	P66, P75, C*, L, W^s, X, Ψ, 083, 0141, 33, 213, 579, 597, 821, 850, 865, pc^4, <u>WH^{mg}</u>, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>
<u>αὐτοῦ</u> οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u>	28, pc^{17}
<u>αὐτῷ</u> οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ <u>αὐτ</u>	69 (sic!)
οἱ δύο μαθηται	P5^{vid}, 157, pc^5
οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ λαλοῦντος <u>αὐτοῦ</u>	892, 1344

P5(3rd CE): NA does not list P5. The reading is in part within a lacuna, but space considerations make it quite probable that it omits αὐτοῦ. So also IGNTP and Comfort in his book. Reconstruction:

```
ΠΑΥΡΙΟΝΕΙCΤΗΚΕΙΟΙWΑΝΝ] ΗCΚΑΙΕΚ
ΤWΝΜΑΘΗΤWΝΑΥΤΟΥΔ] ΥΟΚΑΙΕΜ
ΒΛΕΨΑCΤWΙΗΥΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΟ] ΥΝΤΙΛΕΓΕΙ
ΙΔΕΟΑΜΝΟCΤΟΥΘΥΚΑΙΗΚΟ] ΥCΑΝΟΙΔΥΟ
ΜΑΘΗΤΑΙΛΑΛΟΥΝΤΟCΚΑΙΗ] ΚΟΛΟΥΘΗ
CΑΝΤWΙΗΥCΤΡΑΦΕΙCΑ] ΕΘΕΑCΑΙΚΑΙΘΕ
```

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>**click here**</u>.

P55(6th CE): only the του of αὐτοῦ is visible, but this is enough to make the reading basically certain.

```
ΗΚΟΥCΑΝΟ[ΙΔΥΟΜΑΘΗΤΑΙΑΥ
ΤΟΥΛΑΛΟΥΝ[ΤΟCΚΑΙΗΚΟΛΟΥ
```

P120(4ᵗʰ CE) reads:

[Τ]ẸC ΟΙ ΔΥΟ Ṃ[ΑΘΗΤΑΙ

It is not clear though if the last letter is really a Ṃ. It looks more like an Λ to me. Unfortunately the position is superimposed by a small, broken-off fragment. At least one can say that P120 does not read the majority reading.

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

Lacuna: D

B: no umlaut

Compare previous verses:

NA28 John 1:35-36 Τῇ ἐπαύριον πάλιν εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰωάννης καὶ ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ δύο 36 καὶ ἐμβλέψας τῷ Ἰησοῦ περιπατοῦντι λέγει· ἴδε ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ θεοῦ.

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 14:58 ὅτι ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος

NA28 John 7:32 ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ ὄχλου γογγύζοντος

NA28 John 8:30 Ταῦτα αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν.

NA28 John 9:27 μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι;

GcP = Genitivus cum Participio

"and the two disciples heard him speaking"

Interesting variation of the αὐτοῦ. The txt reading is equivocal. It could be interpreted as "his disciples" (which is the normal understanding in the Gospels), but in this case it is different, as GcP. The ambiguity is removed in the Byzantine version.

The P66, P75 version actually fixes the wrong understanding, probably inspired from the previous verse 35, where μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ appears. In this reading the αὐτοῦ refers back to John ("his disciples" = John's), who speaks in the previous verse 36. This construction is grammatically very awkward, because now λαλοῦντος has no explicit subject anymore, which is unusual. Why have so many good witnesses such a peculiar text?

One could argue that this is certainly the harder reading and that it has been changed in various ways.

Zahn (Comm. Jo) even thinks that perhaps the reading without αὐτοῦ is original.

Difficult.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 19

11. Difficult variant

NA28 John 1:41 εὑρίσκει οὗτος <u>πρῶτον</u> τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσσίαν, ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον χριστός.

BYZ John 1:41 εὑρίσκει οὗτος <u>πρῶτος</u> τὸν ἀδελφὸν τὸν ἴδιον Σίμωνα καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Εὑρήκαμεν τὸν Μεσίαν ὅ ἐστιν μεθερμηνευόμενον Χριστός·

Byz 01*, K, L, Wˢ, Δ, 0141, 124, 157, 397, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1241, Maj,
  <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt P66, P75, 01ᶜ², A, B, M, X, Θ, Π, Ψ, 083, 0211, 0233, f1, f13, 22, 892, al,
  Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, Or

<u>πρωΐ</u> b, e, j, r¹
mane

<u>on that day</u> Sy-S

<u>omit:</u> 1424, vgᵐˢ, Sy-C, Aug

Lacuna: C, D, 33
B: no umlaut

txt "he finds first his own brother"
Byz "he, the first, finds his brother"

Compare verse 43:
NA28 John 1:43 <u>Τῇ ἐπαύριον</u> ἠθέλησεν ἐξελθεῖν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν καὶ <u>εὑρίσκει Φίλιππον.</u> καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀκολούθει μοι.

The πρῶτον makes good sense with respect to verse 43. First he finds Simon, the other day Philip.
On the other hand the Byzantine reading "this, the first (nominated apostle)" also makes sense and could be seen as the harder reading (so Zahn). But it is also quite probable that the πρῶτος has been adjusted to the case of the οὗτος (so Weiss).

πρωΐ is probably a misreading of πρῶτον or πρῶτος. Note that we have a possible h.t. case here: πρῶ<u>τον</u> <u>τὸν</u>. If one τον has been omitted, πρωΐ would be a possible reconstruction. It makes very good sense.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 20

NA28 John 1:42 ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν. ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ Σίμων <u>ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου</u>, σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς, ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.

BYZ John 1:42 καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐμβλέψας αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν Σὺ εἶ Σίμων <u>ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωνᾶ·</u> σὺ κληθήσῃ Κηφᾶς ὃ ἑρμηνεύεται Πέτρος

T&T #11

Byz   A, B^C2, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 397, 579, Maj, (aur), c, q, **11A**, vg^mss, Sy, <u>Trg^mg</u>

txt   P66, P75, P106, 01, B*, L, W^S, 33, pc,
       it(a, b, f, ff², l, r¹, **9A***), Co, Diatess^Arab

<u>Ἰωάννα</u>   Θ, 0141, L890, pc, **9A^c**, vg
<u>Ἰωάνα</u>   1241, pc⁵

<u>filius Bar Iona</u>   aur
<u>frater Andreae</u>   e

<u>1241</u> reads Ἰωάνα. This has been confirmed by Klaus Witte from Muenster from the film: T&T has 1241 for Ἰωνᾶ. NA has it for Ἰωάννα. Lake's collation has correctly Ιωανα. Witte writes: "The first α is very blurred and should be given with an underdot."

<u>0141</u> is listed in the IGNTP Byzantine text of John. It is a minuscule commentary manuscript whose lemmata are written in majuscule.

Lacuna: C, D
B: umlaut! (1351 A 6 R)   <u>Ἰωάνου, σὺ κληθήσῃ</u>
The A and the OU in Ἰωάνου are not enhanced and a (minuscule) A is written on top of the O, giving Ἰωνᾶ.
Note that B always writes Ἰωάνου with one Nu only.

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 16:17 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μακάριος εἶ, <u>Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ,</u> ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Compare ch. 21:

NA28 John 21:15 Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν λέγει τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>Σίμων Ἰωάννου</u>, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων;

BYZ John 21:15 Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν λέγει τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ,</u> ἀγαπᾷς με πλεῖόν τούτων

      same in verses 16 and 17. In verse 17: Ἰωάνα 69, 1071

The Byzantine reading is possibly a harmonization to Mt (<u>Βαριωνᾶ).</u> On the other hand Ἰωνᾶ is the more rare word and it is possible that scribes erroneously took it as Ἰωάννου.

The reading Ἰωάννα is interesting. Note that it's also the reading of the Vulgate! Ἰωάννα appears only twice in Lk:

NA28 Luke 8:3 καὶ <u>Ἰωάννα</u> γυνὴ Χουζᾶ

NA28 Luke 24:10 ἦσαν δὲ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ Μαρία καὶ <u>Ἰωάννα</u> καὶ

Ἰωάννα is possibly also a scribal error by scribes reading the rare Ἰωνᾶ and changing it to Ἰωάννα.

Compare the same variant in 21:15, 16, 17 below.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 21

  12.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 1:47 εἶδεν **ὁ** Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ναθαναὴλ

<u>omit</u>   B, Γ, S, Ω, pc, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**²⁵, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, P75, 01, A, L, W^{sup}, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, Maj

NA28 John 3:5 ἀπεκρίθη ___ Ἰησοῦς·

add ὁ: B, L, N, U, 063, 0233, f13, 33, 579, 1071, 1424, al, <u>[Trg]</u>, <u>[WH]</u>

<u>omit</u>   P66, P75, 01, A, W^s, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, Maj

NA28 John 7:16 ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτοῖς **[ὁ]** **Ἰησοῦς** καὶ εἶπεν·

<u>omit</u>   01, B, (33), <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**²⁵, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, D, L, T, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0105, 0250, f1, f13, Maj

NA28 John 12:12 ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἔρχεται **ὁ Ἰησοῦς** εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

<u>omit</u>   01, A, D, L, Q, W, X, Ψ, f1, 33, 1241, Maj, L844,
       <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**²⁵, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, P75, B, Γ, Θ, f13, 579, 892^s, 1424, al

NA28 John 13:10 λέγει αὐτῷ **ὁ Ἰησοῦς·**

txt incomplete in NA!

<u>omit</u>   P75, B, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**²⁵, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, 01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj, <u>[Trg]</u>

<u>omit</u>   Ψ

NA28 John 13:21 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν **[ὁ] Ἰησοῦς**

<u>omit</u>   P66*, 01, B, L, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**²⁵, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66^c, A, C, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Or

NA28 John 13:27 λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ **ὁ Ἰησοῦς·**

txt in NA incomplete!

<u>omit</u>   B, L, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**²⁵, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, 01, A, C, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj

NA28 John 13:29 ὅτι λέγει αὐτῷ **[ὁ] Ἰησοῦς·**

<u>omit</u>   01, B, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**²⁵, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, Maj, <u>[Trg]</u>

<u>omit</u> **ὁ Ἰησοῦς**   f1, 565, pc, e, Sy-S, Sy-P, pbo

NA28 John 14:6 λέγει αὐτῷ **[ὁ] Ἰησοῦς**·

omit   P66, 01, C*, L, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**²⁵</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   A, B, C^{C3}, D, Q, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, <u>Trg</u>

NA28 John 16:19 Ἔγνω **[ὁ] Ἰησοῦς**

omit   P5, B, L, W, pc, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**²⁵</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   01, D, f1, 33, 565, pc

<u>οὖν</u>   A, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, Maj, L844

NA28 John 21:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα ἐφανέρωσεν ἑαυτὸν πάλιν **ὁ Ἰησοῦς**

omit   B, C, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**²⁵</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   01, A, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, Maj

<u>**omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς**</u>   D, M, pc

NA28 John 21:5 λέγει οὖν αὐτοῖς **[ὁ] Ἰησοῦς**·

omit   01, B, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**²⁵</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   A^C, C, D, L, P, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, <u>[Trg]</u>

<u>**omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς**</u>   A*^{vid}, W, a, Sy-S

(The omission of ὁ Ἰησοῦς is probably due to h.t. ΑΥΤΟΙCΟΙ͞C)

NA28 John 21:17 λέγει αὐτῷ **[ὁ Ἰησοῦς]**· βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

omit   B, C, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**²⁵</u>, <u>[Trg]</u>

txt   A, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj

<u>**omit ὁ Ἰησοῦς**</u>   01, D, W, f1, 33, 565, 1071, al, Lat, Sy-S, pbo, bo, <u>[Trg]</u> , <u>Bal</u>

(The omission of ὁ Ἰησοῦς is probably a conformation to immediate context.)

Compare also:

NA28 John 11:44 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·

        <u>omit ὁ:</u>   P75, B, C*, [WH]

These are basically "B plus something else":

B, Γ

B, 01

B, P75

B, L

B, 01

B, C

B, 01

B, C

Only 3:5, 12:12, 13:21, 14:6 and 16:19 are different in this respect:

3:5
add ὁ   B, L, N, U, f13, 33, 579, 1071, 1424, al
txt   P66, P75, 01, A, Wˢ, Θ, Ψ, f1, Maj

12:12
omit ὁ   01, A, D, L, W, Ψ, f1, 33, 1241, Maj, L844
txt   P66, P75, B, Γ, Θ, f13, 579, 892ˢ, 1424, al

13:21
omit ὁ   P66*, 01, B, L
txt   P66ᶜ, A, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Or

14:6
omit ὁ   P66, 01, C*, L
txt   A, B, Cᶜ³, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj

16:19
omit ὁ   P5, B, L, W, pc
txt   01, D, f1, 33, 565, pc
οὖν   A, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, Maj, L844

In the NA²⁷ text of John the phrase ὁ Ἰησοῦς appears 115 times, whereas it appears in Robinson's Majority text 153 times!
Ἰησοῦς without the article appears 76 times in NA²⁷ (= 40%), but only 44 times in the Majority text (= 22%).
In 01 ὁ Ἰησοῦς appears 109 times and Ἰησοῦς without the article 74 times (40%).
In B ὁ Ἰησοῦς appears 80 times and Ἰησοῦς without the article 106 times (57%).

In the Synoptics the ratio is only about 27% (Ἰησοῦς without the article).

On the one hand it is a well known phenomenon that the article is easily left out. It is well known that B is rather unreliable with regard to articles and pronouns. On the other hand it is also a well known phenomenon that the article has been added to indicate the special importance of a person, i.e. it would be only natural to add an article to Ἰησοῦς.

There are no clear internal rules to follow, except that later scribes probably rather added the article.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 22

Minority reading:
NA28 John 1:50 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὅτι εἶπόν σοι ὅτι εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, πιστεύεις; <u>μείζω</u> τούτων ὄψῃ.

<u>μείζων</u>	P75, M, X, Y, Δ, 063, 0211, 0233, f13^{pt}, 2*, 28, 131, 397, 579, 1071, 1424, al, L2211
<u>μείζονα</u>	P66, 01, 0141, pc, Epiph, Chrys (D lacuna)
<u>μείζον</u>	Π^{Cvid}, pc, c, vg ("maius")
<u>μείζω</u>	A, B, L, Θ, Ψ, W^S, f1, f13^{pt}, 33, 565, Maj, it ("maiora")

W^S reads: τούτων μίζω ὄψῃ.
f13: Swanson has f13 for μείζων, against NA and Geerlings (who has only 346 and 983 for μείζων). Checked from images: 13, 346 read μείζων. 69 and 124 read μείζω. 828 isn't clear. It seems that μείζω has been corrected into μείζων, by writing a Nu above the line. There is also something in the margin.

Lacuna: C, D, Sy-S, Sy-C
B: no umlaut

μείζων   nominative masculine singular
μεῖζόν   nominative neuter singular
μείζονα accusative neuter plural
μείζω   accusative neuter plural (sic!)
The masculine/feminine plural form of μείζων is: μείζονας

Compare:
NA28 John 5:20 καὶ <u>μείζονα</u> τούτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα,
                         safe!

NA28 John 5:36 Ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν <u>μείζω</u> τοῦ Ἰωάννου·
<u>μείζων</u>   P66, A, B, E, G, M, N, W, Λ, Ψ, 063, f13, 33, 157, 579, 1071, 1241, al
<u>μείζον</u>   69
<u>μείζονα</u>   D, 1424, pc
txt <u>μείζω</u> 01, L, K, Π, Θ, f1, 124, 565, Maj, WH
       here: μείζω accusative feminine singular !

NA28 John 14:12 καὶ <u>μείζονα</u> τούτων ποιήσει,
                         safe!

μείζων is singular and does not agree with the plural τούτων, but it agrees in the ending –ων and it is thus probably a conformation error. Metzger suggests (at 5:36) that μείζων might be an incorrect form of the accusative.

μείζονα appears several times without variants. It is thus the normal accusative neuter plural and there would be no reason to change it.

μείζω appears only here and in Jo 5:36 in the NT. It is a rarer form derived by contraction from μείζοσ-α = μείζω (comparative infix –ιοσ-).

In Jo 5:36 (and 1 Ki. 11:19; 4 Ma. 15:9) μείζω is also derived from μείζο-σα but here as masc/fem. singular.

It is quite probable that the rare form μείζω has been changed in various ways.

See also the discussion at 5:36 below.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 23

NA28 John 1:51 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, _____ ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

BYZ John 1:51 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν <u>ἀπ' ἄρτι</u> ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου

T&T #13

Byz   A, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 1071, 1241, Maj, e, q, r[1], Sy

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, L, W[S], 0141, 397, 579, 821, 1819, 2129, pc[5],
      Lat, Co, arm, Or, Willoughby-papyrus*

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

ἀπ' ἄρτι "from this time, henceforth, from now on"

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:64 <u>ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε</u> τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ ἐρχόμενον ἐπὶ τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

ἀπ' ἄρτι appears two more times in Jo:
NA28 John 13:19 <u>ἀπ' ἄρτι</u> λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι, ἵνα πιστεύσητε ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.
NA28 John 14:7 εἰ ἐγνώκατέ με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου γνώσεσθε. καὶ <u>ἀπ' ἄρτι</u> γινώσκετε αὐτὸν καὶ ἑωράκατε αὐτόν.

It is possible that the term has been omitted, because what is said did not really happen "from now on".
The only reason for an addition is as a harmonization to Mt 26:64.

_____

* Jan 2015 auctioned on ebay, spotted by <u>Brice C. Jones</u>. A papyrus of perhaps the 3rd or 4th CE, from Willoughby's library.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 24

14. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 2:3 καὶ <u>ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου</u> λέγει ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ πρὸς αὐτόν· οἶνον οὐκ ἔχουσιν.

<u>καὶ οἶνον οὐκ εἶχον ὅτι συνετελέσθη ὁ οἶνος τοῦ γάμου· εἶτα</u>
01*, it(a, b, ff², j, r¹), Sy-H^{mg}, aeth, <u>Tis</u>

it: <u>et vinum non habebant, quoniam finitum est vinum nuptiarum</u>

<u>et factum est per multam turbam vocitorum vinum consummari.</u>
e, l, 11A

txt   P66, P75, B, Wˢ ... Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg)
                          et deficiente vino

01 corrected by 01^{C1}.
Lacuna: C, D, Sy-S and Sy-C
B: no umlaut

txt   "When the wine gave out ..."
01*   "And they didn't have any more wine, because the supply of the wedding
       wine exhausted, then ..."

A strange, slightly redundant paraphrase.
Zahn sees the reading as a "true semitic text" and "original without doubt".
Since 01 is Western in the beginning of Jo and D has a lacuna here, it is quite probable that D had this reading, too.
I think it is possible that this was a Latin-only reading originally. Note that e, l have yet another reading here.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 25

15. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 2:12 Μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ αὐτὸς **καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ] καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ** καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας.

B: no umlaut

T&T #15

1 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ _____ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
2 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ _____ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ_____
3 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ _____ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
4 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ <u>καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ</u> αὐτοῦ <u>καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ_____</u>

5 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
6 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u>
7 καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ _____ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u>
8 καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ _____ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ <u>αὐτοῦ</u>

1 P66*, P75, B, Ψ, 0162, 397, 1071, pc[1], c, vg[ms],
  NA[25], WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, SBL
2 L, 0141, 397, 821, Or
3 0211, 579, al[28], q, bo[ms]
4 K, Π, 13, 28, al[48]

5 P66[c], A, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 892, 1241, Maj,   = txt
  Lat(f, r[1], vg), Sy, Co, Bois, Tis, Bal
6 01, al[32], it(aur, b, e, ff[2], l), ac[2], arm, geo[1], Jerome
7 W[S], 2718, pc[5], j
8 1241, pc[3]

Lacuna: C, D, Sy-S and Sy-C

<u>1241</u> reads 8. This has been confirmed by Klaus Witte from Muenster from the film. T&T have 1241 wrongly for Byz. NA does not list it. Lake's collation correctly notes the omission of καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ.

083: According to Tischendorf it reads 2, IGNTP has it for 1.
      IGNTP: αυτος [και η μ̅η̅ρ αυ]
              του και ο[ι αδελφοι]
              και οι μ[αθηται αυτου]
      Not sure. T&T: "unleserlich" (unreadable).

μήτηρ	W^S, pc^7, j
-	1241, pc^5
μήτηρ αὐτοῦ	all others

ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ	P66^C, 01, A, W^S, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy
ἀδελφοὶ	P66*, P75, B, K, Π, L, Ψ, 083, 0141, 0162, f13, 28, 821, 1071, 2718, al^{49}, a, c, Or
-	0211, 579, al^{28}, q, bo^{ms}

Compare also:
NA28 John 20:17 πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς μου καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς·
omit μου: 01*, D, W, pc, e, bo^{mss}, Ir^{Lat}

The omissions in 3, 6 and 8 are probably due to h.t.
A very strong group of witnesses omits the αὐτοῦ after ἀδελφοὶ. The idea of Jesus having brothers cannot be the problem really, it is clearly accepted with James the Just. It is possible though that by omitting αὐτοῦ, the ἀδελφοὶ becomes a more general term, including various followers.
Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the αὐτοῦ has been added to conform it to the other terms.

Rating: - (indecisive)
      (retain the brackets)

TVU 26

16. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 2:15 καὶ ποιήσας <u>φραγέλλιον</u> ἐκ σχοινίων πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν τὸ κέρμα καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέτρεψεν,

T&T #16

<u>ὡς φραγέλλιον</u> P66, P75, G, L, N, W^S, X, 083?, 0141, 0162, f1, 22, 33, 397, 565, 821, 865, 892, 1010, 1241, 1293, 1819, 2129, al^{25}, Lat, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, Or^{once}

<u>quasi flagellum de sparto</u> Olat **11A**$^{(ca.\ 800\ CE)}$, Chromatius of Aquileia$^{(late\ 4th\ CE)}$
        ("broom, besom")

txt 01, A, B, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, 1071, Maj, l, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, Or$^{9\ times}$

<u>083:</u> και ποιη[ϲαϲ φρα
       γελλιον [εκ ϲχοινιων] acc. to IGNTP.

But a reconstruction with ὡς appears more probable:

CTACKAΘHMENOYC
KAIΠOIHCAC<u>ωC</u>ΦPA
ΓEΛΛIONEKCXOINIωN

T&T have it for txt, without note! 083 is not noted in NA.

Lacuna: C, D, Sy-S and Sy-C
B: umlaut! (1351 C 34 R) 14 … καθημέ<u>νους,</u> 15 <u>καὶ ποιήσας φρα</u>γέλλιον

φραγέλλιον lat. "flagellum", a whip

Metzger argues that some scribes would consider it inappropriate for Jesus to use a real whip, thus "like a whip". It is on the other hand also possible that it is an idiom.
An interesting mixture of witnesses.

The "de sparto" reading is interesting. Where did this originate? Bishop Chromatius notes it in one of his sermons:

"Cum ingressus fuisset in templo Iudaeorum Dominus et Salvator noster ut uidisset negotiationem illicitam exerceri, id est uendentes oues et boues et columbas et nummularios sedentes, ut audiuit in praesenti lectione dilectio uestra, **_flagellum fecit quasi de sparto_** et eiecit eos omnes, et cathedras uendentium euertit, dicens as eos: Domus mea domus orationis uocabitur; uos autem fecistis illam domum negotiationis. Iudaei immemores …" (IV, 1-9)

Compare:
N. Clayton Croy, "The Messianic Whippersnapper: Did Jesus Use a Whip on People in the Temple (John 2:15)?", JBL 128 (2009) 555–68
(He is not discussing the textcritical question, but the general one, if Jesus used a whip and for what.)

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 27

    17.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 2:15 καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν <u>τὸ κέρμα</u> καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέτρεψεν,

T&T #17

<u>τά κέρματα</u>

    P66^C, P75, B, L, W^{sup}, X, 083, 0141, 0162, 33, 213, 397, 579, 821, 865, pc,
    <u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   P66*, 01, A, N, Θ, Ψ, (f1), f13, (565), 892, 1071, 1241, Maj, <u>Gre</u>

Lacuna: C, D
B: no umlaut

Either "collective singular" τὸ κέρμα or plural τά κέρματα (like English "the money" or "the coins"). The word appears only here in the Greek Bible.
Internally it appears more probable that the singular has been changed into the plural as a conformation to immediate context.
Externally the plural is clearly to be preferred.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 28

NA28 John 2:24 αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν <u>αὐτὸν</u> αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας

BYZ John 2:24 αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν <u>ἑαυτὸν</u> αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας

Byz   P66, 01^{C2}, A^C, P, W^S, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 050, 083, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 565, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, ff², l, vg), Sy, Or^{pt}, <u>Weiss</u>
         ἑαυτὸν ἑαυτοῖς   33

txt   01*, A*, B, L, Ψ*, Ω*, 700, 1071, al, it(a, b, e, j, q, r¹), Or^{pt}

<u>αὐτὸν</u>   <u>WH</u> (note accent!)

<u>omit:</u>   P75, 579, pc

omit αὐτὸν ante γινώσκειν: 01
Lacuna: C, D, Sy-C
B: no umlaut

"and Jesus himself was not trusting himself to them"
= "But Jesus himself kept on refusing (negative imperfect) to trust himself to
   them." (so Robertson, Wordpictures)

ἑαυτὸν is more clear than αὐτὸν (note WH: αὐτὸν). There is no reason for a change from ἑαυτὸν to αὐτὸν.
The omission is probably due to a presumed dittography or a misunderstanding as "he did not believe them".
Zahn (Comm. Jo) notes: "πιστεύειν already, with dative of person and accusative of case, is rare (Lk 16:11), but πιστεύειν ἑαυτὸν τινι is almost never heard of."

Compare 13:32 below for a similar case.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 29

Minority reading:
NA28 John 3:5 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν <u>βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>

T&T #22

<u>βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν</u>   01*, 0141, 472, 821, pc[10],
<u>regnum caelorum</u>   e, Justin (Apol. 61:4), Tis

01 corrected by 01[C2].
Lacuna: C, D
B: no umlaut

Compare verse 3:
NA28 John 3:3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἄνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν <u>βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>

Compare: Justin Apol 61:4
καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· ἄν μή ἀναγεννηθῆτε οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθε εἰς τὴν <u>βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.</u>

Probably derived from the baptismal liturgy. βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν seems to be the earlier form. Probably John modified his source.

βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν appears only(!) in Mt. It is possible that scribes simply remembered the familiar term. The terms appear only here (verse 3 and 5) in John. It would be strange for John to use two different terms.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 30

Minority reading:
NA28 John 3:6 τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστιν [1], καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος πνεῦμά ἐστιν [2].

Vulgata:
Quod natum est ex carne caro est [1] et quod natum est ex Spiritu spiritus est [2]

[1] ὅτι ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς ἐγεννήθη   161*, it(a, b, e, ff², j, l, r¹, **11A**),
    quia de carne natum est   vg^mss, Sy-C, Tert
    quoniam … (b, r¹)

[2] ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ πνεύματος ἐστιν   161*
[2] quia   Deus spiritus est   it(aur, ff², **11A**), vg^mss, Sy-S, Tert
[2] quoniam Deus spiritus est   e, r¹, Aug
[2] quia Deus spiritus est et ex Deus natus est   a, j, vg^mss, Sy-C

Tertullian, De Carne Christi XVIII, 5:
"Quod in carne natum est caro est quia ex carne natum est. […] Et quod de spiritu natum est spiritus est, quia Deus spiritus est, et de Deo natus est."
The words can be also found in the records of the council of Carthage (Cyprian, 251 CE).

Lacuna: C, D
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 4:24 πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν.

NA28 John 1:13 οἳ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ᾽ ἐκ θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν.

A Western variation.
Perhaps these additions were inspired from Jo 4:24 and 1:13.

Ambrose (4th CE, *de Spir.* 3:11) accused the Arians of having cut out the phrase "quia Deus spiritus est".

Augustine: De fide et symbolo 9:19 (ca 393 CE). Houghton writes:

"Augustine has no trace of the additional *quia de carne natum est*."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 31

Minority reading:
NA28 John 3:8 τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ καὶ τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ οἶδας πόθεν ἔρχεται καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγει· οὕτως ἐστὶν πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ _τοῦ πνεύματος.

 _τοῦ ὕδατος καὶ 01, it(a, aur, b, e, ff², r¹, **9A**, **11A**), vg^ms, Sy-S, Sy-C

it: Sic est et omnis, qui natus est ex aqua et spiritu.

Lat(c, f, l, q, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: C, D, X
B: no umlaut

A Western reading: It is possible that D had this reading, too.

Compare:
NA28 John 3:5 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ἐὰν μή τις γεννηθῇ ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, οὐ δύναται εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

Clearly a harmonization to verse 5. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 32

Difficult variant

NA28 John 3:13 καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

BYZ John 3:13 καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀναβέβηκεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν εἰ μὴ ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου <u>ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ</u>

T&T #23

Byz   A, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 050, f1, f13, 565, 579, 892, 1071, Maj,
      Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>
      <u>ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ</u>   0141, 397, pc, some Lect, Sy-S
      <u>ὃς ἦν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ</u>   e, Sy-C
      qui erat in caelis

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, L, T, W^S, 083, 086, 33, 1010, 1241, 1293, pc^5, Co, Eus

<u>omit ὢν</u>:   A*

Lacuna: C, D, X
B: no umlaut

If Jesus is still speaking, the addition is difficult: how can he be in heaven?
The whole section Jo 3:11 ff. looks strange, because in verse 11 there is a change from "I" to "we": ὃ οἴδαμεν λαλοῦμεν ...
It appears that now not Jesus is speaking anymore but the church (or the Johannine community) after the resurrection. Then the longer reading makes good sense and is not problematic at all.
Zahn, on the other hand thinks (Comm. Jo), that the "we" refers to Jesus and John the baptist.

What we have here is a clear case of external against internal evidence. Internally the longer reading is clearly the harder reading and there is no reason why the words should have been added. Metzger says it could be an "interpretative gloss, reflecting later Christological development", but is this probable? It seems more probable that scribes omitted the difficult words or changed them as 0141, Sy-S and e, Sy-C did. The ἐκ in 0141 et al. probably comes from the previous ἐκ in the verse.

Hort writes: "it may have been inserted to correct any misunderstanding arising out of the position of ἀναβέβηκεν, as coming before καταβάς."
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 131) notes that the words have been added to emphasize the having-been-in-heaven of Jesus in contrast to the καταβάς.

This verse is comparable to Jo 1:15, somewhat contradictory:
> "This was he of whom I said, He who comes after me ranks ahead of me because he was before me."

Jo 3:13
> No one has ascended into heaven except the one who descended from heaven, the Son of Man, who is in the heaven.

What we have here is a typical Johannine Oxymoron.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)

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

TVU 33

NA28 John 3:15 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων <u>ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ</u> ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

BYZ John 3:15 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων <u>εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται, ἀλλ' ἔχῃ</u> ζωὴν αἰώνιον

T&T #24 (in part)

<u>εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχει</u>	Δ, Ψ, f13, 1071, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H
<u>εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ</u>	P63(c.500), G, K, Π, U, Δ, Θ
<u>ἐπ αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ</u>	A, 1459
<u>αὐτῷ μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχει</u>	579

The reading of 579 seems to imply an ἐν before the αὐτῷ.

<u>ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ</u>	P75, B, T, Wˢ, 083, 0141, 821
<u>ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἔχῃ</u>	P66, L, 397, pc⁵
<u>εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχῃ</u>	01, 086, f1, 22, 33, 565
<u>εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχει</u>	124
<u>one of these</u>	P36(6ᵗʰ CE), a, fᶜ, Sy-C, Co

P36 reads: …] ἔχῃ ζωὴν. Space considerations make it impossible to read the long text.
Lacuna: C, D, X
B: no umlaut

Compare next verse:
NA28 John 3:16 οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν,
ἵνα πᾶς ὁ <u>πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.</u>

It is probable that the text has been changed to conform it to the next verse (so also Weiss).

John uses πιστεύω + εἰς 34 times, but never ἐν elsewhere. In the Gospels it only appears in Mk 1:15:
NA28 Mark 1:15 καὶ λέγων ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς καὶ ἤγγικεν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ· μετανοεῖτε καὶ <u>πιστεύετε ἐν</u> τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ.

There is no reason for an omission, except possibly a change to avoid repetition.

It is possible that the use of ἐν here also changes the meaning, that it does not mean "who believes in him, has eternal life", but "who believes, in him has eternal life".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 34

Minority reading:
NA28 John 3:16 οὕτως γὰρ ἠγάπησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ ἔδωκεν __, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ' ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Not in NA and not in SQE but in Tis!

εἰς τὸν κόσμον	P63 (ca. 500), ℵ, 33, 1071, pc
in hunc mundum	e
pro mundo	vg^ms
pro saeculo	gat, vg^ms
pro illo	m

01* omits ἔδωκεν, corrected by 01^C1.
ℵ is listed in IGNTP John.
Lacuna: C, D, X
B: no umlaut

From here (Jo 3:16) Codex Bezae starts (3:16-26 d only!).

Compare context.
NA28 John 3:17 οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν υἱὸν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἵνα κρίνῃ τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωθῇ ὁ κόσμος δι' αὐτοῦ.
NA28 John 3:19 αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς· ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα.

It is possible that it's a harmonization to immediate context. Additionally there is the problem that ἔδωκεν could be interpreted as "gave *the life of* his only son", but this past tense is not really suitable here, because Jesus is still alive. See also Jo 10:18: αἴρει / ἦρεν.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 35

19.   Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 John 3:18 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν οὐ κρίνεται· ὁ δὲ μὴ πιστεύων ἤδη κέκριται, ὅτι μὴ πεπίστευκεν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ.

omit   01, B, W^sup, ff², l, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Tis, Bal

txt   P36(6th CE), P63(c. 500), P66, P75, A, L, Θ, Ψ, 083, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, Maj, Lat, [Trg]

vero   b
enim   aur
autem   a, c, d, f, q, r¹, vg

Lacuna: C, D, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 Luke 12:47-48 Ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὁ δοῦλος ὁ γνοὺς τὸ θέλημα τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ … 48 ὁ δὲ μὴ γνούς, ποιήσας δὲ ἄξια πληγῶν δαρήσεται ὀλίγας.
            safe!

It would be only natural to add a δὲ. There is no reason to omit it.
But externally the support for δὲ is strong.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 36

Minority reading:
NA28 John 3:20 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων μισεῖ τὸ φῶς καὶ οὐκ ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸ φῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἐλεγχθῇ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ __·

T&T #26

 ὅτι πονηρά ἐστιν   P66, L, N, Θ, Λ, Ψ, f13ᵃ, 33, 213, 397, 597, 892ᶜ,
   "quoniam mala sunt"   1010, 1071, 1241, 1293, al¹⁰⁰, r¹, **35, 47, 48**, Co

 de luce   d (D has a lacuna, ὑπὸ τοῦ φωτός ? ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ?)

 et videantur si in deo sunt gesta   Or (acc. to Tis)

f13ᵇ,ᶜ omit!
Lacuna: C, D, X
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 19:
NA28 John 3:19 αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις ὅτι τὸ φῶς ἐλήλυθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ ἠγάπησαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι μᾶλλον τὸ σκότος ἢ τὸ φῶς· ἦν γὰρ αὐτῶν <u>πονηρὰ τὰ ἔργα.</u>

Compare also:
NA28 John 7:7 οὐ δύναται ὁ κόσμος μισεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἐμὲ δὲ μισεῖ, ὅτι ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ περὶ αὐτοῦ <u>ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρά ἐστιν.</u>

There is no reason for an omission. The addition is only natural from the previous verse.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 37

Minority reading:
NA28 John 3:25 Ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννου μετὰ
Ἰουδαίου περὶ καθαρισμοῦ.

T&T #27

txt   P75, 01^C2, A, B, L, N, W^S, Δ, Ψ, 070, 086, 33, 157, 213, 397, 579, 799,
       892, 1010, 1241, 1293, 1424, 1819, 2129, 2561, 2718, 2786, Maj,
       Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sa^pt, arm, WH, **NA^25**

Ἰουδαίους   0211

Ἰουδαίων   P66, 01*, F, G, Y, Θ, Λ^C, 0141, f1, f13, 565, 597, 821, 1071, al^200,
             Latt(incl. d), Sy-C, sa^pt, bo, Or, WH^mg

Ἰησοῦ   cj. (R. Bentley 1662-1742)
τοῦ Ἰησοῦ   cj. (Baldensperger 1856-1936)
τῶν Ἰησοῦ   cj. (J. Markland 1693-1776, O. Holtzmann 1859-1934)
             A. Pallis accepts this, too.

D has a lacuna here, but d is present and reads "IUDAEOS" = plural, same as 01.
So it is quite probable that D reads so, too.
083 reads μετὰ Ἰου[lac. in IGNTP (correctly), but T&T have it for txt.
Sy-S: Burkitt writes (Evangelion Intro, p. 311): "The plural points are not legible
in Sy-S, so that it is impossible to discover whether Sy-S reads μετὰ
Ἰουδαίων with Sy-C or μετὰ Ἰουδαίου with Sy-vg and the majority of Greek
manuscripts."

Lacuna: C, D, X
B: no umlaut

The whole sentence is not really connected with the preceding or the following.
Possibly a left-over from a source? One should note that after the speech of
John (3:27-36), the narrative continuous equally awkward with 4:1
(Ἰησοῦς/Κύριος).

The singular Ἰουδαίου is very unusual and does not appear in the other Gospels.
It would be only natural to change it to the plural. Weiss thinks that Ἰουδαίων
is a conformation to the plural of τῶν μαθητῶν.

The conjectures make good sense. That an error arose accidentally is very unlikely. The explanation goes like this:
1. original reading: ΜΕΤΑΙΟΥ̅ (problem: this nomen sacrum is unknown)
2. dittography: ΜΕΤΑΙΟΥΙΟΥ
3. correction: ΜΕΤΑΙΟΥΔΔΙΟΥ
This scenario is quite improbable.

As already pointed out by Markland, the conjecture Ἰησοῦ (without article) is equivocal. τοῦ/τῶν Ἰησοῦ means "a discussion arose between the disciples of John and those of Jesus." Ἰησοῦ without the article can mean the same, but could also mean: "a discussion arose between the disciples of John and Jesus (himself)."

It has been suggested by the commentators that Ἰησοῦ was the original reading, but that its intended meaning (= τῶν Ἰησοῦ) was not understood. A dispute between the disciples of John and Jesus was considered 'insolent' and the change has been made to Ἰουδαίου or Ἰουδαίων.

Pryor suggests that the sources of the evangelist "did refer to Jesus, and that for his own theological reasons he decided to change Ἰησοῦ to Ἰουδαίου. [...] the evangelist wanted to avoid the merest hint of controversy between even the disciples of John and (disciples) of Jesus. [... There is] similarity between our verse and the synoptic tradition found in Mk 2:18 and Mt 9:14 [the question about fasting]. Lindlars drew our attention to the fact that in both the synoptic (Mk 2:19/Mt 9:15) and the Johannine narratives (3:29) the answer includes the bridal imagery. All of this makes it tempting to believe that we are dealing here with some common tradition."

T. Nicklas asks the interesting question, why, if τοῦ/τῶν Ἰησοῦ was original, the article has been omitted in the modification (= txt). He has no explanation. In John "the Jews" is the normal term and appears 65 times, always with the article! Pryor writes: "Returning to the question of whether the evangelist had before him Ἰησοῦ or τῶν Ἰησοῦ, what possibly tips the balance in favor of Ἰησοῦ is the likelihood that if he had found τῶν Ἰησοῦ in the inherited tradition, the evangelist would have inserted his favorite τῶν Ἰουδαίων in its place."

Nicklas also notes the geographical problem. Jesus is baptizing εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γῆν, whereas John is ἐν Αἰνὼν ἐγγὺς τοῦ Σαλείμ.

Compare:

- W. Bowyer "Critical Conjectures", 1782, p. 165-66
- O. Holtzmann "Das Johannesevangelium", 1887, p. 210
- C. Bouquet "St. John 3:25 – A suggestion" JTS 27 (1926) 181-2
- J.W. Pryor "John the Baptist and Jesus: Tradition and Text in John 3:25" JSNT 66 (1997) 15-26
- T. Nicklas "Notiz zu Jo 3:25" ETL 76 (2000) 133-35

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 38

Difficult variant

NA28 John 3:27 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν· οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν **οὐδὲ ἕν** ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ.

BYZ John 3:27 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰωάννης καὶ εἶπεν Οὐ δύναται ἄνθρωπος λαμβάνειν **οὐδὲν** ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

From here on, D is extant again!

Byz 01, N, A, D, Wˢ, Δ, Ψ, 083, 0141, f1, 565, 579, 597, 799, 821, 892, 1010, 1241, 1293, 1424, 1819, 2129, 2718, Maj, NA²⁵, WH, Trg, Tis, Bal

txt P66, P75, B, (472), pc

ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ ἕν   472
ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν   L, Λ, Θ, 086, f13, 33, 157, 213, 397, 1071, 2561, 2786, al¹⁵⁰, c, e, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

083 reads: [ναται αω̅ ο]ϲ λαμ
        [βανειν ου]δεν εαν   acc. to IGNTP.
        This is correct. Checked at the film.
Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

txt "not even one (thing)"
Byz "nothing"

Compare:
NA28 John 5:19 οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς ποιεῖν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν ἐὰν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα·
        ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ ἕν   P66, f1, 124, 565

NA28 John 5:30 Οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν·
        οὐδὲ ἕν   P66, G, pc

NA28 John 8:28 καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ ποιῶ οὐδέν,
        οὐδὲ ἕν   P66

NA28 John 10:41 ὅτι Ἰωάννης μὲν σημεῖον ἐποίησεν οὐδέν,
οὐδὲ ἓν   P45, W, Θ, f1, 69, 124, 346, 788(=f13), 565, pc

NA28 John 12:19 θεωρεῖτε ὅτι οὐκ ὠφελεῖτε οὐδέν·
οὐδὲ ἓν   579

NA28 John 15:5 ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμοῦ οὐ δύνασθε ποιεῖν οὐδέν.
οὐδὲ ἓν   P75, B (P66 lacuna! Space slightly in favor of οὐδέν)

NA28 John 18:20 καὶ ἐν κρυπτῷ ἐλάλησα οὐδέν.
οὐδὲ ἓν   579

NA28 John 21:3 καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπίασαν οὐδέν.
οὐδὲ ἓν   C*, W

Only other variant in the Synoptics:
NA28 Luke 20:40 οὐκέτι γὰρ ἐτόλμων ἐπερωτᾶν αὐτὸν οὐδέν.
οὐδὲ ἓν   f1

ἀφ᾿ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδέν is certainly a conformation to 5:19 (or 5:30 and 8:28). It is interesting that at most occurrences of οὐδέν in John, there is a variant οὐδὲ ἓν. The question, if this stylistic feature is original to John or has been introduced later is difficult to decide.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 39

NA28 John 3:28 <u>αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι</u> μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον [ὅτι] οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου.

BYZ John 3:28 <u>αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς</u>   μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον Οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός ἀλλ ὅτι Ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου

Only Byz in NA and SQE!

Byz   P75, 01, 788, 828, 2, 28, 397, 1342, 1424,
       Maj-part[E, F, H, M, V, Γ, Ω, 047], pc, aur, sa^pt

txt   P66, A, B, D, K, Π, L, N, W^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 083, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 579,
      700, 892, 1071, (1241), Maj-part[G, S, U, Y, Λ], Lat, Sy, sa^pt, bo
      <u>αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ</u>   f1, 124, 565
      <u>αὐτοὶ δὲ ὑμεῖς μοι</u>   1241

Lacuna: C, X, 086(but editors reconstruct <u>with</u> μοι)
B: no umlaut

"You yourselves are <u>my</u> witnesses that I said"
"You yourselves are __ witnesses that I said"

Metzger suggests that the omission might be accidental, "arising perhaps from the succession of syllables beginning with the same letter."
The question is if it makes any difference, if the disciples are witnesses especially for him or just in general.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 40

21.Difficult variant
NA28 John 3:28 αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς μοι μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον **[ὅτι]** οὐκ εἰμὶ
ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου.

BYZ John 3:28 αὐτοὶ ὑμεῖς   μαρτυρεῖτε ὅτι εἶπον ___ Οὐκ εἰμὶ
ἐγὼ ὁ Χριστός ἀλλ ὅτι Ἀπεσταλμένος εἰμὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐκείνου

omit: 01, A, D, L, Wˢ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 086, 0141, f1, 33, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
       Lat, **NA²⁵**, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

ὅτι   P66, P75, 700, pc, it(aur, (e), f, ff², l), Sy-S, Sy-C, Bois
ὅτι ἐγὼ οὐκ εἰμὶ ὁ Χριστός 397
ἐγὼ   B, (sic! no omission of the second ἐγὼ), [WH]
ὑμῖν   f13, pc, a

083:
ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον οὐκ εἰμι ἐγὼ   083ᵛⁱᵈ (acc. to Tis)

   [μαρτυρειτ]ε οτι ε
   [ιπον 3-5] ουκ ει   083 (reconstruction by IGNTP)
   [μι εγω ο χc] αλλ οτι   Correct. Checked at the film.
   Having the Iota on a new line seems improbable. Tischendorf's
   reconstruction ἐγὼ εἶπον appears more probable, but creates a singular
   reading.

ὅτι εἶπον ___ οὐκ εἰμὶ ___ ὁ Χριστός   086

eis, qui missi sunt ab Hierosolymis ad me   e

Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 1:50 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὅτι εἶπόν σοι ὅτι
εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, πιστεύεις; μείζω τούτων ὄψῃ.

NA28 John 3:7 μὴ θαυμάσῃς ὅτι εἶπόν σοι· ___δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι
ἄνωθεν.   ὅτι   2, 579

NA28 John 6:41 Ἐγόγγυζον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ ὅτι εἶπεν·
ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,   ὅτι   2

NA28 John 7:36 τίς ἐστιν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὃν εἶπεν__· ζητήσετέ με καὶ
οὐχ εὑρήσετέ [με],   ὅτι   P66

NA28 John 8:22 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· μήτι ἀποκτενεῖ ἑαυτόν, ὅτι
λέγει· ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν;
          ὅτι   U, 2, 157

NA28 John 10:36 ὃν ὁ πατὴρ ἡγίασεν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον
ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι βλασφημεῖς, ὅτι εἶπον· υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ εἰμι;

It is possible that the word has been added to make the sentence structure more clear. The combination of very good (P66, P75, B) with almost Byzantine witnesses (f13, 700) is strange.
The B reading arose probably from an attempt to move the ἐγὼ directly after εἶπον but then the scribe forgot to delete it after εἰμὶ (so Weiss).

Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 506) sees the addition of ὅτι "as an example of the scribal avoidance of asyndeton". P66 similarly adds ὅτι after εἶπεν at Jo 7:36. 700 adds ὅτι after γέγραπται in Mt 4:4 and after λέγοντες in Mk 5:12. So this may be a scribal tendency.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
        better omit ὅτι.

TVU 41

Minority reading:
NA28 John 3:31 Ὁ ἄνωθεν ἐρχόμενος <u>ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν</u>· ὁ ὢν ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστιν καὶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς λαλεῖ. ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἐρχόμενος <u>**[ἐπάνω πάντων ἐστίν]**</u>·

T&T #30

<u>omit:</u> P75, 01*, D, f1, 22, 565, pc³,
it(a, b, d, e, ff², j, l, r¹, **11A, 33**), Sy-C, sa, arm, Eus, <u>WH^{mg}</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt P36(6ᵗʰ CE), P66, 01^{C2}, A, B, L, W^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 083, 086, 0141, f13, 33, 157, 213, 397, (579), 799, 821, 1071, 1241, Maj,
Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, Or, Aug, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**</u>²⁵

579: omits due to h.t. ἐστιν (2) - ἐστιν (3). So, implicitly, 579 can be counted for txt. Checked at the film.
Lacuna: C, X, 865
B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation

Compare next verse:
NA28 John 3:32   ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ, καὶ τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτοῦ οὐδεὶς λαμβάνει.
BYZ John 3:32 <u>καὶ</u> ὃ ἑώρακεν καὶ ἤκουσεν τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ ...
     <u>add καὶ:</u>   A, K, Π, Θ, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H

On the one hand the words could be either mechanically or deliberately repeated from the beginning of the verse, possibly to make the saying more symmetrical.

On the other hand it is equally possible that the words have been deleted to avoid repetition (so Aland). Since a repetitive style is typical for John, the txt reading is slightly more probable.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 185) thinks that the words have been omitted to create with the remaining words a subject for the next verse. Note that the Byzantine text adds a καὶ then in verse 32! This has already noted by Tischendorf. Only with a καὶ the longer reading is tolerable (so Zahn).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(brackets ok)

TVU 42

22. Difficult variant

NA28 John 3:34 ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ , οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου <u>δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα.</u>

BYZ John 3:34 ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖ οὐ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου <u>δίδωσιν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα</u>

Byz   A, C^{C2}, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 086, f13, 157, 397, 1071, Maj,
       Lat(a, aur, c, d, ff², l, π, q, r¹, **11A**, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, arm, geo, [Trg]

txt   P36^{vid}(6th CE), P66, P75, 01, B^{C2}, C*, L, W^S, 083, 0141, f1, 33, 565, 579, 1241, pc, it(b, e, f, l)

<u>δίδωσιν</u>   B*, pc

Not in NA and not in SQE: noted from von Soden
<u>δίδωσιν   ὁ πατὴρ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ</u>   Sy-C, Diatess^{Ephrem}
<u>δίδωσιν ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατὴρ</u>   Sy-S

These readings are confirmed by Burkitt, but he notes:
"C is mutilated" and: "S is partly illegible".

<u>δίδωσιν αὐτῷ τὸ πνεῦμα</u>   cj.
<u>οὐ</u> γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου <u>δίδωσιν τὸ πνεῦμα</u>   cj.

In B (p. 1353 B 40) the words τὸ πνεῦμα were originally omitted. They have been added in uncial in the left margin and an insertion sign (./.) notes the point after δίδωσιν. It is not clear when the words have been added, the letters are not faded and no original ink can be seen. Tischendorf assigns this correction to B² (= before enhancement).

NA notes Origen for the txt reading. Ehrman writes: "remove Or". According to him, the only evidence for this shorter reading derives from unreliable materials (catenae and Latin references). Compare also Zahn (Comm. Jo).

P36: The reconstruction is difficult. IGNTP gives:

οθ‾c‾ταρηματατου]ΘΥ
λαλειουγαρεκμετρου]ΔΙΔΩ
cιΝτοπ‾Ν‾αοπ‾Η‾ραγαπα]ΤΟ
ΥΙΟΝΚΑΙΠΑΝΤΑΔΕΔ]ΩΚΕΝ
ΕΝΤΗΧΕΙΡΙΑΥΤΟΥΟΠ]ΙCΤΕ

The red letters are doubtful (underdots).

Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare τὸ πνεῦμα as subject:
NA28 John 3:8 τὸ πνεῦμα ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ
NA28 John 6:63 τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν τὸ ζῳοποιοῦν,
NA28 John 14:17 τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας (also: 15:26 and 16:13)
NA28 John 14:26 ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,

Compare τὸ πνεῦμα as object (accusative):
NA28 John 1:32 ὅτι τεθέαμαι τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον
NA28 John 1:33 ἐφ᾽ ὃν ἂν ἴδῃς τὸ πνεῦμα καταβαῖνον

Compare use of δίδωσιν:
NA28 John 6:32 ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πατήρ μου <u>δίδωσιν</u> ὑμῖν <u>τὸν ἄρτον</u>
NA28 John 6:37 πᾶν <u>ὃ δίδωσίν</u> μοι ὁ πατὴρ
NA28 John 13:26 βάψας οὖν <u>τὸ ψωμίον</u> … <u>δίδωσιν</u> Ἰούδᾳ Σ. Ἰ.
NA28 John 21:13 καὶ λαμβάνει <u>τὸν ἄρτον</u> καὶ <u>δίδωσιν</u> αὐτοῖς

Normally τὸ πνεῦμα is taken here as accusative object, given by God. It has also been argued that it is Jesus who gives the Spirit. On the other hand Zahn thinks (Einfuehrung II, 1907, p. 567) that the main reason for a change here was that the scribes did not recognize τὸ πνεῦμα as <u>subject</u>.
τὸ πνεῦμα as subject appears several times in John, but always in the first position of a sentence or phrase. On the other hand forms of δίδωμι are followed by the subject in John (4:5, 5:36, 6:37, 11:22, 11:57, 13:3, 18:11).

It is also possible to think of οὐ as οὗ: "whose spirit gives by measure" (τὸ πνεῦμα = nominative). But from context one should prefer the negation:
    34 "for he gives the Spirit without measure.
    35 … and has placed all things in his hands."

This is more an exegetical question, because the early copies didn't have accents.

When one comes to λαλεῖ one would expect λαλεῖν at first, but no such variant is recorded:

ὃν γὰρ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ λαλεῖν

"for whom God has sent to speak the words of God"

Carl W. Conrad on the b-greek mailing list translates (Dec 29, 1999):
"The One whom God has sent speaks God's words, since he does not give the Spirit in measured amounts."

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 43

Difficult variant

NA28 John 4:1 Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω <u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u> ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι <u>Ἰησοῦς</u> πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης

BYZ John 4:1 Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω <u>ὁ Κύριος</u> ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ φαρισαῖοι ὅτι <u>Ἰησοῦς</u> πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης

T&T #32

Byz   P66ᶜ, P75, A, B, C, L, Wˢ, Ψ, Δ, 083, 0141, f13, 33, 157, 213, 397, 579, 799, 821, 1071, 1424, Maj¹²⁵⁰, f, q, **27**, **33**, Sy-S, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, sa, boᵐˢ, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>Scrivener</u>

txt   P66*, 01, D, Θ, Λ, 086, f1, 22, 565, 1241, al³⁶², Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, arm, Chrys, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Trg</u>ᵐᵍ

<u>omit:</u>   047, pc²³, vgᵐˢ, conj. (Barrett, RE Brown)

<u>omit 2ⁿᵈ Ἰησοῦς</u>   Λ, pc, Sy-P, Sy-S, Sy-C

047: This is already in von Soden and is confirmed by Ulrich Schmid from the IGNTP collations.
Lacuna: X, 865
B: no umlaut

Preliminary remark: The verses 1-3 look awkward. Many commentators see here an unskillful editing of a source text. JH Bernhard (1928): "on purely linguistic grounds verses 1-3 are a monstrosity."

It is possible that "Jesus" has been changed to "Lord" to avoid a repetition of "Jesus". But in that case one would have expected the corrector to have changed the second occurrence of "Jesus" and not the first one.

On the other hand "Lord" could have been changed to "Jesus" to avoid two different subjects. It is also possible that the more unusual term "Lord" has been changed into the common "Jesus".

Compare the following other instances:

NA28 Luke 7:13 ὁ κύριος
              ὁ Ἰησοῦς by: D, W, f1, 700, 1241, pc, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-P, bo

NA28 Luke 7:19 τὸν κύριον
BYZ Luke 7:19 τὸν Ἰησοῦν
Byz   01, A, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, Maj, it, Sy, bo
txt   B, L, Ξ, f13, 33, pc, sa, bo^{mss}

NA28 Luke 10:39 τοῦ κυρίου
BYZ Luke 10:39 τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,
Byz   P45, P75, A, B*, C, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Sy-S, Sy-H, sa, bo^{mss}
txt   P3, 01, B^{C2}, D, L, Ξ, 579, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, bo

NA28 Luke 10:41 ὁ κύριος·
BYZ Luke 10:41 ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
Byz   A, B*, C, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, Maj, it, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo
txt   P3, P45, P75, 01, B^{C2}, L, 579, 892, pc, Lat, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, bo^{mss}

NA28 Luke 11:39 ὁ κύριος
              ὁ Ἰησοῦς   U, 1071, pc

NA28 Luke 12:42 ὁ κύριος·
              ὁ Ἰησοῦς   f13, 1071, pc

NA28 Luke 13:15 ὁ κύριος
              ὁ Ἰησοῦς   D, F, U, N, Γ, Θ, f1, f13, 28, 1071, al,
                                vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, bo^{pt}

NA28 Luke 17:6 ὁ κύριος·
              ὁ Ἰησοῦς   N, 1071, pc

NA28 Luke 19:8 ὁ κύριος·
              ὁ Ἰησοῦς   G, K, Π, M, 118, f13, 1071, pc

NA28 Luke 19:9 ὁ Ἰησοῦς
              ὁ κύριος   579

NA28 Luke 22:61 ὁ κύριος·
              ὁ Ἰησοῦς   D, f1, 124, pc

The designation of Jesus as ὁ Κύριος is rare in Mt and Mk. In Mt it appears only in 21:3 and in Mk only in the parallel 11:3 (also in 16:20). In Lk 1-2 the term is used for God. For Jesus it appears first in 7:13 and then several times. In almost all cases a significant number of witnesses changed ὁ κύριος to ὁ Ἰησοῦς. In none of these cases the committee decided against κύριος.

In John the term is also rare:
NA28 John 6:23 εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.
                                    τοῦ Ἰησοῦ   pc, Sy-P, Sy-H^mg
                  omit phrase εὐχ. … κυρίου: D, f13-part, Sy-S, Sy-C

NA28 John 11:2 ἦν δὲ Μαριὰμ ἡ ἀλείψασα τὸν κύριον
                                              safe!
I has been suggested that κύριος (besides the vocative) appears only in the passion narrative of John and that the other three occurrences (4:1, 6:23, 11:2) are all editorial glosses (note that D et al. omit the phrase in 6:23!).

WH: "The Western change is doubtless due to the apparent awkwardness of the combination of ὁ κύριος … ὁ Ἰησοῦς: but the difficulty lies rather in the absence of any perceptible force in the double naming; the most probable explanation being that ὅτι is 'recitative' and that Ἰησοῦς … Ἰωάννης are in *oratio recta* as the very words of the report." – "On the whole the text of the verse cannot be accepted as certainly free from doubt."
The awkwardness of the double subject is removed if one considers the ὅτι-phrase as direct speech, as WH suggest:
"Now when Jesus learned that the Pharisees had heard, 'Jesus is making and baptizing more disciples than John' …"

It has been also conjectured that originally no direct subject was expressed and that scribes subsequently added either "Jesus" or "Lord". The last speaker from 3:27-36 was John. It is also possible that some early editor inserted or changed something in verses 1-3 and this resulted in the clumsy style.

Compare:
G. van Belle "Κύριος or Ἰησοῦς in John 4:1?" in Festschrift Delobel, 2002, p. 159 – 174 [who argues for κύριος on contextual, stylistic and theological grounds.]

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

External rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)
        (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 44

24.   Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 4:1 Ὡς οὖν ἔγνω ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ὅτι Ἰησοῦς πλείονας μαθητὰς ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει ἢ Ἰωάννης

T&T #33

<u>omit:</u> A, B*, G, L, W^S, Γ, Ψ, 0211, 397, 579, 892, 1071, 1424*, al, Trg^mg

καὶ   pc⁴ = 891, 1128, 1291, 2148

ὡς   pc⁵ = 740, 827, 1265, 1446, 1457

txt   P66, P75, 01, B^C1, C, D, Δ, Θ, 083, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 213, 565, 799, 821, 1424^C, Maj, Latt, Sy, Co, **NA²⁵**
WH have ἢ in brackets.

In B (p. 1353 C 9) the H is added above the line. It is not clear when the letter was added. Tischendorf assigns it to B². But B¹ cannot be excluded.
1424: H is squeezed in between the two words.
Lacuna: X, 865
B: no umlaut

The text is difficult to understand without the ἢ.
The omission can be understood as accidental after the similar sounding -ει. Especially since the support is incoherent.

Hort writes: "It remains no easy matter however to explain either how the verse as it stands can be reasonably understood without ἢ, or how such a mere slip as the loss of H after ΕΙ should have so much excellent Greek authority, more especially as the absence of ἢ increases the obvious no less than the real difficulty of the verse. The dissent of the versions may easily have a connection with their prevailing support of the Western reading; that is ὁ Ἰησοῦς and ἢ may have come in together: the authority of the combination of ὁ κύριος with ἢ consists of [actualized:] P66, P75, B^C, C, f13, 33, 157, Maj, a group of mainly Syrian complexion [not correct anymore today]. On the whole the text of the verse cannot be accepted as certainly free from doubt."

Why do I always think of καὶ βαπτίζει Ἰωάννην here?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 45

Difficult variant
NA28 John 4:3
ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν <u>πάλιν</u> εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
BYZ John 4:3
ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν <u>_____</u> εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν

T&T #34

Byz   A, B*, K, Π, Δ, Ψ, 0141, 157, 579, 799, 821, 1424, Maj,
       q, Sy-H, bo^mss, <u>Weiss</u>

txt   P66, P75, 01, B^C2, C, D, L, M, W^S, Θ, 083, 086, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397,
       565, 892, 1071, al^120, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co, arm

In B (p. 1353 C 14) the word has been added in the right margin and an insertion sign (./.) after ἀπῆλθεν indicates the point. Tischendorf assigns the addition to B².
Lacuna: X, 865
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 4:12 Ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἰωάννης παρεδόθη ἀνεχώρησεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
NA28 Mark 1:14 Μετὰ δὲ τὸ παραδοθῆναι τὸν Ἰωάννην ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ
NA28 Luke 4:14 Καὶ <u>ὑπέστρεψεν</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν. καὶ φήμη ἐξῆλθεν καθ᾽ ὅλης τῆς περιχώρου περὶ αὐτοῦ.
                   ὑποστρέφω "return, turn back"

The variant is difficult to explain. There is no reason for an omission. The word could have been added, because in ch. 1-2 Jesus was already in Galilea (so Weiss).
Zahn (Comm. Jo) thinks that the πάλιν does not refer to a second journey, but simply says that it is a return to his home after leaving it for Passah.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 46

Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:5 ἔρχεται οὖν εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην <u>Συχὰρ</u> πλησίον τοῦ χωρίου ὃ ἔδωκεν Ἰακὼβ [τῷ] Ἰωσὴφ τῷ υἱῷ αὐτοῦ·

<u>Συχεμ</u>   Sy-S, Sy-C
(=Shechem)
B: no umlaut

Jerome (Questions on Genesis 48:22):

> Sicima iuxta graecam et latinam consuetudinem declinata est, alioquin hebraice Sychem dicitur, ut Iohannes quoque evangelista testatur, licet vitiose, ut Sychar legatur, error inolevit: et est nunc Neapolis urbs Samaritanorum.
>
> According to Greek and Latin usage, [the noun] Sicima is declined. But in Hebrew it is pronounced Sichem, as also the Evangelist John bears witness, although an error has grown up and it is read in a defective manner as Sichar. And today it is Neapolis, the city of the Samaritans.

It is not clear if Jerome actually knew manuscripts with this reading or if he was just conjecturing it.

Robertson (Wordpictures): "There is a dispute whether this is just a variation of Shechem as meaning 'drunken-town' (Isa 28:1) or 'lying-town' (Hab 2:18) or is a separate village near Shechem (Neapolis, Nablous) as the Talmud and Eusebius indicate. Apparently the present village Askar corresponds well with the site. The use of πόλιν (city) does not mean that it was a large town. Mark and John use it freely for small places."

TVU 47

Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:9 λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρῖτις· πῶς σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν παρ' ἐμοῦ πεῖν αἰτεῖς γυναικὸς Σαμαρίτιδος οὔσης; <u>οὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρίταις.</u>

<u>omit:</u> 01*, D, it(a, b, d, e, j), <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
     <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u> both have the clause in brackets.

The words are added by 01^{C1} in the margin.
Lat(aur, c, f, ff², l, q, r¹, **11A**, vg) read txt.
Sy-S omits γυναικὸς Σαμαρίτιδος οὔσης.
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

συγχράομαι "associate on friendly terms"

Western non-interpolation

Possibly early marginal note? Or interpreted as such and therefore omitted? The support for the omission is very slim.
Aland (NT Papyri II) suggests that the words have been omitted as superfluous.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 185) thinks that the words have been omitted because they separate the answer from the question.
συγχράομαι appears only here in the Greek Bible.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 48

26.   **Difficult variant**
Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:11 λέγει αὐτῷ [ἡ γυνή]· κύριε, οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ· πόθεν οὖν ἔχεις τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ζῶν;

T&T #36

omit: P75, B, Sy-S, ac², NA²⁵, WH, Weiss

ἐκείνη   01*, aeth

txt   P66, 01^{C2}, A, C, D, L, N, Wˢ, Xˢ, Θ, Ψ, 050, 083, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 33,
      213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 821, 865, 1071, Maj,
      Latt, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sa, bo, Or, WHᵐᵍ
Lacuna: X (but suppl.)
B: no umlaut

It is possible that the words have been omitted as unnecessary. It is also possible that the words have been added early to make the subject clear.

ἐκείνη is probably a mishearing of ἡ γυνή from (self-)dictation.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 49

NA28 John 4:15 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή· κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ, ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ <u>**διέρχωμαι**</u> ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν.

BYZ John 4:15 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή Κύριε δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ ἵνα μὴ διψῶ μηδὲ <u>**ἔρχομαι**</u> ἐνθάδε ἀντλεῖν

Byz   01^{C2}, A, C, D, L, N, W^S, X^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 397, 565, 579, 892, 1241, Maj, <u>Trg</u>

txt   P66, P75, 01*, B, Or, Heracleon^{Or}, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>
       01* also: ὧδε instead of ἐνθάδε

Heracleon: Rome, ca. 170 CE!
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 4:4 Ἔδει δὲ αὐτὸν <u>διέρχεσθαι</u> διὰ τῆς Σαμαρείας.

διέρχομαι normally: "go or pass through" (as in verse 4!)
        but here: movement toward a destination "come here"

Tischendorf: "si scriptum fuisset, quis tandem διέρχ- maluisset?"

WH (§304, p. 226):
"διέρχωμαι is here used in its idiomatic sense "come all the way", which expresses the woman's sense of her often repeated toil. Being commonly used in other senses, the word was easily misunderstood and assumed to be inappropriate; and the change would be helped by the facility with which one of two similar consecutive syllables drops out."

To the contrary Burgon suggests that διέρχωμαι is accounted for by the final syllable δε of μηδὲ.

The word appears nowhere else in Jo, except 4:4. The support is very limited.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 50

27.   **Difficult variant:**
Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:16 λέγει αὐτῇ· ὕπαγε φώνησον **τὸν ἄνδρα σου** καὶ ἐλθὲ ἐνθάδε.

No txt in NA and SQE!

σου τὸν ἄνδρα
        B, 086, 69, 131, pc, Or^{pt}, Trg^{mg}, WH

txt   P66, P75, 01, A, C, D, L, W^S, X^S, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579,
        Maj, Or^{pt}
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 4:18
πέντε γὰρ ἄνδρας ἔσχες καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστιν <u>σου ἀνήρ·</u>   safe!

The B reading is the more unusual (emphasis?) and agrees with the order in 4:18. On the other hand this does not really explain the universal support for the txt reading.
Weiss (Com. John) thinks that the B reading is a conformation to 4:18.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 51

Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή· <u>οἶδα</u> ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ <u>ἡμῖν</u> ἅπαντα.

<u>οἴδαμεν</u>   P66^C, 01^{C2}, G, L, N, Λ, f13, 33, 397, 1071, 1241, al,
         f, Sy-H^{mg}, sa, ac², bo, arm, Or^{pt}

<u>ἰδοὺ</u>   Sy-S

txt   P66*, P75, 01*, A, B, C, D, W^S, X^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 086, 0141, f1, 565, 579,
         Maj, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, pbo, Or^{pt}

f13: 124, 174, 788 have οἶδα.
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 4:22 ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε ὃ οὐκ οἴδατε· ἡμεῖς προσκυνοῦμεν ὃ <u>οἴδαμεν</u>, ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν.

Compare:
NA28 John 5:32 ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ <u>οἶδα</u> ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.
         <u>οἴδατε</u>   01*, D, 124, pc, L547, L1016, a, aur, d, e, q, Sy-C, arm, geo[1]
         <u>οἴδαμεν</u>   1424, pc

οἴδαμεν is probably a conformation to context, either to 4:22 or to ἡμῖν in this verse 25.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 52

Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:28 ἀφῆκεν οὖν τὴν ὑδρίαν αὐτῆς ἡ γυνὴ καὶ <u>ἀπῆλθεν</u> εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ λέγει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις·

Not in NA and Tis.

<u>ἀπῆλθεν τρέχουσα</u>	Θ, L253, Aug
<u>"run"</u>	Sy-S, Tatian[N], Aug, Bois
<u>δραμοῦσαν</u>	Chrys
<u>τρέχει</u>	Romanos Melodos (6th CE)

The full support is in Bois only! The Θ reading is in SQE, Swanson, Vogels and von Soden. Tatian and Sy-S are also in Merck.
L253 is given in the IGNTP Byzantine text of John.
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

τρέχω (aor. ἔδραμον, ptc. δραμών) "run, speed on, make progress"

Chrysostom (homily on John 34:1):
Τοιαύτη τις ἦν καὶ αὕτη ἡ γυνή. Οὕτω γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀνήφθη, ὡς καὶ τὴν ὑδρίαν ἀφεῖναι, καὶ τὴν χρείαν δι' ἣν παρεγένετο, <u>καὶ δραμοῦσαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν</u>, πάντα τὸν δῆμον ἑλκύσαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

Augustine: (from Houghton)
cucurrit	"run, speed"	(In Iohannis Evangelium tractatus 15.30.1)
abiit ...festinans	"depart in a hurry"	(De diversis quaestionibus 64.211)
festinanter cucurrit	"hastenly run"	(Sermon 101.2.2)

Romanos Melodos: cp. Petersen, Tatian, p. 367-8

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 28:8 Καὶ ἀπελθοῦσαι ταχὺ ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου μετὰ φόβου καὶ χαρᾶς μεγάλης <u>ἔδραμον</u> ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ.
NA28 Mark 5:6 καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ μακρόθεν <u>ἔδραμεν</u> καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ
NA28 Luke 24:12 Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀναστὰς <u>ἔδραμεν</u> ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον
NA28 John 20:2 <u>τρέχει</u> οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον
NA28 John 20:4 <u>ἔτρεχον</u> δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ·

A Tatianism?

Romanos Melodos is said to have used the Diatessaron (Petersen).

The Θ reading is interesting, because such an almost singular support by Θ is rare. Possibly the versions are representing this Greek form. But since this is quite a self suggesting variant, it is probable that the versions independently invented this reading.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 53

28.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:29 δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα <u>ὅσα ἐποίησα,</u> μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός;

T&T #40
T&T #42

<u>ἃ ἐποίησα</u>
    01, B, C*, (579), Or^pt, **<u>NA²⁵</u>**, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg^mg</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
    <u>ὅσα ἃ</u>   579, 2437

txt   P66, P75, A, C^C3, D, L, W^sup, X^s, Θ, Ψ, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397,
      565, 821, 865, 1071, 1241, Maj, Or^pt

B: no umlaut

Following context:
NA28 John 4:39 Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης ὅτι εἶπέν μοι πάντα <u>ἃ ἐποίησα.</u>
<u>ἃ   ἐποίησα</u>   P75, 01, B, C*, L, 083, 2786, pc
<u>ὅσα ἐποίησα</u>   P66, A, C^C3, D, W^s, X^s, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 579,
                799, 821, 865, 1071, 1241, Maj

NA28 John 4:45 ὅτε οὖν ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι πάντα ἑωρακότες <u>ὅσα ἐποίησεν</u> ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν.
<u>ἃ   ἐποίησεν</u>   01*, D, 083, Maj
<u>ὅσα ἐποίησεν</u>   P66, P75, 01^C2, A, B, C, L, N, W^s, Θ, Ψ, 086, 0141, f1, f13, 33,
                565, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al

Compare usage of ἃ with ποιέω:
NA28 John 2:23   τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει·
NA28 John 3:2   τὰ σημεῖα ποιεῖν ἃ σὺ ποιεῖς
NA28 John 5:19   ποιοῦντα· ἃ γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος ποιῇ
NA28 John 5:20   αὐτῷ ἃ αὐτὸς ποιεῖ
NA28 John 5:36   ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι
                     τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ

NA28 John 6:2   τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει
NA28 John 6:13   κριθίνων ἃ ἐπερίσσευσαν τοῖς βεβρωκόσιν.
NA28 John 6:63   ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λελάληκα
NA28 John 7:3   τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιεῖς·
NA28 John 8:26   κἀγὼ ἃ ἤκουσα
NA28 John 8:38   ὑμῖν. ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα
                 οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε
NA28 John 10:6   ἦν ἃ ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς.
NA28 John 10:16 ἔχω ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ τῆς αὐλῆς
NA28 John 10:25 τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ

NA28 John 11:45 καὶ θεασάμενοι <u>ἃ ἐποίησεν</u>
                           <u>ὅσα ἐποίησεν</u>   P66^{C}, 0141, pc
                           <u>ὃ   ἐποίησεν</u>   P66*

NA28 John 11:46 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς ἃ ἐποίησεν Ἰησοῦς.
                           <u>ὅσα ἐποίησεν</u>   A, K, Π, Υ, Λ, f13, al

NA28 John 12:50 ἐστιν. ἃ οὖν ἐγὼ λαλῶ,
NA28 John 14:10 ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λέγω
NA28 John 14:12 τὰ ἔργα ἃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ

NA28 John 14:26 πάντα <u>ἃ εἶπον</u> ὑμῖν
                         <u>ὅσα εἶπον</u> Θ, f1, 28, 33, 157, 565, pc

NA28 John 15:14 ποιῆτε <u>ἃ</u> ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν.
                      <u>ὅσα</u> A, Θ, Ψ, 33, Maj

NA28 John 15:15 πάντα <u>ἃ</u> ἤκουσα
                      <u>ὅσα</u> D*, S, Ω, 28, 33, pc

NA28 John 15:24 αὐτοῖς ἃ οὐδεὶς ἄλλος ἐποίησεν,

NA28 John 17:8   ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα <u>ἃ</u> ἔδωκάς μοι
                           <u>ὅσα</u>   Π, pc

NA28 John 18:21 οἴδασιν ἃ εἶπον ἐγώ.

NA28 John 20:30 τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ], ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα

NA28 John 21:25   Ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ <u>ἃ ἐποίησεν</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς
                    <u>ὅσα ἐποίησεν</u> A, D, W, Θ, f1, Maj
                    txt   01, B, C, X, Ψ, 33, pc, Or

The normal Johannine usage clearly seems to be ἃ.
John elsewhere uses ὅσα only at 10:41, 11:22, 16:13, 16:15 safe, and 17:17 (here only 579 reads ἃ).
It is curious why at this block of three verses 4:29, 39, 45 such a strong variation occurs, since the first two occurrences of ἃ and the following 13 occurrences are safe! Besides this block of three verses John uses ἃ 29 times, 22 times this reading is safe.

It is possible that ἃ has been changed into ὅσα to avoid the double α: πάντα ἃ. It can cause confusion in copying and in reading out. But in several of the examples above a double α appears without variation.

Perhaps the ὅσα is a conformation to the immediately preceding ὃς:
ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα **ὅσα** ἐποίησα

Strange.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 54

Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:35 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι **ἔτι** τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται;

<u>omit:</u>   P75, D, L, S, X^S, Π, Ω, 047, 086^vid, f1^pt (118, 131, 205, 209, 872), f13, 28, 1241, L844*, pm, d, Sy-C, Or^pt

ὅτι <u>τὸ</u>   K*

txt   P66, 01, A, B, C, K^C, W^s, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 083, 0141, f1, 33, 157, 397, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, Or^pt

ἄρτι   conj. A. Pallis (1926)

Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 8:17 καὶ γνοὺς λέγει αὐτοῖς· τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ <u>συνίετε; πεπωρωμένην</u> ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν;
BYZ Mark 8:17 καὶ γνοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς Τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ <u>συνίετε ἔτι πεπωρωμένην</u> ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν
Byz   A, K, Π, 157, 700, 1071, Maj, f, l, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H
txt   P45^vid, 01, B, C, D, L, N, W, Δ, (Θ), 0143^vid, f1, f13, 28, 33, (565), 579, 892*, 1241, pc, it, Co

NA28 Luke 22:37 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι_____τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.
BYZ Luke 22:37 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι <u>ἔτι</u> τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί τὸ Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὰ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει
Byz   K, Π, N, Θ, Ψ, f13, 565, 700, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy
txt   01, A, B, D, H, L, Q, T, W, X, f1, 157, 579, 892, 1241, 2542^C, L844, pc^8, b, d, f, r^1, Co

NA28 Romans 5:8 συνίστησιν δὲ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἀγάπην εἰς ἡμᾶς ὁ θεός, ὅτι <u>ἔτι</u> ἁμαρτωλῶν ὄντων ἡμῶν Χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπέθανεν.
<u>omit:</u> 131, 460, 618, 1836*, 2147

Difficult.
The support for the omission is not coherent. It appears probable that the omission is an attempt to avoid the awkward ὅτι ἔτι.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "Read ἄρτι for ἔτι. *Now* is the fourth month of *the year* (counting from springtime), *and the harvest* therefore *is at hand.* No satisfactory sense can be elicited with ἔτι."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 55

NA28 John 4:35-4:36 οὐχ ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἔτι τετράμηνός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ θερισμὸς ἔρχεται; ἰδοὺ λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐπάρατε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν καὶ θεάσασθε τὰς χώρας ὅτι λευκαί εἰσιν πρὸς <u>θερισμόν. ἤδη</u> 36 <u>ὁ θερίζων</u> μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρῃ καὶ ὁ θερίζων.

<u>θερισμόν. ἤδη</u> 36 <u>ὁ θερίζων</u>	01ᶜ, C*, D, L, (Wˢ), Ψ, 33, pc, Sy-S, Sy-C, boᵖᵗ, <u>WH</u>, **NA²⁵**, <u>Trgᵐᵍ</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u>θερισμόν ἤδη.</u> 36 <u>ὁ θερίζων</u>	P75, 083, it, Sy-P, boᵖᵗ, sa, Or, **NA²⁵⁻ᴬᵖᵖ**, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>
<u>one of the above, sine interp.</u>	P66, 01*, B, Θ, 083, al
<u>θερισμόν. ἤδη</u> 36 <u>καὶ ὁ θερίζων</u>	579, 700
<u>θερισμόν ἤδη.</u> 36 <u>καὶ ὁ θερίζων</u>	Cᶜ³, Xˢ, Δ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, vg), Sy-H, boᵖᵗ
<u>θερισμόν.</u> 36 <u>καὶ ὁ θερίζων</u>	397
<u>one of the above, sine interp.</u>	A

W has a dot after λευκαί εἰσιν.
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

A question of punctuation:
"look around you, and see how the fields are ripe for harvesting.
36 The reaper is <u>already</u> receiving wages ..."
"look around you, and see how the fields are ripe for harvesting <u>already.</u>
36 The reaper is receiving wages ..."

The addition of καὶ makes the second interpretation explicit. According to Metzger it is more in accord with John's style for ἤδη to begin a sentence (4 times at the beginning, 12 times in the middle of a sentence, none at the end). Schnackenburg (Joh Commentary) notes that with one or the other punctuation it is either an actual date or a general proverb.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 56

Minority reading:
NA28 John 4:41 καὶ πολλῷ <u>πλείους</u> ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ,

<u>πλείον</u>   P75, e, r¹   (e: amplius, r¹: plus)

<u>πληθὺς</u>   Θ

Lacuna: X (suppl. reads txt), Sy-S
B: no umlaut

πλείους nominative masculine plural   comparative
πλεῖον   nominative neuter   singular comparative

txt   "And many more believed"
P75   "And they believed much more"

Compare context:
NA28 John 4:39 Ἐκ δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἐκείνης <u>πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν</u> εἰς αὐτὸν τῶν Σαμαριτῶν διὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς γυναικὸς μαρτυρούσης ὅτι εἶπέν μοι πάντα ἃ ἐποίησα.

Compare also:
LXX 4 Maccabees 2:6 καίτοι ὅτε μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν εἴρηκεν ἡμᾶς ὁ νόμος <u>πολὺ πλέον</u> πείσαιμ' ἂν ὑμᾶς ὅτι τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν κρατεῖν δύναται ὁ λογισμός ὥσπερ καὶ τῶν κωλυτικῶν τῆς δικαιοσύνης παθῶν
In fact, since the law has told us not to covet, I could prove to you all the more that reason is able to control desires. Just so it is with the emotions that hinder one from justice.

Interesting variation.
The text reading is a progression from verse 39. "Many" believed the woman, but "many more" believed Jesus. The Latin readings may be best explained as mistranslations of the complex πολλῷ πλείους. The P75 reading can be either a subconscious slip or a deliberate change. There is no reason why the whole tradition should have changed this reading.

The German literal translation "Münchener Neues Testament" has this reading:
"Und (um) vieles mehr glaubten sie"

For the Θ reading compare:

Mark 3:7-8 … καὶ πολὺ πλῆθος … ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτόν.

Luke 23:27 Ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ πολὺ πλῆθος …

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 57

NA28 John 4:42 τῇ τε γυναικὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλιὰν πιστεύομεν, αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.

BYZ John 4:42 τῇ τε γυναικὶ ἔλεγον ὅτι Οὐκέτι διὰ τὴν σὴν λαλιὰν πιστεύομεν· αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἀκηκόαμεν καὶ οἴδαμεν ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου <u>ὁ Χριστός.</u>

Byz   A, C^{C3}, D, L, X^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
      d, e, f, q, **27**, **33**, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{pt}

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C*, W^S, 083?, pc, Lat, Sy-C, sa, bo^{pt}, ac², arm, Or

083 reads: [θωϲ ο ϲ͞η͞ρ το]υ κοϲμου
              43 [Μετα δε ταϲ δ]ῳ ο ημε   acc. to IGNTP
              IGNTP list it for txt without reservation. Probable, but not sure.

Ephrem in his Diatessaron commentary: "we know that he is the Messiah."

Lacuna: X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 2:11 ὅτι ἐτέχθη ὑμῖν σήμερον <u>σωτὴρ ὅς ἐστιν χριστὸς</u> κύριος ἐν πόλει Δαυίδ.

Compare context:
NA28 John 4:25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή· οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται ὁ <u>λεγόμενος χριστός·</u>
NA28 John 4:29 δεῦτε ἴδετε ἄνθρωπον ὃς εἶπέν μοι πάντα ὅσα ἐποίησα, μήτι οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ὁ χριστός;</u>

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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 58

NA28 John 4:43 Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας <u>ἐξῆλθεν</u> ἐκεῖθεν _____ εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν·

BYZ John 4:43 Μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας <u>ἐξῆλθεν</u> ἐκεῖθεν **καὶ ἀπῆλθεν** εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν·

T&T #43

Byz   A, N, Xˢ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 124, 33, 397, 799, 821, 865, Maj,
      aur, c, vg, Sy-P, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, Vogels
      <u>omit ἐκεῖθεν:</u> S, Θ, al³⁸

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C, D, Wˢ, 083, 0141, f13, 892, 1241, pc²⁰, it, Sy-C, Co, Or

<u>καὶ ἦλθεν</u>   L, 213, 597, al³⁷, vgᵐˢˢ, Sy-H

Lacuna: X (but suppl.), Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:35 Καὶ πρωῒ ἔννυχα λίαν ἀναστὰς <u>ἐξῆλθεν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν</u> εἰς ἔρημον τόπον κἀκεῖ προσηύχετο.

<u>ἐξῆλθεν</u>   B, 28*, 565, pc²⁰, saᵐˢˢ, boᵖᵗ
<u>ἀπῆλθεν</u>   W, pc³, it, Sy-P

NA28 John 4:3
ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν.
BYZ John 4:3 ἀφῆκεν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν <u>καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν</u>

The words could have been omitted as being redundant, note the similar omission at Mk 1:35!
On the other hand they could have been added to create a more clear sentence structure. It is possible that the words have been added from 4:3.
Weiss (Jo Com.) notes that the addition removes the terseness of the connection of ἐξῆλθεν with εἰς.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 59

29. Difficult variant

NA28 John 4:51 ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ _____ **λέγοντες** ὅτι ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ ζῇ.

BYZ John 4:51 ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ **καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν λέγοντες** ὅτι ὁ παῖς σου ζῇ

T&T #44

Byz **καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν λέγοντες**	P45^{vid}, P66, A, C, W^s, X^s, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 799, 865, Maj, Latt, Sy, sa, ac², [Trg]
καὶ ἀ**ν**ήγγειλαν λέγοντες	K, Π, f1, 33, 157, 565, al¹⁴⁰
καὶ ἤγγειλαν	01, Tis, Bal
καὶ ἤγγειλαν αὐτῷ	D, b
καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες	1071, 1424, pc¹²
καὶ ἤγγειλαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες	0233, pc²
one of these:	P45
txt _____ **λέγοντες**	P75, B, L, N, 0141, 213, 397, 579, 597, 821, 892, 1010, 1241, 2561, 2718, pc¹⁷, pbo, bo, aeth, Or

P45: T.C Skeat makes a reconstruction of the fragments (Hermathena, 1991) and from space calculations it clearly must have some longer addition after ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ. IGNTP agrees.
Lacuna: X (but suppl.), Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 20:18 ἔρχεται Μαριὰμ ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ___ ἀγγέλλουσα …
BYZ John 20:18 ἔρχεται Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἀπαγγέλλουσα …

	Byz	P66^c, 01^{C2}, D, L, Θ, f1, f13, Maj
	ἀνήγ.	W, Δ, Ψ, 33, al
	txt	P66*, 01*, A, B, 078, 0250, pc

It is possible that ἀπήγγειλαν has been omitted as being redundant and to create a more straightforward sentence structure.
On the other hand the word could have been added as a natural addition.

This is one of the cases suggested by Metzger ("Lucianic recension", 1959) where one could have an old relict of the earliest Antiochian text. Not necessarily correct, but at least older than any possible recension. (Note also 10:29 and 11:32).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 60

30. Difficult variant

NA28 John 4:51 ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος οἱ δοῦλοι <u>αὐτοῦ</u> ὑπήντησαν αὐτῷ λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ <u>**παῖς αὐτοῦ**</u> ζῇ.

BYZ John 4:51 ἤδη δὲ αὐτοῦ καταβαίνοντος οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ ἀπήντησαν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ <u>**παῖς σου**</u> ζῇ

T&T #45

Byz <u>παῖς σου</u>	Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 157, 565, 597, 799, 1010, 1293, 1424, 2786, Maj[1250], Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Or[pt], Heracleon[Or]	
<u>υἱὸς σου</u>	P45?, P66[C], D, K, Π, L, N, U, X[S], 0141, f13-part, 33, 213, 397, 579, 821, 865, 892, 1071, 1241, 1819, 2129, 2718, al[310], it(a, b, e, q), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H[mg], Co	
	<u>f13:</u> 69, 124, 124, 174(=f13[b]), 543	
txt <u>παῖς αὐτοῦ</u>	P66*, P75, 01, A, B, C, W[S], 0211, pc[9], arm, Or[pt]	
<u>υἱὸς αὐτοῦ</u>	pc[16], Lat(aur, c, d!, f, ff[2], l, r[1], **11A**, vg)	
<u>παῖς σου ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ</u>	f13[a,c] (13, 828, 873, 983)	

Lacuna: X (but suppl.), Sy-S
P45: T.C Skeat makes a reconstruction of the fragments (Hermathena, 1991) and from space calculations he <u>concludes</u> that παῖς αὐτοῦ is too long and suggests υἱὸς σου written as ΥCϹΟΥ. Reconstructions show that one can quite certainly exclude the readings with αὐτοῦ. An abbreviated υἱὸς fits slightly better, but it remains doubtful.
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 8:6 καὶ λέγων· κύριε, <u>ὁ παῖς μου</u> βέβληται …
NA28 Matthew 8:8 ἀλλὰ μόνον εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήσεται <u>ὁ παῖς μου</u>.
NA28 Matthew 8:13 καὶ ἰάθη <u>ὁ παῖς [αὐτοῦ]</u> ἐν τῇ ὥρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.

NA28 Luke 7:2 Ἑκατοντάρχου δέ τινος <u>δοῦλος</u> κακῶς ἔχων …
NA28 Luke 7:7 ἀλλὰ εἰπὲ λόγῳ, καὶ ἰαθήτω <u>ὁ παῖς μου</u>.
NA28 Luke 7:10 …εὗρον τὸν <u>δοῦλον</u> ὑγιαίνοντα.

Compare immediate context:
NA28 John 4:46 Καὶ ἦν τις βασιλικὸς οὗ <u>ὁ υἱὸς</u> ἠσθένει
NA28 John 4:47 ... καὶ ἰάσηται αὐτοῦ <u>τὸν υἱόν</u>,
NA28 John 4:49 κύριε, κατάβηθι πρὶν ἀποθανεῖν <u>τὸ παιδίον μου.</u>
NA28 John 4:50 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πορεύου, <u>ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ.</u>
NA28 John 4:53 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ,</u>

A very difficult question. παιδίον appears twice elsewhere in John (16:21, 21:5).
παῖς appears nowhere else in Jo.
Basically it could be a harmonization to immediate context (υἱὸς) or to the parallels (παῖς).

Note the interesting conflation in f13.
Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the σου comes from verse 50.

Regarding the αὐτοῦ it is also possible that ὁ παῖς αὐτοῦ is a conformation to οἱ δοῦλοι αὐτοῦ earlier in the verse.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 61

Minority reading:

NA28 John 4:53 ἔγνω οὖν ὁ πατὴρ ὅτι **[ἐν]** ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ <u>ἐν ᾗ</u> εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὁ υἱός σου ζῇ, καὶ ἐπίστευσεν αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ οἰκία αὐτοῦ ὅλη.

omit	P75, 01*, B, C, T, f1, 892, pc, <u>**NA²⁵**</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>
txt	P66, 01^C2, A, D, L, W^sup, X^s, Θ, Ψ, 078, 0141, f13, 33, 397, Maj, [Trg]
B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 John 5:9 Ἦν δὲ σάββατον <u>ἐν ἐκείνῃ</u> τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

NA28 John 14:20 <u>ἐν ἐκείνῃ</u> τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
        omit <u>ἐν</u>:	W

NA28 John 16:23 Καὶ <u>ἐν ἐκείνῃ</u> τῇ ἡμέρᾳ
        omit <u>ἐν</u>:	W, Θ, 579

NA28 John 16:26 <u>ἐν ἐκείνῃ</u> τῇ ἡμέρᾳ

NA28 John 21:3 καὶ <u>ἐν ἐκείνῃ</u> τῇ νυκτὶ ἐπίασαν οὐδέν.
        omit <u>ἐν</u>:	L

ἐν ἐκείνῃ is the normal usage. It would thus be natural to add the preposition.
On the other hand the omission of ἐν happens in 3 out of 5 cases by some witnesses.
Externally the shorter reading is clearly preferable.
Weiss (Com. John) thinks that the ἐν is a conformation to the immediately following ἐν ᾗ.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 62

NA28 John 5:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα <u>ἦν   ἑορτὴ</u> τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἀνέβη Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα.

BYZ John 5:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα <u>ἦν ἥ ἑορτὴ</u> τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἀνέβη ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

Byz   01, C, L, Xˢ, Δ, Π, Ψ, 0141, f1, 828, f13ᶜ, 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1342, 1424, Maj-part[E, F, H, M], Co, Tis, Bal

txt   P66, P75, A, B, D, K, N, T, Wˢ, Θ, f13ᵃ,ᵇ, 2, 22, 28, 397, 565, 579, 700, 1241, Maj-part[G, S, U, V, Y, Γ, Λ, Ω], Sy-C, arm, geo, Or

Note also:
ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν <u>ἀζύμων</u> καὶ ...   Λ
ἦν ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων <u>ἥ σκηνοπηγία</u>   131

Lacuna: X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 22:1 Ἤγγιζεν δὲ <u>ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων</u> ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα.
NA28 John 6:4 ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, <u>ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.</u>
NA28 John 7:2 Ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς <u>ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἡ σκηνοπηγία.</u>

Context:
NA28 John 2:23 Ὡς δὲ ἦν ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις <u>ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ</u>, ...
NA28 John 4:45 ἐδέξαντο αὐτὸν οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι πάντα ἑωρακότες ὅσα ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις <u>ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ</u>, καὶ αὐτοὶ γὰρ ἦλθον <u>εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν</u>.

It is possible that there was a tendency of the scribes to identify the otherwise indeterminate feast. The addition of ἥ probably means then the Passover. Although Hort writes: "If it [ἥ] were genuine, the reference would be to the Feast of Tabernacles (ἥ σκηνοπηγία), emphatically 'the Feast of the Jews' and not to the Passover." - This is also the view of Zahn.
It is also possible that some kind of accidental error is involved: ἥ ἑ...

It has often been suggested that the order of chapters 5 and 6 should be interchanged. In that case 5:1 stands after 6:4 "Now the Passover, the festival of the Jews, was near."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 63

NA28 John 5:2 Ἔστιν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ <u>Βηθζαθὰ</u> πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα.

BYZ John 5:2 ἔστιν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη Ἑβραϊστὶ <u>Βηθεσδὰ</u> πέντε στοὰς ἔχουσα

T&T #47

Byz	<u>Βηθεσδα</u>	A, C, N, X^S, Δ^{Gr}, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 213, 397, 565, 579, 597, 865, 881*, 892, 1071, 1241, 2129, 2718, 2786, Maj, f, q, vg^{mss}, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, arm, geo, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>SBL</u>
	<u>Βηθσεδα</u>	582

txt	<u>Βηθζαθα</u>	01, 0211, L, 33, 713, it(b, e, ff², l), Eus^{Onomast.}, Cyr, <u>WH</u>, <u>NA²⁵</u>
		omit ἐπὶ τῇ: 01*, aur, e, vg^{Cl}, Eus
		<u>Betzetha</u>: b, ff²*, **11A**, 33 <u>Betzatha</u>: e, l
	<u>Βελζεθα</u>	D, a, d, r¹, vg^{mss}

	<u>Βηθσαϊδα</u>	P66, P75, B, T, W^S, (Ψ), 881^C, 2737
		aur, c, ff²^C, vg, Δ^{Lat}, Sy-H, Co, Tert, Jerome, Pilgrim^{Bord.}, <u>WH</u>^{mg}
		Ψ reads <u>Βησσαϊδα</u>
		IGNTP lists additionally E* for Βηθσαϊδὰ.

P45: In the IGNTP volume on the papyri of John a tiny scrap of P45 is noted that contains part of this verse. Unfortunately the condition is very bad and one cannot make out a single letter in the published photo. The editors note an Epsilon on the last line, which may belong to either Bethesda or Belzetha, but this is very uncertain.

Reconstruction: (green = identified letters)

ΑΥΤΟΥΟΛΗ**ΤΟΥ**ΤΟΔΕΠΑΛΙΝΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΝCΗΜΕΙΟΝΕΠΟΙΗCΕΝΟΙΗΕΛ
ΘΩΝΕΚΤΗCΙ**ΟΥΔΑ**ΙΑCΕΙCΤΗΝΓΑΛΙΛΑΙΑΝ ΜΕΤΑΤΑΥΤΑΗΝΕΟΡΤΗ
ΤΩΝΙΟΥΔΑΙΩ**ΝΚΑΙ**ΑΝΕΒΗΟΙΗCΙCΙΕΡΟCΟΛΥΜΑ ΕCΤΙΝΔΕΕΝΤΟΙC
ΙΕΡΟCΟΛΥ**ΜΟΙC**ΕΠΙΤΗΠΡΟΒΑΤΙΚΗΚΟΛΥΜΒΗΘΡΑΗΕΠΙΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΗΕΒΡΑ
ΙCΤΙ**ΒΗΘ**ΕC**ΔΑΠΕΝΤ**ΕCΤΟΑCΕΧΟΥCΑ·

Lacuna: X (but suppl.), Sy-S
B: umlaut! (1355 C 1 L)   Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθσαϊδα πέντε

Eusebius writes in his Onomastikon (ca. 324-330 CE):

<u>Βηζαθά.</u> Κολυμβήθρα ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἥτις ἐστὶν "ἡ προβατική", τὸ παλαιὸν Εʼ στοὰς ἔχουσα. Καὶ νῦν δείκνυται ἐν ταῖς αὐτόθι λίμναις διδύμοις, ὧν ἑκατέρα μὲν ἐκ τῶν κατʼ ἔτος ὑετῶν πληροῦται, θατέρα δὲ παραδόξως πεφοινιγμένον δείκνυσι τὸ ὕδωρ, ἴχνος, ὥς φασι, φέρουσα τῶν πάλαι καθαιρουμένων ἐν αὐτῇ ἱερείων. Παρʼ ὃ καὶ προβατικὴ καλεῖται, διὰ τὰ θύματα.

"<u>Bezatha</u>, a pool in Jerusalem, which is the sheep [pool] formerly having five porches. It is now identified with the twin pools, both are supplied by the periodic rains, but the water of one is unexpectedly of a reddish color, a trace, they say, of the carcasses of the sacrifices which were formerly cleansed in it before offering, whence also it was called sheep [pool]."

The Pilgrim of Bordeaux writes (333 CE):

"Within the city are the twin pools [piscinae gemellares], with 5 porticoes, called <u>Betsaida</u>. There persons who have been sick for many years are cured. The pools contain water which is red when it is disturbed [in modum coccini turbatam]."

Cyrill of Jerusalem writes (Hom. in Paralyt. ca. 348-386):

Εν γαρ τοις Ιεροσολυμοις ην προβατικη κολυμβηθρα, πεντε στοας εχουσα, τεσσαρας μεν περιτρεχουσας, μεσην δε την πεμπτην, εν η κατεκειτο πληθος ασθενουντων.

"In Jerusalem there was a sheep pool with five porticoes, four running around it, but the fifth being in the middle of it. In it were lying a lot of sick."

Jerome's translation of Eusebius' Onomasticon (ca. 390 CE):

"<u>Bethsaida</u> piscina in Ierusalem quae uocobatur προβατική. haec quinque quondam porticus habuit, ostendunturque gemini lacus, quorum unus hibernis pluuiis adimpleri solet, alter mirum in modum rubens quasi cruentis aquis antiqui in se operis signa testatur. nam hostias in eo lauari a sacerdotibus solitas ferunt, unde et nomen acceperit."

(Jerome accepts Bethsaida in his Vulgata.)

Theodor of Mopsuestia († 428) writes regarding the pool (Comm. in Evang. Johannis, Catena, see Jeremias, p. 13-14):

μετα γαρ τας εν κυκλω τεσσαρας, μεσην ειχεν ετεραν.

"Because besides the four running around, it had another in the middle."

<u>Bethsaida</u> ("House of Fish") is a city on the Sea of Galilee. Probably an early error. But Hort thinks "a tank hewn in the rock might naturally bear the name." The support for Bethsaida is surprisingly strong. That such an error can occur can be seen in the Byzantine minuscule 2737, which also reads thus. Also possibly E*.

<u>Bethesda</u> means in Hebrew "House of Mercy". Though widely supported, it is also suspect as a scribal alteration, because of its "edifying etymology" (Metzger). Alleged support got Bethesda from the Copper Scroll from Qumran, which in the ed. pr. contains a reference to a pool at "bᵉbeyt 'eschdatayin" ("place of poured out [water]") or "bᵉbeyt ha'aschuchiyn" ("place of the (two) pools"). The NET Bible comments:

There is some new archeological evidence (published by M. Baillet, J. T. Milik, and R. de Vaux in *Les "petites grottes" de Qumran*): Copper scroll 3Q15 from Qumran seems to indicate that in the general area of the temple, on the eastern hill of Jerusalem, a treasure was buried in *Bet *Esdatayin*, in the pool at the entrance to the smaller basin. The name of the region or pool itself seems then to have been *Bet *Esda*, "house of the flowing." It appears with the dual ending in the scroll because there were 2 basins. Βηθεσδά seems to be an accurate Greek rendition of the name, while Milik suggests Βηθζαθά is a rendition of the Aramaic intensive plural *Bet *Esdata*. All of this is not entirely certain, but is certainly plausible; if Milik is correct, both the textual variants would refer to the same location, one a Greek rendering of the Hebrew name, the other a Greek rendering of the Aramaic. This would be an unusual instance where two textual traditions which appear to be in conflict would both be correct."

But according to a new reconstruction of the Copper Scroll published in 2006 (ref. below), the line in question only mentions some sort of installation (building) with two reservoirs, but contains no proper name.

<u>Bezetha</u> is attested by Josephus as the name of a quarter of the city near the northeast corner of the temple area. He reports that the Syrian Legate Cestius burned this suburb in his attack on Jerusalem in October A.D. 68.
He mentions the name Βεζεθά 5 times in his History of the Jewish War (2:328 = II 15:5, 2:530 = II 19:4, 5:149 = V 4:2, 5:151 = V 4:2, 5:246 = V 5:8). The name occurs in several spellings (Βεζεθά, Βεζαθὰ). He explains the name in 5:151: "This newly built part of the city was called 'Bezetha' in our language, which, if interpreted in the Greek language, may be called 'the New City'." This area is north of the tower Antonia.

The external evidence is curiously divided. Unfortunately the most suspect reading is supported by the best witnesses.
An interesting fact is that if one changes two letters in Βεθε<u>σ</u>δα, one is getting Βεθ<u>σε</u>δα, which sounds the same as Βεθ<u>σαι</u>δα in Koine pronunciation (if one does not know the correct diaeresis pronunciation). Βεθ<u>σε</u>δα is actually supported by the (Byz) manuscript 582. Perhaps this contributes to the origin of Βεθσαιδα?
I don't see that the etymology is a strong argument against Bethesda. It could very well be that the pool or place had that name.

For the UBS committee the reading Βηθζαθὰ was the least unsatisfactory reading.

In view of the many hospitals and sanatoria bearing the name Bethesda I think the place and the incident will always be remembered as Bethesda, whatever else the critical editions print.

The location of the pool was for a long time not clear:

1. Prior to archeological digs, the pool of Bethesda was identified with the Pool of Israel, close to the northern temple wall. This was the dominant tradition of the late middle ages.

2. Others identified it with the Siloah spring, which is the one true spring in Jerusalem. It seems to be an intermittend spring, which could explain the moving water. But compare Jo 9:7, where John explicitly mentions the Siloah pool, why then not in 5:2 also?

3. In digs conducted in the late 19th century, a large cistern situated about 100 feet north-west of St. Anne's church was discovered (between the Pool of Israel and the northern wall, in the Bezetha valley). Most of the associated building has disappeared, but it would seem to have been a church of perhaps the fourth or fifth century. In addition to the testimony of the ruins to the sacredness of the site, various objects were found among the rubbish, indicating that this was a place where cures had been supposed to occur. Especially noticeable was the marble model of a foot with a Greek inscription which had been placed there by one Pompeia Lucilia in thankfulness for the cure of some disease (ca. 120-140 CE!). In later digs (ca. 1914-38), archaeologists unearthed a rectangular pool with a portico on each side and a fifth one dividing the pool into 2 separate compartments. The pool was about 90 m long and 50/65 m wide. The dividing portico was about 6,5 m wide. The pillars were about 7 m high and the complete building about 8.5 m. The above mentioned cistern was located next to this portico and was probably part of a church. Also found were faded frescoes of the miracle of Christ's healing. This pool is matching Cyrill's description. Lying in the Bezetha valley, it was well suited to collect the rainwater. Its position next to the temple suggests a cultic function. It is possible that it had been built under Herod the Great during the temple expansion. Perhaps at the position of an earlier pool, which was called sheep-pool?

Problematic is the fact that a "sheep-pool" is nowhere mentioned in the non-Christian literature. It has been suggested that sheep-pool meant that the pool was close to the Sheep Gate or Market. The Sheep Gate is not exactly located, but was in the north-eastern corner of the wall (Neh 3:1, 3:32, 12:39). It was called the Sheep Gate because it led out to the sheep markets, where lambs were sold for sacrifice in the Temple.

Note the minor variant

Ἔστιν δε … ἐν τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα by 01^C2, A, D, G, L, Θ, a, r[1]

Jeremias suggests that this perhaps points to the fact that the place "Bethesda" was <u>in</u> the pool, namely the dividing portico.

Regarding the grammatical construction of:

Ἔστιν δὲ ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις <u>ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα</u> …

It might be noted that there are two possibilities to accent the word κολυμβηθρα, either as nominative κολυμβήθρα, or as dative κολυμβήθρᾳ.

1. Nominative: In this case one has to add a noun in the dative to ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ. Normally one adds πύλῃ and gets sheep-gate: "There is in Jerusalem by the sheep gate a pool, called …" In that case Bethesda is the name of the pool.

2. Dative: In this case one gets: "There is in Jerusalem by the sheep-pool, a place called …"

Against the nominative can be argued that

- no father or pilgrim mentions the addition of πύλῃ. All fathers take προβατικῇ κολυμβήθρα together.

- Some witnesses omit the ἐπὶ τῇ, which removes the difficulty of the construction.

- a pool cannot adequately be called a "house".

- since κολυμβηθρα has no article, there shouldn't be one in front of ἐπιλεγομένη.

Against the dative can only be said that one is missing the explicite "a place". But this is not unusual (compare Mk 15:7 or Lk 22:47).

If one accepts the dative one should speak of a place called Bethesda near the sheep-pool and not of a pool called Bethesda.

Compare:

- E. W. G. Masterman "The Pool of Bethesda" The Biblical World 25 (1905) 88-102 [prior to the latest finds]

- J. Jeremias "Die Wiederentdeckung von Bethesda" Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 59 = N.F. 41, Göttingen, 1949, 26 pages

- L. Devillers "Une piscine peut en cacher une autre. A propos de Jn 5:1-9a" RB 106 (1999) 175-205

- U. von Wahlde "The 'upper pool', its 'conduit' and 'the road of the Fuller's field' in the eights century BC Jerusalem and their significance for the pools of Bethesda and Siloam" RB 113 (2006) 242-262

- D. Brizemeure et al. "Le Rouleau de cuivre de la grotte 3 de Qumrân (3Q15). Expertise – Restauration – Epigraphie I", STDJ 55.1, Leiden, 2006, page 203 (comment) and 215 (translation) [no Bethesda in the Copper Scroll]

- Reinhart Ceulemans "The Name of the Pool in Joh 5,2. A Text-Critical Note Concerning 3Q15" ZNW 99 (2008) 112-15 [discussion of above article]

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
      slight tendency to accept Bethesda

TVU 64

NA28 John 5:3 ἐν ταύταις κατέκειτο πλῆθος τῶν ἀσθενούντων, τυφλῶν, χωλῶν, ξηρῶν.
NA28 John 5:4 -

BYZ John 5:3 ἐν ταύταις κατέκειτο πλῆθος πολὺ τῶν ἀσθενούντων τυφλῶν χωλῶν ξηρῶν <u>ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν</u>
BYZ John 5:4 <u>ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, καὶ ἐτάρασσεν τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὑγιὴς ἐγίνετο, ᾧ δήποτε κατειχετο νοσήματι.</u>

T&T #48
T&T #49

<u>with asterisks:</u> S, Λ, Π, 045, 047, al⁷² , Sy-H

<u>a) verse 3b:</u>
Byz   A^C, C^C3, D, W^S, X^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 865,
       892, 1071, 1241, Maj,
       Lat, Sy-Pal, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo^pt, arm, geo, Chrys, <u>Bois</u>
       <u>παραλυτικὸν, ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν</u>
       D, it, vg^ms (Book of Kells)

txt   P66, P75, 01, A*, B, C*, L, T, 0141, 157, 821, q, Sy-C, Co

<u>b) verse 4:</u>
Byz   A, C^C3, L, X^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 865, 892,
       1071, 1241, 1424, Maj, it, vg^Cl, Sy-P, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, bo^pt, Chrys, Tert, <u>Bois</u>

       <u>ἄγγελος γὰρ κυρίου</u>   A, K, Π, L, Υ, Δ, 0233, f13, 1241, al, it^pt, vg^Cl
       <u>ἐλύετο</u> for κατέβαινεν: A, K, Π, Ψ, 0211, 579, 1241, pc, r¹, vg^mss
                <u>κατέβαινεν</u>   C^C3, L, X^S, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, Maj

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C*, D, T, W^S, 0141, 33, 157, 821, 2718,
       d, f, l, q, **11A**, vg^St, pc, Sy-C, Co, arm, geo

Lacuna: X (but suppl.), Sy-S
B: no umlaut

<u>English:</u>
3 In these lay many invalids - blind, lame, and paralyzed,
  waiting for the stirring of the water;
4 **for an angel of the Lord went down at certain seasons into the pool,**
  and stirred up the water; whoever stepped in first after the stirring
  of the water was made well from whatever disease that person had.

<u>Tertullian (De Baptismo 5):</u>

"Angelum aquis intervenire si novum videtur, exemplum futuri praecucurrit. Piscinam Bethsaidam angelus interveniens commovebat. Observabant qui valetudinem querebantur, nam si quis praevenerat descendere illuc, queri post lavacrum desinebat."

"If it is thought strange that an angel should do things to waters, there has already occurred a precedent of that which was to be. An angel used to do things when he moved the Pool of Bethsaida. Those who complained of ill-health used to watch out for him, for anyone who got down there before the others, after washing had no further reason to complain."

<u>Didymus (De Trinitate Libri Tres 2:14):</u>
ευροιμεν δε αν - και την κολυμβηθραν - ομολογουμενως εικονα του βαπτισματος, αλλ ουκ αυτην τυγχανουσαν την αληθειαν. η γαρ εικων προς καιρον - διο και απαξ του ενιαυτου υπο αγγελου κινηθεν το εν αυτη υδωρ και ενα μονον τον πρωτον κατιοντα.

G. Fee writes: "It is often asserted that Didymus (d. 398) also knew the reading, but this is not quite accurate. It is clear from *de Trinitate* 2.14 that Didymus knew the *tradition* about the angel. But it seems equally clear that he was not acquainted with the actual text of the tradition, for there is not a single verbal correspondence to John 5:4 in his sentence. Furthermore, he says the water was stirred by the angel *once a year!* That is a far cry from the κατὰ καιρὸν of the text." (Evangelical Quarterly 54 (1982) 207-218)

It should further be noted that some have doubted the genuineness of De Trinitate (i.e. that it really is from Didymus). There is only one manuscript from the 11th CE of which the title is missing. The work consists of three books. The main argument for Didymus is that the church historian Sokrates mentions ca. 440 CE a work τα περι τριαδος τρια βιβλια by Didymus.

Codex Alexandrinus:

The correction in A is not completely clear. Tischendorf, followed by NA, thinks that originally A* omitted verse 3b. In that case A* would have written:

ΑϹΘΕΝΟΥΝΤѠΝΤΥΦΛѠΝΧѠ
ΛѠΝΖΗΡѠΝ ΑΓΓΕΛΟϹΓΑΡΚ͞Υ
ΚΑΤΑΚΑΙΡΟΝΚΕΛΟΥΕΤΟΕΝΤΗ
ΚΟΛΥΜΒΗΘΡΑΚΑΙΕΤΑΡΑϹϹΕ

The corrected Aᶜ reads:

ΑϹΘΕΝΟΥΝΤѠΝΤΥΦΛѠΝΧѠᴸѠᴺᶻᴴᴾѠᴺ
ΕΚΔΕΧΟΜΕΝѠΝΤΗΝΤΟΥΥΔΑᵀᴼϹᴷᴵᴺᴴϹᴵᴺᴬᴳᴳᴱ
ΚΑΤΑΚΑΙΡΟΝΚΕΛΟΥΕΤΟΕΝΤΗ ᴸᴼϹᴳᴬᴾᴷ͞ᵞ
ΚΟΛΥΜΒΗΘΡΑΚΑΙΕΤΑΡΑϹϹΕ

From what is left visible below the correction this reconstruction fits good. Especially the characteristic Rhos, which vertical bar extends below the line, are still visible. Also the nomen sacrum bar above the final Υ is still visible. But it is not completely secure. This should be checked at the original. (Image: CSNTM 48a, column B line 13-14)

In his transcription B.H. Cowper writes (London 1860, post Woide): "Videtur olim scriptum fuisse, χωλων ξηρων αγγελος γαρ κυριου, quae erasit antiqua vel. 1 m., et ad finem lineae praecedentis posuit quaedam, quaedam ad finem huius lineae, caetera rescripsit."

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>click here</u>.

Have 3b, but not 4:   D, Wˢ, 33, 2718, Lat, arm, geo
Have not 3b, but 4:   A*, L
omit all: P66, P75, 01, B, C*, T, 0141, 157, 821, q, Sy-C, Co

Very certainly this is not an original part of John's Gospel.
It is interesting that the two parts 3b and 4 don't have identical support. This might simply be some copying error, but it is also possible that it indicates independent origin. So actually Tregelles (Account.., 1854, p. 245): "the words added to verse 3 seem to have been one scholion, and verse 4 another. […] These scholia belonged at first to different manuscripts (whether in margin or text);"

According to Zahn this might be an interpretation by Papias. It was probably stimulated to explain verse 7:
NA28 John 5:7 ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔχω ἵνα ὅταν <u>ταραχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ</u> βάλῃ με εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν· ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγώ, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει.
This is important to keep in mind. A complete explanation must also explain and take into account verse 7!

It is generally held that it probably was an early marginal comment which made it into the text.

The passage contains several un-Johannine expressions:
ἐκδέχομαι   "wait for",   only here in the Gospels
κίνησις   "movement, motion", only here in the NT
κατὰ καιρὸν   only here in the Gospels (Rom 5:6)
ταραχή   "stirring up",   only here in John, once in Mk 13:8
δήποτε   with a relative "whatever time", only here in the NT
κατέχω   "hold fast, keep",   only here in John
νόσημα   "disease, illness",   only here in the NT

τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν: enclosed genitive, very un-Johannine style. John would probably have written τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος.
κατέβαινεν ἐν: the use of ἐν with forms of βαινω is un-Johannine. John uses εἴς nowhere ἐν.
ἐμβὰς: is reserved for getting into boats. For people entering water καταβαίνουσιν and ἀναβαίνουσιν is used, also in Jo 5:7!

Already Tertullian (de bapt. 5) knew verse 4 and interpreted κατὰ καιρὸν = "once per year".

The words also probably stood in the Diatessaron, because Ephrem writes: "If they believe that the Angel by the water of Shiloah was healing the sick, how much rather should they believe that the Lord of the Angels purifies by baptism

from all stain?" – Only in the interpolated version there is any mention of an angel. The words are also in the Arabic Diatessaron.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "In this passage we have to deal with two corruptions. The first corruption is κίνησιν, a misreading of κένωσιν, *pouring out*. The afflicted were lying about in the shed waiting for fresh water to be poured out into the bath, for the water of the previous day, being contaminated by leprous and other diseased bathers, would be renewed every morning. ... The second corruption is ταραχθῇ, a misreading of παραξυθῇ. ... So that ὅταν παραξυθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ means *when the water is poured out* into the bath, παραξυθῇ being thus a synonym of κενωθῇ. Now, when these two corruptions were committed, a miracle was imagined, and so the legend about an angel agitating the water was formed and interpolated into the text. ... Some manuscripts omit also the words ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν, but these are indispensable, first because some reason had to be assigned for the presence of the diseased crowd at the bath and secondly because the word κίνησιν formed the foundation of the legend. On the other hand, the clause ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἔρχομαι ἐγώ, ἄλλος πρὸ ἐμοῦ καταβαίνει evidently belongs to the legend."

Maurice Robinson suggests the following (tc-list 16 June 1997):
"My own viewpoint is that the omission of vv.3b-4 reflects deliberate recensional activity, performed primarily by the orthodox (thank you, Bart!) in order to remove a passage which superstitiously might have encouraged a false worship of angels, exaggerated claims regarding "healing spas" or the like in the early centuries, particularly in Egypt and the Western regions of the Empire. Accidental omission hardly seems likely in regard to such a variant, especially when some witnesses only omit verse 4 while others omit 3b and 4, and still others include 3b and omit 4. Such "mixed" recensional activity was faulty, however, in that none of it addressed (for whatever reason) the problem of the wording of verse 7; yet that easily could have been recensionally altered by a similar curtailing and replacement of the text into something like "Do you want to become whole?" "Sir, I have no man, in order that he should assist me". Yet recensional activity, even when clearly evidenced, is not always wholly rational, so
this fact occasions me no major difficulty, even when charging recensional activity in those early witnesses in regard to vv.3b-4."

This suggestion appears not very probable to me.

The added explanation is very catchy. Once heard you will never forget it. It appears very improbable that it was omitted deliberately. I think that what we have here are "remains of this evangelic tradition which were rescued from oblivion by the scribes of the second century" (WH).

It has been suggested that 5:3b-4 have been added together with the PA to John. Both stories are catchy and make the impression of oral tradition.

The remaining problems are:
1. It has to be explained why some witnesses have 3b, but not 4 and vice versa. I personally think that the suggestion by Tregelles of two independent scholions which have finally been combined appears quite possible.
2. Verse 7: Either verse 7 assumes knowledge of 3b-4 or 3b-4 have been added as an explanation of verse 7. Since no convincing explanation for an omission exists, one has to conclude that 3b-4 have been added as an explanation of verse 7.

Compare:
- Z. Hodges "The Angel at Bethesda - John 5:4" Bibliotheca Sacra 136 (1979) 25-39
- Gordon D. Fee "On the Inauthenticity of John 5:3b-4." The Evangelical Quarterly 54 (1982) 207-218

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 65

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:9 καὶ εὐθέως ἐγένετο ὑγιὴς ὁ ἄνθρωπος <u>καὶ</u> ἦρεν τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ καὶ περιεπάτει. Ἦν δὲ σάββατον ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

Not in NA but in SQE!

<u>καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ</u>   01, a, b, e, j, **33**, Sy-H**, ac²
<u>et surrexit et</u>

<u>καὶ ἠγέρθη</u>   D, f1, f13, d, ff²
<u>et surgens</u>   Tis adds: arm

Sy-C omits καὶ ἦρεν τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ (h.t.? καὶ - καὶ)
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare immediate context:
NA28 John 5:8 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν</u> σου καὶ περιπάτει.   Lat: Surge …

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 8:15 καὶ ἥψατο τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, καὶ ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός, <u>καὶ ἠγέρθη καὶ</u> διηκόνει αὐτῷ.
NA28 Matthew 9:25 ὅτε δὲ ἐξεβλήθη ὁ ὄχλος εἰσελθὼν ἐκράτησεν τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς, <u>καὶ ἠγέρθη</u> τὸ κοράσιον.
NA28 Mark 2:12 <u>καὶ ἠγέρθη</u> καὶ εὐθὺς <u>ἄρας τὸν κράβαττον</u> ἐξῆλθεν ἔμπροσθεν πάντων

Probably a conformation to immediate context verse 8. A natural addition.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 66

Difficult variant

NA28 John 5:10 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ τεθεραπευμένῳ· σάββατόν ἐστιν, καὶ οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἆραι τὸν κράβαττόν <u>σου.</u>

BYZ John 5:10 ἔλεγον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ τεθεραπευμένῳ Σάββατόν ἐστιν   οὐκ ἔξεστίν σοι ἆραι τὸν κράββατον ___

Byz   A, B, C^{C3}, K, X^S, Δ, 0141, f1, 124, 2, 28, 157, 397, 565, 700, Maj,
       e, 27, <u>**NA**^{25}</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   P66, P75, 01, C*, D, L, N, W^S, Θ, Λ, Π, Ψ, 0211, 0233, 2193^C, f13, 579,
       892, 1071, 1241, al, Lat, Sy, Co, arm

Lacuna: X, 33
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verses:
NA28 John 5:8 ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν <u>σου</u> καὶ περιπάτει.
NA28 John 5:9 καὶ ἦρεν τὸν κράβαττον <u>αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ περιεπάτει.

Compare next verse:
NA28 John 5:11 ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν <u>σου</u> καὶ περιπάτει.
                      <u>omit σου:</u>   01*

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 2:9 ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν <u>σου</u> καὶ περιπάτει;
NA28 Mark 2:11 ἔγειρε ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν <u>σου</u> καὶ ὕπαγε

It is possible that the addition of σου is an attempt to harmonize to the previous verses. Note that B supports the omission. Compare next variant.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 67

   34. <u>**Difficult variant:**</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 5:11 <u>ὁ δὲ</u> ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς· ὁ ποιήσας με ὑγιῆ ἐκεῖνός μοι εἶπεν· ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου καὶ περιπάι.

<u>ὃς δὲ</u> P75, A, B, <u>**NA**²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   P66, 01, *C**, L, Wˢᵘᵖ, Xˢ, Θ, 0141, f13, 131, 397, 579, 892, 1071, 1241, al[G, K, Π, N, Y, Δ, Λ]

<u>omit:</u>   *C*^{C3}, D, Ψ, f1, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj[E, F, H, M, S, U, V, Γ]

B: no umlaut

ὁ   definite article
ὃς   relative pronoun

Compare:

NA28 Matthew 22:5 οἱ δὲ ἀμελήσαντες ἀπῆλθον, ὃς μὲν εἰς τὸν ἴδιον ἀγρόν, <u>ὃς δὲ</u> ἐπὶ τὴν ἐμπορίαν αὐτοῦ·

    txt   B, L, W, Θ, f1, f13, 700, 1424, pc
    <u>ὁ δὲ</u>   01, C, 579, Maj

NA28 Mark 15:23 καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον· <u>ὃς δὲ</u> οὐκ ἔλαβεν.   txt   01, B, Γ*, 33, 579, 1424*
    <u>ὁ δὲ</u>   A, C, L, P, Θ, Ψ, 700, f13, 28, 157, Maj

It is possible that the complete omission was original and the other readings are attempts to add a subject. On the other hand it is also possible that the unusual use of ὃς here lead to the other readings. ὃς must be taken as a demonstrative "this one".
The support for ὃς is incoherent. The support for the omission is bad.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 68

35. Difficult variant
NA28 John 5:12 ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν· τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ εἰπών σοι·
ἆρον _____ καὶ περιπάτει;
BYZ John 5:12 ἠρώτησαν οὖν αὐτόν Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ εἰπών σοι
ἆρον <u style="color:green">τὸν κράββατον σου</u> καὶ περιπάτει

Byz   A^C, C^C3, D, X^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, Maj,
       Latt, Sy, sa^ms, bo, arm, [Trg]
       <u style="color:green">σου τὸν κράββατον</u>   579

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C*, L, sa, ac²

A*, W^S, Λ* omit due to h.t.
The supplementum W^S ends here in the middle of verse 11 with … ἆρον τὸν. The
first page of W proper starts with … κράββατον σου καὶ περιπάτει. This
could either be the end of verse 11 or the end of the Byzantine text of verse 12.
Since W is not Byzantine, it appears more probable that we have here the end of
verse 11. Then verse 12 has been omitted due to parablepsis in W proper.
The texttype of W^S and W is not significantly different.

Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verses:
NA28 John 5:8 ἔγειρε ἆρον <u>τὸν κράβαττόν σου</u> καὶ περιπάτει.
NA28 John 5:9 καὶ ἦρεν <u>τὸν κράβαττον αὐτοῦ</u> καὶ περιεπάτει.
NA28 John 5:11 ἆρον <u>τὸν κράβαττόν σου</u> καὶ περιπάτει.
          omit σου: 01*
Compare also:
NA28 Mark 2:9 ἆρον <u>τὸν κράβαττόν σου</u> καὶ περιπάτει;
NA28 Mark 2:11 ἔγειρε <u>ἆρον τὸν κράβαττόν σου</u> καὶ ὕπαγε

NA28 John 19:15 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν ἐκεῖνοι· <u>ἆρον ἆρον, σταύρωσον
αὐτόν.</u>

Compare previous variant 5:10.
It is possible that the words have been added to harmonize with the previous
verses (so Weiss). On the other hand it is possible that they have been edited
out to avoid unnecessary repetition.

It has been noted that αἴρω is transitive and always takes a direct object, except here. On the other hand it could be argued that here we have an imperative short form as in Jo 19:15. M.A. Robinson calls this "wholly ungrammatical".

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 69

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:15 ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ <u>ἀνήγγειλεν</u> τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις
ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὸν ὑγιῆ.

<u>εἶπεν</u>   01, C, L, 397, pc, <u>WH</u>, **NA**[25], <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, P75, A, B, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, Maj, <u>WH</u>[mg]
        <u>ἀπήγγειλεν</u>   D, K, U, Xˢ, Δ, f13, 33, 1241, 1424, al

<u>λέγει</u>   579

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 4:25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή· οἶδα ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται ὁ
λεγόμενος χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, <u>ἀναγγελεῖ</u> ἡμῖν ἅπαντα.

Interestingly ἀναγγέλλω appears in the Gospels only in John. Mt, Mk and Lk
use ἀπαγγέλλω.
ἀνήγγειλεν is comparatively unusual here. There would have been no reason to
change εἶπεν.
<u>ἀπ</u>αγγέλλω is probably a conformation to the preceding <u>ἀπ</u>ῆλθεν.
Weiss (Com. John) thinks that the unusual ἀνήγγειλεν has been changed.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 70

NA28 John 5:16 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδίωκον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν Ἰησοῦν,
_____ ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ.

BYZ John 5:16 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδίωκον τὸν Ἰησοῦν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι
καὶ ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ

T&T #51

Byz   A, N, X^S, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 213, 865, 1071, Maj, e, f, q, r[1], **27**, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo[pt]

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C, D, L, W, 0141, f1, 69, 33, 397, 565, 579, 597, 821,
       892, 1010, 1241, 2718, 2786, pc[20],
       Lat(a, aur, b, c, d, ff[2], l, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo[pt], ac[2]

Lacuna: X (but suppl.)
B: no umlaut

Compare second next verse 18:
BYZ John 5:18 διὰ τοῦτο οὖν μᾶλλον ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι
ἀποκτεῖναι
omit μᾶλλον: U, f, Sy-C

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 14:1 καὶ ἐζήτουν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς πῶς αὐτὸν
ἐν δόλῳ κρατήσαντες ἀποκτείνωσιν·
NA28 John 7:1 ὅτι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι.

Reading verse 18 with μᾶλλον seems to require a previous mentioning of the
words. Since this was not present, some scribes inserted the required words in
verse 16 and others omitted μᾶλλον in verse 18.
There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 71

36. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 5:17 Ὁ δὲ **['Ἰησοῦς]** ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτοῖς· ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι·

omit   P75, 01, B, W, 0141, 892, 1071, 1241, pc, pbo,
      WH, **NA**²⁵, Weiss, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt   P66, A, D, L, Xˢ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj, Latt, Sy-S, Co

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 16:
NA28 John 5:16 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐδίωκον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι ταῦτα ἐποίει ἐν σαββάτῳ.

The addition of the subject is only natural here, because it is not clear from preceding context who is speaking here.
Metzger notes that the absence of the name is possibly "an Alexandrian deletion prompted by stylistic considerations".

Rating: 1 (NA clearly wrong)

TVU 72

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:19 Ἀπεκρίνατο οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ δύναται ὁ υἱὸς __ποιεῖν ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲν ἐὰν μή τι βλέπῃ τὸν πατέρα ποιοῦντα·

__ τοῦ ἀνθρῶπου D, f13, pc, d, arm

Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

The words do not appear in immediate context. There is no reason for an omission. The other occurrences of the term in John are safe (except for an occasional mix of ἀνθρῶπου and θεοῦ, see 5:25). Probably an accidental addition.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 73

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:25 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ <u>υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ</u> καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσιν.

T&T #52

Not in NA but in SQE!

<u>υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</u>   K, Π, S, Ω, 28, 2718, al[80], Sy-H[mg], Sy-Pal, pbo

<u>θεοῦ</u>   070, pc[18]

The 070 reading is not in NA, but in the ed. pr. and in T&T.
Lacuna: C, X
B: umlaut! (1356 B 24 L)   τῆς φω<u>νῆς τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ</u> καὶ

Compare:
NA28 John 9:35 σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ <u>ἀνθρώπου;</u>
BYZ John 9:35 σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ <u>Θεοῦ;</u>

Byz   A, L, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0250, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo
txt   P66, P75, 01, B, D, W, pc, Sy-S, Co

This change here in 5:25 contradicts Metzger's remark on 9:35: "the improbability of θεοῦ being altered to ἀνθρώπου is so great, that the Committee regarded the reading adopted for the text as virtually certain."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 74

37. Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 John 5:29 καὶ ἐκπορεύσονται <u>οἱ τὰ</u> ἀγαθὰ ποιήσαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς, <u>**οἱ δὲ τὰ**</u> φαῦλα πράξαντες εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως.

<u>οἱ τὰ</u>   P66^C, B, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Tis, Bal

<u>καὶ οἱ τὰ</u>   P66*, W

<u>οἱ δὲ τὰ</u>   P75, 01, A, (D), L, X^S, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj,
          WH^{mg}, [Trg]
          <u>οἱ δὲ</u>   D

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

There would have been no reason to omit δὲ here, except for symmetry reasons. It appears probable that οἱ τὰ is original and that the additions of καὶ or δὲ are attempts to smooth the abrupt change.

Irritating is only the support of P75 for δὲ.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 75

NA28 John 5:30 Οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν· καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω, καὶ ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν, ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.

BYZ John 5:30 Οὐ δύναμαι ἐγὼ ποιεῖν ἀπ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν· καθὼς ἀκούω κρίνω καὶ ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν ὅτι οὐ ζητῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με <u>πατρός.</u>

Byz   Χˢ, Θ, 1ᶜ, 1852ᶜ, f13, 2, 28, 397, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj[E, G, H, M, S, U, V, Y, Γ, Ω, 047, 063, 0211], it(b, c, ff², l, r¹, **33**), boᵖᵗ

txt   P66, P75, 01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Ψ, Δ, 070, 0141, f1, 69, 33, 157, 565, 579, al, Lat(a, d, e, f, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, boᵖᵗ, ac², Or

Lacuna: C, X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 4:34 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με</u> καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον.
     <u>add πατρός</u>:   1424

NA28 John 5:37 καὶ ὁ <u>πέμψας με πατὴρ</u> ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ.
     <u>omit πατὴρ</u>:   f13

NA28 John 6:38 ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με</u>.
<u>add πατρός</u>:   D, 047, 700, 118ᶜ, 892, 1424, al, it, Sy-S, Sy-C

NA28 John 6:39 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με,</u>
BYZ John 6:39 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με πατρός,</u>
Byz   K, Π, M, U, Γ, Θ, f13, 33, 579, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy-H
txt   P66, P75, 01, A, B, C, D, L, T, W, Ψ, f1, 157, 565, 700, 892, al, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P

NA28 John 6:40 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα <u>τοῦ πατρός μου,</u>
BYZ John 6:40 τοῦτο δὲ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα <u>τοῦ πέμψαντος με,</u>
<u>τοῦ πέμψαντος με πατρός</u>   Δ, Ψ, f13

NA28 John 7:16 ἀπεκρίθη οὖν αὐτοῖς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν· ἡ ἐμὴ διδαχὴ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὴ ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με·
add πατρός: 33

NA28 John 8:16 καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ, ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθινή ἐστιν, ὅτι μόνος οὐκ εἰμί, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ.
omit πατὴρ: 01*, D, Sy-S, Sy-C, **NA**[25], WH [πατήρ in brackets]

NA28 John 8:18 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ.   safe!

NA28 John 8:26 πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρίνειν, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πέμψας με __ἀληθής ἐστιν,
add πατήρ: 01

NA28 John 8:29 καὶ ὁ πέμψας με __μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐστιν·
add πατήρ: L

NA28 John 12:49 ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλάλησα, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν δέδωκεν τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω.

NA28 John 14:24 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ· καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν ἀκούετε οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸς ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός.
omit πατρός: f13

The variations are difficult to decide internally. The phrase with πατὴρ is more clear and explicit, without πατὴρ it might be not clear who sent him.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 76

38. Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:32 ἄλλος ἐστὶν ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμοῦ, καὶ <u>οἶδα</u> ὅτι ἀληθής ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία ἣν μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ.

<u>οἴδατε</u>   01*, D, 124, pc, L547, L1016, a, aur, d, e, q, Sy-C, arm, geo[1]

 scitis

<u>οἴδαμεν</u>   1424, pc

01 is corrected by 01^C2.
Lat(b, c, f, r[1], vg) read txt ("scio").
ff[2], l omit (h.t.)
Lacuna: C, X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

There is another who testifies on my behalf, and **I** know that his testimony to me is true.
There is another who testifies on my behalf, and **you** know that his testimony to me is true.

Compare immediate context:
NA28 John 5:28 μὴ <u>θαυμάζετε</u> τοῦτο,
NA28 John 5:30 Οὐ <u>δύναμαι ἐγὼ</u> ποιεῖν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐδέν· καθὼς <u>ἀκούω κρίνω</u>, καὶ ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ δικαία ἐστίν, ὅτι οὐ <u>ζητῶ</u> τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.
NA28 John 5:31 Ἐὰν <u>ἐγὼ μαρτυρῶ</u> περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ, ἡ μαρτυρία μου οὐκ ἔστιν ἀληθής·
NA28 John 5:33 <u>ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε</u> πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκεν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ·
NA28 John 5:34 <u>ἐγὼ</u> δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν <u>λαμβάνω</u>,

Compare also:
NA28 John 4:25 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή· <u>οἶδα</u> ὅτι Μεσσίας ἔρχεται ὁ λεγόμενος χριστός· ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν ἅπαντα.
          <u>οἴδαμεν</u>   P66^C, 01^C, G, L, N, Λ, f13, 33, 1071, 1241, al,
            f, Sy-H^mg, sa, ac[2], bo, Or^pt

NA28 John 5:37 καὶ ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ ἐκεῖνος μεμαρτύρηκεν περὶ ἐμοῦ. <u>οὔτε φωνὴν αὐτοῦ πώποτε ἀκηκόατε οὔτε εἶδος αὐτοῦ ἑωράκατε</u>
"... you have never heard his voice or seen his form"

NA28 John 7:28 <u>κἀμὲ οἴδατε καὶ οἴδατε πόθεν εἰμί·</u> καὶ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλήλυθα, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ἀληθινὸς ὁ πέμψας με, ὃν <u>ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε·</u>

NA28 John 8:14 ὅτι <u>οἶδα πόθεν ἦλθον</u> καὶ ποῦ ὑπάγω· <u>ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐκ</u> <u>οἴδατε πόθεν ἔρχομαι</u> ἢ ποῦ ὑπάγω.

NA28 John 8:19 <u>οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε οὔτε τὸν πατέρα μου·</u> εἰ ἐμὲ ἤ δειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου ἂν ᾔδειτε.

Both οἶδα and οἴδατε make good sense. οἶδα is more normal, because it is clear that Jesus knows the truth. οἴδατε is the more dramatic reading, because if the Jews know the truth about Jesus' testimony, they are even more guilty. It could be argued that this is contradicted by verse 5:37, but the meaning is not exactly the same. Generally in the Gospel of John the Jews do not know who Jesus is and always wrongly interpret the Biblical evidence.
The οἴδατε fits good to the ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην in verse 33. The Jews should know the truth from the testimony of John.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 77

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:36 Ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν <u>μείζω</u> τοῦ Ἰωάννου· τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά, αὐτὰ τὰ ἔργα ἃ ποιῶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ ὅτι ὁ πατήρ με ἀπέσταλκεν.

<u>μείζων</u> P66, A, B, E, G, M, N, W, Λ, Ψ, 063, 0211,
          f13, 33, 157, 579, 1071, 1241, al, Trg
<u>μείζον</u> 69, 397
<u>μείζονα</u> D, 1424, pc

txt <u>μείζω</u> 01, L, K, Π, Xˢ, Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, 124, 565, Maj, WH

Lacuna: P75, C, X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

μείζω / μείζονα   adjective <u>accusative</u> <u>feminine</u> singular comparative
μείζων   adjective <u>nominative</u> <u>masculine</u> singular comparative

txt   "But I have a testimony greater than John's."
P66 et al.: "But I am greater than John and have the testimony (of God)."

Zahn notes the following translation possibilities:
txt   "I have the (required) testimony on a larger scale/to a higher degree
            than John."
P66 et al.:"I have the (the only possible) testimony, as a more important figure
            than John."

Metzger writes: "The latter [P66..] reading, however, gives an antithesis, that is out of accord with the context."
This is not clear though. Both readings make good sense, but μείζων is clearly the harder reading.

Metzger also notes that it is possible that μείζων is just an incorrect form of the accusative. This is supported by the following variant:

NA28 John 1:50 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ὅτι εἶπόν σοι ὅτι εἶδόν σε ὑποκάτω τῆς συκῆς, πιστεύεις; <u>μείζω</u> τούτων ὄψῃ.
<u>μείζων</u>   P75, M, Δ, f13, 2*, 28, 579, 1071, 1424, al
<u>μείζονα</u>   P66, 01, pc, Epiph (D lacuna)

μείζω is accusative masc/fem. singular and is derived from μείζοσ-α (normally the forms are based on the comparative infix –ιον-, but there is a second comparative infix –ιοσ-. μείζω uses both forms).
The incoherent support for the readings shows that the variation is at least in part accidental.

Compare also discussion at 1:50.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
(both readings mean basically the same)

TVU 78

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:39 ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ·

T&T #54

27[92% Byz], aur, e, q, P. Egerton 2 (1v, lines 7-10), Ir[Lat]:
ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ζωὴν ἔχειν· ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ·
in quibus putatis vos vitam aeternam (- aur) habere,
et haec testimonio sunt de me.   e
haec sunt, quae testifucantur de me   q
et ipsae sunt, quae testimonium perhibent de me. aur

a, b, (ff²), Sy-C, arm:
ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ·
ἐν αἷς ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ζωὴν ἔχειν·
ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ·
In quibus putatis vos vitam habere,
haec sunt quae testificantur de me.   (ff² omits this last line)

ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ἐν αὐταῖς εὑρήσετε ζωὴν αἰώνιον …
Gregory Thaumaturgus (3rd CE), Methodius (9th CE), Photius (9th CE)

Augustine (8 times, see Houghton):
Scrutamini scripturas, in quibus putatis vos vitam aeternam habere,
ipsae testimonium perhibent de me.

Lacuna: C, X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

One question that arises with this variant is one of punctuation. Is it:
a) "You search the scriptures, in which you think that you have life; they are they which bear witness of me."
or
b) "Search the scriptures: Those (scriptures) in which you think that you have life, they it is that bear witness of me"

Is it an assertion (a) or a command (b)? In Egerton we have a command. In Egerton there is a point after γραφάς, but also a free space after ἔχειν. Curiously one Byzantine witness, manuscript 27, supports the Egerton reading (T&T).

Some Western witnesses combine both forms! The T&T analyses found no Greek support for this combination.

See:
- T.W. Manson, Review of Bell/Skeat "Unknown Gospel and New Gospel", Journal of Egyptian Archaeology 23 (1937) 130-132
- H.I. Bell "Search the Scriptures (Jo 5:39)" ZNW 37 (1938) 10-13
- M.-E. Boismard "A propos de Jean 5:39, essai de critique textuelle" RB 55 (1948) 5-34
- J.N. Birdsall "Photius and the text of the fourth Gospel" NTS 4 (1957-8) 61-3

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 79

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:40 καὶ οὐ θέλετε ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἵνα ζωὴν __ἔχητε.

   αἰώνιον D, Θ, 69, 884, pc, d, e, **29**, Sy-P
     aeternam

The IGNTP Byzantine edition of John lists: pc = 817, 994, L638, L1075, Chrys
Lacuna: C, X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 39:
NA28 John 5:39 ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν· καὶ ἐκεῖναί εἰσιν αἱ μαρτυροῦσαι περὶ ἐμοῦ·

A natural addition from the previous verse. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 80

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:44 πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι δόξαν παρὰ <u>ἀλλήλων</u> λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ οὐ ζητεῖτε;

T&T #55

Not in NA and not in SQE!

<u>ἀνθρώπων</u>   Δ, 1071, 1241, 1424, al[380], Or[pt]

Lacuna: C, X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 41:
NA28 John 5:41 Δόξαν παρὰ <u>ἀνθρώπων</u> οὐ λαμβάνω,

A natural conformation to verse 41. There would be no reason for a change to ἀλλήλων.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "There is something wrong in this sentence, for there is no logical connection between the two clauses. Perhaps πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνειν καὶ τὴν δόξαν κτλ. *How is it possible for you, or any sane person, to prefer glory bestowed by another man, and not rather seek that glory which comes from God?* I cannot, however, account for the intrusion of πιστεῦσαι."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 81

Minority reading:
NA28 John 5:44 πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ <u>τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ</u> οὐ ζητεῖτε;

T&T #56 (in part)
No txt in NA!

<u>τοῦ μόνου</u>	P66, P75, B, W, 228, 355*,
unico a, solus b	a, b, sa, bo^{pt}, ac², pbo, bo, arm^{mss}, Or^{pt}
<u>τοῦ μονογενοῦς θεοῦ</u>	N, 1071 (not in NA, SQE and Tis! Only in Swanson!)
txt	01, A, D, L, N, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 565, 579, 597, 821, 1071, 1241, 2786, Maj, Lat, Sy

<u>WH</u> have θεοῦ in brackets.
Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [θεοῦ] in brackets in the margin.

Or: ἀλλὰ τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἀπὸ <u>τοῦ μόνου</u> ζητοῦντες (Com. Mt 15, 23)
He cites it twice with θεοῦ in De Oratione 19, 2 and 29,8.
Lacuna: C, X, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

It is possible that some scribes got confused by the similar looking letters:

ΜΟΝΟ<u>ΥΘΥΟΥ</u>ΖΗΤΕΙΤΕ

Perhaps the overbar of the nomen sacrum has been interpreted as a deletion label? On the other hand one could argue that scribes would not have easily misinterpreted or overlooked such a NS bar.
The object θεός seems to be required, except one takes μόνος as a noun. E.A. Abbott in his "Johannine Grammar" notes that τοῦ μόνου could be written as a title τοῦ Μόνου = "the only One".
The support for the short reading is strong.
Zahn (Comm. Jo) notes that παρὰ τοῦ μόνου θεοῦ does not mean "from God alone", but "from the one who alone is God", which, in context, is not very fitting.
Perhaps one can punctuate: "from the only one, (from) God, …"?

The second variant by N, 1071 is even more interesting, because it seems to be a relict of the μονογενὴς θεὸς reading in 1:18! N has a lacuna at 1:18, but 1071 reads υἱὸς there.

Unfortunately T&T only lists the first variant and not the second (μονογενοῦς).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 82

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:1 Μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπῆλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης
τῆς Γαλιλαίας τῆς Τιβεριάδος.

T&T #57

τῆς Γαλιλαίας	P66*, 1093
τῆς Τιβεριάδος	(G), N, 047, 0210, al⁸² , boᵐˢ

τῆς Γαλιλαίας Τιβεριάδος   579ᶜ (579* reads txt)

τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἰς τὰ μέρη τῆς Τιβεριάδος
    Galilaeae in partes (fines d) Tiberiadis
D, Θ, 397, 597, 892, pc¹⁹, b, d, e, j, r¹, **33**

omit: 157, pc⁴

P66: the words are added in the margin.
G omits θαλάσσης also (h.t.)
579: see Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 446)
Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:23 ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοι[άρι]α ἐκ <u>Τιβεριάδος</u> ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου
ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.

Looks like a conflation, but the support for the short forms is just too weak. It is more probable that the short forms are either stylistic improvements, removing one redundant term, or accidental omissions due to parablepsis (τῆς - τῆς).
It is possible that the D reading represents a tradition in which the feeding took place near Tiberias and not Bethsaida (so Boismard).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 83

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:4 ἦν δὲ ἐγγὺς τὸ πάσχα, ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

T&T #59

omit verse: 163*, 1634, 2206
                     cum asteriscis: 156, 178, 187, 748, 2525, 2684

omit τὸ πάσχα: church fathers, probably: Ir, Or

WH note on τὸ πάσχα: perhaps a primitive interpolation

472 (= c^scr): Scrivener notes in his collation: "obelo notatur rubro in marg", T&T
have it for txt.
Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

The longer period of Jesus' ministry in John (about 3 years) caused problems,
because the other Gospels speak only of one year.
See the extensive discussion in WH (Notes on Select Readings, p. 77-81).
T&T note no witness for the sole omission of τὸ πάσχα.

Compare: Theodor Zahn, Commentary on John, Excursus 4.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 84

<u>Difficult variant:</u>

NA28 John 6:7 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ <u>**[ὁ] Φίλιππος**</u>· διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχύ [τι] λάβῃ.

BYZ John 6:7 Ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ <u>**Φίλιππος**</u>, Διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς, ἵνα ἕκαστος αὐτῶν βραχύ τι λάβῃ.

Byz   P75, A, B, D, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>SBL</u>
txt   P66, 01, L, N, W, 892, 1071, 2193*, pc

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Context:
NA28 John 6:5 λέγει πρὸς <u>Φίλιππον</u>·
<u>omit</u> τὸν: P66, 01, B, D, L, N, W, Δ, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, pc
<u>add</u> τὸν: A, Θ, f1, f13, Maj

Compare:
NA28 John 1:46 λέγει αὐτῷ <u>[ὁ] Φίλιππος</u>· ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε.
<u>omit</u> ὁ: P66*, 01, A, Wˢ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, Maj
<u>add</u> ὁ: P66ᶜ, P75, B, L, 33, 579, L2211, pc

NA28 John 12:21
οὗτοι οὖν προσῆλθον <u>Φιλίππῳ</u> τῷ ἀπὸ Βηθσαϊδὰ τῆς Γαλιλαίας
<u>add</u> τῷ: D, W

NA28 John 12:22 ἔρχεται <u>ὁ Φίλιππος</u> καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ, ἔρχεται Ἀνδρέας καὶ <u>Φίλιππος</u> καὶ λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.
<u>add 1ˢᵗ ὁ</u>:   P66, P75, B, L, 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, pc
<u>add 2ⁿᵈ ὁ</u>:   P66*, W

NA28 John 14:8 Λέγει αὐτῷ <u>Φίλιππος</u>· κύριε,
<u>add</u> ὁ: 01

There is a great variation with Φίλιππος and the article. No clear rule is discernible. Since normally the Majority text adds the article, there is a slight tendency here to regard the reading without the article as original.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 85

  40.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 6:7 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ [ὁ] Φίλιππος· διακοσίων δηναρίων ἄρτοι οὐκ ἀρκοῦσιν αὐτοῖς ἵνα ἕκαστος βραχύ <u>**[τι]**</u> λάβῃ.

omit P75, B, D, it, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>

txt   P66, 01, A, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj,
      Lat(c, f, vg), Sy-H, [<u>Trg^{mg}</u>]

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

βραχύ τι "a small amount"

Compare:
LXX Psalm 8:6 ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν <u>βραχύ τι</u> παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους
NA28 Hebrews 2:7 ἠλάττωσας αὐτὸν <u>βραχύ τι</u> παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους
NA28 Hebrews 2:9 τὸν δὲ <u>βραχύ τι</u> παρ᾽ ἀγγέλους

NA28 Acts 5:34 … ἐκέλευσεν ἔξω <u>βραχὺ</u> τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ποιῆσαι
               <u>βραχύ τι</u>   015, 025, 049, 056, 1241, Maj

Curious support. Difficult to judge.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 86

NA28 John 6:11 ἔλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν _____ τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον.

BYZ John 6:11 ἔλαβεν δὲ τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ εὐχαριστήσας διέδωκεν <u>τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ</u> τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις ὁμοίως καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀψαρίων ὅσον ἤθελον

Byz   01^C2, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, 397, 1071, Maj, b, d, e, j, Sy-S, ac², bo^mss
       <u>τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ</u>   157, 1424

txt   P28(3rd CE), P66, P75, 01*, A, B, L, N, W, Π, 063, 0141, f1, 33, 565, 579, 1241, al, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, pbo, bo, arm, goth

Lacuna: C, X
B: umlaut! (1357 C 1 R)   <u>διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακει</u>μένοις

"and Jesus took the loaves, and having given thanks he distributed **to the disciples, and the disciples** to those reclining, in like manner, also of the little fishes as much as they wished."

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 14:19 καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκεν <u>τοῖς μαθηταῖς</u> τοὺς ἄρτους, οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ τοῖς ὄχλοις.
NA28 Matthew 15:36 ἔλαβεν τοὺς ἑπτὰ ἄρτους καὶ τοὺς ἰχθύας καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἐδίδου τοῖς μαθηταῖς, <u>οἱ δὲ μαθηταὶ</u> τοῖς ὄχλοις.
NA28 Mark 6:41 καὶ ἐδίδου <u>τοῖς μαθηταῖς</u> [αὐτοῦ] ἵνα παρατιθῶσιν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοὺς δύο ἰχθύας ἐμέρισεν πᾶσιν.
NA28 Luke 9:16 καὶ ἐδίδου <u>τοῖς μαθηταῖς</u> παραθεῖναι τῷ ὄχλῳ.

It is possible that the term fell out due to h.t. (τοῖς - τοῖς).
Possibly the words have been added, because the disciples also collected the pieces left over, or to avoid a similarity with the Last Supper?
The most probable explanation is that the words have been added as a harmonization to the Synoptics (so also Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 87

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:12 ὡς δὲ ἐνεπλήσθησαν, λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ· συναγάγετε τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα, ἵνα μή τι <u>ἀπόληται.</u>

Not in NA and not in SQE!

<u>ἀπόληται ἐξ αὐτῶν.</u>   D, d, f, bo
pereat ex illis f
pereat ex eis   d

<u>ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπόληται.</u>   Θ, L735, b, l, r¹
ex illis pereat

Lat(a, aur, c, e, ff², j, q, vg) read txt (ne pereant).
Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Again a natural addition. Not from context. Arisen probably independently.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 88

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:14 Οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες <u>ὃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον</u> ἔλεγον ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

T&T #62

<u>ἃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖα</u>   P75, B, 091(fragm. 6ᵗʰ CE), pc⁷, a, bo, ac², arm, <u>WH</u>, <u>Trg</u>ᵐᵍ
                              pc = 109, 207, 1273, 1654, 2487, 2722, 2768

txt   01, A, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 28, 33, 397, 565, 700, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth, <u>WH</u>ᵐᵍ, **NA**²⁵
    <u>τὸ σημεῖον ὃ ἐποίησεν</u>   157, 1010, 1293, al⁹⁰
     <u>ἐποίησεν σημεῖον</u>   213*, 579

For 091 compare Gregory, Textkritik III, p. 1063. T&T and IGNTP confirm.
Lacuna: P66, C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 2:23 πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ θεωροῦντες αὐτοῦ <u>τὰ σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει</u>·
NA28 John 6:2 ἠκολούθει δὲ αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς, ὅτι ἐθεώρουν τὰ <u>σημεῖα ἃ ἐποίει</u> ἐπὶ τῶν ἀσθενούντων.
NA28 John 6:26 ζητεῖτέ με οὐχ ὅτι εἴδετε <u>σημεῖα</u>, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ τῶν ἄρτων καὶ ἐχορτάσθητε.

The singular σημεῖον refers specifically to the Feeding. The plural is more general and it is possible that it is a scribal assimilation to 2:23 or 6:2 (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 89

NA28 John 6:15 Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἁρπάζειν αὐτὸν ἵνα ποιήσωσιν _____ βασιλέα, <u>**ἀνεχώρησεν πάλιν**</u> εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος.

BYZ John 6:15 Ἰησοῦς οὖν γνοὺς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἔρχεσθαι καὶ ἁρπάζειν αὐτὸν ἵνα ποιήσωσιν <u>αὐτὸν</u> βασιλέα <u>**ἀνεχώρησεν**</u> _____ εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος

πάλιν not in NA and SQE but in Tis!

<u>**ἀνεχώρησεν πάλιν**</u> secessit iterum	P75, 01^{C2}, A, B, D, K, Π, L, N, Y, Θ, Λ, 0141, 0211, f1, 124, 33, 157, 397, 565, 579, 700, 1071, al it(b, d, e, f, q, r¹, **27**, **33**), Sy-S, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sa, arm, goth
<u>**ἀνεχώρησεν**</u>	W, Δ, Ψ, f13, 28, 1424, Maj, Sy-P, bo, Or
<u>**φεύγει πάλιν**</u> fugit iterum	01*, Lat(a, aur, c, ff², l, vg), <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u>**φεύγει καὶ ἀνεχώρησεν πάλιν**</u>	Sy-C

Lacuna: P66, C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:3 <u>ἀνῆλθεν δὲ εἰς τὸ ὄρος</u> Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐκάθητο μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ.

a) πάλιν
There is no reason for an omission. It is possible that the word has been added to refer back to 6:3.
Occurrences/verses of πάλιν in the Gospels:
Mat, 16/1068   1.5%
Mar, 26/673   3.9%
Luk, 3/1149   0.3%
Joh, 45/878   5.1%

b) φεύγει / ἀνεχώρησεν

Very slim Greek support. This word is never used for Jesus elsewhere. It is certainly the harder reading. It fits good in the context. Metzger thinks it has been introduced "to enliven the narrative". It is possible that it comes from the Latin fugit (note that 01 is Western in Jo 1-8!).

ἀναχωρέω occurs 11 times in Mt and once in Mk. Additionally it appears twice in Acts.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 90

42. <u>Difficult variant</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:17 καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναούμ. <u>**καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει**</u> καὶ οὔπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,

<u>κατέλαβεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ σκοτία</u>   01, D, d, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
Adpraehendit autem eos tenebra

Lacuna: P66, C, X
B: no umlaut

For L* Swanson reads:
<u>κατέλαβεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἡ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει</u>
This reading is not in NA and SQE. It is probably just a conjecture by Swanson. L^C reads txt.
Tischendorf writes: "post ουμ quae primitus scripta fuerant, erasa sunt corumque loco ab ipsa prima manu καὶ legitur; id quod edidimus." (folio 213)
So, after Καφαρναούμ one and a half line have been erased. Over the erasure of the first line a καὶ has been written:

ΠΛΟΙΟΝΗΡΧΟΝΤΟ ΣΚΟΤΙΑΗΔΗΕΓΕΓΟ
ΠΕΡΑΝΤΗΣΘΑΛΑΣ ΝΕΙΚΑΙΟΥΠΩΕΛΗ
ΣΗΣΕΙΣΚΑΦΑΡΝΑ ...
ΟΥΜΚΑΙ ----------

This means that originally after the ΟΥΜ no καὶ appeared, otherwise it would not have been written over the erasure. It is interesting that the scribe did not continue after the καὶ, but left the lines blank. This could mean that he noted the error only later.

The proposed reconstruction by Swanson would look like this:

ΠΛΟΙΟΝΗΡΧΟΝΤΟ ΣΚΟΤΙΑΗΔΗΕΓΕΓΟ
ΠΕΡΑΝΤΗΣΘΑΛΑΣ ΝΕΙΚΑΙΟΥΠΩΕΛΗ
ΣΗΣΕΙΣΚΑΦΑΡΝΑ ...
ΟΥΜΚΑΤΕΛΑΒΕΝ
ΔΕΑΥΤΟΥΣΗ-----

The reading by Swanson makes no real sense. It also does not fit good into the two lines. It is also strange why L, which is not Western, should adopt this curious reading here.

txt   "And darkness had already come"
01, D "Darkness had come upon them/caught/overtook them"

Compare:
NA28 John 1:5 καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ <u>σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ</u> <u>κατέλαβεν.</u>
NA28 John 12:35 περιπατεῖτε ὡς τὸ φῶς ἔχετε, ἵνα μὴ <u>σκοτία ὑμᾶς</u> <u>καταλάβῃ·</u>

Compare also:
Protogospel of James 14:1 <u>καὶ κατέλαβεν αὐτὸν νὺξ</u>

Interesting variation, possibly idiomatic. It is noteworthy that this usage only appears twice in John and not in the Synoptics.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 47) thinks that the words should emphasize the unexpected beginning of the darkness.
Zahn (Comm. Jo) thinks that the txt reading with ἐγεγόνει is an assimilation to the following pluperfect ἐληλύθει.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 91

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:17 καὶ ἐμβάντες <u>εἰς πλοῖον</u> ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἰς Καφαρναούμ. καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει καὶ οὔπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς __,

T&T #64

<u>εἰς τὸ πλοῖον</u> K, 13, 543, 828 (=f13ᵃ), 2193ᶜ, al⁸³

f13 not mentioned in NA and SQE, but in Swanson and Geerlings! According to Geerlings 69, 124, 174, 230(all f13ᵇ) omit. In T&T only 13 and 543 are noted for the words.
Checked from images: 13, 828 have the words. 69 omits. 346 has a lacuna.

Lacuna: P66, C, X, Π
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:21 ἤθελον οὖν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν <u>εἰς τὸ πλοῖον</u>, καὶ εὐθέως ἐγένετο <u>τὸ πλοῖον</u> ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς εἰς ἣν ὑπῆγον.
NA28 John 6:22 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος … εἶδον ὅτι … οὐ συνεισῆλθεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>εἰς τὸ πλοῖον</u> ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον·

Probably added from context to be more specific.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 92

NA28 John 6:22 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἑστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης <u>εἶδον</u> ὅτι πλοιάριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἕν _____
καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον·

BYZ John 6:22 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἑστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης <u>ἰδὼν</u> ὅτι πλοιάριον ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἕν <u>ἐκεῖνο εἰς ὃ ἐνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</u>
καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸ πλοιάριον ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀπῆλθον·

T&T #66

Byz   01*, D, Δ, Θ, 0141, 0211, f13, 33, 397, 597, 821, 1071, 2786, Maj,
      a, d, e, **27**, **33**, Sy, sa, arm, geo
      omit ἐκεῖνο   D, 0211, 33, 1071, pc, Sy-H

txt   P75, 01^C2, A, B, L, N, W, Ψ, 063, f1, 22, 157, 213, 565, 579, 799*, 1010,
      1241, 2561*, 2718, al^58, Lat, bo, pbo, ac², mf, goth

Sy-S: "illegible" (Burkitt)
Lacuna: P66, C, X
B: no umlaut

The next day the crowd that had stayed on the other side of the sea saw that there had been only one boat there -- **that into which his disciples entered** --. They also saw that Jesus had not got into the boat with his disciples, but that his disciples had gone away alone.

Compare:
6:16 When evening came, his disciples went down to the sea, 17 got into a boat, and started across the sea to Capernaum. It was now dark, and Jesus had not yet come to them.

Probably a clarification what boat is meant and that it is strange for Jesus being there without another boat.
There is no reason for an omission.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "The difficulty of the passage is increased by the article οἱ having dropped out before εἶδον; without its addition the text reads as if it were on the morrow that the disciples saw that there had not been another boat."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 93

NA28 John 6:23 <u>ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοι[άρι]α ἐκ</u> Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.

BYZ John 6:23 <u>ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθεν πλοιάρια ἐκ</u> Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου

T&T #67

ἄλλα = "other"

<u>ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοῖα ἐκ τῆς</u>	B
<u>ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοῖα ἐκ</u>	P75, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}, <u>WH</u> (!)
<u>ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθεν πλοῖα ἐκ</u>	W, 157, pc[12]
<u>ἄλλα δὲ πλοῖα ἦλθεν ἐκ</u>	Ψ, 280
<u>ἄλλα δὲ πλοῖα ἐκ</u> Τιβεριάδος <u>ἦλθεν</u>	0141

<u>ἐπελθόντων οὖν τῶν πλοίων ἐκ</u>	01
<u>ἄλλων πλοιαρίων ἐπελθόντων</u>	D

<u>ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθεν πλοιάρια ἐκ</u>	A, Δ, Θ, f13, 28, 700, 1424, Maj

<u>ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοιάρια ἐκ</u>	<u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>
	(no manuscripts support!)

<u>ἄλλα δὲ ἦν πλοιάρια ἐκ</u>	892
<u>ἄλλα ἦλθον πλοιάρια ἐκ</u>	091, 33, <u>Tis</u>
<u>ἄλλα πλοιάρια ἦλθον ἐκ</u>	397, pc[1]
<u>ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθον πλοιάρια ἐκ</u>	M, Γ, f1, 124, 565, al[160]
<u>ἄλλα δὲ πλοιάρια ἦλθον ἐκ</u>	K, 1071, 1241, al[36]
<u>ἄλλα πλοιάρια ἐκ</u> Τιβεριάδος <u>ἦλθον</u>	L, (213, 799 add δὲ)

<u>καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ἦλθον πλοιάρια ἐκ τῆς</u>	N, pc[2]
<u>καὶ ἄλλα ἦλθον πλοιάρια ἐκ</u>	579, pc[3]

Swanson has ἄλλα δὲ πλοῖα ἐκ for Ψ in error. NA, Lake and IGNTP (majuscule) have πλοῖα ἦλθεν against Swanson.
Lacuna: P66, C, X
B: no umlaut

Latin:
"naves"   aur, b, c, f, ff², l, r¹, vg
"naviculae" a, d, e, q

Only a reads δὲ (autem).

The txt reading is not in any manuscript and it is strictly speaking a conjectural emendation! The NA apparatus separates the word πλοῖα/πλοιάρια from the rest and gets thus witnesses for both variants.
When omitting the bracketed part the words are read by P75, (B) only.

Compare previous and next verse:
NA28 John 6:22 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἑστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης εἶδον ὅτι <u>πλοιάριον</u> ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἓν καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>εἰς τὸ πλοῖον</u> ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ <u>ἀπῆλθον·</u>
BYZ John 6:22 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ἑστηκὼς πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης ἰδὼν ὅτι <u>πλοιάριον</u> ἄλλο οὐκ ἦν ἐκεῖ εἰ μὴ ἓν ἐκεῖνο εἰς ὃ ἐνέβησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ὅτι οὐ συνεισῆλθεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>εἰς τὸ πλοιάριον</u> ἀλλὰ μόνοι οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀπῆλθον·

The first occurrence (blue) is basically safe except for e, q: "navis" for "navicula"! (not in NA!)

The second occurrence:
<u>πλοιάριον</u> Δ, Θ, 579, 700, Maj, a, f, q, r¹ ("in navicula")
<u>πλοῖον</u>   P75, 01, A, B, D, K, L, N, W, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 1071, 1424, pc, Lat ("in navem")

NA28 John 6:24 ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ <u>εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια</u> καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ ζητοῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν.
<u>εἰς τὰ πλοῖα</u>   A, Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, q, Sy-H
<u>εἰς τὸ πλοῖον</u>   01*
<u>εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια</u>   P75, 01^{C2}, B, L, N, W, Ψ, 33, 579, 892, 1071, al, Lat, Sy-H^{mg}

B: no umlaut

Compare also:

NA28 Mark 3:9 καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἵνα <u>πλοιάριον</u> προσκαρτερῇ αὐτῷ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον ἵνα μὴ θλίβωσιν αὐτόν·

NA28 John 6:17 καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς πλοῖον   safe!
NA28 John 6:19 καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου   safe!
NA28 John 6:21 εἰς τὸ πλοῖον ... τὸ πλοῖον   safe!
NA28 John 21:3 εἰς τὸ πλοῖον   safe!
NA28 John 21:8 οἱ δὲ ἄλλοι μαθηταὶ <u>τῷ πλοιαρίῳ ἦλθον,</u> safe!

But note:
NA28 Luke 5:2 καὶ εἶδεν <u>δύο πλοῖα</u> ἑστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην· οἱ δὲ ἁλιεῖς ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἀποβάντες ἔπλυνον τὰ δίκτυα.
δύο πλοῖα   P75, 01, C^C3, D, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, Lat
πλοῖα δύο   B, W, 579, 892, pc, e, WH
δύο πλοιάρια A, C*, L, Q^sic, Ψ, 33, 1241, 1424, al, NA^25

A curious nest of readings.
There are several problems here:

1. The addition of δὲ and καὶ:
These conjunctions have probably been added to make clear the meaning of ἄλλα = "other" and to distinguish it from the conjunction ἀλλὰ = "but".

2. Singular versus plural ἦλθεν / ἦλθον:
The singular is the more unusual usage with a neuter plural. The plural may come from the ἀπῆλθον in 6:22.

3. the diminutive form: πλοῖα/πλοιάρια
πλοῖα is read by: P75, (01), B, W, Ψ, 157, pc, Lat
This is the most difficult point.
Blass notes that diminutives are not accepted in "good Greek", so it is possible that scribes changed πλοιάρια into πλοῖα. But note Lk 5:2 where A, C*, L et al. changed πλοῖα into πλοιάρια, probably secondary.

4. ἐκ / ἐκ τῆς:
τῆς is read by: B, N, W, 1071, pc
Compare:
NA28 John 6:1 πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς Γαλιλαίας <u>τῆς Τιβεριάδος.</u>
NA28 John 21:1 ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης <u>τῆς Τιβεριάδος·</u>

Probably added from verse 6:1 where the lake is meant.

Now putting all these arguments together we get the txt reading. If one values the external evidence higher, then the P75 reading ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοῖα ἐκ should be taken. The bracketing is, although very unusual, ok therefore.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
         (brackets ok)

TVU 94

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:23 ἄλλα ἦλθεν πλοι[άρι]α ἐκ Τιβεριάδος ἐγγὺς τοῦ τόπου ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον <u>εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου.</u>

T&T #68

<u>omit:</u> D, 091, 69*, 788(=f13ᵇ), a, d, e, Sy-C, (Sy-S), arm, geo¹, Bois

<u>τοῦ κυρίου εὐχαριστήσαντος</u>   f1 (1, 118, 205, 209, not 1582!)

<u>εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ</u>   al¹¹⁹, Sy-P, Sy-Hᵐᵍ

69: The words have been added in the margin by a different pen.
Sy-S omits until verse 24 πλοιάρια.
Boismard adds Tatian's Diatessaron for the omission. The verse is not commented upon in Ephrem and the Arabic has the words, though.
Lacuna: P66, C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:11 ἔλαβεν οὖν τοὺς ἄρτους ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ <u>εὐχαριστήσας</u> διέδωκεν τοῖς ἀνακειμένοις

NA28 John 6:24 ὅτε οὖν εἶδεν ὁ ὄχλος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐνέβησαν αὐτοὶ εἰς τὰ πλοιάρια καὶ ἦλθον εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ ζητοῦντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

The words are not really needed. If it is a secondary addition it would be a very strange one. Possibly added to make clear what eating is meant (6:11)? It is more probable that the words have been omitted as unnecessary. Note the even further omission by Sy-S.
κύριος is only rarely used in narrative of John (11:2).

Compare discussion at Lk 24:3.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 95

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:32 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ Μωϋσῆς **δέδωκεν** ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου δίδωσιν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ τὸν ἀληθινόν·

<u>ἔδωκεν</u>   B, D, L, W, pc, Cl, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt <u>δέδωκεν</u>   P75, 01, A, T, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj,
Or, <u>WH^{mg}</u>, <u>Tis</u>

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Immediate context:
NA28 John 6:31 ἄρτον ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ <u>ἔδωκεν</u> αὐτοῖς φαγεῖν.
    <u>δέδωκεν</u>   01, W, Θ, f13, pc

Compare:
1. Change from δέδωκεν to ἔδωκεν:
NA28 John 3:35 καὶ πάντα <u>δέδωκεν</u> ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.
            <u>ἔδωκεν</u>   D, K

NA28 John 5:22 ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν <u>δέδωκεν</u> τῷ υἱῷ,
            <u>ἔδωκεν</u>   G, f13

NA28 John 5:36 τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ <u>δέδωκέν</u> μοι ὁ πατὴρ ἵνα τελειώσω αὐτά
            <u>ἔδωκεν</u>   A, D, Θ, 579, Maj

NA28 John 6:39 ἵνα πᾶν ὃ <u>δέδωκέν</u> μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ,
            <u>ἔδωκεν</u>   A, D, Θ, 579, Maj

NA28 John 7:19 Οὐ Μωϋσῆς **δέδωκεν** ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον
            <u>**ἔδωκεν**</u>   B, D, H, Π^c, pc, <u>WH</u>

NA28 John 7:22 διὰ τοῦτο Μωϋσῆς <u>δέδωκεν</u> ὑμῖν τὴν περιτομήν
            <u>ἔδωκεν</u>   D, L, pc

NA28 John 10:29 ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ <u>δέδωκέν</u> μοι πάντων μεῖζόν ἐστιν
<u>ἔδωκεν</u>   P66, P75, M, U

NA28 John 12:49 αὐτός μοι ἐντολὴν <u>δέδωκεν</u> τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω.
<u>ἔδωκεν</u>   D, L, Θ, Maj

NA28 John 18:11 τὸ ποτήριον <u>ὃ δέδωκέν</u> μοι ὁ πατὴρ οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό;
<u>ἔδωκεν</u>   D, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 1424

1. Change from <u>ἔδωκεν</u> to δέδωκεν:

NA28 John 4:12 ... Ἰακώβ, ὃς <u>ἔδωκεν</u> ἡμῖν τὸ φρέαρ
<u>δέδωκεν</u>   P66, P75, C, f13, pc

NA28 John 13:3 εἰδὼς ὅτι πάντα <u>ἔδωκεν</u> αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας
<u>δέδωκεν</u>   P66, P75, A, D, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, Maj
<u>ἔδωκεν</u>   01, B, K, L, W, 070, f1, 579, L844, pc

A typical variation.
δέδωκεν / ἔδωκεν in John = 10 : 11.
Of the Gospels it is only in John, that δέδωκεν appears. The perfective usage of δίδωμι is typically Johannine. He uses it 23 times. A change from δέδωκεν to ἔδωκεν is thus more probable. This can be also seen from the examples above which show 9 changes from δέδωκεν to ἔδωκεν, but only 2 the other way round. And it is not at all clear, if these 2 examples are really valid, because it is possible that here the txt reading is wrong.
Possibly ἔδωκεν is a conformation to immediate context, verse 31 (so already Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 96

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:36 Ἀλλ᾽ εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι
καὶ ἑωράκατέ [με] καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε   .

καὶ ἑωράκατε __ καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε _____   01, pc, a, b, e, q, vg^{mss},
                                            Sy-S, Sy-C, Tis, Bal

καὶ ἑωράκατε __ καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε μοι.   A (not in NA but in SQE!)
καὶ ἑωράκατέ με καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε μοι.   W, Π^C, bo^{ms}
                                            (also not in NA but in SQE!)

___ ἑωράκατέ με καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε ___.   K, Λ, 397 (not in NA and SQE!)

txt   P66, B, D, Π*, L, T, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
       Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, goth

Note that A and W have μοι after πιστεύετε ! This is not noted in NA.

T reads according to Balestri (ed.pr.) and Tischendorf:
καὶ ἑωράκατέ μὴ καὶ οὐ μὴ πιστεύετε.
IGNTP does not note the second μὴ.

WH, NA^{25} both have με in brackets.
P75 has a lacuna. Acc. to NA it reads txt "vid".
Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:26 ζητεῖτέ με οὐχ ὅτι εἴδετε σημεῖα, ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἐφάγετε ἐκ
τῶν ἄρτων καὶ ἐχορτάσθητε.
"you are looking for me, not because you saw signs, but because you ate your fill of the loaves."

John 5:37-40 And the Father who sent me has himself testified on my behalf. You have never heard his voice or seen his form, 38 and you do not have his word abiding in you, because you do not believe him whom he has sent. 39 "You search the scriptures because you think that in them you have eternal life; and it is they that testify on my behalf. 40 Yet you refuse to come to me to have life.

It is not clear what Jesus meant with the "But I said to you..." (Ἀλλ᾽ εἶπον ...).

If the με is not genuine, then the words may refer back to verse 26 and the feeding and other signs (so many commentators). Zahn (Comm. Jo) thinks that this back reference is "unquestionable".

It is possible that the με and μοι have been added to provide an object. The different additions by txt (με), A (μοι) and W(με + μοι) may indicate a secondary cause.

If the με is genuine, the saying to which Jesus refers has not been explicitly reported before. 5:37-40 have been suggested, but are not fitting perfectly. It is therefore possible that the με has been omitted to avoid this difficulty.

It is probable also that the με has been omitted to improve style:
καὶ ἑωράκατε καὶ οὐ πιστεύετε.

It is also possible that με fell out accidentally: ἑωράκατέ με

Note the καὶ that can either mean "also, even" or with the following καὶ:
καὶ ... καί "both ... and" or "not only ... but also".
K, Λ omit the first καὶ.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original) (omission wrong)
        (but brackets ok)

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

TVU 97

NA28 John 6:37 πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει, καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρὸς <u>ἐμὲ</u> οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω,

BYZ John 6:37 Πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει· καὶ τὸν ἐρχόμενον πρός <u>με</u> οὐ μὴ ἐκβάλω ἔξω.

Byz A, B, D, L, W, Ψ, 0211, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>
txt P66, P75, 01, T, Θ, 0141, al[E, G, K, Δ]

<u>με for first ἐμὲ:</u> G, L, Λ, Π*, f1, 124, 28, 397, 565, 579, 700, pc

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Immediate context:
NA28 John 6:35 ὁ ἐρχόμενος <u>πρὸς ἐμὲ</u> οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ,
<u>πρὸς με</u>   A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
<u>πρὸς ἐμέ</u>   P75, 01, B, T

Compare:
NA28 John 6:44 οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν <u>πρός με</u>
<u>πρὸς ἐμὲ</u>   B, E, H, M, U, Δ, Θ, 2, al

NA28 John 6:45 καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται <u>πρὸς ἐμέ.</u>
<u>πρὸς με</u>   P66, A, C, D, L, W, Ψ, f1, f13579, Maj
<u>πρὸς ἐμέ</u>   P75, 01, B, T, Θ, 157, pc

NA28 John 6:65 τι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν <u>πρός με</u>
<u>πρὸς ἐμὲ</u>   01, C

NA28 John 7:37 ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω <u>πρός με</u> καὶ πινέτω.
<u>πρὸς ἐμὲ</u>   P75, B

Probably an accidental error in B. B is unreliable here, compare Jo 6:44 and 7:37.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 98

NA28 John 6:38 ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με _.

NA28 John 6:39 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με</u>, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ [ἐν] τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

BYZ John 6:39 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με πατρός,</u> ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ___ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ

<u>verse 38:</u> Minority reading
<u>**add πατρός:**</u>   D, 047, 118^C, 1689(=f13^c), 131, 700, 892, 1424, al,
                        it(a, d, e, ff², j, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-Pal, arm
                        (047 is in IGNTP only, not in NA)

<u>verse 39:</u>
<u>**add πατρός:**</u>   01^{C1}?, K, Π, M, U, Γ, Δ, Θ, 047^{vid}, f13, 33, 579, 1071, Maj,
                        Lat(a, aur, c, ff², j, r¹, vg), Sy-H

txt   P66, P75, 01*^{vid}, A, B, C^{vid}, D, L, T, W, Ψ, 091, 0141, f1, 157, 397, 565^{vid},
        700, 892, al, it(b, d, e, f, q), Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Co

omit due to parablepsis:
omit 39a: 01*, C, 047, 565, L2211, al, bo^{mss}
                  From what these read in verse 38 one can deduce what they must have read in verse 39.
omit full 39:   0211 (from 39 to 40)
omit 39 πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν to 40 πέμψαντος με: M(+πατρός), 157(sine πατρός)

01: The scribe omits 39a due to parablepsis. The words have been added at the bottom of the page, but then, strangely, have subsequently been deleted again! For this text the online IGNTP majuscule edition and Swanson have πατρός, Tischendorf, NA and the online Sinaiticus transcription have not.
From the images a clear decision is not possible, though there is a slight preference for the text without πατρός.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

See discussion in 5:30!
In almost all occurrences of this phrase a variation takes place, either the addition or omission of πατρός.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 99

Difficult variant:

NA28 John 6:39 … ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ **[ἐν]** τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
BYZ John 6:39 …ἀλλὰ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸ ___ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

Byz   P66, P75, B, C?, L, T, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, 397, 579, 892, L844, L2211,
       Maj-part[E, G, H, U, V, Y, Γ, Δ, Λ, 2, 565, 700,],
       Robinson, Trg, WH, Bal, SBL

txt   01, A, D, 0141, f13, 22ᶜ, 33, 131,
       Maj-part[K, Π, N, S, 28, 1071, 1241, 1424], Tis

C: Tis, Swanson, NA have C for the omission of ἐν, IGNTP has it for ἐν.

NA28 John 6:40 … καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ **[ἐν]** τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
BYZ John 6:40 … καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ ___ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

Byz   P75, B, C, T, W, Θ, 0141, f1, 397, 579, Maj, Trg, WH, Bal, SBL

txt   P66, 01, A, D, L, Ψ, f13, 33, L844, L2211,
       al[K, Π, N, Y, S, U, 157, 1071, 1241], Cl, Tis

NA28 John 6:44 … κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν **ἐν** τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

omit   P66ᶜ, P75, 01, T, Θ, pc [Y, Δ, Λ, Π]
txt   P66*, A, B, C, D, L, W, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj, WH

NA28 John 6:54 κἀγὼ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν__τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

omit   P66, P75, 01, A, B, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, 579,
       Maj-part[E, G, H, U, Γ, 157, 565, 1424], Robinson

add ἐν: C, T, f13, 397,
       Maj-part[K, Π, M, S, V, Y, Δ, Λ, Ω, 700, 892, 1071, 1241],

       C, T: Tis, Swanson, NA have C and T for the addition of ἐν,
       IGNTP does not list them.

B: no umlaut

These verses must be considered together.

Compare:
NA28 John 11:24 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ Μάρθα· οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσει <u>ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.</u> safe!

NA28 John 12:48 ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν <u>ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ</u>. <u>omit ἐν:</u>   P66, 1241

At first this looks like an example of the rule that when a certain wording appears several times and the scribe changes it at first, he finally gives in. This means that the support for the wrong reading gets weaker in succession.
This is true for the first three verses, but is turned upside down in verse 6:54, where an overwhelming number of MSS supports the short reading. This is then once again followed later by two almost safe long readings.
It is comparatively improbable that John used both wordings. Curious!

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 100

NA28 John 6:40 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα <u>τοῦ πατρός μου</u>, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ [ἐν] τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

BYZ John 6:40 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα <u>τοῦ πέμψαντος με</u>, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχη ζωὴν αἰώνιον καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ

Not in NA but in SQE and Tis!

Byz   A, K, Π, Δ, Ψ, f13, 157ᵛⁱᵈ, 700, 1424, Maj, goth
       <u>τοῦ πέμψαντος με πατρός</u>   Mᵛⁱᵈ, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f13, Lectᵐˢˢ
                                        Lat(aur, c, f, ff², r¹, vg), Sy-Pal
                                        (compare 6:38, 39)

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C, D, L, N, T, U, W, Θ, 0233, f1, 33, 397, 565, 579, 892,
       1071, 1241, pc, it(a, b, d, e, j, q, **35**), Sy, Co, arm, Cl
       <u>τοῦ πατρός με</u>   Cᴵᴳᴺᵀᴾ, Lˢʷᵃⁿˢᵒⁿ ?

omit due to parablepsis:
full verse 40: (τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ verse 39-40): Λ*
omit 39 πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν to 40 πέμψαντος με: M(+πατρός), 157(sine πατρός)

0141 is listed in the IGNTP Byzantine text.
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:
NA28 John 6:39 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με</u>,
BYZ John 6:39 τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με πατρός</u>,

Compare also:
NA28 John 5:30 ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με</u>.
BYZ John 5:30 ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με πατρός</u>.
Byz   M, U, Γ, Θ, 1582ᶜ, f13, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, Maj, it
txt   P66, P75, 01, A, B, C, D, L, W, Ψ, f1, 69, 28, 33, 565, 579, 892, 1241, al,
       Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, boᵖᵗ

Probably a harmonization to the previous verse 39 (so also Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 101

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:42 καὶ ἔλεγον· <u>οὐχ</u> οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα; πῶς νῦν λέγει ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα;

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>οὐχί</u>   P75, B, T, Trg, WH

txt   P66ᶜ, 01, A, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj,
      WHᵐᵍ, Trgᵐᵍ

<u>ὅτι</u>   P66*

B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 13:55   <u>οὐχ</u> οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τοῦ τέκτονος υἱός;
NA28 Mark 6:1 3   <u>οὐχ</u> οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τέκτων,
NA28 Luke 4:22   <u>οὐχὶ</u> υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος;

Compare:
NA28 John 7:42 <u>οὐχ</u> ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος Δαυὶδ καὶ ἀπὸ Βηθλέεμ τῆς κώμης ὅπου ἦν Δαυὶδ ἔρχεται ὁ χριστός;
       <u>οὐχὶ</u>   01, Bᶜ, D, W, X, 0105, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
       <u>οὐχ</u>   P66, P75, L, T, Θ, Ψ, pc
       <u>οὐκ</u>   B*, N

NA28 John 14:22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, <u>οὐχ</u> ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης· κύριε, [καὶ] τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν καὶ <u>οὐχὶ</u> τῷ κόσμῳ;
                                        both safe!

John uses οὐχ 20 times and οὐχί 5 times. Normally these are safe. John even uses both forms in one verse: 14:22, both safe!
It is possible that οὐχί is a harmonization to Lk. Otherwise it is difficult to explain, why the other appearances are all safe.

Compare also the discussion at Lk 17:17.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 102

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:42 καὶ ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν Ἰησοῦς ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ, οὗ ἡμεῖς οἴδαμεν τὸν πατέρα <u>**καὶ τὴν μητέρα**</u>; πῶς νῦν λέγει ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβέβηκα;

T&T #70

<u>**omit:**</u> 01*, W, pc⁴, b, Sy-S, Sy-C, arm, geo¹
            pc = 1059*, 1319, 1349, 2182

01 corrected by 01^C².
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Omitted perhaps due to h.t. (...TERA - ...TERA, so Weiss) or deliberately to correspond more exactly with the preceding clause (ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωσήφ).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 103

NA28 John 6:47 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων _____ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

BYZ John 6:47 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον

T&T #74

Byz   A, C^{C2}, D, N, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 821, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, geo², goth, [Trg]

txt   P66, 01, B, C*, L, T, W, Θ, 892, 1071, j, ac², arm, geo¹, Cl

εἰς θεὸν   Sy-S, Sy-C

C: is given as in NA. This is in contrast to Tischendorf who has C for εἰς ἐμὲ in his GNT. IGNTP list a lacuna of 10 letters here, which must have read εἰς ἐμὲ ἔχει. Tischendorf has this lacuna in his transcription but no note on this.
P75 has a lacuna: NA lists it as "vid" for txt. Reconstructions show that this is not justified. P75 should be dropped from this variant.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 3:15 ἵνα πᾶς <u>ὁ πιστεύων</u> ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
BYZ John 3:15 ἵνα πᾶς <u>ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν</u> ...

NA28 John 3:36 <u>ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν</u> ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον·
NA28 John 5:24 καὶ <u>πιστεύων τῷ πέμψαντί με</u> ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον
NA28 John 6:35 καὶ <u>ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ</u> οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε.

Compare also:
NA28 John 14:1 Μὴ ταρασσέσθω ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία· <u>πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν θεὸν</u> καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε.

From here on πιστεύων is always followed by εἰς ἐμὲ: 7:38; 11:25-26; 12:44, 12:46; 14:12.

Except for 3:15 πιστεύων always takes an object.

If the words were originally present, there is no reason for an omission.
Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the words are from context 6:35.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 104

NA28 John 6:51 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα,
καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ <u>ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω</u>
ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν _____ ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς.

BYZ John 6:51 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ζῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς· ἐάν τις φάγῃ ἐκ τούτου τοῦ ἄρτου ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ <u>ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω</u>
ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν <u>**ἣν ἐγώ δώσω**</u>, ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς

Byz   K, Π, Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 397, 565, 700, Maj,
      f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, goth, Or^On Prayer

txt   P66, P75, (01), B, C, D, L, T, W, Ψ, 33, 0211, 157, 579, 1071, al,
      Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, ac², Cl, Or^Com.Jo

01, Tert, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>:
καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω
<u>ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς</u> <u>ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν</u>

Origen quotes the long form twice in De Oratione and the short form twice in his commentary on John.
Lacuna: X, A(until 8:52)!
B: no umlaut

txt "and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world."
Byz "and the bread that I will give is my flesh **that I will give** for the life of the world."

The question is if there is a real difference in meaning. Bousset (Studien NT, p. 102) even calls the txt reading "nonsense".
Without the words the saying is (grammatically) more difficult and a deliberate omission is improbable. In the txt reading the words "for the life of the world" appear like an afterthought: "The bread is my flesh, – for the life of the world."

Grammatically the ἐστιν connects ὁ ἄρτος and ἡ σάρξ: "The bread is my flesh." So it is not possible to directly connect ἐστιν with ὑπὲρ. The ὑπὲρ must be connected with δώσω. The stylistically awkward txt construction has been improved in two ways:

1. 01, Tert rearrange the words. Now ὑπὲρ directly follows δώσω. Compare NRS: "and the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh."
2. In the Byzantine text ἣν ἐγώ δώσω has been added, a repetition of the δώσω to directly connect it with ὑπὲρ.

WH suggest that the Byzantine reading is perhaps a conflation of 01 and txt.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 105

44. Difficult variant

NA28 John 6:52 Ἐμάχοντο οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες· πῶς δύναται οὗτος ἡμῖν δοῦναι <u>τὴν σάρκα [αὐτοῦ]</u> φαγεῖν;

BYZ John 6:52 Ἐμάχοντο οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι λέγοντες Πῶς δύναται οὗτος ἡμῖν δοῦναι <u>τὴν σάρκα</u> φαγεῖν

Byz P75^{vid}, 01, C, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 565, 579, 1071, Maj, d, ff², goth, <u>**NA²⁵**</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
τὴν σάρκα δοῦναι φαγεῖν   D, K, Θ, f13 397, 1071, al, it, vg^{pt}

txt P66, B, T, 892, 1424, pc, L253, Lat, Sy, Co, arm, geo, Or, <u>WH</u>
<u>WH</u>, <u>Trg^{mg}</u> have αὐτοῦ in brackets.

<u>τὴν ἑαυτοῦ σάρκα</u> φαγεῖν   1216, 1243, L638

Lacuna: P75, A, X
P75: The words are within a lacuna, but from space considerations almost certain. Swanson omits the word. So also Comfort & Barrett. NA does not note it. Reconstruction:

ΚΟΣΜΟΥΖΩΗΣΕΜΑΧΟΝΤΟΟΥΝΟΙΙΟΥ
ΔΑΙΟΙΠΡΟΣΑΛΛΗΛΟΥΣΛΕΓΟΝΤΕΣΠΩΣΔΥ
ΝΑΤΑΙΟΥΤΟΣΗΜΙΝΔΟΥΝΑΙΤΗΝΣΑΡΚΑ<u>ΑΥΤΟΥ</u>
ΦΑΓΕΙΝ· ΕΙΠΕΝΟΥΝΑΥΤΟΙΣΟΙΣ ΑΜΗΝ

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

B: umlaut! (1359 A 32 R)   <u>σάρκα [αὐτοῦ] φαγεῖν;</u>

Compare immediate context:
NA28 John 6:51 καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω <u>ἡ σάρξ μού ἐστιν</u>
NA28 John 6:53 ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν <u>σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</u>
NA28 John 6:54 ὁ τρώγων <u>μου τὴν σάρκα</u>
NA28 John 6:55 ἡ γὰρ <u>σάρξ μου</u> ἀληθής ἐστιν βρῶσις,

If originally missing, αὐτοῦ would be a natural addition. If originally present there would be no reason for an omission.
Internally the point is not that he gives <u>his</u> flesh, but flesh (of a human) at all (so Zahn).
The support for the addition is not coherent.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 106

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:55 ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθής ἐστιν βρῶσις,
 <u>καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου ἀληθής ἐστιν πόσις.</u>

T&T #76

<u>omit:</u> (01*), D, d

01* is not noted in NA but in SQE!
01* reads:
ἡ γὰρ σάρξ μου ἀληθῶς ἐστιν <u>πότον</u> (τὸ πότον = "the drink")
It is very probable that 01* omitted due to parablepsis (ἀληθής - ἀληθής), and
changed accidentally πόσις into πότον).
01^C2 adds after the first μου: <u>ἀληθής ἐστιν βρῶσις καὶ τὸ αἷμά μου</u> and
corrects <u>πότον</u> into <u>πόσις</u>.
B: no umlaut

The omission by D could be due to parablepsis, too, either h.t. –σις … -σις, or
the complete symmetric structure caused the omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 107

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:56 ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ _.

T&T #77

D, d:
 καθὼς ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ λάβετε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ζωῆς, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν αὐτῷ·
d: sicut in me pater et ego in patre. Amen amen dico vobis,
nisi acceperitis corpus fili hominis sicut panem vitae, non habetis vitam in aeo.

a, ff²:
 Si acceperit homo corpus filii (ff²: fili) hominis quemadmodum panem vitae, habebit vitam in eo (ff²: illo).
= ἐὰν μὴ λάβετε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ζωῆς, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν αὐτῷ·

Marius Victorinus (4ᵗʰ CE, Adversus Arium book IV.7):
 Nisi acceperitis corpus filii hominis sicut panem vitae et biberitis sanguinem eius, non habebitis vitam in vobis.
B: no umlaut

"As the father is in me, I also am in the father. Truly, truly, I say to you,
if you do not receive the body of the Son of Man as the bread of
life, you have no life in him."

Compare:
NA28 John 10:38 ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί.
NA28 John 6:53 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ φάγητε τὴν σάρκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καὶ πίητε αὐτοῦ τὸ αἷμα, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.   D, a read: λάβετε τὴν σάρκα

Compare also next verse 57:
NA28 John 6:57 καθὼς ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ὁ τρώγων με κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δι᾽ ἐμέ.

Parallels:
NA28 Mark 14:22 λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.
NA28 Matthew 26:26 λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου.
NA28 Luke 22:19 τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον·

The words look like a combination of 10:38 and 6:53 (where D also reads λάβετε).
Metzger calls it "a homiletic expansion". We know that D is fond of such additions. It possibly also a reflection of Mk 14:22 and parallels.

Note that both, the end of verse 56 + addition by D and the addition by D + beginning of verse 57 are the same: ἐν αὐτῷ· καθὼς
56 ὁ τρώγων μου τὴν σάρκα καὶ πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα ἐν ἐμοὶ μένει κἀγὼ **ἐν αὐτῷ.**

       καθὼς ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐὰν μὴ λάβετε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὡς τὸν ἄρτον τῆς ζωῆς, οὐκ ἔχετε ζωὴν **ἐν αὐτῷ·**
57 **καθὼς** ἀπέστειλέν με ὁ ζῶν πατὴρ κἀγὼ ζῶ διὰ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ ὁ τρώγων με κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δι' ἐμέ.

Thus in principle the words could have fallen out due to haplography.

W has a long dittography here: He repeats 54 ἔχει ... 56 αἷμα. To the contrary 33 omits that part!
D and 01 (which is Western in this part!) omit the final clause of verse 55, but 01 is not following D in the long addition in verse 65.

It should be noted that the word σῶμα is suspicious here. It appears nowhere else in these chapters, but only σὰρξ is used 7 times within 6:51 and 6:63!

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 108

NA28 John 6:58 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς, οὐ καθὼς ἔφαγον οἱ πατέρες _____ καὶ ἀπέθανον· ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

BYZ John 6:58 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς οὐ καθὼς ἔφαγον οἱ πατέρες <u>ὑμῶν τὸ μάννα,</u> καὶ ἀπέθανον· ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

T&T #79
T&T #80

Byz   K, Π, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
      Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, goth

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C, L, T, W, 397, pc², bo^pt, Or

<u>ὑμῶν</u>   D, 0141, 33, 597, 821, pc³, d, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo^mss, ac², pbo, <u>Gre</u>

<u>ὑμῶν τὸ μάννα ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ</u>   213, 799, al¹¹⁰

<u>01</u>: NA has 01 correctly for txt, T&T notes it wrongly for ὑμῶν. I have checked it at the facsimile. Klaus Witte confirms.
Tischendorf notes additionally "3pe" (= L251) for txt.
Lacuna: A, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:31 οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν <u>τὸ μάννα</u> ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ,
NA28 John 6:49 οἱ πατέρες <u>ὑμῶν</u> ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ <u>τὸ μάννα</u> καὶ ἀπέθανον·

There is no reason for an omission.
The witnesses for txt are excellent, but Alexandrian only.
Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the words are glosses from 6:49.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 109

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:59 Ταῦτα εἶπεν ἐν συναγωγῇ διδάσκων ἐν Καφαρναούμ _.

_ σαββάτω D, it(a, aur, d, ff², r¹, **35**), vg^{mss}, Aug
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 1:21 Καὶ εἰσπορεύονται εἰς Καφαρναούμ· καὶ εὐθὺς <u>τοῖς</u> <u>σάββασιν</u> εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν <u>συναγωγὴν</u> <u>ἐδίδασκεν.</u>
NA28 Mark 6:2 καὶ γενομένου <u>σαββάτου</u> ἤρξατο <u>διδάσκειν</u> ἐν τῇ <u>συναγωγῇ,</u>
NA28 Luke 4:31 Καὶ κατῆλθεν εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας. καὶ ἦν <u>διδάσκων</u> αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς <u>σάββασιν·</u>
NA28 Luke 6:6 Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ <u>σαββάτῳ</u> εἰσελθεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ <u>διδάσκειν.</u>
NA28 Luke 13:10 Ἦν δὲ <u>διδάσκων</u> ἐν μιᾷ τῶν <u>συναγωγῶν</u> ἐν τοῖς <u>σάββασιν.</u>

A combination of διδάσκω or συναγωγή with σάββατον does not appear in John, only in the Synoptics. A quite natural addition.
John only uses ἐν σαββάτῳ, never σαββάτῳ alone.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 110

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:64 ἀλλ' εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες οἳ <u>οὐ πιστεύουσιν.</u> ἤδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>**τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες καὶ**</u> τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν.

T&T #81

<u>omit:</u>   P66*, pc, e, Sy-S, Sy-C

<u>omit μὴ:</u>   01, G, X^Comm, 1071, al^90, aur, vg^WW,St, Aug

X: txt not extant, but cited in the commentary (p. 15 B9, PDF p. 31)
P66 corrected in the upper margin.
Lacuna: A, X
B: no umlaut

"But among you there are some who do not believe." For Jesus knew from the first who were the ones that did **not** believe, and who was the one that would betray him.

Compare:
NA28 John 16:1 Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε.
                              <u>omit:</u> 01*, 1424*
                              01* corrected by 01^C2.

The omission by P66 et al. is probably due to homoioarcton (τι - τι).
On the other hand, then, one must assume that the Greek exemplars of the Latin e and Sy^s,c were all erroneous here due to parablepsis. This is comparatively improbable.

The omission of μὴ is not easy to explain. The negation is clearly paralleled in the οὐ πιστεύουσιν earlier in the verse.
Metzger notes that the omission "may be the result of a desire to indicate that Jesus knew his own, rather than those who were not his own. The parallelism, however, with the first part of the verse seems to require the presence of the negative."
The support for the omission is not coherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 111

NA28 John 6:65 καὶ ἔλεγεν· διὰ τοῦτο εἴρηκα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ <u>τοῦ πατρός.</u>

BYZ John 6:65 καὶ ἔλεγεν Διὰ τοῦτο εἴρηκα ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ <u>τοῦ πατρός μου.</u>

Byz C^{C3}, Δ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
     Lat(aur, c, f, j, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^pt, ac², goth

txt P66, 01, B, C^*, D, L, T, W, Θ, 124, 892, al,
     it(a, b, d, e, ff², l), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa^pt, bo

Lacuna: P75, A, X
B: no umlaut

Similar cases:
a) Majority variants:

	NA²⁷	BYZ
6:65	τοῦ πατρός	τοῦ πατρός <u>μου</u>
Byz	C^{C3}, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^mss	
txt	P66, 01, B, C^*, D, L, T, W, Θ, 124, 892, al, it, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa^mss, bo	

8:28	ὁ πατήρ	ὁ πατήρ <u>μου</u>
Byz	B, 0250, f1, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co	
txt	P66, P75, 01, D, L, N, T, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 579, 892, 1241, al, Lat, Sy-S, bo^mss	

8:38	τῷ πατρὶ	τῷ πατρὶ <u>μου</u>
Byz	01, D, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 892, Maj, it, Sy	
txt	P66, P75, B, C, L, W, X, 070, pc	

10:29	τοῦ πατρός	τοῦ πατρός <u>μου</u>
Byz	A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, ac², bo	
txt	P66, P75^vid, 01, B, L, pc, Sy-S, pbo	

10:32	τοῦ πατρός	τοῦ πατρός <u>μου</u>
Byz	P66, 01^C2, A, L, W, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, pbo, bo	
txt	P45^vid, 01*, B, D, Θ, pc, e, Sy-S	

14:12   τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   not in NA and SQE!
Byz   K, Γ, Δ, Λ, 0141, 118, 1582^C, f13, 700, Maj, Sy
txt   P66, P75, 01, A, B, D, L, Q, X, W, Θ, Π, Ψ, f1, 69, 22, (33), 579, 1071,
         Lat, Sy-Pal, Co, arm

14:28   ὁ πατὴρ   ὁ πατὴρ <u>μου</u>
Byz   01*^{,C2}, D^{C2}, Θ, 0141, 0250, f13, Maj,
         a, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa^{mss}, ac^2, bo, arm
txt   01^{C1}, A, B, D*, L, X, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 565, 1071, pc,
         Lat, Sy-Pal, sa^{ms}, pbo, Ir^{Lat}

16:10   τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>
Byz   A, Θ, 0141, f13, Maj, c, f, q, Sy, sa^{mss}, ac^2, pbo
txt   01, B, D, L, W, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 579, al, Lat, sa^{mss}, bo

20:17^1 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>
Byz   P66, A, L, Θ, Ψ, 050, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co, Or^{pt}, Eus
txt   01, B, D, W, 124, pc, b, e, Ir^{Lat}, Or^{pt}
         IGNTP does not list D. NA is right. This is confirmed from the facsimile.

There is only one such example in the Synoptics:
Mt 24:36 ὁ πατὴρ   ὁ πατὴρ <u>μου</u>
Byz   K, W, Γ, 579, 1241, Maj-part
txt   01, L, Δ, Θ, Π*, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj-part,
         Lat, Sy, Co

b) Minority readings:
4:23 τῷ πατρὶ   τῷ πατρὶ <u>μου</u>   69
6:44 ὁ πατὴρ   ὁ πατὴρ <u>μου</u>   P66, G, 157, pc
6:57 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   P75, Sy-S
10:15 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   579
10:30 ὁ πατὴρ   ὁ πατὴρ <u>μου</u>   W*, Δ, 700, pc, e, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co
12:26 ὁ πατὴρ   ὁ πατὴρ <u>μου</u>   P66^C, U, Θ, 0211, f13, 28, 700, 1424, pc, Lat
12:50 ὁ πατὴρ   ὁ πατὴρ <u>μου</u>   1424
14:26 ὁ πατὴρ   ὁ πατὴρ <u>μου</u>   D, Θ, 118
14:28 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   G, f13, 157
15:16 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   1424
15:26^1 τοῦ πατρός   τοῦ πατρός <u>μου</u>   D, Π, 579, 1424
15:26^2 τοῦ πατρός   τοῦ πατρός <u>μου</u>   D
16:3 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   1424
16:16 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   G, 0233, pc, Sy-S
16:23 τὸν πατέρα   τὸν πατέρα <u>μου</u>   N, 054

16:25 τοῦ πατρός	τοῦ πατρός **μου**	1071
16:26 τὸν πατέρα	τὸν πατέρα **μου**	D, 1424
16:28 τὸν πατέρα	τὸν πατέρα **μου**	H
16:32 ὁ πατὴρ	ὁ πατὴρ **μου**	054, 69, 788, 346(=f13), 28
18:11 ὁ πατὴρ	ὁ πατὴρ **μου**	P66ᵛⁱᵈ, 69, 700, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co

Minority readings (the other way round):

8:19 τὸν πατέρα **μου**	τὸν πατέρα	01, 1424
8:54 ὁ πατήρ **μου**	ὁ πατήρ	W
10:18 τοῦ πατρός **μου**	τοῦ πατρός	D, 0233
10:29 ὁ πατήρ **μου**	ὁ πατήρ	01*, f13, 892s, 1424, pc, it, Sy-S, pbo
14:20 τῷ πατρί **μου**	τῷ πατρί	Θ, 579
14:23 ὁ πατήρ **μου**	ὁ πατήρ	1424
15:8 ὁ πατήρ **μου**	ὁ πατήρ	579
15:10 τοῦ πατρός **μου**	τοῦ πατρός	P66, P75ᵛⁱᵈ, B, it
15:15 τοῦ πατρός **μου**	τοῦ πατρός	f1, 565

In the following cases the τοῦ πατρός μου is safe: Jo 2:16; 5:17; 5:36; 5:43; 6:32; (6:40); 8:49; 10:25; 10:37; 14:2; 14:7; 14:21; 15:1; 15:23; 15:24; 20:17[2].

There are also several cases where ὁ πατὴρ without μου is safe.

Especially inconsistent is manuscript 1424 (omits 3 times, adds 6 times), 579 omits twice and adds twice, D adds 4 times and omits once, 69/f13 adds 5 times and omits once, 700 adds three times.

The Minority variants where μου has been added are more in number than those where it has been omitted (21 : 8). It is of course a natural addition. In all Majority cases Byz has the added μου.
That the additions are secondary is probable for several reasons:
a) they represent a slightly higher Christology
b) there is no reason for an omission, except accidental.
c) the μου is well known from the Synoptics where it appears often. There it is the rule to have πατήρ be followed by a personal pronoun.

In the instances of 8:38; 10:29; 10:32 and 20:17[1] the support for the addition is quite good.
On the other hand at 15:10 the support for the omission is also quite good. These cases should be reconsidered.
It is interesting that this variation is so prominent in John.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 112

NA28 John 6:69 καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ <u>ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>

BYZ John 6:69 καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ <u>Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος</u>

T&T #83

<u>Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος</u>
N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f13, 213, 799, Maj, Lat(f, ff², q, r¹, vg), Sy, bo^mss, goth

<u>Χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</u>	C^C3, 0141, f1, 33, 565, 821, 1010, 1819, 2129, pc⁸, it(a, aur, c, e, j, l, **9A, 11A, 29, 33, 47, 48**), Sy-S, arm
<u>Χριστὸς</u>	Tert
<u> ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</u>	pc, b, Sy-C
<u> ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ</u>	P75, 01, B, C*, D, L, W, 397, d, sa^ms, pbo, bo^ms
<u>Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ</u>	P66, Co^pt, ac²

C: Above is given the readings as they appear in Tischendorf, NA and Swanson. IGNTP has for C^c: Χριστὸς ὁ ἅγιος υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. Tischendorf writes in his GNT: "minus recte in append. cod. C ο χς ο αγ. υι. diximus". Not sure, what this means. In his C edition Tischendorf has the text as given above for C*.

omit ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ: 047 (unknown reason)
Lacuna: A, X
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 16:16 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος εἶπεν· σὺ εἶ ὁ <u>χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος.</u>
NA28 Mark 8:29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ <u>χριστός.</u>
NA28 Luke 9:20 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν <u>χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.</u>
NA28 John 1:49 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ Ναθαναήλ· ῥαββί, <u>σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</u>, σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.

NA28 John 11:27 λέγει αὐτῷ· ναὶ κύριε, ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα ὅτι <u>σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ</u> ὁ εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐρχόμενος.

If the longer form is original, there would have been no reason to change it into the short form. The expansions are harmonizations to the above parallels, especially Mt 16:16 (so Weiss).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 113

Minority reading:
NA28 John 6:71 ἔλεγεν δὲ τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος <u>Ἰσκαριώτου·</u> οὗτος γὰρ ἔμελλεν παραδιδόναι αὐτόν, εἷς ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα.

T&T #85

<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   01*, Θ, f13, Sy-H^mg
01 corrected by 01^C2

<u>Carioth</u>   e

<u>Σκαριώθ</u>   D, Lat
Scarioth

Lacuna: A, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 12:4 λέγει δὲ Ἰούδας ὁ <u>Ἰσκαριώτης</u> εἷς [ἐκ] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι·
<u>Ἰσκαριώτου</u>   Ψ
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D

NA28 John 13:2 καὶ δείπνου γινομένου, τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος <u>Ἰσκαριώτου,</u>
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D, e

NA28 John 13:26 ἀποκρίνεται [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ. βάψας οὖν τὸ ψωμίον [λαμβάνει καὶ] δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ Σίμωνος <u>Ἰσκαριώτου.</u>
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D

NA28 John 14:22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ <u>Ἰσκαριώτης·</u>
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D

"Man of Kerioth" (a town in southern Judea). This is very certainly the meaning but not the correct text. Probably a scribe wanted to make the meaning more explicit.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 114

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:1 Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ· οὐ γὰρ <u>ἤθελεν</u> ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ περιπατεῖν, ὅτι ἐζήτουν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀποκτεῖναι.

<u>εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν</u>   W, pc², it(a, b, ff², l, r¹), Sy-C, Chrys, <u>Bois</u>
<u>habebat potestatem</u>

                pc = 196, 743 (from IGNTP Byzantine text)
                both commentary manuscripts.

Lat(aur, c, d, e, f, q, vg) read txt:
"volebat", e: "voluntatem"
Sy-S also reads txt.
Lacuna: A
B: no umlaut

ἐξουσία "authority, right, liberty, ability, capability"

txt   "He <u>did not wish</u> to go about in Judea"
W   "He <u>was not able</u> to go about in Judea"

Compare:
NA28 John 10:18 οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ τίθημι αὐτὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ. <u>ἐξουσίαν ἔχω</u> θεῖναι αὐτήν, καὶ <u>ἐξουσίαν ἔχω</u> πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν· ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου.
NA28 John 19:10 λέγει οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος· ἐμοὶ οὐ λαλεῖς; οὐκ οἶδας ὅτι <u>ἐξουσίαν ἔχω</u> ἀπολῦσαί σε καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχω σταυρῶσαί σε;
NA28 John 19:11 ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ] Ἰησοῦς· οὐκ <u>εἶχες ἐξουσίαν</u> κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ οὐδεμίαν εἰ μὴ ἦν δεδομένον σοι ἄνωθεν· διὰ τοῦτο ὁ παραδούς μέ σοι μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει.

Compare for this use of ἐξουσία:
NA28 Revelation 9:10 καὶ ἔχουσιν οὐρὰς ὁμοίας σκορπίοις καὶ κέντρα, καὶ ἐν ταῖς οὐραῖς αὐτῶν ἡ ἐξουσία αὐτῶν ἀδικῆσαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μῆνας πέντε,
"...they are able to harm people for five months."

οὐ γὰρ εἶχεν ἐξουσίαν does probably not mean "not having authority/right" (which makes no sense with the following clause), but simply "not being able to".

But Chrysostom shows that the understanding of "not having authority" was common. He writes in his 48th homily on the Gospel of John:

> "What sayest thou, O blessed John? Had not He 'power', who was able to do all that He would? ... The Evangelist spake not so that he might be supposed to utter riddles, but to make it plain that He showeth proofs both of His Godhead and His Manhood. For when he saith, that "He had not power," he speaketh of Him as a man, doing many things after the manner of men; but when he saith, that He stood in the midst of them, and they seized Him not, he showeth to us the power of the Godhead, (as man He fled, as God He appeared,) and in both cases he speaks truly."

So, the W reading is clearly the more difficult one. Possibly from the Latin? "potestatem" has a broad range of meanings: "power, strength" but also "chance, opportunity". The latter is more probable.

Compare below Jo 7:52 for another agreement of W with the Latin.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 115

45. <u>Difficult variant</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 7:4 οὐδεὶς γάρ τι ἐν κρυπτῷ ποιεῖ καὶ ζητεῖ <u>αὐτὸς</u> ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι. εἰ ταῦτα ποιεῖς, φανέρωσον σεαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ.

T&T #87

<u>αὐτὸς</u> ἐν παρρησίᾳ	P66ᶜ, P75, 01, Eᶜ, L, X, Δ, Ψ, 070, 0141, f1, 124, 33, 213, 397, 579, 799, 821, 865, 892, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, geo², <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA²⁵</u>**, <u>Trg</u>
ἐν παρρησίᾳ <u>αὐτὸς</u>	Dᶜ, Θ, f13
ἐν παρρησίᾳ <u>αὐτὸ</u>	D*
<u>αὐτὸ</u> ἐν παρρησίᾳ	P66*, B, (D*), W, pc⁷, <u>WH^mg</u>, <u>Trg^mg</u>
<u>αὐτὸν</u> ἐν παρρησίᾳ	E*, pc¹², r¹, geo¹
_____ ἐν παρρησίᾳ	pc³, b, e, Sy-C, pbo, aeth

NA/SQE list only the last three variants (and D* in the appendix).

<u>579</u> reads txt, as given in T&T, Swanson and Schmidtke. This has been checked at the film. NA notes it wrongly for the P66* reading.
Merck lists also Tatianᴺ for αὐτὸ.
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

txt   "for no one does anything in secret, and <u>himself</u> seeks to be in public"
B..   "for no one does anything in secret, and seeks <u>it</u> to be in public"

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 10:26 Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε <u>αὐτούς· οὐδὲν</u> γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον

It is possible that the text originally lacked a pronoun, which has been supplied later at various places and in different forms. But the support for this is only versional and may simply be translational inaccuracy.

The neuter form might have been suggested from Mt 10:26 (Lk 12:2) where also a neuter follows a masculine form. Weiss (Textkritik, p. 41) notes that possibly the αὐτὸ is a conformation to the neuter τι. The B reading is more difficult (almost nonsensical), the txt reading makes better sense in context.
The variation is strange and difficult to decide. The support for αὐτὸ is quite good.

It might be a transcriptional problem too:
ZHTEIAYTOCENΠAϸϸHCIA
ZHTEIAYT͞OEN͞ΠAϸϸHCIA

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 116

46. <u>Difficult variant</u>

NA28 John 7:8 ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν· <u>ἐγὼ οὐκ</u> ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν ἑορτὴν ταύτην, ὅτι ὁ ἐμὸς καιρὸς <u>οὔπω</u> πεπλήρωται.

BYZ John 7:8 ὑμεῖς ἀνάβητε εἰς τὴν <u>ἑορτήν ταύτην·</u> <u>ἐγὼ οὔπω</u> ἀναβαίνω εἰς τὴν <u>ἑορτὴν ταύτην·</u> ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς <u>οὔπω</u> πεπλήρωται

Byz   P66, P75, B, L, T, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0105, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 1071, Maj,
       f, j, q, **27**, **29**, vg^{mss}, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sa, ac², goth, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>

txt   01, D, K, Π, M, 1071, 1241, al, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, bo, arm, Diatess,
       <u>WH^{mg}</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Trg</u>

add ταύτην after first ἑορτήν:
01*, M, S*, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 579, 700, Maj, Lat, Sy, arm
01* corrected by 01^{C2}

Latin: vos ascendite ad <u>diem festum</u> (hunc), ego <u>non</u> ascendo ad <u>diem festum</u> …
                                              (nondum f, q et al.)

P66 changes the second οὔπω singularly into οὐδέπω (so, too, in Jo 7:30).
33, 397, 565, 579 omit due to h.t. ἑορτήν ταύτην· … ἑορτὴν ταύτην·
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Diatessaron:
Ephrem (McCarthy): "*I am not going up during this feast*, that is, to the cross. He did
                    not say, *to the feast*, but, *during the feast*. … They were
                    seeking him in order to hand him over. Therefore he deceived
                    them, *I am not going up*. But he went up secretly."
Arabic (Preuschen): "ich gehe jetzt nicht hinauf zu diesem Fest"
Arabic (Hogg):   "but I go not up now to this feast"

Compare verse 10:
NA28 John 7:10 Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, τότε <u>καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη</u> οὐ φανερῶς ἀλλὰ [ὡς] ἐν κρυπτῷ.

Compare also the following variations:
NA28 Matthew 15:17 οὐ νοεῖτε   B, D, Z, Θ, f13, 33, 565, 579, pc, Or
                              οὔπω νοεῖτε   01, C, L, W, 0281, f1, 892, Maj

NA28 Matthew 16:9 οὔπω νοεῖτε,
                   οὐ   f13

NA28 Matthew 16:11 πῶς οὐ   νοεῖτε
                    πῶς οὔπω νοεῖτε   565

NA28 Mark 4:40 τί δειλοί ἐστε;   οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν;
BYZ Mark 4:40 τί δειλοί ἐστε οὕτως; Πῶς οὐκ ἔχετε πίστιν;
      Byz   A, C, 33, Maj, f, (Sy-P), Sy-H

NA28 Mark 7:18 οὐ νοεῖτε   A, B, D, W, Θ, 28, 33, 565, 579, 1424, Maj
              οὔπω νοεῖτε   01, L, Δ, U, f1, 700, 892, 1342, pc

NA28 Mark 8:21 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· οὔπω συνίετε;
BYZ Mark 8:21 Καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς, Πῶς οὐ συνίετε;
      Byz   (B), 28, 157, 579, 700, 2542, Maj-part

NA28 John 6:17 καὶ οὔπω ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς,
BYZ John 6:17 καὶ οὐκ   ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
      Byz   A, K, Π, Θ, f1, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1424, Maj

NA28 John 7:6 ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς οὔπω πάρεστιν,
                                   οὐ 01*

NA28 John 11:30 οὔπω δὲ ἐληλύθει ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὴν κώμην
                 οὐ γὰρ   D^gr

It is possible that scribes changed οὐκ into οὔπω to remove the inconsistency between verse 8 and verse 10.

On the other hand οὔπω could have been changed into οὐκ to improve style, because there is one more οὔπω later in the verse. It is also possible that οὐκ is at least in part just an accidental error (several οὔπω/οὐκ variations appear, see examples above). οὐκ is basically a Western reading (01, D, it, vg, Sy-S, Sy-C), joined by a few Byzantine manuscripts. Both 01 and D change one other οὔπω to οὐκ.
The external support for οὔπω is very strong.

Difficult.

Already Porphyry the philosopher (3ʳᵈ CE) notes that with the οὐκ we would have a "changeable" Jesus. Jerome's Against the Pelagians 2:17 writes:

"Ut autem ascenderunt fratres ejus, tunc et ipse ascendit ad solemnitatem, non manifeste, sed quasi in abscondito (Joan. VII, 10). Iturum se negavit, et fecit quod prius negaverat. Latrat Porphyrius, **inconstantiae ac mutationis** accusat, nesciens omnia scandala ad carnem esse referenda. Moyses, inquit, dedit vobis legem, et nemo ex vobis facit legem, utique possibilem, et tamen quod erat possibile, nemo impleverat, neque enim culpa imperantis est, sed fragilitas audientis, ut omnis mundus subditus fiat Deo."

Pseudo-Ambrosius (4ᵗʰ CE, Latin) preserved a similar objection to Jesus' change of intention (Quaestiones Vet. et N. Test. 74).

Weiss (Jo Com.) suggests that the οὔπω indicates that Jesus did not want to go to THIS festival (ταύτην !), but only to a later one. This, he thinks, is also required from context (thus there is no real difference here between οὐκ and οὔπω). Weiss thinks that Jesus changed his mind due to a hint from God or what ever. We will never know.

The Latin (Old Latin and Vulgate) could be interpreted as if Jesus would not go up on that special day only. Compare Augustine: (Sermon LXXXIII. = CXXXIII. Benedictine Edition)

"Ipsa verba solvunt quaestionem. Multis diebus agebatur ille dies festus. 'Ad istum', utique hodiernum 'diem', inquit, 'festum', istum utique hodiernum quando illi sperabant, non ascendit; sed quando ipse disponebat. Denique attende quod sequitur: 'Haec cum dixisset, ipse mansit in Galilaea.' Ergo non ascendit 'ad istum diem festum.' ...
... Non ascendo, inquit, ad diem festum. Dixit: Non ascendo, ut occultaretur; addidit: istum, ne mentiretur. Aliquid intulit, aliquid abstulit, aliquid distulit; nihil tamen falsi dixit, quia nihil falsi de eius ore procedit."

"The words themselves solve the difficulty. That feast was kept for many days. 'On this', that is, this present 'feast day', saith He, this day, that is, when they hoped, He went not up; but when He Himself resolved to go. Now mark what follows, 'When He had said these words, He Himself stayed in Galilee.' So then He did not go up 'on that feast day'. ...
... He said, 'I go not up,' that He might be hid; He added 'this,' that He might not lie. Something He expressed, something He suppressed, something He repressed; yet said He nothing false, for 'nothing false proceedeth out of His Mouth.' "

But on the other hand "diem festum" could be simply a translation of ἑορτήν ταύτην.

Compare:
Chrys C. Caragounis "Jesus, his brothers and the journey to Jerusalem (Jo 7:8-10)" Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok 63 (1998) [he argues for οὔπω]

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 117

47. **Difficult variant**
NA28 John 7:9 ταῦτα δὲ εἰπὼν **αὐτὸς** ἔμεινεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ.

BYZ John 7:9 ταῦτα δὲ εἰπὼν **αὐτοῖς** ἔμεινεν ἐν τῇ Γαλιλαίᾳ

T&T #88

Byz   P75, B, D^{C1}, T, Π^{C}, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0105, 0141, f13, 33, 579, 799, 821, Maj,
       a, ff^2, q, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, geo^2, goth, **NA^{25}**, WH, Weiss, Trg

txt   P66, 01, D*, K, Π*, L, N, W, X, 070, f1, 22, 213, 397, 565, 799, 865, 1071,
       1241, al^{100}, Lat, Co, arm, WH^{mg}, Trg^{mg}

omit: 2786, al^{55}, e, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P

Λ reads Byz. This has been confirmed by Klaus Witte from Muenster from the film. NA lists it wrongly for the omission. Swanson and T&T (implicitly) have it correctly.

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

"After saying this, he <u>himself</u> remained in Galilea."
"After saying this <u>to them</u>, he remained in Galilea."

Compare:
NA28 John 7:10
Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ … τότε καὶ <u>αὐτὸς</u> ἀνέβη …

Very evenly divided support.
The change is probably accidental, because it involves only one Iota. Both readings make good sense. αὐτὸς might have been suggested from the next verse 10 (so also Weiss).

αὐτοῖς appears to be the easier reading, because with εἰπὼν it suggests itself. It is interesting that no εἰπὼν αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς ἔμεινεν appears. One also wonders why no αὐτὸς δὲ appears.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
        = slight tendency for the Byzantine reading.
          (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 118

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:10 Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, τότε καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνέβη οὐ φανερῶς ἀλλὰ **[ὡς]** ἐν κρυπτῷ.

omit: 01, D, 205, 1424, pc, it(a, b, d, e, r¹, **48**), Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, ac², geo,
Bois, Tis, Bal

txt   P66, P75, B, L, T, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0105, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 565, 579,
1071, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, ff², l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, bo, arm, goth
"quasi"

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 2:15 καὶ ποιήσας__φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων πάντας ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ τά τε πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας, καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεεν τὸ κέρμα καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέτρεψεν,

ὡς   P66, P75, G, L, N, Wˢ, X, 0162, f1, 22, 33, 565, 892, 1241,
al, Lat, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, Orˢᵘᵖ
txt   01, A, B, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, 1071, Maj, l, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, Or

No parallel for this construction in the Greek Bible. Possibly idiomatic (compare Jo 2:15)?

It is probable that ὡς has been omitted as superfluous or awkward. It is also possible that it has been omitted, because in this sentence ὡς appears twice with two different meanings. The first is a temporal particle "while, when", the second a particle of comparison "as, like". Weiss (Textkritik, p. 170) thinks that the ὡς has probably been omitted, because there was none in front of the parallel φανερῶς.

Metzger notes that "a copyist may have inserted the word in order to soften the force of the expression ἐν κρυπτῷ." (so already Tischendorf) - But is this probable?

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original) (remove brackets)

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

TVU 119

48. Difficult variant

NA28 John 7:12 καὶ γογγυσμὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν <u>πολὺς</u> ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις·
BYZ John 7:12 καὶ γογγυσμὸς <u>πολὺς</u> περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις·

T&T #89

Byz	<u>πολὺς</u> περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν	Δ, 0105, 0141?, f1, f13, 157, 565, 579, Maj
	<u>πολὺς</u> ἦν περὶ αὐτοῦ	01, N, Ψ, 397, 892, 1010, 1071, 1293, al[100]
	<u>πολὺς</u> ἦν	1424, pc[4]
txt	περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν <u>πολὺς</u>	P75, B, L, T, W, X, 213, 597, 799, 821, 865, 1241, 1819, 2786, pc[9]
	ἦν περὶ αὐτοῦ <u>πολὺς</u>	P66[C], 070[vid], 33, <u style="color:red">Tis</u>, <u style="color:red">Bal</u>

one of these: Lat(b, f, ff[2C], j, q, r[1], 11A, vg), Sy, Co, goth

et murmur <u>multus</u> de eo erat	11A, vg	(=Byz)
et murmur <u>multus</u> de illo erat	ff[2C], g[2], gat	(=Byz)
et murmur <u>magnus</u> de illo erat	f, j	(=Byz)
et mormor <u>multus</u> erat de eo	35, 47, vg[mss]	(= 01 …)
et murmur de eo erat <u>magnum</u>	b	(= txt)
et murmur de illo factus est <u>magnus</u>	q	(= txt)
et murmur erat <u>magnum</u> in turba de eo	r[1]	

<u>omit πολὺς:</u>   P66*, D, Y, Θ, pc, it(a, aur, c, d, e, ff[2]*, l), arm

       ἦν περὶ αὐτοῦ   P66*, D
       περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν   Y, Θ, pc[11]

Tischendorf gets this reading, because he separates it into two variants: a) the position of ἦν and b) the position of πολὺς.
X: πολλοῖς
070 reads: καὶ γ]ογγυσμὸς [ἦν] πε[ρὶ] αὐτοῦ [πολ]ὺς [ἐ]ν τοῖς
0141: T&T have it for Byz, IGNTP for txt.
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 John 6:41 <u>Ἐγόγγυζον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ αὐτοῦ</u> ὅτι εἶπεν· ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος ὁ καταβὰς ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ,

NA28 John 6:61 εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὅτι <u>γογγύζουσιν περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ</u> εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτο ὑμᾶς σκανδαλίζει;

NA28 John 7:32 ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τοῦ ὄχλου <u>γογγύζοντος περὶ αὐτοῦ ταῦτα,</u>

All thinkable combinations! Difficult to judge.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 120

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:19 Οὐ Μωϋσῆς **δέδωκεν** ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον; καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ ὑμῶν ποιεῖ τὸν νόμον. τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτεῖναι;

    ἔδωκεν   B, D, H, pc, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg, Bal

txt **δέδωκεν**   P66, P75, 01, L, T, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0105, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33,
                             397, Maj, WHᵐᵍ, Tis

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare discussion at Jo 6:32
Weiss thinks that δέδωκεν is a conformation to verse 7:22.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 121

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:23 εἰ περιτομὴν λαμβάνει _____ ἄνθρωπος ἐν σαββάτῳ ἵνα μὴ λυθῇ ὁ νόμος Μωϋσέως, ἐμοὶ χολᾶτε ὅτι ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῆ ἐποίησα ἐν σαββάτῳ;

ὁ ἄνθρωπος
     B, N, Θ, (0250), 33, pc, [NA²⁵] , [WH], Weiss, [Trg^{mg}]

txt   P66, 01, D, L, T, W, X, Ψ, 0105, 0141, f1, f13, 397, 579, Maj, Trg

Trg^{mg}, WH, NA²⁵ have ὁ in brackets.
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 7:22 διὰ τοῦτο Μωϋσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὴν περιτομήν - οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἐστὶν ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν πατέρων - καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ περιτέμνετε ἄνθρωπον.

Compare also:
NA28 John 9:11 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος· ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς πηλὸν ἐποίησεν
with ὁ: P66, 01, B, L, 070, f1, 22, 33, 1071, pc
without ὁ: P75, A, C, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 579, Maj

NA28 John 16:21 ... οὐκέτι μνημονεύει τῆς θλίψεως διὰ τὴν χαρὰν ὅτι ἐγεννήθη ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
add ὁ: 01*, 157, 579

The support is incoherent and probably the addition is just accidental.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 122

NA28 John 7:26 καὶ ἴδε παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσιν. μήποτε <u>ἀληθῶς</u> ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν _____ ὁ χριστός;

BYZ John 7:26 καὶ ἴδε παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσιν μήποτε <u>ἀληθῶς</u> ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν <u>**ἀληθῶς**</u> ὁ Χριστός

Not in NA and not in SQE but in Tis!

Byz   M, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, 0105, 157, 579, 700, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, goth

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, D, K, Π, L, N, T, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0105, 0141, f1, f13, 28, 397, 565, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, al, Lat, Sy-C, Sy-S, Co, arm, Or

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 4:42 οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου.
NA28 John 6:14 οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης
NA28 John 7:40 οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·

Clearly a secondary addition stimulated by the ἀληθῶς earlier in the verse and the similar occurrences in John.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 123

49. **Difficult variant**

7:34 and 7:36

NA28 John 7:34 <u>με</u> καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ **[με]**, καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν.

omit: P66, 01, D, G, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 1582ᶜ?, 118, f13, 33, 397, Maj, Latt, arm, goth, **NA²⁵**, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt   P75, B, N, T, X, 0105, f1(1582*?), 565, al, Sy, Co, WH, [Trgᵐᵍ]

Note: B alone reads at the end: … ἐλθεῖν <u>ἐκεῖ</u>.
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

NA28 John 7:36 τίς ἐστιν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὃν εἶπεν· ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ **[με]**, καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν;

omit: P66, 01, D, L, N, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 1582ᶜ?, 2193ᶜ, 0105, 0141, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, arm, goth, **NA²⁵**, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt   P75, B, G, T, X, f1(1582*?), 565, 892, pc, vgᵐˢ, Sy, Co, WH, [Trgᵐᵍ]

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

1582: We only have the old b/w photos from Münster, but it looks like με has been erased in both verses. A. Welsby (f1 in Jo) agrees with this.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Compare:
LXX Jeremiah 36:13 καὶ <u>ἐκζητήσατέ με καὶ εὑρήσετέ με</u> ὅτι ζητήσετέ με ἐν ὅλῃ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν

NA28 John 8:21
Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς· ἐγὼ ὑπάγω καὶ ζητήσετέ με ___,
    καὶ οὐκ εὑρήσετέ <u>με</u>   N, f1, 565
    καὶ οὐκ εὑρήσετε ___   118, 700

NA28 John 13:33 τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι· <u>ζητήσετέ με</u>

Difficult.

Either the με has been omitted to improve style or it has been added to make the saying more symmetrical (compare the previous ζητήσετέ με) and to harmonize it with Jer and other occurrences in John.

Note that the same variation also appears in 8:21! Here N has the με!

P. Williams comments on the Syriac:
> "The general Syriac tendency to put the object later and the particular preference for VOVO and VVO is evident.
> John 7:34. Where *txt* has ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ [με] NA27 cites *SCP* with the VOVO structure in its support against the variant VOV without the second με. The support of *SCP* has to be dropped, but without this support the balance of external evidence shifts yet further away from *txt*, which, on the principles on which the edition was compiled, had only a marginal lead over the variant.
> John 7:36. Not only is *txt* and the variant and NA27's citation of *Sy* exactly the same as in John 7:34, but the evidence for both is remarkably similar. The citation of *Sy* is slightly misleading since *S* goes its own direction and does not have a straightforward correspondence with *txt* or the variant. *CP*, however, have the expected VOVO structure. Again, without their support, *txt* loses any slender lead it had over the variant."
> P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 57-58.

Rating: - (indecisive)
    (brackets ok)

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

TVU 124

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:36 τίς ἐστιν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὃν εἶπεν· ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ [με], καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν _;
NA28 John 7:37 Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔκραξεν λέγων· ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρός με καὶ πινέτω.

Jo 7:53 - 8:11   225 (1192 CE)
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 7:52 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶ; ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας προφήτης οὐκ ἐγείρεται.

NA28 John 8:12 Πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν ἐμοὶ οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἕξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς.

A Byzantine minuscule. Probably added accidentally here, but there is no obvious reason.
Perhaps some lectionary cause: The Pentecost reading was: Jo 7:37-52+8:12.

TVU 125

50. Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:37 Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς εἰστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔκραξεν λέγων· ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω **πρός με** καὶ πινέτω.

omit: P66*, 01*, D, b, d, e, vg^ms, Or^Lat, Tis, Bal

πρός ἐμὲ P75, B, Or^once, Weiss

txt P66^C, 01^C2, L, N, X, Θ, Ψ, T, 0105, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 397, 565, 579, 1424, Maj, Or^3 times

Note also: P66*: τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ <u>**τῆς μεγάλης**</u> ἑορτῆς
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Revelation 22:17 Καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ ἡ νύμφη λέγουσιν· ἔρχου. καὶ ὁ ἀκούων εἰπάτω· ἔρχου. καὶ ὁ <u>διψῶν ἐρχέσθω,</u> ὁ θέλων λαβέτω ὕδωρ ζωῆς δωρεάν.

A Western stylistic improvement?
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 177) notes that the omission is due to realize a close connection of the ἐρχέσθω with the καὶ πινέτω. It might also have been omitted as a reminiscence of Rev. 22:17.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 126

NA28 John 7:37-7:38 Ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς εἱστήκει ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔκραξεν λέγων· <u>ἐάν τις διψᾷ ἐρχέσθω πρός με</u> <u>καὶ πινέτω. 38 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ,</u> καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ῥεύσουσιν ὕδατος ζῶντος.

A question of punctuation.
There is either a full stop after πινέτω or after ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ.

after πινέτω: P66, P75?, 01ᶜ, Origen, Eus, Chrys, Cyril, Basil, Athanasius, Jerome

after ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ: D, d, e, m, saᵐˢ, Hippolytus, Cyprian
                              + some other Latin references, see Turner

P75: The papyrus is fragile at this point. It appears from the Bodmer b/w image that there may be a high point after πινέτω. But this should be checked at the original.
In 01 a highpoint is squeezed between ω and ο in a different, lighter brown, color. Similarly after γραφὴ such a point appears. 03 has no points at all.
D, d, e have no point after ἐμὲ, but a line ends there (argument from colometry).

The interpretation of these verses is an old crux.
If we place the stop after πινέτω, the scriptural citation applies to the believer. But if we place the full stop after ἐμέ, the reference is then transferred to Christ.

The "Western" punctuation has in its favor that it gives a nice parallelism and chiasmus:
                         ἐάν τις διψᾷ
                              ἐρχέσθω πρός με.
                         καὶ πινέτω
                              ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ.

Compare the similar Jo 6:35   ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρὸς ἐμὲ
                              οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ,
                         καὶ ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ
                              οὐ μὴ διψήσει πώποτε.

Kilpatrick notes: "When καθὼς introduces a following quotation in the NT it invariably follows its main clause." He translates:

"If any man thirst, let him who believes in me come to me and drink."
The problems with this punctuation are:
1. In John 'drinking' means 'believing'. This gives a rather meaningless tautology for the second part: "And let him believe who believes in me."
2. The position of the words ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμέ. Menken: "These or similar words are often used in John with a conditional meaning, as is the case in 7:38, and they are always at the beginning of the clause (John 3:15,16,18,36; 5:24; 6:40; 11:25,26; 12:44,46; 14:12). Punctuation B results in their being placed at the end of the clause, and this is obviously at variance with Johannine style."

The problem with punctuation 1 is that in this case it is normally assumed that the αὐτοῦ of verse 38 refers to the believer, which is extremely improbable, since it does not fit the context and John's theology (cp. Menken).
Menken now suggests that one may translate:
"He who believes in me, for him, as scripture has said, rivers of living water shall flow from his [Jesus'] inside."
Schnackenburg is seeing this as a viable option, too.

It is interesting to note that there is no scripture passage known to which verse 38 refers (cp. Menken). Several have been suggested, e.g. Isa 55:1, Isa 58:11, Joel 4:18, Zech 14:8 or Ps 77:16, 20. Compare Jo 19:34-5 also:
19:34 one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once blood and water came out. 35 He who saw this has testified <u>so that you also may believe</u>.

Turner writes: "Chrysostom in loc. takes the same interpretation as Origen, and refers τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ to the believer, though he adopts a punctuation of his own. As the Scripture nowhere says that 'rivers shall flow out of his belly', it results that the words καθὼς ἡ γραφη λέγει must be constructed not with what follows but with what precedes, and we must put a light stop (ὑποστίξαι δεῖ) after λέγει, and translate 'He that believes on Me in the full sense in which Scripture foretold Christ - as Son of God, and Creator of all things, and coeternal with the Father, and coming as Man and as Redeemer - out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water'. But in spite of St Chrysostom's eminence as a commentator, and in spite of the assent of later Greeks like Theophylact who adopted his view, we may say confidently that whatever arrangement of the words is right, this arrangement is certainly wrong."

Zahn, Weiss and Barrett think that it is the believer from which the water flows. Schnackenburg argues that from internal considerations it is basically safe that, whatever solution on the punctuation one prefers, it is Jesus from which the water flows. It remains an open question. Interesting is that no textual variants are recorded here.

Since this is not really a textcritical question please refer to the commentaries. E.g. the following have a detailed discussion: C.K. Barrett 1978 p. 326-29, Schnackenburg 1977 II, p. 211-17

Compare:
- T. Herbert Bindley "John VII.37, 38" Expositor 20 (1920) 445
- C.H. Turner "On the punctuation of Jo 7:37-38" JTS 24 (1922) 66-70 [he is giving many fathers references]
- K.H. Kuhn "St. John 7:37-8" NTS 4 (1957-8) 63-5 [discusses the Coptic evidence]
- J. Blenkinsopp "John 7:37-9: Another note on a notorious crux" NTS 6 (1959-60) 95-8
- G.D. Kilpatrick "The punctuation of John 7:37-38" JTS 11 (1960) 340-2
- M.J.J. Menken "The Origin of the Old Testament Quotation in John 7:38" NovT 38 (1996) 160-75
- M.A. Daise "If anyone thirsts, let that one come to me and drink: The literary texture of Jo 7:37b-38" JBL 122 (2003) 687-699

TVU 127

NA28 John 7:39 τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος <u>ὃ ἔμελλον</u> λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη.

BYZ John 7:39 Τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος <u>οὗ ἔμελλον</u> λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη.

Byz   P66, 01, D, L, T, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579,
       Maj-part[G, H, N, Γ, Δ, Π, 28, 157, 565, 892, 1241, 1424],
       <u>Robinson</u>, **NA**²⁵, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   P75, B,
       Maj-part[E, K, M, S, U, V, Y, Λ, Ω, 0105, 700] , <u>WH^{mg}</u>, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

ὅ   pronoun relative accusative neuter singular
οὗ   pronoun relative genitive   neuter singular

"But this he said of the Spirit, which are about to receive those believing in him"

Similar instances:
NA28 John 4:14 ὃς δ' ἂν πίῃ ἐκ <u>τοῦ ὕδατος οὗ</u> ἐγὼ δώσω αὐτῷ,
NA28 John 15:20 μνημονεύετε <u>τοῦ λόγου οὗ</u> ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν·
NA28 John 21:10 ἐνέγκατε ἀπὸ <u>τῶν ὀψαρίων ὧν</u> ἐπιάσατε νῦν.

NA28 John 4:5 Συχὰρ πλησίον <u>τοῦ χωρίου ὃ</u> ἔδωκεν Ἰακὼβ [τῷ] Ἰωσὴφ
       <u>τοῦ χωρίου οὗ</u>   P66, C*, D, L, Wˢ, Θ, 086, f1, 33,
                          Maj-part[M, N, S, Ω, 28, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1241]

       txt   P75, 01, A, B, Cᶜ, Ψ, 083, f13, 579, 892,
                          Maj-part[K, Π, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, 1424]

Robertson (Wordpictures) notes:

> "Which (οὗ). Genitive by attraction of the relative ὃ (accusative singular object of λαμβάνειν) to the case of τοῦ πνεύματος (the Spirit) the antecedent. But it is purely grammatical gender (neuter ὃ because of πνεῦμα) which we do not have in English. Even here one should say "whom," not which, of the Spirit of God."

The three other examples of attraction in John (see above) are safe. To the contrary the only other example without attraction in John (4:5) shows the same variation.
The conclusion would be that it was the ὃ that initiated the change.
The change emerged independently several times, because the support is not coherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 128

NA28 John 7:39 τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ὃ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὔπω γὰρ ἦν <u>πνεῦμα</u>, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη.

BYZ John 7:39 τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος οὗ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύοντες εἰς αὐτόν· οὔπω γὰρ ἦν <u>πνεῦμα ἅγιον</u>, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη

T&T #90

<u>πνεῦμα ἅγιον</u>	P66*, L, N^c, W, X, Δ, 0105, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 821, 865, 1071, 1241, Maj, [Trg]
<u>τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐπ᾽ αὐτούς</u>	D, d, f, goth(!)
<u>πνεῦμα ἅγιον δεδόμενον</u>	B, pc⁹, e, q, vg^{mss}, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, geo², Weiss
<u>πνεῦμα δεδόμενον</u>	it, vg^{mss}, Sy-S, Sy-C, Sy-P, Eus, Lachmann
<u>πνεῦμα</u>	P66^c, P75, 01, K, Π, N*, T, Θ, Ψ, 849, pc²⁴, **33**, vg, Co, arm, Or

goth: unte ni nauhþanuh was ahma sa weiha ana im
     but   not yet   was spirit the holy on him

Or: Mt Comm tom 12:40
ἐδίδαξε γὰρ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ὁ Ἰωάννης πρὸ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ σωτῆρος μηδένα πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐσχηκέναι εἰπών· "οὔπω γὰρ ἦν <u>πνεῦμα</u>, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη."

The reading πνεῦμα δεδέμενον is not given in NA.
Lacuna: A, C
B: umlaut! (1361 A 38 L)   αὐτόν· <u>οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα,</u> ὅτι

Natural additions. There is no reason for an omission.

This is one of the cases suggested by Metzger ("Lucianic recension", 1959) where one could have an old relict of the earliest Antiochian text. Not necessarily correct, but at least older than any possible recension.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 131) thinks that the B reading is rather difficult, because it seems to exclude the communication of the Spirit to Jesus and the prophets. Hoskier (Codex B, I, 373) sees the B reading as a conflation.

It is possible that the ἦν refers to Jesus and not to the Spirit:
"and not yet was <u>he</u> Spirit" against: "for not yet was the Spirit". To avoid this view δεδόμενον might have been added.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 129

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:39 τοῦτο δὲ εἶπεν περὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ὃ ἔμελλον λαμβάνειν οἱ πιστεύσαντες εἰς αὐτόν· <u>οὔπω</u> γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα, ὅτι Ἰησοῦς <u>οὐδέπω</u> ἐδοξάσθη.

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>οὔπω</u>   01, B, D, Θ, pc, Or^pt, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>

txt   P66, P75, (L), T, W, X, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj

<u>οὐδέπωτε</u>   L

Lacuna: A, C
B umlaut! 1361 A 40 L
ὅτι Ἰησοῦς <u>οὔπω ἐδοξάσθη.</u> 40 <u>Ἐκ τοῦ</u> ὄχλου

οὐδέπω/ οὔπω   "not yet"
οὐδέποτε   "never"

Compare:
NA28 John 7:6 ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς <u>οὔπω</u> πάρεστιν
            <u>οὐδέπω</u>   W

NA28 John 7:30 ὅτι <u>οὔπω</u> ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ.
            <u>οὐδέπω</u>   P66

NA28 John 8:57 πεντήκοντα ἔτη <u>οὔπω</u> ἔχεις καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ἑώρακας;
            <u>οὐδέπω</u>   D

οὐδέπω appears two more times in John, both occurrences are safe.
οὔπω appears 11 times, basically safe, too, but with three times singular variation to οὐδέπω.
Probably οὔπω here is a conformation to immediate context, the οὔπω earlier in the verse. The support for οὔπω is incoherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 130

NA28 John 7:40   <u>Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν</u> ἀκούσαντες τῶν λόγων τούτων ἔλεγον· οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·

BYZ John 7:40 <u>πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου</u> ἀκούσαντες τὸν λόγον, ἔλεγον· οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·

<u>πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου</u>	K, Π, Δ, Ψ, 0105, 0141, f13, 33, 579, 1071, Maj, q, Sy, goth
<u>ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν πολλοὶ</u>	118
<u>οἱ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου</u>	Θ
<u>πολλοὶ ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οἱ</u>	P66*
<u>οἱ οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου πολλοὶ</u>	124
<u>πολλοὶ οὖν</u> ἀκούσαντες <u>ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου</u>	157
ἀκούσαντες <u>ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου</u> ἀκούσαντες	047

txt	<u>Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν</u>	P66^c, P75, 01, B, D, L, T, W, X, f1, 397, 565, pc, Lat, Co, arm

The Θ reading is in brackets for the Byzantine reading. This is misleading, because it is not clear (though probable) that the οἱ comes from a misreading of πολλοὶ.
T reads actually Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου <u>ου</u> without ν!
Lacuna: A, C
B: umlaut! (1361 A 40 L)
39 Ἰησοῦς <u>οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη.</u> 40 <u>Ἐκ τοῦ</u> ὄχλου

Compare:
NA28 John 6:60 <u>Πολλοὶ οὖν ἀκούσαντες</u> ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπαν·
NA28 John 11:45 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἐλθόντες

If πολλοὶ was originally present, there would have been no reason for an omission. Note 6:60, which is safe. Probably πολλοὶ has been added from 6:60.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 131

NA28 John 7:40 Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν ἀκούσαντες <u>τῶν λόγων τούτων</u> ἔλεγον· οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·

BYZ John 7:40 πολλοὶ οὖν Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου ἀκούσαντες <u>τὸν λόγον,</u> ἔλεγον Οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·

Not in NA, partially only in SQE, in Tis!
T&T #91

Byz	<u>τὸν λόγον</u>	S, Δ^c, Λ, 69, 788(=f13^b), 28, 579, 1424, Maj-part⁸⁹⁸
	<u>τῶν λόγων</u>	E, H, M, Y*, Γ, Δ*, 0105, 0211, 157, 700, 1342, Maj-part³⁰⁹, Sy-P, Sy-H
txt	<u>τῶν λόγων τούτων</u>	P66^c, P75, 01^{C2}, B, L, N, T, Ψ, 0141, f1, 33, 397, 565, 597, 799, 821, 892, 1071, 2193, al⁶⁰, it(a, b, e, f, q, r¹), Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, goth
	<u>τὸν λόγον τοῦτον</u>	X, 213, 849, 865, 1241, 2786, al¹²⁴, sa^{mss}, bo^{ms}
	<u>τούτων τῶν λόγων</u>	G, pc²

<u>αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων τούτων</u>	P66*, 01*, D, Lat(aur, c, d, ff², l, vg)
<u>αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων</u>	Θ, pc¹⁹
<u>τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ</u>	K, W, Y^c, Π, al⁷³, Sy-C(or the previous)
<u>τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ</u>	f13, al¹⁴⁰
<u>αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον</u>	124, pc³

<u>omit:</u> pc, Sy-S

01: IGNTP completely omits the word τούτων for 01. It is clearly there, confirmed from the facsimile (CSNTM 052b column C, last line).
The versions are from Tis and are not completely clear!
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Several variations:
a) add αὐτοῦ: P66*, 01*, D, K, W, Y^c, Θ, f13, pc
b) add τοῦτον/τούτων: P66, P75, 01, D, B, G, L, N, U, X, Π, Ψ, f1, 33, 565, 1071, Lat, Co, arm

The addition of τούτων and the plural are almost safe. The omission could be due to h.t. (-ων … -ων).

The only question is the addition of αὐτοῦ, which is basically Western/Caesarean.

Metzger: The P66* et al. reading "has the appearance of being a conflation."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 132

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:40 Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν ἀκούσαντες τῶν λόγων τούτων ἔλεγον·

<u>_____ οὗτός</u> ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·

T&T #92

<u>ὅτι οὗτός</u>

      B, D, 821, 1010, 1293, pc[20] , [**NA**[25]] , [WH], Weiss, [Trg[mg]]

txt   P66, P75, 01, L, N, T, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 799, 849, 865, Maj

Trg[mg], WH, NA[25] have ὁ in brackets.
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 7:12 καὶ γογγυσμὸς περὶ αὐτοῦ ἦν πολὺς ἐν τοῖς ὄχλοις· οἱ μὲν <u>ἔλεγον ὅτι</u> ἀγαθός ἐστιν,

NA28 John 7:31 Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου δὲ πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλεγον·__ὁ χριστὸς ὅταν ἔλθῃ μὴ πλείονα σημεῖα ποιήσει ὧν οὗτος ἐποίησεν;

<u>ὅτι</u>   Ψ, 579, al[K, Π, M, Γ, Λ, 28, 157, 700, 1071, 1424]

NA28 John 7:41 ἄλλοι ἔλεγον·__οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός, οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον· μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ χριστὸς ἔρχεται;

<u>ὅτι</u>   D, L, W, X, 69, 157, 1071, 1241, al

The addition is probably accidental. There is no reason for an omission. Note similar additions in context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 133

    51.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:44 τινὲς δὲ ἤθελον ἐξ αὐτῶν πιάσαι αὐτόν,
ἀλλ᾽ οὐδεὶς <u>ἐπέβαλεν</u> ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας.

ἔβαλεν   P75, B, L, T, pc, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66^C, 01, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0105, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj
          <u>ἐπέβαλλεν</u>   P66*, 1424

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 7:30 Ἐζήτουν οὖν αὐτὸν πιάσαι, καὶ οὐδεὶς <u>ἐπέβαλεν ἐπ᾽</u>
<u>αὐτὸν</u> τὴν χεῖρα, ὅτι οὔπω ἐληλύθει ἡ ὥρα αὐτοῦ.   safe!

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 26:50
τότε προσελθόντες <u>ἐπέβαλον τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ</u> τὸν Ἰησοῦν
NA28 Mark 14:46 οἱ δὲ <u>ἐπέβαλον</u> τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῷ
NA28 Luke 9:62 οὐδεὶς <u>ἐπιβαλὼν τὴν χεῖρα ἐπ᾽</u> ἄροτρον
NA28 Luke 20:19 καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς <u>ἐπιβαλεῖν ἐπ᾽</u> αὐτὸν
NA28 Luke 21:12 πάντων <u>ἐπιβαλοῦσιν ἐφ᾽</u> ὑμᾶς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν

It appears quite probable that ἐπέβαλεν is a conformation to context, verse 30
(so Weiss) and/or to the parallels where ἐπιβάλλω is safe always. There is no
reason for a change to ἔβαλεν here.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 134

52. **Difficult variant**
NA28 John 7:46 ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ὑπηρέται· οὐδέποτε <u>ἐλάλησεν οὕτως</u> ἄνθρωπος.

BYZ John 7:46 ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ ὑπηρέται Οὐδέποτε <u>οὕτως ἐλάλησεν</u> ἄνθρωπος <u style="color:green">ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος,</u>

T&T #94

<u style="color:green">ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος</u>   Χ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 397, 579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj, Lat, Sy, sa, ac², pbo, arm, geo, goth, <u style="color:red">Gre</u>, <u style="color:red">Vogels</u>, <u style="color:red">von Soden</u>, <u style="color:red">[Trg]</u>
                                       Οὐδέποτε οὕτως ὁ ἄνθρωπος 13*

<u>οὕτως ἄνθρωπος ἐλάλησεν</u> <u style="color:green">ὡς οὗτος λάλει</u>   D, aur, c, d
<u>οὕτως ἄνθρωπος ἐλάλησεν</u> <u style="color:green">ὡς οὗτος λάλει ὁ ἄνθρωπος</u>
                                    P66*, 01*, <u style="color:red">NA²⁵</u>, <u style="color:red">Weiss</u>, <u style="color:red">Tis</u>, <u style="color:red">Merk</u>

ἐλάλησεν <u style="color:green">οὗτος</u> ἄνθρωπος <u style="color:green">ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος</u>   N, Ψ, 33, 1241, pc
ἐλάλησεν ____ ἄνθρωπος <u style="color:green">ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος</u>   28, 700

txt   P66ᶜ, P75, 01ᶜ², B, L, T, W, 849, pc⁹, vgᵐˢ, bo, Or, <u style="color:red">WH</u>

<u>13</u>: T&T note 13* for txt, but this is not correct. The evidence acc. to Swanson (and Geerlings) is given above. It is clear that 13* is an accidental omission due to homoioarcton οὕτως - οὗτος. This has been confirmed by Klaus Witte from Münster from the film. The corrector adds the missing words. Swanson interprets this wrongly by inserting them after ὁ ἄνθρωπος and not before.

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 4:26 Καὶ ἔλεγεν· <u>οὕτως</u> ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ <u>ὡς</u> ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

The additions are probably natural expansions: οὕτως ... ὡς.

As in the previous 7:40 variant (αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων τούτων), the P66*, 01* reading looks like a conflation.

It is possible that the words fell out due to h.t. (ἄνθρωπος - ἄνθρωπος, so Weiss). Some Byzantine minuscules omit, too (e.g. 225, 229 acc. to Tis). h.t. is at least in part responsible for the omission.

Interestingly the longest reading is also the earliest (P66).
It has been suggested that this is the result of a conflation of the D and the Θ reading.
On the other hand it is also possible that the shorter readings are attempts to straighten the rather clumsy style. This repetitive style is typically Johannine.

The txt reading is unusual Greek. Normally οὕτως comes in front of the verb.

The N, Ψ et al. readings can be seen as remnants of the txt reading.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 135

NA28 John 7:50 λέγει Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτούς,
ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν [τὸ] πρότερον, εἷς ὢν ἐξ αὐτῶν·

BYZ John 7:50 λέγει Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτούς
ὁ ἐλθὼν νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν   εἷς ὢν ἐξ αὐτῶν

T&T #97
T&T #98

Byz	ὁ ἐλθὼν νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν	G, 579, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, goth
	ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς	K, Π, N, Δ, Ψ, 0211, 0250, 157, 1071, al

ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον   P66, L, W, 597, pc², Bois
ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν   πρότερον   P75, 01^C2, B, T, 849, 2786,
                                   a?, sa, ac², Sy-Pal,
                                   NA²⁵, WH, Weiss, Trg, SBL

omit: 01*, pc⁷, Tis, Bal

ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον	D, 397 (but post αὐτῶν!)
ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρότερον	X, 33, 865
ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον νυκτὸς	0141, 821
ὁ ἐλθὼν τὸ πρότερον νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν	1241
ὁ ἐλθὼν νυκτὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον	Θ, f1, f13, 213, 565, 799, 892, 2193, al, r¹, Sy-H**, bo, arm

According to Tischendorf, NA and Balestri (ed.pr.) T does read πρότερον.
According to IGNTP it does not (they have the singular reading ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν).
Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 3:2 [Nikodemus:] οὗτος ἦλθεν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς

Compare also:
NA28 John 6:62 ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν τὸ πρότερον;

NA28 John 9:8 Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν <u>τὸ πρότερον</u> ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν;

NA28 John 19:39 ἦλθεν δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος, <u>ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον,</u>

NA28 John 10:40 … τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης <u>τὸ πρῶτον</u> βαπτίζων
     <u>τὸ πρότερον</u>   P45, 01, Δ, Θ, f13, 579, 1071, 2786, pc

NA28 John 12:16 ταῦτα οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταὶ <u>τὸ πρῶτον</u>
     <u>τὸ πρότερον</u>   Ψ

νυκτὸς is the more clear reference to the previous (πρότερον) mentioning of Nicodemus. Note the clear conflation in the Western and Caesarean witnesses. There is no reason for a change if νυκτὸς was originally present.

The phrase τὸ πρότερον/τὸ πρῶτον appears only in John (5 times).

Note Jo 19:39, where the reading is basically safe and is identical with the D reading!

Zahn (Comm. Jo) thinks that the 01 reading is correct and considers the words to be an interpolation from 19:39. On the other hand it is possible that the words have been omitted to improve style. Note that 7 Byzantine minuscules omit the words, too.

Compare also the discussion about τὸ πρότερον versus πρότερον, next variant.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 136

53.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 7:50 λέγει Νικόδημος πρὸς αὐτούς, ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν [τὸ] πρότερον, εἷς ὢν ἐξ αὐτῶν·

<u>omit</u>   P75, 01^{C2}, B, T, 205, 1582*, 849, 2786, pc⁴, <u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>

txt   P66, (D), L, W, X, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 565, 799, 821, 865, 892, 1241, pc²³, e
   <u>τὸ πρῶτον</u>   D, 397

<u>omit τὸ πρότερον</u>   N, Ψ, 0211, 0250, 579, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy

<u>omit ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον</u>   01*, pc, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:62 ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῆτε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀναβαίνοντα ὅπου ἦν <u>τὸ πρότερον;</u>

NA28 John 9:8 Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν <u>τὸ πρότερον</u> ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν;
      <u>omit</u> τὸ: 700*

NA28 John 19:39 ἦλθεν δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος, <u>ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον,</u>
      <u>omit</u> τὸ: P66*

Also:
NA28 John 10:40 ... τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης <u>τὸ πρῶτον</u> βαπτίζων
      <u>τὸ πρότερον</u> P45, 01, Δ, Θ, f13, 579, 1071, pc

NA28 John 12:16 ταῦτα οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταὶ <u>τὸ πρῶτον</u>
            <u>τὸ πρότερον</u> Ψ
         <u>omit</u> τὸ: 579

The change from [τὸ] πρότερον to νύκτος has already been discussed in the main commentary with rating 2 (NA clearly original).

The phrase τὸ πρότερον/τὸ πρῶτον appears in the Gospels only in John (5 times). It appears also in Gal 4:13 and 1.Tim 1:13. In three of the cases there exists a singular omission of τὸ.
It is possible that the addition of τὸ is a conformation to 6:62.
The witnesses supporting the omission are very good ones, but they represent a very narrow stream in the transmission only.

Compare also the discussion to this verse in the main commentary!

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 137

Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:52 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶ; ἐραύνησον **καὶ ἴδε** ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας προφήτης οὐκ ἐγείρεται.

καὶ ἴδε τὰς γραφάς   D, d

τὰς γραφάς καὶ ἴδε   W, it(a, aur, c, e, ff², l, r¹, **9A**), vg^{Cl}, sa, ac²
    scripturas et vide

f, q, vg read txt.
Lacuna: A, C
B: umlaut (p. 1361 C 1 R)   ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι

Compare:
NA28 John 5:39 ἐραυνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν·

Another of those agreements of W with the Latin. Compare Jo 7:1, 8:53.
The self suggesting addition is probably inspired from Jo 5:39.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 138

54. <u>**Difficult variant**</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 7:52 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· μὴ καὶ σὺ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας εἶ; ἐραύνησον καὶ ἴδε ὅτι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας <u>προφήτης</u> οὐκ ἐγείρεται.

T&T #99
In NA only in the appendix (lect. minores).

<u>ὁ προφήτης</u>   P66*, sa, <u>Bois</u>
                    cj. (Henry Owen, 1716-1795)

E.R. Smothers notes a letter of Prof. Martin, the editor of P66, to him. Martin writes: "On p. 52, line 2, the article ὁ with προφήτης, as finally written, is paler and, on close inspection, seems to have been imperfectly scratched. If so, the corrector, whoever he was, wished to remove it." G. Fee agrees with this view (P66, S&D, 1968, p. 70).
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>click here</u>.

That the Sahidic reads the article, is noted in Horner (1910) and in Hans Quecke "Das Joh.ev. in Saidisch", Rome, 1984.

Boismard additionally adds: P75[vid]
In P75 there is quite a large lacuna: γαλιλα[... c. 6 ...]φ[η]τη[ς].
It is not possible, unfortunately, to decide if ὁ was present or not.
B: umlaut? (p. 1361 C 3 R) προ<u>φήτης οὐκ ἐγείρεται.</u>
(It is probable that this umlaut indicates the PA, which would follow immediately hereafter.)

Compare:
NA28 Luke 7:39 ἰδὼν δὲ ὁ Φαρισαῖος ὁ καλέσας αὐτὸν εἶπεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων· οὗτος εἰ ἦν <u>προφήτης</u>,
<u>ὁ προφήτης</u>   B*, Ξ, 205, 482, pc, Weiss, NA[25], WH both have ὁ in brackets

NA28 John 1:21 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτόν· τί οὖν; σὺ Ἠλίας εἶ; καὶ λέγει· οὐκ εἰμί. <u>ὁ προφήτης</u> εἶ σύ; καὶ ἀπεκρίθη· οὔ.
NA28 John 1:25 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· τί οὖν βαπτίζεις εἰ σὺ οὐκ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς οὐδὲ Ἠλίας οὐδὲ <u>ὁ προφήτης</u>;
NA28 John 6:14 Οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες ὃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον ἔλεγον ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς <u>ὁ προφήτης </u>ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.

NA28 John 7:40 Ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου οὖν ἀκούσαντες τῶν λόγων τούτων ἔλεγον· οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης·

Several commentators think that this is the correct reading, at least the intended reading.
Smothers notes that there actually was a prophet from Galilee, Jonas:
LXX 2 Kings 14:25 ὃ ἐλάλησεν ἐν χειρὶ δούλου αὐτοῦ Ιωνα υἱοῦ Αμαθι τοῦ προφήτου τοῦ ἐκ Γεθχοβερ
"which he spoke by his servant Jonah son of Amittai, the prophet, who was from Gath-hepher."

The reading of P66* makes perfect sense and fits good into the Fourth Gospel.

G. Fee (P66, S&D, 1968, p. 79) writes: "it has been pointed out that the singular readings of P66* are ALL of dubious quality and most likely the product of the scribe himself, not his exemplar. The reading of ὁ προφήτης in P66* therefore has as little textual value as the 19th CE conjectures; and even though this reading is contextually to be preferred, and perhaps even what the author intended in terms of meaning, there can be little question that he in fact wrote προφήτης without the article. Even if a GOOD early manuscript were found which had the article, it must continue to be rejected as secondary on the basis of ardua lectio potior."

The reading could be a harmonization to context, verse 40: οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης and verse 41: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός.
Compare also 10:33 below, where P66* adds τὸν before θέον.

Compare:
E.R. Smothers "Two readings in papyrus Bodmer II" HTR 51 (1958) 109-122

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

The Pericope de Adultera: Jo 7:53 - 8:11

This is covered in an [extra file](#).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original) [for the complete pericope]

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

TVU 139

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:12 Πάλιν οὖν αὐτοῖς ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων· ἐγώ εἰμι τὸ φῶς τοῦ κόσμου· ὁ ἀκολουθῶν <u>ἐμοὶ</u> οὐ μὴ περιπατήσῃ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, ἀλλ᾽ ἕξει τὸ φῶς τῆς ζωῆς.

<u>μοὶ</u>   B, T, Or, <u>**NA**</u>[25], <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>
txt   P66, 01, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 397, Maj

Lacuna: P75, A, C
B: no umlaut

Compare Johannine usage:
NA28 John 1:43 καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>ἀκολούθει μοι.</u>
NA28 John 10:27 κἀγὼ γινώσκω αὐτὰ καὶ <u>ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι,</u>
NA28 John 21:19 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν λέγει αὐτῷ· <u>ἀκολούθει μοι.</u>

Interestingly the combination of ἀκολουθέω with μοὶ appears 3 more times and always safe. Perhaps John used ἐμοὶ here for emphasis purposes:
<u>ἐγώ</u> εἰμι ... ὁ ἀκολουθῶν <u>ἐμοὶ</u> ...

It is hardly conceivable that almost all witnesses changed μοὶ here.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 140

55. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 8:16 καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγώ, ἡ κρίσις ἡ ἐμὴ ἀληθινή ἐστιν, ὅτι μόνος οὐκ εἰμί, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πέμψας με <u>πατήρ.</u>

T&T # 103

<u>omit:</u> 01*, D, 1655*, d, Sy-S, Sy-C, **NA**²⁵, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u>WH</u> have the word in brackets

Lacuna: A, C
B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

Compare following verses:
NA28 John 8:18 ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ ἐμαυτοῦ καὶ μαρτυρεῖ περὶ ἐμοῦ <u>ὁ πέμψας με πατήρ.</u>
Here πατήρ is safe.

NA28 John 8:26 πολλὰ ἔχω περὶ ὑμῶν λαλεῖν καὶ κρίνειν, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πέμψας με __ἀληθής ἐστιν,
<u>add πατήρ:</u> 01

NA28 John 8:29 καὶ ὁ πέμψας με __μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐστιν·
<u>add πατήρ:</u> L

Compare also:
NA28 John 6:38 ὅτι καταβέβηκα ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οὐχ ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με.</u>
<u>add πατρός:</u> D, 700, 118^C, 892, 1424, al, it, Sy-S, Sy-C

NA28 John 6:44 οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ <u>ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν,</u>   <u>omit:</u> A (homoioarcton)

NA28 John 12:49 ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ   safe!

Compare discussion at 5:30 with all parallels!

The variation is difficult to evaluate internally. In this case it is possible that πατήρ has been added as a harmonization to verse 18 (so Weiss). That the Western evidence is not consistent in this respect is shown by the addition in verse 6:38.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 141

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:21 Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν αὐτοῖς· ἐγὼ ὑπάγω καὶ ζητήσετέ με
_, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν ἀποθανεῖσθε· ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ
δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν.

Not in NA and not in SQE!

  καὶ οὐκ εὑρήσετέ με   N, f1, 22, 565, pc, Sy-H**
  καὶ οὐκ εὑρήσετε   118, 700, pc
                               pc = 994, 1194, 1210 (from IGNTP Byzantine text)

Lacuna: A, C, Sy-C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 7:34 ζητήσετέ με καὶ οὐχ εὑρήσετέ [με], καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ
ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν.
omit: P66, 01, D, G, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 1582, 118, f13, 33, Maj, Latt, arm, NA[25]
txt   P75, B, N, T, X, 0105, 1, 565, al, Sy, Co, WH

A secondary harmonization to 7:34. Note the same variation of the με here!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 142

56. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 8:25 ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ· σὺ τίς εἶ;
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν;

01* reads: τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ ἔν λαλῶ ὑμῖν;

P66^C has a marginal correction (add εἶπον ὑμῖν):
εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· εἶπον ὑμῖν τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν;
Jesus said to them: "I told you at the beginning [of my mission], what I am also telling you [now]."

047 omits τὴν ἀρχὴν

Principium, qui et loquor vobis   e, vg^{mss} (incl. Lindisfarne G.)
"I am the Beginning, even I who speak to you."

C.C. Torrey (1933) conjectures:
τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν;
"I am even yet in the beginning of my word to you."

Diatess^{Arab}: "If I should begin to speak unto you …" (Hogg, Preuschen)
Sy-S,C: "The chief is, that I should speak myself with you, …" (Burkitt)
Bohairic: "At the beginning I also told you …" (Horner)
Sahidic: "From at first I speak to you." (Horner)

P75 has a dot between the ὅ and the τι. (The dot is not a high point but a normal full stop which is located under the horizontal bar of the T. It is not entirely clear if it is intentional or simply a blot.)
B: umlaut! (1362 A 31 L)
αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν;

An obscure, difficult to interpret sentence.
Also a question of punctuation, resulting in different meanings:

1. As a question, with ὅτι: "Why do I speak to you at all?"
2. As an exclamation, with ὅ τι: "That I speak to you at all!"
3. As an affirmation, with ὅ τι: "[I am], what I told you from the beginning."
                              or: "Primarily I am what I am telling you."

Chrysostom:
τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν; Ὃ δὲ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστι· τοῦ ὅλως ἀκούειν τῶν λόγων τῶν παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἀνάξιοί ἐστε, μήτι γε καὶ μαθεῖν ὅστις ἐγώ εἰμι.
Chrysostom takes it as: "That I even speak to you at all!"

Cyril of Alexandria:
ὅτι καὶ λόγου παρ᾽ ὑμῖν ἐποιησάμην ἀρχήν.
"That I even began to speak to you!"

Nestle notes (Exp. Times 14, 1903, p. 191):
"For the difficult words of the second half of this verse the R.V. proposes as alternative translation: 'How is it that I even speak to you at all?' This translation has not only the high authority of Chrysostom, as Fred. Field remarks in his Notes on this passage, but is confirmed by a very exact parallel in the Clementine Homilies. There a certain Apion is giving an explanation, his hearer does not appear to him to be attentive, therefore he interrupts his speech (τὸν λόγον ἐγκόψας) and says to him: Εἰ μὴ παρακολουθεῖς οἷς λέγω, τί καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν διαλέγομαι; If you do not follow my words, why do I speak (or discuss) at all?' See Clementina, ed. P. de Lagarde, p. 77, ed. Dressel, p. 163, bk. vi. chap. 2.

A.T. Robertson in his Wordpictures:
"Even that which I have also spoken unto you from the beginning."
A difficult sentence. It is not clear whether it is an affirmation or a question. The Latin and Syriac versions treat it as affirmative. Westcott and Hort follow Meyer and take it as interrogative. The Greek fathers take it as an exclamation. It seems clear that the adverbial accusative τὴν ἀρχὴν cannot mean "from the beginning" like ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς (15:27) or ἐξ ἀρχῆς (16:4). The LXX has τὴν ἀρχήν for "at the beginning" or "at the first" (Ge 43:20). There are examples in Greek, chiefly negative, where τὴν ἀρχήν means "at all," "essentially," "primarily." Vincent and Bernard so take it here, "Primarily what I am telling you." Jesus avoids the term Messiah with its political connotations. He stands by his high claims already made.

BDAG 3rd ed.:

As nearly all the Gk. fathers understood it, is emphatically used adverbially = ὅλως = *at all*

τὴν ἀ. ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν *(how is it) that I even speak to you at all?*

More prob. the meaning is somewhat as follows: *What I said to you from the first* (so NT in Basic English; sim. REB et al.; cp. τὴν ἀρχήν 'at the beginning' Thu, 74, 2; s. also RFunk, HTR 51, '58, 95-100; B-D-F §300, 2, but appeal to P66 is specious, s. EMiller, TZ 36, '80, 261).

R. Bultmann: "the text must me corrupt."

Funk: "It is improbable that John would have used this phrase [τὴν ἀρχήν] in a way foreign to his usual understanding of ἀρχή. τὴν ἀρχὴν = ὅλως does not suit either the context or the grammatical structure ... It should, therefore, be assigned a temporal meaning."

Smothers: "The ancient versions are an important indication that to the earliest translators the original afforded no evident meaning."
"Every attempt to find a meaning for our text that will meet all requirements labors under the inexorable difficulty that, as it stands, it is an ellipse the resolution of which is not self-evident. Hence it is that the best of scholars fail of a definitive solution, and differ widely in their selection of a provisional one."
"If this [the P66^C reading] were the common tradition of the text, it is safe to surmise that the main body of Johannine scholars would be content with it."

If the reading of P66^C is correct, the error must be an extremely early one.
It is possible that the words fell out due to a scribal oversight of the two ЄΙП:

ЄΙΠЄΝΑΥΤΟΙϹΟΙϹ**ЄΙΠΟΝΥΜΙΝ**ΤΗΝΑΡΧΗΝ
ЄΙΠЄΝΑΥΤΟΙϹΟΙϹΤΗΝΑΡΧΗΝ

Funk has an interesting observation:
He notes that the addition of εἶπον ὑμῖν is made in the margin with a mark "./." in the text to show the place of insertion. In all other places where the scribe uses this symbol, "the correction has some support in the tradition. In the majority of examples, the reading supplied in the margin is universally attested, and in some places the text is meaningless without the addition. Only in 8:28 is there no trace in the tradition. The probability is strong, then, that these two words (εἶπον ὑμῖν) stood in the text from which P66 was copied."

This is not imperative though. I am not sure if this means anything.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "The meaning of τὴν ἀρχὴν is still a puzzle; the interpretations so far given are unconvincing. The next words ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν are probably the prototype of the MGk current phrase αὐτὸ ποῦ σᾶς λέγω = *what I tell you (it is what I tell you and nothing else)*, which often disputants in Greece employ when they wish to reassert their opinions without further discussion."

Zahn notes (Comm. Jo) that the early Greek commentators agreed on the meaning "that I read to you at all". There was no question about that and no indication of any difficulty in the understanding of the words. Zahn also thinks that we should take OTI as simple ὅτι and not ὅ τι.

After a detailed check of the thousands of occurrences in the Greek literature Chrys Caragounis (2007) comes to the conclusion that τὴν ἀρχὴν is used as an adverb without accusative force. The meaning as such is then "the beginning". The preposition must be deduced from the context. The position of τὴν ἀρχὴν at the beginning is for emphasis.
He further concludes that ὅ τι should be taken as "that which/what" and the καὶ as "precisely" (Caragounis: "Needless to say καὶ does not mean 'precisely'. This is only the force it assumes in the present context"). His final translation of the sentence is:
"[I am] From the beginning! - precisely what I have been saying (speaking) to you."
with the comment: "The English may translate it with *'[I am] what I have been saying to you from the beginning'*, but this is only a functional reading deprived of the literary effect of the original."

Compare:
- Theodor Zahn, Commentary on John
- R. W. Funk "Papyrus Bodmer II (P66) and John 8:25" HTR 51 (1958) 95 - 100;
- E.R. Smothers "Two readings in Papyrus Bodmer II" HTR 51 (1958) 111 - 122
  [both tend to accept the reading of P66[c].]
- C. Rico "Jn 8:25 Au Risque de la Philologie: L'histoire d'une expression Greque" RB 112 (2005) 596-627 [Unfortunately my French is too bad to understand what his conclusion is.]

- Chrys Caragounis "What did Jesus mean by τὴν ἀρχὴν in John 8:25?" NovT 49 (2007) 129-47 [Detailed investigation of the evidence in the Greek literature. He concludes that it means "from the beginning"]

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 143

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:27 οὐκ ἔγνωσαν ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν __.

__ τὸν θεόν 01*, D, pc³, it, vg^Cl, arm^mss-mg, Tis, Bal

ὅτι τὸν πάτερ αὐτοῦ λέγει τὸν θεόν   D
ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν τὸν θεόν   01*

quia patrem eis dicebat   vg
quia de patre eis dicebat   f, q
quia patrem eis dicebat Deum   aur, c, ff², r¹, vg^Cl
quia patrem esse Deum dicebat   gat, vg^ms
quod patrem illis diceret Deum   a
quod patrem illis dicebat Deum   e
quod patrem suum dicit   Deum   d
quia patrem suum dicebant Deum   l
quoniam de Deo patre diceret eis   b
quia patrem   dicebat Dominum   vg^ms

01: The words have been deleted by dots above the letters and additionally by small slashes through Θ and N. Tischendorf assigns it to corrector C (= 01^C2).
Lacuna: Sy-C
B: no umlaut

There is no reason for an omission. Probably a clarifying addition.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 144

57. <u>**Difficult variant**</u>
58. <u>**Difficult variant**</u>

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:28 εἶπεν οὖν **[αὐτοῖς]** ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ὅταν ὑψώσητε …

T&T #108 (in part, only οὖν αὐτοῖς)

_____ ὁ Ἰησοῦς	L, T, W, f1, 565, 892, 1241, 2786, pc², a, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>
_____ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι	P66*, B
αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι	P66^C, P75
<u>αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς πάλιν</u>	01, 2098, Sy, sa^{ms}
<u>αὐτοῖς πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>	D, 28, pc¹¹, d
<u>αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>·	K, N, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33, 157, 397, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, Co, goth, <u>Bois</u>, [<u>Trg</u>^{mg}]

Lacuna: A, C, Sy-C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:32 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
NA28 John 6:53 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς _·   <u>add πάλιν: 28</u>
NA28 John 12:35 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
NA28 John 18:31 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος·
NA28 John 20:21 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς [ὁ Ἰησοῦς] πάλιν·

NA28 John 4:48 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>πρὸς αὐτόν·</u>
NA28 John 6:67 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>τοῖς δώδεκα·</u>
NA28 John 7:33 εἶπεν οὖν _ὁ Ἰησοῦς·   <u>add αὐτοῖς: f1, 565</u>
NA28 John 12:7 εἶπεν οὖν _ὁ Ἰησοῦς·   <u>add αὐτῷ: 1424</u>
NA28 John 18:11 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>τῷ Πέτρῳ·</u>

The ὅτι is clearly secondary, because there is no reason for an omission. It has been inserted as a separator for the direct speech.

The omission of αὐτοῖς is more difficult to account for. The phrase is typical for John and the other 5 instances are safe! It is the exception that John does not specify to whom Jesus is talking. In these instances (7:33 and 12:7) some witnesses added a pronoun! It is thus more probable that the addition is secondary here too.

Regarding πάλιν compare:
NA28 John 3:14-15 Καὶ καθὼς Μωϋσῆς ὕψωσεν τὸν ὄφιν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, οὕτως <u>ὑψωθῆναι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</u>, 15 ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
It is possible that the πάλιν should refer back to 3:14-15. Very difficult to decide.

<u>αὐτοῖς:</u>
Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
    (remove αὐτοῖς)

<u>πάλιν:</u>
Rating: - (indecisive)
    External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
      (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 145

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:34 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν <u>τὴν ἁμαρτίαν</u> δοῦλός ἐστιν <u>τῆς ἁμαρτίας.</u>

<u>omit:</u> D, b, d, Sy-S, bo^{mss}, Cl, Cypr, <u>Bois</u>
     <u>WH</u> have the words in brackets.

Sy-C has a lacuna (from here to end).
B: no umlaut

For the phrase compare:
NA28 Romans 6:17 χάρις δὲ τῷ θεῷ ὅτι <u>ἦτε δοῦλοι τῆς ἁμαρτίας</u> ὑπηκούσατε δὲ ἐκ καρδίας εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς,
NA28 Romans 6:20 ὅτε γὰρ <u>δοῦλοι ἦτε τῆς ἁμαρτίας</u>, ἐλεύθεροι ἦτε τῇ δικαιοσύνῃ.

Compare next verse:
NA28 John 8:35 ὁ δὲ δοῦλος οὐ μένει ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ...

Even without the words the meaning is the same. It is possible that the words have been omitted as almost redundant to improve style, to avoid repetition.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 132) thinks that the words have been omitted, because verse 35 continues with the simple ὁ δὲ δοῦλος.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 146

NA28 John 8:38 ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ·
καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε.

BYZ John 8:38 ἐγὼ ὃ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ μου, λαλῶ·
καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ὃ ἑωράκατε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν ποιεῖτε

T&T #113

Byz   P66, 01*, D, N, Δ, Ψ, 070, 0250, 124, 157, 579, 1071, 1424, Maj,
       Lat, Sy, sa, ac²

txt   P75, 01^{C2}, B, C, K, L, W, X, Y, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 565, 597, 799,
       821, 849, 865, 892, al¹³⁰, f, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal, bo, arm, geo, goth, Or, Chrys

1ˢᵗ ὃ: Ψ, 070, 0250, f1, f13(ὣ), 157, Maj, Lat
2ⁿᵈ ὃ: 01^{C2}, L, Ψ, 070, 0250,   157, Maj, a, c, ff², q

Lacuna: A, Π, 1241
B: no umlaut

It is very probable that ἑωράκατε is a secondary harmonization to the preceding ἑώρακα (so also Weiss and Fee). If originally present there would have been no reason to change it to ἠκούσατε.
It is also possible that an original ἑωράκατε has been changed to improve style?

Note also that ἃ is substituted twice by ὃ.

Fee writes (P66, S&D, 1968, p. 55): "One must ultimately ask at a point like this, to whom is one to attribute the greater insight, to the author or to the subsequent scribe? Distinctions are probably to be made between the two verbs and such distinctions probably belong to the author, not to a second century reviser."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 147

NA28 John 8:38 ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ___ λαλῶ·
καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ <u>τοῦ πατρὸς   ποιεῖτε.</u>

BYZ John 8:38 ἐγὼ ὃ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ <u>μου,</u> λαλῶ·
καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ὃ ἑωράκατε παρὰ <u>τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν ποιεῖτε</u>

<u>μου</u>	01, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 397, Maj,
	it, Sy, a?, sa, ac², Sy-Pal, arm, geo, Tert
<u>ταῦτα</u>	W
<u>μου ταῦτα</u>	D, 33, 892, b, c, q, bo, Chrys
<u>ἡμῖν</u>	579
txt	P66, P75, B, C, L, W, X, 070, pc, l, vg, Sy-Pal, Or

W reads: ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς <u>ταῦτα</u> λαλῶ·

Lacuna: A, Π, 1241
B: no umlaut

T&T #114
T&T #115

<u>τοῦ πατρὸς ποιεῖτε</u>	P66, B, L, W, 070, 597, 849, 2516, sa, pbo, Or
<u>τοῦ πατρὸς λαλεῖτε</u>	P75

<u>τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν ποιεῖτε</u>	01, C, K, X, Θ, f1, f13^pt, 33, 213, 397, 565, 799, 865, 892, al¹³⁰

<u>τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν ποιεῖτε</u>	(D), N, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f13^pt, 157, 579, 821, 1071, 1424, Maj, Lat, Sy, bo, ac², goth, Tert
	<u>f13:</u> 69, 124, 174, 230 =f13^b
	<u>D:</u> <u>ὑμῶν ταῦτα ποιεῖτε</u>

<u>τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν λαλεῖτε καὶ ποιεῖτε</u>   1689(=f13^c), pc

Tis notes erroneously that 13 omits ὑμῶν, against Swanson, Geerlings and NA.
Checked from the film image. 13 reads παρὰ τοῦ πρς ὑμῶν ποιεῖτε.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 8:41 ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ <u>πατρὸς ὑμῶν.</u>
NA28 John 8:44 ὑμεῖς ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν.
"You are from your father the devil, and you choose to do your father's desires."

The meaning of this saying at this position is not entirely clear. What father is meant here? We are told only in verse 44 that their father is meant to be the devil.
For this reason the insertion of ὑμῶν clearly contrasts the father of Jesus from the father of the Jews. See also verse 41. In the Byzantine text the emphasis lies on the μου and the ὑμῶν: "I say what I see from <u>my father</u> and you do what you see from <u>your father</u>."
On the other hand in the txt reading it is possible that both fathers are the same, namely God and that the saying is in the imperative mood: "What I see from the father that am I saying, and what you see from the father, <u>please do it!</u>"
There is no reason why the personal pronouns should have been omitted if originally present. The txt reading is much more difficult.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 148

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:39 ἀπεκρίθησαν καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· ὁ πατὴρ ἡμῶν Ἀβραάμ ἐστιν. λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραάμ <u>ἐστε</u>, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ <u>**ἐποιεῖτε·**</u>

<u>ποιεῖτε</u>   P66, B*, S*, <u>**NA²⁵**</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Bal</u>

<u>ποιεῖτε αν</u> 700

txt   P75, 01*, B^C2, D, W, Γ, Θ, 070, 0141, 0250, 13, 28, 157, 397, 1424,
        Maj-part, Epiph, <u>WH^mg</u>, <u>Tis</u>
    <u>ἐποιεῖτε αν</u> 01^C2, C, K, Π, L, N, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 892,
                Maj-part, Robinson has αν in brackets

B p. 1362 C 7: Since ποιεῖτε happens to be the first word of a line the enhancer added a small Є in front of it. There is an umlaut on the line before.
Lacuna: A
B: no umlaut

Compare immediate context:
NA28 John 8:38 ἃ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἠκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς <u>ποιεῖτε.</u>   safe!
NA28 John 8:41 ὑμεῖς <u>ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα</u> τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν.

Robertson (Wordpictures) notes:
"Ye would do (ἐποιεῖτε αν). Read by C L N and a corrector of Aleph while W omits an. This makes a mixed condition (protasis of the first class, apodosis of the second. See Robertson, Grammar, p. 1022). But B reads ποιεῖτε like the Sin-Syriac which has to be treated as imperative (so Westcott and Hort)."

From context it is only possible to take ποιεῖτε as an imperative.
ποιεῖτε is possible, but the support is just too slim. Probably ποιεῖτε is a conformation to ποιεῖτε of verse 38, where it is safe. An accidental error is also possible, it is only an omission of an Є.

Another question is the omission/addition of ἄν. John uses this construction several times. Compare:

NA28 John 5:46 εἰ γὰρ ἐπιστεύετε Μωϋσεῖ, <u>ἐπιστεύετε ἄν</u> ἐμοί·

NA28 John 8:19 εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου <u>ἄν ᾔδειτε.</u>
<div align="center"><u>omit ἄν:</u>   D</div>

NA28 John 8:42 εἰ ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἦν <u>ἠγαπᾶτε ἄν</u> ἐμέ,

NA28 John 9:41 εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ <u>ἄν εἴχετε</u> ἁμαρτίαν·
<div align="center"><u>omit ἄν:</u>   D, K, Y, Θ, f13</div>

NA28 John 11:21 εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ <u>ἄν ἀπέθανεν</u> ὁ ἀδελφός μου·
NA28 John 11:32 εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ <u>ἄν</u> μου <u>ἀπέθανεν</u> ὁ ἀδελφός.

NA28 John 14:2 εἰ δὲ μή, <u>εἶπον ἄν</u> ὑμῖν ὅτι πορεύομαι ἑτοιμάσαι τόπον ὑμῖν;   <u>omit ἄν:</u>   01, W, 579, pc

NA28 John 14:7 εἰ ἐγνώκατέ με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου <u>γνώσεσθε.</u>
<div align="center"><u>ἐγνώκειτε ἄν</u>   A, C^{C3}, Θ, f13, 892, Maj</div>
<div align="center"><u>ἄν ᾔδειτε</u>   B, C*, L, Q, N, X, Ψ, f1, 22, 33, 565, al</div>
<div align="center"><u>txt</u>   P66, 01, D, W, 579</div>

NA28 John 14:28 εἰ ἠγαπᾶτέ με <u>ἐχάρητε ἄν</u> ὅτι πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα
NA28 John 15:19 εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἦτε, ὁ κόσμος <u>ἄν</u> τὸ ἴδιον <u>ἐφίλει·</u>
NA28 John 18:30 εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος κακὸν ποιῶν, οὐκ <u>ἄν</u> σοι <u>παρεδώκαμεν</u> αὐτόν.

NA28 John 18:36 εἰ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου ἦν ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμή, οἱ ὑπηρέται οἱ ἐμοὶ <u>ἠγωνίζοντο [ἄν]</u> ἵνα μὴ παραδοθῶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις·
<div align="center"><u>omit ἄν:</u>   B*</div>
<div align="center">(+ word order variation by other witnesses)</div>

At some points several witnesses omit ἄν. Note the characteristic variation at John 14:7 (see discussion of this variant in the main John commentary!).

Metzger explains: "It appears that the original text of this verse involved a mixed conditional sentence, with εἰ ... ἐστε in the protasis, and ἐποιεῖτε in the apodosis ('If you are really Abraham's children, you would be doing the works of Abraham'). The variant readings arose in an effort to make a more grammatically 'correct' condition; thus, instead of ἐστε, the later text reads

ἦτε, which, with ἐποιεῖτε, makes a condition contrary to fact. Other witnesses add ἄν, even though in Koine Greek 'the addition of ἄν to the apodosis is no longer obligatory (BDF §360,1)."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 149

59.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 8:41 ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. εἶπαν **[οὖν]** αὐτῷ· ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας οὐ γεγεννήμεθα, ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν θεόν.

<u>omit</u>   01, B, L, W, 070, f1, it, Sy-S, Sy-P, Co,
        NA²⁵, WH, Weiss, Trg (-ον) , Tis, Bal, SBL

txt   P66, P75, C, D, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj, f, vg, Sy-H**

NA28 John 8:52 εἶπον **[οὖν]** αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· νῦν ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι δαιμόνιον ἔχεις. Ἀβραὰμ ἀπέθανεν καὶ οἱ προφῆται, καὶ σὺ λέγεις· ἐάν τις τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσῃ, οὐ μὴ γεύσηται θανάτου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

<u>omit</u>   P66, 01, B, C, W, X, Θ, 579, pc,
        it(a, b, e, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-P, saᵖᵗ, ac², pbo, bo, Trg, WH, SBL

txt   P75, D, L, Ψ, 070, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, Maj,
        Lat(aur, c, d, f, ff², l, q, vg), Sy-H, saᵖᵗ

Lacuna: A
B: no umlaut

Context:
NA28 John 8:20 Ταῦτα__τὰ ῥήματα ἐλάλησεν
<u>add</u> οὖν: 579
NA28 John 8:24 εἶπον <u>οὖν</u> ὑμῖν
omit οὖν: P66, 01
NA28 John 8:25 ἔλεγον <u>οὖν</u> αὐτῷ· ... εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς
omit οὖν¹: P66, 01, Γ
<u>add</u> οὖν²: 01, D, 1071

NA28 John 8:27 οὐκ ἔγνωσαν__ὅτι τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν.
<u>add</u> οὖν: Λ, 69
NA28 John 8:31 ἔλεγεν <u>οὖν</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς
omit οὖν: 579

NA28 John 8:36 ἐὰν <u>οὖν</u> ὁ υἱὸς ὑμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ

omit οὖν: P75, f13-part

NA28 John 8:42 εἶπεν__αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς·

<u>add</u> οὖν: 01, D, 579, f13-part, Maj-part[M, S, U, Ω, 28, 700, 1424]

NA28 John 8:47 διὰ τοῦτο__ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε,

<u>add</u> οὖν: 1424

NA28 John 8:48 Ἀπεκρίθησαν__οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι

<u>add</u> οὖν: Maj-part[K, Π, M, U, Δ, Λ, Ψ, 28, 157, 700, 1424]

NA28 John 8:57 εἶπον <u>οὖν</u> οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν·

safe!

NA28 John 8:58 εἶπεν__αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς·

<u>add</u> οὖν: D, N, f1, f13, 700, al[G, K, 28, 565]

Compare also the addition/omission of οὖν at Jo 13:25-26 and 16:19 below.

οὖν is a typical John word. It appears more often in John than in the Synoptics together:

	total	normalized (per 1000 words)
Mt	56	3.1
Mk	6	0.5
Lk	33	1.7
Jo	200	**12.8** (= every 4th verse!)

The Byzantine text has 201 times οὖν (01: 188, B: 194)

Interestingly the Byzantine text adds οὖν 13 times in the Synoptics: Whereas there are 95 occurrences of οὖν in NA[27] (Mt-Lk), there are 108 in Robinson's Byzantine text.

The addition of οὖν is either a conformation to Johannine usage or it is an omission of an unnecessary word.

Overall it appears slightly more probable that οὖν has been added.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 150

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:41 ὑμεῖς ποιεῖτε τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. εἶπαν [οὖν] αὐτῷ· ἡμεῖς ἐκ πορνείας <u>οὐ γεγεννήμεθα</u>, ἕνα πατέρα ἔχομεν τὸν θεόν.

<u>οὐκ ἐγεννήθημεν</u>

     B, D*, C2, 397, <u>NA25</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P75, 01C2, C, DC1, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, 33, Maj, Or, <u>WHmg</u>, <u>Tis</u>
     <u>οὐκ ἐγεννήμεθα</u>   01*, L, 070
     <u>οὐ γεγενήμεθα</u>   P66, N, W, 0250, f13, 28, 157, 565, al

Swanson has Ψ for the 01* reading, probably in error. No note in Lake and IGNTP (majuscule) = implicitly for txt.
Lacuna: A
B: no umlaut

γεγε**νν**ήμεθα indicative perfect passive 1st person plural
ἐγεννήθημεν indicative aorist   passive 1st person plural
    of γεννάω "be father of; bear, give birth to"

γεγε**ν**ήμεθα indicative perfect passive 1st person plural
    of γίνομαι

The B reading is probably an error. There is no reason for a change of the perfect. Note that both readings sound similar at the beginning:
ΟΥΓΕΓ
ΟΥΚΕΓ

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 151

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:44 ὑμεῖς ἐκ <u>τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ διαβόλου</u> ἐστὲ καὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν θέλετε ποιεῖν. ἐκεῖνος ἀνθρωποκτόνος **ἦν** ἀπ᾽ ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐκ **ἔστηκεν**, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ. ὅταν λαλῇ τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ, ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶν καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ.

<u>τοῦ διαβόλου</u>   K, 13, bo^{ms}

<u>"But you that are evil …"</u>   Sy-S

<u>τοῦ Κάϊν</u>   Diatessaron (Aphraates), Ambrosiaster

<u>τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ διαβόλου</u>   Λ^C, 124, 28, 157, Cl

<u>τοῦ πατρὸς διαβόλου</u>   X

Note that Heracleon, dated around 170 CE(!), cited in Origen, reads txt.

Lacuna: A
B: no umlaut

Ephrem has (McCarthy): "You are <u>the sons of the Evil One</u>, of him, who from the beginning was a murderer."

Compare:
NA28 1 John 3:12 οὐ καθὼς <u>Κάϊν ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ ἦν</u> καὶ ἔσφαξεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ· καὶ χάριν τίνος ἔσφαξεν αὐτόν; ὅτι τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ πονηρὰ ἦν τὰ δὲ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ δίκαια.

The omission of τοῦ πατρὸς is probably due to avoid a misunderstanding "you are of the father of the devil". Parablepsis is also possible (compare the omission of τοῦ διαβόλου by X).

Where does Kain come from? Compare 1.Jo 3:12.
Wellhausen noted that the verbs ἦν (imperfect) and ἔστηκεν (perfect) fit better for Kain than for the devil.

Drachmann suggests:
ὑμεῖς ἐκ <u>τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ Κάϊν</u>

Compare:

- J. Wellhausen "Erweiterungen und Änderungen im Vierten Evangelium" Berlin 1907, p. 19-24
- A.B. Drachmann "Zu Joh 8:44" ZNW 12 (1911) 84-5

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 152

60. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 8:47 <u>ὁ ὢν ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ</u> τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούει· διὰ τοῦτο ὑμεῖς οὐκ ἀκούετε, <u>**ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἐστέ.**</u>

NA28 John 8:48 Ἀπεκρίθησαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ·

omit: D, G, 579, pc, d, bo

NA adds "(Sy-S)" but this is probably in error. Burkitt has: " 'therefore ye hear it not, because you are not… ' - One line has been dropped by the scribe of S."

Lacuna: A

B: no umlaut

Possibly added to make the saying more symmetrical.

It is also possible that the words have been omitted due to h.t. (...τε - ...τε). D and G omit also in immediate context due to h.t. (D in verse 46, G in 55).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 153

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:53 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ <u>πατρὸς ἡμῶν</u> Ἀβραάμ, ὅστις ἀπέθανεν; καὶ οἱ προφῆται ἀπέθανον. τίνα σεαυτὸν ποιεῖς;

<u>omit:</u> D, W, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², j, l), Sy-S, pbo

Lat(aur, f, q, r¹, vg) read txt.
B: no umlaut

Another agreement of W with the Latin (compare 7:1, 7:52).
Metzger suggests that the words have probably been omitted "because they seem to contradict the statement in verse 44, 'you are of your father the devil'."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 154

61. <u>Difficult variant</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 8:54 ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δοξάζων με, ὃν <u>ὑμεῖς</u> λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς <u>ἡμῶν</u> ἐστιν,

<u>ὑμῶν</u>   01, B*, D, F, X, Ψ, 0233, 13, 230, 346(=f13), 2, 700, 1071, 1424, al, it, bo^{ms}, vg^{mss}, <u>WH</u>, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>

<u>ἡμῶν</u>   P66, P75, A, B^{C2}, C, L, W, Δ, Θ, 070, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 397, 579, 1241, Maj, aur, f, vg, Sy, Co, goth, <u>WH^{mg}</u>, **NA²⁵**, <u>Trg</u>

B: no umlaut

In B (p. 1363 B 2) the H is added above the Υ. Interestingly both letters, the H and the Υ are enhanced and accented! Possibly the enhancer did not know which one to choose? Tischendorf assigns the addition of the H to B².

          ... he of whom you say, that it is your God.
txt   ... he of whom you say: "He is our God."

Compare previous verse 53:

NA28 John 8:53 μὴ σὺ μείζων εἶ τοῦ πατρὸς <u>ἡμῶν</u> Ἀβραάμ,

Mainly a distinction between direct and indirect discourse. Difficult to judge internally and externally.

Metzger thinks that the change more likely was from direct to indirect discourse.

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 38) thinks that the ὑμῶν is a conformation to the preceding ὑμεῖς.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 155

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:57 εἶπον οὖν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι πρὸς αὐτόν· <u>πεντήκοντα</u> ἔτη οὔπω ἔχεις καὶ Ἀβραὰμ <u>ἑώρακας;</u>

<u>ἑώρακέν σε;</u>   P75, 01*, 070, Sy-S, sa, bo[ms], ac[2], Diatess[Ephrem], <u>WH[mg]</u>

Note also (not in NA): <u>ἑώρακες</u>   B*, W, Θ
and: τεσσαράκοντα for πεντήκοντα: Λ, pc, Chrys

<u>B reads</u> (p. 1363 B 17):   B* ΕΟΡΑΚΕC
                                 B[C] ΕѠΡΑΚΑC

The **O** has been corrected by inserting a little bar in the middle within the **O**. The **Λ** is written above the line over the **Є**. It is not clear if the **Є** is enhanced, probably not, it looks weaker. It is not canceled. If both corrections are by the same corrector/time (Tis: B[3]) is not clear. It is possible that the correction of the **O/Ѡ** is earlier.
B: no umlaut

        "... and Abraham has seen you?"
txt   "... and you have seen Abraham?"

Compare:
NA28 John 8:56 Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμήν, καὶ <u>εἶδεν</u> καὶ ἐχάρη.
"Your father Abraham rejoiced **that he would see my day; he saw it** and was glad."

It is possible that this reading is an assimilation to the previous verse 56 (so Weiss). The meaning is basically the same. Metzger thinks that there may be a subtle difference in whom the Jews consider superior (Abraham) and who is thus be seen.

The quality of the witnesses shows that the reading must be very early. If original it is possible that the txt reading is a conformation to the preceding verb ἔχεις which is also second person.
The scholars J.H. Bernhard, A.S. Lewis (Sy-S), A Merx and F. Blass argued for the originality of the reading. T. Baarda: "the present writer … cannot escape the conclusion that …[this reading]… may, in fact, be correct."

Note that McCarthy in his Ephrem translation has "and you have seen Abraham?", probably in error. Compare Baarda's article.

Compare:
T. Baarda "John 8:57B – The contribution of the Diatessaron of Tatian" NovT 38 (1996) 336-43

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 156

Minority reading:
NA28 John 8:58 εἶπεν αὐτοῖς Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, πρὶν Ἀβραὰμ <u>**γενέσθαι**</u> ἐγὼ <u>**εἰμί.**</u>

<u>**omit γενέσθαι:**</u>   D, it
                  f, vg have the word.

<u>**ἤμην**</u> for <u>εἰμί:</u>   157, 397
       indicative imperfect middle 1st person singular
B: no umlaut

Robertson's "Wordpictures":
"Before Abraham was" (*prin Abraam genesthai*). Usual idiom with *prin* in positive sentence with infinitive (second aorist middle of *ginomai*) and the accusative of general reference, "before coming as to Abraham," "before Abraham came into existence or was born." I am (*egô eimi*). Undoubtedly here Jesus claims eternal existence with the absolute phrase used of God. The contrast between *genesthai* (entrance into existence of Abraham) and *eimi* (timeless being) is complete. See the same contrast between *en* in 1:1 and *egeneto* in 1:14.

The omission of γενέσθαι is probably a simplification. There is no need for its insertion.

The ἤμην of 157 is a smoothing of the absolute "I am!" - 157: "Before Abraham was, I was already."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 157

NA28 John 8:59 ἦραν οὖν λίθους ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ' αὐτόν. Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ.

BYZ John 8:59 ἦραν οὖν λίθους ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ αὐτόν· Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ <u>διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν· καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως.</u>

T&T #119

Byz   A, K, Π, Δ, Θ^c, f1, f13, 157, Maj, f, q, goth

<u>καὶ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως.</u>
01^{C1}, C, L, N, X, Ψ, 070, 0141, 0211, 33, 213, 397, 579, 597, 799, 821, 865, 892, 1010, 1071, 1241, 2786, pc^{19}, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, geo^2

<u>καὶ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν</u>
01^{C2}, 13, pc

<u>καὶ παρῆγεν οὕτως</u>
69, pc

txt   P66, P75, 01*, B, D, W, Θ*, 849, pc^9, Lat, Sy-S, sa, ac^2, arm, geo^1
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Luke 4:30 αὐτὸς δὲ διελθὼν διὰ μέσου αὐτῶν ἐπορεύετο.

For παρῆγεν compare next verse 9:1:
NA28 John 9:1 <u>Καὶ παράγων</u> εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς.

"... going through the midst of them, and so passed by."

The words have probably been added from Lk 4:30 "to give the impression that Jesus escaped by miraculous power" (Metzger, so also Weiss).
There is no reason for an omission. In Lk the words are safe.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 158

NA28 John 9:4 <u>ἡμᾶς</u> δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με</u> ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νὺξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι.

BYZ John 9:4 <u>ἐμὲ</u> δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ <u>πέμψαντός με</u> ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστίν· ἔρχεται νὺξ ὅτε οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐργάζεσθαι

T&T #120

<u>ἐμὲ</u> ... <u>πέμψαντός με</u>	01^{C1}, A, C, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 821, 865, 892, 1071, 1241, Maj, Latt, Sy, ac², arm, goth
<u>ἡμᾶς</u> ... <u>πέμψαντός με</u>	B, D, 070, Sy-Pal, sa, geo¹, <u>WH</u>, **NA²⁵**
<u>ἡμᾶς</u> ... <u>πέμψαντός ἡμᾶς</u>	P66, P75, 01*, L, W, 849, pbo, bo, <u>Tis</u>

B: no umlaut

πέμψαντός με appears 7 times in John, but never πέμψαντός ἡμᾶς which is alien to John. The second ἡμᾶς is possibly a harmonization to the first. On the other hand it is also possible that it has been changed just for that reason, because it is unjohannine?
In this verse there is no need to use a plural. The preceding and the following verses would fit perfectly well with the singular. The Byzantine text is the most straightforward, normal and pro-johannine text. There would have been no need to change it. Thus only the second or the third reading would cause any trouble. In the third reading the second ἡμᾶς is probably a conformation to the preceding ἡμᾶς. It makes no sense.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
    = slight preference for the ἡμᾶς ... ἡμᾶς reading.
      (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 159

NA28 John 9:6 ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἔπτυσεν χαμαὶ καὶ ἐποίησεν πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πτύσματος καὶ <u>ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ</u> τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

BYZ John 9:6 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν, ἔπτυσεν χαμαί, καὶ ἐποίησεν πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πτύσματος, καὶ <u>ἐπέχρισεν</u> τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς <u>τοῦ τυφλοῦ,</u>

Omission of αὐτοῦ not in NA and SQE.

<u>ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ</u>	P66, P75^C, 01, A, C^C, L, N, Θ, f1, 33, 157, 565, 579, 1071, pc, <u>WH^{mg}</u>
<u>ἐπέχρισεν αὐτὸν</u>	P75*
<u>ἐπέχρισεν αὐτῷ</u>	D, <u>Baljon</u>
<u>ἐπέθηκεν αὐτοῦ</u>	B, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>
<u>ἐπέθηκεν</u>	C*?
<u>ἐπέχρισεν</u>	W, X, Ψ, f13, 28, 397, 700, 1424, Maj[E, F, G, H, K, Π, M, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ω], Chr
<u>add τοῦ τυφλοῦ</u>	A, C, W, X, Ψ, f13, 28, 157, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj
<u>add αὐτοῦ</u>	D, N, 387

<u>he touched with the clay his eyes</u>	sa (Horner)
<u>he anointed (the) eyes of the blind</u>	bo
<u>smeared upon the eyes of that blind man</u>	Sy-S (Burkitt)

Latin:
linvit/levit		a, aur, vg
linvit	<u>ei</u>	d (Dative = D)
superlinvit		b, f
superunxit		e
superunxit	<u>eum</u>	c, ff², l, (q) (Accusative)

According to Swanson and Tischendorf C*^{vid} reads ἐπέθηκεν. This is not in NA and not in SQE. C* also omits αὐτοῦ. In Tischendorf's C-edition only C^{C2} is given with the txt reading in smaller letters indicating a correction. Tischendorf writes: "ΧΡΙCΕΝ ΑΥΤΟΥ scripsit B. Videtur antea defuisse ΑΥΤΟΥ, idque rursus improbavit C, ΤΟΥ ΤΥΦΛΟΥ etiam B intactum reliquit."

IGNTP (majuscule) notes: C* ∈π∈ and C1: (∈π∈)χρισ∈ν
for αὐτοῦ: * om., C1 αὐτοῦ, C2 om.

P75: Ⲩ is written over Ⲛ, probably by the first hand.
Swanson also notes Ω for ἐπέθηκεν, but in error. Lake in his Ω collation has:
ἐπέχρησεν. So also IGNTP.

0216(5ᵗʰ CE!), 69 omit αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν.
B: no umlaut

ἐπιχρίω "smear or spread out"

Compare:
NA28 John 9:11 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος· ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς
πηλὸν ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐπέχρισέν μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ εἶπέν μοι ὅτι
ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν Σιλωὰμ καὶ νίψαι· ἀπελθὼν οὖν καὶ νιψάμενος
ἀνέβλεψα.
NA28 John 9:15 πάλιν οὖν ἠρώτων αὐτὸν καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πῶς
ἀνέβλεψεν. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πηλὸν ἐπέθηκέν μου ἐπὶ τοὺς
ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐνιψάμην καὶ βλέπω.   μοι H, 579, pc

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 8:25 εἶτα πάλιν ἐπέθηκεν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς
αὐτοῦ,
NA28 Luke 13:13 καὶ ἐπέθηκεν αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας·

1. ἐπέχρισεν / ἐπέθηκεν
In context both words appear. In verse 11 and 15 the words are safe.
ἐπιχρίω is a rare word. It appears only here in the Gospels.
Since the support is so weak, it is more probable that we have a change to the
more common word here. Note that in verse 15 also ἐπέθηκεν is used.
Metzger: "Perhaps because the verb 'anoint' seemed inappropriate to describe
the application of clay, a few copyists substituted a more general term."
Weiß thinks that ἐπέχρισεν is a conformation to verse 11.

Diatessaron:
Metzger, in his commentary (first edition only!), gives the following citiation
from Ephrem's commentary on the Diatessaron: "he made eyes from the clay".
McCarthy gives (p. 258): "When he said this, he spat on the ground, and made
clay from his spittle, and <u>fashioned</u> the eyes with the clay." McCarthy has the

following footnote on the word "fashioned": "The Syriac verb *to make/to do*, which is used here alludes to the idea of *re-creation* in Jesus' action."

2. Omission of αὐτοῦ

ταῦτα εἰπὼν ἔπτυσεν χαμαὶ καὶ ἐποίησεν πηλὸν ἐκ τοῦ πτύσματος καὶ ἐπέχρισεν <u>αὐτοῦ</u> τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς

αὐτοῦ is strange here.
Weiss refers it to πτύσματος: "the mud of it (the saliva)", So also Meyer, Luthardt, Belser (1905) et al.
Others think, it refers to Jesus: "his mud". Still others to the eyes, "his eyes".
It may be that we have here a "dative-genitive", a genitive with dative meaning, like in Modern Greek (and D: αὐτῷ). So already Blass.

Carl Conrad disagrees and thinks that the case is comparable to
Mark 5:30 τίς <u>μου</u> ἥψατο τῶν ἱματίων;
and
Matthew 8:8 κύριε, οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς ἵνα <u>μου</u> ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην εἰσέλθῃς,
and therefore the αὐτοῦ belongs to ὀφθαλμοὺς.
Note, that in both cases variants appear that move the μου behind the object. That scribes considered it this way here in Jo 9:6, too, can be seen from the fact that the Byzantine text omitted αὐτοῦ and added τοῦ τυφλοῦ after τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς. On the other hand there is manuscript N, which has the double <u>αὐτοῦ</u> τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς <u>αὐτοῦ.</u>

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "Respecting αὐτοῦ Bloomfield remarks with reason that it is in opposition to *usus linguae*, since ἐπιχρίω is never construed with the genitive. Nor can it be construed with ὀφθαλμοὺς; where it stands it must be construed either with ἐπέχρισεν or with πηλόν. D gives αὐτῷ, which makes the syntax unobjectionable. But in some old Latins we have *superunxit eum luto*, ἐπέχρισεν αὐτὸν τῷ πηλῷ, and this is probably the original reading."
So Pallis conjectured the reading of P75*.

Compare:
C.C. Tarelli "Historical Greek Grammar and Textual Criticism" JTS 38 (1937) 238-42

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 160

NA28 John 9:8 Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον
<u>ὅτι προσαίτης</u> ἦν ἔλεγον· οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος
καὶ <u>προσαιτῶν</u>;

BYZ John 9:8 Οἱ οὖν γείτονες καὶ οἱ θεωροῦντες αὐτὸν τὸ πρότερον
<u>ὅτι τυφλὸς</u>   ἦν ἔλεγον Οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος
καὶ <u>προσαιτῶν</u>

No txt in NA!

Byz C^{C3}, 0141, f13, 700, 892, 1241, 1424,
      Maj[E, F, G, H, M, S, U, Y, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ω, 047]

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, C*, D, K, $Π^c$, L, N, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0211, f1, 124, 788, 33,
      157, 397, 565, 579, 1071, pc, L253, Lat, Sy, Co, arm

<u>ὅτι τυφλὸς προσαίτης</u>   Π*
<u>ὅτι τυφλὸς</u> ἦν <u>καὶ προσαίτης</u>   69, pc, it (a, b, c, e, l, 27)

B: umlaut! (1363 C 15 R) τὸ πρότερον <u>ὅτι προσαίτης ἦν ἔλε</u>γον·

προσαίτης "beggar"

Compare:
NA28 John 9:1 Καὶ παράγων εἶδεν ἄνθρωπον <u>τυφλὸν</u> ἐκ γενετῆς.
NA28 John 9:2 οὗτος ἢ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα <u>τυφλὸς</u> γεννηθῇ;

That the person is a beggar has not been mentioned before. The term follows also later in the verse. Everything in the story concentrates on the blindness, this is the issue. That he was a beggar is only of marginal relevance. It is therefore more probable that the change went from beggar to blind.

One could of course also argue that beggar is a conformation to the same word later in the verse, but this is not very probable in so large a group of diverse witnesses.

Weiss (Jo Com.) notes that he was probably known to the others more as a beggar than as a blind.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 161

NA28 John 9:9 <u>ἄλλοι ἔλεγον</u> ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν, <u>ἄλλοι ἔλεγον· οὐχί, ἀλλὰ</u>
ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν. ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγεν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

BYZ John 9:9 ἄλλοι ἔλεγον ὅτι Οὗτός ἐστιν <u>ἄλλοι δὲ, ὅτι</u>
ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν. ἐκεῖνος ἔλεγεν ὅτι Ἐγώ εἰμι.

ἄλλοι ἔλεγον· οὐχί, ἀλλὰ	P66, P75, B, C, L, W, X, 0141, 33, 397, 892, 1071, 1241, al, b, r¹, (Sy-S), Sy-P
ἄλλοι <u>δὲ</u> ἔλεγον· οὐχί, ἀλλὰ	01, Θ, 0233, 124, pc, vgᵐˢˢ, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, Sy-Pal, bo, arm
ἄλλοι <u>δὲ·</u> οὐχί, ἀλλὰ	070, f1, 565, pc, aur, vg, sa
ἄλλοι <u>δὲ,</u> ὅτι	A, Δ, Ψ, f13, 579, Maj, Sy-H, ac², goth, <u style="color:red">Trgᵐᵍ</u>
ἄλλοι ὅτι	N
<u>ἕτεροι δὲ,</u> ὅτι	D
Alii dicebant	a, e

070 has for the first ἄλλοι ἔλεγον: ἄλλοι <u>δὲ</u> ἔλεγον

L, X, 33, 892, 1071, 1241, al omit the first part due to parablepsis (ἄλλοι ἔλεγον - ἄλλοι ἔλεγον). They start again with οὐχί, ἀλλ' which makes it quite probable that they originally read txt.
047 omits the first part ἄλλοι … ἐστιν and continues with ἄλλοι δὲ, ὅτι.
B: no umlaut

It is quite clear that all the changes are attempts to improve the repetitive style.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 162

NA28 John 9:11 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος· ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς πηλὸν ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐπέχρισέν μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ εἶπέν μοι ὅτι ὕπαγε εἰς <u>τὸν Σιλωὰμ</u> καὶ νίψαι· ἀπελθὼν οὖν καὶ νιψάμενος ἀνέβλεψα.

BYZ John 9:11 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπέν ἄνθρωπος λεγόμενος Ἰησοῦς πηλὸν ἐποίησεν καὶ ἐπέχρισέν μου τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ εἶπεν, μοι ὕπαγε εἰς <u>τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωὰμ</u> καὶ νίψαι· ἀπελθὼν δὲ καὶ νιψάμενος ἀνέβλεψα

T&T #122

Byz   A, Δ, Ψ, f13, 33, 579, Maj, Lat(aur, f, q, vg), Sy, geo, goth
       <u>ὕπαγε *νίψαι* εἰς τὴν ...</u>   and omit the following καὶ νίψαι:
       K, Π, X, 0233, f13, 22, 28, 33, 397, 1071, 1424, al (not in NA, SQE and T&T!)

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, D, L, W, X, Θ, 070, 0141, f1, 213, 397, 565, 597, 799, 821, 849, 865, 1241, al, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, r¹), Sy-Pal, Co, arm, Ir

Burkitt has for Sy-S: "Go and wash thy face with a baptism of Shiloah."

Irenaeus (Ad. Her. V 15,3):
"Postquam linivit lutum super oculos eius, dixit ei: Vade in Siloam et lavare."

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare immediate context:
NA28 John 9:7   ὕπαγε νίψαι εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωάμ
   Aᶜ, 1424:   ὕπαγε εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν τοῦ Σιλωὰμ <u>καὶ νίψαι·</u>

Clearly a harmonization to immediate context. Interestingly A has been corrected in verse 7 to the reading of verse 11!
It is clear that ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν Σιλωὰμ sounds awkward, especially in view of the preceding longer form. It is of course basically possible that κολυμβήθραν τοῦ fell out at a very early date, but this is not very probable, because there is no apparent reason for this.

The pool of Siloam has been uncovered in 2004:

Jun. 9, 2004 22:48 Jerusalem Post

2nd Temple pool found by ETGAR LEFKOVITS

"A pool that served as a main water reservoir for Jerusalem residents 2,000 years ago has been uncovered, the Antiquities Authority announced Wednesday. The Pool of Siloam was uncovered last week by chance at the southern end of the City of David – in what today is Silwan – while the city was carrying out infrastructure work for a new sewage pipe. Archeologist Eli Shukrun said that two millennia ago, Jewish residents would use the pool to gather water for their homes, as a meeting place, and also possibly as a mikve. After lying untouched for 2,000 years, archeologists first uncovered one step, and then several more leading down to the pool, whose water came from the nearby Gihon spring. "This find is of major importance to the archeological world," Antiquities Authority director Shuka Dorfman said Wednesday at a short ceremony at the site, where excavations are ongoing."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 163

Difficult variant

NA28 John 9:14 ἦν δὲ σάββατον <u>ἐν ᾗ ἡμέρᾳ</u> τὸν πηλὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνέῳξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς.

BYZ John 9:14 ἦν δὲ σάββατον **ὅτε** τὸν πηλὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἀνέῳξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς

T&T #123

Byz   A, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 565, 579, 821, 1071, Maj,
       Lat(aur, d, e, f, l, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, goth

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, L, W, X, 070, 33, (213), 397, 597, 799*, 849, 865,
       it(a, b, c, ff², j, r¹), Sy-S, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, Sy-Pal
       213 omits ἡμέρᾳ

<u>ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὅτε</u>   0141

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 5:9 Ἦν δὲ σάββατον <u>ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ</u>

It is possible that txt is a harmonization to 5:9. The Byzantine reading sounds more elegant. Difficult to decide. Evenly divided support.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 164

Difficult variant

NA28 John 9:21 πῶς δὲ νῦν βλέπει οὐκ οἴδαμεν, ἢ τίς ἤνοιξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμεῖς οὐκ οἴδαμεν·
<u>αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸς</u>   περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει.

BYZ John 9:21 πῶς δὲ νῦν βλέπει οὐκ οἴδαμεν ἢ τίς ἤνοιξεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἡμεῖς οὐκ οἴδαμεν·
<u>αὐτὸς ἡλικίαν ἔχει αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε αὐτὸς</u> περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει.

<u>αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸς</u>
          P66, 01^C2, B, D, L, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 397, 579, pc, Lat, Sy-Pal, bo, arm

<u>αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, αὐτὸς ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸς</u>   1241

<u>αὐτὸς ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε, αὐτὸς</u>   A, Δ, 0141, 0250, f13, Maj, l, q, Sy, goth

<u>αὐτὸς ἡλικίαν ἔχει,   αὐτὸς</u>   P75, 070, b, sa, ac², Chrys
<u>αὐτὸς ἡλικίαν ἔχει,   </u>   01*
<u>   ἡλικίαν ἔχει,   αὐτὸς</u>   W

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 9:23 διὰ τοῦτο οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπαν ὅτι <u>ἡλικίαν ἔχει, αὐτὸν ἐπερωτήσατε.</u>

The main problem here is the omission by P75 et al. It is interesting to note that they seem to support the Byzantine sequence of the words.
The sentence is slightly redundant and it is possible that P75 et al. omitted the words for that reason.
It is also possible that scribes added the words αὐτὸν ἐρωτήσατε from verse 23, and did so at different positions.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 165

NA28 John 9:26 εἶπον οὖν αὐτῷ ____· τί ἐποίησέν σοι; πῶς ἤνοιξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;

BYZ John 9:26 εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ <u>**πάλιν**</u>, τί ἐποίησέν σοι πῶς ἤνοιξέν σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς

Byz   P66, 01^{C2}, A, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 397, Maj,
      f, q, Sy-P, Sy-H, arm, goth, [Trg^{mg}]

txt   P75, 01*, B, D, W, pc, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Co

εἶπον δὲ αὐτῷ· τί ἐποίησέν <u>πάλιν</u>;   579 (wrongly inserted?)

Tischendorf has 565 (2^{pe}) wrongly for txt, Swanson and NA (implicitly) have it correctly for Byz. It reads: εἶπον οὖν αὐτω πάλιν, τί ἐποίησέν 8 (checked at the film).

NA and Schmidtke have 579 for txt! But it actually reads as Swanson has it (checked at the film): εἶπών δὲ αὐτῷ· τί ἐποίησέν <u>πάλιν</u>; πῶς ἤνοιξέν …
This looks like a wrongly inserted correction.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verses:
NA28 John 9:10 <u>ἔλεγον οὖν αὐτῷ·</u> πῶς [οὖν] ἠνεῴχθησάν σου οἱ ὀφθαλμοί;
NA28 John 9:15 <u>πάλιν</u> οὖν <u>ἠρώτων αὐτὸν</u> καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι πῶς ἀνέβλεψεν.

NA28 John 9:17 <u>λέγουσιν</u> οὖν τῷ τυφλῷ <u>πάλιν</u>· τί σὺ λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, …
<u>omit πάλιν</u>: D, it

NA28 John 9:24 <u>Ἐφώνησαν</u> οὖν τὸν ἄνθρωπον <u>ἐκ δευτέρου</u> ὃς ἦν τυφλὸς καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· …

πάλιν appears in the previous verses. They ask him again and again, so πάλιν is only natural here.
In verse 17 (D, it) omit πάλιν, possibly to avoid repetition.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 166

Minority reading:
NA28 John 9:27 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς· εἶπον ὑμῖν ἤδη καὶ <u>οὐκ</u> ἠκούσατε· τί πάλιν θέλετε ἀκούειν; μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτοῦ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι;

<u>omit:</u> P66^{vid}, pc, Lat(aur, b, c, e, ff², l, vg), Sy-S

it(a, d, f, gat, q, r¹, **27**, **30**) read txt.

vg: "respondit eis dixi vobis iam et audistis
    quid iterum vultis audire numquid et vos vultis discipuli eius fieri"

οὐ <u>πιστεύετε</u>   28, L253, r¹ (non creditis)
οὐκ <u>ἐπιστεύσατε</u> f13

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

"I told you already, and you did <u>not</u> hear, why again do you wish to hear?"

P66: NA has the omission as "vid", Swanson as "cj.".
The photo in the ed. pr. looks as if the sheet is superimposed by another sheet on the right side. It appears that this happened accidentally during photographing. So, unfortunately one cannot read the last 2-3 letters on the right margin. Both the ed. pr and Comfort were able to read what was below this part and give the complete text without reservation. They note certain things that are only possible if they really were able to read this text. For the right margin we have to rely on their word therefore. Space considerations make it certain that P66 omitted οὐκ.
The reconstruction gives:
(blue = letters not visible on the photo but present)
(red = letters not extant = lacunae)

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>click here</u>.

The οὐκ is problematical here. The text is easier and more logical without it:
"I told you already, and you've heard it! Why again do you wish to hear?".
There is no reason for a secondary insertion of οὐκ.

It is possible to take it as a question (e.g. Luther did so):
"I told you already, haven't you heard? Why again do you wish to hear?"
(It might be in order to add a punctuation note in NA and UBS.)

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 167

64. <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 9:31 οἴδαμεν ὅτι <u>ἁμαρτωλῶν ὁ θεὸς</u> οὐκ ἀκούει, ἀλλ' ἐάν τις θεοσεβὴς ᾖ καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ τούτου ἀκούει.

<u>ὁ θεὸς ἁμαρτωλῶν</u>

B, D, (N), Θ, Λ, Ψ, 070, 0141, L844, L2211, pc, **NA**[25], WH, Weiss, Trg

ὅτι <u>ἁμαρτωλῶν</u> οὐκ ἀκούει <u>ὁ θεὸς</u>   N

txt   P66, P75, 01, A, L, W, X, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj
<u>ἁμαρτωλῶν ἀνθρώπων ὁ θεὸς</u>   X (cp. 9:16,24)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 John 9:29 ἡμεῖς <u>οἴδαμεν ὅτι Μωϋσεῖ λελάληκεν ὁ θεός</u>, τοῦτον δὲ οὐκ οἴδαμεν πόθεν ἐστίν.   order safe!

Genitive case ἁμαρτωλῶν with ἀκούει.

Possibly the txt reading is a conformation to the previous verse 29. This is taken to completion by N.

On the other hand the support for the txt reading is very good and the support for the B reading is not coherent.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 168

Minority reading:
NA28 John 9:33 εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ __, οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν.

T&T #126

  ὁ ἄνθρωπος   P66, N, Θ, 1043, 1241, pc
                    1241: οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare verse 16:
NA28 John 9:16 ἔλεγον οὖν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων τινές· οὐκ ἔστιν <u>οὗτος παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος</u>, ὅτι τὸ σάββατον οὐ τηρεῖ.

Clearly added from context.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 169

Difficult variant
NA28 John 9:35 Ἤκουσεν Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω καὶ εὑρὼν αὐτὸν εἶπεν·   σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ <u>ἀνθρώπου;</u>

BYZ John 9:35 Ἤκουσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἐξέβαλον αὐτὸν ἔξω καὶ εὑρὼν αὐτὸν εἶπεν αὐτῷ Σὺ πιστεύεις εἰς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ <u>Θεοῦ;</u>

T&T #129

Byz   A, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
       Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, arm, goth, <u>Trg</u>

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, D, W, 397, d, Sy-S, sa, ac²

The Vulgate manuscript "book of Armagh" (8th or 9th CE, Dublin) reads txt, too (hominis), but has been corrected.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 16:13 τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν <u>υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;</u>

NA28 John 5:25 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἔρχεται ὥρα καὶ νῦν ἐστιν ὅτε οἱ νεκροὶ ἀκούσουσιν τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ <u>υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ</u> καὶ οἱ ἀκούσαντες ζήσουσιν.
<u>υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</u>   K, Π, S, Ω, 28, al, Sy-H^mg, Sy-Pal, pbo
                          (not in NA but in SQE!)

The change in 5:25 contradicts Metzger's remark, that "the improbability of θεοῦ being altered to ἀνθρώπου is so great, that the Committee regarded the reading adopted for the text as virtually certain."

The change the other way round also appears:
NA28 John 6:27 ὁ υἱὸς <u>τοῦ ἀνθρώπου</u>
                       579: <u>τοῦ θεοῦ</u>

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 170

66. **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 9:36 <u>ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν</u>· καὶ τίς ἐστιν, __
κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;

<u>omit, but</u> καὶ τίς ἐστιν, <u>ἔφη</u> κύριε   P75, B, W, <u>WH</u>^{mg}, <u>Weiss</u>
<u>omit, but</u> καὶ <u>ἔφη</u> τίς ἐστιν, κύριε   070

<u>ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος + ἔφη:</u>   P66*, <u>Trg</u>^{mg} (!)

<u>ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος</u>   P66^C, A, 1241, pc
<u>εἶπεν</u>   sa, ac²
<u>ἀπεκρίθη</u>   a
<u>ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν</u>   bo, aeth
<u>"He that was healed said to him"</u>   Sy-S

<u>ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος [καὶ εἶπεν]·</u>   WH

txt   01, D, K, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 397, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
       Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, (Co), goth, <u>NA</u>²⁵, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Trg</u>
         κύριε,   τίς ἐστιν   01*
         κύριε, καὶ τίς ἐστιν   01^C
         τίς ἐστιν, κύριε,   A, L, Γ, Θ, 0306, pc, Lat, Sy-P, Co

<u>WH</u> has καὶ εἶπεν in brackets, and the P75, B reading as alternate reading.
Lacuna: C, N, Π
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 9:37 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ...
              ἔφη   αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ...   01
              ἀπεκρίθη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ...   D

NA28 John 9:38 ὁ δὲ <u>ἔφη</u>· πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ.
NA28 John 9:39 Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·

It is possible that the P75, B reading with ἔφη is original, because it is awkward stylistically. In the previous verse Jesus is speaking. Then it follows without break καὶ τίς ἐστιν. The short ἔφη may easily be overlooked. The simplest correction would be the one by 070.

The txt reading is the much more normal form. There would have been no reason to change it. The correction in P66 shows how the change probably worked. First inserting something before καὶ τίς ἐστιν, to separate the different speakers and then eliminating the ἔφη.

In a later step the style is further improved by omitting the καὶ before τίς ἐστιν.

It is basically possible that the omission by P75, B, W, 070 is accidental, but the various other changes indicate that there apparently was some stumbling block here for the scribes, most probably a missing introductory formula.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
        (retain P75, B reading)

TVU 171

67. <u>Difficult variant</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 9:37 εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· καὶ ἑώρακας αὐτὸν καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν.
NA28 John 9:38 <u>ὁ δὲ ἔφη· πιστεύω, κύριε· καὶ προσεκύνησεν αὐτῷ.</u>
NA28 John 9:39 <u>Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς·</u> εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον ἦλθον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσιν καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται.
NA28 John 9:40 ἤκουσαν ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων ταῦτα …

T&T #130

<u>omit:</u> P75, 01*, W, b, l, sa^{ms}, ac², mf, <u>Bois</u>
      In 01 the corrector Cᵃ (= 01^C2) added the words (acc. to Tischendorf).

<u>ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· …</u>   Θ

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare verse 36:
NA28 John 9:36 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν· καὶ τίς ἐστιν,<u> </u>κύριε, <u>ἵνα</u> <u>πιστεύσω</u> εἰς αὐτόν;
                                                    <u>ἔφη</u>: P66*, P75, B, W

Compare the discussion of the previous variant (verse 36) for the addition of ἔφη, which might very well be original. With ἔφη we have a difficult, redundant style. Note Θ.
There is no convincing argument, why the words could have been omitted. It is basically possible that the words 38-39a have also been omitted as not really needed to combine the saying in verse 39 directly with Jesus' words in verse 37. So also B. Aland who suggests that the belief of the blind born is only natural after Jesus' disclosure.
But that is not really convincing.

It is possible that the words have been added to fulfill verse 36. The support for the omission is strong and diverse. If it has been added secondarily, ἔφη might have been borrowed from verse 36.

The Tuscan Diatessaron (Vaccari) omits verses 38 and 39 entirely. It has been suggested that the verses fell out due to homoioarcton (37: et dixit ei Iesus ... ; 39: dixit ei Iesus ...). But it is not clear how this would result in the complete omission of verse 39.

C.L. Porter suggests that the words have been added because the story was a baptismal lesson. One lectionary lesson runs from 9:1 to 9:38, the other from 9:39 to 10:9. It is thus possible that the words Καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς have been added as an incipit to verse 39. Also verse 38 has been added as a conclusion to the story.

R.E. Brown additionally comments (Com. Jo.) that it is possible that the words "were an addition stemming from the association of John 9 with the baptismal liturgy and catechesis. ... When the catechumens passed their examinations and were judged worthy of Baptism, lessons from the OT concerning cleansing water were read to them. Then came the solemn opening of the Gospel book and the reading of John 9, with the confession of the blind man, 'I do believe, God', serving as the climax."
Porter notes a similar addition, Acts 8, verse 37, also clearly a baptismal confession:
Acts 8:37 εἶπε δὲ ὁ Φίλιππος, Εἰ πιστεύεις ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, ἔξεστιν. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ εἶπε, Πιστεύω τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐιναι τὸν Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.
 add verse: E, 1739, pc, Lat, Sy-H, arm, mae, Ir, Cyp
 All other witnesses omit this verse.

Brown further notes that φημί appears only two (or three? Verse 36?) more times in John and προσκυνέω is not used in John concerning Jesus, therefore he concludes that 38-39a is a secondary addition.

Compare:
- C.L. Porter "John 9:38, 39a: A liturgical addition to the text" NTS 13 (1966) 387-94
- B. Aland "NT Handschriften als Interpreten des Textes? - P75 und seine Vorlagen in Jo 10." in: *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum*, ed. D.-A. Koch et al. Festschrift Willi Marxen, Gütersloh, 1989, p. 379-397

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 172

NA28 John 10:4   ὅταν τὰ ἴδια <u>πάντα</u> ἐκβάλῃ, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ·

BYZ John 10:4 καὶ ὅταν τὰ ἴδια <u>πρόβατα</u> ἐκβάλῃ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ ὅτι οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ·

Byz   A, Δ, 0141, 0211, 0250, f13, 22^{mg}, 1582^C, 157, 579, Maj,
       f, q, vg, (Sy-S), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt   P66^C, P75, 01^{C1}, B, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, f1, 1582*, 22^{txt}, 33, 397, 565, 1071, 1241, al,
       a, d, e, Co, arm
       τὰ ἴδια ἐκβάλῃ <u>πάντα</u>   P66*

<u>πρόβατα πάντα</u>   it(b, c, ff², j, l, r¹)
oves suas omnes

<u>omit:</u> 01*^{,C2}, aur

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 10:1 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν <u>τῶν προβάτων</u> ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστὶν καὶ λῃστής·
NA28 John 10:2 ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας ποιμήν ἐστιν <u>τῶν προβάτων</u>.
NA28 John 10:3 τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει καὶ <u>τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα</u> φωνεῖ κατ᾽ ὄνομα καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά.
And also: 10:7-8, 10:11-13, 10:15-16, 10:26-27.

It is possible that πρόβατα has been changed to πάντα to improve style and to avoid unnecessary repetition.

On the other hand it is possible that πάντα has been changed to πρόβατα as a harmonization to immediate context, especially the previous verse 3 (so also Weiss).

At last it is also possible that originally no object was specified as in 01*.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 173

68.   Difficult variant:

Minority reading:

NA28 John 10:7 Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν <u>ὅτι</u> ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα τῶν προβάτων.

T&T #132

<u>omit</u>   P75, B, L, X, Ψ, 0141, 33, 157, 213, 397, 579, 597, 700, 799*, 821, 849, 865, 1071, 1241, 1424, 2786, pm⁴²⁰ [G, K, Π, U, 157], <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>

txt   P66, 01, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 1424, Maj¹²⁰⁰

Lacuna: C, 892
B: no umlaut

Compare context:

NA28 John 10:1 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν <u>λέγω ὑμῖν</u>, ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος διὰ τῆς θύρας εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν προβάτων ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστὶν καὶ λῃστής·   safe!

Compare the phrase ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν:

NA28 John 5:24 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν <u>λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι</u> ὁ τὸν λόγον μου ἀκούων
                    omit ὅτι: D

NA28 John 6:47 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν <u>λέγω ὑμῖν</u>, ὁ πιστεύων ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
                    <u>add ὅτι:</u>   01, Θ, 124

NA28 John 14:12 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ
                    <u>add ὅτι:</u>   Θ

NA28 John 16:23 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν <u>λέγω ὑμῖν</u>, ἄν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δώσει ὑμῖν.
<u>omit ὅτι:</u>   P5, B, C, D*, L, (Ψ), pc, Or
<u>add ὅτι:</u>   01, A, Dᶜ, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj, L844 (P22 not clear!)

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν without ὅτι safe at:
         1:51, 5:19, 6:26, 6:32, 6:53, 8:51, 8:58, 12:24, 13:16, 13:20

ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν with   ὅτι safe at: 5:25, 8:34, 13:21, 16:20

John uses the phrase ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν more often without (13) than with (5) ὅτι. But he can use both forms it in two consecutive verses: 13:20 and 21.
Almost all occurrences are safe. It is only this verse and Jo 16:23, where there is significant variation.
It is possible that the omission is a conformation to context, verse 1.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 174

Minority reading:
NA28 John 10:7 Εἶπεν οὖν πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι <u>ἡ θύρα</u> τῶν προβάτων.

<u>ὁ ποιμὴν</u>   P75, sa, ac, mf

ac², pbo, bo read θύρα
P66, Ephrem (Diatess), Clement (Strom. 5.86.4) also have ἡ θύρα.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 10:1 ὁ μὴ εἰσερχόμενος <u>διὰ τῆς θύρας</u> εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τῶν προβάτων ἀλλὰ ἀναβαίνων ἀλλαχόθεν ἐκεῖνος κλέπτης ἐστὶν καὶ ληστής·
NA28 John 10:2 ὁ δὲ εἰσερχόμενος <u>διὰ τῆς θύρας</u> **ποιμήν** ἐστιν τῶν προβάτων.
NA28 John 10:9 <u>ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ θύρα·</u> δι' ἐμοῦ ἐάν τις εἰσέλθῃ σωθήσεται καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ νομὴν εὑρήσει.
NA28 John 10:11 Ἐγώ εἰμι <u>ὁ ποιμὴν</u> ὁ καλός. <u>ὁ ποιμὴν</u> ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων·
NA28 John 10:12 ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν <u>ποιμήν</u>,
NA28 John 10:14 Ἐγώ εἰμι <u>ὁ ποιμὴν</u> ὁ καλὸς

The reading "I am the gate" is difficult. The change of P75 is only natural and derived from context. Perhaps a local Egyptian reading, known to the scribe of P75? Even though B. Aland thinks this argumentation is "compelling", she writes: "it should be noted though, that similar variants scarcely appear in P75."

On the other hand a change the other way round could be explained as a harmonization to verse 9.

P6:
The Codex named "ac" is also the NT papyrus P6 and is bilingual Greek - Achmimic. Unfortunately the Greek part for verse 7 is lost. About three lines are missing. The text extant is close to P75. So it is possible, though impossible to prove, that P6 also read ὁ ποιμὴν.

Compare:

- Royse, Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 694-5
- P. Weigandt "Zum Text von Joh 10:7" NovT 9 (1967) 43 - 51
- B. Aland "NT Handschriften als Interpreten des Textes? - P75 und seine Vorlagen in Jo 10." in: *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum, ed. D.-A. Koch et al. Festschrift Willi Marxen, Gütersloh, 1989, p. 379-397*

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 175

69. <u>**Difficult variant**</u>

NA28 John 10:8 <u>πάντες</u> ὅσοι ἦλθον **[πρὸ ἐμοῦ]** κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λησταί , ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα.

BYZ John 10:8 πάντες ὅσοι ἦλθον _____ κλέπται εἰσὶν καὶ λησταί ἀλλ οὐκ ἤκουσαν αὐτῶν τὰ πρόβατα

Byz   P45[vid], P75, 01*, 0141, 28, 892[S], 1424,
       Maj-part[E, F, G, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, 047],
       Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, sa, pbo, ac², goth, Diatess, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66, 01[C2], A, B, D, K, Π, L, W, X, Θ, Λ, Ψ, 0233, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 157,
       397, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1241, Maj-part,
       d, vg[mss], Sy-H**, bo, ac, Cl, Or[3/4]
       <u>πρὸ ἐμοῦ</u> ἦλθον Θ, f1, 124, 565, arm, geo, Or[1/4]

P45 has a lacuna, but space considerations make it very improbable that it contained the words.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Diatessaron: The sentence is in Ephrem and in the Arabic, both times in the short form.

Note also: D, b, d, vg[ms] **omit πάντες.**

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Without the words the sentence is difficult to understand:
"All who came <u>before me</u> are thieves and bandits; but the sheep did not listen to them."
If not originally present an addition would be natural. Different insertion points are often an indication of a secondary insertion.

It is difficult to account for an omission of the words. Metzger suggests: "... they omitted the words in order to lessen the possibility of taking the passage as a blanket condemnation of all OT worthies."
This explanation is also supported by the omission of πάντες by D, pc.

WH suggest: "The omission perhaps seemed to emphasize the sense of ἦλθον; or to be a natural simplification on the assumption that πάντες means 'they all' (τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, verse 5; cf. verse 1), as ὅσοι ἐλάλησαν Act 3:24; or to obviate or lessen risk of reference to the prophets."

Zahn (Comm. Jo): "It remains probable that πρὸ ἐμοῦ facilitated the misinterpretation by Gnostics and Manichaeans and prompted its omission in many catholic manuscripts."

B. Aland notes that the text in P75, which reads ὁ ποιμὴν in verse 7 and omits πρὸ ἐμοῦ makes sense. She thinks that we have here an "extremely intelligent, vigorous" intervention, provoked by the offence of the original text, giving:

> 10:7 I am the shepherd of the sheep.
> 10:8 All that ever came are thieves and robbers: but the sheep did not
> hear them.
> 10:9 I am the door: …

Aland thinks that the scribe wanted to restore the original sense of a corrupted transmission.

Compare:

- B. Aland "NT Handschriften als Interpreten des Textes? - P75 und seine Vorlagen in Jo 10." in: *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum, ed. D.-A. Koch et al. Festschrift Willi Marxen, Gütersloh, 1989, p. 379-397*

Rating: - (indecisive)
      (brackets ok)

TVU 176

Minority reading:
NA28 John 10:11 Ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός. ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλὸς τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ <u>τίθησιν</u> ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων·

<u>δίδωσιν</u>   P45, 01*, D, Lat(b, c, d, ff², r¹, vg), Sy-S, Sy-Pal, bo
    dat   c, d, ff², vg
    tradit   b, r¹, vg^ms

it(a, aur, e, f, l), vg^mss read txt ("ponit").
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

same in 10:15
NA28 John 10:15 καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ γινώσκω τὸν πατέρα, καὶ τὴν ψυχήν μου <u>τίθημι</u> ὑπὲρ τῶν προβάτων.

<u>δίδωμι</u>   P45, P66, 01*, D, W, pbo

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare verse 17 and 18:
NA28 John 10:17 Διὰ τοῦτό με ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ ὅτι ἐγὼ <u>τίθημι</u> τὴν ψυχήν μου, ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν.
NA28 John 10:18 οὐδεὶς αἴρει αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ <u>τίθημι</u> αὐτὴν ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ. ἐξουσίαν ἔχω <u>θεῖναι</u> αὐτήν,

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 20:28 ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ <u>δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν</u> αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.
NA28 Mark 10:45 καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ <u>δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν</u> αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

The meaning is essentially the same.
ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ τίθησιν is generally translated as "lay down his life", whereas δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν is translated as "give his life".

It seems that the form with τίθημι is the special Johannine form, compare:
Jo 10:17-18, 13:37-38; 15:13, 1.Jo 3:16, 5:

Probably the scribes where influenced by the Synoptic form (which was possibly the more standard formula?) διδόναι τὴν ψυχὴν and changed it therefore in John. In the last two instances of these verses (11, 15, 17+18) finally they "gave in" and took the Johannine form.
Nevertheless Zahn (Comm. Jo) thinks that because τίθημι in verses 17-18 is safe, it cannot be correct here.

It is an interesting and strong combination of "Western" (?) witnesses.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 177

NA28 John 10:13 _____ ὅτι μισθωτός ἐστιν καὶ οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν προβάτων.

BYZ John 10:13 ὁ δὲ μισθωτός φεύγει, ὅτι μισθωτὸς ἐστιν καὶ οὐ μέλει αὐτῷ περὶ τῶν προβάτων

Byz   Aᶜ, X, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 22ᵐᵍ, 157, 565, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj,
      Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, [Trgᵐᵍ]

txt   P44-Aᵛⁱᵈ(6ᵗʰ CE), P45, P66, P75, 01, A*, B, D, L, W, Θ, 0211, f1, 22*, 33,
      397, 579, 1241, al, L253, d, e, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, Co, aeth, arm
      W further omits ὅτι μισθωτὸς ἐστιν

579 reads: ὁ δὲ μισθωτὸς ἐστιν

Sy-S is not noted in NA, but wrongly included into "Sy" under Byz.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 12:
NA28 John 10:12 ὁ μισθωτὸς καὶ οὐκ ὢν ποιμήν, οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν τὰ πρόβατα ἴδια, θεωρεῖ τὸν λύκον ἐρχόμενον καὶ ἀφίησιν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ φεύγει - καὶ ὁ λύκος ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει -

BYZ John 10:12 καὶ ὁ λύκος ἁρπάζει αὐτὰ καὶ σκορπίζει τὰ πρόβατα

The addition seems superfluous, since it has already been mentioned in the previous verse 12 that he flees.
It is possible that the words have been added to avoid the possible interpretation of the wolf being the hireling: "the wolf ..., because a hireling he is ..." (note that in verse 12, the Byzantine text also adds τὰ πρόβατα).
It is also possible that the words have been omitted accidentally: ὁ δὲ - ὅτι.
The reading of 579 is due to h.t., skipping μισθωτός φεύγει, ὅτι.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 178

70. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 10:18 οὐδεὶς <u>αἴρει</u> αὐτὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ <u>τίθημι</u> αὐτὴν ἀπ᾽ ἐμαυτοῦ. ἐξουσίαν <u>ἔχω</u> θεῖναι αὐτήν, καὶ ἐξουσίαν <u>ἔχω</u> πάλιν λαβεῖν αὐτήν· ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον παρὰ τοῦ πατρός μου.

ἦρεν P45, 01*, B, Sy-P, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss

txt   WH^mg

ϵⲡϳ   P66
ϵⲣϵϳ   01^C2, L, W, Θ, 346
      (so, too, L, W, f13, 28 in Mk 4:15, 01, A, W in Lk 11:22)

01: H and N are canceled with a slash (/) and ϵ and ϳ are written above it.
Lacuna: P75, C
B: no umlaut

"No one takes ..."
"No one has taken ..." (Aorist)

Compare previous verse 17:
NA28 John 10:17 Διὰ τοῦτό με ὁ πατὴρ <u>ἀγαπᾷ</u> ὅτι ἐγὼ <u>τίθημι</u> τὴν ψυχήν μου, ἵνα πάλιν <u>λάβω</u> αὐτήν.

Compare also:
NA28 John 3:16 οὕτως γὰρ <u>ἠγάπησεν</u> ὁ θεὸς τὸν κόσμον, ὥστε τὸν υἱὸν τὸν μονογενῆ <u>ἔδωκεν   </u>, ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ᾽ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
 <u>εἰς τὸν κόσμον</u> P63 (ca. 500), 33, 1071,pc, e

In the previous verse the verbs are present tense. Also the following verbs are present. Thus formally a present tense verb would be expected here too.
ἦρεν is clearly the harder reading. It is possible that Jesus here speaks of his death as already past. The same thing happened in 3:16 (and here too a correction has been added!). ἦρεν may be considered a "timeless" Aorist.
Weiss (Jo Com.) suggests that the ἦρεν points to the previous, futile attacks of his opponents.

Unfortunately P75 has a lacuna here.

P66 writes ∈ρι here. In 1:29 it has correctly αἴρων, in 10:24 it correctly writes αἴρεις. In 16:22 it has either αιρι or ∈ρι.

ἦρ∈ν in Jo 5:9, 11:41 and 19:38 is safe in all witnesses.

Perhaps ἦρ∈ν is an accidental error, due to the similar sounding words?

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 179

NA28 John 10:22 Ἐγένετο τότε τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις, χειμὼν ἦν,

BYZ John 10:22 Ἐγένετο δὲ   τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις καὶ χειμὼν ἦν

Byz   P66*, 01, A, D, X, Δ, Θ, 0141, f13, 157, 397, Maj,
       Lat, ac², Sy-P, Sy-H, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Trg</u>

txt   P66^C, P75, B, L, W, Ψ, 33, 579, 1071, pc, Co, arm, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}

<u>omit:</u> f1, 565, pc, a, b, j, l, **29**^{c}, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, pbo, geo[1]

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

"At that time came the feast of dedication in Jerusalem."

Ἐγένετο τότε appears only here in the Greek Bible. It is thus very unusual.
Ἐγένετο δὲ appears 97 times (17 times in Lk, none in Mt/Mk).
Both forms are easily confused:
ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΤΟΤΕ
    ΕΓΕΝΕΤΟΔΕ

John only rarely begins a sentence with Ἐγένετο:
1:6   Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος,
3:25   Ἐγένετο <u>οὖν</u> ζήτησις
19:36 ἐγένετο <u>γὰρ</u> ταῦτα ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ·

Zahn (Comm. Jo) also correctly notes that John when using τότε (9 times), he always puts it at the beginning of the sentence or phrase, never after the verb. In this respect this verse would be unique.

Metzger writes: "the origin of either [τότε or δὲ] is suspectible of explanation on transcriptional grounds (dittography or haplography), followed by confusion (not infrequent in some Greek manuscripts) of δε and τε."

It is also possible that originally nothing was there and the words have been added to smooth the abrupt change. On the other hand it is also possible that the word has been deleted at the beginning of a lection.

Metzger writes: "After considerable debate a majority of the Committee preferred τότε as 'too appropriate not to have been included originally'. "

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 180

Difficult variant
NA28 John 10:26 ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε, ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν.

BYZ John 10:26 ἀλλ᾽ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε οὐ γὰρ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν <u>καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν.</u>

T&T #137

Byz (P66*), A, D, X, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 865, Maj,
     it, Sy, bo^pt, goth, [Trg^mg]
     <u>καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι</u>   P66*

txt P66^C, P75, 01, B, K, Π, L, M*, W, Θ, 0141, 33, 597, 821, 1241, 2561*, al^60,
     aur, c, vg, sa, bo^pt, ac², arm

Lacuna: C
B: umlaut! (1365 C 39 R)   <u>προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν.</u>

Compare:
NA28 John 1:23 καθὼς εἶπεν Ἠσαΐας ὁ προφήτης.
NA28 John 7:38 καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή,
NA28 John 12:50 καθὼς εἴρηκέν μοι ὁ πατήρ,
NA28 John 13:33 καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις

Compare also:
NA28 John 10:3-4 τούτῳ ὁ θυρωρὸς ἀνοίγει καὶ τὰ πρόβατα τῆς φωνῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκούει καὶ τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα φωνεῖ κατ᾽ ὄνομα καὶ ἐξάγει αὐτά. 4 ὅταν τὰ ἴδια πάντα ἐκβάλῃ, ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται καὶ τὰ πρόβατα αὐτῷ ἀκολουθεῖ, ὅτι οἴδασιν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ·

"... as I told you."

A typical Johannine phrase.
It is possible that the words have been deleted because there has been previously no saying reported explicitly stating that the Jews do not belong to his sheep.

Why should the words have been added? Possibly to point back to verses 3-4 (so Weiss).

It is also possible, and clearly suggested by the P66* reading, that the words are meant to go with what follows:

> 10:26 ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε,
> ὅτι οὐκ ἐστὲ ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν.
> <u>καθὼς εἶπον ὑμῖν (ὅτι)</u>
> 10:27 τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἐμὰ τῆς φωνῆς μου ἀκούουσιν,
> κἀγὼ γινώσκω αὐτὰ καὶ ἀκολουθοῦσίν μοι,

P66 elsewhere adds the ὅτι recitativum (3:28, 7:36).

Compare also the mysterious phrase from Jo 8:25:
τὴν ἀρχὴν ὅ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν;

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 181

72. Difficult variant

NA28 John 10:29 ὁ πατήρ μου <u>ὃ</u> δέδωκέν μοι πάντων <u>μεῖζόν</u> ἐστιν, καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἁρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρός.

BYZ John 10:29 ὁ πατήρ μου <u>ὃς</u> δέδωκέν μοι <u>μεῖζων</u> πάντων ἐστιν καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἁρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ πατρός μου

T&T #139
T&T #140

Byz	<u>ὃς ... μεῖζων</u> πάντων	P66, Δ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj¹⁶⁰⁰, sa, <u>Weiss</u>
	<u>ὃς ... μεῖζον</u> πάντων	A, Θ, pc⁷, Sy
	<u>ὃς ...</u> πάντων <u>μεῖζόν</u>	P75ᵛⁱᵈ, Bᶜ¹, 869
	<u>ὃς ...</u> πάντων ἐστιν <u>μεῖζόν</u>	X, 213, 799, 865
	<u>ὃς ...</u> πάντων <u>μεῖζών</u>	249, 317, 333, 397, 423, 743, d(!), <u>WH</u>ᵐᵍ, <u>Bal</u>(!)
	<u>ὃ ...</u> πάντων <u>μεῖζών</u>	01, (D), L, W, Ψ, <u>SBL</u>
	<u>ὃ ...</u> πάντων ἐστιν <u>μεῖζών</u>	2786
txt	<u>ὃ ...</u> πάντων <u>μεῖζόν</u>	B*, (Lat), bo, <u>WH</u>, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>Tis</u>

P75 reads: <u>ὃς ἐδωκέ</u>[... ...]<u>των μεῖ</u>[...]<u>ν</u>

μεῖζον is slightly preferable due to space and also to avoid a singular reading.
D reads: <u>ὃ</u> δεδωκ<u>ώς</u> μοι <u>μεῖζων</u> πάντών ἐστιν

Lat: "Pater meus quod dedit mihi maius omnibus est"
d: "Pater   <u>qui</u>   dedit mihi <u>omnium maior</u> est"

Lacuna: C
B: umlaut! (1366 A 7 L)   <u>ὁ πατήρ μου ὃ δέδωκέν</u>
In B there is a small ⊂ written above the line between the Omikron and the Delta: $O^C\Delta$. All letters are enhanced. It is not clear whether the added Sigma is early or not. Tischendorf assigns it to B² (= Bᶜ¹, NA).

ὃ   accusative neuter singular
μεῖζον   nominative neuter singular

ὃς   nominative masculine singular
μεῖζων   nominative masculine singular

Meaning:
Byz   "My father, who has given to me, is greater than all …"
01, L: "My father, in regard to what he has given to me, is greater than all …"
txt   "My father, what he has given me is greater than all …"

The reading of A et al. is impossible Greek, but C.K. Barrett suggests this meaning in his commentary: "My father who gave them to me is greater than any other power … This reading makes as good sense as Byz, and in addition could easily give rise to … [the other readings]. This seems to be the only satisfactory way of accounting for all the variants."

C. Conrad wrote on the bgreek list (30th July 2002):
a) regarding the 01 et al. reading:
I don't really think so [that it makes sense], UNLESS one understands hO DEDWKEN MOI as a (rather awkward) substantive clause in the adverbial accusative, adverbially qualifying MEIZWN: "My father is greater than all with respect to what he has given me." The only way it would make sense to me is if hO, which as spelled and accented in our critical text can only be the neuter accusative of the relative pronoun, is intended to be a nominative singular masculine relative pronoun, which is to say, that this is a solecism of the kind somewhat less uncommon in the text of Revelation.

b) regarding the A et al. reading:
This makes no sense at all--or hardly an acceptable sense: "My father, who gave it to me, is a bigger (thing) than all others (things/persons)." This appears to me a copyist's attempt to solve the problem of the neuter accusative relative pronoun where a masculine nominative relative pronoun should be expected--but if that's so, the copyist has formulated a still more intolerable construction wherein the masculine PATHR becomes a thing compared quantitatively with other things.

The Byzantine text is the most simple and straightforward and makes good sense. Everything else is either wrong Greek, or difficult to understand.

Compare:
NA28 John 5:36 τὰ γὰρ ἔργα ἃ δέδωκέν μοι ὁ πατὴρ
NA28 John 6:37 πᾶν ὃ δίδωσίν μοι ὁ πατὴρ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἥξει,
NA28 John 6:39 ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκέν μοι μὴ ἀπολέσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ,
NA28 John 17:4 τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ δέδωκάς μοι ἵνα ποιήσω·
NA28 John 17:6 τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς ἔδωκάς μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου.
NA28 John 17:7 πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν·
NA28 John 17:8 ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἔδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς,
NA28 John 17:9 ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι, ὅτι σοί εἰσιν,
NA28 John 17:11 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι,
NA28 John 17:12 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι,

NA28 John 17:22 κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν <u>ἣν δέδωκάς μοι</u> δέδωκα αὐτοῖς
NA28 John 17:24 Πάτερ, <u>ὃ δέδωκάς μοι</u>, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ
NA28 John 18:9 <u>οὓς δέδωκάς μοι</u> οὐκ ἀπώλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα.
NA28 John 18:11 τὸ ποτήριον <u>ὃ δέδωκέν μοι</u> ὁ πατὴρ οὐ μὴ πίω αὐτό;

It is Johannine usage that the relative pronoun always refers to things given, never to the one who gives.

It is therefore possible that ὃ is a conformation to common Johannine usage. And following that, μείζων had to be changed then into μείζον. ω <--> ο confusion was also introduced.
On the other hand it is possible that the B* reading is original. Because it is difficult to understand and not really suiting the context, it has been changed into the Byzantine form with the same ω <--> ο confusion.
B. Aland, too, thinks that the B* reading is original and that an early ancestor of P75 changed ὃ δέδωκεν into the smoother ὃς ἔδωκεν "in an intelligent manner without changing the letter distance".

Birdsall thinks that the 01, L reading is original:
  "if ὃς had stood originally we can conceive no reason for the alteration to ὃ." – "[the reading μείζον] exegetically is an impossibility; even if the thought of such inherent greatness in the church be conceivably Johannine, it has no place here. Parallelism, a well-known feature of Johannine style, suggests that the Father's power is the subject here as well as in the latter part of the verse. The combination of ὃ and μείζον fails on any exegesis to provide such parallelism of thought."

The problem with this reading is that it may be acceptable, but nevertheless awkward Greek. On the other hand just that might have been the reason for the changes. Schnackenburg favors this reading, too.

This is one of the cases suggested by Metzger ("Lucianic recension", 1959) where one could have an old relict of the earliest Antiochian text. Not necessarily correct, but at least older than any possible recension.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "the [txt reading] is worthless. But how has so unsuitable a reading as ὃ - μείζον arisen? Perhaps we had originally ὅτι in the sense of ὃς, and its sense being missed, it was disfigured to ὃ, and then the predicate naturally followed in the neuter."

Compare also the next verse:
BGT John 10:29 … μεῖζόν / μεῖζων ἐστιν
BGT John 10:30 ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ <u>ἕν ἐσμεν.</u>   ἕν = Neuter
The neuter form here is the only correct possibility to express identity (compare Whittaker).

Robertson's "wordpictures":
"But the context calls for ὃς … μεῖζων with ὁ πατήρ as the subject of ἐστιν. The greatness of the Father, not of the flock, is the ground of the safety of the flock."

Weiss thinks that txt may be a thoughtless reminiscence to Mt 6:37, 39 or it came up because the object-less δέδωκεν was considered a problem. He considers the A et al. reading "mixed" and notes that Meyer defended it, appealing to Mt 12:6.
Zahn, interestingly, accepts the txt reading. He argues that ὃς suggested itself following ὁ πατήρ and is adding these references for the general thought:
1. Jo 2:13f., 4:4 and 5:5.

Whittaker points out that μεῖζων πάντων (or πάντων μεῖζων) was a Hellenistic liturgical formula (ἐπίκλησις) applied to the supreme deity.

Barrett: "The question, however, is an open one. … It is a fair question whether any alternative to [Byz] is not so *difficilis* as to be *impossibilis*." So also Weiss: txt is "exegetically impossible".
Context and exegesis thus seem to favor the Byzantine reading very strongly (The support for ὃς is strong (P66, P75, A, B[C1], X, 33, Maj, sa …). Perhaps ὃ (01, B*, D, L, W, Ψ, Lat, bo) is a conformation to common Johannine usage (see above). Note that d departs from D[Gr] here in reading ὃς … πάντων μεῖζών !
The μεῖζον / μεῖζων itacistic variation may be at least in part accidental, as can be seen at other occurrences of this word (cp. Jo 4:12 μεῖζόν 01*, W[s]). Conformation of the pronoun may then have followed.
From a purely textcritical point of view the question must remain open, because the evidence is very evenly divided. So, it seems, that exegesis has the last word here and it strongly favors Byz.

Compare:

- J.H. Michael "The text and context of St. John 10:29" JTS 24 (1922) 51-54
- R.G. Bury "St. John 10:29" JTS 41 (1940) 262-3
- J.N. Birdsall "John 10:29", JTS 11 (1960) 342-44
- St.N. Sakkos Ἰωάννου 10:29 (Thessaloniki, 1968) [also opts for Byz]
- John Whittaker "A Hellenistic Context for John 10, 29" Vigiliae Christianae 24 (1970) 241-260 [accepts Byz]
- J.R. Royse "Scribal Habits" 2008, p. 683, 685-7
- B. Aland "NT Handschriften als Interpreten des Textes? - P75 und seine Vorlagen in Jo 10." in: *Jesu Rede von Gott und ihre Nachgeschichte im frühen Christentum, ed. D.-A. Koch et al. Festschrift Willi Marxen,* Gütersloh, 1989, p. 379-397

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)
    (txt reading possibly wrong, prefer ὃς ... μεῖζων,
        either in the P66 or in the P75 word-order)

TVU 182

73. <u>Difficult variant</u>

Minority reading:
NA28 John 10:31 Ἐβάστασαν <u>πάλιν</u> λίθους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν.

T&T #142

<u>omit:</u>   P45, Θ, aur, ff², vg^{St, WW}, Sy-S, pbo, arm

<u>οὖν</u>   D, 0211, 69, 124, 788(=f13), 28, al³⁷, L844, pc, it, vg^{Cl}, sa^{ms}, bo

   <u>πάλιν</u>   01, B, L, W, 33, pc¹⁵, Sy-P, sa, ac, ac²

<u>οὖν πάλιν</u> P66, A, X, Ψ, Δ, 0141, f1, f13, 213, 397, 565, 579, 799, 821, 865, 1071, 1241, Maj, f, Sy-H, sa^{ms}, [Trg], SBL

Lacuna: P75, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 8:59 ἦραν οὖν λίθους ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν. Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐκρύβη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ.

NA28 John 10:39 Ἐζήτουν [οὖν] αὐτὸν <u>πάλιν</u> πιάσαι, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.
omit: P45, 01*, D, 69, 579, 1241, al, Lat, ac²

The πάλιν refers back to 8:59. The omission is difficult to explain.
Compare 10:39.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 183

Minority reading:
NA28 John 10:32 ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πολλὰ ἔργα <u>καλὰ ἔδειξα</u> <u>ὑμῖν</u> ἐκ τοῦ πατρός· διὰ ποῖον αὐτῶν ἔργον ἐμὲ λιθάζετε;

T&T #143

	ἔργα <u>ἔδειξα ὑμῖν καλὰ</u>	B, 597, pc², <u>**NA²⁵**</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>
txt	ἔργα <u>καλὰ ἔδειξα ὑμῖν</u>	P45, 01, A, K, Π, Λ, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 397, 565, 1010, 1071, 1241, 1293, L2211, al, <u>WH^mg</u>
	<u>ἔδειξα ὑμῖν</u> ἔργα <u>καλὰ</u>	P75^vid
	<u>καλὰ ἔδειξα ὑμῖν</u> ἔργα	047, pc²
	ἔργα <u>ἔδειξα ὑμῖν</u>	W, pc¹²
	<u>καλὰ</u> ἔργα <u>ἔδειξα ὑμῖν</u>	P66, D, L, X, 0141, f13, 213, 579, 799, 821, 865, 892, 2786, Maj, <u>Trg</u>

Lacuna: C, 892
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 10:33 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· περὶ <u>καλοῦ ἔργου</u> οὐ λιθάζομέν σε

Obviously something caused confusion here.
Probably one problem was homoioteleuton:

ΠΟΛ<u>ΛΑ</u> Ε<u>ΡΓΑ</u> ΚΑ<u>ΛΑ</u>

ΠΟΛ<u>ΛΑ</u> ΚΑ<u>ΛΑ</u> Ε<u>ΡΓΑ</u>

It is possible that some scribes omitted either ἔργα or καλὰ due to h.t. and added it later at various positions.
It is also possible that either the P75 or the B reading was original and due to the unusual word order it has been changed. The txt reading and the Majority reading are rather straightforward.
Weiss (Com. John) thinks that the refined B reading has been changed to combine the καλὰ with the substantive.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 184

Minority reading:
NA28 John 10:33 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· περὶ καλοῦ ἔργου οὐ λιθάζομέν σε ἀλλὰ περὶ βλασφημίας, καὶ ὅτι σὺ ἄνθρωπος ὢν ποιεῖς σεαυτὸν __θεόν.

__τὸν P66* (" _the_ God")
	corrected by the first hand.
B: no umlaut

The Jews answered, "It is not for a good work that we are going to stone you, but for blasphemy, because you, though only a human being, are making yourself **a God."**

Ehrman argues for a deliberate change: "The change appears not to have been made by accident, in view of the tendency of the scribe of P66 to omit short words far more readily than to add them." ("Orthodox corruption", 1993, p. 84 + 114)

On the other hand it could be a dittography: τον - τον. This appears to be more probable since the scribe corrects himself.

Compare also above 7:52, where P66* adds the article ὁ in front of προφήτης.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 185

NA28 John 10:38 εἰ δὲ ποιῶ, κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ <u>πιστεύητε</u>, τοῖς ἔργοις <u>πιστεύετε</u>, ἵνα <u>γνῶτε</u> καὶ <u style="color:green">γινώσκητε</u> ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί.

BYZ John 10:38 εἰ δὲ ποιῶ κἂν ἐμοὶ μὴ <u>πιστεύητε</u> τοῖς ἔργοις <u>πιστεύσατε·</u> ἵνα <u>γνῶτε</u> καὶ <u style="color:green">πιστεύσητε</u> ὅτι ἐν ἐμοὶ ὁ πατὴρ κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ.

T&T #149

Byz   (01), A, K, Π, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f13, (579, 1241), Maj, aur, f, vg, goth
 <u style="color:green">πιστεύητε</u> 01, 0211, 1010, 1293, pc[8]
 <u style="color:green">πιστεύητε</u> 579, 1241, pc[3]

txt   P45, P66, P75, B, L, W, X, Θ, f1, 33, 213, 397, 565, 597, 799*, 865, pc[9], L844, Co, Sy-Pal, arm

<u style="color:green">omit καὶ γινώσκητε</u> D, 157, 1424, pc[5], it, Sy-S

<u style="color:green">omit πιστεύσατε· ἵνα γνῶτε και:</u> f13[c] (h.t.)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

"But if I do them, even though you do not believe me, believe the works, so that you may know and <u>*understand*</u> that the Father is in me and I am in the Father."

The problem here is the repetitive πιστεύω.

John sometimes uses πιστεύω and γινώσκω together:
NA28 John 2:24 αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ <u>ἐπίστευεν</u> αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν <u>γινώσκειν</u> πάντας
NA28 John 6:69 καὶ ἡμεῖς <u>πεπιστεύκαμεν</u> καὶ <u>ἐγνώκαμεν</u> ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ.
NA28 John 17:8 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον καὶ <u>ἔγνωσαν</u> ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ <u>ἐπίστευσαν</u> ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

It is probable that scribes considered γινώσκητε after γνῶτε as redundant and therefore either changed it into πιστεύσητε or omitted it entirely. The choice of πιστεύσητε is not very creative, because it already appeared twice before.

That someone changed πιστεύσητε into γινώσκητε is even more improbable.

P. Williams comments on Sy-S:

> John 10:38. For *txt*'s ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε, NA27 cites *S* along with D 1424 (it) for the omission καὶ γινώσκητε. However, as Syriac lacks the possibility of ready expression of two different aspects of the same verb, and as *SCP* have been shown to avoid redundant repetition, one would almost expect the reading of *S*, with a single equivalent of γινώσκω, to result if its *Vorlage* was *txt*. *C* is not extant, and *P* follows a variant involving πιστεύω. The agreement between *S* and D would result not only from *S* being translated from a text such as D, but would be likely to result if D were influenced by any Aramaic text, since all Aramaic dialects would have the same restriction on expression of verbal aspect as Syriac.
> P. Williams "Early Syriac Translation Technique and the textual criticism of the Greek Gospels", Gorgias Press, 2004, p. 283-84.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 186

75. Difficult variant
Minority reading:
NA28 John 10:39 Ἐζήτουν [οὖν] <u>αὐτὸν πάλιν</u> πιάσαι, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

T&T #150

<u>αὐτὸν</u>   P45, 01*, D, 69(=f13), 579, 1241, pc²⁸,
                     Lat, ac², Sy-Pal, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

<u>πάλιν αὐτὸν</u>   P66, B, Θ, f13, 1010, 1293, Maj, Sy, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>SBL</u>
               ... <u>πάλιν</u> πιάσαι <u>αὐτὸν</u>   U, 2718, pm³⁰⁰, sa

<u>[πάλιν] αὐτὸν</u>   WH^mg

<u>αὐτὸν πάλιν</u>   01^c², A, K, Π, L, W, X, Δ, Ψ, Ω, 047, 0141, f1, 33, 213, 397,
                   565, 597, 799, 821, 865, 1424, 2561, 2786, al¹⁸⁰, f, <u>WH</u>

P45 reads Ἐζήτουν <u>δὲ αὐτὸν</u> πιάσαι ...
Sy-S has πάλιν.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 10:31 Ἐβάστασαν <u>πάλιν</u> λίθους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἵνα λιθάσωσιν αὐτόν.
<u>omit</u>: P45, D, Θ, 69, 124, 788(=f13), 28, pc, Lat, sa^ms, pbo, bo, arm
txt   P66, 01, A, B, L, W, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 1241, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, ac, ac²

Interesting similar combination of witnesses here and in 10:31. And again the omission is difficult to explain.
Weiss (Jo Com.) notes (correctly) that πάλιν is often omitted, but gives no reason (stylistic?).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 187

Minority reading:
NA28 John 10:40 Καὶ ἀπῆλθεν πάλιν πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων καὶ **ἔμεινεν** ἐκεῖ.

txt incomplete in NA!

ἔμενεν   B, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg^mg
txt   P45, P66, P75, 01, A, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj, WH^mg

Lacuna: C, 892
B: no umlaut

ἔμεινεν   indicative aorist   active 3rd person singular
ἔμενεν   indicative imperfect active 3rd person singular

ἔμενεν is certainly the rarer form. It appears only one more time in the Gospels (Lk 8:27). The aorist appears 8 times in John.

Probably an accidental error.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 188

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:17 Ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς _εὗρεν αὐτὸν τέσσαρας ἤδη ἡμέρας ἔχοντα ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ.
NA28 John 11:18 ἦν δὲ <u>ἡ Βηθανία</u> ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε.

<u>_εἰς Βηθανίαν</u>   01^{C2}, A^{C2}, C^{C2}, D, X, Λ, 0211, f13, 33, 157, 397, 579, 1071, al, L253, d, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, bo^{pt}

txt   P66, P75, 01*, A*, B, C*, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, 69, 788(=f13), 565, 700, Maj, Lat, sa, bo^{pt}, ac², goth

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 11:1 Ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν, Λάζαρος <u>ἀπὸ Βηθανίας</u>, ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς.

It is possible that the place has been repeated here, because the last mention was in verse 1. Verse 18 seems to require a previous mentioning. If original there is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 189

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:17 Ἐλθὼν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὗρεν αὐτὸν τέσσαρας **ἤδη** ἡμέρας ἔχοντα ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ.

omit: A*, D, pc, d, e, Sy-P, Sy-Pal^{ms}, sa, bo, ac², Tis, Bal

τέσσαρας **ἤδη**	P75, B, C*, Θ, f13, 397, pc
ἤδη τέσσαρας ἡμέρας	P66
τέσσαρας ἡμέρας **ἤδη**	A^C, 01, C^C, L, W, X, Δ, Λ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, 33, 124, 157, 565, 579, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj

τέσσαρας ἡμέρας ἔχοντα **ἤδη**   892

A: IGNTP misinterprets the evidence. A* is not omitting ἡμέρας, but ἤδη originally, which is obvious from the facsimile, where the vertical bar of the Rho is still visible on the next line, also the Sigma (CSNTM 51b, column B, line 14-15). This is correctly given in Tischendorf, Swanson and NA.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

892: confirmed by J.R. Royse (Scribal habits, 2008, p. 518) from microfilm.
Tis additionally notes: Sy-P, arm
B: no umlaut

Omitted possibly accidentally:

ΔΗΔΗΗΜΕϷΑϹ (τέσσαρας as numeral Δ)

It is also possible that it has been omitted to improve style, to bring τέσσαρας and ἡμέρας together. The other word order variants seem to support this.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 190

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:18 ἦν δὲ ἡ Βηθανία ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων ὡς ἀπὸ σταδίων δεκαπέντε.

txt incomplete in NA!

omit   01*, B, 0211*, 1346, pc, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Tis, Bal
txt   P66, 01^C2, A, C, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj

P75: The H is not visible. The situation looks like this (with the B not visible):

ϷΑϹ Є
ΒΗΘ

Both readings are possible.

0211* is only in IGNTP, not NA.
Lacuna: 892
B: no umlaut

Context:
NA28 John 11:1 Ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν, Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας
NA28 John 12:1
Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν

There probably have been different Bethanies (compare Jo 1:28). It is therefore possible that the article has been added (perhaps by John already) for emphasis: THIS Bethany is near Jerusalem ...
The usage in context is safe without the article.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 191

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:21 εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς <u>**τὸν**</u> Ἰησοῦν· κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧ δε οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός μου·

txt incomplete in NA!

<u>**omit**</u>   01, B, C*, pc, **<u>NA²⁵</u>**, <u>WH</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P45, P66, P75ᵛⁱᵈ, A, Cᶜ², D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 397, 579, Maj, <u>[Trg]</u>

C*: Noted in Tischendorf ("vid"), Swanson and NA, but not in IGNTP.
R. Lyon writes: "add perhaps τὸν after πρὸς. This is based entirely on the space available."
Lacuna: 892
B: no umlaut

Compare:
a) omission:
NA28 John 3:26 καὶ ἦλθον <u>πρὸς τὸν Ἰωάννην</u>
          <u>omit</u> τὸν: 1, 118, 124

NA28 John 13:1 μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου <u>πρὸς τὸν πατέρα,</u>
          <u>omit</u> τὸν: P66*

NA28 John 13:3 καὶ <u>πρὸς τὸν θεὸν</u> ὑπάγει,
          <u>omit</u> τὸν: Λ, Π

b) addition:
NA28 John 6:5 λέγει <u>πρὸς</u> Φίλιππον<u>:</u>
          <u>add</u> τὸν: A, Θ, f1, f13, Maj

NA28 John 13:6 ἔρχεται οὖν <u>πρὸς</u> Σίμωνα Πέτρον
          <u>add</u> τὸν: D, 69

NA28 John 20:2 τρέχει οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται <u>πρὸς</u> Σίμωνα Πέτρον
          <u>add</u> τὸν: 01

The norm is the usage with the article, but John also uses πρὸς sometimes without the article safe.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 192

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:21 εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· **κύριε,** εἰ ἧς ὧ
δε οὐκ ἂν ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός μου·

omit: B, Sy-S

<u>WH</u> have the reading without κύριε in the margin.
Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [κύριε] in brackets in the margin.

It is possible that C* supports the omission, too. Tis writes:
"C* ?, C^{C2} rescripsit paullo angustiore spatio πρὸς τὸν IN· KE, εἰ ἧς."
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 11:32 Ἡ οὖν Μαριὰμ ὡς ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἰδοῦσα
αὐτὸν ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας λέγουσα αὐτῷ· <u>κύριε,</u> εἰ ἧς ὧδε
οὐκ ἄν μου ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός.

It is possible that κύριε here is a harmonization to verse 32, where it is safe.
The combination of these two witnesses is curious. Probably accidental.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 193

78.   Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 11:22 **[ἀλλὰ]** καὶ νῦν οἶδα ὅτι ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν θεὸν δώσει σοι ὁ θεός.

omit: P75, 01*, B, C*, X, f1, 33, 397, 1241, pc, a, **35**, bo^{mss},
WH, **NA²⁵**, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt   P45, P66, 01^{C2}, C^{C3}, D, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f13, 157, 579, Maj,
Lat, Sy, Co, Bois, [Trg^{mg}]

B: no umlaut

ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν ("but even now") is an unusual phrase and appears only here in the Gospels. It nevertheless fits perfectly and an omission is difficult to understand.
The omission is limited to the Alexandrian texttype.
ἀλλὰ is a typical Johannine word and appears more often in John than in the Synoptics (33 - 30 - 19 - 56).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 194

79. <u>Difficult variant</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:25 εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις <u>καὶ ἡ</u>
<u>ζωή·</u> ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ κἂν ἀποθάνῃ ζήσεται,

<u>omit:</u> P45, l, Sy-S, Sy-Pal^{ms}, Diatess^{Ephrem}, Cyprian († 258)

Sy-C has a lacuna.

Ephrem (McCarthy): "I am the resurrection. Whoever believes in me, even if he dies, yet shall he live."

Clement: διὸ καὶ φησίν ὁ κύριος· <u>ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ζωή·</u>

Or Com. Mt 12:33 (2 times), 13:9, 15:12, Kat.frgm. 209
καὶ ἔστιν ἡ μὲν ζωή ὁ εἰπών· "<u>ἐγώ εἰμι καὶ ἡ ζωή·</u>"
(Origen cites all five times the short form, omitting ἡ ἀνάστασις.)
But: Or Com. Jo (28, 9, 71): ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις <u>καὶ ἡ ζωή·</u>

Cyprian (De Mortalitate 21): ipso Christo Domino et Deo nostro monente et dicente: Ego sum resurrectio. Qui credit in me, licet moriatur, uiuet et omnis qui uiuit et credit in me non morietur in aeterum.

Codex a (Vercellensis) apparently reads: "Dixit illi IHS. Ego in me etsi mortuus fuerit vivet." It omits εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή· ὁ πιστεύων, possibly due to parablepsis (ει – ει).
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 14:6 λέγει αὐτῷ [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· <u>ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια</u>
<u>καὶ ἡ ζωή·</u> οὐδεὶς ἔρχεται πρὸς τὸν πατέρα εἰ μὴ δι' ἐμοῦ.

Compare previous verses:
NA28 John 11:23 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>ἀναστήσεται</u> ὁ ἀδελφός σου.
NA28 John 11:24 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ Μάρθα· οἶδα ὅτι ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῇ
<u>ἀναστάσει</u> ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

There is no reason for an omission. B. Aland suggests "durch den Kontext bedingte Auslassung?" = "omission stimulated by context?".

It is possible that the word has been omitted, because in the previous verses the resurrection alone was discussed. And then, in this verse, the emphasis is on the *I*: "I am the resurrection!"

A strange diversity of witnesses (Metzger: "puzzling"). Possibly liturgical usage? Note Clement, who omits ἡ ἀνάστασις.

Compare:
B. Aland "Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium", in: Recent Developments in Textual Criticism. hrsg. von W. Weren und D.-A. Koch, Assen 2003, 19-38.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 195

NA28 John 11:31 οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ παραμυθούμενοι αὐτήν, ἰδόντες τὴν Μαριὰμ ὅτι ταχέως ἀνέστη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν, ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῇ **δόξαντες** ὅτι ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον ἵνα κλαύσῃ ἐκεῖ.

BYZ John 11:31 οἱ οὖν Ἰουδαῖοι οἱ ὄντες μετ αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ καὶ παραμυθούμενοι αὐτήν ἰδόντες τὴν Μαρίαν, ὅτι ταχέως ἀνέστη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῇ **λέγοντες**, ὅτι ὑπάγει εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον ἵνα κλαύσῃ ἐκεῖ

Byz   P66, A, C^{C2}, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f13^b, 397, Maj, Lat, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, sa, ac^2, goth

txt   (P75), 01, B, C*, D, L, W, X, 0141, f1, f13^{a,c}, 22, (33), 157, 579, 700, 1241, al, d, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, bo, arm, geo
      δοξάζοντες P75, 33

Lacuna: P45, 565
B: no umlaut

δοξάζοντες   δοξάζω   "praise, honor, glorify"
δόξαντες   δοκέω   "think, suppose"

"They followed her because they _thought_ that she was going to the tomb to weep there."

Compare:
NA28 John 11:13 εἰρήκει δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς περὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ <u>ἔδοξαν</u> ὅτι περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως τοῦ ὕπνου λέγει.
   ἔλεγον X

δοξάζοντες by P75, 33 is clearly a transcriptional error.
It is possible that δόξαντες has been changed to λέγοντες because δόξαντες reminds one of δοξάζω which is clearly inappropriate. That this connection happened can be seen at P75 and that this problem has been felt can be seen as early as P66.
It is also possible, as Metzger suggests, that nobody can know what the Jews thought, only what they said. He notes a similar case where in Jo 11:13 X reads ἔλεγον instead of ἔδοξαν.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) comments: "The variant λέγοντες is rather better attested and perfectly suitable. It means δοκοῦντες, *thinking*, as it does also in MGk."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 196

80. Difficult variant

NA28 John 11:32 Ἡ οὖν Μαριὰμ ὡς ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν Ἰησοῦς ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τοὺς πόδας λέγουσα αὐτῷ· κύριε, εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ ἄν μου ἀπέθανεν ὁ ἀδελφός.

BYZ John 11:32 ἡ οὖν Μαρία, ὡς ἦλθεν ὅπου ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἰδοῦσα αὐτὸν ἔπεσεν αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς πόδας λέγουσα αὐτῷ Κύριε εἰ ἦς ὧδε οὐκ ἄν ἀπέθανεν μου ὁ ἀδελφός

Byz   P66, A, C^{C3}, Δ, Θ, 0141, 0211, 0250, f13, Maj
txt   P75^{vid}, 01, B, C*, D, L, W, X, Ψ, f1, 33, 157, 397, 579, 1241, al

P75: reads […]ς but space considerations make πρὸς much more likely.
Lacuna: P45, 565
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 18:29 πεσὼν οὖν ὁ σύνδουλος αὐτοῦ _____
BYZ Matthew 18:29 πεσὼν οὖν ὁ σύνδουλος αὐτοῦ <u>εἰς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ</u>
Byz   C^c, W, f13, 33, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, mae-1+2
txt   01, B, C*, D, L, Θ, 058, f1, 124(=f13), 579, 700, 892, 1424, al,
       Lat, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo

NA28 Mark 5:22 καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν πίπτει <u>πρὸς τοὺς πόδας</u> αὐτοῦ
safe!
NA28 Mark 7:25 ἐλθοῦσα προσέπεσεν <u>πρὸς τοὺς πόδας</u> αὐτοῦ·
                          700: <u>εἰς τοὺς πόδας</u>

NA28 Luke 10:11 καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν <u>εἰς τοὺς πόδας</u> ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν·
BYZ Luke 10:11 καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν _____ ἀπομασσόμεθα ὑμῖν·
Byz   Δ, Λ, 124, 174, 230, 346, 788(=f13), 2, 28, 565, Maj, vg
txt   P45, P75, 01, A, B, C, D, G, K, Π, L, M, R, U, W, Θ, Ξ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157,
       579, 700, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, al, it, Sy

NA28 Luke 10:39 [ἣ] καὶ παρακαθεσθεῖσα <u>πρὸς τοὺς πόδας</u> τοῦ κυρίου
BYZ Luke 10:39 ἣ καὶ παρακαθίσασα <u>παρὰ τοὺς πόδας</u> τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,

NA28 Luke 15:22 καὶ ὑποδήματα εἰς τοὺς πόδας   safe!

Compare also LXX:
LXX Judith 10:4 καὶ ἔλαβεν σανδάλια εἰς τοὺς πόδας
          "She put sandals on her feet"

Both εἰς and πρὸς τοὺς πόδας are used in the Gospels. Although the phrase with εἰς sounds slightly strange, it is possibly idiomatic.
Is it possible to translate this as: "when she saw him she felt into his feet"?

Again (as in 10:29) this is one of the cases suggested by Metzger ("Lucianic recension", 1959) where one could have an old relict of the earliest Antiochian text. Not necessarily correct, but at least older than any possible recension.

Compare:
Marie-Luise Lakmann "Papyrus XIV-XV (P75) Neue Fragmente"
Museum Helveticum 64 (2007) 22-41

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 197

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:33 Ἰησοῦς οὖν ὡς εἶδεν αὐτὴν κλαίουσαν καὶ τοὺς συνελθόντας αὐτῇ Ἰουδαίους κλαίοντας, <u>ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν</u>

<u>ἐταράχθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐνεβριμώμενος</u>
P45, P66ᶜ, D, Θ, f1, 22, 1210, pc, d, p, sa, ac², arm
conturbatus est spiritu, sicut era plenus   d
   turbatus est spiritu, commotus   p

<u>ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>   047

1582: There is a tilde sign ~ above ἐταράχθη and the normal text is given in the margin. Above it is a special sign, a combination of πρ, of which Amy Anderson (f1, p. 19) says that it is "the typical mark for the citation of a father". Possibly Origen?
Lacuna: 565
B: no umlaut

ταράσσω   "trouble, disturb, upset; terrify, frighten"
ἐμβριμάομαι 1. "speak harshly to, criticize harshly, scold, indignant";
                  2. "be deeply moved" **?**

Compare:
NA28 John 11:38 Ἰησοῦς οὖν <u>πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ</u> ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον·

Note also "Secret Mark": καὶ <u>ὀργισθεὶς</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀπῆλθεν μετ' αυτῆς εἰς τὸν κῆπον ὅπου ἦν τὸ μνημεῖον

A similar case appeared at:
NA28 John 2:15
καὶ ποιήσας   φραγέλλιον   01, A, B, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, Or
καὶ ποιήσας <u>ὡς</u> φραγέλλιον

                  P66, P75, G, L, N, Wˢ, X, 0162, f1, 33, 565,
                  892, 1241, al, Lat, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, Orˢᵘᵖ

Difficult to translate. Possibly:

txt   "he became indignant/angry in spirit and got disturbed"
P45:   "he was disturbed in spirit, like being angry"

Origen writes (PG, Fragmenta in evangelium Joannis, in catenis):
Μακρὰν μὲν τυγχάνων τοῦ μνημείου <u>ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι</u>. ὅτε δὲ ἐγγὺς γίνεται τῷ νεκρῷ, οὐκέτι ἐμβριμᾶται τῷ πνεύματι, ἀλλὰ συνέχει ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὴν ἐμβρίμησιν. διὸ λέγεται· Ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔρχεται εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον.

Carl Conrad wrote on the bgreek mailing list (04. Aug. 2002):
> LSJ-Glare indicates a fundamental sense applicable to horses, "snort in" (the citation is from Aristophanes, hIPPOUS EN AMPUKTHRSIN EMBRIMWMENAS with an added rfc. to Lucian in that sense--so that its most common usage would be metaphorical for "express anger or disdain" as indicated by gesture or snorting. The article also cites LXX Lam. 2:6 in the sense "indignation," and EMBRIMHSIS in the same sense from several extra-biblical sources. In John 11:33 my sense of what the text is saying that Jesus saw the women weeping and immediately felt an inner indignation at this reaction to what was not a final death of Lazarus. It's as if, in English at least, we might say, "he saw the women weeping and said to himself (though nobody else heard him), 'Humph!'"

It appears therefore that ἐμβριμάομαι has always a tone of anger in it and that "being deeply moved" is probably not an entirely correct rendering.
Thus the ἐμβριμάομαι, indicating an angry Jesus, caused a problem and has been softened by inserting ὡς. Interesting is the combination of witnesses.

Note the similar case at 2:15.

This is one of the cases where the original scribe of P66 changed deliberately one reading into another, very probably from a different manuscript. P75 has the normal reading.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes: "The words ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν, i.e. ἐταράχθη ἐν αὐτῷ, are probably a glossa, for they mean nothing different to ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι, i.e. ἐνεβριμήσατο ἐν ἑαυτῷ (cf. v. 38), *was agitated within himself*."

Compare:
C. Story "The mental attitude of Jesus at Bethany. Jo 11:33, 38" NTS 37 (1991) 51-66.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 198

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:39 λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἄρατε τὸν λίθον. λέγει αὐτῷ <u>ἡ</u>
<u>ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος</u> Μάρθα· κύριε, ἤδη ὄζει, τεταρταῖος γάρ
ἐστιν.

<u>omit:</u> Θ, it(aur, b, c, e, ff², l, **9A**), Sy-S, ac²

Lat(a, d, f, r¹, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: 565
B: no umlaut

Martha appears in Jo 11:1, 5, 19, 20, 21, 24, 30, 39; 12:2
The addition of "the sister of the dead man", is not necessary, because Martha
has been mentioned several times before. It is possible therefore that the
words have been omitted as superfluous. There is no reason for an addition.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 199

NA28 John 11:41 <u>ἦραν</u> οὖν τὸν λίθον. _____ ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς <u>ἦρεν</u> τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω καὶ εἶπεν· πάτερ, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου.

BYZ John 11:41 ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον <u>**οὗ ἦν ὁ τεθνηκὼς κειμένος.**</u> ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἦρεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω καὶ εἶπεν Πάτερ εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι ἤκουσάς μου

Only Byz in NA!

Byz   C^{C3}, Δ, 0141, f13, 700, 892^{S}, 1424, Maj

txt   P59^{vid}(7th CE), P66, P75^{vid}, 01, B, C*, (D), L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0233, 33, 157, 1241, pc, Lat, Sy, sa, ac², arm
       ὅτε οὖν ἦραν τὸν λίθον   D, pc

<u>οὗ ἦν</u>   A, K, Π, 0211, 0250, f1, 22, 579, al, f, Sy-H, goth
<u>ὅπου ἦν</u>   1071, pc
<u>ὅπου ἔκειτο</u>   pc, bo

P59 not in NA, but in IGNTP. The reading is not completely clear.

ΤΗΝ Δ[ΟΞΑΝ ΤΟΥ Θ̅Υ̅ ΗΡ]**ΑΝ**
[ΟΥ]**Ν Τ**[ΟΝ ΛΙΘΟΝ .....] **Ο Ι**[C̅
ΤΟΥ[C̅ ΟΦΘΑΛΜΟΥC ΑΝω]

The papyrus reads … ὁ Ις τοὺ[ς … This is a singular reading. There is space for about 4 letters in the lacuna. The editors of the Ed. pr. reconstruct:
41 ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον. <u>ἦρεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς</u> ὀφθαλμοὺς
This would fit the space. Whatever the exact wording in the lacuna was, it is clear that the words οὗ ἦν ὁ τεθνηκὼς κειμένος were not included.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Lacuna: 565
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 11:38 Ἰησοῦς οὖν πάλιν ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἔρχεται εἰς <u>τὸ μνημεῖον· ἦν δὲ σπήλαιον καὶ λίθος ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ.</u>

Note also "Secret Mark": καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς <u>ἀπεύλισεν τὸν λίθον</u> ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου·

Compare also:
NA28 John 8:59 <u>ἦραν οὖν λίθους</u> ἵνα βάλωσιν ἐπ’ αὐτόν
      "So they took up stones to throw at him"
NA28 John 11:39 λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>ἄρατε τὸν λίθον</u>
      "Take away the stone."
NA28 John 20:1 καὶ βλέπει <u>τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον</u> ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου.
      "the stone having been taken away from the tomb"

αἴρω here: "take away"
The stone and the tomb have already been mentioned before in verse 38. So there is no need to explain what stone is meant. Possibly stylistic reasons?

Note also the double appearance of ἦραν / ἦρεν: They lifted up the stone and Jesus lifted up his eyes.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 200

<u>81.</u>   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 11:44 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκὼς δεδεμένος τοὺς πόδας καὶ τὰς χεῖρας κειρίαις καὶ ἡ ὄψις αὐτοῦ σουδαρίῳ περιεδέδετο.
λέγει <u>αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>· λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἄφετε αὐτὸν ὑπάγειν.

<u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς</u>

     P75, B, C*, L, W, <u>[Trg^{mg}]</u>, [WH]
     <u>omit ὁ:</u>   P75, B, C*
     Trg^{mg} and WH have ὁ in brackets.

txt   P45, P66, 01, A, C^{C2}, D, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj

<u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς</u>   700
<u>αὐτοῖς</u>   157

C*: C is given in NA as above; it is listed in IGNTP as having a lacuna of 9 letters. Swanson does not list a correction and notes C for txt, so also Tischendorf ("vid"). R. Lyon writes: "αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, probably, for Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς. I am quite certain of this although I have not seen any letters well enough to place them without brackets. To include the article would crowd the text. Also, a ς, smaller than the rest of the text, indicates the text has been corrected, although Tischendorf notes nothing of the corrector's hand. Furthermore the horizontal line for the nomina sacra is seen at both the beginning and end of the space. The former is almost certainly by the original scribe."
Lacuna: 892
B: no umlaut

The phrase λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς appears 5 more times in John (Jo 2:7; 4:34; 8:39 (D omits αὐτοῖς); 21:10; 21:12), always basically safe! Therefore it appears probable that here something was different.
It should be noted that h.t. may have happened:

ΑΥΤΟΙϹΟΙϹ

This caused probably in the omissions in 157 and 700.

It is basically possible that at a very early stage of the transmission a scribe accidentally omitted αὐτοῖς or ὁ Ἰησοῦς and that the words have been added subsequently at the wrong position.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 201

Difficult variant

NA28 John 11:44 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· λύσατε <u>αὐτὸν</u> καὶ ἄφετε <u>**αὐτὸν**</u> ὑπάγειν.

BYZ John 11:44 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· λύσατε <u>αὐτὸν</u> καὶ ἄφετε _____ ὑπάγειν

Byz   01, A, C^{C2}, D, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy, arm, Ir^{Lat}

txt   P45, $P59^{vid}$, P66, P75, B, C*, L, Θ, 33, 157, 579, pc,
      ff^2, Sy-Pal, Co, goth, Or, [Trg]

P59: Both the editors of the ed. pr. and IGNTP reconstruct with αὐτὸν. It is required by the space.

[ΑΥΤΟΙC ΛΥCΑΤΕ ΑΥΤΟΝ] ΚΑΙ
[ΑΦΕΤΕ ΑΥΤΟΝ ΥΠ]ΑΓΕΙΝ
[ΠΟΛΛΟΙ ΟΥ]Ν ΕΚ Τ[ΩΝ] ΙΟΥ

Lacuna: 565
B: no umlaut

Normally it is the Byzantine text that adds personal pronouns. It is possible that it has been omitted as superfluous to improve style. It is also possible that it has been added to make the saying more symmetrical.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 202

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:45 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαριὰμ καὶ θεασάμενοι <u>ἃ ἐποίησεν</u> ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν·

<u>ὃ ἐποίησεν</u>
  P66*vid, A^C, B, C, D, f1, pc, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>
  <u>ὃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον</u>   C^C2

txt   P6(4th CE), P45, 01, A*, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f13, 33, Maj, <u>Trg^mg</u>
  <u>ὅσα ἐποίησεν</u>   P66^C, 0141, pc

Lacuna: 892
B: no umlaut

ἃ   accusative neuter plural
ὅσα accusative neuter plural
ὃ   accusative neuter singular

Compare next verse 46:
NA28 John 11:46 τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς <u>ἃ ἐποίησεν</u> Ἰησοῦς.
        <u>ὃ</u>   C, D, M, f13-part, pc
        <u>ὅσα</u> A, K, Π, Υ, Λ, f13-part, pc

Compare:
NA28 John 6:14 Οἱ οὖν ἄνθρωποι ἰδόντες <u>ὃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖον</u> ἔλεγον ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.
<u>ἃ ἐποίησεν σημεῖα</u>   P75, B, 091(6th CE), pc, <u>WH</u>

NA28 John 15:14 ὑμεῖς φίλοι μού ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε <u>ἃ ἐγὼ</u> ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν.
<u>ὃ</u>   B, 579, pc
<u>ἃ</u>   P66, 01, D, L, X, f1, f13, 565, 1071, pc
<u>ὅσα</u> A, Θ, Ψ, 0250, 33, Maj

John uses ἃ with ποιέω 6 times elsewhere safe, but only once ὃ (13:27).
Both the singular and the plural refer to the raising of Lazarus. Probably the singular is a correction. Note that C^C2 additionally adds σημεῖον.
The support for the singular is curiously diverse.

Compare discussion at Jo 4:29 above and 15:14 below.
Weiss (Com. John) thinks that ἃ is a conformation to verse 46.

Metzger: "the majority of the committee thought it more likely that copyists replaced ἃ with the singular because the context speaks of Jesus' having performed one σημεῖον."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 203

Difficult variant

NA28 John 11:50 οὐδὲ   λογίζεσθε ὅτι συμφέρει <u>ὑμῖν</u> ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται.

BYZ John 11:50 οὐδὲ διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι συμφέρει <u>ἡμῖν</u> ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος ἀποθάνῃ ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται

Byz   A, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892s, 1071, Maj,
       c, f, r¹, vg^{St, WW}, Sy, sa, ac², arm, geo, Or, [<u>Trg^{mg}</u>]

txt   P45, P66, B, D, L, M, X, Γ, 0233, 346, 1241, 1424, al, it, vg^{Cl}, bo

<u>omit:</u> 01, pc, L950, sa^{ms}, pbo, fathers, Photius

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

"You do not understand that it is better for <u>you</u>"
"You do not understand that it is better for <u>us</u>"

Compare previous verse 49:
NA28 John 11:49 εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καϊάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· <u>ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν,</u>

Compare also:
NA28 John 18:14 ἦν δὲ Καϊάφας ὁ συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι <u>συμφέρει</u> ἕνα ἄνθρωπον ἀποθανεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ.
"Caiaphas was the one who had advised the Jews that it was better to have one person die for the people."

The exchange of ὑμῖν / ἡμῖν is a typical and widespread error in Greek manuscripts. Both words make good sense here, although ἡμῖν makes slightly better sense, because why should Kaiaphas exclude himself from the group? It is possible that ὑμῖν is a conformation to the previous verse 49: <u>ὑμεῖς</u> οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν.

The omission is possibly inspired by 18:14, where also no pronoun appears.

Compare:

- Boismard RB 57 (1950) 401-8
- J.N. Birdsall "Photius and the text of the fourth Gospel" NTS 4 (1957-8) 61-3

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 204

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:51 τοῦτο δὲ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν <u>τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου</u> ἐπροφήτευσεν ὅτι ἔμελλεν Ἰησοῦς ἀποθνῄσκειν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἔθνους,

<u>τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ</u>   P66, D^{Gr} (d has txt: anni illius)

<u>omit:</u>   P45, e, l, Sy-S

P6(4th CE) reads txt.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 11:49 εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν Καϊάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν <u>τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου</u>, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς οὐκ οἴδατε οὐδέν,

The omission of ἐκείνου has possibly been omitted due to h.t.

The complete omission is probably due to the fact that it has already been mentioned in verse 49 and is thus considered redundant.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 205

Minority reading:
NA28 John 11:54 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς οὐκέτι παρρησίᾳ περιεπάτει ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, ἀλλὰ ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖθεν εἰς τὴν χώραν ___ ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐρήμου, εἰς Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην πόλιν, κἀκεῖ ἔμεινεν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν.

    Σαμφούρειν   D
      Sapfurim   d

P66* reads: ἐγγὺς τῆς ἐρήμου, ___ Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην ____, κἀκεῖ
B: no umlaut

Unknown name.
Sepphoris is excluded by its geographical position, but see below.
WH: "perhaps a local tradition".

JR Harris (Codex Bezae, 1891, p. 184) thinks it is possibly a corruption from the Syriac. That the words εἰς Ἐφραὶμ λεγομένην πόλιν in Syriac could be read as "the city of Samphurim". He notes a similar case where Ephrem in his Diatessaron commentary reads "whose name is Gerizim" as "Samgriazim".
Harris write: "In this last case Mar Ephraem is evidently perplexed about the name which, if his text had been quite clear, would have needed no comment; that is, he found it in the text upon which he had been working, and we have therefore to suggest that Tatian had inserted the name of the mountain in his text. Such a proceeding would be quite in harmony with many of his other expansions and elucidations of the Scripture. But this drives us back to the first case; for the two belong so suspiciously together that we are obliged to ask whether Σαμφούρειν is not also a corruption of a Tatian text."

Zahn rejects those speculations and has a more simple explanation:
According to him Sepphoris is meant. This of course does not fit the Judean setting in John, but it is quite possible that a scribe confused the Judean Ephraim with the Galilean one, which is about 10 miles south of Sepphoris.

Compare:
Theodor Zahn "Zur Heimatkunde des Ev. Joh." Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift 1908, p. 31-39

TVU 206

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:1 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἓξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς.

πέντε P66*

    P66ᶜ: There are superior dots over the ΠΕΝ, the ΤΕ has been scraped out and ΕΞ written over it.

Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 11:39 λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἄρατε τὸν λίθον. λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ τετελευτηκότος Μάρθα· κύριε, ἤδη ὄζει, <u>τεταρταῖος</u> γάρ ἐστιν.

Is it possible that the scribe remembered "four" from 11:39 and accidentally wrote "five"?

Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 430) suggests that perhaps the scribe misread the ε of εξ as numeral ε = 5, and wrote πέντε. Sometimes there is a rough breathing above the ε (so. e.g. in P75, Jo 2:6, 20), which may be the cause for this confusion.
Scrivener notes two other cases of πέντε for εξ (Heracleon at Jo 2:20 and A in Acts 27:37).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 207

NA28 John 12:1 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἒξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν, ὅπου ἦν <u>Λάζαρος</u>, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν Ἰησοῦς.

BYZ John 12:1 Ὁ οὖν Ἰησοῦς πρὸ ἒξ ἡμερῶν τοῦ πάσχα ἦλθεν εἰς Βηθανίαν ὅπου ἦν <u>Λάζαρος ὁ τεθνηκώς</u>, ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν

"Lazarus, the dead"

Byz   P66, A, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
      Lat(b, d, f, ff², vg), Sy-S, Sy-H, bo, ac², goth, [Trg]

txt   01, B, L, W, X, pc,
      it(a, aur, c, e, r¹), Sy-P, Sy-Pal, sa, bo^ms

Lacuna: P75, C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 11:21 οὐκ ἂν <u>ἀπέθανεν</u> ὁ ἀδελφός μου·
BYZ John 11:21 ὁ ἀδελφός μου οὐκ ἂν <u>ἐτεθνήκει</u>

NA28 John 11:39 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ <u>τετελευτηκότος</u> Μάρθα·
BYZ John 11:39 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τοῦ <u>τεθνηκότος</u> Μάρθα

NA28 John 11:41 <u>ἦραν</u> οὖν τὸν λίθον.
BYZ John 11:41 ἦραν οὖν τὸν λίθον <u>οὗ ἦν ὁ τεθνηκὼς κείμενος.</u>

NA28 John 11:44 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ <u>τεθνηκὼς</u> δεδεμένος

NA28 John 12:2 ἐποίησαν οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἡ Μάρθα διηκόνει, <u>ὁ δὲ Λάζαρος</u> εἶς ἦν ἐκ τῶν ἀνακειμένων σὺν αὐτῷ.

It is quite probable that the words have been deleted as inappropriate and superfluous. First, he is not dead anymore and second immediately following are the words "whom he had raised from the dead". This is typically repetitive Johannine style.
On the other hand it is possible that the words have been added for some lectionary purposes, although this must have been quite early (P66).

Ross notes a stylistic consideration, namely that John normally inserts the article before the noun, unless the name is followed by other words in apposition (e.g. ἡ Μάρθα, but Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης). "Had John intended the shorter version he would have written ὁ Λάζαρος, as in verse 2."

Compare:
J.M. Ross "Some unnoticed points in the text of the NT" NovT 25 (1983) 59-72

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 208

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:3 Ἡ οὖν Μαριὰμ λαβοῦσα λίτραν μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς πολυτίμου ἤλειψεν τοὺς <u>πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ</u> καὶ ἐξέμαξεν ταῖς θριξὶν αὐτῆς <u>**τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ·**</u> ἡ δὲ οἰκία ἐπληρώθη ἐκ τῆς ὀσμῆς τοῦ μύρου.

Not in NA but in SQE!

<u>**omit:**</u> f1, 565, 1071, pc, Sy-S, ac², pbo, bo, Codex Fuldensis

ταῖς θριξὶν <u>τῆς κεφαλῆς</u> αὐτῆς: X, 065, 0233 (from Lk 7:38)
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Probably omitted as redundant.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 209

NA28 John 12:4 λέγει δὲ <u>Ἰούδας</u> ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης εἷς [ἐκ] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι·

BYZ John 12:4 λέγει οὖν εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ <u>Ἰούδας Σίμωνος</u> Ἰσκαριώτης ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι

Byz   A, (D), Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 565, Maj, it, Sy-H, bo, goth
     <u>Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου</u>   Ψ
     <u>Ἰούδας Σίμων ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης</u>   G, H, U, pc
     <u>Ἰούδας   ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης</u>   0233, f1, 565, pc
     <u>Ἰούδας   ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D
     <u>Ἰούδας Σίμωνος</u> Ἰσκαριώτης <u>εἷς ὢν ἐκ τῶν δώδεκα</u>   157

txt   P66, P75^vid, 01, B, L, W, 0217, f1, 33, 579, 1241, pc,
     d, vg, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, sa, ac², arm

Tregelles, remarkably, has in the margin: "Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτης ante εἷς τῶν μαθητῶν". There is no manuscript evidence for this. Perhaps he meant "post"?
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:71 ἔλεγεν δὲ τὸν Ἰούδαν <u>Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου·</u>
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   01*, Θ, f13, Sy-H^mg
                 corr. by 01^C2
<u>Σκαριώθ</u>   D, it

NA28 John 13:2 καὶ δείπνου γινομένου, τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας <u>Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου,</u>
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D, e

NA28 John 13:26 βάψας οὖν τὸ ψωμίον [λαμβάνει καὶ] δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ <u>Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου.</u>
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D
<u>omit Σίμωνος:</u>   69, 788(=f13)

NA28 John 14:22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ <u>Ἰσκαριώτης·</u>
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυώτου</u>   D

The addition of Σίμωνος is the norm in John. There is no reason for an omission here. It has probably been added to harmonize it with standard Johannine usage.

Note also that here we have (ὁ) Ἰσκαριώτης against Ἰσκαριώτου in the other occurrences.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 210

85. <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 12:4 λέγει δὲ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης εἷς **[ἐκ]** τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ, ὁ μέλλων αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι·

<u>omit</u> P66, P75^{vid}, B, L, Q, W, 33, 157, 579, pc, <u>**NA²⁵**</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>SBL</u>
txt   01, A, D, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 1241, Maj, L844

Lacuna: C, 892
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:8 λέγει αὐτῷ <u>εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν</u> αὐτοῦ   safe!

NA28 John 6:66 Ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ <u>[ἐκ] τῶν μαθητῶν</u> αὐτοῦ
<u>omit</u> ἐκ: 01, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj
<u>add</u> ἐκ: P66, B, G, T, f1, 33, 157, 565, pc

NA28 John 6:71 <u>εἷς ἐκ τῶν</u> δώδεκα.
<u>omit</u> ἐκ: 28, 157

NA28 John 7:25 Ἔλεγον οὖν <u>τινες ἐκ τῶν</u> Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν·
<u>omit</u> ἐκ: 01, K, Γ

NA28 John 7:48 μή <u>τις ἐκ τῶν</u> ἀρχόντων
<u>omit</u> ἐκ: K, W, f13

NA28 John 11:19 πολλοὶ δὲ <u>ἐκ τῶν</u> Ἰουδαίων
<u>omit</u> ἐκ: Θ, 346

NA28 John 11:45 Πολλοὶ οὖν <u>ἐκ τῶν</u> Ἰουδαίων
<u>omit</u> ἐκ: D, f1

NA28 John 12:2 ὁ δὲ Λάζαρος **εἷς** ἦν **ἐκ τῶν** ἀνακειμένων σὺν αὐτῷ.
<u>omit</u> **ἐκ:**   A, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
<u>add</u> **ἐκ:**   P66, 01, B, L

NA28 John 12:9 Ἔγνω οὖν [ὁ] ὄχλος πολὺς <u>ἐκ τῶν</u> Ἰουδαίων
<u>omit</u> ἐκ: P66, W, 157, (579)

NA28 John 12:20 Ἦσαν δὲ Ἕλληνές τινες ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων
omit ἐκ: 700, 1424

NA28 John 13:23 ἦν ἀνακείμενος εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ
omit ἐκ: U, Θ, Λ, f1, 28, 700, 1424, Maj-part

John uses the phrase εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ two times elsewhere, but never without ἐκ elsewhere. The usage εἷς τῶν appears 12 times in the Synoptics, but only once in John (19:34 safe). Compare:
NA28 Mark 13:1 ... λέγει αὐτῷ εἷς τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ·

As can be seen from the ἐκ τῶν examples above, the omission of ἐκ is frequent, mostly by Western/Majority MSS.
In the immediately preceding context (12:2) a similarly divided case appears.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 211

NA28 John 12:7 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἄφες αὐτήν, <u>ἵνα</u> εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου <u>τηρήσῃ</u> αὐτό·

BYZ John 12:7 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ῎Αφες αὐτήν ____ εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου <u>τετηρήκεν</u> αὐτό·

Byz   A, Δ, 0141, f1, f13, Maj, f, Sy-P, Sy-H, goth

txt   P66, P75, 01, B, D, K, Π, L, Q, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0211, 0217, 33, 579, 1241, al, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H^{mg}, Co, arm

<u>ἵνα τί … τηρήσῃ</u>   cj. (W. Kühne)

<u>ἵνα … ποιήσῃ</u>   cj. (P. Schmiedel)

Lacuna: C
B: umlaut! (1368 C 15 L)   <u>εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἄφες αὐτήν</u>, ἵνα

B: umlaut! (1368 C 15 L)   μου τη<u>ρήσῃ αὐτό·</u> 8 <u>τοὺς πτω</u>χοὺς

τηρήσῃ   subjunctive aorist   active 3rd person singular
τετηρήκεν   indicative   perfect active 3rd person singular
            "keep, hold, reserve, preserve"

Compare:
NA28 John 2:10 σὺ <u>τετήρηκας</u> τὸν καλὸν οἶνον ἕως ἄρτι.

The txt reading is rather difficult to understand. It is probably idiomatic with the meaning:
"Let her alone, it was that she might keep it for the day of my burial."

The Byzantine reading on the other hand is:
"Let her alone, she has kept it for the day of my burial."

The Byzantine reading is what one might have expected. The txt reading is paradoxical: On the one hand Mary has broken the bottle and the oil is gone, on the other hand she should keep it for his burial.
Is it possible that John intended the meaning of Byz, but wrote txt?

W. Kühne suggests the following conjecture:
ἵνα τί εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό·
"Why should she keep it … ?"

Zahn (Comm. Jo) suggests that the txt reading is difficult, because a) the anointing at Jesus burial did not happen due to his resurrection and b) a Mary of Bethany is not mentioned with the women at the tomb.
Zahn explains the difficult text so that Mary did not use all of the oil but retained some of it.

Compare:
W. Kühne "Eine kritische Studie zu Jo 12:7" TSK 98-99 (1926) 476-7

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 212

86.   **Difficult variant**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 12:7 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἄφες αὐτήν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό·

NA28 John 12:8 <u>τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.</u>

NA28 John 12:9 Ἔγνω οὖν [ὁ] ὄχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων

<u>omit verse:</u>   D, d, Sy-S
<u>omit μεθ' ... ἔχετε:</u>   P75, 892ˢ*, Λ*, pc (h.t.)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

Parallels:

NA28 Matthew 26:11 πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε·

NA28 Mark 14:7 πάντοτε γὰρ τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἔχετε μεθ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ ὅταν θέλητε δύνασθε αὐτοῖς εὖ ποιῆσαι, ἐμὲ δὲ οὐ πάντοτε ἔχετε.

There is no reason for an omission.
It is possible that the words have been added as a harmonization to Mt/Mk.

Streeter ("Four Gospels", p. 411) thinks that the verse is an assimilation to Mt/Mk.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 213

NA28 John 12:9 Ἔγνω οὖν **[ὁ]** ὄχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
BYZ John 12:9 Ἔγνω οὖν __ ὄχλος πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων

Byz   P66*, P75, 01^C?, A, B^c2, Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 28^c, 33, 157, Maj,
      Co, Weiss, Trg, SBL
      Ὄχλος δὲ πολὺς ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἤκουσαν   D, it, Sy-P, sa^mss, ac²
      Ἔγνω οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὄχλος πολὺς   700

txt   P66^c, 01*, B*, L, W, 047, 0250, 28*, 579, 892^S, 1241, pc,
      bo^ms, arm, geo, [Trg^mg]
      ὁ ὄχλος ὁ πολὺς   P66^c, W, 0250, 1010, pc
      Ἔγνω οὖν ὁ ὄχλος τῶν Ἰουδαίων   579, arm, geo

UBS has 157 erroneously for ὁ ὄχλος against NA, Swanson and Hoskier's
collation (JTS 1913). Checked at the film.
01: There is an unusual dot above the letter. It is probably accidental, but it
cannot be ruled out completely, that it is a deletion sign. Tischendorf, Swanson,
IGNTP and the online transcription note nothing, but NA does.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

For other minutiae see also Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 508-9). He checked 579 from microfilm
and several others.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut
In B the ὁ is left unenhanced (= B³).

Similar:
NA28 John 12:12 Τῇ ἐπαύριον ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς ὁ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν
ἑορτήν, ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα

BYZ John 12:12 Τῇ ἐπαύριον __ ὄχλος πολὺς ὁ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν
ἀκούσαντες ὅτι ἔρχεται Ἰησοῦς εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα

Byz   P2, 01, A, D, Q, W, Ψ, f1, 28, 33, 157, 579, 700, 892^S, 1071, 1424, Maj
txt   P66*, B, L, f13, pc, Weiss
      ὁ ὄχλος ὁ πολὺς   P66^c, Θ

The reading of 892^S has been confirmed by Royse (p. 407) from the microfilm.
B: no umlaut

Metzger writes: "But the expression ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς serving as a subject of a verb is such unusual Greek (with πολὺς in the predicate position) that serious doubts arise whether the evangelist could have written it thus."

Robertson writes in his "wordpictures":

ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς: This is the right reading with the article ὁ, literally, "the people much or in large numbers." One is reminded of the French idiom. Gildersleeve (Syntax, p. 284) gives a few rare examples of the idiom ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀγατός. Westcott suggests that ὄχλος πολὺς came to be regarded as a compound noun. This is the usual order in the N.T. rather than πολὺς ὄχλος (Robertson, Grammar, p. 774). Mark (Mr 12:37) has ho πολὺς ὄχλος. Moulton (Proleg., p. 84) terms ὁ ὄχλος πολὺς here and in verse 12 "a curious misplacement of the article." John's use of ὄχλος is usually the common crowd as "riff-raff."

The reading of P66 et al. clearly shows that the ὁ was originally present. What other reason could there be to explain this variety of readings?
A check of all occurrences of ὄχλος in John shows that from time to time some manuscripts omit the article before ὄχλος, but never add it, if not originally present.
So, overall and especially in this case a secondary addition of the article is very unlikely.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
        (remove brackets in NA!)

TVU 214

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:17 ἐμαρτύρει οὖν ὁ ὄχλος ὁ ὢν μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ <u>ὅτε</u> τὸν Λάζαρον ἐφώνησεν ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου καὶ ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

<u>ὅτι</u>   P66, D, E*, K, Π, L, 579, al, L640,
        it(a, b, c, d, ff², l, r¹), vg^mss, Sy-P, Co, <u>Trg^mg</u>
        quia   b, c, ff², vg^mss
        quoniam a, d, e
        quod   r¹

<u>πῶς</u>   Sy-S

Lat(aur, f, vg) read txt ("quando").
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

"It were testifying the crowd that had been with him **_when_** he called Lazarus out of the tomb"
"It were testifying the crowd that had been with him **_that_** he called Lazarus out of the tomb"

Compare next verse 18:
NA28 John 12:18 διὰ τοῦτο [καὶ] ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ <u>ὁ ὄχλος</u>, ὅτι ἤκουσαν τοῦτο αὐτὸν πεποιηκέναι τὸ σημεῖον.

Metzger argues that the txt reading is more difficult because it could be taken as referring to two crowds: one that had been with him and another that is following him in verse 18.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 96) thinks that the ὅτε has been changed into ὅτι because an object was missing for the ἐμαρτύρει.

Compare 12:41 also.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 215

87. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 12:19 οἱ οὖν Φαρισαῖοι εἶπαν πρὸς ἑαυτούς· θεωρεῖτε ὅτι οὐκ ὠφελεῖτε οὐδέν· ἴδε ὁ κόσμος _ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν.

No txt in NA!

ὅλος D, L, Q, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0211, f13, 33, 157, 892, 1071, 1241, 1424, al,
       Latt, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, bo, arm, [Trg^mg]
       ὅλος ὁ κόσμος   0211

txt   P66, 01, A, B, K, Π, W, Δ, f1, 565, 579, Maj, sa, ac², goth

Lacuna: C

B: umlaut! (1369 A 31 L)   κόσμος ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθεν.

"the whole world"

Compare:

NA28 Mark 8:36 τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖ ἄνθρωπον κερδῆσαι <u>τὸν κόσμον ὅλον</u> καὶ ζημιωθῆναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ;
NA28 Mark 14:9 ἀμὴν δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον <u>εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον,</u>
and parallels: Matt. 16:26; 26:13; Lk. 9:25

Compare also:

NA28 1 John 2:2 καὶ αὐτὸς ἱλασμός ἐστιν περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν, οὐ περὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων δὲ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ <u>ὅλου τοῦ κόσμου.</u>
NA28 1 John 5:19 οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐσμεν καὶ <u>ὁ κόσμος ὅλος</u> ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ κεῖται.

Quite good and diverse support. Of course it is a natural addition. The word could have fallen out due to h.t. (..OS - ..OS).
The phrase also appears in 1. John.

Zahn (Comm. Jo) considers it genuine, because a) it is johannine (1.Jo), b) in its meaning ("everybody") it is common Jewish usage and c) as being too hyperbolic exposed to changes.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 216

NA28 John 12:22 <u>ἔρχεται</u> ὁ Φίλιππος καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ,
ἔρχεται   Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φίλιππος καὶ λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ.

BYZ John 12:22 ἔρχεται Φίλιππος καὶ λέγει τῷ Ἀνδρέᾳ
καὶ πάλιν Ἀνδρέας καὶ Φίλιππος ___ λέγουσιν τῷ Ἰησοῦ

καὶ πάλιν ... -		(P66*), W, X, Ψ, Δ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, Maj, Lat(aur, b, f, ff², vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, goth, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>
___ πάλιν ὁ ... -		D, d
καὶ πάλιν ... καὶ		33, 1071

καὶ πάλιν ἔρχεται ... καὶ   01, 157
___ πάλιν ἔρχεται ... καὶ   von Soden (no support!)

_____ ἔρχεται ... καὶ   P75, A, B, L, pc, a, Sy-S, Sy-Pal

_____ Ἀνδρέας δὲ ... -   P66^C, (Θ), c, l, sa, ac², pbo

Ἀνδρέας πάλιν καὶ Φίλιππος ἔρχεται   bo

P66* reads:
καὶ πάλιν ὁ Ἀνδρέας δὲ καὶ ὁ Φίλιππος ___ λέγουσιν
P66^C reads:
_____Ἀνδρέας δὲ καὶ _ Φίλιππος ___ λέγουσιν
Θ reads:
_____Ἀνδρέας τε καὶ _ Φίλιππος ___ λέγουσιν

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

καὶ πάλιν is probably a stylistic improvement to avoid the simple repetitive ἔρχεται.
καὶ πάλιν ἔρχεται is clearly a conflation of both readings.
The reading with καὶ πάλιν does not need an additional καὶ after Φίλιππος. Nevertheless a καὶ can be found in 33 and 1071. This indicates a correction in an ancestor of these manuscripts.
It is basically possible also that καὶ πάλιν has been changed to ἔρχεται to indicate movement.

The readings by P66 are strange. It is a correction from one singular reading to another. Perhaps, as Royse notes (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 531) "resulting from the scribe's having been confused by some indication of correction in his Vorlage(n)."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 217

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:28 πάτερ, δόξασόν <u>σου τὸ ὄνομα</u>. ἦλθεν οὖν φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· καὶ ἐδόξασα καὶ πάλιν δοξάσω.

No txt in NA!

<u>μου τὸ ὄνομα</u>   B, pc

<u>σου τὸν υἱόν</u>   L, X, 0233, f1, f13-part, 33, 579, 1071, 1241, pc,
                  vg^{mss}, Sy-H^{mg}, bo, Aug

<u>σου τὸ ὄνομα</u>
<u>ἐν τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον παρά σοι πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον γένεσθαι</u>   D, d
tuum nomen
in gloria quam habebam aput te antequam mundus fieret.

txt   P66, P75, 01, A, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13^b, 1689(=f13-part), 157, Maj,
       Lat, Sy, sa, ac², goth

1582 has τὸ ὄνομα in the text, but τὸν υἱόν in the margin, by the original scribe Ephraim (10th CE). 2193 has it the other way round! It is probable that both codices are copies of the same exemplar.
f1 is divided here, compare Welsby (f1 in Jo).
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Cyril of Alexandria (early 5th CE, Comm. Jo):
    Εἴτε δέ Δόξασόν σου τόν υἱὸν ἔχει ἡ γραφὴ, εἴτε Δόξασόν σου τόν ὄνομα, ταὐτὸν ἐστι τῇ τῶν θεωρημάτων ἀκριβείᾳ.
    Whether the text has: Glorify Thy Son, or: Glorify Thy Name, makes no difference in the exact significance of the ideas conveyed.

Augustine: Sermon 12.148 and De trinitate libri 2.10.82

Compare:
NA28 John 8:54 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· ἐὰν ἐγὼ <u>δοξάσω ἐμαυτόν</u>, ἡ δόξα μου οὐδέν ἐστιν· ἔστιν ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ <u>δοξάζων με</u>, ὃν ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐστιν,

NA28 John 17:1 πάτερ ... δόξασόν <u>σου τὸν υἱόν</u>, ἵνα ὁ υἱὸς δοξάσῃ σέ,

NA28 John 17:5 καὶ νῦν <u>δόξασόν με σύ, πάτερ</u>, παρὰ σεαυτῷ <u>τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ</u> <u>εἶχον πρὸ τοῦ τὸν κόσμον</u> εἶναι παρὰ σοί.

    <u>d: gloria quam habebam aput te antequam fieret mundus.</u> (!)
    <u>D:τῇ δόξῃ ᾗ εἶχον παρά σοι πρὸ τοῦ γένεσθαι τὸν κόσμον</u>

The D reading is clearly a secondary conformation to the well known words from 17:5, where D has (again alone) the same words.
The reading of B is either accidental or might be a reminiscence to 8:54 or also to ch. 17.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 218

<u>88. Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 12:30 ἀπεκρίθη <u>Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν·</u> οὐ δι᾽ ἐμὲ ἡ φωνὴ αὕτη γέγονεν ἀλλὰ δι᾽ ὑμᾶς.

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>καὶ εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς</u>
P75, B, L, 157, 1424, pc, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>, <u>WH</u>
<u>ὁ</u> Ἰησοῦς   L, 157, 1424

txt   P66, A, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
<u>ὁ</u> Ἰησοῦς   A, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13-part, 579, Maj

<u>Ἰησοῦς</u>   01

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

The phrase ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν appears 13 times in John, all basically safe! The word order ἀπεκρίθη καὶ εἶπεν Ἰησοῦς appears nowhere else.

If the txt reading is original there is absolutely no reason why it should be changed.

Note the following: The form ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς <u>without</u> καὶ εἶπεν also appears several times:

NA28 John 3:5 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
add καὶ εἶπεν: 01^{C2}, K, Π, L, M, f13, 579, 1424, pc
NA28 John 8:19 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
add καὶ εἶπεν: 01, D, 28, 700
NA28 John 8:49 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
add καὶ εἶπεν: 01, G, Θ, f1, f13, 157, 565, pc
NA28 John 8:54 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
add καὶ εἶπεν: 28
NA28 John 9:3 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς
add καὶ εἶπεν: f1, 565, pc
NA28 John 11:9 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
safe!

NA28 John 13:8 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
    add καὶ εἶπεν: 1071
NA28 John 18:8 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
    safe!
NA28 John 18:34 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
    add καὶ εἶπεν: 1071
NA28 John 18:36 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
    safe!

Only 3 out of ten occurrences are safe. In 7 cases καὶ εἶπεν has been added. Under these circumstances it is possible that originally no καὶ εἶπεν was present at all (= 01 has alone the correct text). For some reason, then, some scribes added καὶ εἶπεν between ἀπεκρίθη and Ἰησοῦς. All this very early in the transmission history. The support by 157 and 1424 is difficult to explain, though, because it would indicate that the variant appeared independently twice.

It is also possible that the P75, B reading is original and has been changed into the common word order.

Rating: 1? or - (= NA probably wrong or indecisive)
    (txt reading probably wrong)

TVU 219

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:31 νῦν κρίσις ἐστὶν τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, νῦν ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου <u>ἐκβληθήσεται ἔξω·</u>

<u>βληθήσεται ἔξω</u>   P66, D, Lat(a, aur, c, d, f, vg)

<u>βληθήσεται κάτω</u>   Θ, 1093, it(b, e, ff², l, r¹), Sy-S, sa, Epiph, Chrys, <u>Bois</u>

                    Tis adds: "22^{ev}", a lectionary.

mittetur deorsum	b, e, l r¹
dimittetur deorsum	ff²
mittitur foras	a, aur, c, d
eicietur foras	f, vg

Macarius, the Magnesian (4th CE, Apokritika 2.31):
βληθήσεται ἔξω, ἢ ὡς ἔχει τινὰ τῶν ἀντιγράφων, **βληθήσεται κάτω**.

Augustine:
princeps huius **saeculi missus est foras** (*in Ps 9:7*) Enarrationes in Psalmos 9.8.26
missus est foras princeps huius **saeculi** (*in Matt 5:9*) De sermone Domini in monte 1.2.9.124

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

No parallel.
Compare next verse:
NA28 John 12:32 κἀγὼ ἐὰν <u>ὑψωθῶ</u> ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν.   "And I, when I am <u>lifted up</u> from the earth ..."

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 4:6 εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, <u>βάλε σεαυτὸν κάτω·</u>
NA28 Luke 4:9   εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ, <u>βάλε σεαυτὸν ἐντεῦθεν κάτω·</u>

NA28 John 8:23 καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· <u>ὑμεῖς ἐκ τῶν κάτω ἐστέ,</u> ἐγὼ ἐκ τῶν ἄνω εἰμί·

The change by Θ could have resulted from an attempt to conform the word better to the next verse. It is also possible that the κάτω is a reminiscence of 8:23.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 220

89. **Difficult variant**
Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:32 κἀγὼ ἐὰν ὑψωθῶ ἐκ τῆς γῆς, πάντας ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυτόν.

πάντα   P66, 01*, D, pc, Latt, Sy-Pal, geo¹, Ir^Lat, Jerome, Aug
omnia

Lacuna: P75, C
B: umlaut! (1369 C 5 R)   πάν<u>τας ἑλκύσω πρὸς ἐμαυ</u>τόν.

ἕλκω "draw, attract; drag"

πάντας   accusative masculine plural:
"And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw <u>all people</u> to myself."

πάντα   accusative neuter plural:
"And I, when I am lifted up from the earth, will draw <u>everything</u> to myself."

Note also:
NA28 John 2:24 αὐτὸς δὲ Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἐπίστευεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν <u>πάντας</u>
πάντα f13, 2*, Maj-part, [Merck: Eʳ?, l, arm, sa+ac, Chrys]
       (not in NA and SQE)

Compare:
NA28 John 6:44 οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐλθεῖν πρός με ἐὰν μὴ ὁ πατὴρ ὁ πέμψας με <u>ἑλκύσῃ αὐτόν</u>,
"No one can come to me unless drawn by the Father who sent me;"

Compare also:
NA28 John 3:35 ὁ πατὴρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸν υἱὸν καὶ <u>πάντα</u> δέδωκεν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ.
NA28 John 13:3 εἰδὼς ὅτι <u>πάντα</u> ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ πατὴρ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας
NA28 John 17:7 νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι <u>πάντα</u> ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν·
NA28 John 17:10 καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ <u>πάντα</u> σά ἐστιν καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμά, καὶ δεδόξασμαι ἐν αὐτοῖς.

It is possible that the more general πάντα has been changed to the more specific πάντας.

In John πάντα appears 21 times, but πάντας only 3 times. It is thus also possible that the more rare πάντας has been changed to the more common πάντα.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 221

NA28 John 12:40 <u>τετύφλωκεν</u> αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ <u>ἐπώρωσεν</u> αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

BYZ John 12:40 <u>Τετύφλωκεν</u> αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ <u>πεπώρωκεν</u> αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐπιστραφῶσιν καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς

Byz   B^{C2}, Δ, 0141, f1, 230, 1689(=f13), 565, 700, 1424, Maj

txt   A, B*, L, X, Θ, Ψ, f13, 33, 1071, al
       <u>ἐπωρώθησαν</u>   157

<u>ἐπήρωσεν</u>   P66, P75, 01, K, Π^C, W, 579, pc
       ἐπερώτησεν Π* ("ask")

<u>πεπήρωκεν</u>   pc

omit τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ... αὐτῶν   D (h.t.)

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut
In B (p. 1370 A 2) the Π is written above the line. It is enhanced or written by the enhancer. Tischendorf assigns it to B³.

"He has blinded their eyes and **<u>hardened</u>** their heart, so that they might not look with their eyes, and understand with their heart and turn - and I would heal them."

<u>τυφλόω "blind"</u>
τετύφλωκεν   indicative perfect active 3rd person singular

<u>πωρόω "made stubborn or without feeling; harden"</u>
ἐπώρωσεν   indicative aorist active 3rd person singular
πεπώρωκεν   indicative perfect active 3rd person singular
ἐπωρώθησαν   indicative aorist passive 3rd person plural

<u>πηρόω "disable, cripple"</u>
ἐπήρωσεν   indicative aorist active 3rd person singular

LXX quote:
LXX Isaiah 6:10 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ <u>καρδία</u> τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς <u>ὠσὶν</u> αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς <u>ὀφθαλμοὺς</u> αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς <u>ὀφθαλμοῖς</u> καὶ τοῖς <u>ὠσὶν</u> ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ <u>καρδίᾳ</u> συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς

"Make the mind of this people dull, and stop their ears, and shut their eyes, so that they may not look with their eyes, and listen with their ears, and comprehend with their minds, and turn and be healed."

Compare:
LXX Job 17:7 <u>πεπώρωνται</u> γὰρ ἀπὸ ὀργῆς οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου πεπολιόρκημαι μεγάλως ὑπὸ πάντων
<u>πεπήρωνται</u>   01^C, A, pc
"My eye has grown dim from grief, and all my members are like a shadow."

NA28 Mark 3:5 καὶ περιβλεψάμενος αὐτοὺς μετ' ὀργῆς, συλλυπούμενος ἐπὶ τῇ <u>πωρώσει</u> τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν   safe!

NA28 Mark 6:52 οὐ γὰρ συνῆκαν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἄρτοις, ἀλλ' ἦν αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία <u>πεπωρωμένη.</u> safe!

NA28 Mark 8:17 τί διαλογίζεσθε ὅτι ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε; οὔπω νοεῖτε οὐδὲ συνίετε; <u>πεπωρωμένην</u> ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν;
<u>πεπηρωμένην</u>   D*

NA28 Romans 11:7 Τί οὖν; ὃ ἐπιζητεῖ Ἰσραήλ, τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπέτυχεν, ἡ δὲ ἐκλογὴ ἐπέτυχεν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ <u>ἐπωρώθησαν,</u>
<u>ἐπερώθησαν</u>   C, 69
BDAG: poorly attested by one late ms. 66** [s. Tdf.]=Gregory 1911; here the mng. is surely *to blind,* which πηρόω signifies as early as Aristot.

NA28 Romans 11:25 ὅτι <u>πώρωσις</u> ἀπὸ μέρους τῷ Ἰσραὴλ γέγονεν ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ   safe!

NA28 2 Corinthians 3:14 ἀλλὰ <u>ἐπωρώθη</u> τὰ νοήματα αὐτῶν. safe!

NA28 Ephesians 4:18 διὰ τὴν <u>πώρωσιν</u> τῆς καρδίας αὐτῶν,   safe!

For πηρόω compare:
LXX 4 Maccabees 18:21 τὰς τῶν ὀμμάτων κόρας <u>ἐπήρωσεν</u>
"pierced the pupils of their eyes"

The Byzantine perfect reading is clearly an adaption to the preceding τετύφλωκεν in tense (so also Weiss).

πηρόω and πωρόω mean essentially the same here. πωρόω appears 5 times in the NT (Mk. 6:52; 8:17; Jn. 12:40; Rom. 11:7; 2 Co. 3:14) plus πώρωσις three times (Mk. 3:5; Rom. 11:25; Eph. 4:18), πηρόω appears not in the Greek Bible (except in 4 Maccabees 18:21).

The external evidence for both forms is very evenly divided.

Metzger writes, that the use of πηρόω is "an attempt to supply a somewhat more suitable verb with τὴν καρδίαν". It is also possible that it is a simple transcription error. The error is easy to understand because the words look very similar and have a similar meaning.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 222

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:40 τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα <u>μὴ</u> ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ <u>__</u>νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

<u>__μὴ</u> P66*, D, a, e, f, l, vg^{Cl}
 non

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare LXX:
LXX Isaiah 6:10 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν <u>μήποτε</u> <u>ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ</u> <u>συνῶσιν</u> καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς

Probably added to make clear that the negation continues.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 223

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:40 τετύφλωκεν αὐτῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς καὶ ἐπώρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν καρδίαν, ἵνα μὴ ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς <u>καὶ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν</u>, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

Not in NA and only the P66 reading in SQE!

<u>καὶ μὴ νοήσωσιν τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσιν</u>   P66*, D, a, d, e, f, l, vg^{Cl}
   et non intellegant corde et convertantur

<u>καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ στραφῶσι</u>   01, K, Π
<u>καὶ συνῶσι   τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ στραφῶσι</u>   Y

<u>καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν</u>
<u>καὶ νοήσωσι τῇ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐπιστρέψουσιν</u>   f13

The reading given for 13 in Swanson is an error. Checked at the film.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare LXX:
LXX Isaiah 6:10 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν <u>μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν</u> καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 13:15 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν, <u>μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.</u>

Clearly all harmonizations to Mt.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 224

NA28 John 12:41 ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἠσαΐας **ὅτι** εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ John 12:41 ταῦτα εἶπεν Ἠσαΐας **ὅτε** εἶδεν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐλάλησεν περὶ αὐτοῦ

Byz   D, Δ, 0141, f13, 565, 700, 892, 1241, Maj,
      Lat, Sy, geo², Or^Lat, Eus, Chrys, Trg^mg

txt   P66, P75, 01, A, B, L, M, X, Θ, Ψ, Ω, f1, 124, 33, 157, 472, 579, 1071, al,
      e, Co, arm, geo¹

ἐπεὶ W

Θ: Swanson has Θ for ὅτε in error. NA, IGNTP (majuscule) and Beermann/Gregory in the ed. pr. have Θ for txt= ὅτι.
Ψ: NA and Swanson have Ψ for ὅτι, so also Lake in his collation. IGNTP does not list it.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

txt   "This Isaiah said *because* he saw his glory..."
Byz   "This Isaiah said *when*   he saw his glory..."

Difficult to evaluate internally. Both mean essentially the same.
Compare 12:17 also.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 225

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:43 ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον **ἤπερ** τὴν δόξαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

ὑπέρ   P66^C, 01, L, W, X, f1, f13-part, 33, 157, 565, 579, 1071, al, <u>WH^{mg}</u>
f13: 13, 69, 346, 543, 828

ἤπερ   P66*, P75, A, B, D, K, Π, Δ, Θ, 0141, 124, 230, 788(= f13), 700, 1424, Maj, <u>WH</u>, <u>NA²⁵</u>
καὶ ἤπερ   0141

εἴπερ   Λ, Ψ, pc

ἤ   1241, pc

<u>magis quam</u>   Latt

33: Swanson has 33 wrongly for txt= ἤπερ, against NA and Tis! Checked at the film.
579: Swanson has 579 correctly for ὑπέρ, but NA (implicitly) and Schmidtke (explicitly) have it incorrectly for ἤπερ. Checked at the film.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἤπερ conjunction,
      "than", strengthened form of ἤ

Compare:
LXX Tobit (S) 14:4 καὶ ἐν τῇ Μηδίᾳ ἔσται σωτηρία <u>μᾶλλον ἤπερ</u> ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις καὶ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι

ἤπερ is very rare and appears only here in the NT. In Koine Greek ἤπερ and ὑπέρ are pronounced alike.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 226

90. Difficult variant

Minority reading:
NA28 John 12:46 ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα <u>πᾶς</u> ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ.

omit: P66*, B, 047, pc, Sy-S

047 is listed in IGNTP, not in NA.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 3:15 <u>ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων</u> ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
NA28 John 3:16 ... <u>ἵνα πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων</u> εἰς αὐτὸν μὴ ἀπόληται ἀλλ᾽ ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
omit πᾶς: P63 (ca. 500)

NA28 John 6:40 τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πατρός μου, <u>ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ πιστεύων</u> εἰς αὐτὸν ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ [ἐν] τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.
NA28 John 11:26 καὶ <u>πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων</u> εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. πιστεύεις τοῦτο;

There is no reason for an omission. It is possible that the addition is a harmonization to earlier occurrences in John.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 227

NA28 John 12:47 καὶ ἐάν τίς μου ἀκούσῃ τῶν ῥημάτων <u>καὶ μὴ φυλάξῃ,</u> ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω αὐτόν· οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον, ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον.

BYZ John 12:47 καὶ ἐάν τίς μου ἀκούσῃ τῶν ῥημάτων <u>καὶ μὴ πιστεύσῃ</u>, ἐγὼ οὐ κρίνω αὐτόν οὐ γὰρ ἦλθον ἵνα κρίνω τὸν κόσμον ἀλλ ἵνα σώσω τὸν κόσμον

Byz   0141, 0250, 124, 700, 1424,
       Maj[E, F, G; H, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ], q, Sy-H^mg, goth

txt   P66*, P75, 01, A, B, K, Π, L, (W), X, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 1071, al,
       vg, Sy, Co, arm, Diatess^Ephrem
       <u>μὴ</u> ἀκούσῃ τῶν ῥημάτων <u>μηδὲ φυλάξῃ</u>   W

<u>καὶ φυλάξῃ</u>   P66^C, D, Θ, 070, 1241, pc, it, ac²
<u>καὶ πιστεύσῃ</u>   S, 0211

<u>μὴ</u> ἀκούσῃ τῶν ῥημάτων <u>καὶ φυλάξῃ</u>   579

Swanson and NA have wrongly 579 for the P66^C reading, against Schmidtke. Schmidtke is right. Checked at the film. (compare also James C. Royse, Scribal habits, 2008, p. 465)
Lacuna: C
B: umlaut! (1370 A 32 L)   τῶν <u>ῥημάτων καὶ μὴ φυλά</u>ξῃ,

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 11:28 αὐτὸς δὲ εἶπεν· μενοῦν μακάριοι οἱ ἀκούοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ <u>φυλάσσοντες.</u>

Compare context:
NA28 John 12:44 Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἔκραξεν καὶ εἶπεν· <u>ὁ πιστεύων</u> εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ <u>πιστεύει</u> εἰς ἐμὲ ἀλλὰ εἰς τὸν πέμψαντά με,
NA28 John 12:46 ἐγὼ φῶς εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἐλήλυθα, ἵνα πᾶς <u>ὁ πιστεύων</u> εἰς ἐμὲ ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ μὴ μείνῃ.
NA28 John 12:48 ὁ ἀθετῶν ἐμὲ καὶ <u>μὴ λαμβάνων τὰ ῥήματά</u> μου ἔχει τὸν κρίνοντα αὐτόν· ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα ἐκεῖνος κρινεῖ αὐτὸν ἐν τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.

Compare also:

NA28 John 5:47 εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐκείνου γράμμασιν οὐ πιστεύετε, πῶς τοῖς ἐμοῖς <u>ῥήμασιν πιστεύσετε</u>;

NA28 John 8:51 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν <u>λόγον τηρήσῃ,</u> θάνατον οὐ μὴ θεωρήσῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

NA28 John 12:25 καὶ ὁ μισῶν <u>τὴν ψυχὴν</u> αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τούτῳ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον <u>φυλάξει</u> αὐτήν.

NA28 John 17:8 ὅτι <u>τὰ ῥήματα</u> ἃ ἔδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον καὶ ἔγνωσαν ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ <u>ἐπίστευσαν</u> ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

πιστεύσῃ has very probably been inserted as a conformation to the previous mentioning of ὁ πιστεύων in verses 44 and 46 (so also Weiss).

With λόγος John uses τηρέω, which is not used here. ῥήμα and πιστεύω are used twice together (5:47 and 17:8).

φυλάσσω is used with ψυχή once in the previous context (12:25). It also appears in the Lukan "parallel".

The essential meaning is basically the same.

<u>The omission of μή</u> originates probably in a misunderstanding of the words. It is assumed that Jesus does not judge him because he kept the words. This makes sense, but is un-johannine.

καί can be translated as "even": "But EVEN if any one may hear my words and does NOT keep them, I do not judge him."

Fee (P66, S&D, 1968, p.74) notes: "the elimination of the negative probably is in the interest of a sharp contrast between verses 47 and 48."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 228

91. Difficult variant
NA28 John 13:2 καὶ δείπνου <u>**γινομένου**</u>, τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου,

BYZ John 13:2 καὶ δείπνου <u>**γενομένου**</u>, τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν Ἰούδα Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου ἵνα αὐτὸν παραδῷ,

Byz   P66, 01^{C2}, A, D, Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 892, 1071, Maj, Lat, Co

txt   01*, B, L, W, X, Ψ, 070, 579, 1241, d, r¹, Sy-S, arm, Or

Lacuna: P75, C
B: no umlaut

γινομένου participle present middle genitive neuter singular
γενομένου participle aorist   middle genitive neuter singular

Byz   "supper being ended"
txt   "during supper"

Compare context:
NA28 John 13:1 <u>Πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα</u> εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι ἦλθεν αὐτοῦ ἡ ὥρα ἵνα μεταβῇ ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου τούτου πρὸς τὸν πατέρα, ἀγαπήσας τοὺς ἰδίους τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰς τέλος ἠγάπησεν αὐτούς.
NA28 John 13:4 <u>ἐγείρεται ἐκ τοῦ δείπνου</u> καὶ τίθησιν τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ λαβὼν λέντιον διέζωσεν ἑαυτόν·
NA28 John 13:26 ἀποκρίνεται [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ <u>βάψω τὸ ψωμίον</u> καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ.

The Byzantine reading is clearly the more difficult, because the following context shows that the supper was still in progress (see verse 26). In verse 13:1 a new story begins, it would be slightly awkward that the supper already ends in verse 2 when in the previous verse it has not yet begun.

On the other hand is the aorist by far the more frequent tense for γίνομαι (aorist/present = 174/27 in the Gospels). It is possible that scribes simply expected that the supper ended and used the more familiar aorist form.

It has also been suggested (Metzger) that the aorist might be an ingressive aorist (indicating the beginning of an action) with the meaning "supper having been served". Then both readings mean basically the same.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 229

Minority reading:
NA28 John 13:2 καὶ δείπνου γινομένου, τοῦ διαβόλου ἤδη βεβληκότος εἰς τὴν καρδίαν ἵνα παραδοῖ αὐτὸν Ἰούδας Σίμωνος <u>Ἰσκαριώτου,</u>

<u>Ἰσκαριώτης</u>   P66, P75^{vid}, 01, B, X, 579, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

<u>Ἰσκαριώτου</u>   A, L, Θ, Ψ, 070, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 1241, Maj, P844

<u>Ἰσκαριώτῃ</u>   W
<u>ἀπὸ Καρυωτου</u>   D, d, e

P75: Compare Robinson HTR 101 (2008) 244
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Ἰσκαριώτου genitive
Ἰσκαριώτης nominative

Compare:
NA28 John 6:71 <u>τὸν</u> Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου·
                              Ἰσκαριώ<u>την</u>   f1, 579, Maj-part

NA28 John 12:4 λέγει δὲ Ἰούδας ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης   safe!

NA28 John 13:26 δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου.
                              Ἰσκαριώτῃ   P66, A, W, f1, Maj
                        τῷ Ἰσκαριώτῃ   f13
                              Ἰσκαριώτης   579

NA28 John 14:22 Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης· safe!

There appears to be a tendency to change the case ending. The name is usually taken to mean "Judas, son of Simon from Kerioth". But it appears that scribes took the complete three words as one name and changed the ending of the third word according to the expected case. So here into the nominative.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 230

NA28 John 13:10 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
ὁ λελουμένος οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν **εἰ μὴ** τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι,
ἀλλ' ἔστιν καθαρὸς ὅλος·

BYZ John 13:10 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς
ὁ λελουμένος οὐ χρείαν ἔχει **ἢ_____** τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι
ἀλλ' ἔστιν καθαρὸς ὅλος·

Byz   P75, A, C^{C3}, Δ, 0141, f1, 124, 1424, Maj

txt   P66, B, C*, (D), K, Π, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0211, f13, 157, 892, 1071, 1424, al,
       it, vg^{Cl}, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co, Or^{txt}, [**NA²⁵**], [**WH**], **Weiss**

οὐ χρείαν ἔχει τὴν κεφαλὴν νίψασθαι **εἰ μὴ** τοὺς πόδας μόνον   D

οὐ χρείαν ἔχει __ τοὺς πόδας νίψασθαι   F, H, 2
οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν _____ νίψασθαι   01, aur, c, vg^{WW,St}, Or^{Com},
                                          Tert^{vid}, Jerome, **Bois**, **Tis**
οὐ χρείαν ἔχει _____   579

add μόνον to νίψασθαι: P66, D, Θ, 1424, pc, Sy-S, Sy-P

WH, **NA²⁵** both have εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας in brackets.

NA cites Sy-H twice (for Byz and txt). The correct reading is txt (confirmed by
A. Juckel from Muenster).

P66 has a correction after καθαρὸς. Instead of ὅλος originally there was
something else, about 2 letters longer. One can see a deleted -ος at the end.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Note also the interesting Latin variant: semel "one time"
"Dicit ei Iesus: Qui lotus est <u>semel</u> ..." c, **11A**, **24** (ρ, Fragmentum Milanense), **Aug**
"Dicit ei Iesus: Qui <u>semel</u> lotus est ..." g¹, vg^{mss}, **Ambrose**

Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

λελουμένος λούω "wash, bathe"
participle perfect middle/passive nominative masculine singular

νίψασθαι νίπτω midd. "wash oneself, wash for oneself"
infinitive aorist middle

According to Robertson ("Wordpictures") νίπτω means "to wash part of the body" and λούω means "to bathe the whole body".

Compare previous verse 9:
NA28 John 13:9 λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· κύριε, μὴ τοὺς πόδας μου μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τὴν κεφαλήν.

Compare also:
NA28 John 13:29 ἀγόρασον ὧν χρείαν ἔχομεν εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν, ἢ τοῖς πτωχοῖς ἵνα τι δῷ.

The addition of μόνον and the reading of D are clearly conformations to the previous verse.

εἰ μὴ   "except, unless"
ἤ   "than"
It is possible that ἤ is idiomatic and means the same here as εἰ μὴ, but normally ἤ requires something to compare with. Metzger suggests that for ἤ John should have written something like:
οὐκ ἄλλου τινὸς χρείαν ἔχει ἤ ...
"Of nothing else he has need than ..."

On the other hand the variation at this phrase might be an indication that it was not present at all originally. This is supported by 01 et al. and several church fathers. Against this Robertson argues in his Wordpictures that νίπτω is used normally as "to wash something", often body parts. This is correct except for the Siloam pericope (Joh 9:7, 11, 15), where it is simply used as "to wash".

The guest was supposed to bathe (λούω) before coming to a feast and so only the feet had to be washed (νίπτω) on removing the sandals.

It is possible that εἰ μὴ τοὺς πόδας has been omitted because of the difficulty of reconciling it with the following ἀλλ᾽ ἔστιν καθαρὸς ὅλος:
            "One who has bathed does not need to wash,
                        except for the feet, but is entirely clean.

But then the question arises why does one need the footwashing? The whole construction is awkward and invites variation. Probably the intended meaning was: "The one who has bathed (to be prepared for the feast), has only to have his feet washed again to be completely clean."

Another possible meaning would be:
"The one who has bathed (to be prepared for the feast), is completely clean. He has to wash his feet again, but this has no bearing on being clean (in terms of purity)."

P. F. Beatrice argued for the shortest, the 579 reading. This reading makes good sense, if understood the way Beatrice has it: "The person who is purified by footwashing, does not need it (washing hands and head), but is totally clean."
The problem with this is that it does not explain the raise of the other variants.

Compare:
- J.D.G. Dunn "The washing of the disciples' feet in John 13:1-20" ZNW 61 (1970) 247-52 [who argues for the short 01 reading on exegetical grounds.]
- J. Owanga-Welo "The function and meaning of the Footwashing in the Johannine Passion narrative: A structural approach." Dissertation Emory University 1980
- F. F. Segovia "John 13:1-20, The footwashing in the Johannine Tradition" ZNW 73 (1982) 31-51
- J.C. Thomas "A note on the text of Jo 13:10" NovT 29 (1987) 46-52
- P. F. Beatrice "John 13:1-10 and Romans 13:1-7 in Irenaeus of Lyons. Two test cases for NT TC", in "The NT Text in Early Christianity, Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium", July 2000, C.B. Amphoux and J.K. Elliott (eds.), p. 369-386

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 231

Difficult variant
NA28 John 13:18 Οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω· ἐγὼ οἶδα τίνας ἐξελεξάμην· ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ·
ὁ τρώγων μου   τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ.

BYZ John 13:18 οὐ περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν λέγω· ἐγὼ οἶδα οὕς ἐξελεξάμην· ἀλλ ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ
ὁ τρώγων μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον ἐπῆρεν ἐπ ἐμὲ τὴν πτέρναν αὐτοῦ

Byz   P66, 01, A, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj,
       Lat, Sy, bo, ac², arm, geo, goth, Eus, Tert, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}

txt   B, C, L, 892, 1071, pc, vg^{ms}, sa

ὁ τρώγων μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον μου   E*, q, ac², pbo, bo
          qui manducat mecum panem <u>meum</u>

Note that P66* and B omit ἐπ᾽ before ἐμὲ.
Lacuna: P75, X
B: no umlaut

LXX reference:
LXX Psalm 40:10 καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῆς εἰρήνης μου ἐφ᾽ ὃν ἤλπισα ὁ <u>ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου</u> ἐμεγάλυνεν ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ πτερνισμόν

Parallels:
NA28 Mark 14:18 εἷς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει με <u>ὁ ἐσθίων μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ.</u>
NA28 Luke 22:21 Πλὴν ἰδοὺ ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με <u>μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ</u> ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης.

Compare:
NA28 John 6:54 <u>ὁ τρώγων μου</u> τὴν σάρκα
NA28 John 6:56 <u>ὁ τρώγων μου</u> τὴν σάρκα
NA28 John 6:57 καὶ <u>ὁ τρώγων με</u> κἀκεῖνος ζήσει δι᾽ ἐμέ.
NA28 John 6:58 <u>ὁ τρώγων τοῦτον τὸν ἄρτον</u> ζήσει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

It has been suggested that μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ is a harmonization to Mk (so Weiss), but it seems more probable that μου is a conformation to Jo 6.

That it is a harmonization to the LXX is quite improbable because the wording is very different.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 232

Minority reading:

NA28 John 13:19 ἀπ' ἄρτι λέγω ὑμῖν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι,
ἵνα <u>πιστεύσητε</u> ὅταν γένηται ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

<u>πιστεύητε</u>	B, C, <u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>
txt <u>πιστεύσητε</u>	P66, 01, A, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj, <u>Trg</u>ᵐᵍ

Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

See the discussion at Jo 19:35 in the main commentary.
Very difficult to judge.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 58) notes that for scribes the subjunctive present was the
norm in ἵνα clauses.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 233

94. **Difficult variant**
Minority reading:
NA28 John 13:24 νεύει οὖν τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ λέγει.

| πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη | A, D, W, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, Maj, d, r¹, Sy, goth |
| πυθέσθαι | Ψ, (e), Sy-S, Co |

πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ εἶπεν	P66ᶜ
καί λέγει αὐτῷ εἰπὲ περὶ οὗ λέγει	P66* (ed.pr., Fee, Swanson, Royse)
καί λέγει αὐτῷ ἐστιν περὶ οὗ λέγει	P66* (IGNTP)

καί λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ τίς ἐστίν   B, C, L, X, 068, 0141, 33, 892, 1071, pc, b, l, Or?,
NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Weiss, Tis, Trg, Bal

πυθέσθαι τίς ἂν εἴη περὶ οὗ ελέγεν,
καί λέγει αὐτῷ· εἰπὲ τίς ἐστίν   01

καί λέγει αὐτῷ· ἐρώτησον ("interroga") τίς ἐστίν   it(a, f, ff²*, q)
καί λέγει αὐτῷ· ἐρώτησον   it(c)
καί λέγει αὐτῷ·   τίς ἐστίν   Lat(aur, b, ff²ᶜ, l, vg)

P66: NA notes the reading for P66* as "illeg.".
The words suggested above for P66* fit the space, but from the photos it is impossible to judge any remaining letters. An Є of ЄІПЄ is possible at the beginning of line 12. At the end of line 11 traces of a possible Y and a vertical bar are visible. I cannot see the ⲱ of ⲀYTⲱ. Compare Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 455). Perhaps multispectral analysis may reveal more?
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

εἴη εἰμί optative present active 3rd person singular
πυνθάνομαι "inquire, ask, question; learn (by inquiry)"

Parallel:
NA28 Luke 22:23 καὶ αὐτοὶ ἤρξαντο συζητεῖν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς τὸ τίς ἄρα εἴη ἐξ αὐτῶν ὁ τοῦτο μέλλων πράσσειν.

Compare:

NA28 Luke 8:9 Ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ <u>τίς αὕτη εἴη</u> ἡ παραβολή.

NA28 Luke 9:46 Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ διαλογισμὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ <u>τίς ἂν εἴη</u> μείζων αὐτῶν.

NA28 Luke 15:26 καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος ἕνα τῶν παίδων <u>ἐπυνθάνετο τί ἂν εἴη</u> ταῦτα.

NA28 Luke 18:36 ἀκούσας δὲ ὄχλου διαπορευομένου <u>ἐπυνθάνετο τί εἴη</u> τοῦτο.

This is the only instance of the optative in John. εἴη is a typical Lukan word and appears there 7 times (Lk. 1:29; 3:15; 8:9; 9:46; 15:26; 18:36; 22:23). In two cases the word εἴη comes together with πυνθάνομαι !

Note also the Lukan parallel Lk 22:23 with τίς ἄρα εἴη.

It thus appears that the phrase is unjohannine and could be a harmonization to Lk. The support for the txt reading is better and quite early though. The reading of P66* is not clear and cannot be taken as evidence for the B et al. reading.

Note also the clear conflation in 01!

Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the txt reading is an explanatory gloss conformed to the next verse 25. He further notes that the λέγει has been felt to be in contradiction with the νεύει.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
    = prefer B reading.
        (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 234

95. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 13:25 ἀναπεσὼν **οὖν** ἐκεῖνος οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ λέγει αὐτῷ· κύριε, τίς ἐστιν;

omit   B, C, **NA²⁵**, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   P66*ᵛⁱᵈ, 01^C2, L, X, 0141, 33, (579), 892, pc, [<u>Trg^mg</u>]
      ἐπιπεσὼν οὖν   P66^C, 01*, D, W, Δ, f1, f13, 565, 1241, al, <u>Tis</u>

ἐπιπεσὼν δὲ   A, Θ, Maj
ἀναπεσὼν δὲ   K, Ψ, pc

NA28 John 13:26 **ἀποκρίνεται**   [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ. βάψας <u>οὖν</u> τὸ ψωμίον [λαμβάνει καὶ] δίδωσιν Ἰούδα Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου.

add οὖν   01^C2, B, C*, L, X, 0141, 892, pc, **NA²⁵**, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>
txt   P66, 01*, A, C^C3, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 579ᵛⁱᵈ, Maj, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>

ἀποκρίνεται αὐτῷ   D, f13, 1424, pc

Compare immediate context:
13:24 νεύει <u>οὖν</u> τούτῳ Σίμων Πέτρος   omit οὖν: C*, Λ, 69
13:25 ἀναπεσὼν <u>οὖν</u> ἐκεῖνος   omit οὖν: A, B, C, Θ, Maj
13:26 ἀποκρίνεται <u>οὖν</u> [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς·   omit οὖν: P66, 01*, A, C^C3, D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj

      βάψας <u>οὖν</u> τὸ ψωμίον   omit οὖν: P66,   A,   D, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, Maj

13:27 λέγει <u>οὖν</u> αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·   omit οὖν: D

B: no umlaut

Compare discussion at Jo 8:41/52. οὖν is a typical John word.

This is four or five times οὖν in four verses, which points to the estimation that scribes omitted οὖν for stylistic reasons. Interestingly in 13:25 B, C omit οὖν, whereas in 13:26 they add it.

This nest of readings is very difficult to evaluate.

In 13:24 οὖν is basically safe. Coming to the second οὖν, it is possible that scribes tried to avoid it, either by simply omitting it (B, C), or by replacing it with δὲ which is rather unsuitable (A, Θ, Maj). The addition of δὲ is typical for the Byzantine text (B: 196, NA: 212, Byz: 231 times δὲ). At 13:26 even more scribes omitted οὖν, but B, C found it not objectionable anymore, because they already omitted it at 13:25, so they left it.

This explanation is uncertain. It is also possible that there was originally no οὖν in verse 25 and that some added οὖν from verse 24 and others inserted δὲ. The support for οὖν is very strong, though.

Compare:
NA28 John 6:10 ἀνέπεσαν <u>οὖν</u> οἱ ἄνδρες τὸν ἀριθμὸν ὡς πεντακισχίλιοι.
omit οὖν: Maj-part[E, F, G, H, M, S, V, Γ, Δ, Ω, 2, 28]
replace by δὲ: 1424, pc

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)   (13:25)
Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)   (13:26a)

TVU 235

Difficult variant

NA28 John 13:26 ἀποκρίνεται [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς· ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψω τὸ ψωμίον καὶ δώσω αὐτῷ. βάψας οὖν τὸ ψωμίον **[λαμβάνει καὶ]** δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου.

BYZ John 13:26 ἀποκρίνεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς Ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψας τὸ ψωμίον ἐπιδώσω. καὶ ἐμβάψας τὸ ψωμίον _____ δίδωσιν Ἰούδᾳ Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτῃ.

Byz   P66, 01*, A, D, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, Maj, Latt, Sy, Co, goth, <u>SBL</u>
txt   01^{C1}, B, C, L, M, X, 33, 892, 1071, 1241, pc, Sy-H^{mg}, aeth, Or

Tregelles reads txt, but has additionally [λαμβάνει καὶ] in brackets in the margin.
Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:26 Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν <u>λαβὼν</u> ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς
NA28 Mark 14:22 Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν <u>λαβὼν</u> ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς
NA28 Luke 22:19 καὶ <u>λαβὼν</u> ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς

It is possible that the words have been omitted as superfluous.
Metzger suggests that the words have been added "to recall Jesus' deliberate action at the Last Supper in _taking_ bread." But this is not very convincing.
The support for the omission is very strong and without 01/B this would certainly be considered a secondary reading, but since it is supported by 01/B AND there is no convincing reason for the secondary addition of the words, brackets are ok.
Hoskier suggests that it may come from the synoptic λαβὼν (see above).

Rating: - (indecisive)
       brackets ok.

TVU 236

97. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 13:31 Ὅτε οὖν ἐξῆλθεν, λέγει Ἰησοῦς·
    νῦν ἐδοξάσθη ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    καὶ <u>ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ·</u>
13:32 [εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ,]
    καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ,
    καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν.

omit: P66, 01*, B, C*, D, L, W, X, Π*, 1, 2*, 579, 1071, al, L253,
    it(a, aur*, b, c, d, ff²*, l, **11A, 29, 47**), vgᵐˢˢ, Sy-S, Sy-H, ac², mf, boᵖᵗ, <u>WH</u>

txt   01^C2, A, C^C2, K, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 1241, 1424, Maj,
    Lat(aur^C, e, f, ff²C, q, r¹, vg), Sy-P, sa, boᵖᵗ, goth, Or^Lem, <u>NA²⁵</u>, [Trg]

omit καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν   W

omit [εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ,]
    καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ, 0141 (h.t.)

omit ἐν αὐτῷ,
    <u>καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν</u>   579 (h.t.)

Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

Western non-interpolation?

On the one hand the words could have been added to make the saying more complete, more symmetrical.

On the other hand it is possible that the words have been omitted due to parablepsis. This is probably correct at least in part, though the diversity of witnesses makes it improbable, that this is the only reason. Also, the following phrase καὶ ... αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ is not omitted by any witness, even though a similar probability for h.t. exists.

It is also possible that the words have been omitted as redundant.

Even if the words are secondary it is possible that they have later been omitted due to h.t. by some witnesses, e.g. Byzantine witnesses Π, 2*.

Metzger calls all this a "dilemma".

The meaning is difficult to get:

> When he had gone out, Jesus said,
> "Now the Son of Man is glorified,
> and God is glorified in him.
> _If God is glorified in him,_
> God will also glorify him in himself
> and will glorify him at once."

It makes no real difference if the phrase in question is present or not.

Rating: - (indecisive)
       (brackets ok)

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

TVU 237

Difficult variant
NA28 John 13:32 [εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη <u>ἐν αὐτῷ,</u>] καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν <u>ἐν αὐτῷ,</u> καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν.

BYZ John 13:32 εἰ ὁ θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη <u>ἐν αὐτῷ</u> καὶ ὁ θεὸς δοξάσει αὐτὸν <u>ἐν ἑαυτῷ,</u> καὶ εὐθὺς δοξάσει αὐτόν

Byz   01^{C1}, A, C, D, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1071, Maj,
      Lat, Co, arm, geo, goth, Chrys, Tert, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>

txt   P66, 01*^{,C2}, B, H, Λ, pc, a, vg^{ms}, Or^{Lem}
      <u>WH</u>: <u>ἐν αὐτῷ</u> (accent!)

omit: Sy-S, aeth

579 omits due to h.t.
C is illegible acc. to NA, acc. to Tischendorf it reads Byz.
Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

txt   "in him   (Jesus)"
Byz   "in himself (God)"

It is possible that txt is a harmonization to immediate context (verses 31 and 32). The support for txt is not coherent (H and Λ appear together with B/01). Metzger calls ἐν ἑαυτῷ "Hellenistic usage".
Zahn wrote (Comm. Jo): "scarcely determinable but unimportant". He thinks that ἐν ἑαυτῷ does not refer back to ὁ θεὸς but to αὐτὸν and in that case there is, then, no difference in meaning.
The support for txt is quite incoherent.

Compare 2:24 above for a similar case.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 238

Minority reading:
NA28 John 13:33 τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι· ζητήσετέ με, καὶ καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν, καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω **<u>ἄρτι.</u>** 13:34 Ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.

<u>ἄρτι· πλὴν</u>   f1(1, 1582*, 565), 1071, pc, sa^pt

<u>πλὴν· ἄρτι</u>   P66, Sy-S, sa^pt

1582: There are dots above πλὴν, probably by a later hand.
Lacuna: P75, Sy-C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 26:64 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ εἶπας. <u>πλὴν λέγω ὑμῖν· ἀπ' ἄρτι</u> ὄψεσθε τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τῆς δυνάμεως

NA28 Luke 12:56 ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν,__τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;   __<u>πλὴν</u> P45, D, 157, pc

BYZ John 8:10 Ἀνακύψας δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, καὶ μηδένα θεασάμενος <u>πλὴν</u> τῆς γυναικός, εἶπεν αὐτῇ,

πλὴν appears nowhere else in John (except in a variant of the PA).
πλὴν and ἄρτι appear elsewhere only once together (Mt 26:64).
πλὴν is a typical Luke word (19 times in Lk-Acts).

The reading is clearly meant as a clarification of the unconnected καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι. The meaning is different depending on the punctuation.

Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 520) thinks that it "would seem to be an extraordinary coincidence that more than one scribe would independently choose this word as a means of clarifying Jo 13:33-34. Rather, it seems much easier to suppose that the scribe of P66 transposed the reading of 1, 565, pc, perhaps by misunderstanding a marginal notation of πλὴν in his Vorlage. If I am correct

here, then P66 is actually a witness to the existence of the reading of 1, 565, pc in about the year 200." Footnote: "That there is Sahidic support ... gives further reason to think that the scribe of P66 has not simply added πλὴν to the majority text."

I don't think that this argumentation is justified. I see the addition of πλὴν as conformation to standard idiom. The different word-order supports this.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 239

Minority reading:
NA28 John 13:36 Λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· <u>κύριε</u>, ποῦ ὑπάγεις; ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ] Ἰησοῦς· ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον.
NA28 John 13:37 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· <u>κύριε</u>, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί σοι ἀκολουθῆσαι ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω.

<u>omit:</u> 01*, 33, 565, pc, aur, vg, Sy-S, sa^{ms}, pbo, bo, WH^{mg}
Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 4:19 λέγει αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή· <u>κύριε</u>, ...
    omit κύριε: 01*, pc
NA28 John 11:21 εἶπεν οὖν ἡ Μάρθα πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· <u>κύριε, ...</u>
    omit κύριε: B, Sy-S
NA28 John 11:39 λέγει αὐτῷ ... Μάρθα· <u>κύριε</u>, ...
    omit κύριε: P66
NA28 John 12:21 καὶ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν λέγοντες· <u>κύριε, ...</u>
    omit κύριε: U*, 28 (not in NA)
NA28 John 12:38 ἵνα ὁ λόγος ... πληρωθῇ ὃν εἶπεν· <u>κύριε, ...</u>
    omit κύριε: H (not in NA)
NA28 John 13:6 ἔρχεται οὖν πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον· λέγει αὐτῷ· <u>κύριε, ...</u>
    omit κύριε: 01* (not in NA)
NA28 John 13:8 λέγει αὐτῷ Πέτρος· _____ οὐ μὴ νίψῃς μου
    <u>add</u> **κύριε:** D, Θ, Π^c, pc (not in NA but in SQE)
NA28 John 13:9 λέγει αὐτῷ Σίμων Πέτρος· <u>κύριε, ...</u>
    omit κύριε: 01* (not in NA)
NA28 John 13:25 λέγει αὐτῷ· <u>κύριε, τίς ἐστιν;</u>
NA28 John 14:5 Λέγει αὐτῷ Θωμᾶς· <u>κύριε</u>, οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις·
NA28 John 14:8 Λέγει αὐτῷ Φίλιππος· <u>κύριε</u>, δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα,
NA28 John 14:22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης· <u>κύριε, ...</u>

It is possible that the word has been omitted as an unnecessary repetition after verse 36. On the other hand it could have been added as a conformation to verse 36.

From the evidence for the other cases above, it is clear that 01* is very unreliable in this respect. Sy-S omits once, too.
There is one case (13:8), where κύριε has been added by D et al.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 240

Minority reading:
NA28 John 13:36 Λέγει <u>αὐτῷ</u> Σίμων Πέτρος· κύριε, ποῦ ὑπάγεις; ἀπεκρίθη **[αὐτῷ]** Ἰησοῦς· ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ δύνασαί μοι νῦν ἀκολουθῆσαι, ἀκολουθήσεις δὲ ὕστερον.

omit   B, C*, L, 1071, pc, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Gre, Bois, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL
       ὁ Ἰησοῦς   1071

txt   P66, 01, A, C^C3, D, X, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
       ὁ Ἰησοῦς   01, C^C3, D, W, X, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj

Compare context:
NA28 John 13:38 <u>ἀποκρίνεται Ἰησοῦς·</u> τὴν ψυχήν σου ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ θήσεις; ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, οὐ μὴ ἀλέκτωρ φωνήσῃ ἕως οὗ ἀρνήσῃ με τρίς.
<u>add αὐτῷ:</u> C^C3, f1, Maj-part[E, G, H, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ^C, 2, 28, 565, 700, 1071, 1424]

Compare also:
NA28 John 13:8 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς αὐτῷ·
txt   P75, A, B, C, L*, pc, L844
αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦς   P66, 01, W, Θ, f1, f13, Maj
<u>omit αὐτῷ:</u>   C^C3, D, Ψ, 157, (1071), 1241, pc

NA28 John 18:8 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς·
<u>add αὐτοῖς:</u>   D, f1, f13, 565

NA28 John 19:11 ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ] Ἰησοῦς·
<u>omit αὐτῷ:</u>   P66, A, Θ, f13, Maj
txt   P60^vid, 01, B, D^S, L, N^C, W, Ψ, f1, 33, 565, 579, al

B: no umlaut

The phrase ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς appears 23 times in John and only in one case (18:8) some scribes added a pronoun. This suggests that also here no addition took place but that B, C, L omitted the pronoun. Perhaps this was for stylistic reasons, because λέγει αὐτῷ appeared earlier in the verse already.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 241

99. <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 13:37 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πέτρος· κύριε, διὰ τί οὐ δύναμαί σοι <u>ἀκολουθῆσαι</u> ἄρτι; τὴν ψυχήν μου ὑπὲρ σοῦ θήσω.

    <u>ἀκολουθεῖν</u>   B, C*, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>

  txt <u>ἀκολουθῆσαι</u>   P66, 01, A, C^{C3}, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj

B: no umlaut

ἀκολουθῆσαι   infinitive aorist   active
ἀκολουθεῖν   infinitive present active

Compare immediate context:

NA28 John 13:36 ἀπεκρίθη [αὐτῷ] Ἰησοῦς· ὅπου ὑπάγω οὐ <u>δύνασαί</u> μοι νῦν <u>ἀκολουθῆσαι, ἀκολουθήσεις</u> δὲ ὕστερον.
<u>ἀκολουθεῖν</u>   C

Compare also:

NA28 John 13:33 τεκνία, ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι· ζητήσετέ με, καὶ καθὼς εἶπον τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ <u>δύνασθε</u> <u>ἐλθεῖν</u>, καὶ ὑμῖν λέγω ἄρτι.

It is possible that ἀκολουθῆσαι is a conformation to immediate context, verse 36. C has ἀκολουθεῖν also in verse 36. Perhaps it is a conformation to common usage. John uses ἄρτι only with the present or perfect.
The support is very slim.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 242

100. <u>**Difficult variant**</u>
NA28 John 14:4 καὶ ὅπου [ἐγὼ] ὑπάγω <u>οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν.</u>

BYZ John 14:4 καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω <u>οἴδατε καὶ τὴν ὁδόν οἴδατε,</u>

Byz   P66*, A, C^{C3}, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, Maj,
       Lat, Sy, sa, ac², arm, geo, goth, <u>Bois</u>, [Trg^{mg}]

txt   P66^{C}, 01, B, C*, L, Q, W, X, 33, (579), 1071, pc, a, sa^{ms}, pbo, bo
       <u>οὐκ οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν</u>   579

<u>τὴν ὁδόν οἴδατε</u>   157

<u>οἴδατε</u>   L1127 (acc. to NTS 14, 1967, p. 140), h.t. from Byz?

<u>omit ἐγὼ:</u>   P66, D, L, W, X, Θ, f1, f13, 565, 1424, pc,
             it(a, b, d, e, ff², q, r¹), pbo, bo^{ms}

Lat(c, f, vg) has ἐγὼ.
Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

Compare next verse 5:
NA28 John 14:5 Λέγει αὐτῷ Θωμᾶς· κύριε, οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις· πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι;

In the following verse Thomas also separates the two things:
a) where Jesus goes and b) to know the way.
It is possible that the Byzantine text is a conformation to that separation. At least the Byzantine text fits better to Thomas reply.

On the other hand it is also possible that the txt reading is a stylistic improvement. Note the reading of 157, which also looks like a stylistic improvement. Metzger on the other hand notes the "syntactical harshness" of the shorter text.

Note the negation of 579!

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 243

101. Difficult variant
Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:5 Λέγει αὐτῷ Θωμᾶς· κύριε, οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις·
πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι;

πῶς οἴδαμεν τὴν ὁδὸν   B, C*, **NA[25]**, WH, Weiss, Tis, Trg, Bal

πῶς τὴν ὁδὸν οἴδαμεν   D

one of these: a, b, d, e, pbo
                  Tis adds: m, aeth, Cyr, Tert[Prax 24]
                  quomodo novimus viam   a
                  quomodo viam scimus   b
                  quomodo viam novimus   d, e, m

txt   P66, 01, A, C[C2], K, L, Q, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33,
             157, 565, 579, 1071, Maj,
             Lat, Sy, sa, ac[2], bo, goth, Trg[mg]
             πῶς τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι δυνάμεθα;   01
             πῶς τὴν ὁδὸν δυνάμεθα εἰδέναι;   K

Tertullian (ca. 215 CE, Adversus Praxean, ch. 24):
"Erant plane qui et tunc non intellegerent: quoniam et Thomas aliquamdiu
incredulus, Domine, inquit, non scimus quo eas, et <u>quomodo viam novimus</u>? Et
Iesus, Ego sum via, veritas et vita; …"

Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:
NA28 John 14:4 καὶ ὅπου [ἐγὼ] ὑπάγω <u>οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν.</u>

The txt reading sounds like a stylistic improvement.
On the other hand the B, C, D reading could be a conformation to the previous
verse:
καὶ ὅπου [ἐγὼ] ὑπάγω   -   οὐκ οἴδαμεν ποῦ ὑπάγεις
οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν   -   πῶς οἴδαμεν τὴν ὁδὸν

Both readings must be very early. Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the simple B reading must be original.

Zahn (Comm. Jo) calls the txt reading a "pedantic emendation" and opts for the B reading.

Note another B, C* agreement in 14:7: omitting αὐτόν.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 244

NA28 John 14:7 εἰ <u>ἐγνώκατέ</u> με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου <u>γνώσεσθε.</u>
καὶ ἀπ' ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐωράκατε αὐτόν.

BYZ John 14:7 εἰ <u>ἐγνώκειτέ</u> με καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου <u>ἐγνώκειτε ἂν</u>·
καὶ ἀπ ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐωράκατε αὐτόν

a) <u>ἐγνώκατε</u>
Byz   A, B, C, D^C1, L, Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0211, f1, 22, f13, 33, 892, Maj,
      <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   P66, 01, D*, W, 579, pc, Ir^Lat
      ἐγνώκαται P66
      ἐγνώκεται W (For ατε W sometimes writes αται. For ειτε, W writes
              ειται. What we have here is an exception.)

b) γνώσεσθε
Byz   A, C^C3, Δ, 0211, Θ, f13, 892, Maj
txt   P66, 01, D, W, 579, pc

<u>ἂν ἤδειτε</u>   B, C*, L, Q, N, X, Ψ, 0141, f1, 22, 33, 565, al,
      <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>SBL</u>

<u>ἐγνώκατέ</u> … <u>γνώσεσθε</u>   P66, 01, D, W, 579
<u>ἐγνώκειτέ</u> … <u>ἐγνώκειτε ἂν</u>   A, C^C3, Θ, f13, 892, Maj
<u>ἐγνώκειτέ</u> … <u>ἂν ἤδειτε</u>   B, C*, L, Q, N, X, Ψ, 0141, f1, 22, 33, 565, al

Swanson has Q for ἐγνώκειτε ἂν in error. NA, Tis and IGNTP (majuscule) have
ἂν ἤδειτε for Q (so also Tis in his Q-edition)!
The readings of the versions are not really unequivocal here.
Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

ἐγνώκατε   indicative perfect   active 2nd person plural
ἐγνώκειτε indicative pluperfect active 2nd person plural
γνώσεσθε   indicative future   middle 2nd person plural
ἤδειτε   indicative pluperfect active 2nd person plural

txt   "If you know me, my Father also you will know."
Byz + B et al.   "If you had known me, my Father also you would have known."

Compare:
NA28 John 8:19 εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου <u>ἂν ᾔδειτε.</u>
BYZ John 8:19 εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου <u>ᾔδειτε ἂν</u>
not in NA:
Byz   01, Θ, f13, 157, 579, Maj
txt   P39, P66, P75, B, L, N, W, Ψ, f1, 33, 1071
omit ἂν: D

ἂν ᾔδειτε is very probably a harmonization to 8:19 where the words are safe.

It is possible that ἐγνώκειτε ἂν is also a reminiscence to 8:19. Additionally it
is possible that the second ἐγνώκειτε is a conformation to the first ἐγνώκειτε
(so Weiss).
The following καὶ ἀπ’ ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν = "From now on you do know
him", seem to suggest that earlier they did not know him.

Metzger translates:
txt   "If you have come to know me [as in fact you do],
        you shall know my father also."
Byz   "If you had come to know me [which, alas, you do not],
        you would have knowledge of my father also."

The txt reading is a promise, the Byzantine reading a reproach. Metzger writes:
"Despite the harmony between this statement [txt] and the rest of verse 7,
another interpretation of Jesus' words gained wide currency [Byz] ... The latter
construction [Byz] (a condition contrary to fact), seems to have arisen either
because copyists recalled Jesus' reproach against unbelieving Jews in 8:19 or
because Philip's question (verse 8) and Jesus reply (verse 9) suggested to them
that the disciples knew neither Jesus nor the Father."

K. Aland adds a minority vote:
"The purpose of the Evangelist as well as the laws of textual development have
been misunderstood. If a negative and a positive statement about the Apostles
stand side by side in the textual tradition, the positive one is usually the later."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 245

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:7 εἰ ἐγνώκατέ με, καὶ τὸν πατέρα μου γνώσεσθε. καὶ ἀπ᾽ ἄρτι γινώσκετε αὐτὸν καὶ ἑωράκατε **αὐτόν.**

omit: B, C*, r¹, vgᵐˢ, Irᴸᵃᵗ, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss

txt   WHᵐᵍ, [Trg]

Lacuna: P75
B: no umlaut

"If you know me, you will know my Father also.
 From now on you do know him and have seen [him]."

Compare:
NA28 Mark 11:2 λύσατε αὐτὸν καὶ φέρετε.

Ellipsis (from ἐλλείπω = "leave out"): Typical in Greek, the pronoun is omitted where it can be supplied easily from context.
The support is very slim.
Note another B, C* agreement in 14:5, see above.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 146) thinks that the ἑωράκατε without the αὐτόν would have been much too striking to be secondary.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 246

<u>**Difficult variant:**</u>

NA28 John 14:9 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ</u> μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με, Φίλιππε; ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμὲ ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα· πῶς σὺ λέγεις· δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα;

BYZ John 14:9 Λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, <u>Τοσοῦτον χρόνον</u> μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι, καὶ οὐκ ἔγνωκάς με, Φίλιππε; Ὁ ἑωρακὼς ἐμέ, ἑώρακεν τὸν πατέρα· καὶ πῶς σὺ λέγεις, Δεῖξον ἡμῖν τὸν πατέρα;

Byz   P66, P75, 01^C1, A, B, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj,
       <u>**NA²⁵**</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   01*, C2, D, L, Q, W, pc, Ir^Lat, <u>WH^mg</u>, <u>Trg^mg</u>, <u>Tis</u>

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Hebrews 4:7 πάλιν τινὰ ὁρίζει ἡμέραν, σήμερον, ἐν Δαυὶδ λέγων μετὰ <u>τοσοῦτον χρόνον</u>, καθὼς προείρηται·

LXX 4 Maccabees 5:7 αἰδοῦμαι γάρ σου τὴν ἡλικίαν καὶ τὴν πολιάν ἣν μετὰ <u>τοσοῦτον ἔχων χρόνον</u> οὔ μοι δοκεῖς φιλοσοφεῖν τῇ Ιουδαίων χρώμενος θρησκείᾳ

Compare Josephus: He uses both versions:
Jwr 1:665 καὶ <u>τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ</u> φυλάξας ἰδίοις τέκνοις κατέλιπεν ἐν δὲ τοῖς κατ' οἶκον ἀτυχέστατος
Ant 10:60 καὶ <u>τοσούτῳ μεταξὺ χρόνῳ</u> μὴ μετανοήσαντας τῶν τε προφητῶν τοῦτο παραινούντων σωφρονεῖν
In Ant 1:317, 6:317, Jwr 2:413 he uses τοσοῦτον χρόνον.

Johannine usage:
NA28 John 7:33 εἶπεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· <u>ἔτι χρόνον μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι</u>
NA28 John 13:33 τεκνία, <u>ἔτι μικρὸν μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι·</u>
                         <u>add χρόνον:</u>   01, L, Θ, Ψ, f13, 28, 157, 1071, pc

The phrase appears only two more times in the Greek Bible, both in the accusative.

John uses χρόνος three more times, also always in the accusative (5:6, 7:33, 12:35). Weiss (Com. John) says the accusative was generally the more common. The question therefore is why someone should change the accusative into the dative?

The evidence for the dative is curiously divided. The text of 01 is not Western anymore in this part of the Gospel and comparatively close to W. Q appears to be a mixed text.

Perhaps idiomatic usage.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 247

NA28 John 14:11 <u>πιστεύετέ μοι</u> ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί· εἰ δὲ μή, διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετε <u>___</u>.

BYZ John 14:11 <u>πιστεύετέ μοι</u> ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν ἐμοί· εἰ δὲ μή διὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτὰ πιστεύετε <u>**μοι**</u>

Byz   A, B, Q, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 1071ᶜ, Maj,
       it(a, b, ff², q), Sy-H, bo, goth, <u>WHᵐᵍ</u>, **<u>NA²⁵</u>**, [Trg]

txt   P66, P75, 01, D, L, W, 33, 579, 1071*, 1241, al,
       Lat(aur, c, d, e, f, r¹, vg), Sy-C, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, sa, ac², <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>

Sy-S omits verses 10b-11.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Very probably a conformation to the preceding πιστεύετέ μοι (so also Weiss).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 248

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:13 καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ.
NA28 John 14:14 <u>ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ποιήσω.</u>
NA28 John 14:15 <u>Ἐὰν</u> ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε·

omit verse: X, Λ*, 0141, f1, 22, 565, pc, L253, b, vg^ms, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, arm, geo
    Λ*, 0141, 118, 205, 209, pc omit from ἵνα verse 13 on.

<u>verse post ποιήσω in verse 13:</u> 157, 1010

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 15:16 ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δῷ ὑμῖν.
NA28 John 16:23 ἄν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δώσει ὑμῖν.

The omission is probably due to h.t. (ἐάν - ἐάν or ποιήσω - ποιήσω).
Metzger additionally suggests that it is possibly omitted as redundant after the very similar statement in verse 13. Or that it has been omitted deliberately to avoid contradiction with 15:16 or 16:23.
There is no reason why the words should have been added.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 249

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:14 ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ <u>με</u> ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ποιήσω.

<u>omit:</u> A, D, K, Π, L, Q, Ψ, 69, 157, 1071, 1241, 1424,
 Maj-part[G, M, Y, Λ^mg], it(a, aur, b, d, e, q, r¹), vg^mss, Co, <u>Trg</u>

txt P66, P75^vid?, 01, B, W, Θ, 060, 0211, f13, 2, 28, 33, 579, 700,
 Maj-part[E, H, U, Γ, Δ, Ω], c, f, (ff²), vg, Sy, arm^Usc, goth,
 <u>NA</u><u>²⁵</u>, [Trg^mg], [Robinson¹⁹⁹¹]

<u>τὸν πατέρα</u> pc
<u>a patre meo</u> ff², aeth

<u>WH</u> have με in brackets.
Lacuna: P75, C
X, Λ*, 0141, f1, 565, pc, b, vg^ms, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, arm omit the verse probably due to h.t.
Arm^usc = Uscanus (Oskan, Usgan) edition from 1666.

P75 has a lacuna here, but the text with με fits the space better.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:
NA28 John 14:13 καὶ ὅ <u>τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου</u> τοῦτο ποιήσω, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ.
And following verse:
NA28 John 14:15 Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ <u>με</u>, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε·

"If <u>in my name you ask me</u> for anything, I will do it" sounds awkward. Either you "ask me" or you "ask in my name", but both? How could one "ask me in my name"? So με is certainly the harder reading. The Byzantine omission is either intended to remove this problem or it is a harmonization to the previous verse (so Weiss). As for the complete omission of the verse one could also argue that it has been omitted deliberately to avoid contradiction with 15:16 or 16:23.

On the other hand it is possible that the txt reading is a harmonization to the following verse, but this is not very likely.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 250

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:14 ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου <u>ἐγὼ</u>   ποιήσω.

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>τοῦτό</u>   P75, A, B, L, Γ, Λ, Ψ, 060, 124, 33, 1071, pc,
           c, g¹, r¹, 11A, vg, Co, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}, <u>WH</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66*, 01, D, Q, W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj, it, <u>WH</u>^{mg}, <u>Tis</u>

<u>τοῦτό ἐγὼ</u>   P66^C, 1241
<u>ἐγὼ τοῦτό</u>   M*

X, 0141, 565 omit verse due to h.t.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verses 12-13:
NA28 John 14:12 Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ τὰ ἔργα ἃ <u>ἐγὼ ποιῶ</u> κἀκεῖνος ποιήσει καὶ μείζονα <u>τούτων ποιήσει</u>, ὅτι ἐγὼ πρὸς τὸν πατέρα πορεύομαι·
NA28 John 14:13 καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου <u>τοῦτο ποιήσω,</u> ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ.   safe!

Compare also:
NA28 John 15:16
ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου <u>δῷ ὑμῖν.</u>
                               <u>τούτῳ ποιήσω</u>   f13

Probably τοῦτο is a conformation to the previous verse, where it's safe (so already Weiss). Also the support for τοῦτο is incoherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 251

103. <u>Difficult variant</u>
NA28 John 14:15 Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς <u>τηρήσετε·</u>

BYZ John 14:15 Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς ἐμὰς <u>τηρήσατε.</u>

Byz <u>τηρήσατε</u> A, D, Q, W, X, Δ, Θ, 0141, 0211, f1, f13, 157, Maj,
                Latt, Sy, arm, goth

txt <u>τηρήσετε</u> B, L, Ψ, 1010, 1071, pc, Co
     <u>τηρήσητε</u> P66, 01, 060, 33, 579, pc

Lacuna: P75, C
B: no umlaut

ἀγαπᾶτε subjunctive present active 2nd person plural
τηρήσετε indicative   future active 2nd person plural
τηρήσατε imperative   aorist active 2nd person plural
τηρήσητε subjunctive aorist active 2nd person plural

txt "If you love me, you will keep my commandments."
Byz "If you love me, keep my commandments!"

Compare context:
NA28 John 14:14 ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ <u>ποιήσω.</u>
NA28 John 14:21 ὁ ἔχων τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ <u>τηρῶν</u> αὐτὰς
                ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαπῶν με·
NA28 John 14:23 ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με τὸν λόγον μου <u>τηρήσει,</u>
NA28 John 14:24 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου <u>οὐ τηρεῖ·</u>

Compare also:
NA28 John 8:51 ἐάν τις τὸν ἐμὸν λόγον <u>τηρήσῃ,</u> …
NA28 John 15:10 ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς μου <u>τηρήσητε,</u> …
NA28 John 15:20 εἰ τὸν λόγον μου <u>ἐτήρησαν,</u>
                καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον <u>τηρήσουσιν.</u>
NA28 John 17:6 σοὶ ἦσαν κἀμοὶ αὐτοὺς ἔδωκας
                καὶ τὸν λόγον σου <u>τετήρηκαν.</u>
NA28 1 John 2:3 ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ <u>τηρῶμεν.</u>
NA28 1 John 2:5 ὃς δ᾽ ἂν <u>τηρῇ</u> αὐτοῦ τὸν λόγον,
                <u>τήρει</u> (Imp.)   018, 33, 81, 1241, pc

NA28 1 John 3:22 ὅτι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ <u>τηροῦμεν</u>
NA28 1 John 3:24 καὶ ὁ <u>τηρῶν</u> τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ μένει
NA28 1 John 5:3 ἵνα τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ <u>τηρῶμεν</u>

Difficult to judge on internal grounds.

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
     = either τηρήσετε or τηρήσητε is correct.
     (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 252

<u>14:16 and 15:11</u>
NA28 John 14:16 κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα ____ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾖ,

BYZ John 14:16 καὶ ἐγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν ἵνα μένῃ μεθ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα __

Byz   P66, A, D, W, Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 1241, Maj, vg, Sy-H

txt   P75, 01, B, L, Q, X, Ψ, 060, 33ᵛⁱᵈ, 1071, pc, it, Sy-Hᵐᵍ
       ἵνα μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ᾖ   P75, B, 060ᵛⁱᵈ, b, <u>WHᵐᵍ</u>, <u>Weiss</u>
       ἵνα μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν ᾖ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα   01, it, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
       ἵνα ᾖ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα   L, Q, X, Ψ, 33ᵛⁱᵈ, 1071, pc,
                                          e, Sy-Hᵐᵍ, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>SBL</u>

060 (6ᵗʰ CE, P. 5877, Berlin):Wrongly transcribed in IGNTP. They give:
           δωσει υμιν ινα
           [με]θ υμων εις τον
           [αιωνα με]νη το πνα
This would be a singular reading.
It is pretty clear that this is simply the txt reading! This can be tentatively confirmed from the plate in the IGNTP volume, because μενη does not fit the space. The parchment suffers from strong bleed- and shine-through. Subtracting everything that comes from the verso, there is nothing before the ⊤Ο (from verse 17) except for a highpoint, which is closing verse 16. αἰῶνα ᾖ is also the text given in the ed. pr. by A.H. Salonius (ZNW 26, 1927 p. 103). Also NA has it correctly.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Same in 15:11:
NA28 John 15:11 Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ᾖ καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ.

BYZ John 15:11 Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, καὶ ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν πληρωθῇ

Byz   01, L, X, 0250, f13, Maj
txt   A, B, D, Θ, Ψ, f1, 33, 565, 579, 1071, 1241, L844, pc, Lat, Sy
<u>omit:</u> 157

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 3:2 ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ ὁ θεὸς μετ᾽ αὐτοῦ.
omit ᾖ: P66*, L
NA28 John 9:31 ἀλλ᾽ ἐάν τις θεοσεβὴς ᾖ καὶ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιῇ
ἦν for ᾖ: P66
NA28 John 16:24 ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾖ πεπληρωμένη.
ἦν for ᾖ: W

NA28 John 17:26 ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ... ἐν αὐτοῖς ᾖ κἀγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς.
ην for ᾖ: P66
omit: 579

Compare also next verse:
NA28 John 14:17 ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε αὐτό, ὅτι παρ᾽ ὑμῖν <u>μένει</u> καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.

It is probable that, to avoid the letter H as a verb, this has been changed to μένῃ. Additionally it is a harmonization to the next verse.
There is no reason why someone should change μένῃ to ᾖ.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 253

104. <u>Difficult variant</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:17 τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει· ὑμεῖς <u>γινώσκετε</u> αὐτό , ὅτι παρ᾽ ὑμῖν <u>μένει</u> καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν <u style="color:green">**ἔσται.**</u>

txt not in NA and SQE!

<u style="color:green">ἐστίν</u>   P66*, B, D*, W, 0211, f1, 69, 22, 565, pc, it, vg^{ms}, Sy-C, Sy-P, <u style="color:red">WH</u>, <u style="color:red">Trg</u>
est

txt   P66^C, 01, A, D^{C2}, Q, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33^{vid}, 157, 579, 1071, Maj,
erit   aur, r¹, vg, Sy-S, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm, <u style="color:red">WH^{mg}</u>, <u style="color:red">**NA²⁵**</u>

P75: The reading, given as …]αι in the ed.pr. and reproduced like that in Swanson, isn't clear at all. The printed NA does not give the notation for txt. The online NA indicates P75 as completely missing for this word, which is probably correct.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u style="color:blue">**click here**</u>.

καὶ <u>σὺν</u> ὑμῖν   f1
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

γινώσκετε indicative present active 2nd person plural
μένει   indicative present active 3rd person singular
ἔσται   indicative future   middle 3rd person singular

P66…   "You know him, because he abides with you, and he <u>*is*</u>   in you"
txt   "You know him, because he abides with you, and he <u>*will be*</u> in you"

Compare previous verse:
NA28 John 14:16 κἀγὼ ἐρωτήσω τὸν πατέρα καὶ ἄλλον παράκλητον δώσει ὑμῖν, ἵνα μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα <u>ᾖ,</u>
          ἵνα <u>μένῃ</u> μεθ ὑμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα

The Spirit is not yet there. The future tense is more appropriate therefore. With ἐστίν being original, ἔσται would be a natural conformation to context.

On the other hand is possible that the present tense is a conformation to the tense of the previous verbs, especially γινώσκετε (so Weiss).

Metzger writes: "A majority of the Committee interpreted the sense of the passage as requiring the future ἔσται, which is adequately supported."

Μένει can be present μένει or future μενεῖ. If scribes interpreted it as future, ἔσται would have been a conformation to that tense.

Jo uses three times elsewhere ἐν + dative of a person + ἐστίν, but never ἔσται (7:18, 12:35, 14:10).

Compare:
- James M. Hamilton Jr. "Appendix 2: 'He Is with You, and He Is in You?' The Text of John 14:17c," in: God's Indwelling Presence, The Holy Spirit in the Old and New Testaments, NACSBT; Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2006, p. 175–82.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 254

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:20 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ <u>γνώσεσθε ὑμεῖς</u> ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί μου καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν ὑμῖν.

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>ὑμεῖς γνώσεσθε</u>
P75, B, L, M*, Q, X, 060, 0141, 33, 1071, L844, pc, Trg, WH

txt   P66, 01, D, W, Ψ, f1, f13, 579, Maj

<u>γνώσεσθε</u> A, Λ, Θ, pc

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 14:17 τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει· <u>ὑμεῖς γινώσκετε</u> αὐτό, ὅτι παρ᾽ ὑμῖν μένει καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται.

Compare:
NA28 John 16:20 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι <u>κλαύσετε καὶ θρηνήσετε ὑμεῖς</u>,

John normally uses the order ὑμεῖς – verb. The order verb - ὑμεῖς is very unusual. There is actually only one other example: Jo 16:20, here the order is safe.
The P75, B reading is clearly the easier reading and the support is incoherent.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 255

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:22 Λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰούδας, οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης· κύριε, **[καὶ]** τί γέγονεν ὅτι ἡμῖν μέλλεις ἐμφανίζειν σεαυτὸν καὶ οὐχὶ τῷ κόσμῳ;

omit P66*, P75, A, B, D, E, L, M, X, Θ, Λ, 0211, 0233, 33, 700, 1071, 1241, al, TR, Trg, WH, SBL

txt P66^C^, 01, W, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 579, Maj

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 9:36 ἀπεκρίθη ἐκεῖνος καὶ εἶπεν· <u>καὶ τίς</u> ἐστιν, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν;

<u>omit καὶ:</u> 01*, A, L, Θ, 1241, pc

Compare also:
NA28 Mark 10:26 οἱ δὲ περισσῶς ἐξεπλήσσοντο λέγοντες πρὸς ἑαυτούς· <u>καὶ τίς</u> δύναται σωθῆναι;

There is no reason for the addition of καὶ. Probably it has been omitted as redundant or to improve style. Similar Jo 9:36.
Weiss (Com. John) thinks that the καὶ has been omitted, because it was not understood. It connects the question with the previous words.
Metzger notes that "in Talmudic discussions, however, questions are normally introduced with 'and'."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 256

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:24 ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν με τοὺς λόγους μου οὐ τηρεῖ· καὶ ὁ λόγος <u>ὃν ἀκούετε</u> οὐκ ἔστιν <u>ἐμὸς</u> ἀλλὰ τοῦ πέμψαντός με πατρός.

<u>ὁ ἐμὸς ὃν ἀκούετε</u>   D, L844, pc, d, r¹, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, ac², mf, pbo, arm, geo

<u>ὁ ἐμὸς</u>   a, e, Did, Chrys, Bois
                          sermo meus   a
                          verbum meum d, e, r¹

Lacuna: C
B umlaut! (p. 1372 B 41)   <u>οὐ τηρεῖ· καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν</u> ἀκούετε

Compare:
NA28 John 7:6 <u>ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς</u>
NA28 John 8:37 ὅτι <u>ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς</u> οὐ χωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.
NA28 John 12:26 καὶ ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ ἐκεῖ καὶ <u>ὁ διάκονος ὁ ἐμὸς</u> ἔσται·

The support for ὁ ἐμὸς is not very strong, but diverse. Strange. Probably added for stylistic reasons to correspond with the second ἐμὸς.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 257

105. Difficult variant

NA28 John 14:26 ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν **[ἐγώ]**.

BYZ John 14:26 ὁ δὲ παράκλητος τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν ____.

Byz εἶπον ὑμῖν ___   P75, 01, A, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 565, 579, 1071, Maj, Latt, Co, goth, Gre, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt εἶπον ὑμῖν ἐγώ   B, L, 060, 0141, 127, 1819, WH, **NA**[25]

    ἐγώ εἶπον ὑμῖν   X

    εἶπον ἐγώ   Cyr (Tis)

060 (6th CE, P. 5877, Berlin): Not listed in IGNTP but in NA. At the place in question (the image is in the IGNTP volume) the parchment is quite damaged, but part of the ⲱ of ⲈⲄⲰ and the bottom part of the vertical bar of Ⲅ can be seen. After it comes εἰρήνην. ἐγω is also in the ed. pr. by A.H. Salonius (ZNW 26, 1927 p. 103).

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

33: From the b/w INTF film this is impossible to judge. The ink is very blurred at this point. Swanson has   πάντα **ὅσα** εἶπον ὑμῖν,
                 NA has πάντα **ἐγὼ** εἶπον ὑμῖν

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

Lacuna: P66, C, W
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 1:31 κἀγὼ οὐκ ᾔδειν αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἵνα φανερωθῇ τῷ Ἰσραὴλ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθον ἐγὼ ἐν ὕδατι βαπτίζων.
omit ἐγώ: 28, 157

NA28 John 18:21 τί με ἐρωτᾷς; ἐρώτησον τοὺς ἀκηκοότας τί ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς· ἴδε οὗτοι οἴδασιν ἃ εἶπον ἐγώ.

It is possible that ἐγώ has been added to make clear that εἶπον is 1ˢᵗ person singular and not 3ʳᵈ person plural. This is supported by the rather unusual support (two Byzantine minuscules) and the differing word order.

This construction with ἐγώ is not unusual in John.

On the other hand it is possible that ἐγώ has been omitted as unnecessary.

It is also possible to take ἐγώ with the next verse:
ἐγώ 27 εἰρήνην ἀφίημι ὑμῖν, εἰρήνην τὴν ἐμὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν·

Weiss (Textkritik, p. 138) notes that a secondary ἐγώ would have been added at the beginning for emphasis (as 33 did) and not at the end where it could have been easily overlooked.

Rating: - (indecisive)
         (brackets ok)

TVU 258

Minority reading:
NA28 John 14:31 ἀλλ᾽ ἵνα γνῷ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι ἀγαπῶ τὸν πατέρα, καὶ καθὼς <u>ἐνετείλατό</u> μοι ὁ πατήρ, οὕτως ποιῶ. ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν.

<u>ἐντολὴν ἔδωκεν</u>   P75ᵛⁱᵈ, B, L, X, 0250, f1, 33, 565, 1071, al,
Lat, pbo, ac², Cyr, <u>WH</u>, <u>Trg</u>

                <u>ἐντολὴν ἔδωκεν</u> μοι ὁ πατήρ   B, L, X, 33
                <u>ἔδωκεν</u> μοι ὁ πατήρ <u>ἐντολὴν</u>   f1
                <u>ἔδωκεν</u> μοι <u>ἐντολὴν</u> ὁ πατήρ   565
                <u>τὴν ἐντολὴν ἣν δέδωκεν</u> μοι ὁ πατήρ   1071

txt   01, A, D, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 157, 579, 1241, Maj,
d, Sy, Co, arm, goth, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>Weiss</u>

omit ὁ πατήρ: D, d, e, l

mandatum dedit mihi   a, aur, f, r¹, vg
mandatum mihi dedit   e, q
praeceptum dedit mihi   c, ff², l
praeceptum mihi dedit   b
         mandavit mihi   d

Lacuna: P66, C, W
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 8:28 ἀλλὰ καθὼς <u>ἐδίδαξέν με</u> ὁ πατὴρ ταῦτα λαλῶ.
                         <u>ἐνετείλατό μοι</u>   1241

NA28 John 12:49 ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐξ ἐμαυτοῦ οὐκ ἐλάλησα, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πέμψας με πατὴρ αὐτός μοι <u>ἐντολὴν δέδωκεν</u> τί εἴπω καὶ τί λαλήσω.

NA28 John 13:34 <u>Ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι</u> ὑμῖν, ...

NA28 John 15:14 ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἃ ἐγὼ <u>ἐντέλλομαι</u> ὑμῖν.
NA28 John 15:17 ταῦτα <u>ἐντέλλομαι</u> ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.

Context:
NA28 John 14:15 Ἐὰν ἀγαπᾶτέ με, τὰς <u>ἐντολὰς</u> τὰς ἐμὰς τηρήσετε·
NA28 John 14:21 ὁ ἔχων τὰς <u>ἐντολάς</u> μου καὶ τηρῶν αὐτὰς

It is possible that we have here a harmonization to 12:49 (so Weiss). In 12:49 the reading is safe. The different word order variants are an additional indication for a secondary cause.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 259

106. <u>Difficult variant</u>
NA28 John 15:8 ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου, ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν <u>φέρητε</u> καὶ <u>γένησθε</u> ἐμοὶ μαθηταί.

BYZ John 15:8 ἐν τούτῳ ἐδοξάσθη ὁ πατήρ μου ἵνα καρπὸν πολὺν <u>φέρητε</u> καὶ <u>γενήσεσθε</u> ἐμοὶ μαθηταί

Byz   01, A, K, Δ, Ψ, 0141, 124, 346, 788(=f13), 700, 1071, Maj,
<u>NA</u><u>²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>^{mg}, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   P66^{vid}, B, D, L, M, S, X, Λ, Θ, Π, 0250, f1, f13-part, 33, 565, 579, 1424, al,
<u>WH</u>
<u>γίνησθε</u>   579

Swanson has 33 for txt, NA for Byz. It's difficult to see on the film, but the short reading appears slightly more probable.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>click here</u>.

Lacuna: C, W
B: no umlaut

φέρητε   subjunctive present active 2nd person plural
γένησθε   subjunctive aorist middle 2nd person plural
γενήσεσθε indicative future middle 2nd person plural
γίνομαι   indicative/imperative present middle 2nd person plural

txt "... that you bear much fruit and <u>*shall be*</u> my disciples."
Byz "... that you bear much fruit and <u>*you will become*</u> my disciples."

It is possible that γένησθε is a conformation to the preceding φέρητε in tense (so Weiss).
The difference in meaning is subtle, if there is one at all.
The error is very probably at least in part accidental.

Metzger writes:
"The Committee found it exceedingly difficult to decide between γένησθε, which depends upon ἵνα and is coordinate with φέρητε, and γενήσεσθε, which probably must be construed as an independent clause or sentence. - Yet on rare occasions the future indicative occurs with ἵνα, see Blass-Debrunner §369(2)."

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 260

107. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 15:10 ἐὰν τὰς ἐντολάς <u>μου</u> τηρήσητε, μενεῖτε ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ <u>μου</u>, καθὼς ἐγὼ τὰς ἐντολὰς τοῦ πατρός **μου** τετήρηκα καὶ μένω αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγάπῃ.

<u style="color:blue">**omit second μου:**</u>   P66, e, vg^{ms}
<u style="color:green">**omit third μου:**</u>   P66, P75^{vid}, B, it, <u style="color:red">WH</u>, <u style="color:red">Weiss</u>^{earlier}

txt   Lat(d, f, r¹, vg), <u style="color:red">WH^{mg}</u>, **NA²⁵**, <u style="color:red">Weiss</u>^{later}

<u style="color:red">Weiss</u>: In his Jo Com. (1893) he recommends to delete the third μου, but in his Greek text (1905) he has it.

Note word-order:
ἐγὼ τοῦ πατρός ___ τὰς ἐντολὰς   P66, P75^{vid}, B, it
ἐγὼ τοῦ πατρός **μου** τὰς ἐντολὰς   01, vg, <u style="color:red">Weiss</u>^{later}

Note also:
τὰς ἐντολάς <u style="color:green">**τὰς ἐμὰς**</u>   A
τῇ ἀγάπῃ   <u style="color:green">**τῇ ἐμῇ**</u>   01, X, pc

Lacuna: C, W
B: no umlaut

See complete discussion at Joh 6:65!
The evidence shows that it is slightly more probable that μου has been added than that it has been removed.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 261

Minority reading:
NA28 John 15:14 ὑμεῖς φίλοι μού ἐστε ἐὰν ποιῆτε <u>ἃ ἐγὼ</u> ἐντέλλομαι ὑμῖν.

     <u>ὃ</u>   B, 579, pc, <u>NA²⁵</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>
txt <u>ἃ</u>   P66, 01, D, L, X, f1, f13, 565, 1071, pc, <u>WH^{mg}</u>

<u>ὅσα</u>   A, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, 33, Maj

Lacuna: C, W
B: no umlaut

ἃ   accusative neuter plural
ὃ   accusative neuter singular
ὅσα   accusative neuter plural

Context:
NA28 John 15:7 ἐὰν μείνητε ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τὰ ῥήματά μου ἐν ὑμῖν μείνῃ, <u>ὃ</u> ἐὰν θέλητε αἰτήσασθε, καὶ γενήσεται ὑμῖν.
<u>ὅσα</u>   01

Compare:
NA28 John 11:45 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἱ ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὴν Μαριὰμ καὶ θεασάμενοι <u>ἃ ἐποίησεν</u> ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτόν·

<u>ὃ ἐποίησεν</u>   P66*^{vid}, A^C, B, C, D, f1, pc
txt   P6(4th CE), P45, 01, A*, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f13, 33, Maj
                <u>ὅσα ἐποίησεν</u>   P66^C, 0141, pc

NA28 John 11:46 τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπῆλθον πρὸς τοὺς Φαρισαίους καὶ εἶπαν αὐτοῖς <u>ἃ ἐποίησεν</u> Ἰησοῦς.
                <u>ὃ</u>   C, D, M, f13-part, pc
                <u>ὅσα</u>   A, K, Π, Υ, Λ, f13-part, pc

Compare discussion at Jo 4:29 and 11:45 above.
The normal Johannine usage clearly seems to be ἃ. Perhaps the ὃ is a reminiscence of 15:7?

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 262

Minority reading:
NA28 John 15:20 μνημονεύετε τοῦ λόγου οὗ ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν· οὐκ ἔστιν δοῦλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ. εἰ ἐμὲ ἐδίωξαν, καὶ ὑμᾶς διώξουσιν· εἰ τὸν λόγον μου **ἐτήρησαν**, καὶ τὸν ὑμέτερον **τηρήσουσιν.**

οὐκ ἐτήρησαν … οὐ τηρήσουσιν   cj. A. Pallis, 1926

B: no umlaut

15:19 If you belonged to the world,
the world would love you as its own.
Because you do not belong to the world,
but I have chosen you out of the world
therefore the world hates you.
20 Remember the word that I said to you,
'Servants are not greater than their master.'
If they persecuted me, they will persecute you;
if they kept my word, they will keep yours also.

Interesting conjecture. Makes good sense. But the omission is difficult to explain. There is the possibility that the double OU caused confusion in the first place: ΜΟΥΟΥΚ.
On the other hand the txt reading makes good sense, too: It contrasts those who persecute, with those who keep the word.

A. Pallis writes (Notes, 1926): "for ταῦτα πάντα ποιήσουσιν εἰς ὑμᾶς διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου, ὅτι οὐκ οἴδασιν τὸν πέμψαντά με [they will do all these things to you on account of my name, because they do not know him who sent me] of the following verse, as well as μισεῖ ὑμᾶς ὁ κόσμος of v. 19, assert that this blind and malignant world has ever hated the apostles, and therefore nothing but violence, and not conformity with their teaching, was to be expected therefrom."

TVU 263

Minority reading:
NA28 John 16:1 Ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα μὴ σκανδαλισθῆτε.

omit: 01*, 1424*

01* corrected by 01^{C2}.
1424: α deleted and added above ν, in the space μὴ added.
Lacuna: P75, C, W, X
P75 is not extant anymore from here to the end!
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 6:64 ἀλλ᾽ εἰσὶν ἐξ ὑμῶν τινες οἳ οὐ πιστεύουσιν. ᾔδει γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁ Ἰησοῦς τίνες εἰσὶν οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν.

<u>omit μὴ:</u> 01, G, X^{Comm}, 1071, 1243, pc, aur, vg^{WW,St}, Aug

An interesting omission. There is no reason for it.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 264

108. Difficult variant

NA28 John 16:4 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα <u>αὐτῶν</u> <u>μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν</u> ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν. Ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ εἶπον, ὅτι μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν ἤμην.

BYZ John 16:4 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα _____ <u>μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν</u> ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν Ταῦτα δὲ ὑμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ εἶπον ὅτι μεθ ὑμῶν ἤμην

<u>αὐτῶν μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν</u>	P66^{vid}, 01^{C2}, A, B, Θ, Π, 0211, 0233, 118, 124, 33, 157, 1071, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^{ms}, goth
<u>αὐτῶν μνημονεύητε </u>	01^{C1}, L, f13, L2211, pc, Lat
<u> μνημονεύητε αὐτῶν</u>	01*, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f1, 230, 1689, 565, 700, 1424, Maj, ff², Sy-Pal, bo^{mss}, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u> μνημονεύητε </u>	D, 788, a, d, Sy-S, Co, arm

Tregelles has the 2nd αὐτῶν in brackets.
Lacuna: C, W, X
B: no umlaut

... so that when <u>their</u> hour comes you may remember <u>them</u> ...
... so that when <u>their</u> hour comes you may remember ____ ...
... so that when <u>the </u> hour comes you may remember <u>them</u> ...
... so that when <u>the </u> hour comes you may remember ____ ...

It appears that the double αὐτῶν was a problem for the scribes. They omitted one or the other or both. Weiss (Jo Com.): "much too difficult to be secondary".

It is not clear what ἡ ὥρα means without αὐτῶν. Elsewhere in John Jesus' hour is meant. So, it is possible that αὐτῶν has been added or moved from the later to the earlier position (as in 01!).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 265

Minority reading:
NA28 John 16:7 ἀλλ᾽ ἐγὼ τὴν ἀλήθειαν λέγω ὑμῖν, συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα ἐγὼ ἀπέλθω. ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ ἀπέλθω, ὁ παράκλητος **οὐκ ἐλεύσεται** πρὸς ὑμᾶς· ἐὰν δὲ πορευθῶ, πέμψω αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς.

    οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ   B, L, Ψ, 33, 1071, pc, **NA**[25], WH, Weiss, Trg, SBL

txt   **οὐκ ἐλεύσεται**   01, A, D, Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 157, 579, Maj, Trg[mg]

Lacuna: P66, P75, C, W and X
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 15:26 Ὅταν <u>ἔλθῃ ὁ παράκλητος</u> ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν
NA28 John 16:4 ἀλλὰ ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν ἵνα ὅταν <u>ἔλθῃ</u> ἡ ὥρα αὐτῶν
NA28 John 16:13 ὅταν δὲ <u>ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος</u>, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,

The form ἐλεύσεται appears only here in John (additionally only once in Mk and Lk par.).
It is possible that the rare ἐλεύσεται has been changed to ἔλθῃ from context.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 91) thinks that the οὐκ ἐλεύσεται fits better to the preceding μὴ ἀπέλθω and the following πέμψω.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 266

NA28 John 16:13 ὅταν δὲ ἔλθη ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς <u>ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ·</u> οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

BYZ John 16:13 Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθη ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς <u>εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν·</u> οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ᾽ ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ λαλήσει, καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

Byz   <u>εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν</u>   Ψ, 068, 0141, f13, Maj
      <u>εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάσαν</u>   A, B, **NA**[25], WH, Weiss, Trg, Bal

txt   01, D, L, W, Θ, f1, 33, 565, 579, 1071, pc, WH[mg], Tis
      <u>ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ</u>   Θ
      01* omits <u>πάσῃ</u>

Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 8:44 καὶ <u>ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ</u> οὐκ ἔστηκεν,
NA28 John 17:17 ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς <u>ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ·</u>

The other two occurrences of ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ are safe.
εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν appears nowhere in the NT.

Compare for ὁδηγέω:
LXX Exodus 32:34 καὶ <u>ὁδήγησον</u> τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον <u>εἰς τὸν τόπον</u> ὃν εἶπά σοι

Probably the two εἰς readings arose independently.
If there is difference in meaning for ὁδηγήσει εἰς ("lead into") and ὁδηγήσει ἐν ("lead within") is difficult to say. Probably idiomatic usage (so also Metzger: ὁδηγήσει εἰς = more idiomatic).
Weiss (Com. John) thinks that the ἐν reading has probably been influenced by the LXX, where ὁδηγέω often comes with ἐν (esp. in the Psalms).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 267

109. **Difficult variant:**

NA28 John 16:13 ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ· οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ,
ἀλλ' ὅσα <u>ἀκούσει</u> λαλήσει καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

BYZ John 16:13 Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν· οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὅσα ἂν <u>ἀκούσῃ</u> λαλήσει, καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

Byz <u>ἀκούσῃ</u>   A, 0141, 0250, f13, Maj

    <u>ἀκούει</u>   01, L, 33, **NA²⁵**, <u style="color:red">WH</u>, <u style="color:red">Weiss</u>, <u style="color:red">Tis</u>, <u style="color:red">Bal</u>

txt <u>ἀκούσει</u>   B, D, W, Θ, Ψ, 054, 0211, f1, 579, 1071,
               L844, L2211, pc[E*, H, Y, 2], <u style="color:red">WH^{mg}</u>

Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

ἀκούσῃ   subjunctive aorist
ἀκούσει   indicative future
ἀκούει   indicative present

It is possible that the future ἀκούσει is a conformation to the following λαλήσει (so Tischendorf and Weiss).
Metzger notes: "ὅσα ἀκούει is a dogmatic improvement, introduced to suggest the eternal relationship of the Holy Spirit with the father." - This appears rather far-fetched.

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 268

NA28 John 16:16 Μικρὸν καὶ <u>οὐκέτι</u> θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με.

BYZ John 16:16 Μικρὸν καὶ <u>οὐ</u> θεωρεῖτέ με καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με <u>ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα</u>

Byz   A, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy, bo^pt, arm, goth
      <u>καὶ ὅτι   ...</u>   N, Ψ, 0211, 69*, 1241, pc, aur
      <u>καὶ   ἐγὼ...</u>   33, 892, pc
      <u>καὶ ὅτι ἐγὼ...</u>   28
          <u>ὅτι ἐγὼ...</u>   054, 1342, pc, TR

txt   P5(3rd CE), P66, 01, B, D, L, W, 0141, 0250, 1071, pc,
      it(a, b, d, e, ff², l, r¹), sa, ac², bo^pt

Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare next verse:
NA28 John 16:17 εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τί ἐστιν τοῦτο ὃ λέγει ἡμῖν· μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με; <u>καί· ὅτι ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα;</u>
          <u>καὶ ἐγὼ</u>   W
          <u>καὶ ὅτι ἐγὼ</u> D, Θ, f1, 157, Maj

Compare verse 10:
NA28 John 16:10 περὶ δικαιοσύνης δέ, <u>ὅτι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα ὑπάγω</u> καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με·

The words are required to explain the second part of the disciples question in verse 17. But the words already appeared in verse 10! So it is probable that the question in verse 17 refers back to verse 10. Thus, according to Weiss the words have been added (from verse 17) as being indispensable here. Note that possibly also the οὐ is a conformation to verse 17.

In the Synaxarion one lection ends with verse 13 and the next goes from verse 14 to 30. So it is possible that the words have been added again in verse 16 due to some such lectionary separation.
There is no reason to omit the words if originally present.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 269

110. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 16:18 ἔλεγον οὖν· τί ἐστιν τοῦτο [ὃ λέγει] τὸ μικρόν; οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί λαλεῖ.

They said, "What is this, *what he says* 'a little while'?
                    We do not know *what he says*."

omit ἔλεγον οὖν   D*, it(a, b, d, r¹), Sy-S

omit τί λαλεῖ   B, pc, aeth
                    WH have τί λαλεῖ in brackets.

τί ἐστιν τοῦτο ὃ λέγει τὸ   pc, Bois, Lachmann, Bal
τί ἐστιν τοῦτο ὃ λέγει   01^{C2}, B, L, Ψ, 054, 33, 1071, pc, Or, WH, Trg
τοῦτο τί ἐστιν ὃ λέγει τὸ   A, (D^{C2}), Δ, Θ, Maj, Weiss, NA²⁵, Trg^{mg}, Tis
τί ἐστιν τοῦτο   τὸ   P5, 01*, D*, W, f1, f13, 565, 579, pc
τί ἐστιν τοῦτο   P66, 124
τοῦτο τί ἐστιν   τὸ   von Soden

omit ὃ λέγει: P5(3rd CE), P66, 01*, D*, W, f1, f13, 565, 579, al,
                    it(a, b, d, e, ff², r¹), Sy-Pal, sa, arm
                    P66, 124 also omit τὸ (h.t. τοῦτο τὸ)

have ὃ λέγει: 01^{C2}, A, B, D^{C2}, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0250, 33, 892, Maj,
                    Lat(aur, c, f, q, vg), Sy, bo, ac², goth, Or, NA²⁵

P5: It is undecidable if P5 reads τὸ or not, but it quite clearly does not read ὃ λέγει. Compare reconstruction:

```
ΓΕΙΗΜΙΝΜΕΙΚΡΟΝΚΑΙΟΥ] ΘΕΩΡΕΙΤΕΜΕ
ΚΑΙΠΑΛΙΝΜΕΙΚΡΟΝΚΑΙΟ┼] ΕϹΘΕΜΕΚΑΙΟΤΙ
ΕΓΩΥΠΑΓΩΠΡΟϹΤΟΝ] ΠΡΑΕΛΕΓΟΝΟΥΝ
ΤΙΕϹΤΙΝΤΟΥΤΟΤΟ] ΜΕΙΚΡΟΝΟΥΚΟΙΔΑ
ΜΕΝΤΙΛΑΛΕΙΕ] ΓΝΩΟΙΗϹΟΤΙΗΘΕΛΟΝ
ΑΥΤΟΝΕΡΩΤΑΝ] ΚΑΙΕΙΠΕΝΑΥΤΟΙϹ
ΠΕΡΙΤΟΥΤΟΥΖΗΤ] ΕΙΤΕΜΕΤΑΛΛΗΛΩΝ
```

0141 omits the complete verse (perhaps parablepsis 18 ἔλεγον οὖν - 19 Byz ἔγνω οὖν)

P66 is not noted in NA for the omission of τὸ.
Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse 17 :
NA28 John 16:17 <u>εἶπαν οὖν</u> ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους·
<u>τί ἐστιν τοῦτο ὃ λέγει ἡμῖν· ...</u>

In the previous verse 17 the disciples are already talking. Therefore the ἔλεγον
οὖν at the beginning of verse 18 is not needed and has probably been omitted as
redundant.
The same is true for the omission of τί λαλεῖ at the end: It has been omitted
as redundant.

The omission of ὃ λέγει is more difficult to explain. Metzger: "the phrase was
deleted either as not absolutely necessary for the sense or was added in order
to clarify the sense."

In the case of P66 it is possible that the scribe simply omitted the phrase due
to h.t. (τοῦτο - τὸ). This seems to have happened independently in 124.

Judging externally one has to decide between
ὃ λέγει __ μικρόν   01^{C2}, B, L, Ψ, 054, 33, 1071, pc, Or
and
_____ τὸ μικρόν   P5, P66, 01*, D*, W, f1, f13, 565, 579, pc

NA conflates the two readings.

For the omission of τὸ compare next variant.

Rating: - (indecisive)
        (brackets ok)

TVU 270

111. <u>**Difficult variant:**</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 16:18 ἔλεγον οὖν· τί ἐστιν τοῦτο [ὃ λέγει] <u>τὸ</u> μικρόν; οὐκ οἴδαμεν τί λαλεῖ.

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>omit</u> P66, 01^{C2}, B, L, Ψ, 054, 124, 33, 892^S, 1071, pc, Or, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   01*, A, D, W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj

τοῦτο	τὸ μικρόν	P5?, 01*, D*, W, f1, f13, 565, 579, al
τοῦτο	μικρόν	P66, 124
τοῦτο ὃ λέγει	μικρόν	01^{C2}, B, L, Ψ, 33, 892^S, 1071, pc, Or
τοῦτο ὃ λέγει τὸ μικρόν		A, D^C, Θ, Maj

P5: It is undecidable if P5 reads τὸ or not, but it quite clearly does not read ὃ λέγει. Compare reconstruction:

ΓΕΙΗΜΙΝΜΕΙΚΡΟΝΚΑΙΟΥΘΕΩΡΕΙΤΕΜΕ
ΚΑΙΠΑΛΙΝΜΕΙΚΡΟΝΚΑΙΟΨΕϹΘΕΜΕΚΑΙΟΤΙ
ΕΓΩΥΠΑΓΩΠΡΟϹΤΟΝΠΡΑΕΛΕΓΟΝΟΥΝ
<u>ΤΙΕϹΤΙΝΤΟΥΤΟΤΟ</u><u>ΜΕΙΚΡΟΝ</u>ΟΥΚΟΙΔΑ
ΜΕΝΤΙΛΑΛΕΙΕΓΝΩΟΙΗϹΟΤΙΗΘΕΛΟΝ
ΑΥΤΟΝΕΡΩΤΑΝΚΑΙΕΙΠΕΝΑΥΤΟΙϹ
ΠΕΡΙΤΟΥΤΟΥΖΗΤΕΙΤΕΜΕΤΑΛΛΗΛΩΝ

01: The το is crossed out by two small diagonal strokes and ΟΛΕΓΙ is written above it. (Image: CSNTM 58a column D, line 10, folio 254a).
P66 not in NA (for the omission of τὸ).
0141 omits the verse.
Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Compare previous context:
NA28 John 16:16-17 Μικρὸν καὶ οὐκέτι θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με. 17 εἶπαν οὖν ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀλλήλους· τί ἐστιν τοῦτο ὃ λέγει ἡμῖν· μικρὸν καὶ οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με, καὶ πάλιν μικρὸν καὶ ὄψεσθέ με;

Compare also:
NA28 John 4:15 λέγει πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ γυνή· κύριε, δός μοι τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ
NA28 John 12:5 διὰ τί τοῦτο τὸ μύρον οὐκ ἐπράθη

Regarding [ὃ λέγει] and [τί λαλεῖ] compare the main commentary.
It is possible that the omission of τὸ is at least in part accidental. It could be due to h.t. for those MSS (P66, 124) which omit ὃ λέγει:

ΤΟΥ**ΤΟΤΟ**ΜΙΚΡΟΝ

This means P66 should be counted to the 01* reading.
It is possible that the omission of τὸ is a conformation to the immediately preceding context, where no τὸ appears. On the other hand the addition of τὸ would be only natural. BDF §267-2a note that τὸ is set before a cited word.
It is rather improbable that ὃ λέγει has been added secondarily. It is stylistically awkward. But it cannot be ruled out that it has been added for clarification.
τί ἐστιν τοῦτο τὸ μικρόν sounds normal and straightforward.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 271

Minority reading:
NA28 John 16:19 Ἔγνω [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ὅτι <u>ἤθελον</u> αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾶν,

txt not noted in NA!

<u>ἤμελλον καὶ ἤθελον</u>   P66*

<u>ἤμελλον</u>   P66^C, 01, W, 69, 579, pc, c, ff², sa^{mss2}

txt   P5^{vid}(3rd CE), A, B, D, L, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1071, Maj, Co

IGNTP reconstructs P5 (P. Oxy. 208 + 1781) as:

ΟΤΙ Ḥ[Θ]ΕΛΟΝ

All letters are damaged, but parts are visible and make the reading certain.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

Lacuna: C, X
B: no umlaut

Interesting, because the conflation is supported by the earliest witness.
Probably just a stylistic change.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 272

112. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 16:21 ἡ γυνὴ ὅταν τίκτῃ λύπην ἔχει, ὅτι ἦλθεν ἡ <u>ὥρα</u> αὐτῆς·

No txt in NA!

ἡμέρα   P66, D, pc, it(a, b, c, d, e, ff², r¹), Sy-S, Sy-P, ac², Aug

txt   P5(3rd CE), 01, A, B, C, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj

Lat(aur, f, q, vg) read txt.
Lacuna: P75, C, X
B: no umlaut

A typical variation.
The versional evidence could be translational freedom.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 273

Minority reading:
NA28 John 16:22 καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν νῦν μὲν λύπην <u>**ἔχετε**</u>· πάλιν δὲ ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ χαρήσεται ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία, καὶ τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς αἴρει ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν.

ἕξετε indicative future active 2nd person plural

<u>**ἕξετε**</u>   P66, 01^{C2}, A, D, L, N, W*, Y, Θ, Π, Ψ, 0211, 33, 157, al,
           it("habebitis" a, b, d, e, r^1), vg^{mss}

txt   P22(3rd CE), 01*, B, C, W^C, Δ, 0141, f1, f13, 579, 1071, Maj,
           Lat("habetis" aur, c, f, ff^2, q, vg)

W: A ✗ is written above the Ƶ. No deletion sign is visible. Therefore NA notes this as "W $^{v.l.}$ ".
Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 16:20 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι <u>κλαύσετε</u> καὶ <u>θρηνήσετε</u> ὑμεῖς, ὁ δὲ κόσμος <u>χαρήσεται</u>· ὑμεῖς <u>λυπηθήσεσθε</u>, ἀλλ᾽ ἡ λύπη ὑμῶν εἰς χαρὰν <u>γενήσεται.</u>

The future of ἔχω is rare. It appears only once in John (8:12). The form ἕξετε appears only once in the NT (Rev 2:10).
In the previous verse 20 all verbs are future. Jesus is talking about the things to come. It is possible that ἕξετε is a conformation to verse 20.
"And you, therefore, now, indeed, <u>have/will have</u> sorrow;"

Weiss (Jo Com.): "the present was probably not understood".

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 274

Minority reading:
NA28 John 16:22 καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν νῦν μὲν λύπην <u>ἔχετε</u>· πάλιν δὲ ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς, καὶ <u>χαρήσεται</u> ὑμῶν ἡ καρδία, καὶ τὴν χαρὰν ὑμῶν οὐδεὶς <u>αἴρει</u> ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν.

ἀρεῖ   P5(3rd CE), B, D*, S^C, Γ, pc,
       it(a, aur, c, d, ff², r¹), vg^{Cl,WW}, sa, ac², bo, arm, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA²⁵**</u>, <u>Trg</u>
ἐρεῖ   N
ἀφέρει W

αἴρει P22(3rd CE), P66, 01, A, C, D^{C2}, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579,
       1071, Maj, Lat(b, e, f, q, vg), Sy, <u>WH^{mg}</u>

Lat: auferet a, ff², r¹   fut act ind 3 sing
        tollet   aur, c, d, vg^{Cl,WW}   fut act ind 3 sing
        tollit   b, vg^{St}   pres act ind 3 sing
        aufert   e, f, q   pres act ind 3 sing
        tollat   vg^{ms= E}   pres act sub 3 sing

Lacuna: X
B: no umlaut

ἀρεῖ   indicative future active 3rd person singular
αἴρει indicative present active 3rd person singular

Similar to the previous case of ἔχετε/ἕξετε. Probably a harmonization to the previous future verbs (so Weiss).
The support is good, but not coherent (note S^C and Γ).

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926): "αἴρει, a present as an emphatic and vivid form of the future."

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 275

113. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 16:23 Καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐμὲ οὐκ ἐρωτήσετε οὐδέν. ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ἄν τι αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δώσει ὑμῖν.

δώσει ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου
P5(3ʳᵈ CE), P66?, 01, B, C*, L, X, Y, Δ, 054, pc, sa, ac², Orᴼⁿ ᴾʳᵃʸᵉʳ, Cyr,
NA²⁵, WH, Gre, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

δώσει ὑμῖν   118, 205

txt   P22ᵛⁱᵈ(3ʳᵈ CE), A, Cᶜ³, D, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
       Latt, Sy, bo, arm, geo

Of P66 only the ο of ὀνόματί is visible. The reconstruction reads as follows (the red lines are not present, except the green omikron):

```
CΕΤΑΙΗΓΥΝΗΟΤΑΝΤΙΚΤΗΛΥΠΗΝΕ
ΧΕΙΟΤΙΗΛΘΕΝΗΩΡΑΑΥΤΗCΟΤΑΝ
ΔΕΓΕΝΝΗCΗΤΟΠΑΙΔΙΟΝΟΥΚΕΤΙ
ΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΕΙΤΗCΘΛΙΨΕΩCΔΙΑ
ΤΗΝΧΑΡΑΝΟΤΙΕΓΕΝΝΗΘΗΑΝΘΡΩ
ΠΟCΕΙCΤΟΝΚΟCΜΟΝΚΑΙΥΜΕΙCΟΥΝ
ΝΥΝΜΕΝΛΥΠΗΝΕΧΕΤΕΠΑΛΙΝΔΕ
ΟΨΟΜΑΙΥΜΑCΚΑΙΧΑΡΗCΕΤΑΙΥΜΩΝ
ΗΚΑΡΔΙΑΚΑΙΤΗΝΧΑΡΑΝΥΜΩΝΟΥΔΕΙC
ΑΡΕΙΑΙΡΕΙΑΦΥΜΩΝΚΑΙΕΝΕΚΕΙΝΗΤΗ
ΗΜΕΡΑΕΜΕΟΥΚΕΡΩΤΗCΕΤΕΟΥΔΕΝ
```
ΑΜΗΝΑΜΗΝΛΕΓΩΥΜΙΝΑΝΤΙΑΙΤΗ
CΗΤΕΤΟΝΠΑΤΕΡΑΔΩCΕΙΥΜΙΝΕΝΤΩ
ΟΝΟΜΑΤΙΜΟΥΕΩCΑΡΤΙΟΥΚΗΤΗ
```
CΑΤΑΙΟΥΔΕΝΕΝΤΩΟΝΟΜΑΤΙΜΟΥΑΙ
ΤΗCΑCΘΑΙΚΑΙΛΗΜΨΕCΘΕΙΝΑΗΧΑ
ΡΑΥΜΩΝΗΠΕΠΛΗΡΩΜΕΝΗΤΑΥ
ΤΑΕΝΠΑΡΟΙΜΙΑΙCΛΕΛΑΛΗΚΑΥΜΙΝ
ΕΡΧΕΤΑΙΩΡΑΟΤΕΟΥΚΕΤΙΕΝΠΑΡΟΙΜΙ
ΑΙCΛΑΛΗCΩΥΜΙΝΑΛΛΑΠΑΡΡΗCΙΑ
ΠΕΡΙΤΟΥΠΑΤΡΟCΑΠΑΓΓΕΛΩΥΜΙΝ
```

With the txt reading this would be:

ΑΜΗΝΑΜΗΝΛΕΓΩΥΜΙΝΑΝΤΙΑΙΤΗ
CΗΤΕΤΟΝΠΑΤΕΡΑΕΝΤΩΟΝΟΜΑΤΙΜ
ΟΥΔΩCΕΙΥΜΙΝΕΩCΑΡΤΙΟΥΚΗΤΗ
CΑΤΑΙΟΥΔΕΝΕΝΤΩΟΝΟΜΑΤΙΜΟΥΑΙ

It would be quite unlikely for a scribe to divide a μ-ου this way, especially (as it appears possible) to a new page. A normal division and line length is only possible with the variant reading.
(The ed. pr. is misleading here, because it notes 3 lines missing, but there are only two. This has already been noted by Aland in his "Neue NT Papyri II" NTS article, 1963/64, on P66.)

P22: Of P22 only the final ὑμῖν is present, but only the txt reading fits the required space. Reconstruction:

ΤΙΕΑΝΑΙΤΗϹ[Η]Τ[ΕΤΟΝΠͣΑΕΝΤѠΟΝΟΜΑΤΙΜΟΥΔѠϹΕΙ
ΥΜΕΙΝ ΕѠ[ϹΑρ]ΤΙ [ΟΥΚ ...

B: no umlaut

Compare next verses:
NA28 John 16:24 ἕως ἄρτι οὐκ ᾐτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου·
NA28 John 16:26 ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε,

Compare also:
NA28 John 14:13 καὶ ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου τοῦτο ποιήσω, ἵνα δοξασθῇ ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ υἱῷ.
NA28 John 14:14 ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου ἐγὼ ποιήσω.
NA28 John 15:16
ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δῷ ὑμῖν.

The txt reading is congruent with John's style and it appears elsewhere in this form. These occurrences are safe.
The 01/B reading is unusual. It could therefore be argued that the txt reading is an attempt to conform this unusual reading to the normal Johannine style.

The support by Y and Δ is strange.
Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the txt reading is from 15:16.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 276

Minority reading:
NA28 John 16:27 αὐτὸς γὰρ <u>ὁ πατὴρ</u> φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ **[τοῦ] θεοῦ** ἐξῆλθον.
NA28 John 16:28 ἐξῆλθον <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u> καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον·

<u>τοῦ θεοῦ</u>   *C*^{C3}, W, Δ, Ψ, f1, f13, 157, 565, 1071, Maj,
                NA²⁵, <u>Bois</u>, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>, <u>Weiss</u>^{earlier}
   <u>θεοῦ</u>   P5(3rd *CE*), 01*,^{C2}, A, N, Θ, 33, 579, al, <u>Weiss</u>^{later}
<u>one of these:</u> P66^{vid}, Lat, Sy-S, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, arm, goth

<u>τοῦ πατρὸς</u> B, *C**, D, L, X, 0141, pc, d, Sy-P, Co, <u>WH</u>, <u>Trg</u>
   <u>πατρὸς</u>   01^{C1}

<u>Deo patre</u>   ff², **48***

Add καὶ ἥκω after ἐξῆλθον: X, f13 (from Jo 8:42)

P66 has a lacuna, but the υ of θεοῦ is visible.
Note that 124 has τοῦ θεοῦ also in verse 28.
Note also the omission of ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς in verse 28 by:
D, W, b, ff², Sy-S, ac², pbo

<u>Weiss</u>: In his Jo Com. (1893) he notes: "the article has to be kept by all means".
Later in his Greek text (1905) he omits the article.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 16:30 ἐν τούτῳ πιστεύομεν ὅτι <u>ἀπὸ θεοῦ</u> ἐξῆλθες.

Compare also:
NA28 John 1:6 Ἐγένετο ἄνθρωπος, ἀπεσταλμένος <u>παρὰ θεοῦ,</u>
NA28 John 6:46 εἰ μὴ ὁ ὢν <u>παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ</u>
          <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u>   01
NA28 John 8:40 λελάληκα ἣν ἤκουσα <u>παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ·</u>
          <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u>   Θ, f13, 1071
NA28 John 8:42 ἐγὼ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον **καὶ ἥκω·**
NA28 John 9:16 οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος <u>παρὰ θεοῦ</u> ὁ ἄνθρωπος,
NA28 John 9:33 εἰ μὴ ἦν οὗτος <u>παρὰ θεοῦ,</u> οὐκ ἠδύνατο ποιεῖν οὐδέν.
NA28 John 1:14 δόξαν ὡς μονογενοῦς <u>παρὰ πατρός,</u>

NA28 John 6:45 πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u>
          <u>παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ</u>   1071
NA28 John 8:38 ἃ ἠκούσατε <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u> ποιεῖτε.
NA28 John 10:18 ταύτην τὴν ἐντολὴν ἔλαβον <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρός</u> μου.
NA28 John 15:15 πάντα ἃ ἤκουσα <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρός</u> μου ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν.

NA28 John 15:26 ὃν ἐγὼ πέμψω ὑμῖν <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρός,</u>
    τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας ὃ <u>παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u> ἐκπορεύεται

A similar case appeared in verses 6:45-46:
45 παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς   All
45 παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ   1071
46 παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ   All
46 παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς   01

It is especially noteworthy that παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ appears never after 9:33. In 10:18; 15:15; 15:26 παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς appears. It is possible that scribes harmonized here to context.
It is possible that πατρὸς is a harmonization to ὁ πατὴρ earlier in the verse and to the next verse 28.
There would be no reason to change πατρὸς to θεοῦ here.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

External Rating: - (indecisive)
     = slight preference for πατρὸς.
      (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 277

114. Difficult reading

Minority reading:

NA28 John 16:27 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ <u>παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον.</u>

NA28 John 16:28 <u>ἐξῆλθον **παρὰ** τοῦ πατρὸς</u> καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

ἐκ   B, C*, L, X, Ψ, 33, pc, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

παρὰ   P5(3ʳᵈ CE), P22(3ʳᵈ CE), 01, A, Cᶜ², Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 157, 579, 1071, Maj

D, W omit ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς (see next variant).

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 John 4:30 <u>ἐξῆλθον ἐκ</u> τῆς πόλεως

NA28 John 6:65 ἐὰν μὴ ᾖ δεδομένον αὐτῷ <u>ἐκ τοῦ πατρός.</u>
          παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς   28

NA28 John 8:42 ἐγὼ γὰρ <u>ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον</u> καὶ ἥκω·
          παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ   579

NA28 John 8:44 ὑμεῖς <u>ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς</u> τοῦ διαβόλου ἐστὲ

NA28 John 8:59 καὶ <u>ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ</u> τοῦ ἱεροῦ.

NA28 John 10:32 πολλὰ ἔργα καλὰ ἔδειξα ὑμῖν <u>ἐκ τοῦ πατρός·</u>

NA28 John 10:39 καὶ <u>ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ</u> τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

NA28 John 17:8 ὅτι <u>παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον</u>,

ἐξῆλθον ἐκ appears several times in John. Two times ἐκ τοῦ has been changed into παρὰ τοῦ. For this reason it is quite possible that ἐκ is original here. It is probable that παρὰ is a conformation to the previous verse (so also Weiss).

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

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

TVU 278

Minority reading:
NA28 John 16:27 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ πατὴρ φιλεῖ ὑμᾶς, ὅτι ὑμεῖς ἐμὲ πεφιλήκατε καὶ πεπιστεύκατε ὅτι ἐγὼ <u>παρὰ [τοῦ] θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον</u>.
NA28 John 16:28 <u>ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u> καὶ ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον· πάλιν ἀφίημι τὸν κόσμον καὶ πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα.

<u>omit ἐξῆλθον</u>   Δ, 579, a, e, r¹ (h.t.)
<u>omit παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον ἐξῆλθον</u>   Γ (h.t.)

<u>omit ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς</u>   D, W, b, d, ff², Sy-S, ac², pbo

<u>ἐξῆλθον παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ</u>   124

Γ: The omission due to parablepsis is not noted in IGNTP.
B: no umlaut

The omission by D, W et al. is a Western improvement by removing a redundant phrase. There is no reason why the phrase should have been added.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 279

NA28 John 17:1 δόξασόν <u>σου</u> τὸν υἱόν, ἵνα <u>   ὁ υἱὸς   </u> δοξάσῃ <u>σέ</u>,

BYZ John 17:1 δόξασόν <u>σου</u> τὸν υἱόν ἵνα <u>καὶ ὁ υἱός σου</u> δοξάσῃ σέ

<u>καὶ ὁ υἱός σου</u>   C^C, K, Π, L, X, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33, 1071, Maj,
                          q, vg^{mss}, arm, goth, Or^{pt}

<u>καὶ ὁ υἱὸς   </u>   P107^{vid}, 0211, e
<u>   ὁ υἱός σου</u>   P60?, A, D, Θ, 0250, f1, 579, pc, Lat, Sy, Co

<u>   ὁ υἱὸς   </u>   P60?, 01, B, C*, W, 0109, 0301, pc, d(!), ff²*, Or^{pt}

IGNTP wrongly notes X for the A, D reading. Tischendorf has it right. Checked at the online PDF color photos.
B: no umlaut

P60(7th CE): Space considerations prefer one of the shorter readings. Reconstruction:

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

P107 (POxy 4446, 3ʳᵈ CE): Space considerations rule out a σου within the lacuna (ed. princeps: "kappa and the spacing thereafter guarantee that this was the reading of the papyrus."). Reconstruction:

ΤΟΥΕΙ]**CΤΟΝ**[ΟΥΡΑΝΟΝΕΙΠΕΝΠΕΡΕ
ΛΗΛΥ]**ΘΕΝΗW**[ΡΑΔΟΖΑCΟΝCΟΥ
ΤΟΝΥΝ]**ΙΝΑΚ**[ΑΙ**ΟΥ͞C**Α]**ΟΖ**[ΑCΗCΕ
ΚΑΘW]**CΕΔWΚΑCΑΥΤW͞Ε**[ΖΟΥCΙΑΝ
ΠΑCΗ]**CCΑΡΚΟCΙΝΑΠΑΝ**[ΟΛΕΔW
ΚΑCΑΥ]**ΤWΔWCΑ**[Υ]**ΤWΖW**[ΗΝ…

I have checked this at the (online) photo and it is certain. There is no space for a σου. The only possibility would be that it was added above the line, as a correction. In verse 2 P107 reads δῷς αὐτῷ, with W. P107 is not noted in NA.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

The addition of σου is possibly a conformation to the previous σου. It makes the saying more symmetrical:

σου τὸν υἱόν   - ὁ υἱός σου

Interestingly υἱός σου appears nowhere else in John applied to Jesus. There is no reason for an omission if originally present, except for Ellipsis.
There is also no reason for an omission of καὶ. It has probably been added for stylistic reasons.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 280

NA28 John 17:2 καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ <u>δώσῃ</u> αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

BYZ John 17:2 καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ, <u>δώσει</u> αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.

Byz B, Θ, Ψ, 0301, f1, f13, Maj, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>, <u>WH</u>
txt 01^{C2}, A, C, X, 0141, 0250, 1582*, 33, 1071, al[G, H, K, M, S, Ω]

<u>δώσω</u> αὐτῷ 01*, 0109, pc
<u>δῷς</u> αὐτῷ P107, W
<u>δῷς</u> αὐτοῖς L

<u>ἔχῃ</u> D (for δώσῃ αὐτοῖς)

Θ: reads δωσι according to Beermann/Gregory (ed.pr.), IGNTP and Swanson, thus supporting B. Θ is not noted at all in NA.
B: no umlaut

δώσει indicative future active 3rd person singular
δώσῃ subjunctive aorist active 3rd person singular
δῷς subjunctive aorist active 2nd person singular

Compare:
NA28 John 15:16
ἵνα ὅ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου <u>δῷ</u> ὑμῖν.
        <u>δώσει</u> 01*, Θ, 579

John uses δώσει 4 more times (6:27; 11:22; 14:16; 16:23), always safe.
δώσει and δῷ are the same morph.
The error is probably at least in part accidental, since H and ЄI where pronounced alike. Also some scribes seemed to be confused over who gave whom what.
The D reading is a conformation to Jo 3:15-16 or 6:40.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 281

Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:7 νῦν <u>**ἔγνωκαν**</u> ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν·

<u>ἔγνωκα</u>	A, W, 0211, 118, 579, pc, <u>Trg</u>^{mg} (!)
<u>ἔγνων</u>	01

<u>one of these:</u> it (a, b, c, e, ff², q), Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H^{mg}, Sy-Pal^{mss}, sa, ac, ac², goth
<u>singular known to:</u> Chrys, Catena-ox, Thphyl [acc. to Tis]

<u>ἔγνω**σαν**</u>	C, U, X, Ψ, f13, 33, 700, 1071, 1241, al
<u>ἔγνω**καν**</u>	B, D, L, Δ, Θ, 0109, 0141, f1, Maj
<u>ἔγνω**κασιν**</u>	S, pc

<u>one of these:</u> aur, d, vg, Sy-H, bo

A: NA has A^{vid} for ἔγνωκαν. This is probably not correct. A reads ἔγνωκα. I have checked this at the facsimile (CSNTM, GA02_55b.jpg, line 15 from the bottom, left column). There is a small A, but no trace of an N, or ephelkustikon. IGNTP confirms this, too.
But Tischendorf writes: "In A lineolam finalem super -κα admodum tenuem esse Woidius refert; sed fortior esset, si posteriore manu suppleta esset."
I cannot see anything. This has to be checked at the original again.
B: no umlaut

ἔγνωκα	indicative perfect active	1st person singular
ἔγνων	indicative aorist active	1st person singular
ἔγνωκαν	indicative perfect active	3rd person plural
ἔγνωσαν	indicative aorist active	3rd person plural

Compare the previous verse 6:
NA28 John 17:6 Ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς <u>ἔδωκάς</u> μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. σοὶ ἦσαν κἀμοὶ αὐτοὺς ἔδωκας καὶ τὸν λόγον σου <u>τετήρηκαν.</u>

And next verse 8:
NA28 John 17:8 ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ <u>ἔδωκάς</u> μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον καὶ <u>ἔγνωσαν</u> ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

6 "I have made your name known <u>to those</u> whom you gave me from the world. <u>They</u> were yours, and you gave <u>them</u> to me, and <u>they</u> have kept your word. 7 Now **they know** that everything you have given me is from you; 8 for the words that you gave to me I have given to <u>them</u>, and <u>they</u> have received <u>them</u> and know in truth that I came from you; and <u>they</u> have believed that you sent me."

Compare also:
NA28 John 17:25 πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε <u>ἔγνων,</u> καὶ οὗτοι <u>ἔγνωσαν</u> ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας·

The context requires the 3rd person plural.
It is possible that the singular has been inspired from Ἐφανέρωσα in verse 6.
The aorist ἔγνωσαν could be a conformation to verses 6 and 8 (so Weiss).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 282

   115.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:7 νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι πάντα ὅσα <u>**δέδωκάς**</u> μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν·

No txt in NA!

ἔδωκας   A, (B), 0109, f1, 579, 1342, pc, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}, <u>WH</u>, <u>Bal</u>
ἔδωκες   B, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}

txt   01, C, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33, Maj, <u>WH</u>^{mg}, <u>Tis</u>
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 17:2 καθὼς <u>ἔδωκας</u> αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκός,
ἵνα πᾶν ὃ <u>δέδωκας</u> αὐτῷ δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
<u>ἔδωκας</u>[1]   safe!
<u>ἔδωκας</u>[2]   Θ, al[E, G, H, K, Π, S, Y, Δ, Λ, Ω, 2, 565^s]

NA28 John 17:4 τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας ὃ <u>δέδωκάς</u> μοι
<u>ἔδωκας</u>   C, D, K, Π, W, Y, pc

NA28 John 17:6 Ἐφανέρωσά σου τὸ ὄνομα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις οὓς <u>ἔδωκάς</u> μοι ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου. σοὶ ἦσαν κἀμοὶ αὐτοὺς <u>ἔδωκας</u> καὶ τὸν λόγον σου τετήρηκαν.
<u>ἔδωκάς</u>[1]   01, A, B, D, K, Π, N, W, Θ, 1582, 157, 579, al
<u>δέδωκάς</u>[1]   C, L, Ψ, 0109, f1, f13, 33, Maj

<u>ἔδωκας</u>[2]   P66, 01, A, B, D, K, Π, L, W, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 157, 1071, al
<u>δέδωκας</u>[2]   C, 33, 579, Maj

NA28 John 17:8 ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ <u>ἔδωκάς</u> μοι <u>δέδωκα</u> αὐτοῖς,
<u>ἔδωκας</u>[1]   A, (B), C, D, W, Π, 579, al
        ἔδωκες   B, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}
<u>δέδωκάς</u>[1]   01, L, Θ, Ψ, 0109, f1, f13, 33, Maj, <u>WH</u>^{mg}
<u>ἔδωκα</u>[2]   N, W

NA28 John 17:9 οὐ περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἐρωτῶ ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν <u>δέδωκάς</u> μοι,
<u>ἔδωκας</u>   D, N, W, Θ, 579

NA28 John 17:11 τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ <u>δέδωκάς</u> μοι,

<u>ἔδωκας</u>   P66^{vid}, 01, L, M, N, W, 579, pc

NA28 John 17:12 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ <u>δέδωκάς</u> μοι

<u>ἔδωκας</u>   C, N, W, 579

NA28 John 17:14 ἐγὼ <u>δέδωκα</u> αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον σου

<u>ἔδωκα</u>   D, W, Θ, 579

NA28 John 17:22 κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν <u>δέδωκάς</u> μοι <u>δέδωκα</u> αὐτοῖς

<u>ἔδωκας</u>[1]   A, D, N, U, Θ, Π, Ψ, 157, 579, al, Trg^{mg}
<u>ἔδωκα</u>[2]   01, A, K, Π, M, N, Θ, f13, al

NA28 John 17:24 Πάτερ, ὃ <u>δέδωκάς</u> μοι, ... ἣν <u>δέδωκάς</u> μοι

<u>ἔδωκας</u>[1]   A
<u>ἔδωκας</u>[2]   B, Θ, Maj-part, Trg^{mg}

Compare discussion at Jo 6:32 above: δέδωκεν / ἔδωκεν.
The perfective usage of δίδωμι is typically Johannine. He uses it 23 times. Overall the variation normally goes from the original perfect to a secondary aorist.

There is a complex variation of the 4 times δέδωκάς / ἔδωκας in verses 6-8. Interestingly the first occurrence in 17:2 of ἔδωκας is safe! Only A and B have ἔδωκας always, 33 has δέδωκάς always.
The support for ἔδωκας is very strong in verse 6 (note the decline in the 2nd instance), so possibly correct.

Perhaps there is a slight difference in meaning also, with the perfect having a more permanent notion.

Discussion on B-Greek 28th Nov. 2004:

Carl W. Conrad wrote:

"Well, for what it's worth, my own judgment is that the author of GJn appears sometimes to use the perfect tense deliberately with emphasis upon the stative present, but that on the other hand he perhaps provides more evidence than most GNT authors of the tendency of the aorist to supplant

the perfect in the indicative so that any real distinction between the perfect as stative and the aorist as perfective has become moot. I really don't believe that there's any aspectual difference between EDWKAS and DEDWKAS in 17:2 or in the other aorists and perfects in these verses. I'd convey them all in English with the auxiliary "have" and the participle."

A. Dirkzwager wrote:

"Is it possible that we have to look for a Hebrew/Aramaic background for these changes? There we have an alternation between perfect and imperfect in sentences in parataxis in order to express what we would like to say in hypotaxis. I think it is possible that a Semite continues to use the alternation where he is writing in hypotaxis."

Alexander Loney wrote:

"Some of these examples are more explainable than others in my estimation. The final one, 17:8, seems to use the perfect as a distinctly more marked stative (emphasizing the present and enduring circumstance of J.'s passing to the disciples the earthly ministry while he, who had been given that ministry, will be leaving). That stands in contrast to the less marked aorist EDWKAS that characterizes the "completeness" (not in a theological way... in a grammatical, perspectival way) of J.'s part.

And, I think, Carl, even if it is not clear to us how to distinguish between perfective aorists and seemingly perfective perfects, there must be *some* distinction, else John would have used only one or the other. Perhaps we are seeing a language in transition (aren't we always?), but I see no way to explain the presence of both aspects throughout the passage so easily."

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 283

116. Difficult reading
Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:8 ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἔδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον **καὶ ἔγνωσαν** ἀληθῶς ὅτι παρὰ σοῦ ἐξῆλθον, καὶ ἐπίστευσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

omit: 01*, A, D, W, 0211, pc, a, d, e, q, ac², vgᵐˢ, pbo, goth

ἀληθῶς **καὶ ἔγνωσαν**	157

P60 has the words.
Note that P66 also omitted something here, but it is unclear what exactly it was. Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 450) suggests that the scribe omitted ἔδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἔλαβον καὶ, due to parablepsis from ἔδωκάς to ἔγνωσαν. Still visible in the upper margin is the correction δεδω]κα αυτοις κ[αι ... (compare also Royse, Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 450).
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 17:7 νῦν <u>ἔγνωκαν</u> ὅτι πάντα ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι παρὰ σοῦ εἰσιν·

ἔγνωκα	W, 118, 579, pc
ἔγνων	01
<u>one of these:</u>	it (a, b, c, e, ff², q, not d), Sy-S, Sy-P,
	Sy-Hᵐᵍ, Sy-Pal, sa, ac, goth

NA28 John 7:26 καὶ ἴδε παρρησίᾳ λαλεῖ καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ λέγουσιν. μήποτε <u>ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν</u> οἱ ἄρχοντες ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός;
NA28 John 17:25 πάτερ δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων, <u>καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας·</u>

A strange omission and a curiously diverse support! Is it possible that the omission is connected with the singular in the previous verse 7? The witnesses are in part identical. Note goth.
It is also possible that the words have been omitted as redundant.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 284

Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:11 καὶ <u>οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,</u>
καὶ <u>αὐτοὶ</u> ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσίν,
κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι.
<u>πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου</u>
<u>ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.</u>

D, d has for this:
καὶ <u>οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν **τούτῳ** τῷ κόσμῳ,</u>
καὶ <u>οὗτοι</u> ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσίν,
κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι.
<u>οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰμὶ</u>
<u>πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου</u>
<u>ὅτε ἤμην μετ' αὐτῶν [ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ D^c]</u>
<u>ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου</u>
<u>ὃ [/οὓς D^c] δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.</u>

The first line <u>οὐκέτι ... εἰμὶ</u> also have:
P107^{vid}(3rd CE), a, (c), r¹ and Origen! c only has the first part. Latin see below.

P107(3rd CE) possible reconstruction:
<u>κἀγὼ πρὸς] σὲ ἔρχ[ομαι.</u>
<u>οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐ]ν τῷ [κόσμῳ καὶ ἐν] τῷ [κόσμῳ εἰ]μὶ</u>
<u>πάτερ ἅγιε, τή]ρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν [τῷ ὀνόματί σο]υ</u>
<u>ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, [ἵνα ὦσιν] ἓν καθὼς καὶ ἡ[μεῖς.</u>

Origen Mt Comm. tom 13:20
ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ σωτὴρ λέγων· "<u>κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι, καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν</u> <u>τῷ κόσμῳ</u>", τὸν ἐπίγειον λέγει κόσμον· οὐ γὰρ νομιστέον τὰ ἀντικείμενα αὐτὸν λέγειν φάσκοντα· "κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι <u>καὶ</u> <u>οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰμὶ</u>." ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ "καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ" τὸν περίγειον τόπον τοῦτον νομιστέον.

P107 (POxy 4446): The editor W.E.H. Cockle comments: "Since the reading in line 2 of the papyrus [σὲ ἔρχ] is clear, as is τή]ρησον in line 5, it is certain that the papyrus had some addition at this point. So little survives, however, and the traces in line 4 are so meagre, that the reading offered in the text is far from certain."
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

B: no umlaut

The Latin evidence in detail:

et iam non sum in mundo
et hii in mundo sunt
et ego ad te venio
Pater sancte serva eos in nomine tuo
quos dedisti mihi ut sint unum sicut et nos   **Vulgate**

et iam non sum in hoc mundo
et ipsi in hoc mundo sunt
et ego ad te venio
iam non sum in mundo et in mundo sum
pater sancte serba eos in nomine tuo
et cum essem cum eis
ego serbabam eos in nomine tuo
quod dedisti mihi ut sint unum sicut nos   **d**

et hi in hoc mundo sunt
et ego ad te venio
et iam non sum in hoc mundo et in hoc mundo sunt
Pater sancte serva eos in nomine tuo
et in hoc mundo   **a**

et iam non sum in hoc mundo.
Et hi in mundo sunt
et ego ad te venio
et iam non sum in hoc mundo.
Pater sancte serva eos in nomine tuo.   **c**

et iam non sum in hoc mundo
et isti sunt in hoc mundo
et ego ad te venio
et iam non sum in hoc mundo et in hoc mundo sum
pater sancte conserva eos in nomine tuo   **r**[1]

et iam non sum in mundo
et hii in mundo sunt
et ego ad te venio
et iam non sum in hoc mundo et in hoc mundo sum
Pater sancte serva eos in nomine tuo
quos dedisti mihi ut sint unum sicut et nos   **g**[1]

Compare verse 12:
NA28 John 17:12 ὅτε ἤμην μετ᾽ αὐτῶν   ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι,
BYZ John 17:12 ὅτε ἤμην μετ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου οὓς δέδωκάς μοι

A strange combination with verse 12. Possibly some kind of transcription error. D^c added in verse 11 the Byzantine ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ from verse 12.

The first line makes no sense, but note that Origen supports this, too!
Note also that (acc. to NA) P66^vid omits αὐτοὶ.
The support from P107 is not secure.

B. Aland notes: "the variant probably originated from the desire to emphasize the ceremonial farewell text. … The direction here goes clearly from P107 (and other early forms) to D."

Compare:
B. Aland "Der textkritische und textgeschichtliche Nutzen früher Papyri, demonstriert am Johannesevangelium", in: Recent Developments in Textual Criticism. hrsg. von W. Weren und D.-A. Koch, Assen 2003, 19-38.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 285

117. <u>**Difficult reading**</u>

NA28 John 17:11 τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι,

NA28 John 17:12 ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι,
BYZ John 17:12 ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου οὓς δέδωκάς μοι

NA28 John 17:24 Πάτερ, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι,
BYZ John 17:24 Πάτερ οὓς δέδωκάς μοι

B: no umlaut

<u>a) verse 11 ᾧ. Minority reading</u>

<u>οὓς</u>	D^{C1}, N, 209, 69, 892^S, al, aur, f, q, vg, sa^{mss}, geo^2
ὃ	D*, U, X, 157, 1424, pc
ᾧ or ὃ	Sy, Co (Sy-S, OLat omit)
txt ᾧ	P60(7th CE), P66, 01, A, B, C, L, W, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 579, 1241, Maj, arm, geo^1, goth

<u>b) verse 12 ᾧ:</u>

Byz οὓς	A, C^{C3}, D, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 157, 1071, Maj, Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, geo^2, goth
txt ᾧ	B, C*, L, W, 33, 579, pc, Sy-Pal, sa, pbo, bo, ac^2, arm, geo^1
ὃ	01^{C2}, (Co, Sy-Pal, arm, acc. to Tis)

<u>omit ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι</u>   P66*, 01*, Sy-S

<u>c) verse 24 ὃ:</u>

Byz οὓς	A, C, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, sa, Cl, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>
txt ὃ	P60, 01, B, D, W, 579, pc, d, Sy-S, bo, goth(!)

Compare:
NA28 John 17:2 πᾶν <u>ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ</u> δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.
NA28 John 17:4 τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας <u>ὃ δέδωκάς μοι</u> ἵνα ποιήσω·
NA28 John 17:7 νῦν ἔγνωκαν ὅτι πάντα <u>ὅσα δέδωκάς μοι</u>

NA28 John 17:9 ἀλλὰ περὶ <u>ὧν δέδωκάς μοι</u>, ὅτι σοί εἰσιν,
NA28 John 17:22 κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν <u>ἣν δέδωκάς μοι</u> δέδωκα αὐτοῖς,
NA28 John 18:9 ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ὅτι <u>οὓς δέδωκάς μοι</u>

In the verses 11 and 12 the dative (attracted to the case of the antecedent) is a difficulty. In the previous verses) never Jesus name is meant, but his followers. Thus it is quite probable that scribes stumbled at verses 11 and 12. There is no reason why someone should change the plural οὕς to the dative singular.
Note that the support for οὕς in verse 12 is much stronger than in verse 11. This is unusual. It is possible that in verse 12 the txt reading ᾧ is a conformation to the preceding verse.
If one changes to οὕς in verse 12 though, the ᾧ in verse 11 would be even more unusual. Both verses have a very similar wording and it would be only natural if in both verses the same meaning is intended.

In verse 24 the intended meaning is probably the same, but the singular ὃ is certainly more difficult. There is no reason for a secondary origin of ὃ.

A. Pallis (Notes, 1926) writes on verse 12: "The sentence ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι evidently refers to the Apostles. Jesus pleaded for his disciples in v. 9 ἐρωτῶ περὶ ὧν δέδωκάς μοι, and the fact that he did so a second time in this passagewas perceived by that student who substituted the variant οὕς for ᾧ. But a second variant ὃ in the form ὅτι is the one probably which represents the true reading; it being the undeclinable relative particle. This remark applies equally to v. 11, where we find the same variations, and to v. 24, where the reading varies between ὃ and οὕς."

verse 11:
Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

verse 12:
Rating: - (indecisive)
External Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
        (after weighting the witnesses)

verse 24:
Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 286

Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:11 καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσίν, κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι.
πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου
ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.
NA28 John 17:12 ὅτε ἤμην μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς

omit: P66*

omit ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς:
it(a, b, c, e, ff², r¹), Sy-S, ac²

ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς   B*, M, S, U, 054, 579, 700, pc,
                                      L844, pc, Lat, Sy-H, arm
ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἓν   X (= Jo 17:22)
ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἓν   Θ
ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἓν ἐσμεν   Ψ, 0141, 0211, 33, 1424, pc, vgᵐˢ
                                      (=Jo 17:22 Byz!)

Lat(aur, d, f, q, vg) read txt.
828 is omitting ἵνα … 12 δέδωκάς μοι due to parablepsis.
In B (1375 B 41) the και appears not enhanced and a dot appears above each of the letters. Royse (Scribal Habits, 2008, p. 448) notes additionally "there seem to be small deletion marks through at least κ and ι". The correction thus appears early (Bᶜ¹ = Tischendorf B2).
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 17:21 ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

NA28 John 17:22 κἀγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς,
ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν·
BYZ John 17:22 Καὶ ἐγὼ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι, δέδωκα αὐτοῖς,
ἵνα ὦσιν ἕν, καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἕν ἐσμεν.

NA28 John 17:23 ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν,

Possibly omitted "due to the difficulty of the original reading" (Metzger). There is no reason for an addition.

Several other manuscripts try to smooth the reading by adding καὶ and/or ἐν, probably inspired from verse 22. Codex D has completely reworked this paragraph (see above).

Note that P66*, 01*, Sy-S also omit ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι in verse 12!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 287

NA28 John 17:12 ὅτε ἤμην <u>μετ' αὐτῶν</u> ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, καὶ ἐφύλαξα, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ.

BYZ John 17:12 ὅτε ἤμην <u>μετ αὐτῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,</u> ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου οὓς δέδωκάς μοι ἐφύλαξα καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ

Byz A, C^C3, D^C, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33, 157, 579, Maj, f, q, Sy, arm, goth

txt P60(7th CE), P66, 01, B, C*, D*, L, W, f1, 1071, pc,
Lat, Co, Did, Diatess^Ephrem

B: no umlaut

Ephrem: "when he was praying, *While I was with them, I was keeping watch over them.*" The Arabic Diatessaron has the long form.

Compare context:
NA28 John 17:11 καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ <u>ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ,</u> καὶ αὐτοὶ <u>ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ</u> εἰσίν, κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι. ...
NA28 John 17:13 νῦν δὲ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι καὶ ταῦτα λαλῶ <u>ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ</u> ἵνα ἔχωσιν τὴν χαρὰν τὴν ἐμὴν πεπληρωμένην ἐν ἑαυτοῖς.

Probably added from context verse 11 (so also Weiss). There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 288

Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:12 ὅτε ἤμην μετ᾽ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου <u>**ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι**</u>, καὶ ἐφύλαξα, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο εἰ μὴ ὁ υἱὸς τῆς ἀπωλείας, ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ.

<u>**omit:**</u> P66*, 01*, (Sy-S), <u>Bois</u>

<u>01*</u> corr. by 01^{C2}
<u>P66^C</u>: Not clear. It can be seen that something is written above the line, but only part of one letter is visible. Aland from the facsimile (NT Papyri II): "part of a ω possible". Barns: "the letter is doubtful".
It is probable though that P66^C added the words above the line.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.
<u>Sy-S</u> also omits καὶ ἐφύλαξα.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 17:11 καὶ οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἰσίν, κἀγὼ πρὸς σὲ ἔρχομαι. πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου <u>ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι</u>, ἵνα ὦσιν ἓν καθὼς ἡμεῖς.
          acc. to UBS4 (it, ac²) omit from ᾧ ... ἡμεῖς.

It is possible that the words have been added here as a conformation to verse 11. But the support is rather weak.
On the other hand it is quite possible that the words have been omitted as redundant here.
Note that Sy-S also omits ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι in verse 11 (see above)!

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 289

NA28 John 17:17 ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ <u>**ἀληθείᾳ**</u> · ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν.

BYZ John 17:17 ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ <u>**ἀληθείᾳ σου**</u>· ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστιν

Byz   01^{C2}, C^{C3}, X, Π*, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33, 157, 1071, Maj, q, Sy, bo^{pt}
txt   P66, A, B, C*, D, L, W, Θ, Π^C, f1, 579, pc, Lat, Co, Sy-Pal, goth

Δ reads: <u>**πάτερ ἅγιε**</u>, ἁγίασον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ <u>**ἀληθείᾳ σου**</u>·

B omits the article before ἀληθείᾳ.
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 17:11 πάτερ ἅγιε, <u>τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου</u>
NA28 John 17:12   <u>ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου</u>

NA28 John 17:19 καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἁγιάζω ἐμαυτόν, ἵνα ὦσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ <u>ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.</u>

Probably a harmonization to verses 11 and 12. Note Δ which completes the conformation by additionally adding πάτερ ἅγιε from verse 11.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 290

Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:21 ἵνα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, **πάτερ**, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

πατήρ   B, D, N, W, pc, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal
πάτερ   01, A, C, L, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Cl

NA28 John 17:24 **Πάτερ**, ὃ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμὶ ἐγὼ κἀκεῖνοι ὦσιν μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμήν, ἣν δέδωκάς μοι ὅτι ἠγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

πατήρ   A, B, N, pc, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal
πάτερ   01, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Cl

NA28 John 17:25 **πάτερ** δίκαιε, καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ σε ἔγνων, καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας·

πατήρ   A, B, N, pc, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal
πάτερ   P59ᵛⁱᵈ(7ᵗʰ CE), 01, C, D, L, W, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Cl

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 12:28 πάτερ, δόξασόν σου τὸ ὄνομα.
πατήρ   B
NA28 John 17:1 εἶπεν· πάτερ, ἐλήλυθεν ἡ ὥρα·
πατήρ   N
NA28 John 17:5 καὶ νῦν δόξασόν με σύ, πάτερ,
πατήρ   D*, N
NA28 John 17:11 πάτερ ἅγιε, τήρησον αὐτοὺς
πατήρ   B, N

Quite clearly an accidental error.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 291

NA28 John 17:21 ἵνα πάντες <u>ἓν ὦσιν</u>, καθὼς σύ, πάτερ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν <u>**ὦσιν**</u>, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

BYZ John 17:21 ἵνα πάντες <u>ἓν ὦσιν</u> καθὼς σύ πάτερ ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν <u>**ἓν ὦσιν**</u> ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας

Byz   01, A, C^C3, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
      Lat(aur, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, bo, goth, Cl, Or

txt   P66^vid, B, C*, D, W,
      it(a, b, c, d, e, r¹), vg^ms, sa, ac², pbo, bo^ms, arm, geo

Sy-S has a lacuna. Burkitt writes: A possible restoration is "united", giving: "that they also may be united".
B: no umlaut

Compare next verses:
NA28 John 17:22 ἵνα <u>ὦσιν ἓν</u> καθὼς ἡμεῖς <u>ἕν</u>·
NA28 John 17:23 ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί,
        ἵνα <u>ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν</u>,

Compare also:
NA28 John 17:11 ἵνα <u>ὦσιν ἓν</u> καθὼς ἡμεῖς.

Metzger writes: "The pedantic addition of ἓν before ὦσιν, which comes from ἓν ὦσιν earlier in the verse, clouds the thought more than illumines it."

It is noteworthy that no minuscule supports the txt reading.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 292

Minority reading:
NA28 John 17:23 ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί, ἵνα ὦσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἕν, ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας καὶ <u>ἠγάπησας</u> αὐτοὺς καθὼς ἐμὲ ἠγάπησας.

<u>ἠγάπησα</u>   D, 0141, 892ˢ, 1424, pc,
               it(a, b, d), vgᵐˢˢ, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, boᵖᵗ, arm

Lat(c, e, f, q, vg) read txt.
Sy-S is not in NA, but in Burkitt.
B: no umlaut

"so that the world may know that you have sent me
and *you have loved them* even as you have loved me."

"so that the world may know that you have sent me
and *I have loved them* even as you have loved me."

Compare:
NA28 John 13:34 Ἐντολὴν καινὴν δίδωμι ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους, καθὼς <u>ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς</u> ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους.
NA28 John 15:9 <u>Καθὼς ἠγάπησέν με ὁ πατήρ, κἀγὼ ὑμᾶς ἠγάπησα·</u>
NA28 John 15:12 Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐντολὴ ἡ ἐμή, ἵνα ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους καθὼς <u>ἠγάπησα ὑμᾶς.</u>

Both readings make good sense and it is probable that the 1ˢᵗ person is an accidental error. It is also possible that the 1ˢᵗ person is influenced by 15:9 which has the same meaning as the D et al. reading here.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 293

NA28 John 18:1 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθεν σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου <u>τοῦ Κεδρὼν</u> ὅπου ἦν κῆπος, εἰς ὃν εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.

BYZ John 18:1 Ταῦτα εἰπὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐξῆλθεν σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ πέραν τοῦ χειμάρρου <u>τῶν Κεδρὼν</u> ὅπου ἦν κῆπος εἰς ὃν εἰσῆλθεν αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ

Byz <u>τῶν Κεδρὼν</u> 01ᶜ², B, C, L, X, Θ, Ψ, 054, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 157, 579, 1071, Maj, Or, <u>WH</u>, <u>Trg</u>

txt <u>τοῦ Κεδρὼν</u> A, S, Δ, Ω, 0250, pc, aur, c, e, f, q, vg ("Cedron"), Sy, arm, (Josephus), **<u>NA²⁵</u>**, <u>Trgᵐᵍ</u>

  <u>τοῦ Κέδρου</u> 01*, D, W, a, b, d, r¹ ("Cedri"), Co, <u>Tis</u>

  <u>Caedrum</u> e

P60: ... κε]ΔΡⲰΝ
B: no umlaut

Compare LXX:
LXX 2 Samuel 15:23 καὶ πᾶσα ἡ γῆ ἔκλαιεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς παρεπορεύοντο ἐν τῷ <u>χειμάρρῳ Κεδρων</u> καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς διέβη τὸν <u>χειμάρρουν Κεδρων</u>
  <u>1. χειμάρρῳ τῶν Κεδρων</u> B, pc
  <u>2. χειμάρρουν τῶν Κεδρων</u> A, it, pc

LXX 1 Kings 2:37   <u>τὸν χειμάρρουν Κεδρων</u>   <u>+ τῶν</u>: N, pc
LXX 1 Kings 15:13   <u>ἐν τῷ χειμάρρῳ Κεδρων</u>   <u>+ τῶν</u>: A, B, al
LXX 2 Kings 23:6   <u>εἰς τὸν χειμάρρουν Κεδρων ... ἐν τῷ χειμάρρῳ Κεδρω</u>
LXX 2 Kings 23:12   <u>εἰς τὸν χειμάρρουν Κεδρων</u>
LXX 2 Chronicles 15:16 <u>ἐν χειμάρρῳ Κεδρων</u>
LXX 2 Chronicles 29:16 <u>εἰς τὸν χειμάρρουν Κεδρων</u>
LXX 2 Chronicles 30:14 <u>εἰς τὸν χειμάρρουν Κεδρων</u>

Κεδρων is an indeclinable noun, a place name, "Kidron-valley". Scribes probably took this for κέδρος "cedar tree" (τὰς κέδρους τοῦ Λιβάνου) and changed it accordingly, either into τῶν Κεδρὼν or τοῦ Κέδρου.

The txt reading is definitely the grammatically correct text, but is it also the original reading? The Greek support for τοῦ Κεδρὼν is very bad. Is it possible that this is a secondarily corrected reading? That several scribes corrected it later to conform to the LXX usage?

WH: "τῶν Κεδρὼν, though not found in any version, is amply attested by Greek manuscripts. It cannot be a mere error of scribes of the NT, being already in the LXX."

Rating: - (indecisive)

External Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)
        either τῶν Κεδρὼν or τοῦ Κέδρου
    (after weighting the witnesses)

TVU 294

NA28 John 18:5 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ· Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον.
λέγει αὐτοῖς· <u>ἐγώ εἰμι.</u> εἰστήκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας
ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν μετ' αὐτῶν.

BYZ John 18:5 ἀπεκρίθησαν αὐτῷ Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον
λέγει αὐτοῖς <u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐγώ εἰμι</u> εἰστήκει δὲ καὶ Ἰούδας
ὁ παραδιδοὺς αὐτὸν μετ αὐτῶν

<u>ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐγώ εἰμι</u>	A, C, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Lat(c, d^S, f, q, vg), Sy-P, Sy-H, Sy-Pal^{mss}, Co, goth, Diatess, <u>Gre</u>
<u>Ἰησοῦς· ἐγώ εἰμι</u>	01 (dot after **IC**, not original)
<u>ἐγώ εἰμι Ἰησοῦς</u> "Ego sum Iesus"	P60?, B, (a), Ambrose, <u>WH^{mg}</u>, <u>Weiss</u>
<u>ἐγώ εἰμι</u> "Ego sum"	P60?, D, 0211, pc, it(b, e, r^1, **9A**, **30**), Sy-S, Sy-Pal^{ms}, pbo, <u>WH</u>, <u>NA^{25}</u>

P60(7th CE) has a lacuna after ἐγώ εἰμι, it can read either the B reading or the D reading.
According to Tischendorf a reads: "Dixit illis 'Ego sum.' Iesus autem stabat et Iudas … " This punctuation has also Jülicher's "Itala".
From here starts D/d^{sup}. The Greek is still old for this verse, but the next page with the Latin is already the supplement (reading the Byz/vg text).
B: no umlaut

Ephrem, in his Diatessaron commentary, has the long form (McCarthy):
"They said to him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus replied to them, It is I. All of them …"
So also the Arabic.

Compare next verses 6, 8:
NA28 John 18:6 ὡς οὖν <u>εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ἐγώ εἰμι,</u> ἀπῆλθον εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω
καὶ ἔπεσαν χαμαί.
NA28 John 18:8 ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς· <u>εἶπον ὑμῖν ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.</u>

This is one of the very few NA readings that is supported only by D in the Greek.

The omission could be accidental:
a) ΑΥΤΟΙϹΙϹ,   Ἰησοῦς written as nomen sacrum after αὐτοῖς.
b) ΑΥΤΟΙϹΟΙϹ, ὁ Ἰησοῦς written as nomen sacrum after αὐτοῖς.
c) ΙϹΙϹΤΗΚΕΙ,   Ἰησοῦς written as nomen sacrum before εἱστήκει,
     which is often written as ἱστήκει in the manuscripts, e.g. P66, 01, B*, D.

On the other hand the different insertion points may indicate a secondary cause.

It is also possible that the 01 reading is original with the meaning:
He says to them: "Jesus? I am he."
This then has been changed to the Byzantine reading by inserting the article, by B by shifting "Jesus" to the end to avoid confusion and in D it is an accidental omission.

B and especially 01 are not very reliable regarding the article.

Overall the support for the omission is just to slim and not weighty enough. Unfortunately d is not present anymore.

Rating: 1? or - (NA probably wrong or indecisive)
     (change to Byzantine reading, possibly with the ὁ in brackets.)

TVU 295

Order of verses 18:13 - 18:24

B: no umlaut
13, 24, 14-15, 19-23, 16-18   Sy-S

13, 24, 14-23, 24   1195 (1123 CE), Sy-H^mg, Sy-Pal^A,
                             Cyril-Alex. (5th CE)

13a, 24, 13b, 14-23, 24   225 (1192 CE), pc

13, 19-23, 24, 14-18   Spitta (conjecture, 1893)

13a First they took him to **<u>Annas</u>**,
13b who was the father-in-law of **<u>Caiaphas</u>**, the high priest that year.
14 **<u>Caiaphas</u>** was the one who had advised the Jews that it was better to have one person die for the people. **15** Simon Peter and another disciple followed Jesus. Since that disciple was known to the high priest, he went with Jesus into the courtyard of the high priest,
16 but Peter was standing outside at the gate. So the other disciple, who was known to the high priest, went out, spoke to the woman who guarded the gate, and brought Peter in. **17** The woman said to Peter, "You are not also one of this man's disciples, are you?" He said, "I am not." **18** Now the slaves and the police had made a charcoal fire because it was cold, and they were standing around it and warming themselves. Peter also was standing with them and warming himself.
19 Then **<u>the high priest</u>** questioned Jesus about his disciples and about his teaching. **20** Jesus answered, "I have spoken openly to the world; I have always taught in synagogues and in the temple, where all the Jews come together. I have said nothing in secret. **21** Why do you ask me? Ask those who heard what I said to them; they know what I said." **22** When he had said this, one of the police standing nearby struck Jesus on the face, saying, "Is that how you answer the high priest?" **23** Jesus answered, "If I have spoken wrongly, testify to the wrong. But if I have spoken rightly, why do you strike me?"
24 Then **<u>Annas</u>** sent him bound to **<u>Caiaphas</u>** the high priest.

Note also:
NA28 John 18:13 καὶ ἤγαγον πρὸς Ἄνναν πρῶτον· ἦν γὰρ πενθερὸς τοῦ Καϊάφα, ὃς ἦν ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ ἐκείνου·
       <u>omit:</u>   P60(7th CE)

The canonical verse order is problematic. Especially the position of verse 24 is difficult. First Annas is questioning him (this is not mentioned in the Synoptics), then Annas sent him to Caiaphas. What happens there? We are not told. Some witnesses solve this problem nicely by inserting verse 24 after verse 13(a). Then the interrogation 19-23 is by Caiaphas and not Annas.

The reading by Sy-S is even more elaborate. It separates the story of Peter's denial from the interrogation. There is no evidence that this is the order of the Diatessaron. The sources we have give the normal order.

Interestingly already Martin Luther inserted a note after verse 13 in his 1545 German Bible: "Hie solt stehen der Vers: 'Und Hannas sandte jn gebunden zu dem Hohenpriester Caiphas.' Ist von dem Schreiber versetzt im umbwerffen des Blats, wie offt geschicht." (= "Here should stand verse 24 … misplaced by a scribe in turning a leaf, as often happens.") [taken from Reclam's Studienausgabe of Luther's 1545 NT].

Friedrich Spitta is discussing the problems in his "Zur Geschichte und Litteratur des Urchristenthums", 1893, vol. 1, p. 158 ff.: "In der That liegt hier eine merkwürdige Unordnung (strange disorder) des Stoffes vor." He conjectures the order 13, 19-23, 24, 14-18 and explains it by some inattentive scribe, skipping from 13 to 24, continuing with 14-18, then noting his error and adding 19-23(24).

On the Sy-S order Blass writes: "This is the narrative of the real author; the other one is that of blundering scribes." (Philology of the Gospels, p. 59)

Streeter discusses this variation ("Four Gospels", p. 382): "possibilities of this kind open".

W. Randolph Church proposed the order: 13, 24, 14, 19-23, 15-18.
He notes that the two interchanged passages have about the same number of letters (19.23: 427; 15-18: 436) and some accidental exchange appeared. Compare: W. Randolph Church "The dislocations in the eighteenth chapter of John" JBL 49 (1930) 375-83

All those changes in order are good suggestions but are difficult to explain. It is nevertheless interesting how many scribes moved verse 24 after verse 13.

C.H. Turner "Transpositions of text in John 2, Jo 18:13-25" JTS 2 (1900) 141-2 speculates about the Old Latin text in e and k:

> "Our best old Latin witness, codex *k*, fails us here: but the next best, codex *e*, or the Palatine MS (Vindob. lat. 1185), is extant, though attention has not yet, as far as I know, been called to its evidence. Fol. 105b ends with the words *cohors itaque et tribunus et ministeria iudaeorum compraehenderunt* (xviii 12): fol. 106a begins with *Dixerunt numquid et tu unus ex discentibus* (xviii 25). In other words, a lacuna begins a few words before the first verse whose order is doubtful, and the text is taken up again at the very point (verse 25b) where the order of the Sinai MS and of our other authorities comes together again. Further, the amount of matter omitted is more, apparently, than one folio of codex *e* ought to contain: if the sumptuous edition of Tischendorf (*Evangelium Palatinum*

ineditum, Leipzig, 1847) be consulted, where the manuscript is reproduced page for page and column for column, it will be found that the folio preceding the lacuna (xviii 1-12) contained matter equivalent to twenty-one or twenty-two lines, the folio succeeding the lacuna (xviii 25-36) to twenty-two or twenty-three lines, of Westcott and Hort's text, whereas the matter omitted amounts to twenty-seven lines. These data were sufficient to excite suspicion, and Mr. A. E. Burn was kind enough to examine the MS at my request last July. He reports that no accidental loss has taken place, but that, apparently at some remote date, between folios 105 and 106 a leaf has been cut out.

The presumption is I think so strong as to amount almost to certainty, that the cancelling of the leaf was due to the fact that it contained the unfamiliar order of events that reappears in the Sinaitic Syriac. If the leaf excised contained the whole lacuna, then its account (as is shown from comparison of the number of lines made just above) must have been shorter than that of the ordinary texts: and the Sinaitic Syriac by omitting verse 25a (a doublet of verse 18b) and part of verse 23, represents a text shorter by at any rate two lines. But it may also have been the case that the original scribe, on noticing the dissimilarity of text, cancelled his own perhaps unfinished page, and meanwhile began again at the point where divergence ceased, leaving the matter over for a correction which was never made."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 296

120.   Difficult variant
NA28 John 18:14 ἦν δὲ Καϊάφας ὁ συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι συμφέρει ἕνα ἄνθρωπον **ἀποθανεῖν** ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ.

BYZ John 18:14 ἦν δὲ Καϊάφας ὁ συμβουλεύσας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὅτι συμφέρει ἕνα ἄνθρωπον **ἀπολέσθαι** ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ

From 18:14 - 20:13 D is not extant anymore, but only as a supplement (D^S).
For 20:1-13 only the Latin d is present.

Byz   A, C^C2, Δ, Ψ, 0250, 157, Maj, Sy-H

txt   P66^vid, 01, B, C*, D^S, L, W, X, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 22, 33, 565, 579, al,
      Latt, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H^mg, Sy-Pal, Co, arm

add καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται (11:50):   22, a
B: no umlaut

ἀποθανεῖν ἀποθνῄσκω infinitive aorist active
                     "die"
ἀπολέσθαι ἀπόλλυμι   infinitive aorist middle
                     "destroy; kill; lose"

Compare:
NA28 John 11:50 οὐδὲ λογίζεσθε ὅτι συμφέρει ὑμῖν ἵνα εἷς ἄνθρωπος <u>ἀποθάνῃ</u> ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος <u>ἀπόληται.</u>

Immediate context:
NA28 John 18:9 ἵνα πληρωθῇ ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπεν ὅτι οὓς δέδωκάς μοι οὐκ <u>ἀπώλεσα</u> ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐδένα.

ἀπολέσθαι probably comes from the reference in 11:50, where both words appear: εἷς ἄνθρωπος <u>ἀποθάνῃ</u> ... τὸ ἔθνος <u>ἀπόληται.</u>
It is either due to confusion or a deliberate abridgement.
This in itself is of course no argument in favor of one reading.

ἀπολέσθαι is the more difficult reading, because it deviates from the position in the reference 11:50.

A direct harmonization to 11:50 is improbable, because in that case it would be more suitable to add the missing phrase καὶ μὴ ὅλον τὸ ἔθνος ἀπόληται, as do 22 and a.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 297

NA28 John 18:15 Ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ <u>ἄλλος</u> μαθητής.

BYZ John 18:15 Ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ <u>ὁ ἄλλος</u> μαθητής

Byz   01^{C2}, C, L, X, Δ, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, 700, 1071, Maj, sa^{mss}, ac², [Trg]
txt   P66, 01*, A, B, D^S, W, Ψ, 472, pc, Sy-S, Sy-P, sa^{mss}, pbo, bo

P60 is not clear. It is not noted in NA and Swanson.
The ed. pr. reconstructs:
πετρος και αλλο[ς μαθη
IGNTP has to the contrary:
πετρος και ο [αλλος μαθη
From the photo the IGNTP suggestion is more probable, since the remains of ink do not look like an α. An ο is possible. But this is not certain.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 18:16 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν <u>ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ ἄλλος</u> ὁ γνωστὸς τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ εἶπεν τῇ θυρωρῷ καὶ εἰσήγαγεν τὸν Πέτρον.
NA28 John 20:2-4 τρέχει οὖν καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς <u>τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν</u> ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς 3 Ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πέτρος καὶ <u>ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς</u> καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον. 4 ἔτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμοῦ· καὶ <u>ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς</u> προέδραμεν τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ ἦλθεν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον,
NA28 John 20:8 τότε οὖν εἰσῆλθεν καὶ <u>ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς</u> ὁ ἐλθὼν πρῶτος εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐπίστευσεν·

The article is important for the identification of "the other disciple". Is it the disciple "whom Jesus loved" (13:23, 20:2)?
The addition of the article is probably inspired from context. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 298

Minority reading:
NA28 John 18:15 Ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος καὶ ἄλλος μαθητής. <u>ὁ δὲ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ἦν γνωστὸς τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ</u> καὶ συνεισῆλθεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ εἰς τὴν αὐλὴν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως,

omit: P66*

Corrected in the upper margin.
B: no umlaut

There is no reason for an omission. Probably accidental.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 299

<u>Verses 18:29 and 19:4</u>
NA28 John 18:29 <u>ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἔξω πρὸς αὐτοὺς</u> καὶ φησίν· τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε [κατὰ] τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;

BYZ John 18:29 <u>ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος   πρὸς αὐτοὺς</u> καὶ εἶπεν Τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε κατὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου

NA28 John 19:4 Καὶ <u>ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν ἔξω ὁ Πιλᾶτος</u> καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς·

<u>verse 18:29</u>
1. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος ___ πρὸς αὐτοὺς
Byz   A, C^C3, D^S, K, Δ, Ψ, 0250, 157, Maj, q, Sy-S, Co? ^probably, acc. to Horner

2. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος ___
Θ

3. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος πρὸς αὐτοὺς <u>ἔξω</u>
P66^vid, N, f13, 579, L253, L844, Lat, Sy-Pal, arm

4. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁ Πιλᾶτος <u>ἔξω</u>
01, W, ff²

5. ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος <u>ἔξω</u> πρὸς αὐτοὺς
txt   B, C*, L, X, Π, 0141, 0211, f1, (788), 33, 565, 700, 1071, pc,
       vg^ms, Sy-P, Sy-H, <u>WH</u>

P66: the available text allows readings 3 and 4. Space considerations make it more probable that P66 reads 3.
B: no umlaut

<u>verse 19:4</u>

ἐξῆλθεν		πάλιν ἔξω ὁ Πιλᾶτος	P66*, A, B, Dˢ, Γ, 0211, f1, 33, 157, al,	
			Sy-H, WH, NA²⁵	txt
ἐξῆλθεν <u>οὖν</u>		πάλιν ἔξω ὁ Πιλᾶτος	P66ᶜ, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 700, Maj	

ἐξῆλθεν		πάλιν ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἔξω	01, L, X, 1071, Lat, Sy-Pal, arm,	
			WHᵐᵍ	
ἐξῆλθεν <u>οὖν</u>		πάλιν ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἔξω	118, f13, 892ˢ	
ἐξῆλθεν <u>οὖν</u>		ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἔξω	W, 346	
ἐξῆλθεν <u>οὖν</u> ἔξω	πάλιν ὁ Πιλᾶτος		054, 1424, pc	
ἐξῆλθεν		ὁ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν ἔξω	pc, Sy-P	

ἐξῆλθεν <u>οὖν</u> πάλιν ὁ Πιλᾶτος		28	
ἐξῆλθεν	πάλιν ὁ Πιλᾶτος	P90?, e, Co? ᵖʳᵒᵇᵃᵇˡʸ ᵃᶜᶜ. ᵗᵒ ᴴᵒʳⁿᵉʳ	
ἐξῆλθεν <u>οὖν</u> ὁ Πιλᾶτος πάλιν		579	

P90: Only ἐξῆλθεν πάλιν is visible. The editors conclude from space considerations that there is not enough space for ἔξω. NA follows them and notes P90 as "vid". But this is not justified. The evidence turns out to be inconclusive. Careful reconstructions show no preference for either reading. P90 should be dropped from the apparatus.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>**click here**</u>.
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Note also:
NA28 John 18:4 Ἰησοῦς οὖν εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν
ἐξῆλθεν _καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· τίνα ζητεῖτε;
     ἔξω   P60

Compare:
NA28 John 18:38 Καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν <u>πάλιν ἐξῆλθεν πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους</u>
NA28 John 19:5 <u>ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω,</u>

Different insertion points often indicate a secondary origin. It is possible that ἔξω has been added in 18:29 to harmonize with 19:4. This is not very probable though, because in the following verse 38, where the same addition could be made, the reading without ἔξω is safe.

On the other hand the different word orders might have just stylistic reasons. This is more probable because in 19:4 the same word-order variants appear. Note that 01 and W have the same word order in both verses.

It is therefore most probable that ἔξω has been omitted as redundant. The word order variants are difficult to decide. The 01, L reading in 19:4 is the same order as the txt reading in 18:29. This is probably the reason, why WH have this reading as alternative in the margin.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 300

121. Difficult reading

Minority reading:

NA28 John 18:29 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἔξω πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ φησίν· τίνα κατηγορίαν φέρετε **[κατὰ]** τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τούτου;

omit: 01*, B, 087^{vid}, 579, pc, a, c, e, q, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Tis, Bal

087: IGNTP has it without the "vid" qualifier. They give it as:
> γοριαν φερετε
> του αw̄ ου τουτο[υ]

01* corrected by 01^{C2}

B: no umlaut

Compare:

NA28 1 Timothy 5:19 κατὰ πρεσβυτέρου κατηγορίαν μὴ παραδέχου

The omission is difficult to explain. Stylistic reasons?
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 174) thinks that the κατὰ has been added, because the genitive was separated from its subject, and to connect it with the verb, κατὰ has been inserted.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 301

Minority reading:
NA28 John 18:31 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτοῖς <u>ὁ</u> Πιλᾶτος· λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς καὶ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὑμῶν κρίνατε αὐτόν. εἶπον αὐτῷ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· ἡμῖν οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἀποκτεῖναι οὐδένα·

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>omit</u>   B, C*, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>
txt   01, A, C^C, D^S, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 579, Maj
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 18:33 Εἰσῆλθεν οὖν πάλιν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον ὁ Πιλᾶτος
<u>omit ὁ:</u>   D^S
NA28 John 18:38 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος·
<u>omit ὁ:</u>   P66

The article is safe in:
Jo 18:29, 31, 35, 37; 19:1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 19, 21, 22, 31, 38

Quite probably an accidental omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 302

122. Difficult variant

NA28 John 18:40 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν <u>πάλιν</u> λέγοντες· μὴ τοῦτον ἀλλὰ τὸν Βαραββᾶν. ἦν δὲ ὁ Βαραββᾶς λῃστής.

BYZ John 18:40 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν <u>πάλιν πάντες</u> λέγοντες Μὴ τοῦτον ἀλλὰ τὸν Βαραββᾶν ἦν δὲ ὁ Βαραββᾶς λῃστής

<u>πάλιν πάντες</u>	A, (D^s), Δ, Θ, Ω*, 0141, 0211, 0250, Maj, L253, f, vg, Sy-H, goth, Gre, Trg
	<u>πάλιν</u> λέγοντες <u>πάντες</u> D^s, 0290
<u>πάντες</u>	P66^vid, G, K, Π, N, U, Ψ, f1, f13, 28, 33, 157, 565, 700, al, it, Sy-P, Sy-Pal, Co, arm
<u>πάλιν</u>	P60(7th CE), 01, B, L, W, X, Ω*, 0109, 118, 579, 1071, pc
<u>omit:</u>	1241, pc, ac²

P90 has a lacuna (only the Π is visible), but from space considerations it is very probable that it read one of the short forms.
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 7:14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος <u>πάλιν</u> τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς· ἀκούσατέ μου <u>πάντες</u> καὶ σύνετε.
BYZ Mark 7:14 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος <u>πάντα</u> τὸν ὄχλον ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς Ἀκούετέ μου <u>πάντες</u> καὶ συνίετε
Byz   A, W, Θ, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Sy, sa^mss
txt   01, B, D, L, Δ, 892, 1342, Lat, Sy-H^mg, sa^ms, bo
<u>omit</u>   565, 579, pc, sa^mss, bo^mss

NA28 John 19:6 Ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται <u>ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες·</u>
NA28 John 19:12 ἐκ τούτου ὁ Πιλᾶτος ἐζήτει ἀπολῦσαι αὐτόν· οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι <u>ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες·</u>
NA28 John 19:15 <u>ἐκραύγασαν οὖν ἐκεῖνοι·</u> ἆρον ἆρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν.

It is possible that πάλιν has been omitted or changed to πάντες because no earlier shouting is recorded.

πάλιν πάντες is probably a conflation.
On the other hand it is also quite possible that one or the other word has been omitted due to homoioarcton (πα.. – πα..). Note especially the incoherent support for πάλιν. Homoioarcton is therefore clearly at least in part the reason for the shorter readings.

Zahn asks (Comm. Jo): "Why should anybody add πάλιν here, with no support from the context? … Also nobody could miss a πάντες here, who has read verses 30, 31 and 19:12. Both short readings are suspicious and therefore πάλιν πάντες must be the origin of the variation."

Compare the similar variation in Mk 7:14.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 303

NA28 John 19:2 ... καὶ ἱμάτιον πορφυροῦν περιέβαλον <u>αὐτὸν</u>
NA28 John 19:3 <u>**καὶ ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν**</u> καὶ ἔλεγον· χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ ἐδίδοσαν αὐτῷ ῥαπίσματα.

BYZ John 19:3 _____ καὶ ἔλεγον Χαῖρε ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ ῥαπίσματα

Byz   A, D^S, K, Δ, Ψ, f1, 157, 1071, Maj, f, q, Sy-P, goth

txt   P60?(7ᵗʰ CE), P66, P90(2ⁿᵈ CE), 01, B, L, N, U, W, X, Θ, Λ, Π, 0141, 0290, f13, 33, 565, 579, 700, pc, L253, Lat, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, Co, arm

P60 is not clear:
φυρουν ιμ[ατιον πε]
ριεβα[λ]ον α[υτον και ηρ]
χο[ντο ...
Both χ and o are extremely doubtful. From the photo in the IGNTP volume only two ink dots from the upper edge of two letters are visible. Then the papyrus breaks off. Impossible to judge.
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: umlaut! (1377 C 38 L)   <u>ἤρχοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν</u>

Very probably omitted due to h.t.
There is no reason for a secondary addition.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 304

123. <u>Difficult reading</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:5 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἔξω, φορῶν τὸν ἀκάνθινον στέφανον καὶ τὸ πορφυροῦν ἱμάτιον. <u>καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς · ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄνθρωπος.</u> 6 Ὅτε οὖν εἶδον αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς ...

"Behold the man!"

<u>omit:</u> P66*, 0141, it(a, e, ff², r¹), ac²
    P66: An insertion sign is visible. P66^C is not visible, probably added at the bottom of the page (so Aland, NT Papyri II).

<u>καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Πιλᾶτος...</u>   N^C

<u>καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος</u>   B   "Behold <u>a</u> man!"

0141 is in IGNTP, but not in NA.
Swanson has P60 for the B reading, but in error! IGNTP "John - Papyri" does explicitly read ἰδοὺ <u>ὁ</u> ἄνθρωπος! So also the ed. pr. The reading (= txt) is clear from the photo.
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Possibly omitted because it is difficult to understand?

Ehrman argues for a deliberate omission: "If the reading now preserved in Vaticanus once had a wider currency, then the deletion of the entire sentence makes considerable sense. Scribes found its implications troubling; for them, even though Jesus had been bloodied and reviled, he was not a mere mortal. Pilate's statement to the contrary could best be dismissed by being excised."

The addition of ὁ Πιλᾶτος is only natural, because it could equally well be Jesus who is speaking, because he is the last mentioned subject. One is wondering why not more scribes added this.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 305

Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:14 ἦν δὲ παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα, ὥρα ἦν ὡς <u>ἕκτη.</u> καὶ λέγει τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις· ἴδε ὁ βασιλεὺς ὑμῶν.

<u>τρίτη</u>   01^{C2}, D^S, L, X^{txt}, Δ, Ψ, pc, L844, other Lect^{IGNTP}
        Ammonius and Eusebius discuss it.

X^{Comm.}: The commentary of X/033 reads txt. It says:
τίνος ἕνεκεν ὁ μὲν <u>Μάρκος τρίτην</u> ὥραν λέγει τὸν χν σταυρωθῆναι, ὁ δὲ <u>Ἰωάννης ἕκτην</u>; Μάρκος μὲν τὴν ὥραν τῆς ἀποφάσεως τοῦ σταυροῦ σαφῶς καὶ ἀναμφιβόλως ἐκτίθεται. ,51'ερσό Α3 8 ΠΔΦ ἦ 104.

Compare the long note in Tis.
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 15:25 ἦν δὲ ὥρα <u>τρίτη</u> καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν.
                    <u>ἕκτη</u>   Θ, 479**, pc, Sy-H^{mg}, aeth

NA28 Luke 23:44 Καὶ ἦν ἤδη ὡσεὶ ὥρα <u>ἕκτη</u>

Most probably the change to τρίτη was an attempt to harmonize the account with that of Mk.

It is possible that the variant readings originally arouse out of a confusion of the Greek numerals (as suggested by Ammonius and Eusebius):
Γ   3 (Gamma)
      6 (Digamma)

For a complete discussion see:
S. Bartina "Ignotum episemon gabex"
Verbum Domini 36 (1958) 16 - 37
(Ammonius names the Digamma "Gabex", see Migne: Patrologia Graeca 85, col. 1512 B)

Note also:
NA28 John 4:6 ἐκαθέζετο οὕτως ἐπὶ τῇ πηγῇ· <u>ὥρα ἦν ὡς ἕκτη.</u>

Compare: Theodor Zahn, Commentary on John, Excursus 6.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 306

NA28 John 19:15 <u>ἐκραύγασαν οὖν ἐκεῖνοι·</u> ἆρον ἆρον, σταύρωσον αὐτόν.

BYZ John 19:15 <u>οἱ δὲ ἐκραύγασαν·</u>　　　ἆρον ἆρον σταύρωσον αὐτόν

<u>οἱ δὲ ἐκραύγασαν</u>	P66^{Cvid}, A, D^S, Δ, Θ, f1, f13, 157, Maj, Lat, Sy, Co
<u>οἱ δὲ ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες</u>	P60, N, U, f13, 700, pc, r¹
<u>οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον</u>	P66*?, 01*, W, 579
<u>ἐκραύγασαν οὖν ἐκεῖνοι</u>	01^{C2}, B, L, X, Ψ, 1071, pc, b, j, <u>WH</u>, <u>NA</u>²⁵
<u>ἐκραύγασαν οὖν</u>	33, L844, e
<u>ἐκραύγασαν οὖν πάντες λέγοντες</u>	0141
ἐκραύγα<u>ζον</u> read:	D^S, K, Π, N, Θ, 054, al

P60 not in NA!
P66: NA²⁷ has "P66* illeg.". In the facsimile one reads: οἱ δὲ ἐκρ]αύγασα^N. Thus P66 wrote ἐκρ]αύγασα but forgot the N, which is supplied above the line. But all of this appears to be a correction of yet something else. Swanson has ἔλεγον as conjecture. IGNTP has ἔλεγον as safe for P66*. This is possible, although nothing can be seen clearly in the facsimile. The ἐκρ]αύγασα is written quite compressed. The shorter ἔλεγον fits quite good to the normal size and distances of the letters.

Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verses:
NA28 John 18:40 ἐκραύγασαν οὖν πάλιν λέγοντες·
NA28 John 19:6 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ὑπηρέται ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες·
NA28 John 19:12 οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐκραύγασαν λέγοντες·
　　　　　omit ἐκραύγασαν: 01*
　　　　　omit λέγοντες:　　579

The Byzantine reading is probably a harmonization to verse 12. There is no reason for a change if original.
On the other hand the support for txt us rather limited.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 307

NA28 John 19:16 Τότε οὖν παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σταυρωθῇ. <u>Παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν</u>,

BYZ John 19:16 τότε οὖν παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σταυρωθῇ <u>Παρέλαβον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν</u> καὶ ἤγαγον

<u>Οἱ δὲ παραλάβοντες αὐτὸν</u>	P66[vid], M, f1, f13, 565
<u>Οἱ δὲ παραλάβοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν</u>	(01*), N, U, W, (Υ), 054, 579, al
one of these:	P60[vid]

<u>Παρέλαβον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν</u>	A, K, Π, Δ, Θ, 0141, 0153, 157, 700, Maj, vg, sa, Sy-H, Sy-P
<u>Παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν</u>	01[C2], B, D[S], L, X, Ψ, 0290, 33, 892[S], 1071, it, bo

P60 not in NA! The papyrus is in a bad state here.
The ed. pr. has:
[οι] δε παρ[αλαβοντες το IN]
IGNTP has:
   ] δε παρ[αλαβοντες το IN]
Judging from the photo, the δὲ is quite clear, also the following αρ of παρα.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **click here**.

For other minor changes see Swanson!
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:27 Τότε οἱ στρατιῶται τοῦ ἡγεμόνος <u>παραλαβόντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν</u> εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον συνήγαγον ἐπ' αὐτὸν ὅλην τὴν σπεῖραν.
NA28 Mark 15:15 …καὶ <u>παρέδωκεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν</u> φραγελλώσας ἵνα σταυρωθῇ.
NA28 Luke 23:24 … <u>τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκεν</u> τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

Παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν sounds not complete. It is not clear who took him and for what. The changes and additions are only natural.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 308

NA28 John 19:16 Τότε οὖν παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σταυρωθῇ. Παρέλαβον οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν _____,

BYZ John 19:16 τότε οὖν παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἵνα σταυρωθῇ Παρέλαβον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν **καὶ ἤγαγον**

καὶ ἤγαγον	D^S, K, Π, Δ, Θ, 157, 1071, 1241, Maj
(καὶ) ἀπήγαγον	P60^{vid}, P66^{vid}, A, N, W, 0153, 0290, f1, 565, 579 al
καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτόν	01, sa

ἀπήγαγον εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον	M?, U, Γ, 700, al, Lect^{mss}, Sy-Pal^{mg}
ἤγαγον καὶ ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρόν	f13, L844, Or^{Lat}

οἵ δε στρατιῶται παρέλαβοντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν **ἀπήγαγον** 118

txt **omit:** B, L, X, Ψ, 0141, 33, pc, it(a, aur, b, c, e, ff², r¹), bo

P60 not in NA! The απ prefix is not completely clear, but quite probable:
IGNTP and the ed.pr. reconstruct:
απ[η]γαγον κ[αι ...
M: Swanson has M for εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον. IGNTP and NA have not.
Lacuna: C, Sy-S
For other minor changes see Swanson!
B: no umlaut

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:31 ... <u>καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν</u> εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσαι.
NA28 Mark 15:20 ... Καὶ ἐξάγουσιν αὐτὸν ἵνα σταυρώσωσιν αὐτόν.
NA28 Luke 23:26 Καὶ ὡς <u>ἀπήγαγον αὐτόν,</u> ἐπιλαβόμενοι Σίμωνά τινα Κυρηναῖον ἐρχόμενον ἀπ᾽ ἀγροῦ <u>ἐπέθηκαν αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν</u> φέρειν ὄπισθεν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.

Next verse 17:
NA28 John 19:17 καὶ βαστάζων ἑαυτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίου Τόπον,

The reading εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον is curious. Even though the praetorium appears twice in 18:28 and 18:33 it makes no sense here.
Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the καὶ ἀπήγαγον is from Mt 27:31.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 309

124. Difficult variant
NA28 John 19:20 καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί.

BYZ John 19:20 καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον Ἑβραϊστί Ἑλληνιστί Ῥωμαϊστί

Byz   A, Dˢ, Θ, 0141, f1, 157, 565, 1071, Maj, Lat, Sy
txt   01^C1, B, L, N, X, Ψ, (f13), 33, 579, al, e, ff², Sy-Pal, Co, arm
       01* h.t.

Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί, Ἑβραϊστί   W, 1194

NA28 John 19:19 ἔγραψεν δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλᾶτος καὶ ἔθηκεν ἐπὶ τοῦ σταυροῦ· ἦν δὲ γεγραμμένον _· Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

Ἑβραϊστί, Ῥωμαϊστί, Ἑλληνιστί   f13-part
Ἑβραϊστί Ἑλληνιστί Ῥωμαϊστί   69, 124, 983, 1689(=f13), 579

01* has an omission due to parablepsis from v. 19 to v. 21 (τῶν Ἰουδαίων)
f13 has the words in verse 19 only. 579 has the words twice: In verse 19 in the Byz order and in verse 20 in the txt order!
Lacuna: C, Δ, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

See also discussion in Luke 23:38
NA28 Luke 23:38 ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ <u>ἐπ' αὐτῷ·</u> ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος.
BYZ Luke 23:38 ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ <u>γεγραμμένη ἐπ αὐτῷ γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς, καὶ Ῥωμαικοῖς καὶ Ἑβραικοῖς,</u>
οὗτος ἐστὶν Ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων
       Byz   01*, A, C^C3, D, Q, W, Θ, Ψ, 0250, f1, f13, 33, 157, Maj,
              Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, bo^pt
       txt   P75, 01^C1, B, C*, L, 070, 579*, 1241, Sy-S, Sy-C, sa, bo^pt

f13, 579 insert the words in verse 19. This probably seemed to be a more appropriate place for them. This is also the position where the words are inserted in the Byzantine text of Lk 23:38.

It is interesting that the wording and the order of the languages in different in Jo and in Byz-Lk.

It has been argued that the txt order, Hebrew, Latin, Greek, is more natural, because we have first the language of the inhabitants, then the language of the occupation regime and finally the main language of the Mediterranean area (= national, official, common language). The Byzantine order could be a geographical ordering from East to West. But all this is not very convincing.

Rating: - (indecisive)

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

TVU 310

Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:21 ἔλεγον οὖν τῷ Πιλάτῳ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων· μὴ γράφε· ὁ <u>βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων</u>,
ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐκεῖνος εἶπεν· βασιλεύς <u>εἰμι τῶν Ἰουδαίων.</u>

No txt in NA and SQE!

<u>τῶν Ἰουδαίων εἰμι</u>
    B, L, X, Ψ, 0141, 33, pc, <u>Trg</u>, <u>WH</u>, <u>SBL</u>

txt   P66, 01, A, Dˢ, W, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj

Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 18:33 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ <u>βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων;</u>
NA28 John 18:37 εἶπεν οὖν αὐτῷ ὁ Πιλᾶτος· οὐκοῦν βασιλεὺς εἶ σύ; ἀπεκρίθη ὁ Ἰησοῦς· σὺ λέγεις ὅτι <u>βασιλεύς εἰμι.</u>
NA28 John 18:39 βούλεσθε οὖν ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν τὸν <u>βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων;</u>
NA28 John 19:3 χαῖρε ὁ <u>βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων</u>
NA28 John 19:19 Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος ὁ <u>βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.</u>

The phrase βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων appears immediately before (and several times elsewhere in John). It is probable that it has simply been repeated and εἰμι added at the end for emphasis.
There is no reason why the B, L word order should have been changed.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 311

125. Difficult reading

Minority reading:

NA28 John 19:24 εἶπαν οὖν πρὸς ἀλλήλους· μὴ σχίσωμεν αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ λάχωμεν περὶ αὐτοῦ τίνος ἔσται· ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ **[ἡ λέγουσα]·** διεμερίσαντο τὰ ἱμάτιά μου ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἱματισμόν μου ἔβαλον κλῆρον. Οἱ μὲν οὖν στρατιῶται ταῦτα ἐποίησαν.

omit: 01, B, pc, L844, it(a, b, c, ff², r¹), sa^mss9, ac², pbo,
NA²⁵, WH, Weiss, Tis, Bal

Lat(aur, f, q, vg), sa^mss3 read txt.
P66 is not clear due to large lacunae: The ed. princeps omits, but space considerations are indecisive. Both are possible.
Lacuna: C, Δ, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 13:18 ἀλλ᾿ ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ·
NA28 John 17:12 ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ.
NA28 John 19:36 ἐγένετο γὰρ ταῦτα ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ·

NA28 John 7:38 καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ γραφή,
NA28 John 7:42 οὐχ ἡ γραφὴ εἶπεν ὅτι
NA28 John 19:28 ἵνα τελειωθῇ ἡ γραφή,
NA28 John 19:37 καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρα γραφὴ λέγει·

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 26:54 πῶς οὖν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ ὅτι
NA28 Matthew 26:56 ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαὶ τῶν προφητῶν.
NA28 Mark 14:49 ἀλλ᾿ ἵνα πληρωθῶσιν αἱ γραφαί.
NA28 Luke 4:21 ὅτι σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφὴ αὕτη
NA28 Acts 1:16 ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἔδει πληρωθῆναι τὴν γραφὴν

Note:
NA28 James 2:23 καὶ ἐπληρώθη ἡ γραφὴ ἡ λέγουσα·

ἵνα ἡ γραφὴ πληρωθῇ appears 4 times in John. Only here ἡ λέγουσα is added. The only other occurrence in the NT with this addition is Jam 2:23.
It is possible that the omission is a conformation to John's style.

Rating: - (indecisive)
(brackets ok)

TVU 312

Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:25 Εἱστήκεισαν δὲ παρὰ τῷ σταυρῷ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὐτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ _καὶ Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνή.

ὁ τίς Κλῶπα καὶ Ἰωσὴφ ἀδελφοὶ
καὶ Μαρία ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ Μαρία ἀδελφὰς·
οἱ οὖν δύο ἀδελφοὶ ἔλαβον τὰς δύο ἀδελφὰς
S, Sy-H^mg
Lacuna: C, Δ, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

Certainly originally a marginal gloss (note Sy-H^mg).

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 313

NA28 John 19:29 σκεῦος ____ ἔκειτο ὄξους <u>μεστόν</u>·
<u>σπόγγον οὖν μεστὸν τοῦ ὄξους</u> ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι.

BYZ John 19:29 σκεῦος οὖν ἔκειτο ὄξους <u>μεστόν</u>·
<u>οἱ δὲ πλήσαντες σπόγγον ὄξους καὶ</u> ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι

Byz   A, Dˢ, Θ, 0141, f13, 157, 892ˢ, 1071, Maj, aur, f, vg, Sy, bo, saᵐˢˢ², arm
       <u>οἱ δὲ πλήσαντες σπόγγον ὄξους <u>μετὰ χολῆς καὶ</u></u>
       Θ, f13, 892ˢ, pc, [+ Sy-H, Sy-Pal, arm, acc. to Tis]

txt   P66ᵛⁱᵈ, 01, B, L, W, X, Ψ, f1, 33, 565, 579, pc, it, saᵐˢˢ⁵, ac², pbo
       <u>ποιήσαντες σπόγγον οὖν μεστὸν τοῦ ὄξους <u>μετὰ χολῆς</u></u>
       Eus (cf. Tis)

Lacuna: C, Δ, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

μεστόν   μεστός "full"
πλήσαντες participle aorist active nominative masculine plural
           πίμπλημι "fill"

Parallels:
NA28 Matthew 27:34 ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ πιεῖν <u>οἶνον μετὰ χολῆς</u> μεμιγμένον·
NA28 Matthew 27:48 καὶ λαβὼν σπόγγον πλήσας τε <u>ὄξους</u>
                   καὶ περιθεὶς καλάμῳ ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν.
NA28 Mark 15:23 καὶ ἐδίδουν αὐτῷ <u>ἐσμυρνισμένον οἶνον</u>·
NA28 Mark 15:36 γεμίσας σπόγγον <u>ὄξους</u> περιθεὶς καλάμῳ
                ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν
NA28 Luke 23:36 οἱ στρατιῶται προσερχόμενοι, <u>ὄξος</u> προσφέροντες αὐτῷ

Compare:
LXX Psalm 68:22 καὶ ἔδωκαν εἰς τὸ βρῶμά μου <u>χολὴν</u> καὶ εἰς τὴν δίψαν μου ἐπότισάν με <u>ὄξος</u>

It is probable that the Byzantine reading is a stylistic improvement, to avoid the double μεστὸν.

πίμπλημι appears only here in John.

μετὰ χολῆς is clearly a harmonization to Mt (or Psalm 68:22).

Weiss (Jo Com.) thinks that the Byzantine reading is from Mt 27:48.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 314

126. Difficult variant
Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:29 σκεῦος ἔκειτο ὄξους μεστόν· σπόγγον οὖν μεστὸν τοῦ ὄξους ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες προσήνεγκαν αὐτοῦ τῷ στόματι.

ὑσσῷ   476*(11ᵗʰ CE), cj. (Camerarius, 1500 - 1574)
= "spear, lance"   Parker (Living text) adds: 1242 (13ᵗʰ CE).
               476 has been corrected to ὑσσώπῳ.

perticae   b, ff², **16**, **25**
= "lath, pole"

omit: c, **9A***, **48** (but see below)

ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες καλάμῳ   Θ, 892ˢ, pc

positum erat aceto plenum hysopo admiscentes   c, **16**, **25**, **48**, Hil, Chrys, Non
"vinegar mixed with Hyssop"

For details of the Latin see the online Vetus Latina Iohannes.
Lacuna: C, Δ, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

ὕσσωπος "hyssop", a small bush with aromatic leaves used for ritual purification
        (appears 10 times in the LXX)
ὑσσῷ   ὁ ὑσσός, "the javelin, spear", Latin "pilum"

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 27:48 καὶ περιθεὶς <u>καλάμῳ ["reed"]</u> ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν.
NA28 Mark 15:36 [καὶ] γεμίσας σπόγγον ὄξους περιθεὶς <u>καλάμῳ</u> ἐπότιζεν αὐτόν λέγων·

Compare also:
LXX Exodus 12:22 λήμψεσθε δὲ δέσμην ὑσσώπου καὶ βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος   "Take a bunch of hyssop, dip it in the blood that is in the basin,"
LXX Numbers 19:6 καὶ λήμψεται ὁ ἱερεὺς ξύλον κέδρινον καὶ ὕσσωπον καὶ κόκκινον   "The priest shall take cedarwood, hyssop, and crimson material,"
and also: Lev 14:4, 6, 49, 51f; Num 19:6, 18; 1 Ki 5:13; Ps 50:9; Heb 9:19

Hyssop is possibly a very early error, perhaps by John already? An aromatic herb is not really suited for the purpose, but see below.

It is possible that the variant arose accidentally:
ΥⲤⲤⲰⲠⲈⲢΙΘⲈⲚⲦⲈⲤ
ΥⲤⲤⲰⲠⲰⲠⲈⲢΙΘⲈⲚⲦⲈⲤ

476 is a typical Byzantine manuscript. It is probable that the reading has been introduced here either accidentally (the other way round) or on purpose to fit better to the context.
The real Hyssop (Hyssopus officinalis) does not occur in Palestine. It has been proposed that the Hyssop in the Bible is Origanum Maru, a marjoram. Its stems get about 1 m long. Another suggestion is that it is Sorghum vulgare, Durra, which gets almost twice as high as Origanum Maru and fits equally well. It is said that it would be in principal possible to put a sponge on it.

ὑσσῷ was first conjectured by Joachim Camerarius in 1572:

> "Hyssop is the name of a herb. What mentioning it here may mean, others have inferred elsewhere through guessing; Matthew mentions a reed. It is perhaps permitted to suspect that to this reed that herb as well had been attached; Nonnus asserts that the vinegar presented to Jesus was mixed with hyssop, for he calls it ὑσσώπῳ κεκερασμένον [mixed with hyssop]. But if there is room left for conjectures, what if it would be permitted to suspect that the archetype had ὑσσῷ προπεριθέντες, so that on top of a spear a sponge, put around there, was presented to Jesus? For the spear of the Roman army, in particular the (throwing) javelin was called ὑσσός by the Greek. From which Matthew perhaps used the common name of spears, 'reed'. Although also someone else could have taken a reed, drench a sponge with vinegar, and bring it mockingly to Jesus' mouth. But that I leave undecided, and in my view it cannot be known thus far, notwithstanding the inquiry into the essential truth." (taken from: "Notatio Figurarum Sermonis in Libris Quatuor Evangeliorum", Leipzig, Vögelin, 1572, pp. 297-298, translation by Jan Krans)

ὑσσῷ was printed by Baljon and Lagrange, and accepted in Moffatt's translation and the NEB.

Parker (Living Text): "Here is a conjecture [ὑσσῷ] which would have been accepted in such a narrative in any other kind of text. It should be accepted here."

The Mishnah notes on the use of Hyssop for purification purposes (Mishnah Parah 12:1a): "Hyssop which is [too] short – one makes it suffice with a thread and with a spindle and immerses it and brings it up and holds on to the Hyssop [itself] and sprinkles."

Beethan writes: "The translation would then be 'therefore having placed round a "hyssop" (i.e. a bunch of hyssop lengthened and thereby stiffened with a spindle for the purpose of dipping and sprinkling) a sponge full of the sour wine, they conveyed it to his mouth.' "
The Jerusalem Bible translates "hyssop stick".

It appears rather improbable that hyssop is a simple error, because it is difficult to explain why it was so universally accepted when it makes no sense at all. There was something right about it, perhaps along the lines of the Mishna quote.

It has been suggested that Hyssop has been introduced here as a symbol, to indicate that Jesus is actually the Passah lamb. Note Exo 12:22 where Hyssop is mentioned to be used to disperse the blood of the lamb.

Compare:
- E. Nestle "Zum Ysop bei Johannes, Josephus und Philo" ZNW 14 (1913) 263-5
- G. Schwarz "ὑσσώπῳ περιθέντες Jo 19:29" NTS 30 (1984) 625-26
- F.G. and P.A. Beethan "A note on Jo 19:29" JTS 44 (1993) 163 - 169

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 315

Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:35 καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν, καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, καὶ ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς πιστεύ[σ]ητε.

omit verse: e, 32, Codex Fuldensis

verse-order 34. 36-37, 35   Cyr, Chrys
B: no umlaut

Compare context 19:33-37:
33 But when they came to Jesus and saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs. 34 Instead, one of the soldiers pierced his side with a spear, and at once blood and water came out.
                                35 (He who saw this has testified so that you also may believe.
                                His testimony is true, and he knows that he tells the truth.)
36 These things occurred so that the scripture might be fulfilled, "None of his bones shall be broken." 37 And again another passage of scripture says, "They will look on the one whom they have pierced."

The verse does not fit very good here, because it separates the events and the scripture references.
Cyrill of Alexandria in his commentary on John discusses the verses in the order 34. 36-37, 35.

This verse has another difficulty, namely: To what refers the ἐκεῖνος? It is normally assumed that it refers to the beloved disciple, but this would be very unusual stylistically and unjohannine. It has been proposed therefore that it refers to Jesus (so Zahn).

Blass concludes: "everything is insecure: The whole verse and its position, also its parts, especially the ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν, and finally, if this could be fixed, we are left with the ἐκεῖνος and dispute about it. One thing should be clear: whoever wants to build on this verse a hypothesis regarding the origin of this Gospel, he builds on sand, drifting sand even."

Compare also the piercing variant at Mt 27:49.

Compare:

- T. Zahn ZKW 1888, 581-596
- H. Dechent "Zur Auslegung der Stelle Joh 19:35" TSK 72 (1899) 446-67
- F. Blass "Über Ev. Joh 19:35" TSJ 75 (1902) 128-33
- Helen Mardaga "The use and meaning of EKEINOS in Jn 19:35" Filología Neotestamentaria 20 (2007) 67-80

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 316

127. <u>Difficult variant</u>
<u>Jo 19:35 + 20:31</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:35 καὶ ὁ ἑωρακὼς μεμαρτύρηκεν, καὶ ἀληθινὴ αὐτοῦ ἐστιν ἡ μαρτυρία, καὶ ἐκεῖνος οἶδεν ὅτι ἀληθῆ λέγει, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς **πιστεύ[σ]ητε.**

NA28 John 20:31 ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα **πιστεύ[σ]ητε** ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

19:35
πιστεύητε   01*, B, Ψ, Or, **NA²⁵**, WH, Trg^{mg}, Tis, Bal, SBL
πιστεύσητε   01^{C2}, A, D^S, L, W, X, Δ, Θ, 0141, 0211, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
              Gre, Bois, Weiss, Trg
              Lacuna: P66, C
20:31
πιστεύητε   P66^{vid?}, 01*, B, Θ, 0211, 0250, 157, 892^S, 1071, L2211, pc
              NA²⁵, WH, Trg^{mg}, Tis, Bal, SBL
πιστεύσητε   01^{C2}, A, C, D, L, W, X, Δ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, 565, Maj,
              Bois, Weiss, Trg   (Gre not covered)

Lat: credatis (subjunctive present active)

P66: In 20:31 NA gives it as "vid" for πιστεύητε. This is more probable, but not completely certain.
There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **<u>click here</u>**.
Lacuna: P75, 579
B: no umlaut

subjunctive <u>present</u> active 2nd person plural OR
subjunctive <u>aorist</u>   active 2nd person plural

Compare:
NA28 John 6:29 <u>ἵνα πιστεύητε</u> εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος.
BYZ John 6:29 <u>ἵνα πιστεύσητε</u> εἰς ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος
Byz   D, W, 1582, f13, 28, 157, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, Maj
txt   P75, 01, A, B, L, N, T, Θ, Ψ, 1, 33, 565, 579, pc, Or   [P66 lac.]

Jo 8:24   πιστεύσητε   P66, …
          πιστεύητε   P75, pc

Jo 10:38[1] πιστεύητε
           πιστεύσητε P66*

Jo 13:19 πιστεύσητε P66, …
          πιστεύητε   B, C

NA28 John 17:21 ἵνα ὁ κόσμος <u>πιστεύῃ</u> ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.
BYZ John 17:21 ἵνα ὁ κόσμος <u>πιστεύσῃ</u> ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας
Byz   P60, 01^{C2}, A, C^{C3}, D, L, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, 565, 579, 1071, Maj, Or
txt   P66, 01*, B, C*, W, pc, Cl

Compare also:
NA28 John 13:34 <u>ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε</u>[present] ἀλλήλους.

Strictly speaking the different tenses would indicate
     a) aorist   "that you may believe" = "come to believe"
     b) present "that you may continue to believe"
This would then further indicate that in case a) the intended audience of the
Gospel are non-believers and in b) those who are already Christians.

Note that also in the earlier cases (6:29, 10:38, 13:19, 17:21) this variation
occurs.
Very difficult to judge.
Weiss (Textkritik, p. 58) notes that for scribes the subjunctive present was the
norm in ἵνα clauses. So also Riesenfeld, who argues that John commonly uses
the present tense after ἵνα.

Carson writes (1987) that "whatever one concludes the outcome of the text-critical
question to be, the meaning of the verse is not determined by the tense of this one verb. Apart
from other considerations, the most that can be deduced from the aorist itself is a reference to
the simple act of believing; from the present, some kind of durative or iterative belief, and even
that can be questioned. John 11:15 provides an instance where the aorist subjunctive πιστεύσητε
curs with the sense of having faith corroborated; John 1:7 provides an instance of the aorist
subjunctive πιστεύσωσιν signifying a coming to faith (cf. also 4:48). At the same time, the
present subjunctive πιστεύητε occurs in the best reading of John 6:29 to refer to the entire
process of coming to faith and continuing to believe: this is the work of God, ἵνα πιστεύητε εἰς
ὃν ἀπέστειλεν ἐκεῖνος. In short, the text-critical evidence is not determinative, not only
because it is evenly balanced but also because both the present subjunctive and the aorist
subjunctive can occur both in the context of coming to faith and in the context of continuing in
faith. R. Schnackenburg rightly observes that even if one reads the aorist in this verse, such a
reading is insufficient ground on which to base an "evangelistic" interpretation."

Both, Carson and Fee, agree that the present subjunctive is original. But they are both strongly biased by the "notable early support" from P66.

Compare:
- H. Riesenfeld "Zu den johanneischen ἵνα-Satzen" Studia Theologica 19 (1965) 213-20
- D.A. Carson "The Purpose of the Fourth Gospel: John 20:31 Reconsidered" JBL 106 (1987) 639-51
- G.D. Fee "On the Text and Meaning of John 20,30–31" in: "The Four Gospels 1992: Festschrift Frans Neirynck (ed. F. van Segbroeck et al.; BETL 100; Leuven, 1992), 2193–2205
- D.A. Carson "Syntactical and Text-Critical Observations on John 20:30-31: One More Round on the Purpose of the Fourth Gospel" JBL 124 (2005) 693-714

Rating: - (indecisive)
      (brackets ok)

TVU 317

128. <u>Difficult variant</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 19:38 Μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἠρώτησεν τὸν Πιλᾶτον Ἰωσὴφ **[ὁ] ἀπὸ** ῾Αριμαθαίας,

<u>omit ὁ</u> P66*^{vid}, A, B, D^S, L, Ψ, 579, pc, <u>WH</u>, <u>**NA**²⁵</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>SBL</u>

  ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ἀπὸ A

txt P66^C, 01, W, X, Θ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, Sy

  ὁ Ἰωσὴφ ὁ ἀπὸ   Θ, 346, Maj-part[H, S, Y, Γ, Δ, Λ, 2, 157, 1424]

P66: J.R. Royse (Scribal habits, 2008, p. 469) writes:

"if we examine the lower left corner of the plate, we see remaining of ιωσεφ the η rather clearly, and to its right the upper left portion of the φ. We can judge from the preceding line that the missing space should hold one letter, and since the scribe's φ is wider than most letters, that space doubtless contained the rest of the φ and no other letter. We then see on the next fragment upper portions of απ quite clearly. But just to the upper left of the α we see a rounded line that must be a superlinear letter, and looks very much like part of an ο.

Looks ok to me. Note that the two fragments are not connected and the space for the lacuna is not exactly known.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, **<u>click here</u>**.

Lacuna: C

B: no umlaut

Compare parallels:

NA28 Matthew 27:57

ἦλθεν ἄνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ ῾Αριμαθαίας, τοὔνομα Ἰωσήφ,

NA28 Mark 15:43 ἐλθὼν Ἰωσὴφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ ῾Αριμαθαίας

omit ὁ: B?, D, W^C, 083, 13, 28, 579, pc

txt   01, A, C, L, W*, Θ, Ψ, f1, f13, 33, Maj

NA28 Luke 23:51 Ἰωσὴφ … ἀπὸ ῾Αριμαθαίας πόλεως τῶν Ἰουδαίων

Compare also:

NA28 John 11:1 Ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν, Λάζαρος <u>ἀπὸ Βηθανίας</u> safe!

NA28 John 21:2 καὶ Ναθαναὴλ <u>ὁ ἀπὸ Κανὰ</u>   safe!

Compare discussion at Mk 15:43. In Mark the reading WITH the article has to be preferred, especially since the B reading is suspect.

Difficult to decide internally. It is possible that the ὁ has been inserted to indicate clearly which Joseph is meant, that it's not e.g. Jesus' father:
"Came Joseph from Arimathea"
"Came Joseph, the one from Arimathea"

Both forms with and without the article appear in John (11:1 and 21:2), both safe.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 318

Minority reading:
NA28 John 19:39 ἦλθεν δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος, ὁ ἐλθὼν πρὸς αὐτὸν νυκτὸς τὸ πρῶτον, φέρων **μίγμα** σμύρνης καὶ ἀλόης ὡς λίτρας ἑκατόν.

ἕλιγμα "a fold, roll" 01*, B, W, bo^ms, WH
ἔχων ἕλιγμα 01*, W (bo has ἔχων too)
φέρων ἕλιγμα B, WH

σμῆγμα "salve" pc, L181, Sy-Pal

μίγμα "mixture" P66^vid, 01^C, A, D^S, L, X, Δ, Θ, f1, f13^a,b, 33, Maj, Sy-H, Co, WH^mg, **NA²⁵**

σμῖγμα "mixture" Ψ, f13^c, 157, 892^S, pc, L47, L1076
(from μίγμα)

mixturam Lat
malagmam e

Lacuna: C, Sy-S
B: no umlaut

All words appear only here in the Greek Bible.
ΜΙΓΜΑ
ΕΛΙΓΜΑ
It is possible that ἕλιγμα is just an accidental error, since both words fit good here and look similar. Note that the verb ἑλίσσω ("roll up") appears 4 times in the Greek Bible: Job 18:8; Isa. 34:4; Heb. 1:12; Rev. 6:14

Metzger writes:
"Although ἕλιγμα, being the more difficult reading (the word normally means "a fold, a wrapping" and not "a roll, a package", which would be required here), might seem to be preferable as explaining the rise of the other readings, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the earlier and more diversified testimony supporting μίγμα."

Hoskier (Codex B, I, p. 400) suggests that the verb ἔχων of 01*, W comes from the Bohairic which has it too.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 319

Minority reading:
NA28 John 20:1 Τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων Μαρία ἡ Μαγδαληνὴ ἔρχεται πρωῒ σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ βλέπει τὸν λίθον ἠρμένον ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου.

From 20:1-13 only the Latin part of D is extant!

 ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας   01, D?, W, f1, 22, 565, 579, al,
                   d, f, r¹, vgᵐˢ, Sy-S, Sy-Pal, pbo, bo, arm

 ἐκ τῆς θύρας   157

D: conjecture from d.
Lacuna: C
B: no umlaut

ἠρμένον αἴρω participle perfect passive accusative masculine singular

Compare:
NA28 Mark 16:3 καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς· τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τῆς θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;

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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 320

NA28 John 20:16 λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς· Μαριάμ. στραφεῖσα ἐκείνη λέγει αὐτῷ <u>Ἑβραϊστί·</u> ραββουνι (ὃ λέγεται διδάσκαλε).

BYZ John 20:16 λέγει αὐτῇ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Μαρία. στραφεῖσα ἐκείνη λέγει αὐτῷ _____ Ῥαββουνι ὃ λέγεται Διδάσκαλε

Not in NA and not in SQE but in Tis!

Byz   A, K, Π^C, 050, 0141, f1, f13, 565, 700, 1071, Maj, Lat(a, aur, f, q, vg)

txt   01, B, D, L, N, W, X, Δ, Π*, Θ, Ψ, 0211, 33, 157, L1043,
      it(b, c, d, e, ff², r¹, **9A, 27, 30, 35*, 48**), Sy, Co, arm

Lacuna: C, 579
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 John 1:38 οἱ δὲ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· <u>ῥαββί,</u>
            <u>ὃ λέγεται μεθερμηνευόμενον διδάσκαλε,</u>
NA28 John 5:2 κολυμβήθρα ἡ ἐπιλεγομένη <u>Ἑβραϊστὶ Βηθζαθὰ</u>
NA28 John 19:13 τόπον λεγόμενον λιθόστρωτον, <u>Ἑβραϊστὶ δὲ Γαββαθα.</u>
NA28 John 19:17 Κρανίου Τόπον, <u>ὃ λέγεται Ἑβραϊστὶ Γολγοθα,</u>

NA28 Mark 10:51 ὁ δὲ τυφλὸς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· <u>ῥαββουνί,</u> ἵνα ἀναβλέψω.

A typical Johannine term. It is possible that the addition at this point has been stimulated by the previous context (19:13+17).
On the other hand it is possible that it has been omitted as redundant, ὃ λέγεται διδάσκαλε follows immediately.
The other occurrences above of Ἑβραϊστί are safe.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 321

Minority reading:
NA28 John 20:16 λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς· Μαριάμ. στραφεῖσα ἐκείνη λέγει αὐτῷ Ἑβραϊστί· ραββουνι (ὃ λέγεται διδάσκαλε) _.

καὶ προέδραμεν ἅψασθαι αὐτοῦ
    et occurrit ut tangeret eum
01^{C1}, Θ, Ψ, f13^{a,c}, pc, vg^{mss(gat, D,E)}, Sy-S, Sy-H, Sy-Pal, geo¹, Cyr
           pc = 1093, 1195*, 1230, 1820, 2145

0141 omits ὃ λέγεται διδάσκαλε.
f13^b omits.
Lacuna: C, 579
B: no umlaut

Compare next verse:
NA28 John 20:17 λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς· μή μου ἅπτου, ...

Compare also:
NA28 John 20:4 καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητὴς <u>προέδραμεν</u> τάχιον τοῦ Πέτρου

No parallel.
If the words were original, there would have been no reason for an omission.

From context a natural addition.
What is interesting is that all these diverse witnesses have the same words. Where are they from?

It had been suggested that this reading was also in the Diatessaron, because it is found in several Gospel harmonies (e.g. the Heliand, the Middle Dutch harmonies, and several Latin harmonies). Compare Petersen "Diatessaron", p. 304-5.

Baarda analyzed the variant and concludes:
"(a) The Greek text was originally inserted into Greek texts as an interpolation in the second or early third century, in Alexandria (Ammonius? Origen?). It has influenced the Caesarean text, and through it also the Koine text and the Irish text of the Vulgate. The latter text may have influenced some of the Latin harmonies.

(b) Independently, or under the influence of this Greek text, the Syriac Diatessaron introduced another phrase, namely *and ran up and wished to seize Him*, which was used by the author of the Syriac version of our Epistle on Virginity and by Romanos. This eastern reading then was introduced into the early Latin translation of the Diatessaron, which in its turn has influenced the wording of the Heliand, Saelden Hort, the Dutch harmonies, Maerlant's Rymbybel and many Latin commentaries on the passage of John 20:16 f."

Baarda further notes that the corrector of Codex Sinaiticus "is supposed to have worked at Caesarea".

Compare:
T. Baarda "Jesus and Mary (Jo 20:16 f.) in the Second Epistle on Virginity ascribed to Clement" in "Studien zum Text …" Festschrift Greeven, 1986, 11-34, esp. 27-32.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 322

Minority reading:
NA28 John 20:17 λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς· <u>μή μου ἅπτου</u>, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα·

<u>μή ἅπτου μου</u>   B, L1043

<u>μή ἅπτου</u>   473, L47 (Tis)

<u>ἅπτου μου</u>   cj. (Johannes Lepsius, 1858-1926)

B: no umlaut

"Do not touch me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father."

Interesting conjecture. The txt reading is difficult to understand, because, when Jesus is gone, he cannot be touched either. And in Jo 20:27 Jesus explicitly invites Thomas to touch him!
But, the universal addition of μὴ cannot really be explained as secondary. One of the many mysteries of St. John's Gospel.
Lepsius conjecture is very tempting, but his explanation is not. He is pointing to a lost Aramaic original of the Gospel and sees the reading as a dittography, without mentioning, which words he had in mind, though.
Jan Krans traced back the conjecture to an earlier source: Christoph Gotthelf Gersdorf (1763-1834). For Gersdorf the original was ἅπτου μου or μου ἅπτου, to which some pious scribe added μή because he found it inappropriate to have Jesus touched by a woman. Perhaps docetism.

Compare:
* Jan Krans:
  http://vuntblog.blogspot.com/2008/12/5-to-touch-or-not-to-touch-lepsius-on.html
* Johannes Lepsius *"Die Auferstehungsberichte"* in the Journal *Das Reich Christi* issues 7-8 (July-August 1902). Of it, a separate publication exists, entitled "Reden und Abhandlungen von Johannes Lepsius. 4. Die Auferstehungsberichte", Berlin, Reich Christi-Verlag, 1902.
* Christoph Gotthelf Gersdorf *"Beiträge zur Sprach-Characteristik der Schriftsteller des Neuen Testaments. Eine Sammlung meist neuer Bemerkungen, Erster Theil"*, Leipzig, Weidmann, 1816. footnote on pp. 79-80

TVU 323

Minority reading:
NA28 John 20:17 λέγει αὐτῇ Ἰησοῦς· μή μου ἅπτου, οὔπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα πρὸς τὸν πατέρα· πορεύου δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς <u>μου</u> καὶ εἰπὲ αὐτοῖς· ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ θεόν μου καὶ θεὸν ὑμῶν.

<u>omit:</u> 01*, D, W, pc, d, e, bo^{mss}, Ir^{Lat}

μαθητὰς μου   47^{ev} (Tis)

Lacuna: C, 579
B: no umlaut

Parallel:
NA28 Matthew 28:10 τότε λέγει αὐταῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· μὴ φοβεῖσθε· ὑπάγετε ἀπαγγείλατε τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς <u>μου</u> ἵνα ἀπέλθωσιν εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, κἀκεῖ με ὄψονται.   <u>omit:</u> 01*
                                        μαθητὰς μου   157, L2211, pc, Cyr

Compare:
NA28 John 21:23 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν οὗτος ὁ λόγος <u>εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς</u> ὅτι ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκει·

NA28 John 2:12 Μετὰ τοῦτο κατέβη εἰς Καφαρναοὺμ αὐτὸς καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ <u>οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ]</u> καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν οὐ πολλὰς ἡμέρας
<u>omit αὐτοῦ</u>: P66*, P75, B, K, Π, L, Ψ, 0162, f13, 28, 1071, pc, Or

NA28 John 7:3 εἶπον οὖν πρὸς αὐτὸν <u>οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ·</u>
NA28 John 7:5 οὐδὲ γὰρ <u>οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ</u> ἐπίστευον εἰς αὐτόν.
NA28 John 7:10 Ὡς δὲ ἀνέβησαν <u>οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ</u> εἰς τὴν ἑορτήν,

In 21:23 the meaning is "the brethren, the community". It is probable that the omission is an attempt to achieve this meaning.
Note the same variation at Mt 28:10.

The omission/addition of μου after πατερα is discussed at Jo 6:65 above!

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 324

NA28 John 20:19 Οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ σαββάτων καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ _____ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς· εἰρήνη ὑμῖν.

BYZ John 20:19 Οὔσης οὖν ὀψίας τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ τῇ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων καὶ τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ <u>**συνηγμένοι**</u> διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦλθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς καὶ ἔστη εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς Εἰρήνη ὑμῖν

Byz   01^{C2}, L, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, 0250, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
       it(b, c, e, f, ff², r¹), vg^{Cl}, Sy-H**, Sy-Pal, Co, arm
       οἱ μαθηται <u>**αὐτοῦ συνηγμένοι**</u>   L, U, Δ, Π, Ψ, 346, 33, al, f, sa

txt   01*, A, B, D, W, Λ*, 078, pc, Lat(a, aur, d, q, vg), Sy-S, Sy-P, ac², pbo

Lacuna: C, 579
B: no umlaut

συνάγω "gather together, assemble"

Compare:
NA28 Matthew 18:20 οὗ γάρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς <u>συνηγμένοι</u> εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμι ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν.

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

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 325

129.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>

Minority reading:

NA28 John 20:20 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἔδειξεν <u>τὰς χεῖρας</u> καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν <u>αὐτοῖς</u>. ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν κύριον.

<u>καὶ τὰς χεῖρας</u>

A, B, **NA²⁵**, Weiss, Trg, WH

txt   01, D, W, 078, 0211, 0250, pc, q

<u>αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας</u>   P66ᵛⁱᵈ, L, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy, [Trgᵐᵍ]
with καὶ τὴν πλευρὰν **αὐτοῦ**

<u>αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας</u>   f13, 565

P66: One can see the Υ of the final αὐτοῦ. Also the space would fit.
Lacuna: C, 579
B: no umlaut

Compare parallel:
NA28 Luke 24:40 καὶ τοῦτο εἰπὼν <u>ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς</u> τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας.

The readings with αὐτοῖς are clearly a harmonization to Lk.
It is possible that originally nothing was present (= txt) and that some scribes added καὶ others changed it to the αὐτοῖς reading.
On the other hand it is also possible that καὶ is original. With the meaning "also" it would seem to indicate that he had already shown something to them.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 326

NA28 John 20:23 ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας <u>ἀφέωνται</u> αὐτοῖς, ἄν τινων κρατῆτε <u>κεκράτηνται.</u>

BYZ John 20:23 ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας <u>ἀφιένται</u> αὐτοῖς ἄν τινων κρατῆτε <u>κεκράτηνται</u>

"If you forgive the sins of any, <u>*they are forgiven*</u> them; if you retain the sins of any, they are retained."

Byz	<u>ἀφιένται</u>	B^{C2}, W, U*, Δ, Θ, 078, 0141, 69, 700, 1071, 1424, Maj, Sy, Or, <u>Trg^{mg}</u>
txt	<u>ἀφέωνται</u>	01^{C2}, A, D, L, U^C, X, 050, 0211, f1, f13, 33^{vid}, 157, 565, L844, al, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA²⁵</u>**
	<u>ἀφιόνται</u>	B*, Ψ, pc, <u>WH^{mg}</u>, <u>Weiss</u>
	<u>ἀφεθήσεται</u>	01*, q, sa, ac², pbo

Or: Mt Comm. tom. 16:15
καὶ εἰπών· "λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον· ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας <u>ἀφιένται</u> αὐτοῖς· ἄν τινων κρατῆτε κεκράτηνται."

Swanson has 33 for Byz against NA. The online image from INTF is impossible to read. The last two pages are completely blurred by black ink.
Lacuna: C, 579
B: no umlaut
B (p. 1380 B 31) originally wrote: ΑΦΕΙΟΝΤΑΙ. The Є and the O are left unenhanced. A very small Є is written above the O. Tischendorf assigns everything to B³.

ἀφιένται   indicative present passive 3rd person plural
ἀφέωνται   indicative perfect passive 3rd person plural
ἀφεθήσεται   indicative future   passive 3rd person singular
κεκράτηνται indicative perfect passive 3rd person plural

It is probable that ἀφιόνται is just an orthographic error for ἀφέωνται.

Compare:
BYZ Matthew 12:31 πᾶσα <u>ἁμαρτία καὶ βλασφημία ἀφεθήσεται</u> τοῖς ἀνθρώποις
BYZ Matthew 12:32 καὶ ὃς ἐὰν εἴπῃ λόγον κατὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου <u>ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ</u>
NA28 Matthew 18:18 ὅσα ἐὰν δήσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται <u>δεδεμένα</u> ἐν οὐρανῷ, καὶ ὅσα ἐὰν λύσητε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἔσται <u>λελυμένα</u> ἐν οὐρανῷ
BYZ Mark 3:28 Ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι <u>πάντα ἀφεθήσεται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα</u> τοῖς υἱοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 9:2 τέκνον, <u>ἀφίενταί</u> σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.
BYZ Matthew 9:2 τέκνον <u>ἀφέωνταί</u> σοί αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου

NA28 Matthew 9:5 <u>ἀφίενταί</u> σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,
BYZ Matthew 9:5 <u>Ἀφέωνταί</u> σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι

NA28 Mark 2:5 τέκνον, <u>ἀφίενταί</u> σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι.
BYZ Mark 2:5 Τέκνον <u>ἀφέωνται</u> σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου

NA28 Mark 2:9 <u>ἀφίενταί</u> σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι,
BYZ Mark 2:9 <u>Ἀφέωνταί</u> σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι

Interestingly in these other occurrences of the word it is the Byzantine text that reads the perfect.
It is possible that ἀφέωνται is a conformation to the tense of κεκράτηνται (so Weiss).
Probably the meaning is the same.
The 01* reading ἀφεθήσεται is probably a harmonization to Mt 12:31, 32 and Mk 3:28.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 327

Minority reading:
NA28 John 20:30 Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν **[αὐτοῦ]**, ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ·

omit A, B, L844, L2211, al[E, K, Π, S, Δ, Λ, Ω, 0250],
f, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg, Tis, Bal, SBL

txt P66, 01, C, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
Lat, Sy-S, Sy-P, Sy-H**

Lacuna: 579
B: no umlaut

NA28 John 1:37 καὶ ἤκουσαν οἱ δύο μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
omit αὐτοῦ: 157, 700

NA28 John 2:12 καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ [αὐτοῦ] καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
omit αὐτοῦ: L

NA28 John 2:17 ἐμνήσθησαν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
omit αὐτοῦ: 33

NA28 John 4:8 οἱ γὰρ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ ἀπεληλύθεισαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν
omit αὐτοῦ: 28

NA28 John 4:31 Ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ ἠρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγοντες·
add αὐτοῦ: N, S, Wˢ, Θ, Ψ, Ω, 124, 28, 33, 1071

NA28 John 6:24 Ἰησοῦς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκεῖ οὐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ,
omit αὐτοῦ: 01*

NA28 John 6:60 Πολλοὶ οὖν ἀκούσαντες ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἶπαν·
omit αὐτοῦ: P66*

NA28 John 6:66 Ἐκ τούτου πολλοὶ [ἐκ] τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ ἀπῆλθον
omit αὐτοῦ: 01

NA28 John 9:2 καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντες
omit αὐτοῦ: D
NA28 John 11:7 ἔπειτα μετὰ τοῦτο λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς·
add αὐτοῦ: A, D, K, Π, Δ, Λ, f13, 28, 157

NA28 John 11:8 λέγουσιν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταί·
add αὐτοῦ: D, 124

NA28 John 11:54 κἀκεῖ ἔμεινεν μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν.
omit αὐτοῦ: P66, 01, B, D, L, W, Γ, Δ, Ψ, 0250, 565, al
add αὐτοῦ: A, Θ, f1, f13, 579, Maj

NA28 John 12:16 ταῦτα οὐκ ἔγνωσαν αὐτοῦ οἱ μαθηταὶ
omit αὐτοῦ: K, Π

NA28 John 13:5 καὶ ἤρξατο νίπτειν τοὺς πόδας τῶν μαθητῶν
add αὐτοῦ: D

NA28 John 13:22 ἔβλεπον εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταὶ
add αὐτοῦ: P66, f13

NA28 John 13:23 ἦν ἀνακείμενος εἷς ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ
omit αὐτοῦ: W

NA28 John 16:29 Λέγουσιν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ·
omit αὐτοῦ: W, 565, 579

NA28 John 19:27 εἶτα λέγει τῷ μαθητῇ·
add αὐτοῦ: 157

NA28 John 20:18 ἀγγέλλουσα τοῖς μαθηταῖς
add αὐτοῦ: D

NA28 John 20:19 ὅπου ἦσαν οἱ μαθηταὶ
add αὐτοῦ: L, U, Δ, Π, Ψ, 33

NA28 John 20:20 ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ
add αὐτοῦ: D

NA28 John 20:26 ἦσαν ἔσω οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ
omit αὐτοῦ:　　W, 69

NA28 John 21:1 πάλιν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς
omit αὐτοῦ:　　P66, 01, A, B, C*, W, Θ, f1, 33, Maj-part
add αὐτοῦ:　　C^{C3}, D, Ψ, 700, Maj-part

NA28 John 21:4 οὐ μέντοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ μαθηταὶ
omit αὐτοῦ:　　69

NA28 John 21:14 τρίτον ἐφανερώθη Ἰησοῦς τοῖς μαθηταῖς
omit αὐτοῦ:　　01, A, B, C, L, N, W, Θ, f1, 33, al
add αὐτοῦ:　　D, Ψ, f13, Maj

At the following verses the pronoun is safe:
1:35, 2:2, 2:11, 2:22, 3:22, 4:2, 4:27, 6:3, 6:8, 6:12, 6:16, 6:22(2x), 6:61, 9:27, 11:12, 12:4, 16:17, 18:1, 18:2, 18:19, (18:25), 21:2

At the following verses the words without pronoun are safe:
4:33, [18:15, 19:26, 20:2-4, 20:8], 20:25, 21:8, 21:12

At the following verses the Byzantine text adds the pronoun:
11:54, (21:1), 21:14

At the following verses a minority adds the pronoun:
4:31, 11:7, 11:8, 13:5, 20:18, 20:19, 20:20, 21:4

At the following verses a minority omits the pronoun:
1:37, 2:12, 2:17, 4:8, 6:24, 6:60, 6:66, 9:2, 12:16, 13:23, 16:29, 20:26
(smaller font size indicates singular readings)

	Added	omitted	safe	none
Mt	21	9	21	5
Mk	7	13	21	0
Lk	13	9	7	0
Jo	10	12	23	4

The situation in John is quite clear. He almost always uses the pronoun and the cases where there is variation are comparatively easy to judge. This case

(20:30) would be also straightforward if not B would be supporting the omission. But B is known to omit pronouns at times. Also B makes the support incoherent.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

NA28 John 20:31 ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα **πιστεύ[σ]ητε**

see above at 19:35!

TVU 328

130. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 21:4   πρωΐας δὲ ἤδη <u>γενομένης</u> ἔστη Ἰησοῦς εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλόν, οὐ μέντοι ᾔδεισαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν.

<u>γινομένης</u>   A, B, C, E, L, pc, <u>WH</u>, **<u>NA</u>**[25], <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Gre</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>

txt   01, D, P, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj, <u>Trg</u>[mg]

Lacuna: 579

γενομένης participle aorist   middle genitive feminine singular
γινομένης participle present middle genitive feminine singular

Parallel:

NA28 Matthew 27:1 Πρωΐας δὲ <u>γενομένης</u> συμβούλιον ἔλαβον πάντες οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς   safe!

Compare:

NA28 John 6:19 θεωροῦσιν τὸν Ἰησοῦν περιπατοῦντα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ πλοίου <u>γινόμενον</u>, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν.

<u>γενόμενον</u> G, 69, 700, 1424, pc

NA28 John 13:2 καὶ δείπνου <u>γινομένου</u>,

<u>γινομένου</u>   01*, B, L, W, X, Ψ, 070, 579, 1241, pc
<u>γενομένου</u>   P66, 01[C2], A, D, Θ, f1, f13, 33, 157, 565, 700, 892, 1071, Maj

Compare discussion at Jo 13:2.

Genitive Absolute.

Robinson (Wordpictures) writes:

"Note present middle participle (dawn coming on and still dark). In Mt 27:1 the aorist participle (γενομένης) means that dawn had come."

Both forms occur only here in John, but John uses the present particle two more times.

It is possible that the aorist is a harmonization to Mt. Weiss (Com. John) thinks that it is a conformation to the following ἔστη.

Externally this is mainly 01, W against B, C, L.

Rating: 1? (= NA probably wrong)

TVU 329

Minority reading:
NA28 John 21:6 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· βάλετε εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ μέρη τοῦ πλοίου τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ εὑρήσετε. _ἔβαλον οὖν, καὶ οὐκέτι αὐτὸ ἑλκύσαι ἴσχυον ἀπὸ τοῦ πλήθους τῶν ἰχθύων.

 οἱ δὲ εἶπον· δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς ἐκοπιάσαμεν καὶ οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν·
 ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ σῷ ῥήματί βαλοῦμεν·
  dixerunt autem: Per totam noctem laborantes nihil coepimus.
  In verbo autem tuo mittemus.
P66, 01^C, Ψ, vg^{mss}, sa, aeth, Cyr

P66 reads ὀνόματι instead of ῥήματι.
Ψ reads κοπιάσαντες (Lk) for ἐκοπιάσαμεν

01: The words have been added at the bottom of the column. Tischendorf assigns this to corrector C^a. There are some dots above this addition, which may indicate that these words have subsequently been deleted again. Tischendorf says by C^b.
Lacuna: 579
B: no umlaut

Compare:_
NA28 Luke 5:5 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς Σίμων εἶπεν· ἐπιστάτα, δι' ὅλης νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα.
et respondens Simon dixit illi praeceptor per totam noctem laborantes nihil cepimus
in verbo autem tuo laxabo rete (e: non intermittimus).

An interesting harmonization, copied from Lk. Interesting because of the several witnesses which support it. P66 and 01 agree in ἐκοπιάσαμεν against κοπιάσαντες from Lk. 01, Ψ and the Vulgate manuscripts agree in the final βαλοῦμεν against χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα (P66 has a lacuna). This points to a shared source and against independent origin. There is no reason for an omission.

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 330

Minority reading:
NA28 John 21:12 λέγει αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς· δεῦτε ἀριστήσατε.
οὐδεὶς <u>δὲ</u> ἐτόλμα τῶν μαθητῶν ἐξετάσαι αὐτόν· σὺ τίς εἶ; εἰδότες ὅτι ὁ κύριός ἐστιν.

<u>omit</u>   B, C, sa, bo^{ms}, <u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>

txt   01, A, D, L, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj,
        Latt, Sy-P, Sy-H, pbo, bo, [Trg]

<u>μέντοι</u> 1071 (21:4)

Lacuna: 579
B: no umlaut

Compare:
NA28 Mark 12:34 καὶ <u>οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι ἐτόλμα</u> αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.
        omit <u>οὐκέτι</u>   D, 579
<u>οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα οὐκέτι</u>   (W), f13

NA28 Acts 5:13 τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν <u>οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα</u> κολλᾶσθαι αὐτοῖς

NA28 Matthew 9:16 <u>οὐδεὶς δὲ</u> ἐπιβάλλει ἐπίβλημα ῥάκους ἀγνάφου ἐπὶ ἱματίῳ παλαιῷ·
<u>omit</u> δὲ   579

NA28 Luke 8:16 <u>Οὐδεὶς δὲ</u> λύχνον ἅψας καλύπτει
<u>omit</u> δὲ   Θ, 346, 579, 1424

Perhaps οὐδεὶς ἐτόλμα is a characteristic phrase and scribes wanted to avoid an intervening word (compare Mk 12:34).
οὐδεὶς δὲ is surprisingly rare in the NT and appears only 2 more times. In both cases the omission is recorded.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 331

NA28 John 21:15 Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν λέγει τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Σίμων <u>Ἰωάννου</u>, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων;

BYZ John 21:15 Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν λέγει τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς Σίμων <u>Ἰωνᾶ,</u> ἀγαπᾷς με πλεῖόν τούτων

NA28 John 21:16 λέγει αὐτῷ πάλιν δεύτερον· Σίμων <u>Ἰωάννου,</u>
BYZ John 21:16 λέγει αὐτῷ πάλιν δεύτερον Σίμων <u>Ἰωνᾶ</u>

NA28 John 21:17 λέγει αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον· Σίμων <u>Ἰωάννου,</u>
BYZ John 21:17 λέγει αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον Σίμων <u>Ἰωνᾶ,</u>

Byz   A, C^C2, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, **33**, Maj, (c), **47**^v. 15, Sy
      <u>Bariona</u>   c

txt   01, B, C*, D, L, W, Lat, Co

<u>Ἰων</u>   Θ (in verse 15)
<u>Ἰωάνα</u>   69, 1071 (in verse 17)

Lacuna: P66, 579
L has a lacuna in verses 16 and 17.

B: umlaut! (1381 B 28 L)   21:15 <u>Ἰωάννου, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέ</u>ον

Compare:
NA28 John 1:42 σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς <u>Ἰωάννου,</u>
BYZ John 1:42 Σὺ εἶ Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς <u>Ἰωνᾶ·</u>
     Byz   A, B^C2, Ψ, f1, f13, Maj, Sy
     txt   P66, P75, 01, B*, L, W^S, **33**, pc, it, Co
     <u>Ἰωάννα</u>   Θ, L890, pc, vg
     <u>Ἰωάνα</u>   1241

Compare also:
NA28 Matthew 16:17 ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μακάριος εἶ, <u>Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ,</u> ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ᾽ ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

It is possible that the Byzantine Ἰωνᾶ in John is a harmonization to Mt: Βαριωνᾶ. On the other hand Ἰωνᾶ is the more rare word and it is possible that scribes erroneously took it as Ἰωάννου.

Compare discussion of the same variant at 1:42 above.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

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

TVU 332

131.   <u>Difficult variant:</u>
Minority reading:
NA28 John 21:16 ποίμαινε τὰ <u>πρόβατά</u> μου.

<u>πρόβατιά</u>   B, C, 22, 565(=f1), pc, <u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>^{mg}, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u>πρόβατά</u>   01, A, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33^{vid}, Maj, <u>WH</u>^{mg}

f1 omits due to parablepsis.
Lacuna: L, 579

NA28 John 21:17 βόσκε τὰ <u>πρόβατά</u> μου.

<u>πρόβατιά</u>   A, B, C, 22, 565(=f1), 1582*, pc, <u>**NA**</u>²⁵, <u>WH</u>, <u>Weiss</u>, <u>Trg</u>, <u>Tis</u>, <u>Bal</u>
<u>πρόβατά</u>   01, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 1, f13, 33^{vid}, Maj, <u>WH</u>^{mg}

Lacuna: L, 579
and 0141 omits the words.
B: no umlaut

John uses πρόβατα 10 more times, always safe. There is no reason to change πρόβατα here.
It appears quite probable that the more rare πρόβατια is correct.
It has been speculated that John 21 has been added later to the Gospel of John.
If this is true it is possible that πρόβατια was in the source already.

Compare:
"A flock of Synonyms? John 21:15-17 in Greek and Latin Tradition" in: "Text and Traditions, Essays in honour of JK Elliott, Brill 2014, p. 220 - 238

Rating: 1? (NA probably wrong)

TVU 333

NA28 John 21:17 <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον· Σίμων Ἰωάννου, φιλεῖς με;
ἐλυπήθη ὁ Πέτρος ὅτι <u>εἶπεν</u> αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον· φιλεῖς με;
καὶ <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ· κύριε, πάντα σὺ οἶδας, σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε.
<u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ [ὁ Ἰησοῦς]· βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

BYZ John 21:17 <u>Λέγει</u> αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον, Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ, φιλεῖς με;
Ἐλυπήθη ὁ Πέτρος ὅτι <u>εἶπεν</u> αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον, Φιλεῖς με;
Καὶ <u>εἶπεν</u> αὐτῷ, Κύριε, σὺ πάντα οἶδας· σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε.
<u>Λέγει</u> αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

Byz   B, C, f13, Maj, **NA**²⁵, WH, Weiss, Trg, SBL
txt   01, A, D, N, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, 33, 157, 565, pc, Trg^{mg}

Lacuna: L, 579
B: no umlaut

Compare context:
NA28 John 21:15 Ὅτε οὖν ἠρίστησαν <u>λέγει</u> τῷ Σίμωνι Πέτρῳ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· Σίμων Ἰωάννου, ἀγαπᾷς με πλέον τούτων; <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ· ναὶ κύριε, σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε. <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ· βόσκε τὰ ἀρνία μου. 16 <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ πάλιν δεύτερον· Σίμων Ἰωάννου, ἀγαπᾷς με; <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ· ναὶ κύριε, σὺ οἶδας ὅτι φιλῶ σε. <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ· ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου. 17 <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον· Σίμων Ἰωάννου, φιλεῖς με; ἐλυπήθη ὁ Πέτρος ὅτι <u>εἶπεν</u> αὐτῷ τὸ τρίτον· φιλεῖς με; καὶ <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ· κύριε, πάντα σὺ οἶδας, σὺ γινώσκεις ὅτι φιλῶ σε. <u>λέγει</u> αὐτῷ [ὁ Ἰησοῦς]· βόσκε τὰ πρόβατά μου.

Context is controlled by λέγει. But the immediately preceding form is εἶπεν, which is safe. All preceding forms are safe!
It appears slightly more probable that scribes have been influenced by the preceding εἶπεν to use it once again, than that scribes changed an existing εἶπεν into λέγει to conform it to context.

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)

TVU 334

132. Difficult variant

Minority reading:

NA28 John 21:18 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, ὅτε ἦς νεώτερος, <u>ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν</u> καὶ περιεπάτεις ὅπου ἤθελες· ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ <u>**ἄλλος σε ζώσει καὶ οἴσει**</u> ὅπου οὐ θέλεις.

ἄλλος ζώσει σε καὶ οἴσει   B, C*ᵛⁱᵈ, WH, **NA²⁵**, Weiss, Trg

ἄλλος σε ζώσει καὶ οἴσει   A, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, f13, Maj, Lat, Sy-S, Co, Trgᵐᵍ
          …καὶ οἴσει <u>**σε**</u>   A
          …καὶ ἄποιση   892ˢ

ἄλλοι σε ζώσουσιν καὶ ἀποίσουσιν σε   W, 0141, f1, 22, 33, 565, pc
ἄλλοι σε ζώσουσιν καὶ ἀπάγουσίν σε   D, d
ἄλλοι σε ζώσουσιν καὶ ἀποίσουσιν   Π
…   καὶ ἄξουσιν   Chrys

ἄλλοι ζώσουσιν σε καὶ ἀποίσουσιν σε   01
ἄλλοι ζώσουσιν σε καὶ οἴσουσιν   Cᶜ²
<u>one of these:</u>   P59ᵛⁱᵈ, P109ᵛⁱᵈ

C: The evidence above is that of Tischendorf and NA. Cᶜ has been reconstructed differently by IGNTP: Cᶜ¹ = ἄλλοι σε ζώσουσιν (as D, W above)
                 Cᶜ² = C* as above

Lacuna: L, 579

B: no umlaut

P59 (7ᵗʰ CE) has been reconstructed as:
[ΤΑΝ ΔΕ ΓΗΡΑCΗC ΕΚ]ΤΕΝΕΙC
[ΤΑC ΧΕΙΡΑC COΥ ΚΑΙ]ΑΛΛΟΙ
[ΖωCΟΥCΙΝ CΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΠ]ΟΙCΟΥ
Thus it can read either the D, W reading or the 01 reading.

P109 (3ʳᵈ CE, P.Oxy. 4448) reads:
[τας χειρας σου κ]αι αλλοι
[… ca. 12 letters …]ουσιν σε
[οπου ου θελεις τ]ουτο δε
The ed. pr. and also Comfort are in general agreement with this.

There is an extra file with images on this paleographic problem, <u>**click here**</u>.

Perhaps the WH word order is a conformation to the preceding ἐζώννυες σεαυτὸν.

Jesus words probably refer to Peter dying a martyr's death. A change to the plural is then only natural (so also Metzger).

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 335

Minority reading:
NA28 John 21:21 τοῦτον οὖν ἰδὼν ὁ Πέτρος λέγει τῷ Ἰησοῦ·
κύριε, οὗτος δὲ τί;
NA28 John 21:22 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς·
<u>ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι</u>, τί πρὸς σέ; σύ μοι ἀκολούθει.
23 ... ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι [, τί πρὸς σέ];

<u>Sic eum volo manere donec veniam</u>   it(aur, b, c, r¹), vg^Cl
"I wish him to remain thus until I come"

<u>Si sic eum volo manere donec veniam</u>   ff², vg^St,WW
"If I wish him to remain thus until I come"

<u>Si eum volo manere ...</u>   e, f, q, Δ^Lat, vg^mss

<u>Si eum volo sic manere ...</u>   d (verse 22), Jerome
<u>Si eum volo   manere ...</u>   d (verse 23)

<u>ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν οὕτως ἕως ἔρχομαι</u>   D (verse 22)

B: no umlaut

si   = "if, whether"
sic   = "so, like this"
eum   = "him"
volo = "I will"

θέλω verb subjunctive present active 1st person singular

A translational issue in the Latin. Is this a hypothetical condition or an affirmative statement? Probably an early error that got into the Clementine Vulgate. According to JR Harris (Codex Bezae, 1891, p. 36-39) it lead to discussions about the possible dominical sanction of celibacy. Jerome's text originally contained both words "si sic", just as D in verse 22.

Compare Jerome:
> "And when they were fishing in the ship on the lake of Gennesaret, Jesus stood upon the shore, and the Apostles knew not who it was they saw; the virgin alone recognized a virgin, and said to Peter, 'It is the Lord.' Again, after hearing the prediction that he must be bound by another, and led whether he would not, and must suffer on the cross, Peter said, 'Lord what shall this man do?' being unwilling to desert John, with whom he had always been united. **Our Lord said to him, 'What is that to you if I wish him so to be?' [Lat:**

Dicit ei Dominus: "Quid ad te si eum volo sic esse?"] Whence the saying went abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die. Here we have a proof that virginity does not die [virginitatem non mori], and that the defilement of marriage is not washed away by the blood of martyrdom, but virginity abides with Christ, and its sleep is not death but a passing to another state. If, however, Jovinianus should obstinately contend that John was not a virgin, (whereas we have maintained that his virginity was the cause of the special love our Lord bore to him), let him explain, if he was not a virgin, why it was that he was loved more than the other Apostles."

<div align="right">

Jerome, "Against Jovinianus", book I, 26
compare: Migne PL, Vol. 23, col. 258

</div>

Cyrill of Alexandria († 444 CE) wrote in his commentary on John (12th book to the passage):

Peter, then, observing him, longed for information, and sought to know in what perils he would be involved in the time to come, and in what way his life would end. But the question seemed unseemly, and it appeared to savour rather of a meddlesome and inquisitive spirit, that, after having learnt what was to happen unto himself, he should seek to know the future fate of others. For this cause, then, I think the Lord makes no direct reply to his question or inquiry, but, diverting the aim of the questioner, does not say that John will not die, but, If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee? That is to say, Thou hast heard, O Peter, the things concerning thyself, what need is there for thee to ask questions about others, and to seek to fathom out of season the knowledge of the Divine decrees. For if he never die at all, He says, what consolation will this be to thy heart?

Chrysostom wrote (ca. 390 CE, 88th homily on the Gospel of John):

And observe, I pray you, here also the absence of pride in the Evangelist; for having mentioned the opinion of the disciples, he corrects it, as though they had not comprehended what Jesus meant. 'Jesus said not', he tells us, that 'he shall not die, but, If I will that he tarry.'

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 336

Minority reading:
NA28 John 21:23 ἐξῆλθεν οὖν οὗτος ὁ λόγος εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ὅτι ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκει· οὐκ εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι οὐκ ἀποθνῄσκει ἀλλ᾽ ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι [τί πρὸς σέ];

omit: 01*, C^{C2vid}, f1, 22, 565, pc, a, e, vg^{ms}, Sy-S, Sy-Pal^{mss}, arm, Tis

txt   P109(3rd CE), P122^{vid}(4/5th CE), 01^{C1}, A, B, C*, W, X, Δ, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f13, 33, Maj, Lat, Sy-P, Sy-H, Co

πρὸς σέ   D (not d)

Quid ad te? Tu me sequere.   c, vg^{ms} (vs. 22)

P109 (POxy 4448) is not noted in NA!
P122 (POxy 4806): The text is within a lacuna, but from space considerations the words must have been present.

Lacuna: P66, L, 579
B: no umlaut

Compare previous verse:
NA28 John 21:22 λέγει αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἐὰν αὐτὸν θέλω μένειν ἕως ἔρχομαι, τί πρὸς σέ; σύ μοι ἀκολούθει.
        Quid ad te?   Tu me sequere.

Probably omitted as irrelevant.
It is of course possible that the words have been added to harmonize with the previous verse.
The reading of D is strange. Probably a simple transcription error (αι - τι).

Rating: 2? (NA probably original)
        (remove brackets)

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

TVU 337

133. **Difficult variant:**

Minority reading:

NA28 John 21:25 Ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται καθ᾽ ἕν, οὐδ᾽ αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον **χωρῆσαι** τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία.

χωρῆσειν   01^{C1}, B, C*, **NA²⁵**, WH, Weiss, Trg, Bal, SBL

txt   **χωρῆσαι**   A, C^{C2}, D, W, X, Θ, Ψ, 0141, f1, f13, 33, Maj

01*, Tis omit verse 25!

Lacuna: L, 579

B: no umlaut

χωρῆσαι   infinitive aorist active
χωρῆσειν   infinitive future active

According to BDAG οἶομαι is followed by an accusative and infinitive.
Difficult to judge.

Rating: - (indecisive)

TVU 338

Minority reading:
NA28 John 21:25 Ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς_
, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται καθ' ἕν, οὐδ' αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία.

omit verse: 01*, Tis

<u>ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ</u>   346 (:: 20:30)

B: no umlaut
Originally the verse had been omitted in 01* and the colophon was added after verse 24 (scribe A). This has been erased and verse 25 added with a new colophon by another scribe (D). WH: "Tregelles, who examined the manuscript in Tischendorf's presence, believed the difference in handwriting to be due only to a fresh dip of the pen."

P109 (=POxy 4448) is our earliest witness to this verse, dated to the 3rd CE.

Compare:
NA28 John 20:30 Πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλα σημεῖα ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐνώπιον τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῦ], ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τούτῳ·
NA28 John 20:31 ταῦτα δὲ γέγραπται ἵνα πιστεύ[σ]ητε ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἵνα πιστεύοντες ζωὴν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.

There are scholia in certain minuscules (e.g. 36, 137, 237, al) by an unnamed writer which claim that the text did not originally belong to the Gospel: The text of the verse, a marginal note by some careful person (τινὸς τῶν φιλοπόνων - elsewhere this is a designation for Theodor of Mopsuestia), stood originally outside of the text (ἔξωθεν) but has crept in without the knowledge of the first later.
It is not clear though if this refers to real knowledge about codices which are missing the verse, or if it is not simply just a suspicion. The note is also found in the Syrian writer Barhebraeus (Nestle 2nd ed TC intro).
For the text of the scholion see Tis (8th ed. p. 966). See Zahn Einl. II p. 495.

Weiss (Jo Com.) suggests that the verse might have been omitted because of the bold exaggeration.

Note that 20:31 is missing in G* (not in NA!).

It has been suggested (e.g. Trobisch, "The first edition of the NT", 2000), that this verse was an editorial note, the conclusion of the first Four-Gospel-Canon and does not really belong to the fourth Gospel.

Streeter ("Four Gospels"), p. 431) notes:
"a double change of person in three successive verses is so remarkable that – especially as the verse is merely a somewhat magniloquent repetition of the simple and natural 'Many other signs did Jesus … which are not written in this book' of 20:30 – we are perhaps justified in holding on the evidence of this single manuscript that it is an addition by a very early scribe."

Rating: 2 (NA clearly original)

TVU 339

Minority reading:
NA28 John 21:25 Ἔστιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ ἃ ἐποίησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἅτινα ἐὰν γράφηται καθ᾽ ἕν, οὐδ᾽ αὐτὸν οἶμαι τὸν κόσμον χωρῆσαι τὰ γραφόμενα βιβλία _.

add PA: f1 (not 118), 565
Also arm^{mss} (acc. to Nestle, TC Intro 2nd ed. and Zahn)

Maurice Robinson comments on 565: "The PA text of 565 is now completely lacking, with only the beginning of a faded introduction to the PA being present (this introduction appears similar to what appears in manuscript 1). The last page is missing (or never was completed; the microfilm only goes to the point described. But I suspect no unfilmed blank page follows, or such would have been stated by earlier researchers, particularly Belsheim."

f1 and 565 form a group in John.
T&T wrongly list 565 for the omission. Klaus Witte confirms.

B: no umlaut