

**A text-critical study on the Lukan account of the Lord's Supper
(Luke 22:17-20): the shorter reading and its implications**

by
Jeung Un Cho



*Thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the Degree of Master of Theology in the Faculty of Theology
at Stellenbosch University*

Supervisor: Prof. Jeremy Punt

March 2020

Declaration

By submitting this thesis electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

Date: March 2020

Copyright © 2020 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

Abstract

The Lukan account of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:15-20) involves one of the most challenging problems in New Testament textual criticism. Six different readings have been transmitted, and the two most preferred readings involve further problems of the order: double mention of the cup (cup-bread-cup) in the longer reading; inverted order of the meal (cup-bread) in the shorter reading. Whereas the majority manuscripts support the longer reading, the shorter reading being one of nine "Western non-interpolations" cannot be disregarded. Since the text-critical problem was raised by Westcott and Hort (1881), numerous scholars have attempted to solve it with various approaches—both externally and internally—but the problem remains unsolved. This study presents an advanced approach to the textual problem of Luke 22:19b-20 and shows that the shorter account of the Lord's Supper can be considered a theologically biased text.

Based on the assumption that either the scribes of the longer reading or those of the shorter reading has altered the text with some theological concerns in mind, this study has adopted more advanced text-critical methods, the full collation over the whole Gospel of Luke and the Quantitative Analysis. The quantitative result has identified Codex Bezae as the only Greek member of the text-group (D-text), which supports the shorter reading. In this respect, this study examined the singular readings of Codex Bezae to disclose its theological emphasis.

While the most singular readings were stylistic changes, some significant singular readings show five theological concerns: (1) Jesus' identity as the Messiah and God; (2) anti-Judaic sentiment against the religious leaders and the destruction of Jerusalem; (3) the Gentiles responding to Jesus' ministry; (4) identification of the kingdom of God with the coming of Jesus and the day of judgement; (5) devotion of the disciples and the discipleship. From these, an inference was drawn that the scribe of Codex Bezae had a great concern about discipleship-living in the eschaton.

Given this theological context, the shorter account of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:15-19a) accords with the imminent eschatology of Codex Bezae. It designates the resurrection of Jesus as the time for the arrival of the kingdom of God and the day of judgement. Furthermore, the omission of Luke 22:19b-20 removes the commemoration of Jesus' atoning sacrifice, and instead, amplifies Jesus' identity as the Son of Man who is to come as a judge on the judgement day.

Opsomming

Lukas se weergawe van die Nagmaal (Lukas 22:15-20) behels een van die uitdagendste probleme in die teks-kritiek van die Nuwe Testament. Ses verskillende lesings bestaan in oorlewering, en die twee voorkeur-lesings behels verdere probleme ten opsigte van die volgorde: dubbele vermelding van die beker (beker-brood-beker) in die langer lesing; omgekeerde volgorde van die maaltyd (beker-brood) in die korter lesing. Terwyl die meerderheid manuskripte die langer lesing ondersteun, kan die korter lesing een van nege “Westerse nie-interpolasies” nie buite rekening gelaat word nie. Sedert Westcott en Hort (1881) hierdie teks-kritiese probleem geopper het, het talle geleerdes gepoog om die probleem op te los vanuit verskillende benaderings - beide ekstern en intern - maar die probleem bly onopgelos. Hierdie studie bied 'n gevorderde benadering tot die teksprobleem van Lukas 22:19b-20 aan en argumenteer dat die korter weergawe van die Nagmaal 'n teologies-bevooroordeelde teks is.

Op grond van die aanname dat een van die skrywers van die langer weergawe of die korter weergawe die teks met 'n mate van teologiese belange verander het, het hierdie studie meer gevorderde tekstkritiese metodes toegepas, naamlik die volledige versameling ten opsigte van die hele Evangelie van Lukas en Kwantitatiewe Analise. Die kwantitatiewe resultaat het Codex Bezae geïdentifiseer as die enigste Griekse lid van die teksgroep (D-tek), wat die korter lesing ondersteun. In hierdie opsig het hierdie studie die enkelvoudige lesings van Codex Bezae ondersoek om die teologiese klem daarvan te openbaar.

Terwyl die mees enkelvoudige lesings stilistiese veranderinge aandui, verrai sekere noemenswaardige enkelvoudige lesings, vyf teologiese belange: (1) Jesus se identiteit as die Messias en God; (2) anti-Judaïstiese sentimente teen die godsdienstige leiers en die vernietiging van Jerusalem; (3) die heidene wat op Jesus se bediening reageer; (4) identifikasie van die koninkryk van God met die koms van Jesus en die oordeelsdag; (5) toewyding aan die dissipels en die dissipelskap. Hieruit kan afgelei word dat die skrywer van Codex Bezae baie bekommerd was oor die dissipelskap wat in die eschaton lewe.

Gegee hierdie teologiese konteks, stem die kort weergawe van die Nagmaal (Lukas 22:15-19a) ooreen met die naderende eskatologie van Codex Bezae. Dit dui die opstanding van Jesus aan as die tyd vir die koms van die koninkryk van God en die dag van die oordeel. Verder verwyder die weglating van Lukas 22:19b-20 die herdenking van die versoeningsoffer van Jesus, en versterk dit eerder Jesus se identiteit as die Seun van die mens wat op die oordeelsdag as regter moet kom.

Acknowledgements

It has been a time of endurance and endeavour since I started the journey of learning for my Lord Jesus Christ and for his church. There have been many troubles and hardships, but God has led me all the time. He further granted me great fellows to guide and encourage me so that I could carry on with the journey. So I would like to acknowledge their sincere favours here.

Firstly, I would like to appreciate Prof. Jeremy Punt for his patience, motivation, immense knowledge, and gentle guidance. He has always been gentle and kind during the course of study, and he guided me to various subjects of the New Testament studies and has drawn my interest in this study. I would like to appreciate Dr. Joochan Kim for widening my perspective in theological studies. When we were together in the research centre in Korea, he taught me various areas of the New Testament studies and their importance.

Secondly, I would like to appreciate all my family. My beloved wife, Eunkyung Ko, spent the whole time of endurance with me. Her encouragement kept me devoted to this study. My both parents, Kyou Tae Cho, Hae Sook Park, Hyun Ko, and Yangho Kim, never stopped supporting me emotionally, financially, and spiritually in prayer. They are examples of how Christians should live for God. I pray to live as a sincere Christian as you have been. My brother Jihoon Cho, my uncle Haewon Park, my cousins, Hyosoo Park, Seonsoo Lim, and Suji Lim, and my aunts Heesoon Jung, Jungsook Park, Misook Ko, and Sookhyun Ko supported me in finance and prayer.

Thirdly, I would like to appreciate my fellows, who supported me. My dearest friend, Jonghoon Lim, helped me with resources. Whenever I requested him for resources, he found them and sent them from Switzerland. Without his help I would not be able to study this subject. My dear friends, Ju Hyeong Yim, Moongoo Kang, Shinhyung Lee, and Yong Jun Kwon, also helped me with the finance and resources from Germany, USA, and S.Korea.

Fourthly, I would like to appreciate Hyosung Presbyterian Church and Hwajang First Church for their support in finance and prayer.

Lastly, I would like to appreciate all the predecessors who have improved the ways for better understanding of the Bible, the Word of God. I am walking along the path their labour and endeavour have made. I endeavour to add one little spade of work to the heritage.

This work is not merely of my own, but a collaboration of all these fellows in Christ. Appreciation to all, and glory be to God.

Abbreviations

Bible and Manuscripts

Deut.	Deuteronomy	
Ex.	Exodus	
Gen.	Genesis	
Heb.	Hebrews	
Jn.	John	
Mk.	Mark	
Mt.	Matthew	
Ps.	Psalms	
a	Codex Vercellensis	(AD 350)
A	Codex Alexandrinus	(AD 450)
aur	Codex Aureus	(AD 750)
b	Codex Veronensis	(AD 450)
B	Codex Vaticanus	(AD 350)
c	Codex Colbertinus	(AD 1200)
C	Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus	(AD 450)
d	Codex Bezae (Latin)	(AD 400)
D	Codex Bezae (Greek)	(AD 400)
e	Codex Palatinus	(AD 450)
f	Codex Brixianus	(AD 550)
ff ²	Codex Corbeiensis II	(AD 450)
i	Codex Vindobonensis Lat. 1235	(AD 450)
l	Codex Rehdigeranus	(AD 750)
q	Codex Monacensis	(AD 600)
r ¹	Codex Usserianus Primus	(AD 600)
r ²	Codex Usserianus II	(AD 800)
Syr ^C	Curetonian Gospels	(AD 450)
Syr ^S	Codex Sinaiticus Syriacus	(AD 350)
Syr ^P	Peshitta	(AD 464)
W	Codex Washingtonianus	(AD 400)
Ⲙ	Codex Sinaiticus	(AD 350)
Ⲕ	Codex Sangallensis 48	(AD 850)
Ⲛ	Codex Coridethianus	(AD 850)

Bible editions and others

BDAG	Bauer, W. [1957] 2000. <i>A Greek-English lexicon of the New Testament and other early Christian literature</i> , rev. by F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. 3rd edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
CBGM	The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method
CNTR	The Center for New Testament Restoration
ECM III	Strutwolf, H., Gäbel, G., Hüffmeier, A., Mink, G. & Wachtel K. (eds.). 2018. <i>Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior. III Die Apostelgeschichte</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
ECM IV	Aland, B., Aland, K. Mink, G., Strutwolf, H. & Wachtel, K. (eds.). 2013. <i>Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior: IV Die Katholischen Briefe</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
IGNTP	The International Greek New Testament Project
INTF	Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung
LXX	Septuagint
NA25	Aland <i>et al.</i> (eds). 1963. <i>Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . 25th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
NA26	Aland <i>et al.</i> (eds). 1975. <i>Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
NA28	Aland <i>et al.</i> (eds). 2012. <i>Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
NEB	New English Bible
NTVMR	New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room
RSV	Revised Standard Version
RSVCE	Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition
SBLGNT	Holmes, M.W. 2010. <i>The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition</i> . Atlanta: SBL Press.
TEI	Text Encoding Initiative
UBS1	Aland <i>et al.</i> 1966. <i>The Greek New Testament</i> . 1st. ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.
UBS3	Aland <i>et al.</i> 1983. <i>The Greek New Testament</i> . 3rd. ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies.
XML	Extensible Markup Language

Tables

A	Addition
ditto.	Dittography
emph.	Emphasis
haplo.	Haplography
harm.	Harmonisation
homoeo.	Homoeoteleuton
O	Omission
S	Substitution
S.A.	Significant Addition
simp.	Simplification
S.O.	Significant Omission
spec.	Specification
S.S.	Significant Substitution
T	Transposition

Table of Contents

Title.....	i
Declaration	ii
Abstract	iii
Opsomming	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Abbreviations	vi
Table of Contents	ix
Table of Figures	xiii
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background and motivation for the study.....	1
1.2 Overview of prior studies	2
1.3 The aim of the Study	2
1.4 Hypothesis of the Study.....	3
1.5 The Method of the Study.....	3
1.5.1 Manuscript collation	3
1.5.2 Quantitative Analysis.....	4
1.5.3 Singular readings	4
1.6 Delimitation of the study	4
1.7 Outline of the study	5
Chapter 2. History of the discussion.....	6
2.1 Introduction.....	6
2.2 Studies before Westcott-Hort.....	6
2.2.1 Textual transmission of Luke 22:15-20.....	6
2.2.2 Critical editions and translations before Westcott-Hort.....	7
2.3 Westcott-Hort and the theory of the “Western non-interpolations”	7
2.4 Studies after Westcott-Hort	8
2.4.1 External critical studies.....	9
2.4.2 Studies of Joachim Jeremias.....	13
2.4.3 Studies concerning intrinsic probabilities	15
2.4.3.1 Redaction critical studies.....	15
2.4.3.2 Linguistic and literary studies	16
2.4.4 Studies by Bart D. Ehrman.....	20

2.4.5 Studies concerning transcriptional probabilities.....	21
2.5 Summary	25
Chapter 3. Methodology	27
3.1 Introduction.....	27
3.2 Limitations of the previous methods.....	27
3.3 Quantitative Analysis of the manuscripts.....	29
3.3.1 Manuscript collation	29
3.3.2 Measuring the manuscript relationship.....	30
3.3.2.1 Variation-unit.....	31
3.3.2.2 Significant readings and insignificant readings	31
3.3.2.3 Singular readings	32
3.4 Research method	32
3.4.1 Research procedures	32
3.4.2 Research extent and limitation	33
3.4.3 Basic assumptions and simplifications.....	34
3.4.3.1 The extent of collation.....	35
3.4.3.2 The extent of manuscripts.....	35
3.4.3.3 Problem of diglot.....	36
3.5 Summary	36
Chapter 4. Quantitative Analysis of manuscripts of Luke and the singular readings of Codex Bezae	37
4.1 Introduction.....	37
4.2 Result of Quantitative Analysis.....	37
4.3 Manuscript Grouping based on the Quantitative data.....	72
4.3.1 B-text group.....	72
4.3.2 A-text group	73
4.3.3 C-text group	73
4.3.4 D-text group	73
4.4 Singular readings.....	74
4.4.1 Singular readings by scribal mistakes	74
4.4.2 Singular readings by stylistic changes	76
4.4.2.1 Simple stylistic changes.....	77
4.4.2.2 Stylistic changes that involved with paraphrasing.....	83
4.4.3 Singular readings with significant changes	94
4.4.3.1 Singular readings by harmonisations.....	94
4.4.3.2 Singular readings that specify or simplify.....	98

4.4.3.3 Singular readings of significant alterations.....	105
4.5 Summary	109
Chapter 5. The theology behind singular readings of Codex Bezae and the shorter reading of the Lord’s supper	110
5.1 Introduction.....	110
5.2 Significant singular readings grouped by theme	110
5.2.1 Singular readings concerning Jesus.....	111
5.2.1.1 Identity of Jesus	111
5.2.1.2 Apologetic concerns about Jesus	114
5.2.2 Singular readings showing anti-Judaic sentiment.....	115
5.2.2.1 Anti-Judaic tendency against the religious leaders	115
5.2.2.2 Anti-Judaic tendency against Jerusalem.....	119
5.2.2.3 Anti-Judaic tendency against the people of Israel.....	120
5.2.3 Singular readings concerning the Gentiles	122
5.2.4 Singular readings concerning the kingdom of God.....	123
5.2.5 Singular readings concerning discipleship	126
5.2.5.1 Appreciation of disciples’ devotion and faith.....	127
5.2.5.2 Apologetic concerns about the disciples	128
5.2.5.3 Exhortation of radical discipleship.....	130
5.2.6 Summary	132
5.3 Theological importance of the shorter reading of the Lord’s Supper in Codex Bezae and the “Western” manuscripts	132
5.3.1 Signs for the kingdom of God	133
5.3.2 Identification of the Son of Man	134
5.3.3 Arrival of the kingdom of God.....	135
5.3.4 Significance of the shorter account of the Lord’s Supper and imminent eschatology	136
5.4 Summary	137
6. Conclusion	138
6.1 General summary and conclusion.....	138
6.2 Limitation and suggestions for future study.....	141
Bibliography.....	142
Appendices	149
Appendix 1: An illustration of automated collation of Luke 22:18.....	149
Appendix 2: List of manuscripts used in the collation (sorted by date).....	150

Appendix 3: List of manuscripts supplemented by IGNTP.....	151
Appendix 4: Result of Quantitative Analysis of Luke chapters 1-24.....	152
Appendix 5: Total result of Quantitative Analysis of Luke	176

Table of Figures

Table 1. Textual tradition of the account of the Lord's Supper in Luke	6
Table 2. Quantitative relationship of P ³	38
Table 3. Quantitative relationship of P ⁴	38
Table 4. Quantitative relationship of P ⁷	39
Table 5. Quantitative relationship of P ⁴²	40
Table 6. Quantitative relationship of P ^{45*}	40
Table 7. Quantitative relationship of P ^{45C}	41
Table 8. Quantitative relationship of P ⁶⁹	42
Table 9. Quantitative relationship of P ^{75*}	42
Table 10. Quantitative relationship of P ^{75C}	43
Table 11. Quantitative relationship of P ⁸²	44
Table 12. Quantitative relationship of P ⁹⁷	45
Table 13. Quantitative relationship of P ¹¹¹	45
Table 14. Quantitative relationship of 01*	46
Table 15. Quantitative relationship of 01 ^C	47
Table 16. Quantitative relationship of 02*	48
Table 17. Quantitative relationship of 02 ^C	49
Table 18. Quantitative relationship of 03*	50
Table 19. Quantitative relationship of 03 ^C	51
Table 20. Quantitative relationship of 04*	52
Table 21. Quantitative relationship of 04 ^C	53
Table 22. Quantitative relationship of 05*	54
Table 23. Quantitative relationship of 05 ^C	55
Table 24. Quantitative relationship of 019	56
Table 25. Quantitative relationship of 032*	57
Table 26. Quantitative relationship of 032 ^C	58
Table 27. Quantitative relationship of 038*	59
Table 28. Quantitative relationship of 038 ^C	60
Table 29. Quantitative relationship of 0171	61
Table 30. Quantitative relationship of 0181	62
Table 31. Quantitative relationship of 0182	62
Table 32. Quantitative relationship of 0312	63
Table 33. Quantitative relationship of 1	64
Table 34. Quantitative relationship of 18*	64

Table 35. Quantitative relationship of 18^C	65
Table 36. Quantitative relationship of 33.....	66
Table 37. Quantitative relationship of 45.....	67
Table 38. Quantitative relationship of 1349.....	68
Table 39. Quantitative relationship of 2860*	68
Table 40. Quantitative relationship of 2860^C	69
Table 41. Quantitative relationship of NA28	70
Table 42. Quantitative relationship of B-text group.....	72
Table 43. Quantitative relationship of A-text group.....	73
Table 44. Quantitative relationship of C-text group.....	73
Table 45. Singular readings by scribal mistakes.....	75
Table 46. Singular readings of minor stylistic changes.....	77
Table 47. Singular readings with stylistic changes by paraphrasing	83
Table 48. Singular readings by harmonisations with other biblical verses.....	95
Table 49. Singular readings that specify or simplify	98
Table 50. Singular readings of significant additions, omissions, and substitutions	105
Table 51. Alterations concerning the identity of Jesus	111
Table 52. Alterations concerning apologetics for Jesus	114
Table 53. Alterations reflecting anti-Judaic tendency against the religious leaders.....	116
Table 54. Alterations reflecting anti-Judaic tendency against Jerusalem.....	119
Table 55. Alterations reflecting anti-Judaic tendency against people of Israel	120
Table 56. Alterations concerning the Gentiles	122
Table 57. Alterations concerning the kingdom of God.....	123
Table 58. Alterations concerning the appreciation of disciples' devotion and faith	127
Table 59. Alterations concerning apologetics for the disciples.....	128
Table 60. Alterations concerning the exhortation of radical discipleship.....	130

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Background and motivation for the study

Christian Communion is one of the most important Christian rites. According to the biblical narratives, it originated from Jesus himself, and subsequently, his followers were commanded to keep this rite in commemoration. However, this significant rite is entangled in one of the most challenging problems in textual criticism (Epp, 2009:407; Christopher, 2018:91).

Whereas the other Synoptics (Matthew 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25) and one Pauline account (1 Corinthians 11:23-25) reports the Supper in bread-cup order, the Lukan account diverges into six different readings. The most preferred reading, the longer reading (Luke 22:15-20), reports a more detailed account with double mention of the cup (cup-bread-cup), whereas its counterpart, the shorter reading (Luke 22:15-19a), reports a single cup but in an inverted order (cup-bread). The longer reading is attested by most of the manuscripts while the shorter reading is attested by Codex Bezae (D, d) and some of the Old Latin (a, (b, e), ff², i, l) and Old Syriac (Syr^C) manuscripts.

Consequently, this textual problem affects the interpretation of the Lukan account of the Lord's Supper. Many commentators support the longer reading and see the Supper as a Jewish Seder tradition (or Passover Meal; *Mishna XIV. Treatise Pesachim* X.1-9), insisting on a number of manuscript support especially after the discovery of P⁷⁵ (Jeremias, 1960:143-144; Clark, 1966:9-10; du Plessis, 1994:529-531; *et al.*). However, recent prominent text-critics insist on the preponderance of the shorter reading arguing that external evidence should be weighed and not be counted; that the "Western non-interpolation" and several other early versions (Old Latin and Old Syriac) should not be disregarded; and that Luke 22:19b-20 is a later interpolation of 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 (Colwell, 1969:156; Ehrman, 1996:198; Parker, 1994:707).

The latter standpoint results in a preference for the cup-bread order of the meal, and this questions the authenticity of Luke 22:19b-20. In that case, the interpretation of the Lukan account should be reconsidered whether it would be valid to see the meal as Jewish Seder, or whether it should be seen as a part of the common, or typical meal tradition of the contemporaries (e.g., the Greek symposium, the Qiddus meal, the Haburah meal, the Essene meal). Therefore, this textual problem demands a thorough study of the shorter reading representative (i.e., Codex Bezae) in comparison with the longer reading representatives (P⁷⁵ or the Codex Vaticanus).

1.2 Overview of prior studies

Since the textual problem of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:19b-20) was first raised by Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort (1881), numerous scholars attempted to solve this problem from various aspects. The early stage of discussion (1881-1950s) was based on external evidence. Scholars attempted either to find traces of the longer reading in the patristic writings or to find possible sources used by Luke (Monks, 1925:233-241; Kenyon & Legg, 1937:272-283; Benoit, 1939:357-393; Shürmann, 1951:366-371; *et al.*). Some other scholars attempted to trace the textual development from the shorter text to the longer text, or vice versa (Zahn, 1909:39-41; Bate, 1927:362-368; Kilpatrick, 1946:49-56; Schäfer, 1952:237-239). However, external approaches fell short of evidence and tended to tilt towards personal preferences.

The next generation (1950s-1980s) attempted to find the solution through intrinsic probabilities. Some scholars took linguistic approaches attempting to identify and compare the stylistic features of Luke 22:15-19a with 22:19b-20 (Shürmann, 1951:382-392; Petzer, 1991:113-129). However, non-Lukan features were found in both passages. On the other hand, structural analyses were taken to demonstrate Luke 22:19b-20 is a part of the original pericope (Cooper, 1962:39-48; Petzer, 1984:249-252; Johnson, 1991:623-630). However, it was pointed out that this pericope forms a parallel structure with or without Luke 22:19b-20 (Ehrman, 1993:206-207). Therefore, the approaches concerning the intrinsic probabilities were found to be only supplementary to the external critical arguments.

Most recent approaches (1980s-current) consider the transcriptional probabilities assuming that scribe(s) of the prototype of either the "Western" reading or the majority reading¹ have altered the text in reaction to the religious or social circumstances they had faced. Consequently, scholars who took this approach saw the "Western non-interpolations" as a group of alterations with a specific theological concern (Rice, 1984; Parson, 1986; Martin, 2005:269-294; Billings, 2006a; 2006b; Carter, 2010:550-582). However, their interpretations tend to diverge as their studies dealt with selective passages of Luke and lacked in extensiveness.

1.3 The aim of the Study

The history of discussion has shown various approaches attempting to solve the problem of Luke 22:19b-20, but all attempts have shown some deficiencies. This problem demands a more nuanced approach with a broader scope. In this regard, this study attempts to apply an advanced method of

¹ In this thesis, the term "majority reading" refers to the text attested by the majority of extant manuscripts. In this regard, "majority text" seems to be clearer. However, since "majority text" may cause confusion with the Byzantine "Majority text (ℳ)," "majority reading" was used instead. At some places where the word "text" is necessary, "majority text" was used with the lowercase 'm'.

textual criticism to the textual problem of Luke 22:19b-20, and to show either the longer or, the shorter account of the Lord's Supper is a theologically biased text. And as the argument goes, the latter will eventually be proved to be secondary.

1.4 Hypothesis of the Study

This study deals with the theological tendency of the scribes of ancient manuscripts on which the New Testament is based. Since Codex Bezae is the only Greek manuscript that reads the shorter account, the focus of the study converges on Codex Bezae. However, Codex Bezae involves a number of textual issues. Therefore, some hypotheses upon the characteristics of Codex Bezae needs to be made.

First of all, this study presupposes that the scribe(s) of Codex Bezae has either sincerely transmitted the early version of the Gospel of Luke, or altered the text with some theological concerns. This eliminates the possibility of Codex Bezae being a mixed product, upon which the shorter reading advocates argue that Codex Bezae may contain some of the original readings (e.g., the "Western non-interpolations"). I, the researcher, find this argument unprovable at this stage due to the limitations of the external evidence.

The second presupposition is a corollary of the first. If Codex Bezae shows some theological tendencies, they must be consistent throughout the text. This assumption allows this study to first focus on the unique characteristics of Codex Bezae, and then apply the characteristics to the shorter reading (Luke 22:15-19a) to examine whether these aspects are indeed in accordance. This does not imply circular reasoning, but rather an examination and then cross-checking of assumptions and results.

1.5 The Method of the Study

In consideration of the aims, this study adopts three stages of text-critical methods: (1) manuscript collation to identify the points of comparison; (2) Quantitative Analysis to establish a portrayal of manuscripts relationships; and (3) analysis of singular readings to discover the unique characteristics of Codex Bezae.

1.5.1 Manuscript collation

The fundamental starting point of the textual criticism is the collation of all existing manuscripts. Since this study attempts to identify theological tendencies of the manuscript containing the shorter account of the Lord's Supper (i.e., Codex Bezae), it requires a thorough comparison with the other manuscripts. For the first procedure of the comparison, this study made a full collation of manuscripts for the whole

Gospel of Luke using CollateX with manuscript transcriptions by the Instituts für Neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) and the Center for New Testament Restoration (CNTR), and two fifth-century uncials (0181 and 0182) deciphered by the researcher. Full manuscript collation will yield two important outcomes: variation-units and singular readings. These outcomes are closely related to the subsequent methods.

1.5.2 Quantitative Analysis

Variation-unit is a fundamental concept in the modern textual criticism, referring to each section or length of the text within which manuscripts present at least two variant forms (Colwell, 1969:97). This identifies variants not counted word by word but in a unit, so that a continuous variation between any two manuscripts is counted as a single difference so that all agreements or disagreements are equally treated.

This study will adopt Quantitative Analysis, using the variation-units for the points of comparison, to establish a portrayal of manuscript relationships. This approach has a specific interest in isolating the group of manuscripts in close relation with the one that reads the shorter account of the Lord's Supper (i.e., Codex Bezae). This will eliminate the possibility that Codex Bezae has accidentally omitted the "Western non-interpolations" while the other group members keep the omitted verses. On the contrary, if Codex Bezae is isolated as the only member of the text-group, the possibility of deliberate alteration by the scribe(s) will significantly increase.

1.5.3 Singular readings

A singular reading is a reading found only in a single manuscript without any support from other manuscripts. It is regarded as insignificant both genetically and genealogically since it is virtually impossible for a singular reading to be the original reading, and it cannot be used in comparison with other manuscripts to draw a genealogical relationship. However, being a unique reading, a singular reading may reflect specific concerns of a scribe(s). Therefore, singular readings can be used as a window through which the context and the possible intention of the scribal alteration can be reconstructed (Colwell, 1969:116-124; Ehrman, 1993; 2013:803-825).

1.6 Delimitation of the study

In text-critical studies, making a full collation of all existing manuscripts is always a preferable foundational task. However, computerisation of the manuscript transcription is an ongoing project by

INTF. In the case of Luke, digitisation is only at an elementary stage, with only 26 important manuscript transcriptions open to the public. In order to reduce the deficiency and minimise the errors for the collation, the researcher has deciphered two fragmentary early uncials (0181 of 4/5C, 0182 of 5C) and further supplemented the data using the critical editions by the International Greek New Testament Project (1984 & 1987). These will cover for the collation 28 manuscripts with 40 different readings including corrections (Appendix 2), and 216 supplementary manuscripts (Appendix 3) for refinement. Although the number of transcriptions is not much compared to the massive volume of works, their coverage is extensive from the earliest period to the fourteenth century, and most manuscripts after the ninth century preserve the almost identical Byzantine text-type. Therefore, the combination of the transcribed manuscripts and the IGNTF apparatus will provide a reasonably reliable amount of data so that the weight of the data for this study is significant enough to draw some conclusion though it will require some refinement later on.

1.7 Outline of the study

As an introduction, chapter 1 presents the research background, motivation, an overview of prior studies, aims of the study, research hypothesis, methodological discussion, and some delimitations.

Chapter 2 will present an overview of the text tradition of the Lord's Supper, related textual problems, and the history of discussion since Westcott-Hort (1881). This will induce the necessity of more nuanced approaches with a broader scope.

Chapter 3 will first discuss the limitations of the previous methods of textual criticism and the development of newer methods after the computerisation. Then, this chapter will introduce the methods applied to this study: manuscript collation, Quantitative Analysis, and analysis of singular readings. Lastly, some practical limitations related to these methods will be discussed.

Chapter 4 will apply the methods discussed in chapter 3. It will first present the result of the Quantitative Analysis and then group the manuscripts according to their mutual relationship. Once the text-group of Codex Bezae is identified (i.e., D-text group), singular readings, as the most prominent unique feature, of the D-text will be picked up and categorised according to their importance.

Chapter 5 will re-categorise the significant singular readings identified in chapter 4, according to their theological interests: Jesus, Judaism, the Gentiles, the kingdom of God, and the discipleship. Based on these theological motives, this chapter will trace possible concerns for each topic and then integrate them into one practical concern of the scribe(s) of Codex Bezae, how Christians should live in the eschaton. In this light, the theological importance of the shorter account of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:15-19a) will be discussed.

Lastly, chapter 6 will provide summaries of the arguments and suggestions for further studies.

Chapter 2. History of the discussion

2.1 Introduction

The textual problem of Luke 22:19b-20 is one of the most challenging problems in textual criticism of the New Testament (Epp, 2009:407; Christopher, 2018:91). This long-standing crux has been challenged by many prominent scholars over a hundred years, but it remains unresolved. However, there have been many fruitful approaches to this problem though they tend to conflict with one another. For the foundation of research, this chapter will present an overview of the text tradition, related textual problems, and significant approaches to these problems since Westcott-Hort (1881).

2.2 Studies before Westcott-Hort

2.2.1 Textual transmission of Luke 22:15-20

The Lukan account of the Lord's Supper has a complex history of transmission. It shows development in seven different forms with three different orders of meals in various languages. However, they can be classified into three groups: the longer reading, the shorter reading, and intermediary readings. These can be tabulated as follows:

Table 1. Textual tradition of the account of the Lord's Supper in Luke

Type	Contents	Manuscripts	Order	Earliest date
I	15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20	Most NT manuscripts	cup-bread-cup	200-225
II	15, 16, 17, 18, 19a	D, a, d, ff ² , i, l	cup-bread	350
III	15, 16, 19a, 17, 18	b, e	bread-cup	450
IV	15, 16, 19, 17, 18	Syr ^C	bread-cup	5C
V	15, 16, 19, 20a, 17, 20b, 18	Syr ^S	bread-cup	4C
VI	15, 16, 19, 20	Syr ^P	bread-cup	4C
VII	15, 19, 20	Coptic Ⲛ ²	bread-cup	889

² Manuscript Curzon Catena, in the Parham Library in the British Museum, which is dated the year 889. In this manuscript, text and commentary derived from various sources are intermixed so that its value is impaired (Horner, 1898a:xxxvii-xxxviii).

Type I is the longer reading attested by most Greek manuscripts and other early versions. The earliest text of this type is attested by P⁷⁵ of the late second century. Type II is the shorter reading which omits Luke 22:19b-20. This text type is attested by one Greek manuscript, Codex Bezae (D), and a few Old Latin manuscripts (a, d, ff², i, l). The earliest manuscript of this type is attested by Codex Vercellensis (a) of the mid-fourth century, however, most scholars agree that this text-type predates to the beginning of the second century as it is found in many patristic writings (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005:276-277; Parker, 1997:63) and the Old Syriac versions, of which ancestors predate to the second century, show similar alteration of vv.19-20 (Knudsen, 1950:76; Aland & Aland, 1989:52-53; Martin, 2005:272). Types III-VI are intermediary readings somewhere in-between the longer reading (Type I) and the shorter reading (Type II). Therefore, they are generally regarded to have been derived either from Type I or Type II. These readings are attested by some of the Old Latin manuscripts (b, e) or by Syriac versions (Syr^C, Syr^S, Syr^P), and the order of the institution follows the traditional bread-cup order. In a similar way to the shorter reading (Type II), even though the earliest date attested by these manuscripts is around the fourth century, the earliest date of these text-types predates to the second century. Type VII is attested by one Coptic Bohairic manuscript (Horner, 1898b:285), and it is mostly ignored as unimportant since it is a solitary instance of the omission of vv.16-18.³ Therefore, there are six different readings in consideration, and if one represents the original reading, others should represent scribal harmonisations or alterations.

2.2.2 Critical editions and translations before Westcott-Hort

Critical editions before Westcott-Hort (Textus Receptus (1550), Griesbach (1809), Lachmann (1831), Tregelles (1857), Tischendorf (1878), *et al.*), however, did not reflect this textual problem. Some of them did not have systematic principles to collate and classify the manuscripts, some regarded the “Western” text as insignificant, therefore, did not take it into consideration, and some placed greater weight on the overwhelming number of manuscripts attesting the longer reading. Moreover, the influence of the Textus Receptus was still prevailing so that the reading attested by the Byzantine type (i.e., the longer reading) was regarded as authoritative (Scrivener (1887), Nestle (1898), *et al.*).

2.3 Westcott-Hort and the theory of the “Western non-interpolations”

In 1881 Brooke F. Westcott and Fenton J. A. Hort published *The New Testament in the Original Greek* which laid a foundation of modern textual criticism. In this work, Westcott-Hort made a significant

³ Scholars suspect this omission of vv.16-18 to be either a homoeoteleuton or scribal mistakes (Sanday, [1899] 1910:636; Monks, 1925:230).

methodological advance, in which the New Testament manuscripts were categorised as Neutral, Alexandrian, “Western,” or Syrian,⁴ and systematic principles based on their predecessors, Karl Lachmann and Johan. J. Griesbach⁵ were applied. A general principle is that when a reading in a manuscript stands against its tendency, the significance of this reading increases. In the case of the “Western” texts which tend to expand the majority reading, when a manuscript preserves a reading shorter than the Neutral (or, Alexandrian) text, the significance of that reading increases greatly so that such reading is regarded as more likely to be original. Westcott-Hort have distinguished nine such readings and named them the “Western non-interpolations” and placed them in double brackets.

This theory of the “Western non-interpolations” triggered an inconclusive debate of the textual problem in the Lukan account of the Lord’s Supper (Luke 22:15-20). While comparing Luke 22:19b-20 they preferred the shorter “Western” reading of D, a, b, d, e, ff², i, and l, which they consider to reflect the more difficult reading, to the longer reading attested by the Neutral, Alexandrian and Syrian manuscripts, considering vv.19b-20 to be one of the “Western non-Interpolations”⁶ (Westcott & Hort, 1882:A.63-64). They, therefore, placed double brackets around them and concluded:

These difficulties, added to the suspicious coincidence with 1 Co xi 24 f., and the transcriptional evidence given above, leave no moral doubt that the words in question were absent from the original text of Lc, notwithstanding the purely Western ancestry of the documents which omits them (Westcott & Hort, 1882:A.64).

2.4 Studies after Westcott-Hort

Since the theory of the “Western non-interpolations,” many scholars have attempted to solve this textual problem from various aspects. Their approaches are usually complex as their approaches are intermixed. However, they can be classified into three major concerns of text criticism: external evidence (text-critical, source-critical approaches); intrinsic probabilities (linguistic, literary, theological approaches); transcriptional probabilities (socio-historical approach).

⁴ Of these types, Westcott-Hort describes the characteristics of each as follows: the Alexandrian is restrained, the “Western” is characterised by extensive paraphrase and expansion, and the Syrian is a smooth combination of the Alexandrian and the “Western” (Westcott & Hort, 1882:119-134).

⁵ Westcott-Hort’s text-critical principles are explained in the appendix of the New Testament in the Original Greek; and they are summarised well by Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (1993:157-158).

⁶ Many scholars use the term “Western non-interpolations” referring to Luke 22:19b-20 *et al.* However, to be precise, the “Western non-interpolations” imply the shorter readings omitting Luke 22:19b-20 *et al.* To be precise to refer to the longer text from the shorter reading advocates’ view, a term suggested by Ehrman (1993:242), “non-Western interpolations,” seems to be more proper.

2.4.1 External critical studies

Hort's new edition of the Greek New Testament influenced many scholars (Blass, 1897:120; Sanday, [1899] 1910:636; Plummer, 1902:496; Weiss, 1903:205; Gressmann & Klostermann, 1919:573-574; Lietzmann, 1926:215-222; Easton, 1926:321; Creed, 1930:263-264; *et al.*), and various editions (Nestle [1906] (1923), Vogels (1922), Kilpatrick (1958), NA25 (1966), UBS1 (1966), RSV [1946] (1952), NEB(1961), SBLGNT(2010)) adopted his theory. Furthermore, even a third argument was proposed. Theodor Zahn (1909:39-41) rejects the shorter "Western" reading because of the inverted order of the bread and the cup.⁷ Then he compares the longer reading with the shortest reading of b and e, and concludes it is more probable that the longer text has been expanded from b and e, than vice versa, therefore b and e attest the original reading.

George G. Monks (1925:233-241) pointed out the weakness of Westcott-Hort's arguments about using the patristic evidence. He surveyed the patristic evidence which records the account of the Lord's Supper and evaluated which reading, shorter or longer, each patristic writing supports. He argues: Justin Martyr (*First Apology* 66.3.1),⁸ considering the order of the meal and the inclusion of the Luke 22:19b, had the longer text; Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* IV.40), considering the order of the meal and the existence of a similar phrase to Luke 22:20, had the longer text; Origen (*Commentary on St. Matthew* XIV.33.86-88),⁹ considering a Lukan expression ποτήριον καινης διαθηκης, had the longer text; Eusebius (*Epistula ad Carpianum*), considering the inclusion of Luke 22:20 in the *Eusebian apparatus*, probably had a text of θ -type (i.e., 038), thus the longer text. Based on these patristic supports, he concludes that the longer reading is much preferable (Monks, 1925:251).

Herbert N. Bate (1927:362-368) takes the arguments of Westcott-Hort and Sanday as a premise and focuses on the textual development in consideration of the order. By comparison, he draws the conclusion that African Latin manuscript e (v.15, 16, 19a, 17, 18) is the most primitive stage of the text, and sees the "Western" reading attested by D, a, ff², i, and l (v.15, 16, 17, 18, 19a) is the other branch of the text of the primitive stage. By comparison of the Old Latin and Syriac versions he suggests a sequence of textual development from e (v.15, 16, 19a, 17, 18) along b (v.15, 16, 19a, 17, 18, with slight additions), Syr^C (v.15, 16, 19, 17, 18), Syr^S (v.15, 16, 19, 20a, 17, 20b, 18), then to the longer

⁷ Zahn referring to his precedent work (1884:293ff.) argues that the inverted order in Didache 9.1-5 is not in reference to the Eucharist, but to the Agape Meal that Early Christians practiced (1909:40). Consequently, he sees it illegitimate to refer to Didache in support of the shorter reading.

⁸ *First Apology* 66.3.1-7 reads: οἱ γὰρ ἀπόστολοι ἐν τοῖς γενομένοις ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἀπομνημονεύμασιν, ἃ καλεῖται εὐαγγέλια, οὕτως παρέδωκαν ἐντετάλθαι αὐτοῖς: τὸν Ἰησοῦν λαβόντα ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· **Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἀνάμνησίν μου**, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου· καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὁμοίως λαβόντα καὶ εὐχαριστήσαντα εἰπεῖν· Τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου· καὶ μόνοις αὐτοῖς μεταδοῦναι.

⁹ *Commentary on St. Matthew* XIV.33.86-88 reads: ... καὶ γῆ καινὴ καὶ ὡς ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ γέγραπται **ποτήριον καινῆς διαθήκης**, ἀπὸ ἀμπέλου οἶμαι καινῆς, ἕτεροῖα δεῖ εἶναι πάντα τὰ τῆς ἐκεῖσε ζωῆς καὶ ἀληθῶς μακάρια.

reading (v.15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20). His conclusion based on the explicability states all readings are derived from one short reading, therefore the short reading, preferably e, is the original.

Frederic G. Kenyon and Stanley C. E. Legg (1937:272-283) start with source-critical arguments by comparing Luke respectively with Markan (Mark 14:22-25), Pauline (1 Corinthians 11:24-25), and patristic accounts of the Lord's Supper. Then they draw a conclusion that there is nothing original in Luke, but all are derived either from Paul or Mark, and the only new feature is the double mention of the cup in the longer version or the inversion of the order in one form of the shorter version (1937:282). Then they start to weigh each reading on transcriptional probabilities. If the longer reading is to be original, the shorter reading is the result of an attempt to remove the double mention of the cup by omitting vv.19b-20. If the shorter reading is to be original, Pauline words of the institution were interpolated into vv.19b-20. Kenyon and Legg found the former more explicable suggesting a Bezan editor puzzled by the double mention of the cup omitted the second cup without caring for the inverted order (1937:285).

Pierre Benoit (1939:357-393) is one of the influential scholars who approached this problem from the source-critical aspect. He firstly focuses on the literary dependence of Luke 22:19b-20 on 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 and suggests the longer text is original as he sees the covenant word in v.20b is an essential element of the institution. He argues the omission of vv.19b-20 does not satisfy a full portrayal of the account and Luke would not have allowed such deficiency. Therefore, the shorter reading is only a later alteration by some scribes satisfied with vv.17-19a while removing the Pauline influence (1939:363-367). In discussion about the source of the mixed texts which lie between the shorter reading and the longer reading,¹⁰ he argues the direction of derivation is more likely from the longer text. He finds the source of v.19 of Syr^S and Syr^C from Luke 22:19 instead of 1 Corinthians 11:24. Thus he suggests the genealogy of the account as the longer text → Syr^S → Syr^C (1939:372-377).¹¹ Moreover, unlike a major scholarly argument that v.19a derived from Mark 14:22 and vv.19b-20 from 1 Corinthians 11:23c-25a, Benoit argues the whole verses 19 and 20 derived from the Pauline text and were then retouched by Luke according to Mark 14:22-23 (1939:372). From a literary-critical view, he concludes vv.15-18 did not derive from any other source nor written by Luke himself independently, but developed from Mark. His final conclusion lies in a theological argument that the concept of Passover in v.15 must continue along the pericope. However, if the pericope ends on v.18 or 19a, the concept of Passover artificially dissipates, but if it ends on v.20, the redemption word in v.20 takes over the concept and completes the pericope. Thus, Benoit concludes the concept of Passover in v.15 requires a continuation of this pericope to v.20 in order to express the idea of redemption, the Christian Passover (1939:390-391).

¹⁰ Old Latin manuscripts b, e and Old Syriac manuscripts Syr^S, Syr^C, and Syr^P have mixed texts.

¹¹ Here, Benoit does not neglect the possibility that the shorter reading precedes the longer reading (i.e. the shorter text → the longer text → mixed texts). However, he argues such a possibility is very unlikely.

Johannes Knudsen proposes the same division of the pericope as Benoit did, i.e., vv.15-18 and vv.19-20 (1950:78). However, he does not limit the extent of the source of vv.15-18 to Mark, but suggests a hypothetical source that might have been common to all Synoptists. He sees no problem with the duplication of the cups as he argues Luke's priority was to report the whole story of the institution using two sources: firstly, a Synoptic source for vv.15-18, then for vv.19-20 a liturgical source common to Paul (1950:79, 84).

George D. Kilpatrick (1946:49-56) focuses on the relation among Old Latin manuscripts on Luke 22:15-22. After collating c, f, q, r¹, r², aur, δ, and δ^{corr} with vg respectively, he finds a high consensus between c and r², in which they show a high number of variation from vg in vv.15-19a and vv.21-22 but show a low number of variation in vv.19b-20.¹² He interprets this common tendency of reduction in vv.19b-20 as a proof of a later supplement of vg text to c and r². Thus, he concludes that the earlier forms of c and r² must have omitted vv.19b-20 (1946:50-51). For a supplementary to this argument, Kilpatrick recalls the linguistic analysis taken by Henry J. Cadbury (1920:149)¹³ and argues that the number of unusual linguistic features in vv.19b-20 suggest vv.19b-20 is not a part of the original. Then he conclusively suggests four stages of development: (1) the "Western" short reading without interpolation; (2) the longer reading with the interpolation; (3) the text influenced by Matthew; (4) the text of Marcion (1946:53-54).

Heinz Shürmann (1951:366-371) in support of the longer reading presents similar arguments to Monks (1925:233-241) dealing with patristic witnesses: Marcion (*Adversus Marcionem* IV.40) tends to shorten the longer Lukan text; Justin Martyr (*First Apology* 66.3.1) is likely to be influenced by the Alexandrian Lukan text; the cup-word (*Becherwort*) in Tatian's version is harmonised after Matthew and Luke, thus it is probable that Tatian had the longer text. Then he suggests possible motives for altering the longer texts: Syr^C, in order to avoid the difficulties of the double cup and correct it to bread-wine order, deleted v.20 and switched v.19 before v.17; Syr^S, considering slight variations of the text, cannot be original, but an advanced version of Syr^C; Syr^P is clearly a correction of the Alexandrian with the double cup; b and e, considering the order, have a secondary reading which cannot explain the formation of the majority reading, thus supposed to be derived from the short "Western" reading (1951:371-376). Shürmann, however, does not provide any persuasive argument against the precedence of the short reading on D, a, d, ff², i, and l, but rather chose to counter the arguments for the short reading:

¹² According to Kilpatrick's analysis, c and r² have 10 and 6 variations respectively from vg in vv.15-19a, 1 and 0 variations in vv.15-19a, and 3+ and 3 variations in vv.21-22 (1946:50). Kilpatrick interprets this similar pattern of fluctuation as a consequence of a common text-type.

¹³ In this work, Cadbury makes a thorough comparison between Luke and other Gospels to derive the linguistic and literary styles of Luke. In Luke 22:20, he concludes, "The omission of the copula by Luke in 22:20 is therefore difficult to understand ..." Kilpatrick takes this conclusion as a statement that Luke 22:20 is not a part written by Luke himself.

against the argument that the longer reading is an editor's interpolation intending to align Lukan text with the rest of the Gospels (Sahlin, 1945:376), he points that v19b-20 does not align with the Gospels, but 1 Corinthians 11:24-25; against the argument that the shorter reading is attributed to Tatian which dates to as early as the first half of the second century (Arnold, 1937:34), he points the inexplicability of the existence of the repetition-command (*Wiederholungsbefehl*; v.19b) and the cup-word (*Becherwort*) in Tatian, and finds the origin from Luke 22:20.¹⁴

After a few months, Karl Theodor Schäfer (1952:237-239) responded in the same journal to Schürmann. He raised an objection pointing out Shürmann had not solved the actual problem posed by the text tradition. He insists that the actual task can only be solved from the text-historical (*Textgeschichte*) point of view by showing the multiplicity of textual forms and their origin (1952:237). He puts his focus purely on the textual history of Luke 22:17-20, and observes two points: (1) the position of vv.17-18 behind v.19 (b, e, Syr^C) is closely related to the absence of v.20; (2) where the witnesses of the Old Latin and the Old Syriac manuscripts partly agree against the entire other tradition, the text version in which representatives of both translations agree against the other witnesses must originate from a common root (1952:237-238). Consequently, he suggests a prototype of b and e with the order v.15, 16, 19a, 17, 18, and suggests all other readings derived from this prototype (1952:237-238).

Kenneth W. Clark (1966:9-10) in his discussion about the theological relevance of text-critical studies, sees the longer text as a part of the original text. He argues that with the discovery of P⁷⁵ the external testimony outweighs the "Western non-interpolations" theory, and Hort was misled by his principles. For an illustration of such critical judgement, he compares the Catholic revision of the RSV (RSVCE) with RSV. His argument about Luke 22:19b-20, however, is wholly dependent on the count of manuscripts, and not on their weight. He misused the concept of weighing the manuscripts by simply equating the number with the significance. Thus, he misjudged the weight of each reading by only considering the number. Such a mistake was made by many scholars and was pointed by later scholars (Colwell, 1969:156; Kilpatrick, 1975:30; Epp, 1989:221; Epp & Fee 1993:148; Clarke, 1997; Metzger & Ehrman, 2005:302; Ehrman & Holmes (eds.), 2013).

In 1967 Kurt Aland published an article on the importance of P⁷⁵. As the subtitle "Ein Beitrag zur Frage des 'Western non-interpolations'" suggests, he sees the discovery of P⁷⁵ as a major thrust to surmount difficulties of the "Western non-interpolations." He states:

Denn auch hier haben sich unter dem Einfluß von P⁷⁵ weittragende Änderungen ergeben. Zwar hätte man manche Entscheidung — etwa beim sog. „langen“ Abendmahlstext in Luk. 22 — schon vorher so

¹⁴ Sürmann suggests Luke 22:20 or 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 for a possible source of the cup-word (*Becherwort*) in Tatian. But he prefers the Lukan origin as he sees it would be more likely that Tatian had used the Gospel as a primary source (1951:378).

treffen können und sollen, wie es jetzt erfolgt ist, denn das Zeugnis der Handschriften war eindeutig genug. Aber erst P⁷⁵ gab den letzten Anstoß dazu, so zu entscheiden, wie geschehen (Aland, 1967:158).

He then discusses eight “Western non-interpolations” and ten other interpolations of what Westcott-Hort suspected to be later interpolations.¹⁵ In his discussion, he points to the lesser certainty of the “Western” texts due to the fluidness, especially with the Old Latin manuscripts in spite of their early dates. He makes a conjecture that a reason for which Westcott-Hort was so dependent on the “Western” manuscripts might be due to the limitation on manuscript access in their days. Only manuscripts earlier than B, \aleph , A and C were D, Old Latin and Old Syriac. But with the discovery of the Papyrus Bodmer XIV (200-225 C.E.), Aland finds P⁷⁵ to be equal value concerning the manuscript age.¹⁶ Consequently, it gives more weight on the longer reading, which has plentiful manuscript support (1967:171-172).

However, such an argument was criticised by Colwell, “Aland occasionally and mistakenly speaks as if the gross number of witnesses, as such, has invalidated all that Hort had done, and forces a new theory upon us” (1969:156). He points the fact that Hort imagined and insisted on the existence of a very early ancestor of the Neutral text though he did not possess it. Thus, the discovery of P⁷⁵ still validates Hort’s reconstruction theory and does not put additional weight on the longer reading except attesting the early date for the longer reading.

2.4.2 Studies of Joachim Jeremias

Joachim Jeremias is a particular figure who has changed his stance from supporting the shorter reading to longer reading. He deserves to be discussed separately as he is one of those who have discussed this matter thoroughly. Starting with the external witnesses, Jeremias asserts that the outstanding number of manuscripts supporting the longer reading attests the longer reading is the original. He focuses

¹⁵ These eighteen passages are: Luke 24:6; 24:12; 24:32; 24:36; 24:40; 24:51; 24:52; 5:39; 10:41f.; 12:19; 12:21; 12:39; 22:19-20; 22:43-44; 22:62; 24:3; John 3:31-32; 4:9 (Aland, 1967:157-162). It is noticeable that he missed out 11 passages out of 27 which Westcott-Hort listed, and these are Matthew (6:15; 6:25; 9:34; 13:33; 21:44; 23:26; 27:49), Mark (2:22; 10:2; 14:39) and Luke 24:9. He also added two passages (Luke 22:43-44; Luke 24:32) which Westcott-Hort did not list as possible “Western non-interpolations.” Moreover, he did not discuss those passages in the same order as Westcott-Hort listed (Westcott & Hort, 1882:176), nor in biblical order.

¹⁶ Moreover, Aland regards P⁷⁵ as a major representative of a “strict” text that carefully preserves a text very close to the original or initial text (Aland & Aland, 1989:64, 93). On the contrary, other scholars see this text as a deliberate attempt to establish a controlled text at the end of the second century (Parker, 1997:200; Koester, 1989:37; Petersen, 2002:33-34).

specifically on the various versions of Tatian's Diatessaron,¹⁷ and affirms that Tatian used the longer Lukan text as a source. Contrary to the argument of Benoit regarding the mixed texts (b, e, Syr^C, Syr^S, Syr^P), Jeremias argues that the mixed texts, especially b, e, and Syr^C, derived from the shorter reading, and Syr^S is an expansion of Syr^C. Then he concludes neither Syr^C nor Syr^S shows any acquaintance with the longer text, and the short readings are solely attested by the "Western" manuscripts (1960:143-144). He combines this argument with a geographical hypothesis of the "Western" manuscript and the history of transmission, and affirms that it is unreasonable to assume these "Western" short readings were circulated only in the West and the interpolation was introduced everywhere else. Consequently, he draws the conclusion that the short readings are secondary (1960:144-145). However, this geographical hypothesis of the "Western" text is now proved invalid (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005:276; Parker, 2008:171; Ehrman & Holmes (eds.), 2013:541-542, 554-555) thus, this argument is weakened.

Jeremias then turns his attention to the linguistic aspect of the pericope and finds some non-Lukan features from the longer reading. He defends the longer text by arguing that it has derived from Paul and Mark (1960:153), however, following the argument of Shürmann that two deviations from 1 Corinthians 11:24-25 betrays the Pauline originality (1960:36-39, 69-72), he raises an opposition to the argument for the literary dependence of the longer reading on Paul. And instead, he attributes the similarity to a common ecclesiastical tradition in a liturgical context that Luke and Paul might have experienced in common.¹⁸ He insists the Lukan style should not be expected within the words of institution because of the liturgical quote Luke has made (1960:155). Finally, from the viewpoint of the longer text priority, Jeremias proposes that the shorter reading is an abbreviation of the full account to protect the Eucharist from misinterpretation and profanation by pagans (*viz. disciplina arcani*) (1960:158-159).

Since the publication of the P⁷⁵ (Martin & Kasser, 1961) and Jeremias' thorough study followed by many scholars and commentators,¹⁹ the 1960s became a turning-point for the majority view to shift from the short reading to the longer reading. Metzger, in his textual commentary, depicts the decision-

¹⁷ Jeremias compares seven different versions of Diatessaron: Tat^{ephr}, Tat^{aphr}, Tat^{arab}, Tat^{fuld}, Tat^{ned}, Tat^{ven} and Tat^{tusc}, and Tat^{pers} (1960:140-141). In his inspection, he finds additional elements (mention of the new covenant and the repetition command) in Matthew and Mark, which are commonly regarded as Tatian's source. He finds the origin of these elements from the Lukan source, the longer reading (1960:141-142).

¹⁸ Jeremias, referring to the conjecture of Adolf Schlatter (1931:421) and Jean Héring (1937:227), suggests Syrian origin of the common liturgical tradition for Luke and Paul. He suggests Paul was indebted to Luke's Syrian home church for his account of the Lord's Supper (1960:156), and consequently argues "Luke 22:19-20 is not a literary compilation from Mark and Paul," but a 'third variant' of the liturgical eucharistic formula (1960:156).

¹⁹ From the 1970s, many commentators began to take the longer text as original without much discussion, and interpret the Lukan institution as a Passover Meal (Rienecker, 1969:498-501; Morris, 1974:305-306; Hendriksen, 1979:959-964; Moessner, 1989:179; du Plessis, 1994:529-531; Green, 1997:756-764; Edwards, 2015:337-339; *et al.*).

making process of the UBS3 Editorial Committee on Luke 22:17-20 (1975:173-177). After discussing the pros and cons of each reading, he reports:

The weight of these considerations was estimated differently by different members of the Committee. A minority preferred the shorter text as a Western non-interpolation. The majority, on the other hand, impressed by the overwhelming preponderance of external evidence supporting the longer form, explained the origin of the shorter form as due to some scribal accident or misunderstanding. The similarity between verses 19b-20 and 1 Cor 11:24b-25 arises from the familiarity of the evangelist with the liturgical practice among Pauline churches, a circumstance that accounts also for the presence of non-Lukan expressions in verses 19b-20 (Metzger, 1975:176-177).

2.4.3 Studies concerning intrinsic probabilities

2.4.3.1 Redaction critical studies

Martin Rese (1975:21-22) in defense of the shorter reading firstly surveys the prior studies and discusses the arguments explaining the secondary omission of Luke 22:19b-20. He classifies the attempts into four categories²⁰ and points out that those attempts trying to solve the problem of the short text are contradictory to one another and unsecured in detail. Based on the idea that Luke is a writer and a theologian, he suggests this problem should be discussed from the viewpoint of redaction history while retreating other interests in this passage. Based on the assumption that Luke used Mark as his source for the institution account, he measures the ratio of correspondence of the short and long texts respectively to the Markan account in order to decide the direction of Lukan redaction, and then he inspects the Lukan account in relation to the narrow and broad contexts (1975:23-30). After a lengthy discussion, he sees the shorter text can only be explained in terms of Luke's theological tendency. He concludes the shorter reading is a result of the Lukan reformulation of the Markan source (*Markusvorlage*), adding the Passover idea to the Markan account (1975:31). Consequently, he argued that vv.19b-20 is not writing that originated from Luke's hand, but a later interpolation influenced by liturgical tradition.

²⁰ Rese summarises four major arguments against the shorter reading as follows: (1) The long text has been shortened to avoid the second cup (Dibelius, 1959:212; *et al.*); (2) The shorter reading is the abbreviation of a liturgical text to protect the sacrament from profanation (*viz. disciplina arcani*) (Jeremias, 1960:158-159); (3) due to a scribal mistake, the long text has become the short text (Harold I. Bell, 1952:262); (4) the long text was shortened in consideration of the following section of Judas' betrayal otherwise Judas had participated in the atoning and covenant-making effect of Jesus' last Supper (Shürmann, 1951:386-387).

2.4.3.2 Linguistic and literary studies

Shürmann (1951:382-392), in addition to his text-critical argument, has also presented literary arguments. Here he discusses the invalidity of arguments of the shorter text advocates one by one: (1) against the argument that Luke 22:19b-20 is the Pauline interpolation of 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25, he identifies seven differences between Luke 22:19b-20 and 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25.²¹ He argues all seven cases have some pre-Lukan features such as Aramaism and five of them preserve a more original version of the text than those in 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25 (1951:385). (2) Against the argument that Luke 22:19a has been taken from the Markan source (*Markusvorlage*), he identifies four differences²² and argues Luke 19a preserves a more original text than 1 Corinthians 11:24a. Putting the results of (1) and (2) together, Shürmann argues Luke 22:19-20 preserves a unified literary form, therefore the argument of the shorter text advocates considering Luke 22:19b-20 an interpolation from an external source should be invalidated. (3) Against the argument that Luke 22:19b-20 is an interpolation, the conjunction *πλήν* at the beginning of v.21 expresses its adversative sense better with the longer reading, therefore the longer reading is the original. (4) Against the argument that Luke 22:29-30 requires the continuation from Luke 22:15-19a, he points out thematic and stylistic differences. (5) Focusing on the unusual order of *τοῦτο* found both in Luke 22:19b-20 and 24:42a, he insists on a possible connection between them and argues that they are from the same oldest tradition.²³ (6) Against the assumption that a later scribe could have added a more parallel form of the cup-word (*Becherwort*) to the shorter reading, he argues there are multiple asymmetries between Luke and other accounts, implying vv.19b-20 is a relatively early tradition. (7) Finally summing up all his arguments, he concludes that the objections raised against the primitive nature of the Alexandrian texts are not conclusive.

²¹ Sürmann identifies the following seven differences (1951:382-385): (1) insertion of *διδόμενον* in Luke; (2) emphasis on different themes despite identical phrase: an order to repeat in Luke but an order to commemorate in 1 Corinthians 11:24b-25; (3) different order of *ὡσαύτως*; (4) omission of *ἐστίν*; (5) different words used: *μου* in Luke, *ἐμοῦ* in 1 Corinthians 11:25; (6) absence of *ὁ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* in 1 Corinthians 11: 25; (7) omission of the second repetition-command in Luke.

²² Sürmann identifies the following four differences (1951:385-386): (1) omission of *ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν* in Luke; (2) different word used: *εὐχαριστήσας* in Luke, *εὐλογήσας* in Mark; (3) different word used: *λέγων* in Luke, *εἶπεν* in Mark; (4) omission of *λάβετε* in Luke.

²³ Shürmann argues that the usage of a demonstrative pronoun before an article is unusual in Luke (9:48; 13:8; 22:15, 20, 37, 42), thus concludes it is a non-Lukan style (1951:389). However, his argument neglects 15 other inflected instances of genders, numbers and cases (Luke 1:24; 7:44; 8:11; 10:36; 12:20; 13:6; 14:30; 15:24, 30; 17:34; 18:11; 19:27; 21:3; 23:7; 24:44). In his later article (1952:185) he does extend his argument to other inflections. However, he does it only to draw favourable ratios (70:21 in Luke; 79:22 in Acts) and still argues while separating *τοῦτο το* instances. It should be pointed that 21 out of 91 is not a negligible number. Thus it seems there is a leap in his argument at this point.

Shürmann's arguments are supported by some of the later commentators (Ellis, 1981:255; Bock, 1996:1722; *et al.*). However, it seems these arguments in overall are based on a hypothesis attributing the non-Lukan features found in Luke 22:19-20 to a pre-Lukan *Vorlage*. Henry Chadwick evaluated Shürmann's arguments as hardly provable though hard to refute (1957:253). As Shürmann acknowledges in conclusion, these arguments may not be convincing individually. Therefore, they have to be taken all together to supplement the probability of the longer reading.

John C. Cooper (1962:39-48) finds text-critical, source-critical, and form-critical approaches have not been successful in solving this problem. He thus suggests a literary approach to the passage. He aligns Luke 22:14-20 dividing into four sections so that each begins with specific words of Jesus beginning with *καὶ* (1962:44):

A	<i>καὶ ... εἶπεν ...</i>	(14-15a)
	<i>λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ... τῆ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</i>	(15b-16)
B	<i>καὶ ... εἶπεν ...</i>	(17a)
	<i>λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ... ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ</i>	(17b-18)
C	<i>καὶ ... λέγων</i>	(19a)
	<i>τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</i>	(19b)
D	<i>καὶ ... λέγων</i>	(20a)
	<i>τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</i>	(20b)

He finds a symmetrical “doublet” between the pairs AB and CD, while AB refers to the kingdom of God and CD refers to the redemption: A, B read *εἶπεν*, and C, D read *λέγων*; A, B read *λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν*, and C, D read *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* (Cooper, 1962:44-45). Based on this structure, Cooper argues the longer text keeps the inner unity, therefore supports its genuineness.

Arthur Vööbus (1968:457-463) focuses on the literary order of the Lukan account compared to the Markan order. He observes that in Mark, Judas is singled out as a traitor before the Last Supper, but in Luke Judas' episode is recorded after the Supper. Vööbus interprets this as a deliberate modification by Luke to prevent the traitor from participating in the Supper. He argues the Lukan account is not a mere recording of tradition, but a deliberate modification to urge the contemporary congregation to self-examine themselves so that they should not lapse and backslide like the traitor (1968:459). In consideration of the narrative flow, he prefers the shorter text as original for it arranges the discourse on the traitor right after the bread (v.19a) omitting the second cup and the words of atonement (vv.19b-20). He is of the opinion that the shorter reading without vv.19b-20 portrays smoother narrative flow as v.21 beginning with an adversative conjunction *πλὴν* and a demonstrative particle *ἰδοὺ* directly contrasts with the community participating in the Eucharist (vv.15-19a).

Similarly, John T. Carrol sees the narrative flow is more dramatic without vv.19b-20 (2012:434, 437) and argues the non-Lukan expressions *ἀνάμνησις* and *καινὴ διαθήκη* imply a later interpolation.

Consequently, he argues vv.19b-20 is a later interpolation due to soteriological and liturgical development.

In 1984 Jacobus H. Petzer (1984:249-252) presented a structural analysis of the accounts of the Lord's Supper. Before he moves onto Luke, he analyses a common structure among other accounts of the Supper in Matthew 26:26-30, Mark 14:22-25 and 1 Corinthians 11:23-26. He suggests a common structure (Petzer, 1984:249):

A	a	ἄρτον	sign:	bread/eating
	b	τὸ σῶμά μου	explanation:	body
B	a'	ποτήριον	sign:	cup/drinking
	b'	τὸ αἷμά μου	explanation:	blood
C	c	ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	eschatology:	Kingdom

Based on this structure, Petzer finds a similar structure in Luke 22:15-20, but with two distinctive parts (1984:250-251):

A	a	τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν	sign:	eating (bread)	(15, 16a)
	b	τῆ βασιλεία	explanation:	Kingdom	(16b)
B	a'	τὸ ποτήριον, πίω	sign:	drinking (cup)	(17, 18a)
	b'	ἡ βασιλεία	explanation:	Kingdom	(18b)
A'	a''	ἄρτον	sign:	bread	(19a)
	b''	τὸ σῶμά μου	explanation:	body	(19b)
B'	a+	ποτήριον	sign:	cup	(20a)
	b+	τῷ αἵματί μου	explanation:	blood	(20b)

Considering the structure, he concludes that this symmetry of structures puts more weight on the longer reading so that the longer reading is the original. And he conjectures the scribes have omitted the second cup to avoid the confusion of two cups. John Nolland has taken this structural symmetry of vv.15-18 and 19-20 as the strongest argument against the shorter reading priority (1993:1041, 1056). However, Ehrman has refuted this argument suggesting another possible structure without vv.19b-20 (1993:206-207).

Kobus Petzer (1991:113-129) took a linguistic approach to analyse the style of Luke 22:19b-20. He discusses linguistic features of eleven disputed words or phrases in vv.19b-20²⁴ to see whether they accord with the Lukan style of writing, and concludes that they bear non-Lukan features (1991:120-

²⁴ Petzer analyzes following eleven disputed words or phrases (1991:115-120): ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (v.19, 20), ἐμός (v.19), ἀνάμνησις (v.19), ποτήριον (v.20), ὡσαύτως (v.20), μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι (v.20), δειπνέω (v.20), the omission of the copula (v.20), καινός (v.20), διαθήκη (v.20), ἐκχέω (v.20).

121). However, Petzer, not neglecting the possibility that Luke 22:17-19a may also bear non-Lukan features, discusses five disputed words in vv.17-19a,²⁵ and concludes these words also bear similar non-Lukan features. Then he discusses the styles of possible sources of the Lukan account to see whether they keep their authors' style in their institution account, or they also bear non-authorial styles: in Matthew 26:26-29 he discusses nine readings²⁶ and finds no non-Matthean feature; in Mark 14:22-25 he discusses eight readings²⁷ and finds six possible non-Markan features; and in 1 Corinthians 11:23b-26 he discusses ten readings²⁸ and finds eight possible non-Pauline features. Petzer sees these disaccording features as coming from some source while the language and style are kept. Based on these observations, he concludes all the institution narratives originated from a common source or at least from sources that closely resemble one another. Then he adds, the linguistic discordance is not sizeable enough to conclude that Luke 22:19b-20 has a non-Lukan origin.

Luke T. Johnson (1991:623-630) took a similar approach considering some non-Lukan features in the longer text: nineteen Greek words in agreement with 1 Corinthians 11:24-26; three evident Hebraisms;²⁹ and a different order from other Synoptic accounts. Then he refers to a parallel account found in Epiphanius (*Panarion*, 30.22.4-5) and argues that Epiphanius' parallel account to Luke provides both historical and lexical evidence for the Hebrew source. He concludes the longer text reflects a longer Hebrew tradition of Jesus' final Passover, slightly reinforced with some additions of v.18 and Pauline Passover tradition (1991:625).

²⁵ These five words are (1991:121-122): δέχομαι (v.17), ποτήριον (v.17), εὐχαριστέω (v.17), γένημα (v.18), ἄμπελος (v.18).

²⁶ Petzer discusses nine words or phrases in Matthew 26:26-29 (1991:123-124): εὐχαριστέω (v.27), διαθήκη (v.28), ἐκχέω (v.28), εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (v.28), ἀπ' ἄρτι (v.29), γένημα (v.29), ἄμπελος (v.29), καινός (v.29), ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς (v.29). Among these he finds three possible non-Matthean features (εὐχαριστέω, ἐκχέω and ἀπ' ἄρτι), but he sees them as parallel expressions of which Matthew does not often use.

²⁷ Petzer discusses eight words or phrases in Mark 14:22-25 (1991:124-125): εὐχαριστέω (v.23), διαθήκη (v.24), ἐκχέω (v.24), ὑπὲρ πολλῶν (v.24), γένημα (v.25), ἄμπελος (v.25), τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης (v.25), καινός (v.25). Among these he sees διαθήκη, ἐκχέω, γένημα, ἄμπελος, the grammatical use of καινός, and ὑπὲρ πολλῶν as possible non-Markan features.

²⁸ Petzer discussed ten words or expressions 1 Corinthians 11:23b-26 (1991:125-126): κλάω (v.24), μου (v.24), ἀνάμνησις (v.24), ὡσαύτως (v.25), μετὰ τὸ δειπῆσαι (v.25), δειπνέω (v.25), λέγων (v.25), καινός (v.25), ὁσάκις ἔαν (v.25, 26), ἄχρι οὗ (v.26). Among these he sees ἀνάμνησις, δειπνέω, λέγων, ὁσάκις ἔαν, κλάω, the position of μου, μετὰ τὸ δειπῆσαι, the way καινός is used, as non-Pauline features.

²⁹ Johnson finds three Hebraisms: καὶ ἐγένετο (v.14), ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα (v.15), and οὗ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου (v.18). He argues καὶ ἐγένετο derives from Hebrew, ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα reflects the Hebrew infinitive absolute, and οὗ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου reflects Isaiah 32:12 (1991:624n41).

2.4.4 Studies by Bart D. Ehrman

Since the discovery of P⁷⁵, scholarly arguments seemed to have tilted towards the longer reading, but Ehrman (1993) presents another turning point in the argument. Starting with a discussion about the legitimacy of the “Western non-interpolations,” he claims this problem is so complex so that external arguments cannot conclude the problem, and moves to the intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities. With respect to the intrinsic probabilities, he firstly gives three examples of non-Lukan linguistic features³⁰ and insists that the uniqueness of these words only found in Luke 22:19b-20 must not be overlooked. He then highlights the atonement theology these words carry and argues that this theology does not correspond to the theology the rest of the Luke carries.³¹ Here, Ehrman makes a specific discussion about Acts 20:28, which is often brought up as an example of Lukan atonement theology (Kimbell, 2014:53-58; *et al.*). Contra arguments associating Acts 20:28 with the Pauline theology of atonement while focusing on the phrase *περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου*, he argues *περιεποιήσατο* does not imply Jesus’ self-giving act as an atoning sacrifice, but God’s action using Jesus’ blood to acquire the church. He interprets this phrase in light of Acts 5:28 that the blood of Jesus works as a medium to arouse the cognizance of guilt which leads one to repentance (1993:202).

Then he moves on to the discussion about the structure of Luke 22:15-20. He recalls Petzer’s structure, a bipartite quadruple ‘sign-explanation’ pairs (1984:250-251), and evaluates it to be less appropriate as Ehrman considers v.19a to be a leading clause for the following pericope (vv.19a, 21-22) instead of being a closing clause of the institution (vv.15-18). He suggests an alternative parallel structure (1993:206-207):

A	a	τὸ πάσχα	(15)
	b	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ... ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ	(16)
B	a’	τὸ ποτήριον	(17)
	b’	λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ... ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ	(18)
A’	a’’	τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου	(19a)
	b’’	πλὴν ... παραδίδόντος	(21)
B’	a+	ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου	(22a)
	b+	πλὴν ... παραδίδοται	(22b)

³⁰ Ehrman picks up three cases: ὑπερ ὑμῶν, ἀνάμνησιν, and καινὴ διαθήκη (1996:199). It seems Ehrman has chosen the most obvious three out of eleven cases discussed by Petzer (1991:120-121).

³¹ Arguing against the atonement theology, Ehrman brings up examples of Luke’s usage of biblical sources while omitting the idea of atonement (Ehrman, 1996:199-203): Acts 8:32-33 quoting Isaiah 53:7-8 omitting v.5 of 10; Luke 22:27 compared to Mark 10:45 (Aland, 1996:354); Luke 23:45 compared to Mark 15:38-39; Luke 23:47 compared to Mark 15:39.

Ehrman argues this structure reveals Jesus' fate in light of the coming Kingdom of God, the fate of Jesus' disciples who would partake of this meal with him, and the martyrdom due to the betrayal (1993:207).

Lastly, Ehrman focuses on the transcriptional probabilities and insists that there is no possible explanation for the shorter text if the longer text is original. Based on the argument that Luke has eliminated the theology of atonement, he argues the shorter reading would have been useful for the proto-orthodox Christians of the second century who wanted to emphasise the martyrdom of Jesus, but later it would have been an obstacle for orthodox Christians who needed to stress against the docetists that Christ had experienced a real passion in his body being broken and his blood being shed for the sins of the world (1993:208-209). Ehrman concludes the Lukan account portrayed his own understanding of Jesus' last meal and death, but later Christians needed to emphasise Jesus' death as an atoning sacrifice, therefore interpolated the familiar institution narrative reflected in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25.

Ehrman's arguments from theological, structural and transcriptional aspects drew consent from recent prominent scholars (Elliott, 1994:405-406; Parker, 1994:704-708; Hernandez, Jr., 2012:133-134; *et al.*), and especially Parker who sees the longer text as a later harmonisation (1997:154-155) repeatedly made a compliment to Ehrman's arguments (1994:707; 1997:156).

2.4.5 Studies concerning transcriptional probabilities

A preliminary study taking the socio-historical aspect into account was started in 1984 by George Rice. A fundamental assumption behind this approach is that the scribe(s) of the prototype of the "Western" texts have altered the text, especially the "Western non-interpolations," in reaction to the religious or social circumstances they had faced. Rice takes the "Western non-interpolations" as a group of alterations through which a single editorial concern penetrates.³² In order to conjecture the scribe's intention, Rice investigates the additions, omissions, and substitutions in the resurrection accounts (Luke 23:53-24:41) and discusses possible causes for each alteration. He argues the additions and omissions of Codex Bezae present reasons for the unbelief of the apostles, i.e., supplying defense for their faith. Based on his observations he concludes the "Western" texts have altered the longer Alexandrian text to provide a defense of the apostolate (1984:1-15). His attempt to discover a theological tendency should be commended. However, its limited extent to Luke 23:53-24:41

³² Such a view taking the "Western non-interpolations" as a group of alterations with an editorial concern is common to the scholars using socio-historical approaches (See below for other scholars). On the contrary, scholars like Klyne Snodgrass sees the "Western non-interpolations" as scattered individuals which have occurred by accidents or for different reasons respectively (1972:369-379).

comparing only two manuscripts, B and D as representatives for each text-type resulted in a rough conjecture.³³ Moreover, his selective use of the textual alterations, not only using the singular readings of Codex Bezae or the alterations common to other “Western” manuscripts but also taking into account the alterations attested by “non-Western” Greek manuscripts,³⁴ have resulted in some speculations.

Mikeal C. Parsons, in his discussion about the influence of P⁷⁵ on the “Western non-interpolations,” highlights the manuscript tradition in which two distinguished text-types have been preserved. He ascribes such a well-preserved tradition to the result of deliberate scribal activity, i.e., a theological tendency of P⁷⁵ or Codex Bezae (1986:469). In order to make a precise argument about scribal intention, Parsons claims to use singular readings:

In this regard, singular readings, that is, readings found in only one Greek manuscript, are most useful. Because of the early date of P⁷⁵, we may expect to find fewer true singular readings. Singular readings constitute only a relative category at best, since new manuscript discoveries could remove the “singularity” of any reading (cf. P⁷⁵ and B). Of secondary importance, but important nonetheless, are all other variants, subsingular and insignificant, which should be examined in the light of the broader theological context. In addition, harmonisations with passages in the other Gospels, vocabulary preferences, changes toward concise expression, additions for clarification, significant sense changes, and changes in word order, all contribute to the understanding of scribal purposes and theological tendencies (Parsons, 1986:470).

Contrary to Rice, Parsons focuses on the singular and subsingular readings of P⁷⁵,³⁵ and claims P⁷⁵ to have Christological interests. He then takes into account a geographical reference to the discovery of P⁷⁵, arguing Abu Mana is close enough to the place where Nag Hammadi codices were found. From

³³ On top of that, Mikeal C. Parsons presents a critical comment that, in order to be convinced, Rice should have examined the entire Synoptics in Codex Bezae (1986:471).

³⁴ This tendency is repeatedly found along his arguments: the omission of ἐξ ἡμῶν in Luke 24:22 is also attested by “non-Western” manuscripts (0211, 157, *et al.*); in Luke 24:24 the substitution of εἶδομεν for εἶδον is attested by only two “Western” manuscripts (d and e) while the “Western” manuscripts (a, aur, b, c, f, ff², l, r¹) read *viderunt*; the substitution of ἦν ἡμῶν κεκαλύμμενη for ἡμῶν κατομένη ἦν in Luke 24:32 is also attested by Coptic Sahidic; the addition of λυπούμενοι in Luke 24:33 is attested only by partial “Western” manuscripts (*tristes* in c and e; *contristati* in d) and by Coptic Sahidic while a, aur, b, f, ff², l and r¹ omit; the substitution of λέγοντες for λέγοντας is again attested by “non-Western” manuscripts (1200, *et al.*) and various Syriac versions; the omission of καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς εἰρήνη ὑμῖν is again attested by partial “Western” manuscripts (omission in a, b, d, ff², l and r¹; *et dixit illis: Pax vobiscum* in c; *et dicit eis: Pax vobis* in aur; *et dixit eis: Pax vobis* in f); he leaves out two “Western non-interpolations” in Luke 24:51-52. Consequently, it is hard to see Rice’s argument as purely based on Codex Bezae or the “Western” witnesses.

³⁵ Parsons takes some examples of singular and subsingular readings in Luke and John (1986:472-475): Luke 16:30; 16:19; 9:34; 22:47; 9:48; 11:31; 23:3; 24:26; John 2:15; 8:57; 6:19.

this, he conjectures the scribe of P⁷⁵ should be concerned with the problem of Christian Gnosticism, especially with regard to the resurrection of Jesus. On top of that, he applies this presumption to the “Western non-interpolations” and concludes P⁷⁵ has altered the text for polemical purposes to accentuate an already exalted Christology.³⁶ Parsons here omits the discussion about Luke 22:19b-20, however, he has formerly clarified that Luke 22:19b-20 is to “be explained as a theological *Tendenz* on the part of P⁷⁵ or Codex D” (1986:469). Therefore, it can be deduced that he supports the shorter reading as original and sees Luke 22:19b-20 as a deliberate interpolation on polemical grounds against Gnosticism.

Parsons has improved Rice’s method by taking singular and subsingular readings into account. However, he does not state which or how many manuscripts have been taken into account while collating manuscripts to identify singular or subsingular readings. Consequently, there are many inadequate judgements in Parsons’ argument.³⁷ Moreover, he shows a tendency to be selective while choosing singular and subsingular readings for his argument,³⁸ and it results in some speculations.

Michael W. Martin (2005:269-294) is another scholar who sees the “Western non-interpolations” as a group of alterations by a single post-orthodox scribe with a certain theological motive. He begins with a discussion about the arguments of his predecessors, Parsons and Ehrman.³⁹ He basically agrees

³⁶ Parsons classifies the “Western non-interpolations” into three categories (1986:476-477): (1) the emphasis on the empty tomb and the resurrection in Luke 24:3 and 6 showing some relation to Matthew (or Mark); (2) apostolic witnesses to the risen Lord in Luke 24:12, 36, and 40 showing dependence on John; (3) highlights on the exaltation of Christ in Luke 24:51 and 52.

³⁷ As Parsons formerly insisted, “Singular readings constitute only a relative category” (1986:470), decisions on singular readings may be influenced by adding a manuscript. Consider a certain reading was declared singular, if a new manuscript with the same reading which has not been used for manuscript collation is added to the collation, that reading becomes no longer a singular reading. Therefore, it is important to state which manuscripts have been used so that no confusion may occur due to the limitation on the number of manuscripts. Such confusion seems to occur along the arguments where Parsons claims to be singular or subsingular, but it cannot actually be seen as singular or subsingular: the omission of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in Luke 9:34 is not singular nor subsingular as it is attested by many Greek manuscripts (P45, 02, 032, 038, 04, 05, 18, 2860, *et al.*); the substitution in Luke 22:47 is attested by 035, 036, 16, 475, 1579; the transposition in Luke 9:48 is attested by D, 1, 6, 118, 131, 205, 209, 579, 726, 827, *et al.*; the substitution in Luke 11:31 is attested by P45, 1424, d; the omission in Luke 23:3 is attested by 047, 6, 60, 544, 1685 and many Latin manuscripts. Parsons claims these readings to be singular or subsingular, but there are way too many witnesses to let them be singular or subsingular.

³⁸ Fee lists 49 singular readings and 36 subsingular readings of P⁷⁵ in Luke (Epp & Fee, 1993:262). However, Parson has listed only 10 readings from Luke and 3 readings from John (1986:472-475).

³⁹ Parsons sees the “Western non-interpolations” as a group of alterations having Christological concern, viz. anti-Gnostic *Tendenz* (1986:463-479). Ehrman, although he argues the “Western non-interpolations” should be treated case-by-case as individual, narrows down Parsons’ theory by placing the “Western non-interpolations” in a sub-category of Gnosticism, viz. anti-docetic *Tendenz* (Martin, 2005:288-290).

with Parsons that the “Western non-interpolations” bear a Christological concern, viz. anti-Gnosticism, but then he takes a sub-category different from Ehrman who argued for anti-docetic motive, viz. anti-separationist *Tendenz*.⁴⁰ Like Parsons, Martin does not discuss much about Luke 22:19b-20, however, it can be deduced that he supports the shorter reading as original for he sees Luke 22:19b-20 as a deliberate interpolation on polemical grounds against separationism.

Whereas Rice, Parsons, and Martin have focused on a theological unity of the “Western non-interpolations,” Bradley S. Billings (2006a; 2006b) focuses on the socio-historical context of Codex Bezae in which the scribe might have altered the text. Before he enters the main thesis, he briefly overviews the precedent text-critical, linguistic and source-critical, and theological arguments and acknowledges that there are non-Lukan features in Luke 22:19b-20. However, he argues these non-Lukan features might have derived from a traditional liturgical formula, therefore suggests the longer text priority (2006a, 509-512; 2006b:22-60). He then focuses on the socio-historical context of the early Christianity, especially on the accusations brought against Christian meal practices (Pliny, *Epistulae* 10.96; Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition* 23; Tertullian, *De anima* 9; *De corona militis* 3; *Ad uxorem* 2.4-5; Tacitus, *Annales* 14.17; 15.44). Billings places the context of Codex Bezae along this stream of social accusations and apology (Justin Martyr, *First Apology* 26; Theophilus, *Ad Autolytus* 3.4-15; Tertullian, *Ad nationes* 1.7; *Apologeticum* 7; Minucius Felix, *Octavius* 7-9; Melito, *Petition*; Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 4.26; Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 25; Lactantius, *Institutiones Divinae* 7.26; Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* 31-35; Origen, *Contra Celsum* 6.27) and argues the most prominent reason for the persecution against Christians in the second century was the meal practices of the Christian community, which was misunderstood or misappropriated as cannibalism (2006a:515-518). With reference to Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 5.1-3) he finally suggests that the intense local persecution of Lyons in 177 C.E. could be a possible socio-historical context of the prototype of Codex Bezae and other “Western” manuscripts (2006a:523-524), and that a scribe of the “Western” prototype, who wanted to protect the church from the persecution, leaving only up to the beginning of the Eucharistic formula (v.19a: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου), deliberately omitted the problematic words (vv.19b-20) which might have provoked social accusations (2006a:525-526).

Whereas Billings finds a reason for the shorter recension from an apologetic context, Tim Carter (2010:550-582) finds a reason from a heretical context, viz. Marcionites’ recension. His argument is based on a fundamental assumption that the “Western non-interpolations” in Luke are revised by a single person or a certain community. Consequently, he holds the “Western non-interpolations” to bear

⁴⁰ Martin suggests three reasons (2005:291-293): (1) the concentration of eight “Western non-interpolations” in the resurrection account makes more sense as an anti-separationist polemic; (2) the phrase “Lord Jesus” in Luke 24:3 is an affirmation of the post-resurrection unity and materiality of the divinity and the humanity, thus it is more likely to be anti-separationist *Tendenz*; (3) the addition of a phrase “And they worshiped him” in 24:52 accentuates the divinity of Jesus, thus it is more suited for combating separationism than docetism.

a common theological interest and observes seven out of eight shorter readings⁴¹ occur in the resurrection narrative, and these seven passages are concerned with the body of Jesus. In order to justify his argument, he makes a comparison between Marcionite readings⁴² and P⁷⁵ on Luke 24:39, which he regards as “a window into the text of Marcion’s gospel, his practice of editing Luke, and his Christology” (Carter, 2010:551), and affirms Marcion made a recension⁴³ according to his docetic theology. Then he compares P⁷⁵, D, and Marcionite text, and suggests that Marcion is responsible for the alterations found in the “Western” text. Consequently, Carter sees the omission of Luke 22:19b-20 as a Marcionite alteration. Referring to Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* III.8.5 and IV.40.4-5, he finds a reason for which Marcionites might have wanted to omit the second cup: “A reference to Jesus’ blood does not sit easily with a docetic Marcionite Christology” (2010:577).

2.5 Summary

Luke 22:19b-20 is one of the most challenging problems in the New Testament textual criticism. It has a very complex history of transmission with six different readings in consideration. The reversed tendency of the “Western” manuscripts in nine “Western non-interpolations” brings difficulty despite the overwhelming number of the manuscripts attesting the longer reading. Both the longer and the shorter readings are dated as early as the second century, and patristic evidence can be interpreted for either side. Therefore, most scholars agree that the external evidences are not enough to resolve this problem. Some scholars have tried to tackle this problem on intrinsic aspects considering linguistic styles or literary structures. However, interpretation of non-Lukan features in vv.19b-20 diverged, and different structures with or without vv.19b-20 were suggested. Consequently, modern scholars tend to focus on the transcriptional probabilities, especially on the “Western non-interpolations” as a group. This approach helps to identify the theological tendency of scribes. However, this approach still needs elaborative development based on full manuscript collation and a complete list of the variation-units. Considering the works of predecessors, it seems that they have left some tasks to the successors: a

⁴¹ Carter identifies the seven readings in four scenes (2010:567): the body of Jesus missing from the tomb (Luke 24:3, 6, 12); Jesus appears to greet his disciples (Luke 24:36); Jesus lets his disciples touch his hands and feet (Luke 24:40); Jesus’ ascension to heaven prompts the disciples to worship (Luke 24:51-52).

⁴² Carter presents three main sources for Marcionite Gospel of Luke (2010:553-554): Tertullian’s *Adversus Marcionem* IV.43.6 and *De carne Christi* 5.9 (pre-220 C.E.); Adamantius’ *Dialogue on the True Faith in God* 5.1 and 5.12 (290-300 C.E.); and Epiphanius’ *Pananon* 42 and *Scholion* 78 (272-337 C.E.).

⁴³ Carter compares Marcion’s Luke 24:39 reconstructed from Tertullian and Epiphanius, with Ignatius’ quotation of Luke 24:39 from *Letter to the Smyrnaeans* 3.1-2, and concludes that Ignatius testifies to a pre-Marcionite version of Luke 24:39, which records the fleshly nature of Jesus (2010:561-565). Consequently, it attests that Marcion has revised the earlier text according to his theology.

thorough collation of the entire Lukan manuscripts; a fine evaluation of the “Western non-interpolations”; and a thorough study of variations of the “Western” texts from the majority texts. Combining the external and transcriptional probabilities, these can reveal a possible genealogy of the manuscripts and theological tendencies of scribes of each manuscript. This leads to the decision about methodology in the next chapter.

Chapter 3. Methodology

3.1 Introduction

During the past 100 years, many scholars have tried to solve the textual problem of Luke 22:19b-20, but there have been limitations due to resources and text-critical methods. The days of Westcott-Hort was the time when the Textus Receptus was just overcome, and the principles of textual criticism were developing. Since then, there has been progress in resources and methodology, but they have not been appropriately applied to this textual problem. This chapter will first discuss the limitations of the previous methods, and then propose an application of a more advanced method.

3.2 Limitations of the previous methods

Westcott-Hort's systematic principles of textual criticism had a significant influence on modern critical editions. Most editions after the Westcott-Hort derive text-critical principles and methodologies from Westcott-Hort's work. Since then, on the one hand, there has been significant advances concerning the number of manuscripts. Over 90 papyri, over 290 uncials, over 2,800 minuscules, almost 2,300 lectionaries, and over tens of thousands of versional manuscripts and patristic quotations were discovered since Westcott-Hort's work (Clarke, 1997:35-36).⁴⁴ On the other hand, however, it has been questioned by many scholars how much methodological advance has been made (Epp, 1974; 1980; Hurtado, 1999; Wasserman, 2013:581-582).⁴⁵ The text-type theory has developed very little since Johann A. Bengel (1687-1752), and it is still used by some scholars, especially among the majority reading advocates (Parker, 2008:172-174; Wallace, 2013). In consideration of the manuscripts, most scholars have gradually concluded that no single manuscript or a group of manuscripts preserve the original. Therefore, they claimed to pursue the original text in variant-by-variant analysis rather than to consider an individual manuscript or a text-type to be preserving the original text. Consequently, most scholars rely on the eclectic method, either through reasoned eclecticism or thoroughgoing eclecticism (Epp & Fee 1993:124-173; Elliot 2013:745-770; Holmes 2013:771-802). The most widely used critical

⁴⁴ Westcott-Hort did not mention any papyrus in his work but only used 45 uncials and about 150 minuscules (Westcott-Hort, 1881).

⁴⁵ In 1974, Epp pointed out five areas of deficiency in text-critical progress (Epp, 1974:387-405): (1) lack of progress in popular critical editions; (2) lack of progress towards a theory and history of the earliest New Testament text; (3) lack of progress in major critical editions/apparatuses; (4) lack of progress in the evaluation of readings; (5) the return of the Textus Receptus. Six years later, Epp applied the same categories to evaluate the contemporary textual criticism and finds some progress in popular critical editions and in textual theories. However, he concludes a more solid foundation is necessary (Epp, 1980:135-151).

edition, Nestle-Aland, from the 26th edition onwards adopted the reasoned eclectic method, which the Alands called the local-genealogical method (Aland & Aland, 1979:42-43). However, it has been pointed out that eclecticism is only a temporary solution to the basic problems in the New Testament textual criticism (Epp, 1976:256). More than half a century ago, Clark evaluated eclecticism as follows:

It is the only procedure available to us at this stage, but it is very important to recognize that it is a secondary and tentative method. It is not a new method nor a permanent one; it does not supplant the more thorough procedure of Westcott and Hort but only supplants it temporarily. The eclectic method cannot by itself create a text to displace Westcott-Hort and its offspring. It is suitable only for exploration and experimentation. ... The eclectic method, by its very nature, belongs to a day like ours in which we know only that the traditional theory of the text is faulty but cannot yet see clearly to correct the fault (Clark, 1956:37-38).

Modern scholars largely agree with this statement while acknowledging the limitations of eclecticism (Epp & Fee, 1993:36; Clarke, 1997:46; Hull Jr., 2010:146). The Alands once claimed in their first edition of *Der Text des Neuen Testaments* that their edition (i.e., NA26) contained the “Standard Text” (1981:25, 34-35), but gradually acknowledged the limitation.⁴⁶ Consequently, the editorial committee has adopted the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) and the results of the *Editio Critica Maior* (ECM), which uses the CBGM to trace the genealogy of the manuscripts. From NA28 onwards the Nestle-Aland is being revised based on the results of the ECM.⁴⁷

Due to the development of technology since the twenty-first century, New Testament textual criticism is rapidly transforming. The text-type theory has been refined as text-groups based on mutual relationship between manuscripts (Epp, 2013:519-577; Parker, 2008:165-174, 305-308; Wasserman & Gurry, 2017:7-10; Epp & Fee (eds.), 1993). Instead of using the test passages (*Teststellen*) only,⁴⁸ the

⁴⁶ It has been repeatedly pointed out that the Alands’ manuscript classification and the Five Categories reflect inconsistency (Epp, 1989:224-228; Ehrman, 1989:381-384; Metzger & Ehrman, 2005:238). Categories I to III rely on the quality of manuscripts, whereas Categories IV and V rely on the text-types (D and Byzantine). Similarly, with the classification, three classes —“free text,” “normal text,” and “strict text”— uses the quality of transmission whereas the fourth class —“D-text”— is just a text-type. The Alands classify and categorise the manuscripts according to textual proximity to the New Testament autograph for which they use the classification and the categories. This is a circular argument.

⁴⁷ NA28 adopted the results of the *ECM: IV. The Catholic Letters* (2013) and revised the Catholic Letters (2012). Now, NA29 is waiting for the revision while adopting the result of the *ECM: III. The Acts of the Apostles* (2018). It is currently scheduled to be published in 2020/2021. The ECM project is planned to be completed by 2030. In the meantime, Nestle-Aland edition will continually be revised according to the result of the ECM until the publication of a new hand edition planned for 2032 (Parker, 2012:111-112).

⁴⁸ *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* series use the “test passages (*Teststellen*).” This method is useful to distinguish obvious text-types such as Byzantine tradition. However, it

whole manuscript can be collated to build up genealogical stemma. However, text-critical studies on individual passages have not yet followed up the developed methods. In the case of Luke 22:19b-20, this passage is excluded from the *Teststellen* (Aland, Aland & Wachtel, 2003) due to the abnormal characteristics of the “Western non-interpolations” compared to the other Lukan passages. According to Parker’s report about the progress of the ECM project (2012:112), it seems the revision of the Gospel of Luke still requires much time.⁴⁹ In the meantime, however, some of the developed methods can be applied to the study of Luke 22:19b-20.

3.3 Quantitative Analysis of the manuscripts

3.3.1 Manuscript collation

Manuscript collation is the most fundamental task in textual criticism. Before doing any text-critical study, differences between manuscripts have to be listed and analysed, and the manuscript relation has to be established. Traditionally manuscripts were collated manually on paper against a chosen base text, and only the differences were listed so that an editor drew attention to the variant readings as a feature of the manuscript in relation to other manuscripts (Parker, 2008:95-101). However, the amount of the manuscripts was beyond a surmountable quantity, so that it was impossible to draw the entire manuscript relationship. The obvious consequences were errors and delays. Therefore, text-critical works often depended on the estimations such as *Teststellen* and the profile methods (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005:236-239). However, since the development of computing technology, full collation of the whole manuscripts can now be made against each and every other. For the computerised collation, the Münster Institut and the International Greek New Testament Project (IGNTP) have been transcribing the manuscripts into text format (XML) according to the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI)

cannot answer all the questions concerning the relationship of the manuscripts since it is based only on the “test passages,” rather than full collations of each manuscript (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005:238, 247; Epp, 2013:548-549).

⁴⁹ Parker reports, “So far only the Catholic Epistles have appeared. Work on Acts is nearing completion [completed in 2017], John is not far behind, and Mark is in hand. Paul is beginning in Birmingham and work on the Apocalypse has started in Wuppertal” (2012:112). Here, the absence of any comment about Matthew and Luke implies the delayed progress of the gospels due to the delay in digitisation of manuscripts. New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room (NTVMR) records 1775 Greek manuscripts (*Liste*, accessed on 23 September 2019), but only 1.5% have been digitised so far. In order to apply CBGM, 100% of manuscripts should be digitised before making the full collation. I inquired of professor Parker on e-mail about the progress of the digitisation of the manuscripts of Luke and the possibility of applying CBGM on Luke. He replied, “The Münster Institution will be starting to make them for their edition, but not for a while as I understand it. Applying the CBGM would require collecting the data for the whole gospel, so while this is the right approach, I’m afraid that it’s not going to happen any time soon ...” (11 March 2019).

standard (Parker, 2008:101-103; Houghton, 2013:31-60). Then the computerised manuscript collation tool (CollateX, *et al.*) is used to automatically align the manuscripts⁵⁰ (Appendix 1) so that the variations can easily be seen and compared.⁵¹

3.3.2 Measuring the manuscript relationship

Once manuscripts have been collated, it is necessary to determine and measure the relationship between manuscripts. The most acknowledged method for accurate measurement of manuscript relationship is Quantitative Analysis. It measures the percentage of agreement between a pair of manuscripts at all places of variation where both are extant and legible (*viz.* variation-unit). Traditionally, the quantitative relationship was measured against a base text, usually the Stephanus edition of the *Textus Receptus*. However, this way was inefficient to reflect statistically significant results.

In 1969, Ernest C. Colwell and Ernest W. Tune presented a refined method of the Quantitative Analysis. They suggested the following eight points of improvement (Colwell & Tune, 1969:56-69): (1) a broad cross-section of manuscripts must be used which will include representatives of all text-types; (2) the section of text used should be large enough to give several hundred places of variation—the more, the better; (3) all the varieties of readings at the place of variation should be listed; (4) the readings which occur commonly in manuscripts as the result of scribal error or habit should be eliminated; (5) those places where the vast majority of manuscripts agree and each of the few disagreeing manuscripts has a unique reading should be eliminated; (6) those places where all manuscripts divide into groups of manuscripts which support two or more variant readings should be considered; (7) the number of times a certain manuscript agrees with any other manuscript out of a given number of places can be tabulated and converted into percentages; (8) these percentages represent a reasonably accurate picture of the quantitative difference between individual manuscripts. Colwell then suggested a quantitative definition of a text-group as “a group of manuscripts that agree more than 70% of the time and is separated by a gap about 10% from its neighbours.”

This refined method obtained much consent among the text-critical scholarship,⁵² and even further refinement was made by later scholars according to their use (Fee, 1968:28-34, 42-43; Hurtado,

⁵⁰ The computer only takes part to align the manuscripts, and the rest of the works are on the researcher’s hand. An optional feature a computer can do is the normalisation process, which makes the computer ignore the insignificant variations caused by punctuation or orthographic differences. For details, refer to Dekker (2014).

⁵¹ For detailed algorithms and applications of CollateX, refer to Dekker and Nury (Dekker, *et al.*, 2014; Nury, 2018).

⁵² Most recently, Quantitative Analysis was adopted in CBGM for the first step to find the pre-genealogical coherence. The percentage of agreement between manuscripts sketches manuscript relationships. For details, refer to Wasserman & Gurry (2017:27-28, 37-58) and Gerd Mink (2011:144, 157-158).

1981:67-84, 86-88). Quantitative Analysis involves a number of important features —variation-unit, significant and insignificant readings, and singular readings. Before any analysis, these features should be taken into consideration.

3.3.2.1 Variation-unit

Variation-unit is a fundamental concept in modern textual criticism. This idea was introduced by Colwell and Tune, referring to each section or length of the text within which manuscripts present at least two variant forms (Colwell, 1969:97). This term was more precisely defined by Epp as a “segment of text where our Greek manuscripts present at least two variant forms and where, after insignificant readings have been excluded, each variant form has the support of at least two manuscripts” (Epp & Fee, 1993:50). This means the variants are not counted word by word but in a unit. A continuous variation between any two manuscripts is counted as a single difference so that all agreements or disagreements are equally treated (Appendix 1).

Quantitative Analysis is concerned with variation-units. In other words, it deals only those places where textual variations occur, since those places where all manuscripts agree do not provide any information about the proximity between manuscripts. Thus, Quantitative Analysis measures the ratio of a number of variation-units containing any variation, out of a total number of variation-units in which two manuscripts are involved.

However, there is an important procedure before deciding the variation-units. This is to decide which variants are to be taken into consideration and which variants should be excluded from counting.

3.3.2.2 Significant readings and insignificant readings

Since the collection of the Greek manuscripts began in the sixteenth century, over 5,800 Greek New Testament manuscripts have been identified so far, and the number is still increasing.⁵³ What makes the situation worse is the fact that none of the manuscripts preserves readings identical to others. Consequently, there are plenty of places at which manuscripts differ from others. If all these differences were counted as variation-units, it would be inefficient in evaluating the percentage of agreement since a significant portion of the differences among manuscripts resulted from unconscious errors. Therefore, all variants should be distinguished either into significant readings or insignificant readings.

In New Testament textual criticism, a significant reading is defined as a meaningful or useful reading for understanding the nature and characteristic of an individual manuscript and the scribe(s) of

⁵³ The *Liste* in the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room catalogues 140 papyri, 323 uncials, 2951 minuscules, and 2484 lectionaries [2019, September 27].

the manuscript. In contrast, an insignificant reading is defined as an inappropriate, inadequate, or inconclusive reading for text-critical tasks (Epp & Fee, 1993:57). Colwell and Tune classified three types of insignificant readings: nonsense readings, dislocated readings, and singular readings (Colwell & Tune, 1969:100-105). A nonsense reading is a reading that fails to make sense due to lexical or grammatical fault made during the transmission. A dislocated reading involves unintentional scribal errors such as haplography, dittography, harmonisation, hearing errors, transposition of letters, or homoeoteleuton. These are the readings that make sense but can be demonstrated and traced with reasonable certainty to be a scribal error. An expansion of this criterion is the orthographic changes made by scribes: itacism, nu-movables, and abbreviations such as *nomina sacra*. Consequently, all other variants fall into the category of significant readings.

3.3.2.3 Singular readings

The last criterion for insignificant readings is the singular reading. It is a reading found only in a single manuscript without any support from others. In other words, it is a unique reading preserved by a single manuscript. Singular readings are not genetically or genealogically significant since it is virtually impossible for singular readings to preserve the original reading. Furthermore, they cannot be used in comparison with other manuscripts to draw a genealogical relationship since singular readings are unique readings. Therefore, singular readings should be excluded from the data for Quantitative Analysis.

However, singular readings bear historical or theological importance as a window through which the context and the possible intention of the scribal alteration can be reconstructed (Colwell, 1969:116-124; Ehrman, 1993; 2013:803-825). After excluding nonsense singular readings, all other features — orthographic differences, scribal corrections, harmonisations, and various alterations— can be considered to reflect scribal habit and ideology.

3.4 Research method

3.4.1 Research procedures

The primary purpose of this study is to decide whether the shorter or the longer reading is more original by tracing theological tendencies of the manuscript containing the shorter reading. The long history of discussion on this problem has shown the difficulty of making a decision since most arguments approached this problem in a narrow scope while isolating this passage from other “Western non-interpolations” or, from other significant variants. Methodological development within textual criticism

has convinced scholars that textual problems require a broad scope of study, that is, the full collation of all and the entire manuscripts and analyses based on this thorough collation.

This study presupposes that the longer or the shorter reading is a result of deliberate scribal alteration and that there was some theological context behind the scribe's intention. And this intention may be revealed by the full collation of the manuscripts of Luke. The differences between manuscripts will reveal possible traces of scribal intention. Among the variants, this study will particularly focus on the singular readings of Codex Bezae since the most apparent alterations which convey the scribe's intention are the singular readings, and Codex Bezae has peculiarities which may draw a more vivid picture of the context.⁵⁴ Therefore, this study requires the following tasks:

Firstly, all manuscripts of Luke should be collated, and variation-units should be decided with significant readings only. Here, insignificant readings —nonsense readings, dislocated readings, orthographic differences, and singular readings— should be excluded from the decision of the variations-units since they do not provide information about genealogical relationships. For the manuscript collation, CollateX will be used for the automated alignment of the manuscripts with the manuscript transcriptions from the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room (NTVMR), maintained by Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF), and the Center for New Testament Restoration (CNTR).

Secondly, it is important to group manuscripts according to proximity and to isolate the manuscripts supporting the shorter reading. Quantitative Analysis will draw the percentage of agreement between the manuscripts. The mutual relationship of all manuscripts should be calculated based on the ratio of the total number of variation-units to the number of variation-units showing mutual agreement. After the calculation, manuscripts should be grouped according to Colwell's guideline of over 70% agreement with a 10% gap from the neighbours.

Thirdly, once the manuscripts of the shorter reading are isolated, the singular readings of the manuscripts should be studied in comparison with the other manuscripts, preferably P⁷⁵ or B, the earliest manuscripts supporting the longer reading. This comparative study will draw a theological tendency of the scribe(s) of the shorter or the longer text.

3.4.2 Research extent and limitation

In text-critical studies, making a full collation of all existing manuscripts is always a preferable foundational task. However, this task was far from reaching the goal before the development of

⁵⁴ Conversely, it is also possible to study the alterations of a representative manuscript of the longer reading, for example, P⁷⁵. But it is not an efficient way since such manuscript may not clearly expose its theological motivation as explicitly as a manuscript containing many unique readings, such as Codex Bezae.

automated collations, and the full collations of most of the New Testament books are still remaining as an ongoing task. INTF is putting significant effort into the complete digitisation of the entire manuscript collection, but it is only at an elementary stage.⁵⁵ Therefore it is impossible at the current stage to make a full collation based on the entire manuscripts of Luke. However, it is still possible to draw a significant analysis from the transcribed pages so far. Most important manuscripts of the early period up to the ninth century have been transcribed, and the IGNTP has published a series of critical editions of Luke (1984 & 1987), which presents an extensive critical apparatus of Luke. This study will use the transcriptions of INTF and CNTR for the manuscript collation (Appendix 2), then use IGNTP apparatus (Appendix 3) to refine the variation-units and to pick over the singular readings. Although the number of transcriptions is not much compared to the massive volume of works, their coverage is extensive from the earliest period to the fourteenth century, and most manuscripts after the ninth century preserve the almost identical Byzantine text-type. Therefore, the combination of the transcribed manuscripts and the IGNTP apparatus will provide a reasonably reliable amount of data so that the weight of the data for this study is significant enough to draw some conclusion though it will require some refinement later on.

3.4.3 Basic assumptions and simplifications

A full collation of the entire manuscripts is a desirable method to draw an accurate manuscript relationship and to study the singular readings. Computerisation made the task simpler, but it still requires refinement of methodology and further improvement in manuscript theories. Therefore, it is unavoidable to make some hypotheses.

⁵⁵ NTVMR reports current progress of the manuscript digitisation as follows:

Mss Type	Transcription	Indexed pages	Imaged pages
Papyri	85.51% (1,286/1,504)	84.04% (1,264/1,504)	86.90% (1,307/1,504)
Majuscules	39.04% (10,383/26,599)	80.76% (21,481/26,599)	96.24% (25,598/26,599)
Minuscules	4.95% (65,020/1,312,220)	19.39% (254,478/1,312,220)	93.14% (1,222,185/1,312,220)
Lectionaries	0.22% (1,752/795,563)	1.41% (11,206/795,563)	35.43% (281,866/795,563)
Total	3.67% (78,441/2,135,886)	13.50% (288,429/2,135,886)	71.68% (1,530,956/2,135,886)

*Numbers indicate the catalogued pages
<http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/home> [2019, October 1]

3.4.3.1 The extent of collation

There has been a debate about the extent of variants to count for the collation. Whereas Colwell suggested counting significant readings (1969:100), Gordon D. Fee insisted on including all variations except orthographic changes and weighing the agreements after the counting (1968:28), and Moisés Silva insisted that all variants must be taken into account (1992:23-24). Klaus Wachtel agreed with Silva and argued that objectivity could only be reached with all available evidence taken into account (2003:39). However, Epp pointed against Silva and Wachtel that when all witnesses are included, the results were skewed toward looser relationships among the early witnesses (2013:548). If all variants are taken into account through Quantitative Analysis, the percentage of agreement will noticeably drop since it will amplify the difference made by scribal habits (orthographic changes) or mistakes (dislocated readings or nonsense readings). Perhaps the threshold suggested by Colwell should be lowered below 70%, but neither Fee nor Silva has suggested another threshold. Therefore, this study will stick to Colwell's criteria taking significant readings into account for the collation, as it also draws manuscript relationships fairly with the significant readings.

3.4.3.2 The extent of manuscripts

Another issue is the extent of manuscripts for the collation. Although the Greek New Testament manuscripts are taken as primary sources, early translations are also significant to trace the original reading. Especially, the "Western non-interpolations" are found only in a single Greek manuscript, Codex Bezae, and all other manuscripts supporting them are the early versions in Latin and Syriac. Ideally, all versional manuscripts should be included in the collation. But manuscript collation requires all manuscripts to be in the same language. It would be ideal if a reverse translation into Greek could be done, but it is far from a practical level since the early translations show great fluidness in choice and order of words. Moreover, grammatical differences in different languages make it more difficult to trace the original style and phrasing of the Greek prototype. Therefore, it is important to decide how to take the early versions into consideration during the study.

This study will take all singular readings of Codex Bezae into account. However, since the Old Latin and Syriac manuscripts are important for the study of the "Western non-interpolations," this study will use the IGTP apparatus (1984 & 1987) to trace the agreement at each singular reading. Where it is necessary, the Old Latin manuscripts will be consulted from Jülicher (1954) and the Syriac from George A. Kiraz (1996). In this way, possible errors that might be caused due to the limitation of the number of manuscripts will be minimised, and the actual singular readings will be left to be analysed. Furthermore, this study will take only the New Testament manuscripts into consideration and exclude

the patristic quotations and lectionaries since it is impossible to reconstruct or to trace the complete manuscript behind these sources. These sources cannot be used for the full collation.

3.4.3.3 Problem of diglot

Codex Bezae is the most important witness for the “Western non-interpolations.” This diglot preserves the text in Greek and Latin. A problem raised here is whether this diglot preserves the same tradition of the New Testament. Parker’s study on Codex Bezae in Acts has pointed out that the bilingual tradition of Codex Bezae is a product of several copyings by several scribes and correctors (1992:118-119), and there are many harmonised corrections between Greek (D) or Latin (d) from either direction (Parker, 1992:165; Philip Burton, 2000:22-23). So, it is difficult to decide whether D and d have a common ancestor, or whether one has first derived from the other and were then harmonised with each other by later scribes. Practically, on the one hand, there are many passages on which D is attested only by d. On the other hand, there are a number of singular readings attested only by D. In general, the text of D shows a lot more agreement with d than with other Old Latin manuscripts. In consideration of this observation, therefore, this study will take D and d as a single manuscript.

3.5 Summary

The textual problem of Luke 22:19b-20 raised by Westcott-Hort persisted through several generations unsolved. There have been many attempts from different directions to solve this problem. But, due to the limitations in the text-critical studies, the method applied to this textual problem by most scholars remained on the Westcott-Hort approach. In the meantime, New Testament textual criticism has developed especially since the development of computer technology. The most recent methodologies are still developing, so it is still too early to adopt the newest methods for this study. However, some of the approved developments, such as Quantitative Analysis can be applied. Since the shorter reading of the Lord’s Supper is found only in Codex Bezae, this study will use Quantitative Analysis to isolate the textual group of Codex Bezae (D-text). Then, the singular readings of Codex Bezae will be discussed and categorised to discover any theological concern in the variation from the majority text.

Chapter 4. Quantitative Analysis of manuscripts of Luke and the singular readings of Codex Bezae

4.1 Introduction

The problem of the “Western non-interpolations” is entangled with the authenticity of Codex Bezae. On the one hand, there is no other Greek New Testament manuscript that omits the “Western non-interpolations.” On the other hand, several Latin and Syriac manuscripts omit the “Western non-interpolations.” Since Codex Bezae shows a high percentage of contamination, it has always been in doubt whether it might have preserved any original reading in it. In order to ascertain whether Codex Bezae resulted from some theological bias, firstly, manuscripts in close relationship with Codex Bezae (D-text group) should be isolated to draw their common theological concerns. Then, secondly, some unique features of the D-text group should be studied.

For this reason, the manuscript grouping based on the mutual relationship between each manuscript pairs is required to show whether Codex Bezae preserves a unique text or whether there is any other manuscript in close relationship with Codex Bezae. This study has done a Quantitative Analysis of 28 digitised manuscripts (Appendix 2) with 40 different readings.⁵⁶ Therefore, this chapter will first present the result of the Quantitative Analysis, and then group the manuscripts according to their mutual relationship. Once the D-text group is identified, as the most prominent unique feature, singular readings of the D-text will be picked up and categorised according to their importance.⁵⁷

4.2 Result of Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative relationship between a pair of manuscripts is the percentage of agreement between two manuscripts at all places of variation where both are extant and legible. A high percentage implies that two manuscripts are in close relationship. In order to group manuscripts of close relationships together, it is efficient to list the result in order. Therefore, this study presents the lists of the quantitative relationship for each manuscript, sorted from the highest agreement to the lowest, with the percentage

⁵⁶ In addition to 28 manuscripts, this study has included NA28 for the comparison since most of the scholars and students are familiar with the text of the Nestle-Aland series. Although it is a critical edition, it can serve as a point of comparison.

⁵⁷ From this chapter on, Greek Biblical quotations are quoted from P⁷⁵, Codex Vaticanus, or Codex Bezae. These manuscripts neither have accents nor spaces but written in uncial. Since all these can affect the meaning of the text, manuscripts are transcribed only with spaces for convenience. In this study, therefore, the quotations will be used without accent.

and the actual number of agreements. Tabulations of the statistics of the agreement in each chapter, as well as the whole Gospel of Luke, may be consulted in Appendices 4 and 5.

Table 2. Quantitative relationship of P³

Rank	P ³ vs mss. ⁵⁸	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	01 ^C	93,02%	40/43
2	01*	90,24%	37/41
3	NA28	81,40%	35/43
4	p ^{75*}	80,00%	24/30
5	p ^{75C}	80,00%	24/30
6	03*	79,07%	34/43
7	04*	73,33%	11/15
8	03 ^C	72,09%	31/43
9	p ⁸²	66,67%	4/6
10	032*	65,12%	28/43
11	032 ^C	65,12%	28/43
12	p ^{45*}	60,00%	9/15
13	p ^{45C}	60,00%	9/15
14	04 ^C	56,25%	9/16
15	02*	51,16%	22/43
16	02 ^C	51,16%	22/43
17	038*	48,84%	21/43
18	2860*	48,15%	13/27
19	2860 ^C	48,15%	13/27
20	038 ^C	46,51%	20/43
21	18*	44,19%	19/43
22	18 ^C	44,19%	19/43
23	05*	29,27%	12/41
24	05 ^C	29,27%	12/41

Table 3. Quantitative relationship of P⁴

Rank	P ⁴ vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	p ⁷	100,00%	3/3
2	03*	93,94%	186/198
3	03 ^C	93,43%	185/198
4	NA28	89,90%	178/198

⁵⁸ Under this column, * denotes the first-hand of the manuscript and the superscript c denotes the revised text by later-hands. This applies throughout the thesis.

5	P ^{75*}	82,86%	29/35
6	P ^{75C}	82,86%	29/35
7	01*	78,87%	153/194
8	01 ^C	78,57%	154/196
9	032*	73,89%	133/180
10	032 ^C	73,89%	133/180
11	33	68,72%	134/195
12	04*	62,02%	80/129
13	04 ^C	55,81%	72/129
14	038*	55,56%	110/198
15	038 ^C	55,56%	110/198
16	2860*	51,09%	47/92
17	02*	50,51%	100/198
18	02 ^C	50,51%	100/198
19	2860 ^C	50,00%	46/92
20	18 ^C	47,72%	94/197
21	18*	47,21%	93/197
22	05 ^C	39,33%	70/178
23	05*	38,20%	68/178
24	0312	33,33%	1/3

Table 4. Quantitative relationship of P⁷

Rank	P ⁷ vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁴	100,00%	3/3
2	P ^{75*}	100,00%	3/3
3	P ^{75C}	100,00%	3/3
4	01*	100,00%	4/4
5	01 ^C	100,00%	4/4
6	03*	100,00%	4/4
7	03 ^C	100,00%	4/4
8	032*	100,00%	4/4
9	032 ^C	100,00%	4/4
10	NA28	100,00%	4/4
11	05*	75,00%	3/4
12	05 ^C	75,00%	3/4
13	038*	50,00%	2/4
14	038 ^C	50,00%	2/4
15	18*	50,00%	2/4
16	18 ^C	50,00%	2/4

17	33	50,00%	2/4
18	02*	25,00%	1/4
19	02 ^C	25,00%	1/4
20	2860*	25,00%	1/4
21	2860 ^C	25,00%	1/4

Table 5. Quantitative relationship of P⁴²

Rank	P ⁴² vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	01*	100,00%	3/3
2	01 ^C	100,00%	3/3
3	03*	100,00%	3/3
4	03 ^C	100,00%	3/3
5	05*	100,00%	3/3
6	05 ^C	100,00%	3/3
7	032*	100,00%	3/3
8	032 ^C	100,00%	3/3
9	038*	100,00%	3/3
10	038 ^C	100,00%	3/3
11	NA28	100,00%	3/3
12	02*	66,67%	2/3
13	02 ^C	66,67%	2/3
14	04*	66,67%	2/3
15	04 ^C	66,67%	2/3
16	18*	66,67%	2/3
17	18 ^C	66,67%	2/3
18	33	66,67%	2/3
19	2860*	66,67%	2/3
20	2860 ^C	66,67%	2/3

Table 6. Quantitative relationship of P^{45*}

Rank	P ^{45*} vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	p ^{45C}	100,00%	660/660
2	0181	83,33%	10/12
3	p ⁹⁷	72,73%	8/11
4	NA28	72,12%	476/660
5	p ^{75C}	71,06%	464/653
6	p ^{75*}	70,18%	459/654
7	03*	69,76%	459/658
8	03 ^C	69,45%	457/658

9	01 ^C	63,48%	419/660
10	01 [*]	63,00%	412/654
11	P ³	60,00%	9/15
12	2860 [*]	59,71%	83/139
13	2860 ^C	59,71%	83/139
14	33	58,82%	20/34
15	18 [*]	57,73%	381/660
16	18 ^C	57,73%	381/660
17	032 [*]	57,54%	374/650
18	032 ^C	57,45%	374/651
19	04 [*]	56,66%	217/383
20	02 [*]	55,18%	362/656
21	04 ^C	54,95%	211/384
22	02 ^C	54,95%	361/657
23	45	52,94%	9/17
24	038 [*]	52,60%	344/654
25	038 ^C	52,45%	343/654
26	05 ^C	43,51%	268/616
27	05 [*]	43,32%	266/614

Table 7. Quantitative relationship of P^{45C}

Rank	P ^{45C} vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ^{45*}	100,00%	660/660
2	0181	83,33%	10/12
3	P ⁹⁷	72,73%	8/11
4	NA28	72,16%	477/661
5	P ^{75C}	71,10%	465/654
6	P ^{75*}	70,23%	460/655
7	03 [*]	69,80%	460/659
8	03 ^C	69,50%	458/659
9	01 ^C	63,39%	419/661
10	01 [*]	62,90%	412/655
11	P ³	60,00%	9/15
12	2860 [*]	59,29%	83/140
13	2860 ^C	59,29%	83/140
14	33	58,82%	20/34
15	18 [*]	57,64%	381/661
16	18 ^C	57,64%	381/661
17	032 [*]	57,45%	374/651

18	032 ^C	57,36%	374/652
19	04*	56,51%	217/384
20	45	55,56%	10/18
21	02*	55,10%	362/657
22	04 ^C	55,06%	212/385
23	02 ^C	54,86%	361/658
24	038*	52,52%	344/655
25	038 ^C	52,37%	343/655
26	05 ^C	43,51%	268/616
27	05*	43,32%	266/614

Table 8. Quantitative relationship of P⁶⁹

Rank	P ⁶⁹ vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	0171	83,33%	10/12
2	NA28	77,27%	17/22
3	03*	69,57%	16/23
4	03 ^C	69,57%	16/23
5	01*	68,18%	15/22
6	01 ^C	68,18%	15/22
7	P ^{75*}	65,22%	15/23
8	P ^{75C}	65,22%	15/23
9	038*	63,64%	14/22
10	038 ^C	63,64%	14/22
11	18*	63,64%	14/22
12	18 ^C	63,64%	14/22
13	02*	60,87%	14/23
14	02 ^C	60,87%	14/23
15	032*	60,87%	14/23
16	032 ^C	60,87%	14/23
17	05*	33,33%	7/21
18	05 ^C	33,33%	7/21

Table 9. Quantitative relationship of P^{75*}

Rank	P ^{75*} vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	3/3
2	P ^{75C}	99,01%	1993/2013
3	45	95,00%	19/20
4	03*	90,32%	1810/2004

5	NA28	90,31%	1818/2013
6	03 ^C	90,07%	1806/2005
7	0181	87,50%	21/24
8	P ⁴	82,86%	29/35
9	P ³	80,00%	24/30
10	01 ^C	79,24%	1576/1989
11	01*	76,64%	1509/1969
12	P ⁸²	75,00%	3/4
13	P ⁹⁷	73,91%	17/23
14	P ^{45C}	70,23%	460/655
15	P ^{45*}	70,18%	459/654
16	0171	69,05%	29/42
17	P ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
18	04*	65,82%	597/907
19	33	65,53%	192/293
20	P ⁶⁹	65,22%	15/23
21	2860*	64,68%	315/487
22	2860 ^C	64,48%	314/487
23	0312	62,50%	5/8
24	04 ^C	61,43%	559/910
25	032 ^C	61,38%	1214/1978
26	032*	61,15%	1209/1977
27	02*	59,77%	1196/2001
28	02 ^C	59,68%	1196/2004
29	18 ^C	59,66%	1198/2008
30	18*	59,48%	1192/2004
31	038*	59,46%	1172/1971
32	038 ^C	59,31%	1169/1971
33	05 ^C	39,25%	728/1855
34	05*	38,83%	718/1849

Table 10. Quantitative relationship of P^{75C}

Rank	P ^{75C} vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	3/3
2	P ^{75*}	99,01%	1993/2013
3	45	95,00%	19/20
4	NA28	91,16%	1836/2014
5	03*	91,12%	1827/2005
6	03 ^C	90,88%	1823/2006

7	0181	87,50%	21/24
8	P ⁴	82,86%	29/35
9	P ³	80,00%	24/30
10	01 ^C	79,75%	1587/1990
11	01*	77,01%	1517/1970
12	P ⁸²	75,00%	3/4
13	P ⁹⁷	73,91%	17/23
14	P ^{45C}	71,10%	465/654
15	P ^{45*}	71,06%	464/653
16	0171	69,05%	29/42
17	P ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
18	04*	66,48%	603/907
19	33	65,53%	192/293
20	P ⁶⁹	65,22%	15/23
21	2860*	64,96%	317/488
22	2860 ^C	64,75%	316/488
23	0312	62,50%	5/8
24	04 ^C	62,09%	565/910
25	032 ^C	61,95%	1226/1979
26	032*	61,73%	1221/1978
27	02*	60,54%	1212/2002
28	18 ^C	60,53%	1216/2009
29	02 ^C	60,45%	1212/2005
30	18*	60,35%	1210/2005
31	038*	59,99%	1183/1972
32	038 ^C	59,84%	1180/1972
33	05 ^C	39,69%	737/1857
34	05*	39,28%	727/1851

Table 11. Quantitative relationship of P⁸²

Rank	P ⁸² vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	03*	90,00%	9/10
2	03 ^C	90,00%	9/10
3	NA28	90,00%	9/10
4	01 ^C	80,00%	8/10
5	032*	80,00%	8/10
6	032 ^C	80,00%	8/10
7	P ^{75*}	75,00%	3/4
8	P ^{75C}	75,00%	3/4

9	01*	70,00%	7/10
10	P ³	66,67%	4/6
11	05*	66,67%	4/6
12	05 ^C	66,67%	4/6
13	038*	50,00%	5/10
14	038 ^C	50,00%	5/10
15	18*	40,00%	4/10
16	18 ^C	40,00%	4/10
17	2860*	40,00%	4/10
18	2860 ^C	40,00%	4/10
19	02*	20,00%	2/10
20	02 ^C	20,00%	2/10

Table 12. Quantitative relationship of P⁹⁷

Rank	P ⁹⁷ vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	NA28	95,65%	22/23
2	03*	91,30%	21/23
3	03 ^C	91,30%	21/23
4	01 ^C	86,36%	19/22
5	032*	82,61%	19/23
6	032 ^C	82,61%	19/23
7	18*	82,61%	19/23
8	18 ^C	82,61%	19/23
9	01*	81,82%	18/22
10	02*	78,26%	18/23
11	02 ^C	78,26%	18/23
12	038*	77,27%	17/22
13	038 ^C	77,27%	17/22
14	P ^{75*}	73,91%	17/23
15	P ^{75C}	73,91%	17/23
16	P ^{45*}	72,73%	8/11
17	P ^{45C}	72,73%	8/11
18	05*	50,00%	11/22
19	05 ^C	50,00%	11/22

Table 13. Quantitative relationship of P¹¹¹

Rank	P ¹¹¹ vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	NA28	83,33%	10/12

2	18*	75,00%	9/12
3	18 ^C	75,00%	9/12
4	P ^{75*}	66,67%	8/12
5	P ^{75^C}	66,67%	8/12
6	02*	66,67%	8/12
7	02 ^C	66,67%	8/12
8	032*	66,67%	8/12
9	032 ^C	66,67%	8/12
10	038*	66,67%	8/12
11	038 ^C	66,67%	8/12
12	01 ^C	63,64%	7/11
13	01*	60,00%	6/10
14	03*	58,33%	7/12
15	03 ^C	58,33%	7/12
16	05*	33,33%	4/12
17	05 ^C	33,33%	4/12

Table 14. Quantitative relationship of 01*

Rank	01* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	4/4
2	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
3	01 ^C	90,87%	2658/2925
4	P ³	90,24%	37/41
5	1349	88,89%	40/45
6	45	85,00%	17/20
7	NA28	81,98%	2398/2925
8	P ⁹⁷	81,82%	18/22
9	P ⁴	78,87%	153/194
10	03*	78,43%	2284/2912
11	03 ^C	78,30%	2281/2913
12	P ^{75^C}	77,01%	1517/1970
13	P ^{75*}	76,64%	1509/1969
14	019	75,00%	3/4
15	P ⁸²	70,00%	7/10
16	0182	70,00%	7/10
17	P ⁶⁹	68,18%	15/22
18	0181	68,00%	17/25
19	33	67,06%	456/680
20	1	65,71%	23/35

21	0171	64,29%	27/42
22	04*	63,67%	843/1324
23	P ^{45*}	63,00%	412/654
24	P ^{45C}	62,90%	412/655
25	04 ^C	61,85%	822/1329
26	032 ^C	61,36%	1734/2826
27	032*	61,06%	1725/2825
28	P ¹¹¹	60,00%	6/10
29	02 ^C	59,12%	1721/2911
30	02*	59,08%	1718/2908
31	038*	58,79%	1666/2834
32	18 ^C	58,62%	1711/2919
33	038 ^C	58,61%	1661/2834
34	18*	58,51%	1705/2914
35	2860*	57,52%	524/911
36	2860 ^C	57,41%	523/911
37	0312	57,14%	8/14
38	05 ^C	37,24%	1019/2736
39	05*	36,98%	1007/2723

Table 15. Quantitative relationship of 01^C

Rank	01 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	4/4
2	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
3	P ³	93,02%	40/43
4	01*	90,87%	2658/2925
5	1349	88,89%	40/45
6	P ⁹⁷	86,36%	19/22
7	45	85,00%	17/20
8	NA28	84,90%	2507/2953
9	03 ^C	80,99%	2381/2940
10	03*	80,75%	2375/2941
11	P ⁸²	80,00%	8/10
12	P ^{75C}	79,75%	1587/1990
13	P ^{75*}	79,24%	1576/1989
14	P ⁴	78,57%	154/196
15	33	75,07%	515/686
16	019	75,00%	3/4
17	0182	70,00%	7/10

18	0171	69,05%	29/42
19	1	68,57%	24/35
20	04*	68,51%	916/1337
21	P ⁶⁹	68,18%	15/22
22	04 ^C	66,34%	891/1343
23	032 ^C	64,70%	1846/2853
24	032*	64,42%	1838/2853
25	0181	64,00%	16/25
26	P ¹¹¹	63,64%	7/11
27	P ^{45*}	63,48%	419/660
28	P ^{45^C}	63,39%	419/661
29	18 ^C	63,22%	1863/2947
30	2860*	63,19%	582/921
31	038*	63,10%	1806/2862
32	2860 ^C	63,08%	581/921
33	18*	63,05%	1855/2942
34	02 ^C	63,01%	1852/2939
35	02*	62,94%	1848/2936
36	038 ^C	62,93%	1801/2862
37	0312	57,14%	8/14
38	05 ^C	39,62%	1095/2764
39	05*	39,44%	1085/2751

Table 16. Quantitative relationship of 02*

Rank	02* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	02 ^C	99,69%	2940/2949
2	2860 ^C	86,59%	794/917
3	2860*	86,48%	793/917
4	18 ^C	85,52%	2522/2949
5	18*	85,43%	2515/2944
6	P ⁹⁷	78,26%	18/23
7	33	76,57%	536/700
8	038*	76,05%	2175/2860
9	038 ^C	75,94%	2172/2860
10	032 ^C	75,74%	2164/2857
11	04 ^C	75,15%	1007/1340
12	032*	75,11%	2145/2856
13	0182	72,73%	8/11
14	04*	71,44%	953/1334

15	0312	71,43%	10/14
16	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
17	P ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
18	NA28	66,33%	1956/2949
19	45	65,00%	13/20
20	1349	63,04%	29/46
21	01 ^C	62,94%	1848/2936
22	03 ^C	62,24%	1831/2942
23	03*	61,66%	1814/2942
24	P ⁶⁹	60,87%	14/23
25	P ^{75C}	60,54%	1212/2002
26	P ^{75*}	59,77%	1196/2001
27	01*	59,08%	1718/2908
28	P ^{45*}	55,18%	362/656
29	P ^{45C}	55,10%	362/657
30	0171	54,76%	23/42
31	1	52,78%	19/36
32	P ³	51,16%	22/43
33	P ⁴	50,51%	100/198
34	019	50,00%	2/4
35	0181	44,00%	11/25
36	05 ^C	36,00%	994/2761
37	05*	35,76%	983/2749
38	P ⁷	25,00%	1/4
39	P ⁸²	20,00%	2/10

Table 17. Quantitative relationship of 02^C

Rank	02 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	02*	99,69%	2940/2949
2	2860 ^C	86,96%	800/920
3	2860*	86,85%	799/920
4	18 ^C	85,71%	2531/2953
5	18*	85,62%	2524/2948
6	P ⁹⁷	78,26%	18/23
7	33	77,00%	539/700
8	038*	76,36%	2187/2864
9	038 ^C	76,29%	2185/2864
10	032 ^C	75,81%	2169/2861
11	04 ^C	75,41%	1012/1342

12	032*	75,17%	2150/2860
13	0182	72,73%	8/11
14	04*	71,63%	957/1336
15	0312	71,43%	10/14
16	1349	67,39%	31/46
17	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
18	P ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
19	NA28	66,44%	1962/2953
20	45	65,00%	13/20
21	01 ^C	63,01%	1852/2939
22	03 ^C	62,29%	1835/2946
23	03*	61,71%	1818/2946
24	P ⁶⁹	60,87%	14/23
25	P ^{75C}	60,45%	1212/2005
26	P ^{75*}	59,68%	1196/2004
27	01*	59,12%	1721/2911
28	1	55,56%	20/36
29	P ^{45*}	54,95%	361/657
30	P ^{45C}	54,86%	361/658
31	0171	54,76%	23/42
32	P ³	51,16%	22/43
33	P ⁴	50,51%	100/198
34	019	50,00%	2/4
35	0181	44,00%	11/25
36	05 ^C	36,87%	1019/2764
37	05*	36,63%	1008/2752
38	P ⁷	25,00%	1/4
39	P ⁸²	20,00%	2/10

Table 18. Quantitative relationship of 03*

Rank	03* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	4/4
2	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
3	45	100,00%	20/20
4	03 ^C	98,61%	2911/2952
5	P ⁴	93,94%	186/198
6	NA28	93,94%	2774/2953
7	1349	93,48%	43/46
8	P ⁹⁷	91,30%	21/23

9	P ^{75C}	91,12%	1827/2005
10	P ^{75*}	90,32%	1810/2004
11	P ⁸²	90,00%	9/10
12	01 ^C	80,75%	2375/2941
13	P ³	79,07%	34/43
14	01 [*]	78,43%	2284/2912
15	019	75,00%	3/4
16	0182	72,73%	8/11
17	0181	72,00%	18/25
18	0171	71,43%	30/42
19	0312	71,43%	10/14
20	33	70,43%	493/700
21	P ^{45C}	69,80%	460/659
22	P ^{45*}	69,76%	459/658
23	P ⁶⁹	69,57%	16/23
24	04 [*]	65,82%	880/1337
25	2860 [*]	64,60%	595/921
26	2860 ^C	64,50%	594/921
27	04 ^C	64,13%	860/1341
28	032 ^C	63,99%	1830/2860
29	032 [*]	63,66%	1820/2859
30	02 ^C	61,71%	1818/2946
31	02 [*]	61,66%	1814/2942
32	1	61,11%	22/36
33	18 ^C	60,75%	1794/2953
34	18 [*]	60,58%	1786/2948
35	038 [*]	60,25%	1725/2863
36	038 ^C	60,08%	1720/2863
37	P ¹¹¹	58,33%	7/12
38	05 ^C	39,43%	1069/2711
39	05 [*]	39,30%	1060/2697

Table 19. Quantitative relationship of 03^C

Rank	03 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	4/4
2	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
3	45	100,00%	20/20
4	03 [*]	98,61%	2911/2952
5	NA28	93,77%	2769/2953

6	P ⁴	93,43%	185/198
7	p ⁹⁷	91,30%	21/23
8	p ^{75C}	90,88%	1823/2006
9	p ^{75*}	90,07%	1806/2005
10	p ⁸²	90,00%	9/10
11	1349	86,96%	40/46
12	01 ^C	80,99%	2381/2940
13	01 [*]	78,30%	2281/2913
14	0181	76,00%	19/25
15	019	75,00%	3/4
16	0182	72,73%	8/11
17	p ³	72,09%	31/43
18	0171	71,43%	30/42
19	0312	71,43%	10/14
20	33	70,24%	491/699
21	p ⁶⁹	69,57%	16/23
22	p ^{45C}	69,50%	458/659
23	p ^{45*}	69,45%	457/658
24	04 [*]	66,32%	886/1336
25	2860 [*]	65,43%	602/920
26	2860 ^C	65,33%	601/920
27	04 ^C	65,03%	872/1341
28	032 ^C	64,42%	1843/2861
29	032 [*]	64,06%	1832/2860
30	02 ^C	62,29%	1835/2946
31	02 [*]	62,24%	1831/2942
32	18 ^C	61,73%	1823/2953
33	18 [*]	61,57%	1815/2948
34	038 [*]	61,31%	1756/2864
35	038 ^C	61,21%	1753/2864
36	1	61,11%	22/36
37	p ¹¹¹	58,33%	7/12
38	05 ^C	39,64%	1075/2712
39	05 [*]	39,51%	1066/2698

Table 20. Quantitative relationship of 04*

Rank	04* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	04 ^C	89,84%	1203/1339
2	33	80,56%	286/355

3	2860*	76,55%	470/614
4	2860 ^C	76,38%	469/614
5	18 ^C	74,20%	995/1341
6	18*	73,96%	991/1340
7	P ³	73,33%	11/15
8	02 ^C	71,63%	957/1336
9	02*	71,44%	953/1334
10	45	70,00%	14/20
11	038*	69,84%	889/1273
12	NA28	69,83%	935/1339
13	038 ^C	69,68%	887/1273
14	01 ^C	68,51%	916/1337
15	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
16	032 ^C	66,64%	851/1277
17	032*	66,56%	850/1277
18	P ^{75C}	66,48%	603/907
19	03 ^C	66,32%	886/1336
20	P ^{75*}	65,82%	597/907
21	03*	65,82%	880/1337
22	01*	63,67%	843/1324
23	P ⁴	62,02%	80/129
24	0312	58,33%	7/12
25	1349	57,78%	26/45
26	P ^{45*}	56,66%	217/383
27	P ^{45C}	56,51%	217/384
28	0181	56,00%	14/25
29	1	54,29%	19/35
30	05 ^C	39,61%	492/1242
31	05*	39,37%	487/1237
32	019	33,33%	1/3

Table 21. Quantitative relationship of 04^C

Rank	04 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	04*	89,84%	1203/1339
2	33	81,51%	291/357
3	2860*	81,23%	502/618
4	2860 ^C	81,07%	501/618
5	18 ^C	80,24%	1080/1346
6	18*	80,00%	1076/1345

7	02 ^C	75,41%	1012/1342
8	02 [*]	75,15%	1007/1340
9	038 ^C	74,26%	949/1278
10	038 [*]	74,18%	948/1278
11	032 ^C	68,43%	878/1283
12	032 [*]	68,28%	876/1283
13	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
14	NA28	66,47%	894/1345
15	01 ^C	66,34%	891/1343
16	03 ^C	65,03%	872/1341
17	45	65,00%	13/20
18	03 [*]	64,13%	860/1341
19	P ^{75C}	62,09%	565/910
20	01 [*]	61,85%	822/1329
21	P ^{75*}	61,43%	559/910
22	1349	60,00%	27/45
23	0312	58,33%	7/12
24	P ³	56,25%	9/16
25	0181	56,00%	14/25
26	P ⁴	55,81%	72/129
27	P ^{45C}	55,06%	212/385
28	P ^{45*}	54,95%	211/384
29	1	51,43%	18/35
30	05 ^C	38,38%	479/1248
31	05 [*]	38,05%	473/1243
32	019	33,33%	1/3

Table 22. Quantitative relationship of 05*

Rank	05* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
2	05 ^C	98,95%	2729/2758
3	P ⁷	75,00%	3/4
4	P ⁸²	66,67%	4/6
5	0312	53,85%	7/13
6	0171	52,50%	21/40
7	1349	52,27%	23/44
8	P ⁹⁷	50,00%	11/22
9	019	50,00%	2/4
10	0181	45,00%	9/20

11	45	44,44%	8/18
12	P ^{45*}	43,32%	266/614
13	P ^{45C}	43,32%	266/614
14	NA28	41,45%	1144/2760
15	1	41,18%	14/34
16	33	41,15%	272/661
17	2860 ^C	39,89%	347/870
18	2860*	39,77%	346/870
19	03 ^C	39,51%	1066/2698
20	01 ^C	39,44%	1085/2751
21	04*	39,37%	487/1237
22	03*	39,30%	1060/2697
23	P ^{75C}	39,28%	727/1851
24	P ^{75*}	38,83%	718/1849
25	P ⁴	38,20%	68/178
26	04 ^C	38,05%	473/1243
27	01*	36,98%	1007/2723
28	032 ^C	36,90%	989/2680
29	02 ^C	36,63%	1008/2752
30	038*	36,55%	978/2676
31	032*	36,54%	979/2679
32	18 ^C	36,39%	1004/2759
33	038 ^C	36,36%	973/2676
34	18*	36,27%	999/2754
35	02*	35,76%	983/2749
36	P ⁶⁹	33,33%	7/21
37	P ¹¹¹	33,33%	4/12
38	P ³	29,27%	12/41
39	0182	27,27%	3/11

Table 23. Quantitative relationship of 05^C

Rank	05 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
2	05*	98,95%	2729/2758
3	P ⁷	75,00%	3/4
4	P ⁸²	66,67%	4/6
5	0312	53,85%	7/13
6	0171	52,50%	21/40
7	1349	52,27%	23/44

8	P ⁹⁷	50,00%	11/22
9	019	50,00%	2/4
10	45	44,44%	8/18
11	P ^{45*}	43,51%	268/616
12	P ^{45C}	43,51%	268/616
13	0181	42,86%	9/21
14	NA28	41,74%	1158/2774
15	33	41,53%	277/667
16	1	41,18%	14/34
17	2860 ^C	40,57%	355/875
18	2860*	40,46%	354/875
19	P ^{75C}	39,69%	737/1857
20	03 ^C	39,64%	1075/2712
21	01 ^C	39,62%	1095/2764
22	04*	39,61%	492/1242
23	03*	39,43%	1069/2711
24	P ⁴	39,33%	70/178
25	P ^{75*}	39,25%	728/1855
26	04 ^C	38,38%	479/1248
27	01*	37,24%	1019/2736
28	032 ^C	37,12%	1000/2694
29	038*	36,91%	993/2690
30	02 ^C	36,87%	1019/2764
31	18 ^C	36,82%	1021/2773
32	032*	36,76%	990/2693
33	038 ^C	36,73%	988/2690
34	18*	36,71%	1016/2768
35	02*	36,00%	994/2761
36	P ⁶⁹	33,33%	7/21
37	P ¹¹¹	33,33%	4/12
38	P ³	29,27%	12/41
39	0182	27,27%	3/11

Table 24. Quantitative relationship of 019

Rank	019 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	01*	75,00%	3/4
2	01 ^C	75,00%	3/4
3	03*	75,00%	3/4
4	03 ^C	75,00%	3/4

5	1349	75,00%	3/4
6	NA28	75,00%	3/4
7	02*	50,00%	2/4
8	02 ^C	50,00%	2/4
9	05*	50,00%	2/4
10	05 ^C	50,00%	2/4
11	038*	50,00%	2/4
12	038 ^C	50,00%	2/4
13	1	50,00%	2/4
14	18*	50,00%	2/4
15	18 ^C	50,00%	2/4
16	33	50,00%	2/4
17	04*	33,33%	1/3
18	04 ^C	33,33%	1/3
19	2860*	25,00%	1/4
20	2860 ^C	25,00%	1/4

Table 25. Quantitative relationship of 032*

Rank	032* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	4/4
2	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
3	032 ^C	99,27%	2848/2869
4	P ⁹⁷	82,61%	19/23
5	0182	81,82%	9/11
6	P ⁸²	80,00%	8/10
7	18 ^C	76,30%	2186/2865
8	18*	76,12%	2177/2860
9	02 ^C	75,17%	2150/2860
10	02*	75,11%	2145/2856
11	P ⁴	73,89%	133/180
12	038*	69,31%	1924/2776
13	038 ^C	69,13%	1919/2776
14	04 ^C	68,28%	876/1283
15	NA28	67,79%	1945/2869
16	33	67,11%	455/678
17	P ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
18	04*	66,56%	850/1277
19	P ³	65,12%	28/43
20	45	65,00%	13/20

21	01 ^C	64,42%	1838/2853
22	2860*	64,34%	554/861
23	2860 ^C	64,34%	554/861
24	03 ^C	64,06%	1832/2860
25	03*	63,66%	1820/2859
26	p ^{75C}	61,73%	1221/1978
27	0312	61,54%	8/13
28	p ^{75*}	61,15%	1209/1977
29	01*	61,06%	1725/2825
30	p ⁶⁹	60,87%	14/23
31	1349	60,00%	3/5
32	p ^{45*}	57,54%	374/650
33	p ^{45C}	57,45%	374/651
34	0181	52,00%	13/25
35	0171	45,24%	19/42
36	05 ^C	36,76%	990/2693
37	05*	36,54%	979/2679

Table 26. Quantitative relationship of 032^C

Rank	032 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	4/4
2	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
3	032*	99,27%	2848/2869
4	P ⁹⁷	82,61%	19/23
5	P ⁸²	80,00%	8/10
6	18 ^C	76,73%	2199/2866
7	18*	76,58%	2191/2861
8	02 ^C	75,81%	2169/2861
9	02*	75,74%	2164/2857
10	P ⁴	73,89%	133/180
11	0182	72,73%	8/11
12	038*	69,61%	1933/2777
13	038 ^C	69,43%	1928/2777
14	04 ^C	68,43%	878/1283
15	NA28	68,12%	1955/2870
16	33	67,26%	456/678
17	P ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
18	04*	66,64%	851/1277
19	P ³	65,12%	28/43

20	45	65,00%	13/20
21	01 ^C	64,70%	1846/2853
22	2860*	64,58%	556/861
23	2860 ^C	64,58%	556/861
24	03 ^C	64,42%	1843/2861
25	03*	63,99%	1830/2860
26	p ^{75C}	61,95%	1226/1979
27	0312	61,54%	8/13
28	p ^{75*}	61,38%	1214/1978
29	01*	61,36%	1734/2826
30	p ⁶⁹	60,87%	14/23
31	1349	60,00%	3/5
32	p ^{45*}	57,45%	374/651
33	p ^{45C}	57,36%	374/652
34	0181	52,00%	13/25
35	0171	45,24%	19/42
36	05 ^C	37,12%	1000/2694
37	05*	36,90%	989/2680

Table 27. Quantitative relationship of 038*

Rank	038* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	p ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
2	038 ^C	99,63%	2712/2722
3	2860*	81,30%	748/920
4	2860 ^C	81,20%	747/920
5	18 ^C	78,45%	2254/2873
6	18*	78,28%	2245/2868
7	p ⁹⁷	77,27%	17/22
8	33	76,89%	519/675
9	02 ^C	76,36%	2187/2864
10	02*	76,05%	2175/2860
11	04 ^C	74,18%	948/1278
12	0182	72,73%	8/11
13	04*	69,84%	889/1273
14	032 ^C	69,61%	1933/2777
15	032*	69,31%	1924/2776
16	p ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
17	45	65,00%	13/20
18	NA28	64,74%	1860/2873

19	P ⁶⁹	63,64%	14/22
20	01 ^C	63,10%	1806/2862
21	03 ^C	61,31%	1756/2864
22	03 [*]	60,25%	1725/2863
23	P ^{75C}	59,99%	1183/1972
24	P ^{75*}	59,46%	1172/1971
25	01 [*]	58,79%	1666/2834
26	P ⁴	55,56%	110/198
27	P ^{45*}	52,60%	344/654
28	P ^{45C}	52,52%	344/655
29	0171	52,38%	22/42
30	P ⁷	50,00%	2/4
31	P ⁸²	50,00%	5/10
32	019	50,00%	2/4
33	1	50,00%	18/36
34	1349	50,00%	23/46
35	P ³	48,84%	21/43
36	0312	46,15%	6/13
37	0181	45,83%	11/24
38	05 ^C	36,91%	993/2690
39	05 [*]	36,55%	978/2676

Table 28. Quantitative relationship of 038^C

Rank	038 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
2	038 [*]	99,63%	2712/2722
3	2860 [*]	80,98%	745/920
4	2860 ^C	80,87%	744/920
5	18 ^C	78,32%	2251/2874
6	18 [*]	78,15%	2242/2869
7	P ⁹⁷	77,27%	17/22
8	33	76,59%	517/675
9	02 ^C	76,29%	2185/2864
10	02 [*]	75,94%	2172/2860
11	04 ^C	74,26%	949/1278
12	0182	72,73%	8/11
13	04 [*]	69,68%	887/1273
14	032 ^C	69,43%	1928/2777
15	032 [*]	69,13%	1919/2776

16	P ¹¹¹	66,67%	8/12
17	45	65,00%	13/20
18	NA28	64,58%	1856/2874
19	P ⁶⁹	63,64%	14/22
20	01 ^C	62,93%	1801/2862
21	03 ^C	61,21%	1753/2864
22	03*	60,08%	1720/2863
23	P ^{75C}	59,84%	1180/1972
24	P ^{75*}	59,31%	1169/1971
25	01*	58,61%	1661/2834
26	P ⁴	55,56%	110/198
27	P ^{45*}	52,45%	343/654
28	0171	52,38%	22/42
29	P ^{45C}	52,37%	343/655
30	P ⁷	50,00%	2/4
31	P ⁸²	50,00%	5/10
32	019	50,00%	2/4
33	1	50,00%	18/36
34	1349	50,00%	23/46
35	P ³	46,51%	20/43
36	0312	46,15%	6/13
37	0181	45,83%	11/24
38	05 ^C	36,73%	988/2690
39	05*	36,36%	973/2676

Table 29. Quantitative relationship of 0171

Rank	0171 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁶⁹	83,33%	10/12
2	03*	71,43%	30/42
3	03 ^C	71,43%	30/42
4	NA28	71,43%	30/42
5	P ^{75*}	69,05%	29/42
6	P ^{75C}	69,05%	29/42
7	01 ^C	69,05%	29/42
8	01*	64,29%	27/42
9	02*	54,76%	23/42
10	02 ^C	54,76%	23/42
11	05*	52,50%	21/40
12	05 ^C	52,50%	21/40

13	038*	52,38%	22/42
14	038 ^C	52,38%	22/42
15	18*	47,62%	20/42
16	18 ^C	47,62%	20/42
17	032*	45,24%	19/42
18	032 ^C	45,24%	19/42

Table 30. Quantitative relationship of 0181

Rank	0181 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	p ^{75*}	87,50%	21/24
2	p ^{75^C}	87,50%	21/24
3	p ^{45*}	83,33%	10/12
4	p ^{45^C}	83,33%	10/12
5	03 ^C	76,00%	19/25
6	03*	72,00%	18/25
7	NA28	72,00%	18/25
8	01*	68,00%	17/25
9	01 ^C	64,00%	16/25
10	18*	60,00%	15/25
11	18 ^C	60,00%	15/25
12	04*	56,00%	14/25
13	04 ^C	56,00%	14/25
14	032*	52,00%	13/25
15	032 ^C	52,00%	13/25
16	2860*	50,00%	1/2
17	2860 ^C	50,00%	1/2
18	038*	45,83%	11/24
19	038 ^C	45,83%	11/24
20	05*	45,00%	9/20
21	02*	44,00%	11/25
22	02 ^C	44,00%	11/25
23	05 ^C	42,86%	9/21

Table 31. Quantitative relationship of 0182

Rank	0182 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	032*	81,82%	9/11
2	02*	72,73%	8/11
3	02 ^C	72,73%	8/11
4	03*	72,73%	8/11

5	03 ^C	72,73%	8/11
6	032 ^C	72,73%	8/11
7	038*	72,73%	8/11
8	038 ^C	72,73%	8/11
9	NA28	72,73%	8/11
10	01*	70,00%	7/10
11	01 ^C	70,00%	7/10
12	18*	54,55%	6/11
13	18 ^C	54,55%	6/11
14	05*	27,27%	3/11
15	05 ^C	27,27%	3/11

Table 32. Quantitative relationship of 0312

Rank	0312 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	18*	78,57%	11/14
2	18 ^C	78,57%	11/14
3	2860*	78,57%	11/14
4	2860 ^C	78,57%	11/14
5	NA28	78,57%	11/14
6	02*	71,43%	10/14
7	02 ^C	71,43%	10/14
8	03*	71,43%	10/14
9	03 ^C	71,43%	10/14
10	p ⁷⁵ *	62,50%	5/8
11	p ⁷⁵ ^C	62,50%	5/8
12	032*	61,54%	8/13
13	032 ^C	61,54%	8/13
14	04*	58,33%	7/12
15	04 ^C	58,33%	7/12
16	01*	57,14%	8/14
17	01 ^C	57,14%	8/14
18	05*	53,85%	7/13
19	05 ^C	53,85%	7/13
20	33	50,00%	3/6
21	038*	46,15%	6/13
22	038 ^C	46,15%	6/13
23	P ⁴	33,33%	1/3

Table 33. Quantitative relationship of 1

Rank	1 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	01 ^C	68,57%	24/35
2	01*	65,71%	23/35
3	03*	61,11%	22/36
4	03 ^C	61,11%	22/36
5	18*	61,11%	22/36
6	18 ^C	61,11%	22/36
7	1349	61,11%	22/36
8	NA28	61,11%	22/36
9	02 ^C	55,56%	20/36
10	2860*	55,56%	20/36
11	2860 ^C	55,56%	20/36
12	04*	54,29%	19/35
13	02*	52,78%	19/36
14	04 ^C	51,43%	18/35
15	019	50,00%	2/4
16	038*	50,00%	18/36
17	038 ^C	50,00%	18/36
18	05*	41,18%	14/34
19	05 ^C	41,18%	14/34

Table 34. Quantitative relationship of 18*

Rank	18* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	18 ^C	99,86%	2953/2957
2	2860 ^C	95,01%	876/922
3	2860*	94,90%	875/922
4	02 ^C	85,62%	2524/2948
5	02*	85,43%	2515/2944
6	P ⁹⁷	82,61%	19/23
7	04 ^C	80,00%	1076/1345
8	0312	78,57%	11/14
9	038*	78,28%	2245/2868
10	038 ^C	78,15%	2242/2869
11	032 ^C	76,58%	2191/2861
12	33	76,46%	536/701
13	032*	76,12%	2177/2860
14	P ¹¹¹	75,00%	9/12
15	04*	73,96%	991/1340

16	1349	67,39%	31/46
17	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
18	45	65,00%	13/20
19	NA28	65,00%	1922/2957
20	P ⁶⁹	63,64%	14/22
21	01 ^C	63,05%	1855/2942
22	03 ^C	61,57%	1815/2948
23	1	61,11%	22/36
24	03*	60,58%	1786/2948
25	P ^{75C}	60,35%	1210/2005
26	0181	60,00%	15/25
27	P ^{75*}	59,48%	1192/2004
28	01*	58,51%	1705/2914
29	P ^{45*}	57,73%	381/660
30	P ^{45C}	57,64%	381/661
31	0182	54,55%	6/11
32	P ⁷	50,00%	2/4
33	019	50,00%	2/4
34	0171	47,62%	20/42
35	P ⁴	47,21%	93/197
36	P ³	44,19%	19/43
37	P ⁸²	40,00%	4/10
38	05 ^C	36,71%	1016/2768
39	05*	36,27%	999/2754

Table 35. Quantitative relationship of 18^C

Rank	18 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	18*	99,86%	2953/2957
2	2860 ^C	95,01%	876/922
3	2860*	94,90%	875/922
4	02 ^C	85,71%	2531/2953
5	02*	85,52%	2522/2949
6	P ⁹⁷	82,61%	19/23
7	04 ^C	80,24%	1080/1346
8	0312	78,57%	11/14
9	038*	78,45%	2254/2873
10	038 ^C	78,32%	2251/2874
11	032 ^C	76,73%	2199/2866
12	33	76,60%	537/701

13	032*	76,30%	2186/2865
14	P ¹¹¹	75,00%	9/12
15	04*	74,20%	995/1341
16	1349	67,39%	31/46
17	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
18	NA28	65,16%	1930/2962
19	45	65,00%	13/20
20	P ⁶⁹	63,64%	14/22
21	01 ^C	63,22%	1863/2947
22	03 ^C	61,73%	1823/2953
23	1	61,11%	22/36
24	03*	60,75%	1794/2953
25	P ^{75C}	60,53%	1216/2009
26	0181	60,00%	15/25
27	P ^{75*}	59,66%	1198/2008
28	01*	58,62%	1711/2919
29	P ^{45*}	57,73%	381/660
30	P ^{45C}	57,64%	381/661
31	0182	54,55%	6/11
32	P ⁷	50,00%	2/4
33	019	50,00%	2/4
34	P ⁴	47,72%	94/197
35	0171	47,62%	20/42
36	P ³	44,19%	19/43
37	P ⁸²	40,00%	4/10
38	05 ^C	36,82%	1021/2773
39	05*	36,39%	1004/2759

Table 36. Quantitative relationship of 33

Rank	33 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	04 ^C	81,51%	291/357
2	04*	80,56%	286/355
3	2860 ^C	77,87%	359/461
4	2860*	77,66%	358/461
5	02 ^C	77,00%	539/700
6	038*	76,89%	519/675
7	18 ^C	76,60%	537/701
8	038 ^C	76,59%	517/675
9	02*	76,57%	536/700

10	18*	76,46%	536/701
11	01 ^C	75,07%	515/686
12	NA28	74,32%	521/701
13	03*	70,43%	493/700
14	03 ^C	70,24%	491/699
15	P ⁴	68,72%	134/195
16	032 ^C	67,26%	456/678
17	032*	67,11%	455/678
18	01*	67,06%	456/680
19	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
20	P ^{75*}	65,53%	192/293
21	P ^{75^C}	65,53%	192/293
22	P ^{45*}	58,82%	20/34
23	P ^{45^C}	58,82%	20/34
24	P ⁷	50,00%	2/4
25	019	50,00%	2/4
26	0312	50,00%	3/6
27	05 ^C	41,53%	277/667
28	05*	41,15%	272/661

Table 37. Quantitative relationship of 45

Rank	45 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	03*	100,00%	20/20
2	03 ^C	100,00%	20/20
3	NA28	100,00%	20/20
4	P ^{75*}	95,00%	19/20
5	P ^{75^C}	95,00%	19/20
6	01*	85,00%	17/20
7	01 ^C	85,00%	17/20
8	04*	70,00%	14/20
9	02*	65,00%	13/20
10	02 ^C	65,00%	13/20
11	04 ^C	65,00%	13/20
12	032*	65,00%	13/20
13	032 ^C	65,00%	13/20
14	038*	65,00%	13/20
15	038 ^C	65,00%	13/20
16	18*	65,00%	13/20
17	18 ^C	65,00%	13/20

18	2860*	60,00%	12/20
19	2860 ^C	60,00%	12/20
20	P45 ^C	55,56%	10/18
21	P45*	52,94%	9/17
22	05*	44,44%	8/18
23	05 ^C	44,44%	8/18

Table 38. Quantitative relationship of 1349

Rank	1349 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	NA28	100,00%	46/46
2	03*	93,48%	43/46
3	01*	88,89%	40/45
4	01 ^C	88,89%	40/45
5	03 ^C	86,96%	40/46
6	019	75,00%	3/4
7	2860*	71,74%	33/46
8	2860 ^C	71,74%	33/46
9	02 ^C	67,39%	31/46
10	18*	67,39%	31/46
11	18 ^C	67,39%	31/46
12	02*	63,04%	29/46
13	1	61,11%	22/36
14	04 ^C	60,00%	27/45
15	032*	60,00%	3/5
16	032 ^C	60,00%	3/5
17	04*	57,78%	26/45
18	05*	52,27%	23/44
19	05 ^C	52,27%	23/44
20	038*	50,00%	23/46
21	038 ^C	50,00%	23/46

Table 39. Quantitative relationship of 2860*

Rank	2860* vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	2860 ^C	99,89%	921/922
2	18*	94,90%	875/922
3	18 ^C	94,90%	875/922
4	02 ^C	86,85%	799/920
5	02*	86,48%	793/917

6	038*	81,30%	748/920
7	04 ^C	81,23%	502/618
8	038 ^C	80,98%	745/920
9	0312	78,57%	11/14
10	33	77,66%	358/461
11	04*	76,55%	470/614
12	1349	71,74%	33/46
13	NA28	68,98%	636/922
14	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
15	03 ^C	65,43%	602/920
16	P ^{75C}	64,96%	317/488
17	P ^{75*}	64,68%	315/487
18	03*	64,60%	595/921
19	032 ^C	64,58%	556/861
20	032*	64,34%	554/861
21	01 ^C	63,19%	582/921
22	45	60,00%	12/20
23	P ^{45*}	59,71%	83/139
24	P ^{45C}	59,29%	83/140
25	01*	57,52%	524/911
26	1	55,56%	20/36
27	P ⁴	51,09%	47/92
28	0181	50,00%	1/2
29	P ³	48,15%	13/27
30	05 ^C	40,46%	354/875
31	P ⁸²	40,00%	4/10
32	05*	39,77%	346/870
33	P ⁷	25,00%	1/4
34	019	25,00%	1/4

Table 40. Quantitative relationship of 2860^C

Rank	2860 ^C vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	2860*	99,89%	921/922
2	18*	95,01%	876/922
3	18 ^C	95,01%	876/922
4	02 ^C	86,96%	800/920
5	02*	86,59%	794/917
6	038*	81,20%	747/920
7	04 ^C	81,07%	501/618

8	038 ^C	80,87%	744/920
9	0312	78,57%	11/14
10	33	77,87%	359/461
11	04*	76,38%	469/614
12	1349	71,74%	33/46
13	NA28	69,60%	577/829
14	P ⁴²	66,67%	2/3
15	03 ^C	65,33%	601/920
16	P ^{75C}	64,75%	316/488
17	032 ^C	64,58%	556/861
18	03*	64,50%	594/921
19	P ^{75*}	64,48%	314/487
20	032*	64,34%	554/861
21	01 ^C	63,08%	581/921
22	45	60,00%	12/20
23	P ^{45*}	59,71%	83/139
24	P ^{45C}	59,29%	83/140
25	01*	57,41%	523/911
26	1	55,56%	20/36
27	P ⁴	50,00%	46/92
28	0181	50,00%	1/2
29	P ³	48,15%	13/27
30	05 ^C	40,57%	355/875
31	P ⁸²	40,00%	4/10
32	05*	39,89%	347/870
33	P ⁷	25,00%	1/4
34	019	25,00%	1/4

Table 41. Quantitative relationship of NA28

Rank	NA28 vs mss.	% agreement	No. of agreement
1	P ⁷	100,00%	4/4
2	P ⁴²	100,00%	3/3
3	45	100,00%	20/20
4	1349	100,00%	46/46
5	P ⁹⁷	95,65%	22/23
6	03*	93,94%	2774/2953
7	03 ^C	93,77%	2769/2953
8	P ^{75C}	91,16%	1836/2014
9	P ^{75*}	90,31%	1818/2013

10	P ⁸²	90,00%	9/10
11	P ⁴	89,90%	178/198
12	01 ^C	84,90%	2507/2953
13	P ¹¹¹	83,33%	10/12
14	01*	81,98%	2398/2925
15	P ³	81,40%	35/43
16	0312	78,57%	11/14
17	P ⁶⁹	77,27%	17/22
18	019	75,00%	3/4
19	33	74,32%	521/701
20	0182	72,73%	8/11
21	P ^{45C}	72,16%	477/661
22	P ^{45*}	72,12%	476/660
23	0181	72,00%	18/25
24	0171	71,43%	30/42
25	04*	69,83%	935/1339
26	2860 ^C	69,60%	577/829
27	2860*	68,98%	636/922
28	032 ^C	68,12%	1955/2870
29	032*	67,79%	1945/2869
30	04 ^C	66,47%	894/1345
31	02 ^C	66,44%	1962/2953
32	02*	66,33%	1956/2949
33	18 ^C	65,16%	1930/2962
34	18*	65,00%	1922/2957
35	038*	64,74%	1860/2873
36	038 ^C	64,58%	1856/2874
37	1	61,11%	22/36
38	05 ^C	41,74%	1158/2774
39	05*	41,45%	1144/2760

So far, the quantitative relationships based on mutual agreement between manuscripts have been established. It should be noticed that each manuscript has a different manuscript rank. A higher rank implies a close affinity between two manuscripts, therefore, a higher chance of being in the same group. However, the quantitative relationship should not be judged solely based on rank. If a manuscript is too fragmentary, the number of variation-units this manuscript involves is too small. Consequently, an unwanted high percentage of agreement may be yielded (e.g., Table 4). Therefore, all three features — rank, percentage of agreement, and the number of agreements— should be taken together to filter out insignificant results. Now, based on these data, manuscripts will be grouped according to the affinity.

4.3 Manuscript Grouping based on the Quantitative data

In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, Colwell has presented a guideline for manuscript grouping based on the results of Quantitative Analysis. That is a percentage of agreement greater than 70%, with a gap of about 10% from the neighbours (Colwell, 1969:59). Following the guideline (Colwell, 1969:59-61), this section will list the manuscripts that satisfy the condition for each base text and trace the mutual agreement until they form a group. For efficiency, the representative manuscripts for each text group —B for B-text group; A for A-text group; C for C-text group; D for D-text group— have been chosen for the starting point.⁵⁹

4.3.1 B-text group

Table 42. Quantitative relationship of B-text group

Manuscript	Mss in agreement > 70%; with 10% gap from neighbour
B	P ³ P ⁴ P ⁴⁵ P ⁷⁵ ⋈ 45 1347 NA28
P ⁷⁵	P ³ P ⁴ ⋈ B 0181 45 NA28
⋈	P ³ P ⁴ B 45 1349 NA28
P ³	P ⁷⁵ ⋈ B NA28
P ⁴	P ⁷⁵ ⋈ B NA28
P ⁴⁵	0181 (P ⁷⁵ NA28)
P ⁶⁹	0171 (P ⁷⁵ ⋈ B NA28)
0171	B NA28 (P ⁶⁹)
0181	P ⁴⁵ P ⁷⁵
45	P ⁷⁵ ⋈ B NA28
1349	⋈ B NA28

Starting from the Codex Vaticanus, P³, P⁴, P⁴⁵, P⁶⁹, P⁷⁵, ⋈, B, 0171, 0181, 45, and 1349 are found to be in a mutually close relationship. There are some manuscripts which show weaker relationship with some group members —P⁴⁵ with P⁷⁵; P⁶⁹ with P⁷⁵, ⋈, and B; 0171 with P⁶⁹— but they are distant enough from other group members to be determined as B-text group members.

⁵⁹ The order of groups is listed according to their significance. B-group stands first due to the significance of Codex Vaticanus (B). What follow are the well-known Byzantine text-type (A); Caesarian text-type (C); and the “Western” text-type (D). However, these terms are avoided since they denote anachronic geographic identifications. Kenyon has suggested Greek letters to designate each group and Epp has suggested “text-cluster” as an alternative designation (Epp, 2013:555-556). This study will use the most widely used term “text-group.”

4.3.2 A-text group

Table 43. Quantitative relationship of A-text group

Manuscript	Mss in agreement > 70%; with 10% gap from neighbour
A	θ 18 33 2860
θ	2860
W	(A 18)
18	A 2860 θ C ^C
2860	A C ^C θ 18

Starting from Codex Alexandrinus, A, W, θ, 18, 33, and 2860 are found to be in a mutually close relationship. Codex Washingtonianus (W) has a very narrow gap between W-A and W-P⁴ (ranks 10 and 11 in Table 24). However, excluding P⁴, W shows a relatively closer relationship with a group member θ (rank 12 and 13 in Table 24) than other group members below rank 13. Therefore, W has been counted as an A-text group member. Furthermore, the corrected text of the Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C^C) has shown close relationships of over 80% with 18 and 2860. But in consideration of a higher percentage of agreement with C and 33, it has been removed from the group with some suspicion.

4.3.3 C-text group

Table 44. Quantitative relationship of C-text group

Manuscript	Mss in agreement > 70%; with 10% gap from neighbour
C	33
33	C

This group has only two members, the Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus (C) and 33. Both C and 33 show a very narrow gap with A-text group members —C with A, 18, and 2860; 33 with A, θ, 18, 2860. Furthermore, the significant proximity that the correction of C (C^C) brings about the presumption that C was corrected based on the A-text manuscript(s). Consequently, the existence of the C-text group of Luke is doubtful.

4.3.4 D-text group

Codex Bezae (D) shows a very low percentage of agreement with other Greek manuscripts (Table 21 and 22). Manuscripts of high ranks in tables 21 and 22 show high percentages. But these manuscripts are too fragmentary to decide any manuscript relationship. Such manuscripts are P⁷, P⁴², P⁸², P⁹⁷, P¹¹¹, 019, 0182, 0312, and 1. Considering this, the highest proper agreement that D has shown is 43.32%

with P⁴⁵ (rank 12). This is so low as to claim either of two possibilities: (1) the text got jumbled up during the transmission; or, (2) the scribe(s) of the D-text have deliberately altered the text with some theological concerns. In order to solve this, textual uniformity should be studied. If D-text shows internal unity—for example, theological unity—that could imply a deliberate alteration. But if there is no internal unity and the textual tradition is scattered, that could indicate accidental contamination, and Codex Bezae may contain some fragments of the original text. It leads to the following section of studies of singular readings.

4.4 Singular readings

Quantitative Analysis has shown the result that Codex Bezae is isolated with a very low percentage of agreement with other manuscripts. Such significant disagreement is mostly caused by stylistic alterations. The scribe(s) of Codex Bezae has altered the text by additions, omissions, substitutions, and transpositions. But there are more significant readings, which seem to be related to some theological concerns. Considering the observation that Codex Bezae is isolated among the Greek manuscripts with a very low percentage of agreement, it is highly conjecturable that there were deliberate alterations with some theological concerns. In this regard, analysis of singular readings can draw the most vivid picture, for singular readings reflect the unique thought of the scribe(s) while variants other than singular readings give less certain information, for each variant always agrees with variants of some other manuscript. Therefore, this section will present the singular readings for the following study of scribal tendencies (chapter 5). For efficiency, the singular readings have been distinguished into three categories—scribal mistakes, stylistic changes, and significant alterations—according to their importance and characteristics, and these will be further categorised according to their characteristics.

4.4.1 Singular readings by scribal mistakes

The first category is the singular readings resulted from scribal mistakes. These mistakes include typographical errors, grammatical errors, dittography, haplography, and homoeoteleuton. These readings may be beneficial for linguistic studies of the particular scribe, but they are insignificant for this study.

Table 45. Singular readings by scribal mistakes

Ch.	Type ⁶⁰	B-text	D-text	Evaluation ⁶¹
1:80	S	το δε παιδιον ηυξανε	το δε παιδιον ηυξανετο(05) / ηυξανε(05 ^c)	grammar
3:12	S	ηλθον δε	ηλθον τε(05) / δε(05 ^c)	errata
4:17	S	ανοιξας ... ευρεν	απτυξας(05) / αναπτυξας(05 ^c) ευρεν	errata
4:18	S	απεσταλκεν με	απεσταλμαι(05) / απεσταλκεν μαι(05 ^c)	grammar
4:18	S	αποστειλαι τεθραυσμενους	αποστειλαι τεθραυματισμενους(05) / τεθραυμενους(05 ^c)	errata
4:35	S	μηδεν βλαψαν αυτον	μηδεν βλαψας αυτον	grammar
5:24	O	επι της γης	επι της [](05) / γης(05 ^c)	errata
6:8	S	εγειρε	εγειρου	grammar
6:8	S	και αναστας εστι	και αναστας εσταθη	grammar
6:20	S	επαρας	ετι αρας	errata
6:32	A	οι αμαρτωλοι τους αγαπωντας αυτους αγαπωσιν	οι αμαρτωλοι τουτο ποιουσιν τους αγαπωντας αυτους αγαπωσιν	homoeo.
7:14	A	νεανισκε	νεανισκε νεανισκε	ditto.
7:40	S	ο δε διδασκαλε ειπε φησιν	ο δε εφη διδασκαλε ειπον	grammar
8:4	S	των κατα πολιν επιπορευομενων	των την πολιν επιπορευομενων	grammar
8:9	A	τις ... ειη η παραβολη	το τις ειη η παραβολη	grammar
8:11	A	ο λογος του θυ	ο λογος ο του θυ	grammar
8:16	S/A	επι λυχνιας τιθησιν	επι την λυχνιαν τιθι	errata ma
8:33	O	απο του ανθρωπου	απο ανθρωπου	haplo.
8:41	S	ανηρ ω ονομα ιαειρος και	ανηρ της συναγωγης πεσων(05) / ω ονομα ιαειρος και(05 ^c)	ditto.
9:1	S	εξουσιαν επι παντα τα δαιμονια	εξουσιαν επι πασαν δαιμονιον(05) / παντα δαιμονιον(05 ^c)	grammar
9:30	S	οιτινες ησαν μουσης και ηλιας	ην δε μουσης και ηλειας	grammar
9:41	S	ω γενεα απιστος	ω γενεα απιστε	grammar
10:14	S/O	ανεκτοτερον εσται ... η υμιν	ανεκτοτερον εσται ... ημειν(05) / η υμειν(05 ^c)	haplo.
11:19	S	εν τινι εκβαλλουσιν	εν τι εκβαλλουσιν	grammar
11:51	S	εκζητηθησεται απο της γενεας ταυτης	εζητησεται(05) / εκζητηθησεται(05 ^c) απο της γενεας ταυτης	errata
12:52	S	διαμεμερισμενοι τρεις επι δυσιν και δυο επι τρισιν	τρεις διαμεμερισμενοι εν δυσιν και δυο εν τρισιν	grammar
12:58	S	εν τη οδω	εν τω οδω	grammar
13:33	T/S	ουκ ενδεχεται προφητην απολεσθαι εξω ιερουσαλημ	ουκ ενδεχεται απολεσθαι προστην εξω ιερουσαλημ	errata

⁶⁰ The column under “Type” denotes the types of variation: A for addition; O for omission; S for substitution; and T for transposition. Multiple occurrences of variations are indicated by the slash (/). The same applies to the following tables in chapter 4.

⁶¹ The column under “Evaluation” denotes the types of error: ditto. for dittography; errata for typographic error; grammar for grammatical error; haplo. for haplography; homoeo. for homoeoteleuton.

13:34	T/S	ον τροπον ορνις την εαυτης νοσσιαν υπο τας πτερυγας	ον τροπον ορνιξ τα νοσσια αυτης υπο τας πτερυγας	grammar
14:19	S	ζευγη βοων ηγορασα πεντε	ζευγη βοων ηγορα πεντε	errata
14:19	S	ερωτω σε εχε με παρητημενον	διο ου δυναμαι ελθειν	homoeo.
14:21	S	οργισθεις ο οικοδεσποτης	οργεις(05) / οργισθεις(05^c) ο οικοδεσποτης	errata
14:26	S	ου μισει τον πατερα εαυτου	ου πεισει(05) / μισει(05^c) τον πατερα εαυτου	errata
14:35	S	εξω βαλλουσιν αυτο	εξω βαλλουσιν αυτον	grammar
15:16	S/O	και επεθυμει	καπεθυμει(05) / και επεθυμει(05^c)	haplo.
15:20	O	και κατεφιλησεν	κατεφιλησεν(05) / και κατεφιλησεν(05^c)	haplo.
16:16	S	απο τοτε	απο τε	haplo.
16:24	S	ινα βαψη το ακρον του δακτυλου αυτου υδατος	ινα βαψη το ακρον του δακτυλου αυτου υδατον	grammar
16:28	O	ινα μη και αυτοι ελθωσιν	μη και αυτοι ελθωσιν	grammar
18:1	S	ελεγεν δε παραβολην	εκει συναχθησονται(05) / ελεγεν δε και παραβολην(05^c)	ditto.
18:14	S	ο υψων εαυτον	ο υψων αυτον(05) / εαυτον(05^c)	haplo.
18:39	S	υιε δαυειδ	υιος δαυειδ	grammar
19:27	S	αγαγετε ωδε	αγαγατε ωδε	grammar
19:43	S	περικυκλωσουσιν σε και συνεξουσιν σε	περικυκλωσιν σε και συνεξουσιν σε	haplo.
20:26	T/S	επιλαβεσθαι αυτου ρηματος	αυτου ρημα επιλαβεσθαι	grammar
21:26	S	αι γαρ δυναμεις των ουρανων σαλευθησονται	αι γαρ δυναμεις η(05) / αι(05^c) εν τω ουρανω σαλευθησονται	grammar
22:13	S	ειρηκει αυτοις	ειρηκει αυτος(05) / αυτοις(05^c)	haplo.
22:61	A	τω πετρω	τω πετω πετρω(05) / τω πετρω(05 ^c)	ditto.
22:65	S	ελεγον εις αυτον	ελεγον εις εαυτους	grammar
23:18	A	αιρε τουτον	αιρε τουτον αιραι τουτον	ditto.
23:22	S	ουδεν αιτιαν θανατου	ουδεμιαν αιτιαν θανατου	grammar
23:23	A	κατισχυον αι φωνα αυτων	κατισχυον αι φωνα αυτων και [των] των αρχιερεων	ditto.
24:36	S	αυτος εστη εν μεσω αυτων	αυτος εσταθη εν μεσω αυτων	grammar

4.4.2 Singular readings by stylistic changes

The second category is the singular readings resulted from stylistic changes. This category can be further distinguished into simple stylistic changes and stylistic changes involving paraphrase.

4.4.2.1 Simple stylistic changes

Singular readings of simple stylistic changes are singular readings that involve transposition of words, addition or omission of article, conjunction, or particle, substitutions of particles, or conjunctions. These readings are relatively insignificant since the change effect is too small to alter the theology.

Table 46. Singular readings of minor stylistic changes

Ch.	Type	B-text	D-text
1:24	T/S	μετα δε ταυτας τας ημερας	και μετα τας ημερας ταυτας
1:26	T/O	εν δε τω μηνι τω εκτω	εν δε τω εκτω μηνι
1:34	S	ειπεν δε μαριαμ	και ειπεν μαριαμ
1:37	T	παρα του θ̄ παν ρημα	παν ρημα παρα του θ̄
1:58	O	ηκουσαν οι περιοικοι και οι συγγενεις αυτης	ηκουσαν οι περιοικοι και συγγενεις αυτης
1:70	T/A	ελαλησεν δια στοματος των αγιων απ αιωνος προφητων αυτου	ελαλησεν δια στοματος αγιων προφητων αυτου των απ αιωνος
1:72	O	ποιησαι ελεος μετα των πατερων ημων και μνησθηναι διαθηκης αγιας αυτου	ποιησαι ελεος μετα των πατερων ημων μνησθηναι διαθηκης αγιας αυτου
2:2	T	αυτη απογραφη πρωτη εγενετο	αυτη εγενετο απογραφη πρωτη
2:4	T	δια το ειναι αυτον εξ οικου και πατριας δαυιδ	δια το ειναι αυτον εξ οικου και πατριας δαυιδ (after 2:5)
2:8	S	και ποιμενες ησαν	ποιμενες δε ησαν
2:15	T	απηλθον απ αυτων εις τον ουρανον οι αγγελοι	απηλθον οι αγγελοι απ αυτων εις τον ουρανον
2:22	O	παραστησαι τω κ̄ω̄	παραστησαι κ̄ω̄
2:41	T/S	και επορευοντο οι γονεις	επορευοντο δε και οι γονεις
2:44	T/S	νομισαντες δε αυτον ειναι	και νομισαντες αυτον ειναι
2:44	T	ηλθον ημερας οδον	ηλθον οδον ημερας
2:50	S	και αυτοι ου συνηκαν το ρημα	αυτοι δε ου συνηκαν το ρημα
3:7	S	βαπτισθηναι υπ αυτου	βαπτισθηναι ενωπιον αυτου
3:22	A	φωνην εξ ουρανου γενεσθαι	φωνην εκ του ουρανου γενεσθαι
4:16	S	και ηλθεν	ηλθεν δε
4:28	S/A	και επλησθησαν παντες θυμου	οι δε επλησθησαν παντες θυμου
4:33	T/S	και εν τη συναγωγη ην ανθρωπος	ην δε εν τη συναγωγη ανθρωπος
5:5	T/S	και αποκριθεις σιμων ειπεν	ο δε σιμων αποκριθεις ειπεν αυτω
5:7	S	και	ουν
5:13	T/S	και εκτεινας την χειρα ηψατο αυτου	εκτεινας δε την χειρα ηψατο αυτου
5:18	T	εζητουν αυτον εισενεγκειν	εζητουν εισενεγκειν αυτον
5:20	S	και ιδων	ιδων δε
5:21	S	ει μη ... ο θ̄ς	ει μη ... [](05) / ο(05 ^c) θ̄ς
5:29	T	δοχην μεγαλην λευις αυτω	λευει δοχην αυτω μεγαλην

5:30	T	εγογγυζον οι φαρισαιοι και οι γραμματεις αυτων	οι φαρισαιοι και οι γραμματεις εγογγυζον
5:31	S	και αποκριθεις	αποκριθεις δε
5:33	T/S	οι μαθηται ιωαν[ν]ου	οι μαθηται ιωαν[ν]ου και οι μαθηται των φαρισαιων
5:36	T	το επιβλημα το απο του καινου	το απο του καινου επιβλημα
6:1	T	και ησθιον τους σταχυας ψωχοντες ταις χερσιν	τους σταχυας και ψωχοντες ταις χερσιν ησθιον
6:3	S	και αποκριθεις	αποκριθεις δε
6:5	T	και ελεγεν αυτοις κς̄ εστιν του σαββατου ο υιος του ανθρωπου	και ελεγεν αυτοις οτι κς̄ εστιν ο υιος του ανθρωπου και του σαββατου (after 6:10)
6:33	T	ποια υμιν χαρις εστιν	ποια χαρις υμειν εστιν
6:34	S	και εαν	καν
6:34	T	ποια υμιν χαρις	ποια χαρις υμειν εστιν
6:43	O	ου γαρ εστιν	ουκ εστιν
7:3	S	ακουσας δε περι του ιω̄	και ακουσας περι του ιω̄
7:6	T	αυτου ου μακραν απεχοντος	ου μακραν απεχοντος αυτου
7:9	T	τοσαυτην πιστιν ευρον εν τω ισραηλ	εν τω ισραηλ τοσαυτην πιστιν ευρον
7:13	S	και ιδων	ιδων δε
7:17	T/A	ο λογος ουτος	ουτος δε ο λογος
7:20	S	παραγενομενοι δε	και παραγενομενοι
7:21	T	πνευματων πονηρων	πονηρων πνευματων
7:30	O	οι δε φαρισαιοι και οι νομικοι	οι δε φαρισαιοι και νομικοι
7:32	A	ομοιοι εισιν παιδιοις	ομοιοι εισιν τοις παιδιοις
7:32	A	εν αγορα	εν τη αγορα
7:37	T	κατακειται εν τη οικια του φαρισαιου	εν τη οικια του φαρισαιου κατακειται
7:37	T	αλαβαστρον μυρου	μυρου αλαβαστρον
7:47	A	ου χαριν λεγω	ου χαριν δε λεγω
8:10	T	υμιν δεδοται γνωμαι τα μυστηρια της βασιλειας του θ̄υ	υμειν δεδοται τα μυστηρια της βασιλειας του θ̄υ γνωμαι
8:12	T	τον λογον απο της καρδιας αυτων	απο της καρδιας αυτων τον λογον
8:18	T	και ο δοκει εχειν αρθησεται απ αυτου	αρθησεται απ αυτου και ο δοκει εχειν
8:27	A	υπηνητησεν	και υπηνητησεν
8:29	A	ηλαυνετο υπο του δαιμονιου	ηλαυνετο γαρ υπο του δαιμονιου
8:32	S/A	και επετρεψεν αυτοις	ο δε επετρεψεν αυτοις
8:33	S	και ωρμησεν	ωρμησεν δε
8:36	S	απηγγειλαν δε αυτοις	απηγγειλαν γαρ αυτοις
8:36	S	πως εσωθη ο δαιμονισθεις	πως εσωθη ο ληγαιων
8:37	S	και ηρωτησεν	ηρωτησαν δε
8:37	S	οτι φοβω μεγαλω συνειχοντο	φοβω γαρ μεγαλω συνειχοντο
8:39	T	οσα σοι εποιησεν ο θ̄ς	οσα σοι ο θ̄ς εποιησεν
8:49	S	ερχεται τις παρα του αρχισυναγωγου λεγων αυτω	ερχονται απο του αρχισυναγωγου λεγοντες αυτω

8:49	T	τεθνηκεν η θυγατηρ σου	τεθνηκεν σου η θυγατηρ
8:56	T/O	ο δε παρηγγειλεν αυτοις	παρηγγειλεν δε αυτοις
9:36	S	και αυτοι εσιγησαν	αυτοι δε εσιγησαν
9:42	T/O	τω π̄νι τω ακαθαρτω	τω ακαθαρτω πνευματι
9:42	T/S	και ιασατο τον παιδα και απεδωκεν αυτον	και αφηκεν αυτον και απεδωκεν τον παιδα
9:43	T	εξεπλησσοντο δε παντες	παντες δε εξεπλησσοντο
9:47	T	τον διαλογισμον της καρδιας αυτων	τον διαλογισμον αυτων της καρδιας
9:60	T/A	ειπεν δε αυτω	ο δε ειπεν αυτω
9:61	T	πρωτον δε επιτρεψον μοι αποταξασθαι	επιτρεψον δε μοι πρωτον αποταξασθαι
9:61	O	εις τον οικον μου	εις οικον μου
10:1	T	πολιν και τοπον	τοπον και πολιν
10:2	O	ο μεν θερισμος πολυς	ο θερισμος πολυς
10:2	O	δηθητε ουν	δηθητε
10:2	S	του κ̄υ του θερισμου	του κ̄υ(05) / θ̄υ(05^c) του θερισμου
10:5	T	εις ην δ αν εισελθητε	εις ην αν δε εισελθητε(05) /εις ην δ αν εισελθητε(05 ^c)
10:5	T	εισελθητε οικιαν πρωτον	εισελθητε πρωτον οικιαν(05) / εισελθητε οικιαν(05^c)
10:19	A	επανω οφεων και σκορπιων	επανω των οφεων και των σκορπιων
10:21	T	απο σοφων και συνετων	απο συνετων και σοφων
10:23	S	και στραφεις	στραφεις δε
10:29	T	ο δε θελων δικαιωσαι εαυτον ειπεν	ο δε θελων εαυτον δικαιωσαι ειπεν
10:35	T	εκβαλων εδωκεν δυο δηναρια τω πανδοχει	εκβαλων δηναρια δυο εδωκεν τω πανδοχει
10:35	T	εγω εν τω επανερχεσθαι με	εν τω επανερχεσθαι με εγω
10:40	T	μονην με κατελιπεν	κατελιπεν με μονην
10:42	O	μαριαμ γαρ την αγαθην μεριδα εξελεξατο	μαριαμ την αγαθην μεριδα εξελεξατο
11:2	T/A	ειπεν δε	ο δε ειπεν
11:2	O	αγιασθητω το ονομα σου	αγιασθητω ονομα σου
11:2	T	η βασιλεια σου	σου η βασιλεια
11:12	S	η και αιτησει ωον	εαν δε και ωον αιτησει
11:12	T	επιδωσει αυτω σκορπιον	σκορπιον αυτω επειδωσει
11:15	S	τινες δε εξ αυτων	και τινες εξ αυτων
11:27	T	επαρσα τις γυνη φωνην	γυνη τις επαρσα φωνην
11:41	T	ιδου παντα καθαρα υμιν εστιν	ιδου παντα καθαρα εσται υμιν
11:46	T	τοις νομικοις ουαι	ουαι τοις νομικοις
12:2	S	ουδεν δε συνκεκαλυμμενον εστιν	ουδεν γαρ συνκεκαλυμμενον εστιν
12:7	T	αι τριχες της κεφαλης υμων πασαι	αι τριχες υμων πασαι της κεφαλης
12:26	T	τι περι των λοιπων μεριμνατε	περι των λοιπων τι μεριμνατε
12:30	T	υμων δε ο π̄ηρ οιδεν οτι χρηζετε τουτων	οιδεν γαρ ο πατηρ υμων οτι χρηζεται τουτων
12:31	S	πλην ζητειτε	ζητειτε δε

12:40	A	και υμεις γινεσθε ετοιμοι	και υμεις δε γεινεσθαι ετοιμοι
12:41	S	ειπεν δε	και ειπεν
12:41	T	την παραβολην ταυτην λεγεις	λεγεις την παραβολην ταυτην
12:46	T	μετα των απιστων θησει	θησει μετα των απιστων
13:2	T	οι γαλιλαιοι ουτοι αμαρτωλοι παρα παντας τους γαλιλαιοους εγενοντο	ουτοι οι γαλιλαιοι παρα παντας τους γαλιλαιοους εγενοντο αμαρτωλοι
13:5	A	εαν μη μετανοητε	οτι εαν μη μετανοησηται
13:7	T	ιδου τρια ετη	ιδου ετη τρια
13:13	T	επεθηκεν αυτη τας χειρας	επεθηκεν τας χειρας αυτη
13:14	T	οτι τω σαββατω εθεραπευσεν ο ις̄ ελεγεν τω οχλω	ελεγεν τω οχλω οτι τω σαββατω εθεραπευσεν ιη̄ς
13:16	A	θυγατερα αβρααμ	θυγατερα του αβρααμ
13:16	T	δεκα και οκτω ετη	ετη ιη̄
13:33	A	σημερον και αυριον	σημερον και τη αυριον
14:7	A	ελεγεν δε προς τους κεκλημενους	ελεγεν δε και προς τους κεκλημενους
14:9	O	τον εσχατον τοπον κατεχειν	εσχατον τοπον κατεχειν(05) / τον εσχατον τοπον κατεχειν(05 ^c)
14:21	O	τους πτωχους	πτωχους
14:22	T	ειπεν ο δουλος	ο δουλος ειπεν
14:27	T	ου δυναται ειναι μου μαθητης	ου δυναται μου μαθητης ειναι
14:28	S	τις γαρ εξ υμων	τις δε εξ υμων
14:29	S	οι θεωρουντες αρξωνται αυτω εμπαιζειν	οι θεωρουντες μελλουσιν
14:31	T	υπαντησαι τω μετα εικοσιν χιλιαδων ερχομενω επ αυτον	τω μετα εικοσι χιλιαδων ερχομενω επ αυτον υπαντησαι
14:32	T	πρεσβειαν αποστειλας ερωτα τα προς ειρηνην	αποστειλας πρεσβειαν ερωτα τα προς ειρηνην
14:33	T	πας εξ υμων	εξ υμων πας
15:6	S	και ελθων	ελθων δε
15:7	T	οιτινες ου χρειαν εχουσιν μετανοιας	οιτινες ουκ εχουσιν χρειαν μετανοιας
15:9	T	τας φιλας και γειτονας	τας γειτονας και φιλας
15:9	T/O	οτι ευρον την δραχμην ην απωλεσα	οτι ευρον ην απωλεσα δραχμην
15:19	T	κληθηναι υιος σου	κληθηναι σου υιος
15:21	T	ειπεν δε ο υιος αυτω	ο δε υιος ειπεν αυτω
15:21	T	κληθηναι υιος σου	κληθηναι σου υιος
15:29	T	ουδεποτε εντολην σου παρηλθον	ουδεποτε παρεβην σου εντολην
16:6	T/O	ο δε ειπεν αυτω	ειπεν δε αυτω
16:22	T	υπο των αγγελων εις τον κολπον αβρααμ	εις τον κολπον αβρααμ υπο των αγγελων
16:28	T	εις τον τοπον τουτον	εις τουτον τον τοπον
17:4	A	και επτακις επιστρευη	και το επτακις επιστρευη
17:14	S	και εγενετο	εγενετο δε
17:15	T	φωνης μεγαλης	μεγαλης φωνης
17:29	O	η δε ημερα εξηλθεν	η ημερα εξηλθεν
18:8	T	ο υιος του ανθρωπου ελθων αρα ευρησει	αρα ο υιος του ανθρωπου ελθων ευρησει

18:10	T	ανθρωποι δυο	δυο ανθρωποι
18:24	T	ο ις περιλυπον γενομενον ειπεν	περιλυπον γενομενον ειπεν ο ιης
18:32	S	παραδοθησεται γαρ	οτι παραδοθησεται
18:34	T	ουδεν τουτων	τουτων ουδεν
18:35	T	τις εκαθητο παρα την οδον επαιτων	τις επαιτων εκαθητο παρα την οδον
18:38	S/A	και εβοησεν	ο δε εβοησεν
18:39	S	και οι	οι δε
19:5	S	σημερον γαρ	οτι σημερον
19:9	T	ειπεν δε προς αυτον ο ις	ειπεν δε ο ιης προς αυτον
19:17	S/A	και ειπεν αυτω	ο δε ειπεν αυτω
19:18	T	εποιησεν πεντε	πεντε εποιησεν
19:19	T	και συ επανω γινου πεντε πολεων	γινου και συ επανω πεντε πολεων
19:32	S	απελθοντες δε	και απελθοντες
19:39	S	και τινες	τινες δε
19:40	S	και αποκριθεις	αποκριθεις δε
19:44	O	καιρον της επισκοπης σου	καιρον επισκοπης σου
20:1	S	και εγενετο	εγενετο δε
20:2	T	την εξουσιαν ταυτην	ταυτην την εξουσιαν
20:6	S	εαν δε	και εαν
20:7	A	ποθεν	το ποθεν
20:10	T	και καιρω	καιρω δε
20:13	T	ειπεν δε ο κς του αμπελωνος	ο δε κς του αμπελωνος ειπεν
20:19	S	και εφοβηθησαν	εφοβηθησαν δε
20:21	T	ορθως λεγεις	λεγεις ορθως
20:24	A	και επιγραφην	και την επιγραφην
20:25	T/O	ο δε ειπεν	ειπεν δε
20:25	A	τα καισαρος	τα του καισαρος
20:26	S	και ουκ ισχυσαν	ουκ εισχυσαν δε
20:31	O	ωσαυτως δε και	ωσαυτως
20:37	O	και μουσης	μουσης
21:1	A	ειδεν τους βαλλοντας ... πλουσιους	ειδεν τους βαλλοντας ... τους πλουσιους
21:5	T	και αναθημασιν κεκοσμηται ειπεν	κεκοσμηται και αναθημασιν ειπεν
21:11	T	και απ ουρανου σημεια μεγαλα	απ ουρανου και σημεια μεγαλα
21:15	T	δωσω υμιν	υμιν δωσω
22:2	T/S	και εξητουν οι αρχιερεις και οι γραμματεις το πως	οι δε αρχιερις και γραμματεις εξητουν πως
22:3	A	εισηλθεν δε σατανας εις ιουδαν	εισηλθεν δε σατανας εις τον ιουδαν
22:10	T	ανθρωπος κεραμιον υδατος βασταζων	ανθρωπος βασταζων κεραμιον υδατος
22:22	T	οτι ο υιος μεν του ανθρωπου	οτι μεν ο υιος του ανθρωπου
22:28	S	υμεις δε	και υμεις
22:30	O	τας δωδεκα φυλας	[](05) / τας(05^c) ιβ φυλας

22:32	S	και συ	συ δε
22:37	A	μετα ανομων ελογισθη	μετα των ανομων ελογισθη
22:38	T	κε̄ ιδου	ιδου κε̄
22:41	S	και αυτος	αυτος δε
22:42	T/O	ει βουλει παρενεγκε τουτο το ποτηριον απ εμου πλην μη το θελημα μου αλλα το σον γινεσθω	μη το θελημα μου αλλα το σον γενεσθω ει βουλει παρενεγκε τουτο το ποτηριον απ εμου
22:46	T	ινα μη εισελθητε εις πειρασμον	ινα μη εις πειρασμον εισελθητε
22:61	S	και στραφεις	στραφεις δε
22:63	S	και οι ανδρες	οι δε ανδρες
22:66	S	αρχιερεις τε	και αρχιερεις
22:68	O	εαν δε ερωτησω	εαν ερωτησω
23:2	T	κωλυοντα φορους καισαρι διδοναι	κωλυοντα φορους διδοναι καισαρι
23:6	T/A	πειλατος δε ακουσας	ακουσας δε ο πειλατος
23:7	S	και επιγνους	επιγνους δε
23:8	T	εξ ικανων χρονων θελων ιδειν αυτον	θελων ειδειν αυτον εξ ικανων χρονων
23:13	T/A	πειλατος δε	ο δε πειλατος
23:22	T	αυτον απολυσω	απολυσω αυτον
23:23	T	αυτον σταυρωθηναι	σταυρωθηναι αυτον
23:24	T	και πειλατος επεκρεινεν	επεκρεινεν δε ο πειλατος
23:26	S	και ως	ως δε
23:28	S	πλην	αλλ[α]
23:47	T	οντως ο ανος̄ ουτος δικαιος ην	οντως δικαιος ην ο ανθρωπος ουτος
24:1	T/O	ορθρου βαθεως επι το μνημα ηλθον	ορθρου βαθεως ηρχοντο επει το μνημα
24:5	A	ειπαν προς αυτας	οι δε ειπαν προς αυτας
24:6	A	μνησθητε	μνησθητε δε
24:13	T/A	δυο εξ αυτων εν αυτη τη ημερα ησαν πορευομενοι εις κωμην	ησαν δε δυο πορευομενοι εξ αυτων εν αυτη τη ημερα εις κωμην
24:14	O	περι παντων των συνβεβηκοτων τουτων	περι παντων συνβεβηκοτων τουτων
24:17	T/A	ειπεν δε	ο δε ειπεν
24:24	T	αι γυναικες ειπον	ειπον αι γυναικες
24:29	O	εισηλθεν του μειναι	εισηλθεν μειναι
24:32	S/A	και ειπαν	οι δε ειπον
24:38	S/A	και ειπεν αυτοις	ο δε ειπεν αυτοις
24:39	T	εγω ειμι αυτος	εγω αυτος ειμι
24:39	T/S	ιδετε οτι πνᾱ σαρκα και οστια ουκ εχει	ιδετε το πνᾱ οστα ουκ εχει και σαρκας
24:42	S/O	οι δε επεδωκαν	και επεδωκαν
24:46	T	παθειν τον χν̄	τον χρν̄ παθειν
24:48	A	υμεις μαρτυρες	και υμεις δε μαρτυρες
24:50	S	και επαρας τας χειρας	επαρας δε τας χειρας

4.4.2.2 Stylistic changes that involved with paraphrasing

Singular readings that involve paraphrases are relatively more significant than those of simple changes. Most of these readings are stylistic adjustments by changing vocabulary or grammatical constructions, sometimes improving and sometimes worsening. These may be important in linguistic analysis of the scribes, but they are still not significant enough to reflect any alteration in theology.

Table 47. Singular readings with stylistic changes by paraphrasing

Ch.	Type	B-text	D-text
1:19	S	εγω ειμι γαβριηλ ο παρεστηκως ενωπιον του θ̄ω̄	εγω ειμι γαβριηλ ο παρεστως ενωπιον του θ̄ω̄
1:21	S	εθαυμαζον εν τω χρονιζειν	εθαυμαζον επι τω χρονιζειν
1:26	S/O	εις πολιν της γαλιλαιας	εις πολιν γαλιλαιαν
1:27	S	προς παρθενον μεμνηστευμενην ανδρι	προς παρθενον μεμνησμενην ανδρι
1:38	S	απηλθεν απ αυτης ο αγγελος	απεστη απ αυτης ο αγγελος
1:47	S	επι τω θ̄ω̄	εν τω θ̄ω̄
1:62	S	το τι αν θελοι καλεισθαι	οτι ο αν θελοι καλ[ε]ισθαι
1:64	T/A	ανεωχθη δε το στομα αυτου παραχρημα και η γλωσσα αυτου	παραχρημα ελυθη η γλωσσα αυτου και (in 1:63)
1:71	T/O	σωτηριαν εξ εχθρων ημων και εκ χειρος παντων των μεισουντων ημας	σωτηριαν εκ χειρος εχθρων ημων και παντων των μεισουντων ημας
2:3	S	εις την εαυτου πολιν	εις την εαυτου πατριδα
2:4	S	εις την ιουδαιαν	εις γην ιουδα
2:6	S	εγενετο δε εν τω ειναι αυτους εκει επλησθησαν αι ημεραι	ως δε παρεγεινοντο ετελεσθησαν αι ημεραι
2:12	A	τουτο υμιν σημειον	τουτο υμειν το σημειον εστω
2:21	S	εκκληθη το ονομα αυτου ῑς̄	ωνομασθη το ονομα αυτου ῑη̄ς̄
2:26	T/S	και ην αυτω κεχηματισμενον	κεχηματισμενος δε ην
2:27	S	κατα το ειθισμενον του νομου	κατα το εθος του νομου
2:34	A	εις πτωσιν και αναστασιν	εις πτωσιν και εις αναστασιν
2:35	O	οπως αν αποκαλυφθωσιν εκ πολλων καρδιων	οπως αν αποκαλυφθωσιν πολλων καρδιων
2:36	O	ην αννα προφητις θυγατηρ φανουηλ	αννα προφητις θυγατηρ φανουηλ
2:40	S	χαρις θ̄ω̄ ην επ αυτο	χαρις θ̄ω̄ ην εν αυτο
2:45	S	και μη ευροντες	και μη ευρισκοντες
2:46	T/S	εν τω ιερω καθεζομενον	καθημενον εν τω ιερω
3:1	S	ηγεμονευοντος ποντιου πιλατου	επιτροπευοντος ποντιου πειλατου
3:9	S	παν ουν δενδρον μη ποιουν καρπον καλον	παν ουν δενδρον μη ποιουν καρπους καλους
3:16	S	ερχεται δε ο ισχυροτερος μου	ο δε ερχομενος ισχυροτερος μου εστιν
3:16	S	λυσαι τον μιαντα των υποδηματων	λυσαι τον μιαντα του υποδηματος
3:17	T/S	συναγαγειν τον σιτον	τον μεν σειτον συναξει
3:18	S	ετερα παρακαλων ευηγγελιζετο τον λαον	ετερα παραινων ευηγγελιζετο τον λαον
3:20	S	κατεκλεισεν τον ιωανην	ενεκλισε τον ιωανην

3:21	S	ανεωχθηναι τον ουρανον	ανοιχθηναι τον ουρανον
3:22	S	ειδει ως περιστεραν επ αυτον	ειδει ως περιστεραν εις αυτον
4:3	S	ειπε τω λιθω τουτω ινα γενηται αρτος	ειπε ινα οι λιθοι ουτοι αρτοι γενωνται
4:4	S	απεκριθη ... ο ις	αποκριθεις ο ιης ειπεν
4:13	S	απεστη απ αυτου αχρι καιρου	απεστη απ αυτου αχρι χρονου
4:17	S	επεδοθη αυτω βιβλιον του προφητου ησαιου	επεδοθη αυτω ο προφητης ησαιας
4:37	S	εξεπορευετο ηχος περι αυτου	εξηλθεν η ακοη περι αυτου
4:39	S	επιστας επανω αυτης	επισταθεις επανω αυτης
4:39	S	αναστασα διηκονει αυτοις	ωστε αναστασαν αυτην διακονειν αυτοις
4:40	S	δυνοντος δε του ηλιου	δυσαντος δε του ηλιου
4:40	S	οσοι ειχον ασθενουντας	οι(05) / οσοι(05^c) ειχον ασθενουντας
4:40	S	ηγαγον αυτους προς αυτον	εφερον αυτους προς αυτον
4:42	S	κατειχον αυτον του μη πορευεσθαι	επειχον αυτον του μη πορευεσθαι
4:43	S	και ταις ετεραις πολεσιν ευαγγελισασθαι δει με	δει με και εις τας αλλας πολεις ευαγγελισασθαι
5:1	S	και αυτος ην εστωσ παρα την λιμνην γεννησαρετ	εστωτος αυτου παρα την λιμνην γεννησαρεδ
5:3	S	επαναγαγειν ολιγον	επαναγαγειν ... οσον οσον
5:4	S	ως δε επαυσατο λαλων	οτε δε επαυσατο λαλων
5:6	S	διερρησσετο δε τα δικτυα αυτων	ωστε τα δικτυα ρησσεσθαι
5:7	S	του ελθοντας συλλαβεσθαι αυτοις	του ελθοντας βοηθειν αυτοις
5:7	S	και ηλθον ... επλησαν	ελθοντες ... επλησαν
5:8	S	ιδων δε σιμων ... προσεπεσεν	ο δε σιμων προσεπεσεν
5:12	S	ανηρ πληρης λεπρας	ανηρ λεπρος
5:14	S	αλλα απελθων δειξον σεαυτον	απελθε δε και δειξον σεαυτον
5:17	S	και αυτος ην διδασκων	αυτου διδασκοντος
5:17	S	και ησαν καθημενοι οι φαρισαιοι και οι νομοδιδασκαλοι	συνελθειν τους φαρισαιους και νομοδιδασκαλους
5:17	S	οι ησαν εληλυθοτες	ησαν δε συνεληλυθοτες
5:17	S	εις το ιασθαι	του ιασθαι
5:19	S	αναβαντες επι το δωμα	ανεβησαν επι το δωμα
5:19	S	καθηκαν αυτον συν τω κλινιδιω	καθηκαν τον κραβαττον συν τω παραλυτικω
5:20	S	ειπεν ανε	λεγει ... ανθρωπε
5:22	S	ειπεν προς αυτους	λεγει αυτοις
5:25	S	αρας εφ ο κατεκειτο	αρας την κλεινην
5:26	S	και επλησθησαν φοβου	και επλησθησαν θαμβους
5:26	O	λεγοντες οτι ειδομεν παραδοξα σημερον	λεγοντες ειδομεν παραδοξα σημερον
5:29	S	οχλος ... αλλων οι ησαν μετ αυτων κατακειμενοι	οχλος ... αλλων ανακειμενων
6:1	T/S	και ετιλλον οι μαθηται αυτου	οι δε μαθηται αυτου ηρξαντο τιλλειν
6:2	T/O	ο ουκ εξεστιν ποιειν τοις σαββασιν	τοις σαββασιν ο ουκ εξεστιν
6:3	S	οι μετ αυτου	οι συν αυτω

6:7	S	ινα ευρωσιν κατηγορειν αυτου	ινα ευρωσιν κατηγορησαι αυτου
6:8	S	ηδει τους διαλογισμους αυτων	γεινωσκων τους διαλογισμους αυτων
6:8	S	ειπεν	λεγει
6:8	S	στηθι εις το μεσον	στηθι εν τω μεσω
6:11	S	διελαλουν προς αλληλους	διελογιζοντο προς αλληλους
6:12	A	εγενετο ... εξελθειν αυτον εις το ορος προσευχεσθαι	εγενετο ... εξελθειν αυτον εις το ορος και προσευχεσθαι
6:14	T/S	σιμωνα ον και ονομασεν πετρον	σιμωνα ον και πετρον επωνομασεν
6:18	S	οι ηλθον ακουσαι αυτου	εληλυθοτων ακουσαι αυτου
6:41	S	εν τω ιδιω οφθαλμω	εν τω σω οφθαλμω
6:44	S	ου γαρ εξ ακανθων συλλεγουσιν συκα	ου γαρ εκλεγονται εξ ακανθων συκα
6:49	S	η προσερρηξεν ο ποταμος	συνερρηξεν ο ποταμος
7:1	S	επειδη επληρωσεν παντα τα ρηματα αυτου εις τας ακοας του λαου	και εγενετο οτε ετελεσεν ταυτα τα ρηματα λαλων
7:1	S	εισηλθεν	ηλθεν
7:2	S	ος ην αυτω εντιμος	ος ην αυτω τιμιος
7:6	T/S	ο δε ις επορευετο συν αυτοις	επορευετο δε μετ αυτων ο ιης
7:10	S	ευρον τον ασθενουντα δουλον	δουλοι ευρον τον ασθενουντα
7:11	O	και εγενετο εν	και
7:12	T/S	ως δε ηγγισεν	εγενετο δε ως ηγγιζεν
7:12	S	και αυτη ην χηρα	χηρα ουση
7:12	S	ικανος ην συν αυτη	συνεληλυθι αυτη
7:18	O	προσκαλεσαμενος δυο ... ο ιωανης	προσκαλεσαμενος δυο ...
7:21	S	εθεραπευσεν πολλους	εθεραπευεν πολλους
7:21	S	τυφλοις πολλοις εχαρισατο βλεπειν	τυφλους εποιει βλεπειν
7:21	S	τυφλοις πολλοις εχαρισατο βλεπειν	τυφλους εποιει βλεπειν
7:24	S	προς τους οχλους περι ιωανου	περι ιωανου τοις οχλοις
7:28	T/S	μειζων εν γεννητοις γυναικων ιωανου ουδεις εστιν	οτι ουδεις μειζων εν γεννητοις γυναικων προφητης ιωανου του βαπτιστου (after 7:26)
7:37	O	γυνη ητις ην εν τη πολει	γυνη εν τη πολει
7:37	S/O	επιγνουςα	γνουςα
7:38	S	τοις δακρυσιν ηρξατο βρεχειν τους ποδας αυτου	τοις δακρυσι εβρεξε τους ποδας αυτου
7:39	S	η γυνη η απομενη αυτου	η γυνη ητις απτεται αυτου
7:44	S	τω σιμωνι εφη	ειπεν τω σιμωνι
7:50	S	πορευου εις ειρηνην	πορευου εν ιρηνη
8:2	S	αφ ης δαμονια επτα εξεληλυθει	εξ ης ζ δαμονια εξεληλυθει
8:6	S	ετερον	αλλο
8:7	S	ετερον	αλλο
8:7	S	επεσεν εν μεσω	επεσεν μεσον
8:8	S	ετερον επεσεν	αλλο επεσεν
8:10	S	ινα βλεποντες μη βλεπωσιν	ινα βλεποντες μη ειδωσιν

8:12	S	οι ακουσαντες ειτα ερχεται ο διαβολος	εισιν οι ακολουθουντες ων ερχεται ο διαβολος
8:17	S	ο ου φανερον γενησεται	ο ου φανερον εσται
8:17	S	ουδε αποκρυφον ο ου μη γνωσθη	ουδε αποκρυφον αλλα ινα γνωσθη
8:22	S	αυτος ενεβη εις πλοιον	αναβηναι αυτον εις πλοιον
8:27	S	εξελθοντι δε αυτω επι την γην	και εξηλθον επι την γην
8:27	S	εχων δαιμονια	ειχεν δαιμονια απο χρονων εικανων
8:27	S	και χρονω ικανω ουκ ενεδυσατο ιματιον	ος ειματιον ουκ ενεδυδισκετο
8:28	T	και φωνη μεγαλη ειπεν	ανεκραξεν φωνη μεγαλη και ειπεν
8:29	S	παρηγγειλεν γαρ τω πνευματι τω ακαθαρτω εξελθειν	ελεγεν γαρ τω δαιμονιω τω ακαθαρτω εξελθε
8:29	S	και εδεσμειτο αλυσεσιν	εδεσμειτο γαρ αλυσεσιν
8:29	S	διαρρησων τα δεσμα	διερησσε τα δεσμα
8:30	S	ο δε ειπεν λεγειων οτι εισηλθεν δαιμονια πολλα εις αυτον	ο δε ειπεν λεγων ονομα μοι πολλα γαρ ησαν δαιμονια
8:31	S	και παρεκαλουν αυτον	παρεκαλουν δε
8:32	S	και παρεκαλεσαν αυτον	παρεκαλουν δε αυτον
8:33	S	εισηλθον εις τους χοιρους	ωρμησαν εις τους χοιρους
8:37	S	απαν το πληθος της περιχωρου των γερασηνων	παντες και η χωρα των γερασηνων
8:38	S	εδειτο δε αυτου	ηρωτα δε αυτον
8:39	S	υποστρεφε εις τον οικον σου	πορευου εις τον οικον σου
8:39	S	και διηγου	διηγουμενος
8:39	S	απηλθεν καθ ολην την πολιν	απελθων κατα την πολιν
8:40	S	απεδεξατο αυτον ο οχλος	αποδεξασθαι αυτον τον οχλον
8:41	S/O	ιδου ηλθεν ανηρ	ελθων ανηρ
8:41	O	αρχων της συναγωγης υπειρχεν και	αρχων της συναγωγης
8:41	S	παρα τους ποδας	υπο τους ποδας
8:41	S	εις τον οικον	εις την οικιαν
8:42	T/S	οτι θυγατηρ μονογενης ην αυτω ως	ην γαρ θυγατηρ αυτω μονογενης
8:42	S	και αυτη απεθνησκειν	αποθνησκουσα
8:45	S	τις ο ασαμενος μου	τις μου ηψατο
8:47	S	ιδουσα δε η γυνη οτι ουκ ελαθεν τρεμουσα ηλθεν	ιδουσα δε η γυνη οτι ουκ ελαθεν εντρομος ουσα ηλθεν
8:48	S	πορευου εις ειρηνην	πορευου εν ιρηνη
8:51	S	τον $\overline{\pi\rho\alpha}$ της παιδος	και τον πατερα του κορασιου
8:56	S	μηδενι	μηδε
9:5	S	τον κονιορτον απο των ποδων υμων αποτινασσετε	εκτειναξατε τον κονιορτον των ποδων υμων
9:6	T/S	εξερχομενοι δε διηρχοντο κατα τας κωμας	εξερχομενοι δε κατα πολεις και ηρχοντο
9:7	S/O	ηκουσεν δε ηρωδης ο τετρααρχης τα γεινομενα παντα και διηπορει	ακουσας δε ηρωδης ο τετρααρχης τα γεινομενα ηπορειτο
9:7	S	οτι ιωαννης ηγερθη εκ νεκρων	οτι ιωαννης εκ νεκρων ανεστη
9:9	S	ακουω τοιαυτα	ταυτα ακουω

9:14	T/S	ησαν γαρ ωσει ανδρες πεντακισχιλιοι	ησαν γαρ ανδρες ως πεντακισχιλιοι
9:16	A	ευλογησεν αυτους	ευλογησεν επ αυτους
9:16	S	παραθειναι τω ογλω	παρατιθεναι τοις ογλοις
9:17	S	δωδεκα	δεκαδυο
9:25	S	ανθρωπος κερδησας τον κοσμον	ανθρωπον κερδησαι(05) / ανθρωπος εαν κερδηση(05^c) τον κοσμον
9:25	S	εαυτον δε απολεσας η ζημιωθεις	εαυτον δε απολεσαι η ζημιωθηναι
9:29	S	το ειδος	η ιδεα
9:29	S	εγενετο ... το ειδος του προσωπου αυτου ετερον	εγενετο ... η ιδεα του προσωπου αυτου ηλλοιωθη
9:31	O	οι οφθεντες	οφθεντες
9:33	S	ειπεν ο πετρος προς τον ιν	ειπεν ο πετρος τω ιην
9:35	S	φωνη εγενετο εκ της νεφελης	φωνη ηλθεν εκ της νεφελης
9:36	S	ουδεν ων εωρακαν	ων εθεασαν(05) / ων εθεασαντο(05^c)
9:37	S	εγενετο δε τη εξης ημερα κατελθοντων αυτων	εγενετο δε δια της ημερας κατελθοντα αυτον
9:37	S	συνηνητησεν αυτω οχλος πολυς	συνελθειν αυτω οχλον πολυν
9:39	S	μογισ αποχωρει απ αυτου συντριβον αυτον	μογισ αποχωρει απ αυτου και συντριβει αυτον
9:40	S	ινα εκβαλωσιν αυτο	ινα απαλλαξωσιν αυτον
9:48	O	ο γαρ μεικροτερος εν πασιν υμιν υπαρχων	ο γαρ μεικροτερος εν πασιν υμειν
9:51	S	εν τω συνπληρουσθαι τας ημερας της αναλημψεως	εν τω πληρουσθαι τας ημερας της αναλημψεως
9:60	S	συ δε απελθων διαγγελλε την βασιλειαν του θυ	συ δε πορευθεις διαγγελλε την βασιλειαν του θυ
10:3	S	ως αρνας εν μεσω λυκων	ως αρνας μεσον λυκων
10:6	S	και εαν εκει η υιος ειρηνης	καν η εκει υιος ειρηνης
10:7	S	εξ οικιας	απο οικιας
10:13	O	ουαι σοι χοραζειν ουαι σοι βησσαιδα	ουαι σοι χοροζαιν και βηδσαιδα
10:20	S	εν τοις ουρανοις	εν τω ουρανω
10:25	T/S/O	και ιδου νομικος τις ανεστη εκπιραζων αυτον	ανεστη δε τις νομικος εκπιραζων αυτον
10:26	S/O	εν τω νομω τι γεγραπται	εν τω ονοματι(05) / νομω(05^c) γεγραπται
10:28	S	τουτο ποιει και ζηση	τουτο ποιει και ζησεις
10:31	S	κατα συγκυριαν	κατα τυχα
10:36	S	τις	τινα
10:36	S	τις ... πλησιον δοκει σοι γεγονεναι του εμπεσοντος	τινα ... δοκεις πλησιον γεγονεναι του ενπεσοντος
10:38	S/O	αυτος εισηλθεν εις κωμην	αυτον εισελθειν εις κωμην
10:40	S	επιστασα δε ειπεν	επισταθεις δε ειπεν
10:40	S	ινα μοι συναντιλαβηται	ινα μου αντιλαβητε
10:42	S	ητις ουκ αφαιρεθησεται	η ουκ αφαιρεθησεται
11:7	S	κακεινος εσωθεν αποκριθεις	εκεινος δε εσωθεν αποκρειθεις
11:7	T/S	ου δυναμαι αναστας δουναι σοι	ου δυναμαι σοι αναστας δωναι

11:8	O	ει και ου δώσει αυτω αναστας	ου δώσει αυτω αναστας
11:17	S	και οικος επι οικον πιπτει	και οικος επ οικον πεσιται
11:18	S	πως σταθησεται η βασιλεια αυτου	ου σταθησεται η βασιλεια αυτου
11:22	S	αιρει εφ η επεποιθει	αιρει εφ η πεποιθεν
11:28	S	αυτος δε ειπεν	ο δε ειπεν
11:34	A	και το σωμα σου σκοτεινον	το σωμα σου εστιν σκοτινον εστιν (05) / το σωμα σου σκοτινον εστιν (05 ^c)
11:37	S	οπως αριστηση	ινα αριστηση
11:52	S	την κλειδα της γνωσεως	την κλιδα της γνωσεως
11:54	S	θηρευσαι τι εκ του στοματος αυτου	αφορμην τινα λαβειν αυτου
12:1	S	εν οις επισυναχθειςων των μυριαδων του οχλου	πολλων δε οχλων συνπεριεχοντων κυκλω
12:1	S	ωστε καταπατειν αλληλους	ωστε αλληλους συνπνιγειν
12:2	S	ο ουκ αποκαλυφθησεται	ο ου φανερωθησεται
12:5	S	εξουσιαν εμβαλειν εις την γεενναν	εξουσιαν εις γεενναν βαλειν
12:9	S	ενωπιον των αγγελων του θυ	ενπροσθεν των αγγελων του θυ
12:10	T/O	τω δε εις το αγιον πνα βλασφημησαντι	εις δε το πνα το αγιον [ρει]
12:11	S	οταν δε εισφερωσιν υμας	οταν δε φερωσιν υμας
12:13	S	ειπε τω αδελφω μου	ειπον τω αδελφω μου
12:18	S	μειζονας οικοδομησω	ποιησω αυτας μειζονας
12:18	S	και συναξω εκει παντα	κακει συναξω παντα
12:20	S	α δε ητοιμασας	α ουν ητοιμασας
12:20	S	τινι εσται	τινος εσται
12:24	S	οις ουκ εστιν ταμειον ουδε αποθηκη	οις ουκ εστιν ουτε ταμειον ουτε αποθηκη
12:30	S	ταυτα γαρ παντα τα εθνη του κοσμου επιζητουσιν	ταυτα γαρ παντα τα εθνη του κοσμου ζητει
12:35	S	εστωσαν υμων αι οσφυες περιεζωσμεναι	εστω υμων η οσφυς περιεσζωσμενη
12:37	S	ους ελθων ο κς ευρησει γρηγορουντας	ους ελθων ο κς ευρη γρηγορουντας
12:42	S	ον καταστησει ο κς επι θεραπειας αυτου	ον καταστησει ο κς επι θεραπειαν αυτου
12:45	S	εσθιειν	εσθιων
12:45	S	πινειν και μεθυσκεσθαι	πεινων μεθυσκομενος
12:48	S	παντι δε ω εδωκθη	παντι δε ω εδωκαν
12:48	S	πολυ ζητηθησεται παρ αυτου	ζητησουσιν απ αυτου περισσοτερον
12:48	S	ω παρεθεντο πολυ περισσοτερον αιτησουσιν αυτον	ω παρεθεντο πολυ πλεον απαιτησουσιν αυτον
12:51	S	ειρηνην παρεγενομην δουναι εν τη γη	ειρηνην παρεγενομην δουναι επι της γης
12:58	S	μηποτε κατασυρη σε προς τον κριτην	μηποτε κατακρεινη σε προς τον κριτην
13:4	S	εφ ους επεσεν ο πυργος εν τω σιλωαμ	εφ ους επεσεν ο πυργος του σιλωαμ
13:4	S	παρα παντας τους ανους τους κατοικουντας	παρα παντας τους ανθρωπους τους ενοικουντας
13:5	S	ουχι λεγω υμιν αλλ	ουχι λεγω δε υμειν
13:6	S	εν αυτη	απ αυτης
13:8	S	αφες αυτην και τουτο το ετος	αφες αυτην επι τουτον τον ενιαυτον

13:10	T/O	εν μια των συναγωγων εν τοις σαββασιν	τοις σαββασιν εν μια των συναγωγων
13:11	T/A/O	γυνη <u>πν̄α</u> εχουσα ασθενης	γυνη εν ασθεθεια ην <u>πν̄ς</u>
13:11	S	ην συγκυπτουσα	ην συνκαμπτουσα
13:15	S	τον βουν αυτου η τον ονον	τον βουν αυτου και τον ονον
13:19	S	εν τοις κλαδοις	υπο τους κλαδους
13:23	A	ει ολιγοι οι σωζομενοι	ει ολιγοι εισιν οι σωζομενοι
13:23	S/O	ο δε ειπεν προς αυτους	ο δε αποκριθεις ειπεν
13:25	S	αφ ου αν	αφ ουτου αν
13:31	S	τινες φαρισειοι λεγοντες αυτω	αυτω τινες των φαρισαιων λεγοντες
13:32	S	ιασεις αποτελω σημερον	ειασεις αποτελουμαι σημερον
14:4	T/S	και επιλαβομενος ιασατο αυτον και απελυσεν	και επιλαβομενος αυτον και ιασαμενος απελυσεν
14:5	A	τινος υμων	τινος εξ υμων
14:5	S	και ουκ ευθεως ανασπασει αυτον εν ημερα του σαββατου	τη ημερα του σαββατου και ουκ ευθεως ανασπασει αυτον
14:6	S	και ουκ ισχυσαν ανταποκριθηναι	οι δε ουκ απεκριθησαν
14:9	S	τοτε αρξη μετα αισχυνης	τοτε εση μετα αισχυνης
14:20	S	ετερος ειπεν	αλλος ειπεν
14:20	S	γυναικα εγημα και δια τουτο ου δυναμαι ελθειν	γυναικα ελαβον διο ου δυναμαι ελθειν
14:21	S	τοτε	και
14:21	S	εισαγαγε ωδε	ενεγκε ωδε
14:25	S	ειπεν προς αυτους	ειπεν αυτοις
14:30	S	λεγοντες	μελλουσιν(v.29) λεγειν
14:31	S/A	ουχι καθισας πρωτον βουλευσεται	ουκ ευθεως καθισας πρωτον βουλευεται
15:4	S	τις ανθρωπος εξ υμων εχων εκατον προβατα	τις ανθρωπος εξ υμων ος εξει εκατον προβατα
15:4	S	ου καταλειπει τα εννηκοντα εννεα	ουκ αφησει τα εννηκοντα εννεα
15:4	S	και πορευεται επι το απολωλος	και απελθων το απολωλος ζητει
15:13	S	διεσκορπισεν την ουσιαν αυτου ζων ασωτως	διεσκορπισεν εαυτου τον βιον ζων ασωτως
15:23	S	φαγοντες ευφρανθωμεν	φαγωμεν και ευφρανθωμεν
15:25	S	και ως ερχομενος ηγγισεν	ελθων δε και εγγισας
15:26	S	τι ειη ταυτα	τι θελει τουτο ειναι
15:28	S	παρεκαλει αυτον	ηρξατο αυτον
15:29	S	εμοι ουδεποτε εδοκας εριφον	ουδεποτε εδοκας μοι εριφον
15:29	S	ινα μετα των φιλων μου ευφρανθω	ινα μετα των φιλων μου αριστησω
15:30	S	οτε δε ο υιος σου ουτος ο καταφαγων σου τον βιον	τω δε υιω σου τω καταγοντι παντα
15:30	S	ηλθεν	και ελθοντι
16:9	S/O	εκ του μαμωνα της αδικιας	εκ του αδικου μαμωνα
16:10	S	εν πολλω αδικος εστιν	εν πολλω αδικος γαινηται
16:19	A	ενεδυδισκετο πορφυραν και βυσσον ευφραινομενος	ενεδυδισκετο πορφυραν και βυσσον και ευφραινομενος
16:23	S	εν τοις κολποις	εν τω κολπω

16:24	S	αυτος φωνησας ειπεν	αυτος ενφωνησας ειπεν
16:26	S	εκειθεν προς ημας	εκειθεν ωδε
17:2	S/A	λυσιτελει αυτω	συνφερει δε αυτω
17:2	S	ει λιθος μυλικος περικειται	ει λιθος μυλικος περικειτο
17:2	S	και ερριπται εις την θαλασσαν	και εριπτετο εις την θαλασσαν
17:4	S	μετανοω	μετανοησω(05) / μετανοω(05^c)
17:6	T/S	ειπεν δε ο κς	ο δε ειπεν αυτοις
17:6	S/O	τη συκαμινω ταυτη εκριζωθητι και	τη συκαμεινω
17:6	S	φυτευθητι εν τη θαλασση	μεταφυτευθητι εις την θαλασσαν
17:7	T/O	τις δε εξ υμων δουλον εχων	τις δε εχων υμων δουλον
17:7	A	ερει αυτω	μη ερει αυτω
17:8	O	αλλ ουχι ερει αυτω	αλλα ερει αυτω
17:10	S	οταν ποιησητε παντα τα διαταχθεντα υμιν	οταν ποιησητε οσα λεγω
17:11	S	δια μεσον σαμαρειας και γαλιλαιας	μεσον σαμαρειας και γαλιλαιας
17:12	S	απηνητησαν αυτω δεκα λεπροι ανδρες	οπου ησαν δεκα ανδρες λεπροι
17:12	S	οι εστισαν πορρωθεν	και εστησαν πορρωθεν
17:13	O	και αυτοι	και
17:13	S	ηραν φωνην λεγοντες	εκραξαν φωνη μεγαλη
17:16	S	παρα τους ποδας αυτου	προς τους ποδας αυτου
17:16	O	και αυτος ην σαμαριτης	ην δε σαμαριτης
17:17	S	ουχι οι δεκα εκαθαρισθησαν	ουτοι δεκα εκαθαρισθησαν
17:24	S	η αστραπη ... λαμπει	η αστραπη ... αστραπτει
17:27	S	και ηλθεν ο κατακλυσμος	και εγενετο κατακλυσμος
17:30	S	εσται εν τη ημερα	εσται η ημερα
17:30	S	ημερα ... αποκαλυπταιται	ημερα ... η αποκαλυφθη
17:31	O	εν εκεινη τη ημερα	εκεινη τη ημερα
17:33	S	ος εαν ζητηση	ος αν θεληση
17:33	T/S	την ψυχην αυτου περιποιησασθαι	ζωογονησαι την ψυχην αυτου
18:7	O	την εκδικησιν των εκλεκτων αυτου των βοωντων	την εκδικησιν των εκλεκτων αυτου βοωντων
18:10	S	ο ετερος τελωνης	εις τελωνης
18:16	S	μη κωλυετε αυτα	μη κωλυσηται αυτα
18:30	S	ος ουχι μη [απο]λαβη	εαν μη λαβη
18:30	S	πολλαπλασιονα εν τω καιρω τουτω	επταπλασιονα εν τω καιρω τουτω
18:43	S	εδωκεν αινον τω θω̄	εδωκεν δοξαν τω θω̄
19:2	O	ανηρ ονοματι ... ζακχαιος και αυτος ην αρχιτελωνης	ανηρ ονοματι ... ζακχαιος αυτος ην αρχιτελωνης
19:4	S	και προδραμων	και προλαβων
19:4	S	οτι εκεινης ημελλεν διερχεσθαι	οτι εκεινη ημελλεν διερχεσθαι
19:5	A	ειπεν	ειδεν και ειπεν
19:7	O	διεγογγυζον λεγοντες	διεγογγυζον

19:14	S	απεστειλαν πρεσβειαν οπισω αυτου	ενεπεμψαν (05) / επεμψαν (05 ^ς) πρεσβιαν οπεισω αυτου
19:18	S	ηλθεν ο δευτερος λεγων	ο ετερος ελθων ειπεν
19:21	T/S	εφοβουμην γαρ σε οτι ανθρωπος	εφοβητην οτι σε ανθρωπος γαρ
19:22	S	λεγει αυτω	ο δε ειπεν αυτω
19:23	S	και δια τι	δια τι ουν
19:24	S	και δοτε τω τας δεκα μνας εχοντι	και απενενκατε τω τας δεκα μνας εχοντι
19:26	S	παντι τω εχοντι δοθησεται	παντι τω εχοντι προστιθεται
19:27	T/S	τους εχθρους μου τουτους	εκεινους τους εχθρους μου
19:28	A	αναβαινων εις ιεροσολυμα	αναβαινων δε εις ιεροσολυμ
19:29	T/S	το ορος τω καλουμενον ελαιων	το ορος των ελαιων καλουμενον
19:31	S	εαν τις υμας ερωτα	αν τις υμας ερωτα
19:34	S	ειπον	απεκριθησαν
19:35	S	και ηγαγον	και αγαγοντες
19:35	S	ηγαγον αυτον προς τον ιν και	αγαγοντες τον πωλον
19:35	S	επι τον πωλον	επ αυτον
19:37	S/O	εγγιζοντος δε αυτου ηδη προς τη καταβασει	εγγιζοντων δε αυτων προς την καταβασιν
19:37	S	απαν το πληθος	παν το πληθος
19:43	S	ηξουσιν ημεραι επι σε και παρεμβαλουσιν οι εχθροι σου	ηξουσιν ημεραι και βαλουσιν επι σε οι εχθροι σου
19:45	S	και εισελθων	ελθων δε
19:48	S	αυτου ακουων	ακουειν αυτου
20:3	S	και ειπατε μοι	ον ειπατε μοι
20:6	S	ο λαος απας καταλιθασει ημας	λιθασει ημας ο λαος απας
20:9	S	και απεδημησεν	αυτος δε απεδημησεν
20:11	S	προσεθετο ετερον πεμψαι δουλον	επεμψεν ετερον δουλον
20:12	S	και προσεθετο τριτον πεμψαι	τριτον επεμψεν
20:13	S	ισως τουτον εντραπησονται	τυχον τουτον εντραπησονται
20:20	S	ινα επιλαβωνται αυτου λογου ωστε παραδουναι αυτον	ινα επιλαβωνται αυτου των λογων ωστε παραδουναι αυτον
20:21	S	ου λαμβανεις προσωπον	ουδενος λαμβανεις προσωπον
20:22	T/S	εξεστιν ... καισαρι φορον δουναι	εξεστιν ... φορον διδοναι καισαρι
20:23	S	κατανοησας δε αυτων	επιγνους δε αυτων
20:31	S	οι επτα ου κατελιπον τεκνα	οι επτα ουκ αφηκαν τεκνον
20:34	S	ειπεν αυτοις	ειπεν προς αυτους
20:34	S	και γαμισκονται	και γαμουνται
20:42	S	ειπεν κς̄	λεγει κς̄
20:43	S	εως αν θω τους εχθρους σου	εως τιθω τους εχθρους σου
20:43	S	υποποδιον των ποδων σου	υποκατω των ποδων σου
20:44	S	καλει και	λεγει
20:47	S	οι κατεσθιουσιν τας οικιας των χηρων	οι κατεσθοντες τας οικιας των χηρων
20:47	O	και προφασει μακρα	προφασει μακρα

21:9	S	μη πτωθητε	μη φοβηθητε
21:14	S	μη προμελεταν απολογηθηναι	μη προμελετωντες απολογηθηναι
21:23	S	ουαι ... ταις θηλαζουσαις	ουαι ... ταις θηλαζομεναις
21:25	O	εν απορια	απορια
21:27	S	μετα δυναμεως και δοξης πολλης	και δυναμει πολλη και δοξη
21:30	A	γινωσκετε	γεινωσκειται ηδη
22:3	S	ιουδαν τον καλουμενον ισκαριωτην	ιουδαν τον καλουμενον ισκαριωδ
22:3	A	εκ του αριθμου των δωδεκα	εκ του αριθμου εκ των ιβ̄
22:16	S	ου μη φαγω	ουκετι μη φαγομαι
22:17	O	λαβετε τουτο και διαμερισατε	λαβετε τουτο διαμερισατε
22:18	T/S	εως ου η βασιλεια του θ̄ν̄ ελθη	εως οτου ελθη η βασιλεια του θ̄ν̄
22:19	S	εδωκεν αυτοις	εδωκεν αυτον(05) / αυτοις(05^c)
22:23	S	και αυτοι ηρξαντο	αυτοι δε ηρξαντο
22:24	S	το τις αυτων δοκει ειναι μειζων	το τις αν ιη μειζων
22:26	S	γενεσθω ως ο νεωτερος	γεινεσθω ως μεικροτερος
22:32	S	ποτε επιστρεψας στηρισον τους αδελφους σου	επιστρεψον και στηριζον τους αδελφους σου
22:34	A	εως τρις με απαρνηση ειδεναι	εως οτου τρις με απαρνηση μη ειδεναι με
22:36	S	ο εχων βαλλαντιον αρατω	ο εχων βαλλαντιον αρει
22:36	S	ο μη εχων πωλησατω το ιματιον	ο μη εχων πωλησαι το ιματιον
22:38	S	ικανον εστιν	αρκει
22:41	S	απεσπασθη απ αυτων ωσει λιθου βολην	απεσταθη απ αυτων ωσει λιθου βολην
22:46	O	τι καθευδετε	καθευδετε
22:48	S	ειπεν αυτω ιουδα	ειπεν τω ιουδα
22:50	S	αφειλεν αυτου το ους το δεξιον	αφειλατο αυτου το ωπιον το δεξιον
22:52	S	στρατηγους του ιερου	στρατηγους του λαου
22:53	S	η εξουσια του σκοτους	εξουσια το σκοτος
22:58	S	ιδων αυτον εφη	ιδων αυτον ειπεν
22:59	S	αλλος τις δυσχυριζετο λεγων επ αληθειας	αλλος τις δυσχυριζετο επ αληθειας λεγω
22:65	S	ετερα πολλα	αλλα πολλα
22:70	S	ο δε προς αυτους εφη	ο δε ειπεν αυτοις
23:2	S	τουτον ευραμεν διαστρεφοντα το εθνος ημων	τουτον ευρον(05) / ευρομεν(05^c) διαστρεφοντα το εθνος ημων
23:6	A	ακουσας	ακουσας ... την γαλιλαιαν
23:7	S/O	ανεπεμψεν αυτον προς ηρωδην οντα και αυτον εν ιεροσολυμοις	ανεπεμψεν αυτον τω ηρωδη οντι αυτω εν ιεροσολυμοις
23:7	S	εν ταυταις ταις ημεραις	εν εκειναις ταις ημεραις
23:13	S	συνκαλεσαμενος τους αρχιερεις	συνκαλεσας τους αρχιερεις
23:14	S	προσηνεγκατε μοι τον ανθρωπον τουτον	κατηνεγκατε μοι τον ανθρωπον τουτον
23:14	S	και ιδου εγω	καγω δε
23:14	S	ουθεν ευρον εν τω ανθρωπω τουτω αιτιον	ουθεν ευρον αιτιον εν αυτω
23:21	S	οι δε επεφωνουν λεγοντες	οι δε εκραξαν

23:28	O	μη κλαιετε επ εμε	μη κλαιετε εμε
23:28	O	εφ εαυτας κλαιετε	εαυτας κλαιετε
23:28	O	επι τα τεκνα υμων	τα τεκνα υμων
23:34	S	διαμεριζομενοι δε τα ιματια αυτου	διεμεριζοντο δε τα ιματια αυτου
23:35	S	ειστηκει ο λαος θεωρων	ειστηκει ο λαος ορων
23:35	S	εξεμυκτηριζον δε	εμυκτηριζον δε
23:36	S/O	οξος προσφεροντες αυτω	οξος τε προσεφερον
23:37	O	και λεγοντες	λεγοντες
23:40	S	λεγων οτι ου φοβη συ τον θ̅ν	εφη ουδε φοβη συ τον θ̅ν
23:41	S	αξια γαρ ων επραξαμεν απολαμβανομεν	αξια γαρ ων επραξαμεν απελαβαμεν
23:41	S	ουτος δε ουδεν ατοπον επραξεν	ουτος δε ουδεν πονηρον επραξεν
23:45	S	του ηλιου εκλειποντος	εσκοτισθη δε ο ηλιος
23:47	S	ιδων δε ο εκατονταρχης το γενομενον εδοξαζεν	και ο εκατονταρχος φωνησας εδοξαζεν
23:48	T/S	παντες οι συνπαραγενομενοι οχλοι επι την θεωριαν ταυτην	παντες οι συνπαραγενομενοι επι θεωρεια οχλοι
23:53	S	εν μνηματι λαξευτω	εν μνημειω λελατομημενω
23:55	S	κατακολουθησασαι ... γυναικες	κατηκολουθησαν ... γυναικες
23:55	S	συνεληλυθιαι εκ της γαλιλαιας αυτω εθεασαντο	συνεληλυθιαι απο της αγαλιλαιας και εθεασαντο
23:55	S	εθεασαντο το μνημειον	εθεασαντο το μνημα
24:1	S	φερουσαι α ητοιμασαν αρωματα	φαιρουσαι α ητοιμασαν
24:4	S	εν τω απορεισθαι αυτας περι τουτου	εν τω απορεισθαι αυτας περι αυτου
24:5	S	εμφοβων δε γενομενων αυτων και κλινουσων τα προσωπα	ενφοβοι δε γενομεναι εκλειναν τα προσωπα
24:6	S	ως ελαλησεν υμιν	οσα ελαλησεν υμιν
24:10	T/O	ησαν δε η μαγδαληνη μαρια	μαρια η μαγδαληνη
24:10	S	προς τους αποστολους	προς αυτους αποστολους
24:13	S	κωμην ... η ονομα ...	κωμην ... ονοματι ...
24:14	S	προς αλληλους	προς εαυτους
24:17	S	αντιβαλεται προς αλληλους	αντιβαλλεται προς εαυτους
24:18	O	συ μονος παροικεις ιερουσαλημ και ουκ εγνωσ τα γενομενα	συ μονος παροικεις ιερουσαλημ ουκ εγνωσ τα γενομενα
24:19	S	και ειπεν	ο δε ειπεν
24:20	S	οπως	ως
24:20	S	παρεδωκαν αυτον	τουτον παρεδωκαν
24:21	S	αυτος εστιν ο μελλων λυτρουσθαι τον ισραηλ	αυτος ην ο μελλων λυτρουσθαι τον ισραηλ
24:21	S	αφ ου ταυτα εγενετο	αφ ου ταυτα γεγονεν
24:23	O	ηλθον λεγουσαι και οπτασιαν αγγελων εωρακεναι	ηλθον λεγουσαι οπτασιαν αγγελων εωρακεναι
24:24	A	απηλθον τινες των συν ημιν	απηλθον τινες εκ των συν ημειν
24:24	S	καθως	ως
24:25	S	και αυτος ειπεν	ο δε ειπεν

24:27	A	και αρξαμενος απο μουσεως	και ην αρξαμενος απο μουσεως
24:27	S	αρξαμενος ... διερμηνευσεν αυτοις	αρξαμενος ... ερμηνευειν αυτοις
24:29	O	προς εσπεραν εστιν και κεκλειεν ... η ημερα	προς εσπεραν και κλειεν ... η ημερα
24:29	S	συν αυτοις	μετ αυτων
24:30	S	επεδιδου αυτοις	προσεδιδου αυτοις
24:32	S	προς αλληλους	προς εαυτους
24:32	S	ως διηνοιγεν ημιν τας γραφας	ως ηνυγεν ημειν η γραφη(05) / τας γραφας(05^c)
24:35	S	ως εγνωσθη αυτοις	οτι εγνωσθη αυτοις
24:39	S	καθως εμε θεωρειτε εχοντα	καθως εμε εβλεπετε εχοντα
24:44	S	ετι ων συν υμιν	εν ω ημην συν υμειν
24:44	S	δει πληρωθηναι παντα τα γεγραμμενα	δει πλησθηναι παντα τα γεγραμμενα
24:47	S	κηρυχθηναι ... εις παντα τα εθνη	κηρυχθηναι ... ως επι παντα τα εθνη
24:51	S	διεστη απ αυτων	απεστη απ αυτων
24:53	S	ησαν δια παντος εν τω ιερω ευλογουντες τον $\overline{\theta\nu}$	ησαν δια παντος εν τω ιερω αινουντες τον $\overline{\theta\nu}$

4.4.3 Singular readings with significant changes

The third category is singular readings which are regarded to be significant in studying the scribal intention. These readings reflect significant linguistic or literary changes which affect the meaning. These are further distinguished into harmonisation, specification or simplification, and significant alterations.

4.4.3.1 Singular readings by harmonisations

Codex Bezae shows a strong tendency of harmonising the Lukan text with that of Matthew or Mark. Sometimes it is challenging to identify harmonisations since D does not always adopt the Matthean or Markan verses literally. D sometimes make changes in vocabulary, sometimes in word order, sometimes in grammatical construction. This study has picked out what seems evident. Considering the harmonisations, the scribes of the D-text show the tendency of removing the difficulties caused by the different accounts between Luke and other Synoptics. Furthermore, the scribes of D-text made certain harmonisations to alter the meaning of Luke according to their own agenda. Therefore, harmonised verses are a good resource to trace the theological tendency of the scribes.

Table 48. Singular readings by harmonisations with other biblical verses

Ch.	Type	B-text	D-text	Reference
2:39	A	επεστρεψαν ... ναζαρετ	επεστρεψαν ... ναζαρετ καθως ερηθη δια του προφητου οτι ναζωραιος κληθησεται	Mt. 2:24
3:1	O	πειλατου της ιουδαιας και τετραρχουντος της γαλιλαιας ηρωδου	πειλατου της ιουδαιας ηρωδου	Mt. 2:21
3:22	T/S	συ ει ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοκησα	υιος μου ει συ εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε	Ps. 2:7; Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5
3:23-31	S	και αυτος ην ις αρχομενος ωσει ετων τριακοντα ων υιος ως ενομιζετο ιωσηφ του ηλει του ματθατ του λευι του μελχει του ιανναι του ιωσηφ του μαθθαθιου του αμωσ του ναουμ του εσλει του ναγγαι του μααθ του ματταθιου του σεμεειν του ιωσηφ του ιωδα του ιωαναν του ρησα του ζοροβαβελ του σαλαθιηλ του νηρει του μελχει του αδδει του κωσαμ του ελμαδαμ του ηρ του ιησου του ελιεζερ του ιωρειμ του ματθατ του λευι του συμεων του ιουδα του ιωσηφ του ιωναμ του ελιακειμ του μελεα του μεννα του μετταθα του ναθαμ του δαυειδ	ην δε ιης ως ετων λ αρχομενος ως ενομιζετο ειναι υιος ιωσηφ του εγενετο ιακωβ του μαθθαν του ελεαζαρ του ελιουδ του ιαχειν του σαδωκ του αζωρ του ελιακειμ του αβιουδ του ζοροβαβελ του σαλαθιηλ του ιεχονιου του ιωακειμ του ελιακειμ του ιωσηφ του αμωσ του μανασση του εξεκεια του αχας του ιωαθαν του οζεια του αμασιου του ιωας του οχοζιου του ιωραμ του ιωσαφαδ του ασαφ του αβιουδ του ροβοαμ του σολομων του δαυειδ	Mt. 1:6-16
4:2	S	πειραζομενος υπο του διαβολου	πειραζομενος υπο του σατανα	Mk. 1:13
4:31	A	πολιν της γαλιλαιας	πολιν της γαλιλαιας την παραθαλασσιον εν οριοις ζαβουλων και νεφθαλειμ	Mt. 4:13
5:10	S	ομοιως δε και ιακωβον και ιωανην υιους ζεβεδαιου οι ησαν κοινωνοι τω σιμωνι και ειπε προς τον σιμωνα ις μη φοβου απο του νυν ανθρωπους εση ζωγων η λεπρα απηλθεν απ αυτου	ησαν δε κοινωνοι αυτου ιακωβος και ιωανης υιοι ζεβεδαιου ο δε ειπεν αυτοις δευτε και μη γεινεσθε αλιεις ιχθυων ποιησω γαρ υμας αλιεις ανθρωπων εκαθαρισθη	Mt. 4:19; Mk. 1:17
5:13	S			Mk. 1:42; Mt. 8:3
5:14	A	-	ο δε εξελθων ηρξατο κηρυσσειν και διαφημειζειν τον λογον ωστε μηκετι δυνασθαι αυτον φανερωσ εις πολιν εισελθειν αλλα εξω ην εν ερημοις τοποις και συνηρχοντο προς αυτον και ηλθεν παλιν εις καφαρναουμ (after 5:14)	Mk. 1:45-2:1a
5:21	A	ηρξαντο διαλογιζεσθαι οι γραμματεις και οι φαρισαιοι	ηρξαντο διαλογιζεσθαι οι γραμματεις και οι φαρισαιοι εν ταις καρδιαις αυτων	Mt. 9:3; Mk. 2:7
5:21	S	τις εστιν ουτος ος λαλει βλασφημιας	τι ουτος λαλει βλασφημιας	Mk. 2:7

5:27	S	μετα ταυτα εξηλθεν	ελθων παλιν παρα την θαλασσαν τον επακολουθουντα αυτω οχλον εδιδασκεν	Mk. 2:13
5:27	S	εθεασατο τελωνην ονοματι λευειν	παραγων ειδεν λευει τον του αλφαιου	Mk. 2:14
5:38	A	αλλ οινον νεον εις ασκους καινους βλητεον	αλλα οινον νεον εις ασκους καινους βαλλουσιν και αμφοτεροι τηρουνται	Mt. 9:18
6:2	S/A	τι ποιειτε	ειδε τι ποιουσιν οι μαθηται σου	Mk. 2:24
6:6	S/O	εγενετο δε εν ετερω σαββατω εισελθειν αυτον εις την συναγωγην και διδασκειν και ην ανθρωπος εκει και η χειρ αυτου η δεξια ην ξηρα	και εισελθοντος αυτου παλιν εις την συναγωγην σαββατω εν η ην ανθρωπος ξηραν εχων την χειρα	Mk. 3:1
6:11	S	τι αν ποιησαιεν τω ιω	πως απολεσωσιν αυτον	Mk. 3:6; Mt. 12:14
6:14	A	ιωανην	ιωανην τον αδελφον αυτου ους επωνομασεν βοανηργες ο εστιν υιοι βροντης	Mk. 3:17
6:15	A	θωμαν	θωμαν τον επικαλουμενον διδουμον	Jn. 11:16, 20:24, 21:2
6:23	S	ιδου γαρ ο μισθος υμων πολυς	οτι ο μισθος υμων πολυς	Mt. 5:12
7:2	S	εκατονταρχου δε τινος δουλος	εκατονταρχου δε τινος παις	Mt. 8:6
7:27	O	ος κατασκευασει την οδον σου εμπροσθεν σου	ος κατασκευασει την οδον σου	Mk. 1:2
8:20	S	ιδειν θελοντες σε	ζητουντες σε	Mk. 3:32; Mt. 12:46
8:24	S	επιστατα επιστατα	κε κε	Mt. 8:25
8:45	S	και ειπεν ο ις	ο δε ιης γνους την εξελθουσαν εξ αυτου δυναμιν επηρωτα	Mk. 5:30
9:22	S	τη τριτη ημερα εγερθηαι	μεθ ημερας τρεις αναστηναι	Mt. 27:63; Mk. 8:31, 9:31, 10:34
9:27	S	εως αν ιδωσιν την βασιλειαν του θυ	εως αν ειδωσιν τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχομενον εν τη δοξη αυτου	Mt. 16:28 & Mt. 25:31
9:33	S	και ποιησομεν σκηνας τρεις	θελεις ποιησω(05) / ποιησωμεν(05^c) ωδε τρεις σκηνας	Mt. 17:4
9:39	S/O	και ιδου πνα λαμβανει αυτον και εξαιφνης κραζει	αυτον εξαιφνης πνευμα	Mk. 9:18, 20
10:23	A	μακαριοι οι οφθαλμοι οι βλεποντες α βλεπετε	μακαριοι οι οφθαλμοι οι βλεποντες α βλεπετε και ακουοντες α ακουετε	Mt. 13:16
11:2	A	οταν προσευχεσθε λεγετε	οταν προσευχησθε μη βαττολογειτε ως οι λοιποι δοκουσιν γαρ τινες οτι εν τη πολυλογεια αυτων εισακουσθησονται αλλα προσευχομενοι λεγετε	Mt. 6:7
11:11	A	αιτησει ο υιος ιχθυν	ο υιος αιτησει αρτον μη λιθον αυτω επιδωσει η και ιχθυν αιτησει	Mt. 7:9

11:14	S	και ην εκβαλλον δαιμονιον [και αυτο ην κωφον] εγενετο δε του δαιμονιου εξελθοντος ελαλησεν ο κωφος και εθαυμασαν οι οχλοι	ταυτα δε ειποντος αυτου προσφερετε αυτω δαιμονιζομενος κωφος και εκβαλοντος αυτου παντες εθαυμαζον	Mt. 9:32-33
11:30	A	-	και καθως ιωνας εν τη κοιλια του κητους εγενετο τρις ημερας και τρεις νυκτας ουτως και ο υιος του ανθρωπου εν τη γη (after 11:30)	Mt. 12:40
11:35	S	σκοπει ουν μη το φως το εν σοι σκοτος εστιν	ει ουν το φως το εν σοι σκοτος το σκοτος ποσον	Mt. 6:23
11:43	A	εν ταις αγοραις	εν ταις αγοραις και πρωτοκλισιας εν τοις δειπνοις	Mt. 23:6-7; Mk. 12:38-39
11:44	A	ουαι υμιν	ουαι υμειν γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι	Mt. 23:23, 23:25
11:51	S	μεταξυ του θυσιαστηριου και του οικου	ανα μεσον του θυσιαστηριου και του ναου	Mt. 23:35
11:54	A	-	ινα ευρωσιν κατηγορησαι αυτου	Mk. 3:2
12:4	S	και μετα ταυτα μη εχοντων	την δε ψυχην μη δυναμενων αποκτειναι μηδε εχοντων	Mt. 10:28
12:10	A	ουκ αφεθησεται	ουκ αφεθησεται αυτω ουτε εν τω αιωνι τουτω ουτε εν τω μελλοντι	Mt. 12:32
12:24	S	κατανοησατε τους κορακας	κατανοησατε τα πετεινα του ουρανου	Mt. 6:26
12:24	S	ποσω μαλλον υμεις διαφερετε των πετεινων	ουχι υμεις διαφερεται των πετεινων	Mt. 6:26
12:26	S/O	ει ουν ουτε ελαχιστον δυνασθαι	και	Mt. 6:28
12:27	S	πως αυξανει ου κοπια ουδε νηθει	πως ουτε νηθει ουτε υφαινει	Mt. 6:28
14:5	S	υς η βους εις φρεαρ πεσειται	προβατον η βους εις φρεαρ ενπεσειται	Mt. 12:11
17:6	A	ελεγετε αν τη συκαμινω	ελεγετε αν τω ορει τουτω μεταβα εντευθεν εκει και μετεβαινεν και τη συκαμινω	Mt. 17:20
17:21	A	ιδου ωδε η εκει	ιδου ωδε η ιδου εκει μη πιστευσητε	Mt. 24:23; Mk. 13:21
17:35	A	-	δυο εν αγρω εις παραληφθησεται και ο ετερος αφεθησεται (after 17:35)	Mt. 24:40
18:15	O	προσεφερον δε αυτω και τα βρεφη	προσεφερον δε αυτω παιδια	Mt. 19:13; Mk. 10:13
18:20	S	μη μοιχευσης μη φονευσης μη κλεψης μη ψευδομαρτυρησης	το ου μοιχευσεις ου φονευσεις ου κλεψεις ου ψευδομαρτυρησεις	Ex. 20:13-16; Deut. 5:18-20; Mt. 19:18
19:27	A	-	και τον αγρειον δουλον εκβαλετε εις το σκοτος το εξωτερων εκει εσται ο κλαυθμος και ο βρυγμος των οδοντων (after 19:27)	Mt. 25:30
19:38	T/A	ο ερχομενος ο βασιλευς εν ονοματι κυ	ο ερχομενος εν ονοματι κυ ευλογημενος ο βασιλευς	Mk. 11:9-10
20:24	S	δειξατε μοι δηναριον	δειξατε μοι το νομισμα	Mt. 22:20
21:2	A	-	ο εστιν κοδραντης (after 21:2)	Mk. 12:43

22:4	O	συνελαλησεν τοις αρχιερευσιν και στρατηγοις το πως	συνελαλησεν τοις αρχιερευσιν πως	Mt. 26:14; Mk. 14:10
22:26	S	ο ηγουμενος ως ο διακωνων	ο ηγουμενος ως ο διακονος	Mt. 20:26
22:47	S	και ηγγισεν τω ιϋ φιλησαι αυτον	και ηγγισας εφίλησεν τον ιην	Mt. 26:49; Mk. 14:45
22:55	S	μεσος αυτων	μετ αυτων θερμαινομενος	Mk. 14:54
22:67	O	ει συ ει ο χς ειπον ημιν	συ ει ο χρς	Mk. 14:62
23:19	A	-	αναγκην δε ειχεν κατα εορτην απολυειν αυτοις ενα (after 23:19)	Mk. 15:6
23:35	S	ει ουτος εστιν ο χς του θυ ο εκλεκτος	ει υιος ει του θυ ει χρς ει ο εκλεκτος	Mt. 27:40
23:37	S	ει συ ει ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων	χαιρε ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων	Mt. 27:29; Mk. 15:18
23:37	S	σωσον σεαυτον	περιτεθεντες αυτω και ακανθινον στεφανον	Mt. 27:29
23:45	T/S	εσχισθη δε το καταπετασμα του ναου μεσον	και το καταπετασμα του ναου εσχισθη (after 23:46)	Mt. 27:51; Mk. 15:38
24:1	A	-	αποκυλισει τον λιθον ελογιζοντο δε εν εαυταις τις αρα (after 24:1)	Mk. 16:3
24:13	S	εμμαους	ουλαμμαους	Gen. 28:19

4.4.3.2 Singular readings that specify or simplify

Another important format of singular readings are those readings which specify or simplify the verses. These readings reflect what the scribes might have wanted to stress or to understate. These readings do not always reflect theological significance as many of them involve an addition or omission of the implied subject or object. It is important, rather, to pick out significant readings that might have affected the theology of a particular manuscript.

Table 49. Singular readings that specify or simplify

Ch.	Type	B-text	D-text	Evaluation ⁶²
1:23	A	απηλθεν εις τον οικον αυτου	τοτε απηλθεν εις τον οικον αυτου	spec.
1:26	O	πολιν της γαλιλαιας η ονομα ναζαρετ	εις πολιν γαλιλαιαν	simp.
1:41	T/A	το βρεφος εν τη κοιλια	εν τη κοιλια της ελισαβεδ το βρεφος	spec.
1:48	A	οτι επεβλεψεν επι την ταπινωσιν της δουλης αυτου	οτι επεβλεψεν κς επι την ταπινωσιν της δουλης αυτου	spec.
1:49	A	εποιησεν μοι μεγαλα ο δυνατος	εποιησεν μοι μεγαλ[ε]ια ο θς ο δυνατος	spec.
1:63	O	εγραψεν λεγων ιωαννης	εγραψεν ιωαν[ν]ης	simp.

⁶² The column under "Evaluation" denotes the types of alteration: spec. for specification; simp. for simplification; and emph. for emphasis.

1:65	T/A	και εγενετο επι παντας φοβος	και εγενετο φοβος μεγας επι παντας	spec.
1:66	O	χειρ $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ ην μετ αυτου	χειρ $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ μετ αυτου	simp.
1:67	S	επροφητευσεν λεγων	ειπεν	simp.
1:79	A	επιφαναι τοις εν σκοτει	επιφαναι φως τοις εν σκοτει	spec.
2:9	O	δοξα $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ περιελαμψεν αυτους	δοξα περιελαμψεν αυτους	simp.
2:10	A	χαραν μεγαλην ητις εσται παντι τω λαω	χαραν μεγαλην ητις εσται και παντι τω λαω	spec.
2:21	A	εν τη κοιλια	εν κοιλια μητρος	spec.
2:40	T/A	το δε παιδιον ηυξανεν και εκραταιουτο	το δε παιδιον $\overline{\eta\varsigma}$ εκραταιουτο και ηυξανε	spec.
2:42	S	αναβαινοντων αυτων	ανεβησαν οι γονεις αυτου εχοντες αυτον	spec.
2:48	A	καγω οδυνωμενοι ζητουμεν σε	καγω οδυνωμενοι και λυπουμενοι εζητουμεν σε	spec.
3:10	A	τι ... ποιησωμεν	τι ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν	spec.
3:12	A	ηλθον δε και τελωναι βαπτισθηναι	ηλθον δε και τελωναι ομοιως βαπτισθηναι	spec.
3:12	A	τι ποιησωμεν	τι ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν	spec.
3:13	T/A	μηδεν πλεον παρα το διατεταγμενον υμιν πρασσετε	μηδεν πλεον πρασσεται παρα το διατεταγμενον υμειν πρασσειν	spec.
3:14	A/O	τι ποιησωμεν και ημεις	τι ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν	spec.
3:16	S	απεκρινατο λεγων πασιν ο ιωαννης	επιγνους τα διανοηματα αυτων ειπεν	spec.
3:16	O	των υποδηματων αυτου	του υποδηματος	spec.
4:15	O	εδιδασκεν εν ταις συναγωγαις αυτων	εδιδασκεν εν ταις συναγωγαις	simp.
4:16	O	κατα το ειωθος αυτω	κατα το ειωθος	simp.
4:34	T/A	ηλθες απολεσαι ημας	ηλθες ημας ωδε απολεσαι	spec.
4:36	A	εγενετο θαμβος επι παντας	εγενετο θαμβος μεγας επι παντας	spec.
5:6	S	τουτο ποιησαντες συνεκλεισαν πληθος ιχθυων πολων	ευθυς χαλασαντες τα δικτυα συνεκλισαν ιχθυων πληθος πολω	spec.
5:7	A	ωστε βυθιζεσθαι	ωστε παρα τι βυθιζεσθαι	spec.
5:7	O	βυθιζεσθαι αυτα	βυθιζεσθαι	simp.
5:8	A	εξελθε απ εμου	παρακαλω εξελθε απ εμου	spec.
5:12	S/O	πεσων επι προσωπον εδεηθη αυτου	επεσεν επι προσωπον	simp.
5:14	S	εις μαρτυριον αυτοις	ινα εις μαρτυριον η υμειν τουτο	spec.
5:19	S	δια των καιραμων	και αποστεγασαντες τους κεραμους οπου ην	spec.
5:20	A	ιδων την πιστιν αυτων	ιδων ... $\overline{\eta\varsigma}$ την πιστιν αυτων	spec.
5:22	A	τι διαλογιζεσθε εν ταις καρδιαις υμων	τι διαλογιζεσθαι εν ταις καρδιαις υμων πονηρα	spec.
5:33	S	οι δε σοι	οι δε μαθηται σου	spec.
5:37	A	ρηξει ο οινος ο νεος τους ασκους	ρηξει ο οινος ο νεος τους ασκους τους παλαιους	spec.
6:3	S	ουδε τουτο ανεγνωτε	ουδεποτε τουτο ανεγνωται	emph.

6:8	O	ειπεν δε τω ανδρι	λεγει []	simp.
6:12	O	εν τη προσευχη του θυ	εν τη προσευχη	simp.
6:14	A	σιμωνα	πρωτον σιμωνα	spec.
6:20	O	αυτος	-	simp.
6:31	O	ποιειτε αυτοις ομοιως	ποιειτε αυτοις	simp.
6:34	O	ινα απολαβωσιν τα ισα	ινα απολαβωσιν	simp.
6:45	A	εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου της καρδιας	εκ του αγαθου θησαυρου αυτου της καρδιας	spec.
6:49	O	και ευθυς συνεπεσεν	και συνεπεσεν	simp.
7:4	O	οι δε παραγενομενοι προς τον ιν	οι δε παραγενομενοι	simp.
7:9	S	ουδε	ουδεποτε	emph.
7:12	O	και ιδου εξεκομιζετο	εξεκομιζετο	simp.
7:12	A	οχλος της πολεως	πολυς οχλος της πολεως	spec.
7:19	S	επεμψεν προς τον κν λεγων	λεγει πορευθεντες ειπατε αυτω	spec.
7:22	S	α ειδετε και ηκουσατε	α ειδον υμων οι οφθαλμοι και α ηκουσαν υμων τα ωτα	spec.
7:28	A/O	ο δε μικροτερος εν τη βασιλεια του θυ	ο μεικροτερος αυτου εν τη βασιλεια του θυ	spec.
7:50	A	η πιστις σου σεσωκεν σε	γυνη η πιστις σου σεσωκεν σε	spec.
8:4	S	ειπεν δια παραβολης	ειπεν παραβολην τοιαυτην προς αυτους	spec.
8:5	O	εν τω σπιρειν αυτον	εν τω σπιρειν	simp.
8:8	A	την γην την αγαθην	την γην την αγαθην και καλην	spec.
8:13	O	ουτοι ριζαν ουκ εχουσιν	ριζαν ουκ εχουσιν	simp.
8:15	O	εν καρδια καλη και αγαθη	εν καρδια αγαθη	simp.
8:15	A	ακουσαντες τον λογον	ακουσαντες τον λογον του θυ	spec.
8:24	O	τω κλυδωνι του υδατος	τω κλυδωνι	simp.
8:28	S/O	ιδων δε τον ιν ανακραζας προσεπεσεν αυτω	ειδων δε τον ιην ανεκραξεν	simp.
8:32	S	επιτρεψη αυτοις εις εκεινους εισελθειν	εις τους χοιρους εισελθωσιν	simp.
8:35	S	εξηλθον δε ιδειν το γεγονος και ηλθαν προς τον ιην και ευραν καθημενον τον ανον αφ ου τα δαιμονια εξηλθεν ειματισμενον και σωφρονουντα	παραγενομενων δε εκ της πολεως και θεωρησαντων καθημενον τον δαιμονιζομενον σωφρονουντα και ιματισμενον καθημενον	simp.
8:37	T/O	αυτος δε εμβας	εμβας δε	simp.
8:37	O	ενβας εις πλοιον υπεστρεψεν	ενβας ... υπεστρεψεν	simp.
8:50	A	ο δε ιης ακουσας	ο δε ιης ακουσας τον λογον	spec.
8:56	T/S	και εξεστησαν οι γονεις αυτης	οι δε γονεις αυτης θεωρουντες εξεστησαν	spec.
9:11	A	τους χριαν εχοντας θεραπειας ιατο	τους χριαν εχοντας θεραπειας αυτου παντας ιατο	spec.
9:16	A	αναβλεψας εις τον ουρανον ευλογησεν	αναβλεψας εις τον ουρανον προσηυξατο και ευλογησεν	spec.
9:16	O	και κατεκλασεν και εδιδου	και εδιδου	simp.

9:19	S	αλλοι δε οτι προφητης τις των αρχαιων ανεστη	η ενα των προφητων	simp.
9:39	O	σπαρασσει αυτον μετα αφρου	σπαρασσει μετα αφρου	simp.
9:47	O	επιλαβομενος παιδιον εστησεν αυτο	επιλαβομενος παιδιον εστησεν	simp.
9:48	O	εμε δεχεται και ος αν εμε δεξηται δεχεται τον αποστειλαντα με	εμε δεχεται και τον αποστειλαντα με	simp.
9:62	T/S	ειπεν δε ο ις	ο δε ιης ειπεν αυτω	spec.
10:6	S/A	εφ υμας ανακαμψει	εφ υμας επιστρεψει η ειρηνη υμων	spec.
10:24	O	πολλοι προφηται και βασιλεις ηθελησαν ιδειν	πολλοι προφηται ηθελησαν ιδειν	simp.
10:35	O	αποδωσω σοι	αποδωσω	simp.
10:36	O	τουτων των τριων	-	simp.
10:39	O	ηκουε τον λογον αυτου	ηκουε τον λογον	simp.
10:41	O	μαρθα μαρθα μεριμνας και θορυβαζη περι πολλα	μαρθα μαρθα θορυβαζη	simp.
11:2	O	ειπεν ... αυτοις	ειπεν	simp.
11:2	A	ελθετω	εφ ημας ελθετω	spec.
11:5	O	ειπεν προς αυτους	ειπεν	simp.
11:8	O	εγερθεις δωσει αυτω	εγερθεις δωσει	simp.
11:26	O	τοτε πορευεται	πορευεται	simp.
11:37	S	εν δε τω λαλησαι ερωτα αυτον	εδεθη δε αυτου	simp.
11:37	A	φαρισαιος	τις φαρισαιος	spec.
11:46	O	αυτοι ενι των δακτυλων υμων ου προσψαυετε τοις φορτιοις	αυτοι ενι των δακτυλων υμων ου προσψαυετε	simp.
12:1	O	προς τους μαθητας αυτου	προς τους μαθητας	simp.
12:15	T/O	ουκ εν τω περισσευειν τινη ζωη αυτου εστιν εκ των υπαρχοντων αυτω	ουκ εν τω περισσευειν τινη εστιν η ζωη εκ των υπαρχοντων αυτω	simp.
12:32	A	ευδοκησεν ο $\overline{\pi\eta\rho}$ υμων δουναι υμιν την βασιλειαν	εν αυτω ηυδοκησεν ο πατηρ υμων δουναι υμειν την βασιλειαν	spec.
12:38	S/A	εν τη δευτερα καν εν τη τριτη φυλακη ελθη και ευρη ουτως	τη εσπερινη φυλακη και ευρησει ουτως ποιησει και εαν εν τη δευτερα και τη τριτη	spec.
12:39	O	ουκ αν αφηκεν διορυχθηναι τον οικον αυτου	ουκ αν	simp.
12:43	A	ον ελθων ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ αυτου ευρησει	ον ελθων ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ αυτου ευρησει αυτον	spec.
12:46	S	ηξει ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ του δουλου εκεινου	ηξει ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ αυτου	simp.
12:53	A	υιος επι πατρι αυτου	υιος επι πατρι αυτου διαμερισθησονται	spec.
13:7	A	εκκοψον αυτην	φερε την αζεινην εκκοψον αυτην	spec.
13:8	S	βαλω κοπρια	βαλω κοφινον κοπριων	spec.
13:12	O	ο $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ προσεφωνησεν και ειπεν	ο $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ ειπεν	simp.
13:17	T/S/O	πασιν τοις ενδοξοις τοις γεινομενοις υπ αυτου	πασιν οις εθεωρουν ενδοξοις υπ αυτου γεινομενοις	spec.

13:20	S	και παλιν ειπεν τινι ομοιωσω την βασιλειαν του θ̄υ	η τινι ομοια εστιν η βασιλεια του θ̄υ και τινι ομοιωσω αυτην	spec.
14:3	O	ο ις̄ ειπεν προς τους νομικους και φαρισαιους λεγων	ο ιης̄ ειπεν προς τους νομικους και φαρισαιους	simp.
14:8	O	οταν κληθης υπο τινος	οταν κληθης	simp.
14:8	S	μηποτε εντιμοτερος σου η κεκλημενος υπ αυτου	μηποτε εντειμοτερος σου ηξει	simp.
14:21	A	απηγγειλεν τω κ̄ω̄ αυτου ταυτα	απηγγειλεν τω κ̄ω̄ αυτου παντα ταυτα	spec.
14:24	O	ουδεις των ανδρων εκεινων των κεκλημενων	ουδεις των ανδρων των κεκλημενων	simp.
14:29	S	ινα μηποτε θεντος αυτου θεμελιον και μη ισχυοντος εκτελεσαι	ινα μηποτε θεντος αυτου θεμελιον μη ισχυση οικοδομησαι και	spec.
15:24	A	και ευρεθη	και αρτι ευρεθη	spec.
15:27	O	ο δε ειπεν αυτω	ο δε ειπεν	simp.
15:27	A/O	τον μοσχον τον σιτευτον	τον σιτευτον μοσχον αυτω	spec.
15:29	A	εριφον	εριφον εξ αιγων	spec.
16:6	O	καθισας ταχεως γραψον πεντηκοντα	γραψον πεντηκοντα	simp.
16:7	O	συ δε ποσον οφειλεις ο δε ειπεν εκατον κορους σιτου	εκατον κορους σειτου ο δε	simp.
16:8	A	οτι οι υιοι του αιωνος τουτου φρονιμωτεροι	οτι διο λεγω υμειν οι υιοι του αιωνος τουτου φρονιμωτεροι	spec.
16:19	T/A	ανος δε τις ην πλουσιος	ειπεν δε και ετεραν παραβολην ανθρωπος τις ην πλουσιος	spec.
17:14	A	ειπεν αυτοις πορευθεντες επιδειξατε εαυτους	ειπεν αυτοις τεθεραπευσθε πορευθεντες επιδειξατε εαυτους	spec.
17:17	A	ο ις̄ ειπεν	ο ιης̄ ειπεν αυτοις	spec.
17:18	S	ουχ ευρεθησαν υποστραψαντες δουναι δοξαν τω θ̄ω̄	εξ αυτων ουδεις ευρεθη υποστρεφων ος δωσει δοξαν τω θ̄ω̄	spec.
17:22	A	μιαν των ημερων του υιου του ανθρωπου	μιαν των ημερων τουτων του υιου του ανθρωπου	spec.
17:37	O	λεγουσιν αυτω	λεγουσιν	simp.
18:4	A	επι χρονον	επι χρονον τινα	spec.
18:4	S/A	ειπεν εν εαυτω ει και τον θ̄ν̄ ου φοβουμαι	ηλθεν εις εαυτον και λεγει ει τον θ̄ν̄ ου φοβουμαι	spec.
18:5	A	την χηραν ταυτην εκδικησω αυτην	την χηραν ταυτην απελθων εκδικησω αυτην	spec.
18:9	A/O	εξουθενουντας τους λοιπους	εξουθενουντας τους λοιπους ανθρωπους	spec.
18:14	S	κατεβη ουτος δεδικαιωμενος εις τον οικον αυτου παρ εκεινον	κατεβη ουτος δεδικαιωμενος μαλλον παρ αικεινον τον φαρισαιον	spec.
18:20	A	τας εντολας οιδας	τας εντολας οιδας ο δε ειπεν ποιας ειπεν δε ο ιης̄	spec.
18:29	A	ος αφηκεν ... ενεκεν της βασιλειας του θ̄υ	ος αφηκεν ... εν τω καιρω τουτω ενεκεν της βασιλειας του θ̄υ	spec.
19:5	S	ως ηλθεν επι τον τοπον αναβλεψας ο ις̄	εγενετο εν τω διερχεσθαι αυτον	simp.

19:12	O	λαβειν εαυτω βασιλειαν	λαβειν βασιλειαν	simp.
19:30	O	ευρησετε πωλον δεδεμενον εφ ον ουδεις ποποτε ανθρωπων εκαθισε και λυσαντες αυτον αγαγετε	ευρησετε πωλον [](05) / εφ ον ουδεις ανθρωπων εκαθισεν και λυσαντες αγαγατε(05^c)	simp.
19:31	O	εαν ... ερωτα δια τι λυετε	αν ... ερωτα	simp.
19:37	O	χαιροντες αινειν τον θν̄ φωνη μεγαλη	χαιροντες αινειν τον θν̄	simp.
19:43	O	χαρακα σοι	χαρακα	simp.
20:9	S	ηρξατο δε προς τον λαον λεγειν την παραβολην ταυτην	ελεγεν δε την παραβολην ταυτην	simp.
20:9	T/O	ανθρωπος [τις] εφυτευσεν αμπελωνα	αμπελωνα εφυτευσεν ανθρωπος	simp.
20:14	O	ιδοντες δε αυτον οι γεωργοι διελογιζοντο	ιδοντες δε αυτον διελογιζοντο	simp.
20:16	O	απολεσει τους γεωργους τουτους	απολεσει τους γεωργους	simp.
20:20	O	υποκρινομενους εαυτους δικαιους ειναι	υποκρινομενους εαυτους δικαιους	simp.
20:20	S/O	τη αρχη και τη εξουσια του ηγεμονος	τω ηγεμονι	simp.
20:28	T/O	εχων γυναικα και ουτος ατεκνος η ινα λαβη ο αδελφος αυτου την γυναικα	ατεκνος εχων γυναικα ινα λαβη ο αδελφος αυτου την γυναικα	simp.
20:29	T/S	επτα ουν αδελφοι ησαν	ησαν παρ ημειν επτα αδελφοι	spec.
20:31	O	ο τριτος ελαβεν αυτην	ο τριτος	simp.
20:34	A	οι υιοι του αιωνος τουτου γαμουσιν	οι υιοι του αιωνος τουτου γεννωνται και γεννωσιν γαμουσιν	spec.
20:44	O	δαυειδ ουν κν̄ αυτον καλει	δαυειδ κν̄ αυτον λεγει	simp.
21:6	A	ουκ αφεθησεται λιθος επι λιθω	ουκ αφεθησεται λιθος επι λιθω εν τοιχω	spec.
21:7	A	επηρωτησαν δε αυτον λεγοντες	επηρωτησαν δε αυτον οι μαθηται λεγοντες	spec.
21:28	O	επαρατε τας κεφαλας υμων	επαρατε τας κεφαλας	simp.
21:32	A	εως αν παντα γενηται	εως ταυτα παντα γενηται	spec.
21:37	T/O	τας δε νυκτας εξερχομενος ηυλιζετο εις το ορος	εις το ορος ηυλιζετο	simp.
22:4	O	πως αυτοις παραδω αυτον	πως παραδοι αυτον	simp.
22:10	O	ο δε ειπεν αυτοις	ο δε ειπεν	simp.
22:22	O	ουαι τω ανθρωπω εκεινω δι ου παραδιδοται	ουαι εκεινω δι ου παραδιδοται	simp.
22:27	S/O	τις γαρ μειζων ο ανακειμενος η ο διακονων ουχι ο ανακειμενος	μαλλον η ο ανακειμενος	simp.
22:27	S	εγω δε εν μεσω υμων ειμι ως ο διακονων	εγω γαρ εν μεσω υμων ηλθον ουχ ως ο ανακειμενος αλλ ως ο διακονων	spec.
22:30	S	εν τη βασιλεια μου	εν τη βασιλεια	simp.
22:37	O	λεγω γαρ υμιν	λεγω γαρ	simp.
22:49	A	οι περι αυτον ... ειπαν κε̄	οι περι αυτον ... ειπαν τω κω̄	spec.

22:51	S	και αψαμενος του ωτιου ιασατο αυτον	και εκτεινας την χειρα ηψατο αυτου και απεκατεσταθη το ους αυτου	spec.
22:55	A	εκαθητο ο πετρος	εκαθητο και ο πετρος	spec.
22:58	S	και συ εξ αυτων ει	το αυτο	simp.
22:64	S	περικαλυψαντες αυτον επηρωτων λεγοντες	περικαλυψαντες αυτου το προσωπον ετυπτον αυτον και ελεγον	spec.
22:71	T/O	αυτοι γαρ ηκουσαμεν απο του στοματος αυτου	ηκουσαμεν γαρ απο του στοματος αυτου	simp.
23:1	O	απαν το πληθος αυτων ηγαγον αυτον	ηγαγον αυτον	simp.
23:9	S/A	αυτος δε ουδεν απεκρινατο αυτω	αυτος δε ουκ απεκρινατο αυτω ουδεν	emph.
23:12	S	εγενοντο δε φιλοι ο τε ηρωδης και ο πιλατος	οντες δε εν αηδια ο πιλατος και ο ηρωδης εγενοντο φιλοι	spec.
23:12	O	εν αυτη τη ημερα μετ αλληλων προυπηρχον γαρ εν εχθρα οντες προς αυτους	εν αυτη τη ημερα	simp.
23:13	A	και τον λαον	και παντα τον λαον	spec.
23:14	O	ων κατηγορειτε κατ αυτου	-	simp.
23:27	T/S	ηκολουθει δε αυτω πολυ πληθος	ηκολουθει δε το πληθος αυτω	simp.
23:28	A	-	μηδε πενθειτε	emph.
23:33	A	εσταυρωσαν αυτον και τους κακουργους	εσταυρωσαν αυτον και τους κακουργους ομου	spec.
23:39	O	εις δε των κρεμασθεντων κακουργων	εις δε των κακουργων	simp.
23:40	A	οτι εν τω αυτω κριματι ει	οτι εν τω αυτω κριματι ει και ημεις εσμεν	spec.
23:42	S	και ελεγεν ιω	και στραφεις προς τον κν ειπεν αυτω	spec.
23:43	S	και ειπεν αυτω	αποκριθεις δε ο ιης ειπεν αυτω τω επιπλησοντι	spec.
23:48	A	τυπτοντες τα στηθη και πεστρεφαν	τυπτοντες τα στηθη και τα μετωπα υπεστρεφαν	spec.
23:52	S/O	ουτος προσελθων τω πειλατω	[](05) / και (05 ^c) προσελθων τω πειλατω	simp.
23:53	S	καθελων ενετυλιξεν αυτο σινδονι	καθελων ενετυλιξεν το σωμα του ιηυ εν σινδονι	spec.
23:54	S	και ημερα ην παρασκευης και σαββατον επεφωσκεν	ην δε η ημερα προ σαββατου	simp.
23:55	S	αι γυναικες	δου γυναικες	spec.
24:1	O	τη δε μια των σαββατων	μια δε των σαββατων	simp.
24:7	O	ελαλησεν (24:6) ... λεγων	ελαλησεν (24:6) ... []	simp.
24:9	O	και υποστρεψασαι απο του μνημειου απηγγειλαν	και υποστρεψασαι απηγγειλαν	simp.
24:13	O	και ιδου	-	simp.
24:14	S/O	και αυτοι ωμιλουν	ωμειλουν δε	simp.
24:17	O	ειπεν ... προς αυτους	ειπεν []	simp.

24:21	A	τριτην ταυτην ημεραν αγει	τριτην ημεραν σημεραν αγει(05) / αγει(05^c)	spec.
24:30	O	εν τω κατακλιθηναι αυτον μετ αυτων	εν τω κατακλιθηναι αυτον	simp.
24:30	O	λαβων τον αρτον ευλογησεν και κλασας	λαβων αρτον ευλογησεν και	simp.
24:31	S	αυτων δε διηνοιχθησαν οι οφθαλμοι	λαβων(05) / λαβοντων(05^c) δε αυτων τον αρτον απ αυτου ηνυγησαν οι οφθαλμοι αυτων	spec.
24:33	A	και ανασταντες αυτη τη ωρα υπεστρεψαν εις ιερουσαλημ	και ανασταντες λυπουμενοι αυτη τη ωρα υπεστρεψαν εις ιερουσαλημ	spec.
24:37	T/A	πτοηθεντες δε	αυτοι δε πτοηθεντες	spec.

4.4.3.3 Singular readings of significant alterations

The last category involves singular readings consisting of significant additions, omissions, or substitutions. These readings definitely affect meaning as many of them imply theological concerns. Therefore, these readings are significant to trace the theology of the scribes.

Table 50. Singular readings of significant additions, omissions, and substitutions

Ch.	Type	B-text	D-text	Evaluation ⁶³
2:32	O	φως εις αποκαλυψιν εθνων	φως εις αποκαλυψιν	S.O.
3:4	S	ποιειτε τας τριβους αυτου	ποιειτε τας τριβους υμων	S.S.
3:6	S	το σωτηριον του θῡ	το σωτηριον κῡ	S.S.
4:16	O	ηλθεν εις ναζαρετ ου ην τεθραμμενος και εισηλθε	ελθων δε εις ναζαρε οπου ην [](05) / τεθραμμενος εισηλθεν(05^c)	S.O.
5:5	S	επιστατα	διδασκαλε	S.S.
5:5	S	χαλασω τα δικτυα	ου μη παρακουσομαι(05) / παρακουσομεν(05^c)	S.S.
5:8	T/S	προσεπεσεν τοις γονασιν ιω̄	προσεπεσεν αυτου τοις ποσιν	S.S.
5:11	S	και καταγαγοντες τα πλοια επι την γην αφεντες παντα ηκολουθησαν αυτω	οι δε ακουσαντες παντα κατελειψαν επι της γης και ηκολουθησαν αυτω	S.S.
5:17	O	εκ πασης [της] κωμης της γαλιλαιας και ιουδαιας και ιερουσαλημ	εκ πασης κωμης της γαλιλαιας και ιουδαιας	S.O.
5:17	O	και δυναμις κῡ ην	-	S.O.
5:33	S	εσθιουσιν και πινουσιν	ουδεν τουτων ποιουσιν	S.S.
5:34	S	εν ω ο νυμφιος μετ αυτων εστιν	εφ οσον εχουσιν τον νυμφιον μεθ εαυτων	S.S.

⁶³ The column under "Evaluation" denotes the types of alteration: S.A. for significant addition; S.O. for significant omission; and S.S. for significant substitution.

5:39	O	ουδεις πειων παλαιον θελει νεον λεγει γαρ ο παλαιος χρηστος εστιν	-	S.O.
6:4	A	-	τη αυτη ημερα θεασαμενος τινα εργαζομενον τω σαββατω ειπεν αυτω ανθρωπε ει μεν ουδας τι ποιεις μακαριος ει ει δε μη ουδας επικαταρατος και παραβατης ει του νομου (after 6:4)	S.A.
6:17	S	απο πασης της ιουδαιας και ιερουσαλημ και της παραλιου τυρου και σιδωνος	απο πασης ιουδαιας και <i>αλλων</i> πολεων	S.O.
6:21	O	μακαριοι οι κλαιοντες νυν οτι γελασετε	-	S.O.
6:42	S	αυτος την εν τω οφθαλμω σου δοκον ου βλεπων	και ιδου η δοκος εν τω σω οφθαλμω υποκειται	S.S.
7:18	S	και απηγγειλαν ιωανη οι μαθηται αυτου περι παντων τουτων	εν οις και μεχρι ιωανου του βαπτιστου ος	S.S.
7:39	S	ο φαρησαιος ο καλεσας αυτον	ο φαρισαιος <i>παρ ω</i> κατεκειτο	S.S.
7:47	O	οτι ηγαπησεν πολυ ω δε ολιγον αφιεται ολιγον αγαπα	-	S.O.
8:43	S	ητις [ιατροις προσαναλωσασα ολον τον βιον] ουκ ισχυσεν απ ουδενος θεραπευθηται	ην ουδε εις ισχυεν θεραπευσαι	S.S.
9:18	S	εν τω ειναι αυτον	εν τω ειναι αυτους	S.S.
9:18	O	προσενχομενον κατα μονας	κατα μονας	S.O.
9:23	O	αρνησασθω εαυτον και <i>αρατω τον</i> σταυρον αυτου καθ ημεραν και ακολουθειτω μοι	αρνησασθω εαυτον [] και ακολουθειτω μοι	S.O.
9:26	O	ος γαρ αν επαισχυνθη με και τους εμους λογους	ος γαρ αν επαισχυνθη με και τους εμους	S.O.
9:46	O	εισηλθεν δε διαλογισμος εν αυτοις το τις αν ειη μειζων αυτων	[] το τις αν ειη μειζων αυτων	S.O.
10:1	O	μετα δε ταυτα ενεδειξεν ο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ ετερους εβδομηκοντα	απεδειξεν δε και ετερους $\overline{\omicron\beta}$	S.O.
10:12	T/S	σοδομοις εν τη ημερα εκεινη ανεκτοτερον εσται	σοδομοις <i>ανεκτοτερον εσται εν</i> τη βασιλεια του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$	S.S.
10:16	S	ο δε εμε αθετων αθετει τον αποστειλαντα με	ο δε εμου ακουων ακουει του αποστειλαντος με	S.S.
10:22	S/O	υπο του $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$ μου	απο του πατρος	S.S.
10:25	O	λεγων διδασκαλε	λεγων	S.O.
10:42	O	ενος δε εστιν χρεια	-	S.O.
11:13	S	δωσει $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ αγιον	δωσει <i>αγαθον δομα</i>	S.S.
11:22	O	επαν ... επελθων νεικησει αυτον	εαν ... επελθων	S.O.
11:24	S	διερχεται δι ανυδρων	διερχεται δια των υδρων	S.S.
11:32	O	ανδρες νινευειται αναστησονται εν τη κρισει μετα της γενεας ταυτης και κατακρινουσιν αυτην	-	S.O.

		οτι μετενοησαν εις το κηρυγμα ιωνα και ιδου πλειον ιωνα ωδε		
11:36	O	ει ουν το σωμα σου ολον φωτεινον μη εχον μερος τι σκοτεινον εσται φωτεινον ολον ως οταν ο λυχνος τη αστραπη φωτιζη σε	-	S.O.
11:38	S	ιδων εθυμασεν	ηρξατο διακρεινομενος εν εαυτω λεγειν	S.S.
11:39	A	οι φαρισαιοι	οι φαρισαιοι υποκριται	S.A.
11:42	O	ταυτα δε εδει ποιησαι κακεινα μη παρειναι	-	S.O.
11:44	O	οτι εστε ως τα μνημεια τα αδηλα	οτι εστε μνημεια αδηλα	S.O.
11:48	S	και συνευδοκειτε	μη συνευδοκειν	S.S.
11:49	O	δια τουτο και η σοφια του θ ^υ ειπεν αποστελω	δια τουτο αποστελλω	S.O.
11:50	S	το αιμα παντων ... απο της γενεας ταυτης	το αιμα παντων ... εως της γενεας ταυτης	S.S.
11:51	S	εως αιματος ζαχαριου του απολομενου	εως αιματος ζαχαριου ... ον εφονευσαν	S.S.
11:53	S	κακειθεν εξελθοντος	λεγοντες δε(05) / λεγοντος δε(05^c)	S.S.
12:19	O	εχεις πολλα αγαθα κειμενα εις ετη πολλα αναπαυου φαγε πιε ευφραινου	εχεις πολλα αγαθα ευφραινου	S.O.
12:21	O	ουτως ο θησαυριζων εαυτω και μη εις θ^ν πλουτων	-	S.O.
12:41	O	η και προς παντας	-	S.O.
12:56	O	τον καιρον δε τουτον πως ουκ οιδατε δοκιμαζειν	τον καιρον τουτον ου δοκιμαζετε	S.O.
12:57	O	τι δε και αφ εαυτων ου κρινετε το δικαιον	και αφ εαυτων ου κρινεται το δικαιον	S.O.
13:17	O	και ταυτα λεγοντος αυτου	και	S.O.
13:17	S	κατισχυνοντο ... οι αντικειμενοι	κατησχυνθησαν οι αντικειμενοι	S.S.
13:25	S	εγερθη ο οικοδεσποτης	ο οικοδεσποτης εισελθη	S.S.
13:27	S	ουκ οίδα [υμας]	ουδεποτε ειδον υμας	S.S.
13:27	O	ποθεν εστε	-	S.S.
14:10	T/S	αναπεσε εις τον εσχατον τοπον	εις τον εσχατον τοπον αναπειπτε	S.S.
14:11	S	πας ο υψων εαυτον ταπεινωθησεται	πας ο υψων εαυτον ταπεινουται	S.S.
14:11	S	ο ταπεινων εαυτον υψωθησεται	ο δε ταπεινων εαυτον υψουται	S.S.
14:12	A/O	μηδε τους συγγενεις σου μη[δε] γειτονας πλουσιους	μηδε τους γειτονας μηδε τους πλουσιους	S.S.
16:31	S	ουδ εαν τις εκ νεκρων αναστη πεισθησονται	ουδ εαν τις εκ νεκρων αναστη και απελθη προς αυτους πιστευσουσιν	S.S.
19:11	T/O	δοκειν αυτους οτι παραρημα μελλει η βασιλεια του θ ^υ αναφαινεσθαι	δοκειν οτι μελλει παραρημα η βασιλεια του θ ^υ αναφαινεσθαι	S.O.

19:32	O	οι απεσταλμενοι ευρον καθως ειπεν αυτοις	-	S.O.
19:37	S	ων ειδον δυναμεων	ων ειδον γεινομενων	S.S.
20:36	S/O	ισαγγελοι γαρ εισιν και υιοι εισιν του θ̄υ της αναστασεως	εισαγγελοι γαρ εισιν τω θ̄ω της αναστασεως	S.S.
21:7	S	τι το σημειον οταν μελλη ταυτα γινεσθαι	τι το σημειον της σης ελευσεως	S.S.
21:21	A	οι εν μεσω αυτης εκχωριτωσαν	οι εν μεσω αυτης μη εκχωριτωσαν	S.A.
21:24	O	αχρι ου πληρωθωσιν καιροι εθνων	αχρισ ου πληρωθωσιν	S.O.
22:7	S	ηλθεν δε η ημερα των αζυμων	ηλθεν δε η ημερα του πασχα	S.S.
22:16	S	εως οτου πληρωθη εν τη βασιλεια του θ̄υ	εως οτου καινον βρωθη εν τη βασιλεια του θ̄υ	S.S.
22:19	O	το υπερ υμων διδομενον τουτο ποιειτε εις την εμην αναμνησιν	-	S.O.
22:20	O	και το ποτηριον ωσαυτως μετα το δειπνησαι λεγων τουτο το ποτηριον η καινη διαθηκη εν τω αιματι μου το υπερ υμων εκχυννομενον	-	S.O.
22:28	S	υμεις ... εστε οι διαμεμενηκοτες μετ εμου	υμεις ηυξηθητε εν τη διακονια μου ως ο διακωνων οι διαμεμενηκοτες μετ εμου	S.S.
23:5	S	καθ ολης της ιουδαιας	καθ ολης της γης	S.S.
23:25	S	δια στασιν και φονον	ενεκα φονου	S.S.
23:35	S/O	οι αρχοντες λεγοντες	ελεγαν αυτω	S.S.
23:35	S	εσωσεν σωσατω εαυτον	εσωσας σεαυτον σωσον	S.S.
23:39	O	εβλασφημει αυτον λεγων ουχι συ ει ο χ̄ς σωσον σεαυτον και ημας	εβλασφημει αυτον	S.O.
23:42	S	εις την βασιλειαν σου	εν τη ημερα της ελευσεως σου	S.S.
23:43	S	αμην σοι λεγω	θαρσει	S.S.
23:53	A	-	και θεντος αυτου επεθηκεν τω μνημειω λειθον ον μογισ εικοσι εκυλιον (after 23:53)	S.A.
23:55	O	εθεασαντο το μνημειον και ως ετεθη το σωμα αυτου	εθεασαντο το μνημα αυτου	S.O.
23:56	S	υποστρεψασαι δε ητοιμασαν	υποστρεψασαι δε ητοιμασαν(05) / ητοιμασεν(05^c)	S.S.
23:56	O	το μεν σαββατον ησυχασαν κατα την εντολην	το μεν σαββατον ησυχασαν	S.O.
24:3	O	ουκ ευρον το σωμα του κῡ ω̄	ουκ ευρον το σωμα	S.O.
24:6	O	ουκ εστιν ωδε αλλα ηγερθη	-	S.O.
24:7	O	εις χειρας ανθρωπων αμαρτωλων	εις χειρας ανθρωπων	S.O.
24:12	O	ο δε πετρος αναστας εδραμεν επι το μνημειον και παρακυψας βλεπει τα οθονια μονα και απηλθεν προς εαυτον θαυμαζων το γεγονος	-	S.O.

24:17	O	περιπατούντες και εσταθησαν σκυθρωποι	περιπατούντες σκυθρωποι	S.O.
24:24	S	αυτον δε ουκ ειδον	αυτον δε ουκ ειδομεν	S.S.
24:25	O	βραδεις τη καρδια του πιστευειν	βραδεις τη καρδια	S.O.
24:26	S	ουχι ταυτα εδει παθειν τον $\overline{\chi\nu}$	οτι ταυτα εδει παθειν τον $\overline{\chi\nu}$	S.S.
24:32	T/S	ουχι η καρδια ημων καιομενη ην	ουχι η καρδια ην ημων κεκαλυμμενη	S.S.
24:36	O	και λεγει αυτοις ειρηνη υμιν	-	S.O.
24:37	S	εδοκουν $\overline{\pi\nu\alpha}$ θεωρειν	εδοκουν φαντασμα θεωρειν	S.S.
24:40	O	και τουτο ειπων εδειξεν αυτοις τας χειρας και τους ποδας	-	S.O.
24:46	O	αναστηναι εκ νεκρων	αναστηναι	S.O.
24:49	O	αποστελλω την επαγγελιαν του $\overline{\pi\rho\varsigma}$ μου	αποστελλω την επαγγελιαν μου	S.O.
24:51	O	και ανεφερετο εις τον ουρανον	-	S.O.
24:52	O	αυτοι υπεστρεψαν εις ιερουσαλημ	αυτοι εις ιερουσαλημ	S.O.

4.5 Summary

This chapter has analysed the quantitative relationship of manuscripts of the Gospel of Luke. Quantitative Analysis has identified four textual groups: B-text group (P³, P⁴, P⁴⁵, P⁶⁹, P⁷⁵, κ , B, 0171, 0181, 45, and 1349), A-text group (A, W, θ , 18, 33, and 2860), C-text group (C and 33), and D-text group (D). The only member of the D-text group, Codex Bezae, showed significant differences from the other groups. These significant differences resulted from massive alterations—additions, omissions, substitutions, and transpositions—and this phenomenon draws an inference that there existed some theological concerns behind the alterations. It leads to a need for the analysis of unique factors of Codex Bezae, viz. singular readings. Codex Bezae has 1,053 singular readings, and this figure can be divided into six categories: 53 scribal mistakes; 219 simple stylistic alterations involving simple transposition or alterations of articles or particles; 422 stylistic paraphrases involving changes of vocabularies or grammatical constructions; 67 harmonisations with other gospel accounts, 195 specifications or simplifications; and 97 significant changes which clearly show theological motives. A thorough study of the significant singular readings will reveal the scribal intention behind extensive alteration, and this leads to the next chapter.

Chapter 5. The theology behind singular readings of Codex Bezae and the shorter reading of the Lord's supper

5.1 Introduction

Singular readings are unique readings of a single manuscript shared with no other manuscript. They result from intentional or unintentional scribal alteration. When a manuscript is deliberately altered with some historical or theological reasons, singular readings serve as the most explicit source to trace scribal intention. Quantitative Analysis of manuscripts of the Gospel of Luke isolated Codex Bezae with great differences from other manuscript groups. Since there is no other manuscript in close relationship with Codex Bezae, a specific scribal intention behind the “Western” tradition or the D-text group is expected. If it is so, singular readings of Codex Bezae will reveal scribal intentions behind extensive alterations. And if certain theological motives consistently flow along the book, the textual problem of the Lord's Supper should also be understood in that light. This chapter will first select and categorise the significant singular readings of Codex Bezae according to their theological concerns and discuss the theological motives behind the scribal alteration. And then, the account of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:15-20) will be discussed in light of the theological motives behind the alteration of Codex Bezae.

5.2 Significant singular readings grouped by theme

The previous chapter has identified 1,053 singular readings in Codex Bezae. Among them, 359 readings—67 harmonisations, 195 specifications or simplifications, and 97 significant alterations—were identified as significant.⁶⁴ Many of these alterations reflect theological emphases on five themes: Jesus, Jews, Gentiles, the kingdom of God, and discipleship.⁶⁵

⁶⁴ The remaining 694 less significant stylistic changes may also be significant in identifying the linguistic or literary style of the scribe. However, it requires extensive study of each variation, and it exceeds the extent of this study, and are therefore not included here.

⁶⁵ These five themes were identified by deductive studies on the significant singular readings. Codex Bezae may have theological concerns other than these five. But due to the research extent, this study concentrates on the five most conspicuous themes that singular readings of Codex Bezae reflect.

5.2.1 Singular readings concerning Jesus

5.2.1.1 Identity of Jesus

Codex Bezae and the Old Latin manuscripts show a number of alterations in the way to exalt Jesus' identity as the Messiah and God.

Table 51. Alterations concerning the identity of Jesus

Ch.	Type ⁶⁶	B-type	D-type	Evaluation ⁶⁷
3:6	S	το σωτηριον του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$	το σωτηριον $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$	S.S.
3:22	T/S	συ ει ο υιος μου ο αγαπητος εν σοι ευδοκησα	υιος μου ει συ εγω σημερον γεγεννηκα σε	harm.
3:23-31	S	και αυτος ην $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$ αρχομενος ωσαι ετων τριακοντα ων υιος ως ενομιζετο ιωσηφ του ηλει του ματθατ του λευει του μελχει του ιανναι του ιωσηφ του μαθθαθιου του αμωσ του ναουμ του εσλει του ναγγαι του μααθ του ματταθιου του σεμεειν του ιωσηφ του ιωδα του ιωαναν του ρησα του ζοροβαβελ του σαλαθιηλ του νηρει του μελχει του αδδει του κωσαμ του ελμαδαμ του ηρ του ιησου του ελιεζερ του ιωρειμ του ματθατ του λευει του συμεων του ιουδα του ιωσηφ του ιωναμ του ελιακειμ του μελεα του μεννα του μετταθα του ναθαμ του δαυειδ	ην δε $\overline{\iota\eta\varsigma}$ ως ετων $\overline{\lambda'}$ αρχομενος ως ενομειζετο ειναι υιος ιωσηφ του εγενετο ιακωβ του μαθθαν του ελεαζαρ του ελιουδ του ιαχειν του σαδωκ του αζωρ του ελιακειμ του αβιουδ του ζοροβαβελ του σαλαθιηλ του ιεχονιου του ιωακειμ του ελιακειμ του ιωσηφ του αμωσ του μανασση του εξεκεια του αχας του ιωαθαν του οζεια του αμασιου του ιωας του οχοζιου του ιωραμ του ιωσαφαδ του ασαφ του αβιουδ του ροβοαμ του σολομων του δαυειδ	harm.
4:16	O	ηλθεν εις ναζαρετ ου ην τεθραμμενος και εισηλθε	ελθων δε εις ναζαρε οπου ην [](05) / τεθραμμενος εισηλθεν(05c)	style
4:31	A	πολιν της γαλιλαιας	πολιν της γαλιλαιας την παραθαλασσιον εν οριοις ζαβουλων και νεφθαλειμ	harm.
6:4	A	-	τη αυτη ημερα θεασαμενος τινα εργαζομενον τω σαββατω ειπεν αυτω ανθρωπε ει μεν οιδας τι ποιεις μακαριος ει ει δε μη οιδας επικαταρατος και παραβατης ει του νομου (after 6:4)	S.A.

⁶⁶ The column under "Type" denotes the types of variation: A for addition; O for omission; S for substitution; and T for transposition. Multiple occurrences of variations are indicated by the slash (/). The same applies to the following tables.

⁶⁷ The column under "Evaluation" denotes the types of alteration: S.A. for significant addition; S.O. for significant omission; S.S. for significant substitution; harm. for harmonisation, style for stylistic change; spec. for specification; simp. for simplification; emph. for emphasis. The same applies to the following tables in chapter 5.

7:18	S	και απηγγειλαν ιωανη οι μαθηται αυτου περι παντων τουτων	εν οijs και μεχρι ιωανου του βαπτιστου ος	S.S.
8:43	S	ητις [ιατροijs προσαναλωσασα ολον τον βιον] ουκ ισχυσεν απ ουδενος θεραπευθηναι	ην ουδε εις ισχυεν θεραπευσαι	S.S.
8:45	S	και ειπεν ο ις	ο δε ιης γνους την εξελθουσαν εξ αυτου δυναμιν επηρωτα	harm.
10:22	S/O	υπο του πρς μου	απο του πατρος	S.S.
11:13	S	δωσει πανα αγιον	δωσει αγαθον δομα	S.S.
23:56	O	το μεν σαββατον ησυχασαν κατα την εντολην	το μεν σαββατον ησυχασαν	S.O.
24:49	O	αποστελλω την επαγγελιαν του πρς μου	αποστελλω την επαγγελιαν μου	S.O.

The most significant alterations are found in the pericope that declares the identity of Jesus before he starts his public ministry. It starts with a quotation from Isaiah 40:3-5. In Luke 3:6, D and d slightly modify the quotation from σωτηριον του θεου to σωτηριον του κυριου. By adopting a particular appellation of Jesus, D and d put emphasis on the Messiahship of Jesus. After the baptism of Jesus in Luke 3:22, D and Old Latin manuscripts (a, b, c, d, ff², l, and r¹) change the Synoptic report of the voice “You are my Son, the Beloved; with you I am well pleased” to “You are my son, today I have begotten you.” Many scholars tried to see this verse as an adoptionist alteration and argued the “Western” texts represent adoptionism (Lake, 1920:102; Streeter, 1961:143). But they failed to take into account the context of the psalm and only considered the quotation itself. It is a harmonisation with Psalm 2:7, which is a part of a royal psalm of Davidic king that God has promised.⁶⁸ The psalmist remembers the covenant of God that He will establish His universal rule over the earth through the seed of David. This psalm was widely used in the early church (Act 13:33; Hebrews 1:5) as scriptural confirmation of Jesus’ Messiahship and his glorious *parousia* with power and authority (VanGemeren, 2008:135). The scribe of the “Western” prototype probably has altered the whole verse with this messianic psalm deliberately and strengthens the Messiahship of Jesus.

This alteration is directly followed by another harmonisation by the scribe of Codex Bezae. He alters the Lukan genealogy since king David (Luke 3:23-31) to resemble the genealogy of the Davidic kings from Matthew 1:6-16⁶⁹ in reverse order with a correction by adding five names —ιωακειμ,

⁶⁸ Willem A. VanGemeren (2008:134-135) points this psalm should not be linked with the actual coronation of Judean kings. He argues it should be read in light of Nathan’s prophecy of God’s covenant with David (2Sa 7:5-16).

⁶⁹ The difference between the Matthean and Lukan genealogies caused a long debate. The majority view is to see the Matthean genealogy as the kingly legal line of descendants from David, and the Lukan genealogy as the actual branch of Davidic family to which Joseph belonged (Machen, 1932:202-209, 229-232). But this argument also has many difficulties. For an overview of the discussion and the further difficulties, refer to I. Howard Marshall

ελιακειμ, αμασιου, αμασιου and οχοζιου— according to the Old Testament (LXX) accounts. While the Lukan genealogy signifies the kinship of Jesus with the entire human race, and further, with God, it seems the scribe of Codex Bezae wanted to amplify the Messiahship of Jesus. In connection with the Messianic psalm in the preceding verse, the alteration of the Lukan genealogy expands Jesus' identity as the Messiah, who is to establish God's universal rule over the earth, to incorporate the Gentiles into the kingdom of God, and to judge the rebellious. The other "Western" or Bezan alterations reflect these theological motives. These will be discussed in the following sections.

A harmonisation by addition in Luke 4:31 again confirms the interest of the scribe in Jesus' Messiahship. D and d supplement the geographical location of Capernaum with a quotation from Matthew 4:13, "by the sea, in the territory of Zebulun and Naphtali." The significance of this phrase is explained in Matthew 4:14-16 that Isaiah's prophecy has been fulfilled by Jesus' ministry as the Messiah for both the Jews and the Gentiles.

Another significant identity that the "Western" manuscripts amplify is the exaltation of Jesus to an equal place with God. In Luke 10:22, D substitutes *υπο του πατρος* with *απο του πατρος* and omits *μου* together with a, c, d, g¹, gat, and l. By this substitution, the weight of the emphasis moves from the donor to the heir of what was given. In this way, the authority of Jesus is elevated to be equal to God. In Luke 11:13, D, b, c, d, ff², i, l, and r¹ changes the gift that God gives to those who ask him, from "the Holy Spirit" to "a good gift (*αγαθα δοματα*)." It may be considered as a metaphor, but in connection with Luke 24:49, in which D, d, and e omit *του πατρος*⁷⁰ and make Jesus the one who promised to send the Holy Spirit (Joel 2:28-32; Acts 2:17-21), it is more convincing to see that the "Western" scribes attempted to exalt Jesus to be equal to God.

The consequence of these theological amplifications is the exaltation of Jesus' power and authority. D and d make two significant alterations to the Sabbath controversy (Luke 6:1-11) concerning the authority of Jesus. One is the addition of an episode after Luke 6:4, which reads, "On the same day he (i.e., Jesus) saw a man working on the Sabbath and said to him, 'Man, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed. But if you do not know, you are accursed, and a transgressor of the laws,'" and the other is a transposition of v.5 after v.10. Metzger sees the addition inserts a supplementary episode to the Sabbath controversy, and the transposition sums up the controversy with the conclusion that "the

(1978:157-161). However, regardless of the problem of the Lukan genealogy, the significance of this alteration lies on the choice of the Matthean genealogy, which signifies Jesus' kingship.

⁷⁰ The substitution of *υπο* to *απο* is also attested by a sixth-century uncial 0124 which preserves Alexandrian text-type (Aland & Aland, 1989:119). This manuscript is a diglot with a Coptic counterpart. The diglot does not always present identical text. Therefore, it is considered to have been written by a Coptic scribe. Considering these, the agreement on the substitution with *απο* seems accidental without any genealogical significance. Moreover, whether the substitution of *υπο* with *απο* is attested by the Old Latin manuscript, cannot be decided for sure since the agent of a passive verb is denoted by *ab/ā*, which also means "from." In spite of the difficulty it seems reasonable to assume those manuscripts which show a common omission of *μου* to D are in the common tradition.

sovereignty of the Son of Man over the sabbath” (Metzger, 1975:117). But it seems better to see the alterations form a parallelism of A (episode of grainfields), B (addition by D and d) // A’ (episode of a man of withered hand), B’ (transposition of v.5). A and A’ deals with what is lawful on the Sabbath, and B and B’ provide Jesus’ authority to determine what is lawful or unlawful on the Sabbath. By addition and transposition, Jesus’ authority over the Jewish law is amplified. D and d reflect this in Luke 23:56 and omits the phrase that they rested on the Sabbath “according to the commandment (κατα την εντολην).”

D and d rewrite the beginning of Luke 7:18 so that John the Baptist did not send his disciples to Jesus, but Jesus’ fame spread even to the place where John the Baptist stayed. In Luke 8:43, D and d rewrites the description of a woman suffering from hemorrhages, so that whereas majority reading retains the focus on the woman (ουκ ισχυσεν απ ουδενος θεραπευθηναι), D and d change the clause to active voice to move the focus to the one who is to cure her (ουδε εις ισχυεν θεραπευσαι). After she was healed, majority reading reads that Jesus merely spoke (και ειπεν ο Ιησους). But D and d harmonises Luke 8:45 with Mark 5:30 to write that Jesus asked, knowing that the power went out from him. These alterations amplify Jesus’ power and omniscience as God.

5.2.1.2 Apologetic concerns about Jesus

The second branch of scribal concern about Jesus is the defense of Jesus’ identity and authority. Codex Bezae and the Old Latin manuscripts show the following apologetic tendency.

Table 52. Alterations concerning apologetics for Jesus

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
1:26	O	πολιν της γαλιλαιας η ονομα ναζαρετ	εις πολιν γαλιλαιαν	simp.
2:39	A	επεστρεψαν ... ναζαρετ	επεστρεψαν ... ναζαρετ καθως ερηθη δια του προφητου οτι ναζωραιος κληθησεται	harm.
6:2	S/A	τι ποιειτε	ειδε τι ποιουσιν οι μαθηται σου	harm.
19:30	O	ευρησετε πωλον δεδεμενον εφ ον ουδεις ποποτε ανθρωπων εκαθισε και λυσαντες αυτον αγαγετε	ευρησετε πωλον [](05) / εφ ον ουδεις ανθρωπων εκαθισεν και λυσαντες αγαγατε (05c)	simp.
19:31	O	εαν ... ερωτα δια τι λυετε	αν ... ερωτα	simp.
19:32	O	οι απεσταλμενοι ευρον καθως ειπεν αυτοις	-	S.O.

Luke 1:26 and 2:39 reports the hometown of both Mary and Joseph was Nazareth. But it seems contrary to the Matthean account, which records that they feared to go back to Judea and chose to live in Nazareth (Matthew 2:22-23). Moreover, considering historical insignificance and Nathanael’s statement of

impression about Nazareth (John 1:46), it must have been a small town disregarded by the public. It seems scribes of D, a, and d had concerns about this record that Jesus was from such a disregarded place. So, Luke 1:26 (D and d) omits the reference to Nazareth leaving only regional information as Galilee (πολιν γαλιλαιαν). In Luke 2:39, scribes of D, a, and d choose to make an addition of Matthew 2:24, providing an apology for why Jesus happened to live in Nazareth. With the addition, the scribes changed the place of disregard to a symbol of accomplishment of a prophecy. Another alteration in Luke 2:51 is worth mentioning though it is not a singular reading. D, d, as well as C and 28 alters κατεβη μετ αυτων και ηλθεν εις ναζαρεθ by omitting και ηλθεν. Majority reading alludes that Jesus voluntarily came to Nazareth, but after the omission, Jesus came to Nazareth due to Mary and Joseph's decision. Even further, the scribe of D makes an omission in Luke 4:16. Majority reading records, "Jesus came to Nazareth where he had been brought up, and went to the synagogue on the Sabbath day according to his custom." But D omits the record that Jesus was brought up in Nazareth (τεθραμμενος) and smooths out the verse with further omission of και εισηλθεν. The verse now reads, "after Jesus came to Nazareth where it was [according to] the custom [to be]⁷¹ in the synagogue, he also stood to read."

The next alteration involves the defense of Jesus' morality. In Luke 6:2, Jesus and his disciples were passing through the grainfields, and they were accused of an unlawful deed (τι ποιειτε). D and d substitute this with Markan account (Mark 2:24; τι ποιουσιν οι μαθηται σου) in order to move the focus of the charge to the disciples.

In Luke 19:30, majority reading records the episode that Jesus sends his disciples to bring a colt possibly without prior permission by the owner. D and d omit Jesus' order to untie and bring the colt on which no one has ever sat (πωλον δεδεμενον εφ ον ουδεις πωποτε ανθρωπων εκαθισεν και λυσαντες αυτον αγαγετε). On the following verse, D, c, d, e, ff², l, and s omits the part that the owner might question the deed (δια τι λυετε;). In 19:32, D and d leave only the record that the disciples departed, and the whole verse 19:33, which could be understood as a complaint of the owner against the action without permission, is omitted by a number of manuscripts (D, G, 063, 477, and g¹). This series of alterations have probably been motivated by an attempt to defend the morality of Jesus from non-believers.

5.2.2 Singular readings showing anti-Judaic sentiment

5.2.2.1 Anti-Judaic tendency against the religious leaders

Authors of the Gospels and the preachers of the early church lay on the Jewish people the charges of disobedience to God and of Jesus' death. It can be said that all four gospels, as well as the Act of the

⁷¹ For the usage of εις with ειμι verb, refer to BDAG under εις 1.a.δ.

apostles, basically reflect anti-Judaic sentiment more or less. However, Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts show even stronger anti-Judaic sentiment.

Table 53. Alterations reflecting anti-Judaic tendency against the religious leaders

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
5:21	A	ηρξαντο διαλογιζεσθαι οι γραμματεις και οι φαρισαιοι	ηρξαντο διαλογιζεσθαι οι γραμματεις και οι φαρισαιοι εν ταις καρδιαις αυτων	harm.
5:21	S	τις εστιν ουτος ος λαλει βλασφημιας	τι ουτος λαλει βλασφημιας	harm.
5:22	A	τι διαλογιζεσθε εν ταις καρδιαις υμων	τι διαλογιζεσθαι εν ταις καρδιαις υμων πονηρα	spec.
6:3	S	ουδε τουτο ανεγνωτε	ουδεποτε τουτο ανεγνωται	emph.
6:11	S	τι αν ποιησαιεν τω $\bar{\omega}$	πως απολεσωσιν αυτον	harm.
6:42	S	αυτος την εν τω οφθαλμω σου δοκον ου βλεπων	και ιδου η δοκος εν τω σω οφθαλμω υποκειται	S.S.
10:25	O	λεγων διδασκαλε	λεγων	S.O.
11:2	A	οταν προσευχεσθε λεγετε	οταν προσευχησθε μη βαττολογειτε ως οι λοιποι δοκουσιν γαρ τινες οτι εν τη πολυλογια αυτων εισακουσθησονται αλλα προσευχομενοι λεγετε	harm.
11:39	A	οι φαρισαιοι	οι φαρισαιοι υποκριται	S.A.
11:42	O	ταυτα δε εδει ποιησαι κακεινα μη παρειναι	-	S.O.
11:43	A	εν ταις αγοραις	εν ταις αγοραις και πρωτοκλισιας εν τοις δειπνοις	harm.
11:44	A	ουαι υμιν	ουαι υμειν γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι	harm.
11:44	O	οτι εστε ως τα μνημεια τα αδηλα	οτι εστε μνημεια αδηλα	S.O.
11:48	S	και συνευδοκειτε	μη συνευδοκειν	S.S.
11:51	S	εως αιματος ζαχαριου του απολομενου	εως αιματος ζαχαριου ... ον εφονευσαν	S.S.
11:53	S	κακειθεν εξελθοντος	λεγοντες δε(05) / λεγοντος δε(05c)	S.S.
11:54	S	θηρευσαι τι εκ του στοματος αυτου	αφορμην τινα λαβειν αυτου	style
11:54	A	-	ινα ευρωσιν κατηγορησαι αυτου	harm.
13:17	O	και ταυτα λεγοντος αυτου	και	S.O.
13:17	S	κατισχυνοντο ... οι αντικειμενοι	κατισχυνθησαν οι αντικειμενοι	S.S.
16:31	S	ουδ εαν τις εκ νεκρων αναστη πεισθησονται	ουδ εαν τις εκ νεκρων αναστη και απελθη προς αυτους πιστευσουσιν	S.S.
18:9	A/O	εξουθενουντας τους λοιπους	εξουθενουντας τους λοιπους ανθρωπους	spec.
18:14	S	κατεβη ουτος δεδικαιωμενος εις τον οικον αυτου παρ εκεινον	κατεβη ουτος δεδικαιωμενος μαλλον παρ οικεινον τον φαρισαιον	spec.

19:27	A	-	και τον αγρειον δουλον εκβαλετε εις το σκοτος το εξωτερικον εκει εσται ο κλαυθμος και ο βρυγμος των οδοντων (after 19:27)	harm.
22:4	O	συνελαλησεν τοις αρχιερευσιν και στρατηγοις το πως ...	συνελαλησεν τοις αρχιερευσιν πως ...	harm.
22:67	O	ει συ ει ο $\chi\varsigma$ ειπον ημιν	συ ει ο $\chi\rho\varsigma$	harm.
23:1	O	απαν το πληθος αυτων ηγαγον αυτον	ηγαγον αυτον	simp.
23:35	S/O	οι αρχοντες λεγοντες	ελεγαν αυτω	S.S.
23:35	S	εσωσεν σωσατω εαυτον	εσωσας σεαυτον σωσον	S.S.
23:35	S	ει ουτος εστιν ο $\chi\varsigma$ του $\theta\upsilon$ ο εκλεκτος	ει υιος ει του $\theta\upsilon$ ει $\chi\rho\varsigma$ ει ο εκλεκτος	harm.
23:37	S	σωσον σεαυτον	περιτεθεντες αυτω και ακανθινον στεφανον	harm.
23:39	S	εβλασφημει αυτον λεγων ουχι συ ει ο $\chi\varsigma$ σωσον σεαυτον και ημας	εβλασφημει αυτον	S.O.

Luke 5:21-24 records a controversy between Jesus and the scribes and the Pharisees over the authority to forgive sins. D and many Old Latin manuscripts (b, d, ff², g¹, l, and q) add the Synoptic account (Mark 2:6; εν ταις καρδιαις αυτων) to accuse the scribes and the Pharisees of internal wickedness, questioning Jesus' authority in their hearts. Then D and d make a further harmonisation of their question with Mark 2:7, accusing them of negligence of Jesus' identity that they are no more interested in "who this person is who speaks blasphemy (τις εστιν ουτος ος λαλει βλασφημιας)" but in "why⁷² this person blaspheme (τι ουτος λαλει βλασφημιας)." In the following verse, D and d add a word πονηρα to Jesus' question, "Why do you discuss 'evil things' in your hearts?" and assert their wickedness.

In another controversy in the grainfields in Luke 6:3, D and d intensify Jesus' criticism against the Pharisees by changing an adverb from ουδε to ουδεποτε. Accordingly, in the same series of the Sabbath controversies, D and d intensify the Pharisees' reaction to Jesus' criticism so that they now discuss how to kill Jesus (πως απολεσωσιν αυτον). Jesus compared the ignorance and wickedness of the religious leaders to the blindness (Luke 6:39-42). D and d again intensify Jesus' criticism by altering a parable "while not seeing the log in your eye" into an accusation, "And look! A log [is] in your eye, hypocrite!" The tension between Jesus and the religious leaders continues to be amplified in Codex Bezae. D and d omit the vocative διδασκαλε in Luke 10:25 to remove a sense of respect for Jesus. In Luke 11:2, D and d harmonise Matthew 6:7 to accuse the leaders of pretentious prayers.

Luke 11:29-12:12 is a major section which records Jesus' teaching against the Pharisees and the lawyers (νομικοι). In this section, alterations of Codex Bezae and many Old Latin manuscripts are concentrated in a way that the wickedness of the leaders is intensified and signified. D and d add

⁷² τι could either mean 'why' or 'what.' But the context of both Luke 5:21 and Mark 2:7 clarifies that the scribes' concern was Jesus blaspheming God. Therefore, it is reasonable to understand τι as 'why.'

υποκριται to the simply descriptive οι φαρισαιοι (Luke 11:39) and omit the admonition (Luke 11:42c) which admits the validity of the Jewish law while leaving to stand the accusation of being hypocrites in their religious practice. In 11:43, D, b, d, l, q, and r¹ harmonise with Matthew 23:6-7 or Mark 12:38-39 to extend the accusation. In Luke 11:44, by addition of γραμματεις και φαρισαιοι D, d, i, and r¹ specify the object of the woe, and by omission of ως they intensify the criticism, “You are unmarked graves!” In Luke 11:48, D and d alter και συνευδοκειτε into μη συνευδοκειν and extend the accusation of the wickedness to the ancestors of the Jews. In Luke 11:51, D, a, and d change the voice of the sentence so that Zechariah’s death was not anonymous (ζαχαριου του απολομενου) but “they killed (ον εφονευσαν)” him. In this way, the sins of the ancestors of the Jews were emphasised. Again, the tension between Jesus and the religious leaders gets more intense. Whereas majority reading reads, “after Jesus came out from there (κακειθεν εξελθοντος αυτου), the scribes and the Pharisees questioned him ... to catch something from his mouth (θηρευσαι τι εκ του στοματος αυτου),” the altered text portrays a tenser scene, “when he was saying these (A, D, W, θ, 18, it, *et al.*) to them before all people (D, X, θ, 16, 157, 213, it, *et al.*), the Pharisees and the lawyers (D and d) disputed with him (συνβαλλειν αυτω; D, 788, b, c, d, e, f, i, l, q, and r¹) to take some chance (D and d) so that they might find [something] to accuse him (D, d, and e).” After a series of controversies, Luke 13:17 portrays the defeat of the leaders, and again, the scene is amplified. D omits ταυτα λεγοντος αυτου and leaves the scene of the defeat of Jesus’ adversaries. One step further, D replaces the verb κατησχυνοντο (they began to feel shame) with κατησχυνθησαν (they became ashamed), and some Old Latin manuscripts record that they were jumbled (a, a², and d: *confundebantur*; d: *confusi sunt*).

Luke 16:19-31 records a parable against the Pharisees. In 16:31, majority reading reads a conclusive statement of their unbelief. Whereas majority reading reads “neither will they be convinced (πισθησονται) if someone should rise from the dead,” D, d, and r¹ intensify this by addition and substitution, “neither will they believe (πιστευσουσιν) if someone should rise from the dead and come to them (και απελθη προς αυτους).”

In Luke 18:9-14, Jesus speaks in a parable pointing out the wickedness of the Pharisees. D, d and some other manuscripts intensify and specify this by means of alterations. D and d specify the object of contempt as the other people (τους λοιπους “ανθρωπους”). Moreover, D, 472, 1347, and d omits the phrase την παραβολην ταυτην and transform the following parable (Luke 18:10-14) into an accusation. In v. 14, D, a, and d indicate the identity of “the other (παρ εκεινον)” who was pronounced to be less righteous than the tax collector by substitution with “the Pharisees (παρ ακεινον τον φαρισαιον).” In the parable of the ten talents (Luke 19:11-27), the judgement on the wicked servant is intensified on D and d by adding the judgement of Matthew 25:30.

Codex Bezae shows a tendency to amplify the participation of the leaders in Jesus’ persecution and death. In Luke 22:4, D and d harmonise with Matthew 26:14 and Mark 14:10 by omitting “to the officers (και στρατηγοις)” to lay a charge of the betrayal on Judah and the chief priests. Furthermore, D and d harmonise Luke 22:67 with Mark 14:61 leaving out ο υιος του ευλογητου (Mark 14:61d). This

alteration changes the euphamistic question to a direct question without any respect. In Luke 23:1, D and d change the identification of the people from “all of the people there (ανασταν απαν το πληθος αυτων)” to “those who were speaking to Jesus (ανασταντες),” i.e., the chief priests and scribes (Luke 22:66). In Luke 23:35, D and d expand the identity of people who scoffed at Jesus by substituting εξεμυκτηριζον δε και οι αρχοντες λεγοντες with εμυκτηριζον δε αυτον και ελεγαν αυτω. The subject of εμυκτηριζον and ελεγαν is identified in connection with Luke 23:13 as the chief priests, the rulers, and the people. Since people were standing by watching (Luke 23:35), those who scoffed at Jesus were the chief priests and the rulers. Furthermore, D, (c), and d changes the degree of the scoffs. Whereas majority reading writes all verbs in the third person (εσωσεν σωσατω εαυτον), D, c, and d portray the scene of direct scoffs at Jesus with all verbs in the second person (εσωσας σεαυτον σωσον). Then D and d harmonise the verse with Matthew 27:40 and include in their mockery Jesus’ Sonship (ει υιος ει του θεου ει χριστος ει ο εκλεκτος) on top of the mockery of the Messiahship which all other manuscripts attest. In order to highlight the wickedness of the religious leaders even further, D and d make a sharp contrast between the religious leaders and the soldiers and one of the criminals who was crucified next to Jesus. Luke 23:37 records that the soldiers also mocked Jesus. While majority reading records, “If you are the King of the Jews, save yourself,” D and d bring in Matthean account and write, “Hail, King of the Jews! (χαϊρε ο βασιλευς των ιουδαιων)” and they put on a crown of thorn. In Luke 23:39, D, d, and e omit the details of slander (ουχι συ ει ο χριστος σωσον σεαυτον και ημας). By these alterations, the hostility of the religious leaders toward Jesus grows larger to the extent of denying both the Sonship and the Messiahship of Jesus, while the wickedness and ignorance of a sinner and the Gentiles are reduced.

5.2.2.2 Anti-Judaic tendency against Jerusalem

Negative alterations not only directed toward the religious leaders as persons but also toward Jerusalem as a symbol of the Jewish religion. D and d separate Jerusalem from other parts of Israel as a place of unresponsiveness, therefore, to be under the judgement.

Table 54. Alterations reflecting anti-Judaic tendency against Jerusalem

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
5:17	O	εκ πασης [της] κωμης της γαλιλαιας και ιουδαιας και ιερουσαλημ	εκ πασης κωμης της γαλιλαιας και ιουδαιας	S.O.
5:17		και δυναμις κυ ην	-	S.O.
6:17	S	απο πασης της ιουδαιας και ιερουσαλημ και της παραλιου τυρου και σιδωνος	απο πασης ιουδαιας και αλλων πολεων	S.O.
21:21	A	οι εν μεσω αυτης εκχωριτωσαν	οι εν μεσω αυτης μη εκχωριτωσαν	S.A.
21:24	O	αχρι ου πληρωθωσιν καιροι εθνων	αχρις ου πληρωθωσιν	S.O.

23:5	S	καθ ολης της ιουδαιας	καθ ολης της γης	S.S.
------	---	------------------------------	-------------------------	------

In Luke 5:17, D and d omit the geographical reference of Jerusalem and alter the text so that the Pharisees and the teachers of the law came to Jesus from all towns of Galilee and Judea to be healed, but none came from Jerusalem. In Luke 6:17, D and d simplify the geographical reference of Jerusalem and the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon as “other cities (αλλων πολεων).” With these alterations, Jerusalem now became a place not responding to Jesus’ ministry, and the only thing left is the judgement. In Luke 21:21, D and d change Jesus’ command by adding μη. In majority reading, people in Jerusalem were to depart the city to avoid the judgement, but D and d portray a scene in which Jesus declares a complete judgement on the city as well as people living in the city. Therefore, they are not to flee from the judgement (μη εκχωριτωσαν). On the contrary, those people from Judea and other towns who responded to the Messiah’s ministry, are commanded not to go near to the place of judgement. In Luke 21:24, D and d amplify the gravity of the judgement by omitting καιροι εθνων. In majority reading, the judgement had a temporal limit until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled. But D and d make the judgement timeless until the vengeance is completely accomplished. In Luke 23:5, sharp contrast is made between Jerusalem and the rest of Israel. In majority reading, the crowds of religious leaders accuse Jesus of having taught throughout all Judea, but D and d replace it to throughout whole land (καθ ολης της γης). D and d portray a scene in which the religious leaders are acknowledging that Jesus has exerted his influence on the whole land from Galilee up to Jerusalem, but at the same time, they are resisting Jesus not to exert any influence in Jerusalem. Altogether, in Codex Bezae, Jerusalem is a city of unresponsiveness and resistance, and soon to be placed under the judgement of God.

5.2.2.3 Anti-Judaic tendency against the people of Israel

It has been attested so far that Codex Bezae and some Old Latin manuscripts show remarkable anti-Judaic sentiment against the religious leaders. On top of that, there are several readings that expand the anti-Judaic sentiment into the people of Israel. These readings tend to be attested by D and the majority of the Old Latin manuscripts.

Table 55. Alterations reflecting anti-Judaic tendency against people of Israel

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
11:35	S	σκοπει ουν μη το φως το εν σοι σκοτος εστιν	ει ουν το φως το εν σοι σκοτος το σκοτος ποσον	harm.
11:36	O	ει ουν το σωμα σου ολον φωτεινον μη εχον μερος τι σκοτεινον εσται φωτεινον ολον	-	S.O.

ως οταν ο λυχνος τη αστραπη φωτιζη σε				
11:49	O	δια τουτο και η σοφια του θυ̅ ειπεν αποστελω	δια τουτο αποστελλω	S.O.
11:50	S	το αιμα παντων ... απο της γενεας ταυτης	το αιμα παντων ... εως της γενεας ταυτης	S.S.
12:56	O	τον καιρον δε τουτον πως ουκ οιδατε δοκιμαζειν	τον καιρον τουτον ου δοκιμαζετε	S.O.
12:57	O	τι δε και αφ εαυτων ου κρινετε το δικαιον	και αφ εαυτων ου κρινεται το δικαιον	S.O.
13:27	S	ουκ οιδα [υμας]	ουδεποτε ειδον υμας	S.S.
13:27	O	ποθεν εστε	-	S.S.
23:13	A	και τον λαον	και παντα τον λαον	spec.
24:7	O	εις χειρας ανθρωπων αμαρτωλων	εις χειρας ανθρωπων	S.O.

In Luke 11:35, majority reading portrays Jesus admonishing people to watch out. But D and majority Old Latin manuscripts (a, b, d, e, ff², and i) alters the text into a reproach, “Therefore, since the light in you [is] dark, how great the darkness [is]! (ει ουν το φως το εν σοι σκοτος το σκοτος ποσον).”⁷³ Then D, a, b, d, e, ff², i, and r¹ omit the whole v.36, which could be understood as an admonition. By these alterations, the majority of “Western” witnesses portray the crowds as already condemned by Jesus without any further admonition.

In Luke 11:50, the same “Western” manuscripts (D, a, b, d, e, ff², i, and r¹) alter the text in a way to specify the extent of liability. They change majority reading “the blood ... from the foundation of the world ... may be charged from this generation (απο της γενεας ταυτης)” to “the blood ... from the foundation of the world up to this generation (εως της γενεας ταυτης) ... may be found.” In connection with Luke 11:49, this alteration specifies the extent of liability to the blood that is to be shed in that generation (i.e., the blood of Jesus and his disciples). D, b, and d make this clear by omitting και η σοφια του θεου ειπεν in 11:49 so that Jesus himself is sending his prophets and apostles (αποστελλω εις αυτους προφητας και αποστολους). In this way, the liabilities of the people of Israel are amplified and expanded to the death of the disciples.

In Luke 12:56-57, D and the “Western” manuscripts (v.56: D, b, c, d, e, ff², i, l, and r¹; v.57: D, b, and d) intensify Jesus’ reproach to the crowds by changing the rhetorical questions into direct statements. In Luke 13:27, D, d, and e intensify Jesus’ response to a man’s question by substituting, “I do not know where you come from” with “I have never seen you.” However, since the grammatical person and number of the verbs are all in the second person plural in v.25-28, Jesus’ admonition is not pointing at the man only, but also to the audience, the Jewish people. The calling of the Gentiles

⁷³ This alteration is a harmonisation with Matthew 6:23. The interpretation of this sentence depends on the interpretation of ει. Considering the omission of the following verse by the same manuscripts, anti-Judaic bias should be taken into account, and the ει-clause should be understood as a causal clause (BDAG, under ει 3).

mentioned in v.29 stands in contrast to this interpretation. In view of this, the alteration of Luke 13:27 suggests a foresight of even harsher forsakenness by God.

The “Western” manuscripts show a tendency of charging the guilt to all people of Israel. In Luke 23:13, D, c, and d expand the guilt to all people by adding *παντα*. By this alteration, all people of Israel, as well as the chief priests and the rulers, participated in the crucifixion of Jesus. In 24:7, D, a, b, d, e, ff², l, and r¹ similarly expand the guilt to all people by omitting *αμαρτωλων*. In this way, the sinners were all people, not just the people who participated in the crucifixion of Jesus.

5.2.3 Singular readings concerning the Gentiles

The Gospel of Luke shows a universalistic concern about the poor (Luke 6:20; 14:12-13; 16:19-31; 18:22), the marginalised (Luke 2:79; 4:18; 13:28-30; 15:11-32; 18:13; 19:2-10; 24:46-49), and the Gentiles (Luke 2:30-32; 3:14; 14:15-24). Codex Bezae shows some interest in the expansion of universalism towards the Gentiles.

Table 56. Alterations concerning the Gentiles

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
3:10	A	τι ... ποιησωμεν	τι ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν	spec.
3:12	A	τι ποιησωμεν	τι ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν	spec.
3:14	A/O	τι ποιησωμεν και ημεις	τι ποιησωμεν ινα σωθωμεν	spec.
5:39	O	ουδεις πειων παλαιον θελει νεον λεγει γαρ ο παλαιος χριστος εστιν	-	S.O.

Luke 3:7-9 portrays a scene in which John the Baptist calls for the repentance. Various groups of people —the Jews, the tax collectors, and the soldiers— arrived in response to John the Baptist. D and d make an interpolation of “in order to be saved (*ινα σωθωμεν*)” after each question of each group (Luke 3:10, 12, 14) to signify that they all had the same concern. One further noticeable alteration is the omission of “We also (*και ημεις*),” which associates the soldiers to the tax collectors. Based on this phrase, some scholars conjecture that the soldiers were Jewish support-units (Paul Joüon, 1930:310-311; Jeremias, 1971:48). However, D, (2487⁷⁴), and d omit this phrase and break the association with the tax collectors, and let them stand on their own. It seems the scribe(s) of D and d wanted to portray a picture in which all representatives of various population groups —the Jews, the marginalised, and the Gentiles— came with the same concern about salvation, and John affirms that it is open to all of them.

⁷⁴ 2487 is an eleventh-century minuscule of Byzantine text-group. Therefore, the omission of *και ημεις* seems accidental.

Luke 5:36-39 presents a series of parables. Among them, D, a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, and r¹ omit the last parable (v.39) and end the discourse with the second. The first parable of a piece of garment and the second parable of the wineskins share the same emphasis; the old Jewish religion cannot accommodate the new teachings of Jesus, while the third presents the reason. Majority reading, including v.39, puts emphasis on the indifference of the Jews, which results in the call for a new community. However, with v.39 omitted, D, a, b, c, d, e, ff², l, and r¹ emphasise the call for a new community (v.38).

5.2.4 Singular readings concerning the kingdom of God

The kingdom of God is one of the most prominent themes of the Gospels. Jesus' teaching always pointed to it. Consequently, the early Christians were always concerned about the coming of the kingdom of God, and past studies have acknowledged the development of the interpretation of the coming of the kingdom. Codex Bezae shows some significant alterations about the kingdom of God with a tendency of identifying it with Jesus' coming. And furthermore, Jesus' coming is associated with the day of judgement and the destruction of the temple.

Table 57. Alterations concerning the kingdom of God

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
9:27	S	εως αν ιδωσιν την βασιλειαν του θυ	εως αν ειδωσιν τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχομενον εν τη δοξη αυτου	harm.
10:12	T/S	σοδομοις εν τη ημερα εκεινη ανεκτοτερον εσται	σοδομοις ανεκτοτερον εσται εν τη βασιλεια του θυ	S.S.
11:2d	A	ελθετω	εφ ημας ελθετω	spec.
11:22	O	επαν ... επελθων νεικησει αυτον	εαν ... επελθων	S.O.
17:21	A	ιδου ωδε η εκει	ιδου ωδε η ιδου εκει μη πιστευσητε	harm.
17:22	A	μιαν των ημερων του υιου του ανθρωπου	μιαν των ημερων τουτων του υιου του ανθρωπου	spec.
19:11	T/O	δοκειν αυτους οτι παραρημα μελλει η βασιλεια του θυ αναφαινεσθαι	δοκειν οτι μελλει παραρημα η βασιλεια του θυ αναφαινεσθαι	S.O.
21:7	S	τι το σημειον οταν μελλη ταυτα γινεσθαι	τι το σημειον της σης ελευσεως	S.S.
23:42	S	εις την βασιλειαν σου	εν τη ημερα της ελευσεως σου	S.S.

In Luke 9:27, D and d harmonise the majority reading “until they see the kingdom of God” with Matthew 16:28 (εως αν ειδωσιν τον υιον του ανθρωπου ερχομενον εν τη βασιλεια αυτου) with the ending slightly modified (εν τη δοξη αυτου). This modification is another harmonisation with Matthew 25:31a (οταν δε ελθη ο υιος του ανθρωπου εν τη δοξη αυτου). Two things are noticeable in these

harmonisations. On the one hand, Codex Bezae shows concern about the coming of Jesus. On the other hand, it is implanting the contextual idea behind Matthew 25:31 into Luke 9:27. Matthew 25:31 is a beginning verse of Jesus' teaching about the final judgement (Matthew 25:31-46). Jesus is teaching about the day of the coming of the Son of Man on which the righteous and the unrighteous will be separated, and the final judgement will be pronounced. Traditional interpretation of Luke 9:27 (also, Matthew 16:28 and Mark 9:1) identifies the kingdom of God with the following story of transfiguration due to the phrase "who will not taste death until they see" However, Codex Bezae makes this speech point in two directions, in a narrow context, referring to the transfiguration, but in a broader context, also to the Son of Man coming in his glory, which implies the day of judgement.

In Luke 10:12, Jesus is giving his disciples instructions about what will happen on the day of judgement to those who do not receive the gospel. Here, D and d alter the majority reading *εν τη ημερα εκεινη* into *εν τη βασιλεια του θεου*.⁷⁵ Again, it is noticeable that Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts identify the day of Judgement with the kingdom of God.

In Luke 11:2, D and d make an addition (*εφ ημας*) to the Lord's prayer for the kingdom (*ελθετω σου η βασιλεια*). Based on the similar account in Tertullian (*Adversus Marcionem* IV.26) and Gregory of Nyssa (*De Oratione Dominica Orationes* V.260.4), Metzger interprets *εφ ημας* as a contracted form of a liturgical adaptation of the petition for the Holy Spirit (*ελθετω το αγιον πνευμα σου εφ ημας*) (Metzger, 1975:130-131). But it seems unlikely that the scribe of D and d contracted the whole phrase into a prepositional phrase (*εφ ημας*). Instead, it seems more probable to read *εφ ημας* with the following phrase (*ελθετω σου η βασιλεια*). This understanding may be referenced to the following pericope in which Jesus speaks about the coming kingdom (Luke 11:20, *αρα εφθασεν εφ υμας η βασιλεια του θεου*). Then, in Luke 11:22, Jesus speaks in a parable of the strong man and his appearance. Here again, D and d alter the majority reading in a way to place focus on the coming of Jesus. Whereas majority reading reads "when the stronger one than him comes and conquers him (*επαν δε ισχυροτερος αυτου επελθων νικηση αυτον*)," D and d remove the image of the war and leaves only the coming of the strong man, and read "when the stronger man comes (*εαν δε ισχυροτερος επελθων*)."⁷⁶ By this alteration, D and d strengthen the coming of Jesus itself without any resistance.

In another discourse of Jesus about the kingdom of God (Luke 17:20-37), D and d make a number of alterations, and among them three are singular alterations: an addition of *μη πιστευσητε* (Luke 17:21); another addition of *τουτων* (Luke 17:22); and a substitution of *λαμπει το αστραπτει* (Luke 17:24).

⁷⁵ Besides D and d, a and b read *in regno* (in the kingdom) and l reads *in die iudicii* (on the day of judgement).

⁷⁶ The altered text shows somewhat peculiar grammar with *εαν* + participle. *εαν* here can be understood as a temporal conjunction 'when' (BDAG, under *εαν* 2). While D shows this peculiarity (*εαν + επελθων*), d reads *si* + subjunctive (*supervenerit*). Therefore, it is reasonable to consider the omission of *νικηση αυτον* is not an accident, but a deliberate alteration by the scribe.

B-text (P⁷⁵ and B)

20 επερωτηθεις δε υπο των φαρισαιων ποτε
 ερχεται η βασιλεια του θεου απεκριθη αυτοις
 και ειπεν ουκ ερχεται η βασιλεια του θεου
 μετα παρατηρησεως
 21 ουδε ερουσιν ιδου ωδε η [] εκει [] ιδου γαρ
 η βασιλεια του θεου εντος υμων εστιν
 22 ειπεν **δε** προς τους μαθητας ελευσονται
 ημεραι **οτε επιθυμησετε** μιαν των ημερων []
 του υιου του ανθρωπου **ιδειν** και ουκ οψεσθε
 23 και ερουσιν υμιν **ιδου εκει η ιδου ωδε** μη
 [απελθητε μηδε]⁷⁷ διωξητε
 24 ωσπερ γαρ η αστραπη [] αστραπτουσα εκ
 της υπο τον ουρανον **εις την υπ ουρανον**
λαμπει ουτως εσται [] ο υιος του ανθρωπου **εν**
τη ημερα αυτου

Codex Bezae

20 επερωτηθεις δε υπο των φαρισαιων ποτε
 ερχετε η βασιλεια του θεου απεκριθη αυτοις
 και ειπεν ουκ ερχεται η βασιλεια του θεου
 μετα παρατηρησεως
 21 ουδε ερουσιν ιδου ωδε η **ιδου** εκει **μη**
πιστευσητε ιδου γαρ η βασιλεια του θεου
 εντος υμων εστιν
 22 ειπεν **ουν** προς τους μαθητας ελευσονται
 ημεραι **του επιθυμησαι υμας** μιαν των ημερων
τουτων του υιου του ανθρωπου [] και ουκ
 οψεσθαι
 23 και ερουσιν υμειν **ιδου ωδε ιδου εκει** μη
 απελθητε μηδε διωξητε
 24 ωσπερ γαρ η αστραπη **η** αστραπτουσα εκ
 της υπο τον ουρανον **αστραπτει** ουτως εσται
και ο υιος του ανθρωπου []

It is noticeable that the addition of μη πιστευσητε (v.21) together with a transposition (v.23) form the following parallelism in Luke 17:20-24:

- A. ποτε ερχεται η βασιλεια του θεου (v.20a)
- B. ουκ ερχεται η βασιλεια του θεου μετα παρατηρησεως (v.20b)
- C. ουδε ερουσιν ιδου ωδε η ιδου εκει **μη πιστευσητε** (v.21a)
- D. η βασιλεια του θεου εντος υμων εστιν (v.21b)
- A'. ελευσονται ημεραι (v.22a)
- B'. του επιθυμησαι υμας μιαν των ημερων **τουτων** του υιου του ανθρωπου
και ουκ οψεσθαι (v.22b)
- C'. και ερουσιν υμειν ιδου ωδε ιδου εκει μη απελθητε μηδε διωξητε (v.23)
- D'. ... **αστραπτει** ουτως εσται και ο υιος του ανθρωπου (v.24)

⁷⁷ [απελθητε μηδε] is not a part of P⁷⁵ or B. is not a part of P⁷⁵ or B. But NA28 has included these words since all other manuscripts besides P⁷⁵, B and a number of minuscules include these words.

This parallelism builds up a strong correspondence between the kingdom of God and the days of Jesus while the former quadruplet points to the present days of Jesus on earth (εντος υμων),⁷⁸ the latter counterpart points to the absence of Jesus. Considering how εν τη ημερα ταυτης is used to indicate the present time (Luke 1:39; 6:12; 19:42; 24:18; Acts 2:29; 6:1; 21:15; 26:22) and ημερα εκεινη to indicate the future judgement (Mathew 24:22; 24:29; 24:36; 26:29; Mark 13:19; 13:32; 14:25; Luke 10:12; 21:34; 2 Thessalonians 1:10; Revelations 9:6), the addition of τουτων in v.22 strengthens this temporal sense. The third singular alteration from λαμπει to αστραπτει together with the omission of εις την υπ ουρανον changes the emphasis of the instruction. While majority reading signifies the extensiveness with the word λαμπει (“lights up” the sky from one side to the other side), D and d signify momentariness with the word αστραπτει and the omission of εις την υπ ουρανον and εν τη ημερα αυτου.

In Luke 19:11, another significant alteration is found in Jesus’ thoughts about the kingdom of God. D and d omit αυτους, the subject of the infinitive δοκειν, and it makes the preceding αυτον become the subject of δοκειν. Consequently, whereas majority reading reports that while Jesus was walking to Jerusalem silently, Jesus’ disciples supposed that the kingdom of God would immediately appear. But D and d rewrite this so that Jesus thought the kingdom of God would appear immediately. This alteration amplifies the imminence of the kingdom of God.

In Luke 21:7, D and d make a connection between the prophecy of the destruction of the temple (Luke 21:6), i.e., the connection between the judgement upon Jerusalem and Jesus’ coming, by the substitution of οταν μελλη ταυτα γινεσθαι with της σης ελευσεως.

In Luke 23:42, one of the criminals who was crucified next to Jesus requests to remember him when Jesus comes into his kingdom (οταν ελθης εις την βασιλειαν σου). D and d substitute this phrase with “on the day of your coming (εν τη ημερα της ελευσεως σου).” Again, D and d put emphasis on Jesus’ coming.

5.2.5 Singular readings concerning discipleship

The last element that Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts emphasise is discipleship. In this regard, they show three major concerns: the appreciation of disciples’ devotion and faith, apologetic concerns about the disciples, and more radical exhortations of discipleship.

⁷⁸ There has been much debate about the interpretation of εντος υμων. Arguments to see this as “inside you” seem less convincing. Considering the contrast between the quadruplets, it is more convincing to interpret εντος υμων as “among you.”

5.2.5.1 Appreciation of disciples' devotion and faith

Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts show a tendency of making alterations to the records of the disciples. These alterations tend to exalt the disciple's devotion by portraying them more submissive to Jesus.

Table 58. Alterations concerning the appreciation of disciples' devotion and faith

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
5:5	S	επιστατα	διδασκαλε	S.S.
5:5	S	χαλασω τα δικτυα	ου μη παρακουσομαι⁽⁰⁵⁾ / παρακουσομεν^(05c)	S.S.
5:6	S	τουτο ποιησαντες συνεκλεισαν πληθος ιχθυων πολυν	ευθυς χαλασαντες τα δικτυα συνεκλεισαν ιχθυων πληθος πολυ	spec.
5:8	T/S	προσεπεσεν τοις γονασιν ιω	προσεπεσεν αυτου τοις ποσιν	harm.
5:8	A	εξελθε απ εμου	παρακαλω εξελθε απ εμου	spec.
5:10	S	ομοιως δε και ιακωβον και ιωαννην υιους ζεβεδαιου οι ησαν κοινωνοι τω σιμωνι και ειπε προς τον σιμονα ις μη φοβου απο του νυν ανθρωπους εση ζωγρων	ησαν δε κοινωνοι αυτου ιακωβος και ιωαννης υιοι ζεβεδαιου ο δε ειπεν αυτοις δευτε και μη γεινεσθε αλιεις ιχθυων ποιησω γαρ υμας αλιεις ανθρωπων	harm.
5:11	S	και καταγαγοντες τα πλοια επι την γην αφεντες παντα ηκολουθησαν αυτω	οι δε ακουσαντες παντα κατελειψαν επι της γης και ηκολουθησαν αυτω	S.S.

Luke 5:1-11 records the vocation of Peter, James, and John. In this pericope, D, (a), d, and (e) make a number of alterations and highlight their submission to Jesus. In Luke 5:5, D, a, and d substitute *επιστατα* with *διδασκαλε*. Otto Glombitza's study on the title *διδασκαλος* and *επιστατης* in Luke concludes that Luke's special usage of *επιστατης* distinguishes Jesus from a secular term (*διδασκαλος*) which is also used for the teachers of philosophy (Glombitza, 1958:275-278). Consequently, *επιστατα* is a term connoting a theological idea of special treatment for Jesus. Then, the alteration of *επιστατα* into *διδασκαλε* is a downgrade of the title to a theological point of view. By this alteration, however, even a stronger contrast is made with *κυριε* in Luke 5:8. The scribes of D, a, and d have altered the title in order to portray more radical submission and deeper realisation of Jesus' Lordship. This process is emphasised by further alterations within this pericope. D and d change Peter's response to Jesus' instruction (Luke 5:5) from "I will let down the nets" to "I will never disobey." Then D, d, and e specify the narration about their obedience (Luke 5:6) by alteration from "when they had done this" to "when they immediately let down the nets." In 5:8, D amplifies Peter's submission to Jesus by portraying Peter as falling down at Jesus' feet. D and d add "please (*παρακαλω*)" before the supplication and make this supplication even more polite and earnest. In Luke 5:10, the focus moves to James and John. While majority reading records James and John were astonished, D and d harmonises with the Synoptic account of Jesus' calling with some addition, "And his partners James and John, sons of Zebedee, were

there. And he said to them, ‘Come, and do not become fishers of fish, for I will make you fishers of men.’” Further in Luke 5:11, D, d, and e portray a more radical submission, “after they heard [this], they left everything on the ground (παντα κατελειψαν επι της γης), and followed him.” These alterations in this pericope portray a more radical, but solemn submission to Jesus.

5.2.5.2 Apologetic concerns about the disciples

Codex Bezae and some Old Latin manuscripts, on the one hand, alter the text relating the disciples to make them good examples of faith for their community. On the other hand, they show a tendency to alter what might be stumbling blocks for the believers.

Table 59. Alterations concerning apologetics for the disciples

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
5:27	S	εθεασατο τελωνην ονοματι λευειν	παραγων ειδεν λευει τον του αλφαιου	harm.
5:33	S	εσθιουσιν και πινουσιν	ουδεν τουτων ποιουσιν	S.S.
5:34	S	εν ω ο νυμφιος μετ αυτων εστιν	εφ οσον εχουσιν τον νυμφιον μεθ εαυτων	S.S.
6:14	A	σιμωνα	πρωτον σιμωνα	spec.
6:14	A	ιωανην	ιωανην τον αδελφον αυτου ους επωνομασεν βοανηργες ο εστιν υιοι βροντης	harm.
6:15	A	θωμαν	θωμαν τον επικαλουμενον διδυμον	harm.
8:24	S	επιστατα επιστατα	κε κε	harm.
9:46	O	εισηλθεν δε διαλογισμος εν αυτοις το τις αν ειη μειζων αυτων	[] το τις αν ειη μειζων αυτων	S.O.
10:16	S	ο δε εμε αθετων αθετει τον αποστειλαντα με	ο δε εμου ακουων ακουει του αποστειλαντος με	S.S.
23:53	A	-	και θεντος αυτου επεθηκεν τω μνημειω λειθον ον μογισ εικοσι εκυλιον (after 23:53)	S.A.
23:55	S	αι γυναικες	δυο γυναικες	spec.
23:55	S	εθεασαντο το μνημειον και ως ετεθη το σωμα αυτου	εθεασαντο το μνημα αυτου	S.O.
24:6	O	ουκ εστιν ωδε αλλα ηγερθη	-	S.O.
24:12	O	ο δε πετρος αναστας εδραμεν επι το μνημειον και παρακυψας βλεπει τα οθονια μονα και απηλθεν προς εαυτον θαυμαζων το γεγονος	-	S.O.
24:17	O	περιπατουντες και εσταθησαν σκυθρωποι	περιπατουντες σκυθρωποι	S.O.
24:24	S	αυτον δε ουκ ειδον	αυτον δε ουκ ειδομεν	S.S.
24:25	O	βραδεις τη καρδια του πιστευειν	βραδεις τη καρδια	S.O.
24:26	S	ουχι ταυτα εδει παθειν τον χν	οτι ταυτα εδει παθειν τον χν	S.S.
24:32	T/S	ουχι η καρδια ημων καιομενη ην	ουχι η καρδια ην ημων κεκαλυμμενη	S.S.

24:33	A	και ανασταντες αυτη τη ωρα υπεστρεψαν εις ιερουσαλημ	και ανασταντες λυπουμενοι αυτη τη ωρα υπεστρεψαν εις ιερουσαλημ	spec.
24:36	O	και λεγει αυτοις ειρηνη υμιν	-	S.O.
24:37	S	εδοκουν πνα θεωρειν	εδοκουν φαντασμα θεωρειν	S.S.
24:40	O	και τουτο ειπων εδειξεν αυτοις τας χειρας και τους ποδας	-	S.O.

Luke 5:27-39 records a controversy between Jesus and the Pharisees. During the controversy, the Pharisees and the scribes blame the disciples. Here, D, d, and e make alterations to defend their lifestyle. In Luke 5:27b, D and d harmonise the verse with Mark 2:14 (λευει τον του αλφαιου) to remove the reference that Levi was a tax collector. In Luke 5:33, Jesus' disciples were blamed on account of eating and drinking (εσθιουσιν και πινουσιν) in comparison with John the Baptist and the Pharisees' disciples who fast often and offer prayers. D, d, and e replace this accusation with the somewhat more relieved expression, "they do none of these (ουδεν τουτων ποιουσιν)," and remove the pleasure-seeking images. In the following verse, D, d, and e rephrase the parable by changing the subject of a subordinate clause from the bridegroom to the wedding guests. Now the viewpoint is changed so that it is not that the bridegroom is with them, but that the wedding guests have the bridegroom with them. This change of viewpoint strengthens the apologetic for the disciples. Luke 6:12-16 provides a list of disciples. D, d, and (r¹) harmonise the gospel account to provide as much information as available to provide the personal details. D, d, and r¹ add πρωτον to indicate Peter as the first apostle (Luke 6:14). In the same verse, D and d add an additional description about John quoting from Mark 3:17. Similarly for Thomas, D and d supplement with Johannine description (11:16; 20:24; 21:2).

D and d tend to hide the disciples' slip away. In Luke 8:24, when the storm came upon them, they came and woke Jesus up calling him "Master, Master (επιστατα επιστατα)." D and d replace the words with κυριε κυριε to mitigate their weaknesses and amplify their faith and devotion. In 9:46, D and d omit the record that there was an argument among the disciples. Then the remaining verse attached to the end of 9:45 recording, "they were afraid to ask about this saying, who would be greater among them (εφοβουντο επερωτησαι περι του ρηματος τουτου το τις αν ειη μειζων αυτων)." In this way, D and d portray a new picture in which the disciples know the shame of this topic and never dispute with one another. In Luke 10:16, D, d, i, and l change the emphasis on the reception of the disciples. Whereas majority reading uses an ab-cd-de structure and places emphasis on the rejection, D, d, i, and l change the text to have an ab-cd-be structure and places emphasis on the listening (ακουω) to the disciples.

Gospel traditions portray the disciples in despair and unbelief after Jesus' death. The resurrection narrative (Luke 24:1-49) also points to the unbelief of the disciples. However, Codex Bezae and some of the "Western" manuscripts attempt to provide apologetics for their unbelief by adjusting the circumstances, which inevitably led to the unbelief. Rice has already discussed the variations of Codex Bezae in the resurrection narrative (Rice, 1984), so it seems sufficient to provide a brief summary and some supplementary arguments. D and d add a testimony about the size of the stone after Luke 23:53,

and D, a, b, d, e, ff², q, and r¹ specify the number of women to emphasise the impossibility of moving the stone. Then Codex Bezae and the “Western” manuscripts make a series of omissions to make the testimony of the women less credible. D and d omit the information that they saw how the body was laid (23:55). D, a, b, d, e, ff², l, and r¹ omit the declaration of the resurrection (24:6). D, a, b, d, e, l, and r¹ omit the whole 24:12 so that no one went to the tomb to verify the testimony. In Luke 24:24, D, d, and e make a change from εἶδον to εἶδομεν, and move the focus to the disciples who did see the empty tomb but still do not believe. D and d provide apologetics by omitting του πιστεueiv (24:25) from Jesus’ reproach and find the reason for unbelief from their lack of understanding of the prophets (24:26). D confirms this with a substitution of καιομενη with κεκαλυμμενη (24:32) that their hearts had been veiled while Jesus was interpreting the Scriptures. In Luke 24:33, D, c, d, and e add “sorrowing (λυπουμενοι)” to indicate that these two acknowledged their lack of understanding and showed a manner of repentance. In Luke 24:34, D, 1200⁷⁹, Syr^S, Syr^C, and Syr^P substitute λεγοντας with λεγοντες resulting that those who announced the resurrection were not the disciples in the room, but two disciples who just came into the room. In Luke 24:36, D, a, b, d, e, ff², l, and r¹ omit Jesus’ greeting and leave Jesus merely standing among them. Consequently, the disciples were frightened, and D and d make further comment with a substitution (24:37) that they thought they saw a ghost (φαντασμα). Lastly, in Luke 24:40, D, a, b, d, e, ff², l, and r¹ omits Jesus’ attestation by showing himself, and justify the continuation of the unbelief to Luke 24:41.

5.2.5.3 Exhortation of radical discipleship

The overture of Jesus’ public ministry, Luke chapter 3, starts with the proclamation of John the Baptist for repentance. The quotation of Isaiah 40:3-5 signifies the fulfillment of the prophecy for the beginning of the kingdom of God with the coming Messiah. D, however, changes the proclamation of the Messiah’s procession to make his (αυτου) path straight to a proclamation of repentance, “make your (υμων) path straight.” Beginning with the emphasis of the repentance in the overture, Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts show a tendency to expand the degree of devotion.

Table 60. Alterations concerning the exhortation of radical discipleship

Ch.	Type	B-type	D-type	Evaluation
3:4	S	ποιειτε τας τριβους αυτου	ποιειτε τας τριβους υμων	S.S.
7:47	O	οτι ηγαπησεν πολυ ω δε ολιγον αφιεται ολιγον αγαπα	-	S.O.
10:41	O	μαρθα μαρθα μεριμνας και θορυβαζη περι πολλα	μαρθα μαρθα θορυβαζη	simp.

⁷⁹ The minuscule 1200 is a twelfth-century manuscript of the Byzantine tradition. Therefore, it probable that this agreement with D is accidental.

10:42	O	ενος δε εστιν χρεια	-	S.O.
12:4	S	και μετα ταυτα μη εχοντων	την δε ψυχην μη δυναμενων αποκτειναι μηδε εχοντων	harm.
12:10	A	ουκ αφεθησεται	ουκ αφεθησεται αυτω ουτε εν τω αιωνι τουτω ουτε εν τω μελλοντι	harm.
12:19	O	εχεις πολλα αγαθα κειμενα εις ετη πολλα αναπαυου φαγε πιε ευφραινου	εχεις πολλα αγαθα ευφραινου	S.O.
12:21	O	ουτως ο θησαυριζων εαυτω και μη εις θ̄ν̄ πλουτων	-	S.O.
12:41	O	η και προς παντας	-	S.O.
18:29	A	ος αφηκεν ... ενεκεν της βασιλειας του θ̄υ	ος αφηκεν ... εν τω καιρω τουτω ενεκεν της βασιλειας του θ̄υ	spec.

Luke 3:10-14 portrays a scene in which various groups of people come to John the Baptist in response to his call for repentance. They ask questions about what they should do, and John instructs them to practice charity and to abandon any social injustice. D and d add “in order to be saved (ινα σωθωμεν)” to the questions of each group and associate ethical practices with salvation as a condition. In Luke 7:47, D and d show a similar point of view. After a woman came and anointed Jesus, he declares that her many sins were forgiven (αφεωνται). The parable in v.41-42 and the following words of Jesus (v.47) clarify why he issued such a judgement. One who is forgiven little loves little, one who is forgiven much loves much. Thus, in the majority reading, Jesus, by inference, declares that her sins were forgiven. On the contrary, D and d omit the words of Jesus explaining the reason for his declaration (οτι ηγαπησεν πολυ ω δε ολιγον αφιεται ολιγον αγαπα), and associate the forgiveness of her sins with the works she has done (ου χαριν ... αφεωνται). In this way, D and d put great emphasis on the obligation that the followers of Jesus should practice.

In Luke 10:41-42, D, d and Old Latin manuscripts make a sharper contrast between Martha and Mary. Firstly, D and d omits *μεριμνας και περι πολλα* from Luke 10:41 and leaves *θορυβαζη* only, resulting Martha is distracting herself.⁸⁰ Then D, c, and d omit Jesus’ gentle reproach (*ενος δε εστιν χρεια*) which might be understood as a suggestion to make a choice from either. By omitting this, the choice which the followers of Jesus should make, becomes clear. That is to come close to Jesus and listen to his words. Even further, the Old Latin manuscripts a, b, c, e, ff², i, l, and r¹ omit Luke 10:41b-42a. By this, a sharp contrast between Martha and Mary is made, and the right choice to be made is even clearer.

Luke chapter 12 records a series of Jesus’ instructions for his disciples, a group of alterations are found in this chapter. In Luke 12:4, D harmonises the verse with Matthew 10:28 and expands Jesus’

⁸⁰ *θορυβαζη* can be understood either in the middle or passive voice. Considering the omission of *περι πολλα*, it is more probable that it is meant to be read in the middle voice. d attests this interpretation with the translation *turbas te circa plurima* (“you are distracting yourself with many things around”).

instruction, “but cannot kill the soul nor have anything more to do.” At the end of Luke 12:10, D and d add a quotation from Matthew 12:32, “either in this age or in the age to come.” Both harmonisations intensify God’s power in his judgement, which all people should fear.

In the parable of the rich man (Luke 12:16-21), D and Old Latin manuscripts make two significant alterations that seem to encourage ascetic life. In Luke 12:19, D, a, b, c, d, e, and ff² omits “[ample goods] laid up for many years; relax, eat, drink” and only leaves “you have ample goods, be merry.” By this omission, this parable presents a stricter standard for the followers of Jesus as a lifestyle that merely desire to be merry with stored goods for oneself, become an object of reproof even if they are not stored as much as for many years’ use. Even further, D, a, b, and d intensify the criticism about such lifestyle by omitting whole Luke 12:21 and ends the parable at v.20 with reproof from God. In Luke 12:41, D and d contract Peter’s question by omitting “or for all (ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας)” to narrow the scope to the followers of Jesus (“telling this parable for us”).

Luke 18:29-30 records Jesus’ declaration of the reward for those who made a complete devotion to the kingdom of God. However, D and d add an additional condition by adding “at this time (ἐν τῷ καρπῷ τούτῳ),” and urge even more radical discipleship.

5.2.6 Summary

So far, significant singular readings of Codex Bezae were discussed. These variants showed theological concerns about Jesus, the Judaism, the Gentiles, the kingdom of God, and the discipleship. Greek singular readings of Codex Bezae with some support of other “Western” manuscripts made the following theological alterations: exaltation of Jesus’ identity as the Messiah with an equal power and authority to God; removal of possible obstacles concerning Jesus’ record; anti-Judaic emphases towards the religious leaders, the Jewish people, and Jerusalem; expansion of the universalism towards the Gentiles; identification of the kingdom of God with Jesus’ coming; presentation of the devotion and faith of the disciples as a model; apologetics for the weaknesses of the disciples; exhortation of radical discipleship.

5.3 Theological importance of the shorter reading of the Lord’s Supper in Codex Bezae and the “Western” manuscripts

The textual problem of Luke 22:19b-20 is a complex problem since it does not seem to reflect any theological concerns discussed above. The omission of Luke 22:19b-20 removes the significance of the atonement of Jesus’ death both from the bread and the cup. Moreover, due to the omission of the word of repetition (v.19b), the institution becomes an ordinary meal. However, considering the observation

that the scribe(s) of Codex Bezae and the “Western” manuscripts reflect specific theological concerns, it would be proper to consider that the shorter account of the Lord’s Supper also shares the same theological concern. In order to disclose theological concerns intertwined with the shorter reading, this problem needs to be discussed in a broader context.

Ehrman has presented an adequate structure that demonstrates the correspondences between v.15-16 and v.17-18, and v.19a-21 and v.22 (Ehrman, 1993:206-207).

A	a	το πασχα	(15)
	b	λεγω γαρ υμιν ... εν τη βασιλεια του θεου	(16)
B	a’	το ποτηριον	(17)
	b’	λεγω γαρ υμιν ... η βασιλεια του θεου	(18)
A’	a’’	τουτο εστιν το σωμα μου	(19a)
	b’’	πλην ... παραδιδοντος	(21)
B’	a+	ο υιος του ανθρωπου	(22a)
	b+	πλην ... παραδιδεται	(22b)

This structure presents two significant elements: (1) signs for the kingdom of God; and (2) the identification of the Son of Man with Jesus.

5.3.1 Signs for the kingdom of God

The kingdom of God is one of the most prominent concerns in the Gospel of Luke. And it has been discussed, Codex Bezae shows a great concern about the kingdom of God while identifying it with the coming of the Son of Man. However, the coming of the kingdom of God was only vaguely described in spacial or temporal descriptions so far (Luke 9:27; 10:9; 10:11; 11:20; 17:20; 17:21; 19:11).

Luke 22:15-18 presents concrete temporal references to the arrival of the kingdom of God with respect to Jesus’ action: (1) I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God; (2) I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes. In v.16, Codex Bezae makes two significant alterations.

B-text

15 και ειπεν προς αυτους επιθυμια επεθυμησα
τουτο το πασχα φαγειν μεθ υμων προ του **με**
παθειν
16 λεγω γαρ υμιν **οτι ου μη φαγω αυτο** εως
οτου **πληρωθη** εν τη βασιλεια του θεου

Codex Bezae

15 και ειπεν προς αυτους επιθυμια επεθυμησα
τουτο το πασχα φαγειν μεθ υμων προ του []
παθειν
16 λεγω γαρ υμειν **ουκετι μη φαγομαι απ**
αυτου εως οτου **καινον βρωθη** εν τη βασιλεια
του θεου

17 και δεξαμενος [] ποτηριον ευχαριστησας
ειπεν λαβετε τουτο και διαμερισατε εις
εαυτους

18 λεγω γαρ υμιν οτι ου μη πιω απο του νυν
απο του γεννηματος της αμπελου εως ου η
βασιλεια του θεου ελθη

17 και δεξαμενος το ποτηριον ευχαριστησας
ειπεν λαβετε τουτο [] διαμερισατε εαυτοις

18 λεγω γαρ υμειν [] απο του νυν ου μη πιω
απο του γεννηματος της αμπελου εως οτου ελθη
η βασιλεια του θεου

The first significant variation is a substitution of αυτο with απ αυτου. Both αυτο and απ αυτου are pointing at the Passover Meal (το πασχα) in v.15. However, they differ in their content as αυτο indicates the Passover Meal as a whole while απ αυτου means something from the Passover Meal or Passover itself, for example, the lamb or the unleavened bread. The second variation is a substitution of πληρωθη with καινον βρωθη. Whereas majority reading leaves the temporal reference still vague with the clause, “until it⁸¹ is fulfilled in the kingdom of God,” with this variation, D and d adopt a more concrete temporal reference to which “until a new [thing from the Passover Meal] is eaten.” Therefore, in D and d, when “a new thing from the Passover Meal” is eaten, it is an indication of the arrival of the kingdom of God. Similarly, with the drink of the fruit of the vine, when Jesus drinks something of the fruit of the vine, it is an indication of the arrival of the kingdom of God.

5.3.2 Identification of the Son of Man

The Son of Man is a self-designation of Jesus, mentioning himself in his teachings or parables about his Messianic ministry. Whereas the longer account of the Lord’s Supper juxtaposes the bread and cup as symbols of the atoning sacrifice, the shorter account juxtaposes the Son of Man with the bread as a symbol of the body of Jesus. In this way, the shorter reading presents Jesus as the Son of Man who has undertaken an earthly ministry (Luke 5:24; 6:5; 6:22; 7:34; 11:30; 12:10; 19:10), and who is now to undertake the subsequent ministry of suffering (Luke 9:22; 18:31; 22:22; 22:48; 24:7) and an apocalyptic role (Luke 9:26; 12:8; 12:40; 17:22; 17:24; 17:26; 17:30; 18:8; 21:27; 21:36; 22:69).

⁸¹ The subject of this clause is implied in the verb πληρωθη. Considering its grammatical person and number, it is proper to see το πασχα as the implied subject. However, it is debatable whether το πασχα indicates the Passover itself of the Passover Meal.

5.3.3 Arrival of the kingdom of God

The alterations of Codex Bezae concerning the kingdom of God made the kingdom more eschatological and more imminent. Furthermore, it was identified with the Son of Man coming in his glory (Luke 9:27), and the day of his coming was described as the day of judgement (Luke 21:7). The scribes of Codex Bezae and some Old Latin manuscripts found a place where all these aspects meet together.

During the Last Supper, Jesus introduced two temporal indications of the arrival of the kingdom of God—the bread to be eaten and the drink of the fruit of the vine to be drunk by Jesus. In Luke 23:36, Luke portrays a scene in which the Roman soldiers offered him sour wine, and signifies that the kingdom of God has come. As a confirmation, D and d make two significant alterations in Luke 23:42.

<u>B-text</u>	<u>Codex Bezae</u>
42 <u>και ελεγεν ιησου</u> μνησθητι μου <u>οταν</u> <u>ελθης εις την βασιλειαν σου</u>	42 <u>και στραφεις προς τον κυριον ειπεν αυτω</u> μνησθητι μου <u>εν τη ημερα της ελευσεως σου</u>
43 και ειπεν αυτω <u>αμην σοι λεγω</u> σημερον μετ εμου εση εν τω παραδεισω	43 <u>αποκριθεις δε ο ιησους</u> ειπεν αυτω <u>τω</u> <u>επιλησοντι θαρσει</u> σημερον μετ εμου εση εν τω παραδεισω

Firstly, while majority reading records that the criminal spoke to Jesus,⁸² D and d add a narration that the criminal turned to the Lord.⁸³ Furthermore, while majority reading reads, “remember me whenever you come into your kingdom,” D and d change it to “remember me in the day of your coming.” Again, the kingdom of God is identified as the day of Jesus’ coming, and Jesus encourages him and confirms that the day is “today (σημερον).”

The second reference to the arrival of the kingdom is found in Luke 24:30. Here, Jesus gives the bread to two disciples who still do not recognise him. But does this bread satisfy the condition of *απο του πασχα* (22:16)? According to Luke 24:13, this day of Jesus’ appearance to the disciples on the road to Emmaus was the same day as the day when the empty tomb was found. So, it was the first day after the Sabbath, and it was still during the festival of the Unleavened Bread. On the other hand, the scribes of D, a, b, d, e, ff², i, l, and r¹ used *το πασχα* in Luke 22:7 instead of *το αζυμος* to denote the entire festival of the Unleavened Bread as many contemporaries did (Luke 22:1; Josephus, *Antiquities of the Jews*, III.10.5; XIV.2.1; XVII.9.3). Therefore, it is likely that the bread Jesus gave to the disciples was

⁸² Considering the context, *ιησου* can be understood either as dative or as vocative. Since D and d did not make a substitution with a vocative in a direct speech, but with an accusative in narration, it seems more adequate to see it as dative. Majority manuscripts read *τω ιησου* and only P⁷⁵, κ , B, C, and L read *ιησου*.

⁸³ *aur*, c, e, f, ff², l, and vg add a vocative *Domine* with a narration that they spoke to Jesus (*et dicebat ad Iesum*).

unleavened bread from the Feast of the Unleavened Bread (*απο του πασχα*). Even though the narrative does not confirm that the bread was eaten, it is reasonable to assume that the disciples ate the bread.

Furthermore, the similarity between Luke 22:19a and 24:30b is noticeable:

Luke 22:19a	λαβων αρτον ευχαριστησας εκλασεν και εδωκεν αυτοις
Luke 24:30b	λαβων αρτον ηυλογησεν [κλασας] ⁸⁴ και προσεδιδου αυτοις

Once the symbol of the body of Jesus was given to the disciples (v.30), what followed was the revelation of the Son of Man, the Messiah. Their eyes were opened and recognised the physical look, the body of Jesus (v.31). They acknowledged their ignorance that their heart was veiled (v.32, *ουχι η καρδια ην ημων κεκαλυμμενη*, D, c, d, e, and l). Then they became distressed (*λυπουμενοι*, D, c, d, and e) in repentance and went back to Jerusalem, and proclaimed his resurrection (v.34). As with the drink of the fruit of the vine (Luke 23:36), the scribes of Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts signify the arrival of the kingdom of God with the bread given to the disciples.

5.3.4 Significance of the shorter account of the Lord's Supper and imminent eschatology

So far, it has been discussed that the scribes of Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts altered the Gospel of Luke in such a way to present Jesus as having more radical thoughts about the kingdom of God and the fallen Judaism. While the Messiahship of Jesus is significantly amplified, two groups of people are contrasted with each other. On the one hand, the followers of Jesus, represented by the disciples, show good examples of devotion. On the other hand, the Jewish religious leaders, as well as the laypeople, are disparaged as irresponsible towards the Messianic ministry. What is left for them is severe punishment. In this regard, the kingdom of God was identified with the coming of the Son of Man as well as the day of judgement.

At this point, the shorter account of the Lord's Supper provides two symbolic references of the arrival of the kingdom of God. Drinking of the fruit of the vine on the cross (Luke 23:36) and eating the bread on the way to Emmaus (Luke 24:30) verified that the kingdom of God has arrived. Furthermore, the structure of the shorter account clarifies Jesus as the Son of Man (Luke 22:19a, 21-22). Combining these together, the scribes of the D-text present the resurrection of Jesus as the arrival of the kingdom of God as well as the day of judgement. Moreover, the omission of Luke 22:19b-20 removes the repetition command "do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19). This again emphasises

⁸⁴ D and d omit *κλασας*, but in Luke 24:35, the disciples report that Jesus was known to them in breaking of the bread (*εν τη κλασει του αρτου*).

the imminence of the kingdom of God. The scribes of the D-text applied this imminent day of judgement to the destruction of Jerusalem in order to make the readers aware that the days of judgement already began. A strong contrast between the disciples and the Jewish people brings the believers into consideration of which example to follow. Such imminent eschatology encourages and demands repentance and radical devotion of the believers.

5.4 Summary

This chapter has discussed the significant singular readings of Codex Bezae that carry theological concerns. These singular readings showed five theological tendencies: exaltation of Jesus' identity, anti-Judaic tendency, the Gentiles' response to Jesus' ministry, the coming of the kingdom of God, and discipleship. And these altogether made up one great concern, how Christians should live in the eschaton. The scribe(s) of Codex Bezae repeatedly showed concerns about the imminent eschatology. Along with this imminent eschatology, the shorter account of the Lord's Supper took a significant role. Two symbolic references of Codex Bezae in the Supper account provide a clue for the identification of the time of the arrival of the kingdom, which was also identified with the day of judgement. By the omission of Luke 22:19b-20, the significance of the iterative commemoration was removed, and instead, the identity of Jesus as the Son of Man, the judge on the judgement day, was emphasised. These altogether emphasises the significance of the imminent eschaton and how to live in the eschaton.

6. Conclusion

6.1 General summary and conclusion

The textual problem of the Lukan account of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22:15-20) is one of the most challenging problems in New Testament textual criticism. The text tradition diverges into six different readings, while the two most preferred texts, named as the shorter text (vv.15-19a) and the longer text (vv.15-20), predate the second century. The long history of debate since Westcott and Hort (1881) has shown the complexity concerning the authenticity of the longer text (Luke 22:19b-20). Many scholars have tried to prove or disprove its authenticity based on external evidence, intrinsic probabilities, and transcriptional probabilities, but the problem remains unsolved. In this regard, this study was designed to present an advanced approach to the textual problem of Luke 22:19b-20 and attempted to show that the shorter account of the Lord's Supper is a theologically biased text.

Chapter 2 discussed the history of scholarly approaches to this problem. The earliest days of the debate (1881-1950s) was the time of external criticism with four major approaches. (1) Some scholars attempted to find traces of the longer reading in the patristic writings. However, the patristic writings failed to provide decisive evidence since they only provided indirect accounts that required interpretations. (2) Some scholars attempted to trace the textual development from the shorter text to the longer text, or vice versa. But this approach remained an elementary conjecture since it only considered the local passage (Luke 22:15-20) instead of comparing the whole manuscripts. (3) Some scholars traced the sources used by Luke to Mark 14:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 11:24. However, their decisions depended on personal preference since the source itself did not clarify the original text while the source could have been used either by the author or by a later scribe. (4) After the discovery of P75, some scholars argued that the weight of the longer reading became heavier with the second-century papyrus. But such argument was opposed by later scholars asserting that the weight of the manuscript does not depend on number, but on quality. Both the longer reading and the shorter reading trace their origin back to the second century. Therefore, external criticism was proved to be insufficient to solve the problem unless more evidence is discovered.

The next generation (1950s-1980s) attempted to find the solution through intrinsic probabilities with two major approaches. (1) Some scholars took linguistic approaches to examine the linguistic style of Luke 22:19b-20. However, the linguistic approaches ended up with non-Lukan features found in both Luke 22:15-19a and 22:19b-20. Consequently, the focus of the argument moved to the source-critical aspect. (2) Some scholars attempted to verify the longer reading as original by structural analyses. They focused on two parallel pairs, the kingdom of God (v.16, 18) and the bread and cup (v.19, 20), and claimed that this parallelism implied the longer reading originality. But it has been pointed out that another parallel structure, the kingdom of God (v.16, 18) and the body and betrayal

(v.21-22), could also be drawn out, excluding Luke 22:19b-20. Therefore, the methods concerning the intrinsic probabilities were found to be only supplementary to the external critical arguments.

Most recent attempts (1980s-current) were made in consideration of the transcriptional probabilities. This approach is based on the assumption that the scribe(s) of the prototype of the “Western” texts have altered the text in reaction to the religious or social circumstances they had faced. Consequently, scholars who took this approach saw the “Western non-interpolations” as a group of alterations with a specific theological concern. The acknowledgement of the importance of the scribes’ role during the transmission and the attempts to find the scribal concerns were a great yield in textual criticism. However, their conclusions tended to diverge from the point of interpretation of the Christological concerns that Codex Bezae showed, as their studies dealt with selective passages of Luke and lacked in extensiveness.

The history of discussion has shown various approaches attempting to solve this problem. However, all attempts showed some greater and smaller deficiencies. Therefore, a more nuanced approach and a broader scope of study was demanded.

Chapter 3 discussed the choice of methodology considering the deficiencies identified in the previous chapter. The first thing to consider was the scope of the study. Before the development of the computerised methods, a broad scope of study was practically unattainable. Consequently, text-critical studies relied on the test passages (*Teststellen*) at most, and on a practical level, studies remained locked into local passages. Even after the development of the computerised methods, text-critical studies did not manage to adopt the advanced methods due to their technical difficulties. However, text-critical studies demand a thorough collation of the entire manuscripts.

In this regard, this study has done a full collation of 28 digitised manuscripts with 40 different readings and refined the result with IGNTP apparatus of 216 manuscripts. Furthermore, this study applied Quantitative Analysis to the collation result to identify mutual relationships between manuscripts and to isolate the textual group of the shorter reading (Luke 22:15-19a) so as to study the common characteristics of this group. For the study of the characteristics of Codex Bezae, the singular readings yielded from the full collation were used. In this way, more accurate characteristics of the manuscript containing the shorter reading could be identified across the whole Lukan text.

Chapter 4 presented the result of Quantitative Analysis. Quantitative Analysis has identified four text-groups: (1) B-text group (P3, P4, P45, P69, P75, κ , B, 0171, 0181, 45, and 1349); (2) A-text group (A, W, θ , 18, 33, and 2860); (3) C-text group (C and 33); (4) D-text group (D). The only member of the D-text group, Codex Bezae, showed significant differences from the other groups. These significant differences resulted from massive alterations, and this phenomenon drew an inference that there existed some theological concerns behind the alterations.

In consideration of the inference that Codex Bezae, the only Greek manuscript containing the shorter reading, might have altered the text with some theological motives, this study concentrated on the singular readings of Codex Bezae in order to trace its unique characteristics concerning the theology.

As a result, 1,053 singular readings were identified in six categories: (1) 53 scribal mistakes; (2) 219 simple stylistic alterations involving simple transposition or alterations of articles or particles; (3) 422 stylistic paraphrases involving changes of vocabularies or grammatical constructions; (4) 67 harmonisations with other gospel accounts, (5) 195 specifications or simplifications; and (6) 97 significant changes which clearly show theological motives. Categories (1) to (3) were not so significant with respect to this study, since they were mostly stylistic changes. However, categories (4) to (6) were considered significant as they could point to significant changes in theology.

Chapter 5 aimed to discuss the singular readings that reflected theological significance and to trace theological significance of the shorter account of the Lord's Supper within that context. As a preliminary step for the latter, this study has identified five theological concerns: (1) Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts attempted with alterations and harmonisations to amplify Jesus' Messiahship and to exalt Jesus' identity as God. Furthermore, they attempted to defend Jesus' reputation and morality. (2) Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts showed strong anti-Judaic sentiment. They amplified the wickedness of the religious leaders and even extended the accusation to the Jewish people. Furthermore, Codex Bezae attempted to separate Jerusalem, a symbol of Judaism, from other parts of Israel as a place to be under the judgement. (3) On the contrary, Codex Bezae portrayed the Gentiles as people more responsive to Jesus' ministry. (4) Codex Bezae showed tendencies to identify the kingdom of God, Jesus' coming, and the day of judgement as equivalent concepts. Furthermore, it repeatedly emphasised the imminence of the kingdom of God. (5) Codex Bezae and some of the Old Latin manuscripts amplified the devotion of the disciples and attempted to reduce the weaknesses of the disciples. Furthermore, they altered Jesus' teachings so as to request more radical discipleship.

Summing up these altogether, an inference was drawn that the scribe of Codex Bezae had a great concern about the discipleship living in the eschaton. While amplifying the Messiahship and Godship of Jesus significantly, he placed emphasis on two groups of people, the disciples, and the Jews, as examples standing in contrast to one another. The attempts of apologetics for Jesus and his disciples and the emphasis on the Gentiles and the marginalised concerned about their salvation implied that the scribe had a missionary concern. Furthermore, a specific interest in the separation of Jerusalem as a place under judgement while identifying the kingdom of God and the day of judgement with the coming of Jesus implied that the scribe had a great concern about the eschaton.

In this context, the shorter account of the Lord's Supper imported two important points. (1) Two symbolic references, the bread and wine (Luke 22:15-18), designated the resurrection of Jesus as the time for the arrival of the kingdom of God. Since the scribe of Codex Bezae identified the kingdom of God with the day of judgement, for him, Jesus' resurrection meant imminent judgement. The scribe must have identified the accomplishment of the judgement with the destruction of Jerusalem and persecutions on early Christianity. (2) The omission of Luke 22:19b-20 made the institution meal an ordinary Passover meal. Consequently, the significance of the commemoration of Jesus' atoning

sacrifice was removed, and instead, Jesus' identity as the Son of Man was amplified. Since the designation, the Son of Man, was found to be closely related to the coming of Jesus in the day of judgement, the removal of iterative commemoration and emphasis on the judgement were inferred to be deliberate scribal alterations in order to stress his imminent eschatology.

6.2 Limitation and suggestions for future study

The "Western non-interpolations" relate not only to Codex Bezae, but also to the Old Latin and the Old Syriac manuscripts. Therefore, the kernel of solving the problem of the "Western non-interpolations" lies in the verification of theological tendencies of the "Western" prototype. This requires a complete portrayal of the genealogical relationship of the "Western manuscripts." However, due to the textual fluidness of the early versions, genealogical relationships can hardly be traced.

During the study, the researcher attempted to categorise the singular readings of Codex Bezae into different groups: (1) singular readings that only appear in Greek (D); (2) singular readings that appear on both sides of Codex Bezae (D and d); (3) singular readings attested by the Old Latin manuscripts; (4) singular readings attested by the Old Syriac manuscripts; and (5) singular readings attested by both the Old Latin and Old Syriac manuscripts. This could distinguish possible differences in theological emphases in different manuscripts. However, due to the extent of this study, these categories were not taken into account.

Some of the theological concerns (e.g., exaltation of Jesus' identity) were shared by multiple manuscripts though not uniformly. Some of the theological concerns were mostly attested only by Codex Bezae. This clearly illustrates there was a textual development within the "Western" witnesses. Further studies need to investigate whether the "Western non-interpolations" in other "Western" witnesses take different theological role from Codex Bezae.

Consistent theological concerns of Codex Bezae implies the secondary character of the text, i.e., its lesser chance to be original. This may have implications for the study of the Historical Jesus such that if Codex Bezae is a biased text, the sentiments preserved in the standard text may be closer to the historical Jesus.

Bibliography

- Aland, B., Aland, K. Mink, G., Strutwolf, H. & Wachtel, K. (eds.). 2013. *Novum Testamentum Graecum. Editio Critica Maior: IV Die Katholischen Briefe*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Aland, K. [1963] 1996. *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum: locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis edidit*. 15th edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelanstalt.
- _____. 1967. Die Bedeutung des P75 für den Text des Neuen Testaments: Ein Beitrag zur Frage des “Western non-interpolations.” *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 155–72.
- Aland, K. & Aland, B. 1989. *The text of the New Testament: an introduction to the critical editions and to the theory and practice of modern textual criticism*. 2nd edition. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Aland, K., Aland, B. & Wachtel, K. (eds.). 2003. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. IV Die Synoptischen Evangelien. Band 3. Das Lukasevangelium*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Arnold, A. 1937. *Der Ursprung des christlichen Abendmahls: im Lichte der neuesten liturgiegeschichtlichen Forschung*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.
- Burkitt, F.C. 1927. On Luke xxii 17–20. *Journal of Theological Studies* 28(Jan):178–181.
- Bate, H.N. 1927. The ‘Shorter Text’ of St Luke xxii 15-20. *The Journal of Theological Studies*. 28(Jul):362-368.
- Bell, H.I. 1952. Review of *Facsimiles and Descriptions of Minuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament*, by W.H.P. Hatch. *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 3(2), October:257-262.
- Benoit P. 1939. Le récit de la Cène dans Lc xxii.15- 20. Étude de critique textuelle et littéraire. *Revue Biblique*. 48(3):357-393.
- Billings, B.S. 2006a. The disputed words in the Lukan institution narrative (Luke 22:19b-20): a sociological answer to a textual problem. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 125(3):507-526.
- _____. 2006b. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b-20): An Historico-Exegetical, Theological and Sociological Analysis*. London: T&T Clark International.
- Blass, F. 1897. *Evangelium Secundum Lucam*. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner.
- Bock, D.L. 1996. *Luke*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Baker Books.
- Burton, P. 2000. *The Old Latin Gospels: A Study of their Texts and Language*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cadbury, H.J. 1920. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press.
- Carroll, John T. 2012. *Luke: a commentary*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.

- Carter, T.L. 2010. Marcion's Christology and its possible influence on Codex Bezae. *The Journal of Theological Studies*. 61(2):550-582.
- Chadwick, H. 1957. The shorter text of Luke 22:15-20. *Harvard Theological Review*. 50(4):249-258.
- Christopher, D. 2018. *The Appropriation of Passover in Luke-Acts*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Clark, K.W. 1956. The Effect of Recent Textual Criticism upon New Testament Studies, in W.D. Davies and D. Daube (eds.). *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 1966. The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 85(1):1-16
- Clarke, K. 1997. *Textual Optimism: A Critique of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Colwell, E.C. 1969. *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- Cooper, J.C. 1962. Problem of the text in Luke 22:19-20. *Lutheran Quarterly*. 14(1):39-48.
- Dibelius, M. 1934. *From Tradition to Gospel*. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson.
- Du Plessis, I.J. 1994. The Saving Significance of Jesus and his Death on the Cross in Luke's Gospel- Focussing on Luke 22:19b-20. *Neotestamentica*, 28(2):523-540.
- Easton, B.S. 1926. *The Gospel According to St. Luke: a critical and exegetical commentary*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Edward, James R. 2015. *The gospel according to Luke*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Ehrman, B.D. 1989. A Problem of Textual Circularity: The Alands on the Classification of New Testament Manuscripts. *Biblica*. 70:377-88
- _____. 1991. The Cup, the Bread, and the Salvific Effect of Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts. *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill.
- _____. 1993. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2013. The Text as Window: New Testament and the Social History of Early Christianity, in B.D. Ehrman & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.
- Ehrman, B.D. & Holmes, M.W. (eds.). 2013. *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.
- Elliott, J.K. 1994. The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament by Bart D. Ehrman. *Novum Testamentum*. 36(4):405-406.
- _____. 2013. Thoroughgoing Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism, in B.D. Ehrman & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.

- Epp, E.J. 1974. The Twentieth Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 93: 386-414.
- _____. 1976. The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom? *Harvard Theological Review*. 69:211-257.
- _____. 1980. A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism? *Harvard Theological Review*. 73:131-151.
- _____. 1989. New Testament Textual Criticism Past, Present, and Future: Reflections on the Alands' "Text of the New Testament." *The Harvard Theological Review*. 82(2):213-229.
- _____. 2009. "The Disputed Words of the Eucharistic Institution (Luke 22,19b-20): The Long and Short of the Matter." *Biblica*. 90(3):407-416.
- _____. 2013. Textual Clusters: their Past and Future in New Testament Textual Criticism, in B.D. Ehrman & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.
- Epp, E.J. & Fee, G.D. 1993. *Studies in the theory and method of New Testament textual criticism*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Fee, G.D. 1968. Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in establishing textual relationships. *New Testament Studies*. 15(01):23-44.
- Glombitza, O. 1958. Die Titel διδάσκαλος und ἐπιστάτης für Jesus bei Lukas. *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. (49): 275-278.
- Green, J.B. 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Gressmann, H. & Klostermann, H. 1919. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Tübingen: Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr.
- Haentjens Dekker, R., Hulle, D. van, Middell, G., Neyt, V. & Zundert, J. van. 2014. Computer-supported collation of modern manuscripts: CollateX and the Beckett Digital Manuscript Project. *Literary and Linguistic Computing* 30(3):452-470.
- Hendriksen, W. 1979. *The Gospel of Luke*. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust.
- Héring, J. 1937. *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa venue: étude sur l'espérance de Jésus et de l'apôtre Paul*. Paris: Alcan.
- Hernández, J., Jr. 2012. The early Text of Luke, in C.E. Hill & M.J. Kruger (eds.). *The Early Text of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2013. Modern critical editions and apparatuses of the Greek New Testament, in B.D. Ehrman & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.
- Holmes, M.W. 2013. Reasoned Eclecticism in New Testament Textual Criticism, in B.D. Ehrman & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.

- Horner, G. 1898a. *The Coptic version of the New Testament in the northern dialect: otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic: with introduction, critical apparatus, and literal English translation*. Vol. 1. The Gospels of S. Matthew and S. Mark. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1898b. *The Coptic version of the New Testament in the northern dialect: otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic: with introduction, critical apparatus, and literal English translation*. Vol. 2. The Gospels of S. Luke and S. John. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Houghton, H.A.G. 2013. The Electronic Scriptorium: Markup for New Testament Manuscripts, in C. Clivaz, A. Gregory & D. Hamidović (eds.). *Digital Humanities in Biblical, Early Jewish and Early Christian Studies*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hull, R.F. Jr. 2010. *The Story of the New Testament Text: Movers, Materials, Motives, Methods, and Models*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Hurtado, L.W. 1981. *Text-critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- _____. 1999. Beyond the Interlude? Developments and Directions in New Testament Textual Criticism, in D.G.K. Taylor (ed.). *Studies in the Early Text of the Gospels and Acts*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- International Greek New Testament Project. American Committee. 1984. *The gospel according to St. Luke: Part One. Chapters 1-12*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- _____. 1987. *The gospel according to St. Luke: Part Two. Chapters 13-24*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jeremias, J. [1935] 1960. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____. 1971. *New Testament Theology I*. London: SCM Press.
- Johnson, L.T. 1991. *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.
- Joüon, P. 1930. *L'Évangile de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ: traduction et commentaire du texte original Grec. Compte tenu du substrat Sémitique*. Verbum Salutis 5. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Jülicher, A. (ed.). 1954. *Itala: das Neue Testament in Altlateinischer Überlieferung nach den Handschriften herausgegeben von Adolf Jülicher. III. Lucas-Evangelium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kenyon, F.G. & Legg, S.C.E. 1937. The Textual Data, in R. Dunkerley (ed.). *The Ministry and the Sacraments*. London: Student Christian Movement. 272-286.
- Kilpatrick, G.D. 1946. Luke XXII. 19b–20. *The Journal of Theological Studies*. 47:49–56.
- _____. (ed.). 1958. *H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ*. 2nd edition. London: British and Foreign Bible Society.
- _____. 1975. *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy: The Moorhouse Lectures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kimbell, J. 2014. *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.
- Kiraz, G.A. 1996. *Comparative edition of the Syriac Gospels: aligning the Sinaiticus, Curetonianus, Peshîttâ and Harklean versions*. Vol. 3 Luke. Leiden: Brill.

- Knudsen, J. 1950. Problem of the two cups. *Lutheran Quarterly*. 2(1):74-85.
- Koester, H. 1989. The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century, in W.L. Petersen (ed.). *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Lake, K. 1920. *Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity*. London: Macmillan and Company.
- Lietzmann, H. 1926. *Messe und Herrenmahl: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie*. Bonn: A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag.
- Machen, J.G. 1932. *The Virgin Birth of Christ*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Marshall, I.H. 1978. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Exeter: Paternoster Press.
- Martin, M.W. 2005. Defending the 'Western Non-Interpolations': The Case for an Anti-Separationist Tendency in the Longer Alexandrian Readings. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 124(2):269-294.
- Martin, V. and Kasser, R. (eds.). 1961. *Papyrus Bodmer XIV-XV: Évangiles de Luc et Jean: Tome I, XIV: Luc chap. 3-24; Tome II, XV: Jean chap. 1-15*. Coligny-Genève: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana.
- Metzger, B.M. & United Bible Societies, 1975. *A textual commentary on the Greek New Testament: a companion volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. 3rd edition. London: United Bible Societies.
- Metzger, B.M. & Ehrman B. 2005. *The text of the New Testament: its transmission, corruption, and restoration*. 4th edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mink, G. 2011. Contamination, Coherence, and Coincidence in Textual Transmission: The Coherence-Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) as a Complement and Corrective to Existing Approaches, in K. Wachtel & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Moessner, D.P. 1989. *Lord of the banquet: the literary and theological significance of the Lukan travel narrative*. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress.
- Morris, L. 1974. *The Gospel according to St. Luke: an introduction and commentary*. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans.
- Monks, G.G. 1925. The Lucan account of the Last Supper. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 44(3-4):228-260.
- Nury, E.L. 2018. Automated Collation and Digital Editions: From Theory to Practice. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. London: King's College London [online]. Available: [https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/theses/automated-collation-and-digital-editions\(1ffc4aa0-5ad5-4ca1-869a-ab3d528eed4a\).html](https://kclpure.kcl.ac.uk/portal/en/theses/automated-collation-and-digital-editions(1ffc4aa0-5ad5-4ca1-869a-ab3d528eed4a).html) [2019, February 25].
- Nolland, J. 1993. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. WBC 35c. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books.
- Parker, D.C. 1992. *Codex Bezae: An early Christian manuscript and its text*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- _____. 1994. The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture. The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament. *The Journal of Theological Studies*. 45(2):704-708.
- _____. 1997. *The living text of the Gospels*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2008. *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. 2012. *Textual Scholarship and the Making of the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parsons, M.C. 1986. A Christological Tendency in P⁷⁵. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 105(3):463-479.
- Petersen, W.L. 2002. The Genesis of the Gospels, in A. Denaux (ed.). *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*. Leuven: Peeters and University of Leuven Press.
- Petzer, J.H. 1984. Luke 22:19b-20 and the Structure of the Passage. *Novum Testamentum*. 26(3):249-252.
- Petzer, K. 1991. Style and Text in the Lucan Narrative of the Institution of the Lord's Supper (Luke 22.19b-20). *New Testament Studies*. 37(1):113-129.
- Plummer, A. 1902. *A critical and exegetical commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Rese, M. 1975. Zur Problematik von Kurz und Langtext in Luk 22:17ff. *New Testament Studies*. 22(1):15-31.
- Rice, G. 1984. Western non-Interpolations: A Defense of the Apostolate, in C.H. Talbert (ed.). *Luke-Acts, new perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature seminar*. New York: Crossroad.
- Rienecker, F. 1969. *Das Evangelium des Lukas* 3. Aufl., Wuppertal: Brockhaus.
- Sahlin, R. 1945. *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie*. Uppsala: Alqvist & Wiksells.
- Sanday, W. [1899] 1910. Jesus Christ, in J. Hastings (ed.). *A Dictionary of the Bible: dealing with its language, literature, and contents including the Biblical Theology*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Schäfer, K. 1952. Zur Textgeschichte von Lk 22,19b-20. *Biblica*. 33(2): 237-239.
- Schlatter, A. 1931. *Das Evangelium des Lukas: Aus seinen Quellen erklärt*. Stuttgart: Calwer.
- Schürmann, H. 1951. Lk 22,19b-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung. *Biblica*. 32(3):364-392. 1952
- _____. 1951a. Lk 22,19b-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung. *Biblica*. 32(4):522-541.
- _____. 1952. Lk 22,42a das älteste Zeugnis für Lk 22,20? *Münchener theologische Zeitschrift* (3):185-88.
- Silva, M.1992. The Text of Galatians: Evidence from the Earliest Greek Manuscripts, in D.A. Black (ed.). *Scribes and Scripture: New Testament Essays in Honor of J. Harold Greenlee*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Snodgrass, K. 1972. Western Non-Interpolations. *Journal of Biblical Literature*. 91(3):369-379.

- Soden von, H.F. 1913. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Streeter, B.H. 1961. *The Four Gospels*. London: Macmillan and Company.
- Strutwolf, H., Gäbel, G., Hüffmeier, A., Mink, G. & Wachtel K. (eds.). 2018. *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior*. III Die Apostelgeschichte. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Tatian. 1926. August Pott (ed.). *Tatians Diatessaron aus dem arabischen übersetzt von Erwin Preuschen, mit einer einleitenden abhandlung und textkritischen anmerkungen*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Vogels, H.J. 1922. *Novum Testamentum Graece*. Düsseldorf: Schwann.
- Vööbus, A. 1968. A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke. *New Testament Studies* 15(1969):457-463.
- Wachtel, K. 2003. Colwell Revisited: Grouping New Testament Manuscripts, in C.B. Amphoux and J.K. Elliott (eds.). *The New Testament Text in Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Lille Colloquium, July 2000*. Lausanne: Zèbre.
- Wallace, D.B. 2013. The Majority Text Theory: history, methods, and critique, in B.D. Ehrman & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.
- Wasserman, T. 2013. Criteria for evaluating readings in New Testament textual criticism, in B.D. Ehrman & M.W. Holmes (eds.). *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*. 2nd edition. Leiden: Brill.
- Wasserman, T. & Gurry P.J. 2017. *A New Approach to Textual Criticism: An Introduction to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Method*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Westcott, B.F. & Hort, F.J.A. 1882. *The New Testament in the original Greek: Introduction, Appendix*. London: Macmillan.
- Weiss, J. 1903. *Das älteste Evangelium: ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Markus-Evangeliums und der ältesten evangelischen Überlieferung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.
- Zahn, T. 1909. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Vol. 3. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

Internet Resources

- Center for New Testament Restoration [online] <https://greekcntr.org/home/index.htm>
- New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room [online] <http://ntvmr.uni-muenster.de/home>

Appendices

Appendix 1: An illustration of automated collation of Luke 22:18

P⁷⁵	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν		ου	μη	πιω	απο	του	νυν	απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	ου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
01	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν	οτι	ου	μη	πιω	απο	του	νυν	απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	ου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
02	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν	οτι	ου	μη	πιω	απο	του				γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	οτου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
03	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν		ου	μη	πιω	απο	του	νυν	απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	ου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
04[*]	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν		ου	μη	πιω				απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	ου		βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
04^C	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν		ου	μη	πιω				απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	ου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
032[*]	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν	οτι	ου	μη	πιω	απο	του	νυν			γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	του	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
032^C	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν	οτι	ου	μη	πιω	απο	του	νυν			γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	οτου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
038	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν	οτι	ου	μη	πιω				απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	οτου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
18	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν	οτι	ου	μη	πιω				απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	οτου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
NA28	λεγω	γαρ	υμιν	οτι	ου	μη	πιω	απο	του	νυν	απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	ου	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	ελθη	
05	λεγω	γαρ	υμειν		απο	του	νυν	ου	μη	πιω	απο	του	γεννηματος	της	αμπελου	εως	οτου	ελθη	η	βασιλεια	του	θ̄υ	

This is an illustration of an automated collation aligned by CollateX. The coloured sections represent variation-units. There are six variation-units here, and these contain various alterations: addition/omission, transposition, substitution. The first four variations-units are significant readings, and the last two are singular readings.

Appendix 2: List of manuscripts used in the collation (sorted by date)

MSS	Date	Contents
P⁷⁵	200-225	Luke 3:18-4:2; 4:34-5:10; 5:37-18:18; 22:4-24:53
P⁴	III	Luke 1:58-59, 62-2:1; 2:6-7; 3:8-4:2, 29-32, 34-35; 5:3-8; 5:30-6:16
P⁴⁵	III	Luke 6:31-41; 6:45-7:7; 9:26-41; 9:45-10:1, 6-22; 10:26-11:1, 6-25, 28-46; 11:50-12:12, 18-37; 12:42-13:1, 6-24; 13:29-14:10, 17-33
P⁶⁹	III	Luke 22:41, 45-48, 58-61
P¹¹¹	III	Luke 17:11-13, 22-23
0312	III-IV	Luke 5:23-24, 30-31; 7:9, 17-18
P⁷	III/IV (?)	Luke 4:1-3
01 (s)	IV	Luke 1:1-24:53
03 (B)	IV	Luke 1:1-24:53
0171	300-325	Luke 22:44-50, 50-56, 61-64
032 (W)	IV/ V	Luke 1:1-24:53
P⁸²	IV/V	Luke 7:32-34, 37-38
0181	IV/V	Luke 9:59-62, 10:1-5, 6-14
02 (A)	V	Luke 1:1-24:53
04 (C)	V	Luke 1:1-2; 2:5-42; 3:21- 4:25; 6:4-36; 7:17-8:28; 12:4-19:42; 20:28- 21:20; 22:19- 23:25; 24:7-45;
05 (D)	V	Luke 1:1-24:53
0182	V	Luke 19:17-20, 22-24
P³	VI/VII	Luke 7:36-45; 10:38-42
P⁹⁷	VI/VII	Luke 14:7-14
P⁴²	VII/VIII	Luke 1:54-55; 2:29-32 (Greek); Luke 1:46-51 (Coptic)
019	VIII	Luke 1:1-6, 1:14-3:38, 4:1-6:4, 6:11-24:53
038 (0)	IX	Luke 1:1-24:53
33	IX	Luke 1:1-13:6; 19:45-21:37; 23:27-24:53
1349	XI	Luke 1:1-48; 2:8-6:22; 6:42-8:23; 9:28-17:4; 17:29-20:15; 20:38-24:53
2860	XI	Luke 1:1-14:33
1	XII	Luke 1:1-24:53
45	XIII	Luke 4:32-5:14
18	XIV	Luke 1:1-24:53

Appendix 3: List of manuscripts supplemented by IGntp

MSS	Date	MSS	Date	MSS	Date	MSS	Date	MSS	Date
P ³	VI/VII	0179	VI	461	835	1352	XIII	/ 890	1420
P ⁴	III	0181	IV/V	472	XIII	1355	XII	/ 950	XIII
P ⁷	IV/V	0182	V	475	XI	1365	XII	/ 1016	XII
P ⁴²	VII/VIII	0190	VI	477	XIII	1392	X	/ 1056	XIII
P ⁴⁵	III	0191	VI	478	X	1424	IX/X	/ 1074	1290
P ⁶⁹	III	0196	IX	480	1366	1443	1047	/ 1127	XII
P ⁷⁵	200-225	0202	VI	489	1315-1316	1452	992	/ 1231	X
P ⁸²	IV/V	0211	VII	517	XIV	1458	X	/ 1579	XIV
		0239	VII	543	XII	1510	XI	/ 1599	X/XI
01	IV	0250	VIII	544	XIII	1542a	XII/XIII	/ 1627	XI
02	V	0253	VI	565	IX	1542b	XII/XIII	/ 1634	XI
03	IV	0265	VI	577	1346	1579	XI	/ 1642	XIII
04	V	0266	VI	579	XIII	1582	948	/ 1663	XIV
05	V	0267	V	669	X	1604	XIII	/ 1761	XV
07	VIII			700	XI	1630	1314		
09	IX	1	XII	713	XII	1654	1326	Lvt e	450
011	IX	2	XI/XII	716	XIV	1675	XIV	a	350
013	IX	5	XIV	726	XIII	1685	XIII	a2	450
017	IX	6	XIII	788	XI	1691	XI	aur	750
019	VIII	7	XII	826	XII	2096	XII	b	450
021	IX	13	XIV	827	XIII	2322	XII/XIII	β	650
022	VI	16	XIV	828	XII	2372	XIII	c	1200
024	VI	21	XII	892	IX	2399	XIV	d	400
026	V	22	XII	903	1381	2487	XI	f	550
027	VI	27	X	954	XV	2542	XIII	ff2	450
029	V	28	XI	983	XII	2613	XI	g1	800
030	IX	33	IX	1005	XIV	2643	XIII	gat	750
031	IX	60	1297	1009	XIII	2757	XIII	i	450
032	V	66	XIV	1010	XII	2766	XIII	l	750
033	X	69	XV	1012	XI			λ	800
034	IX	71	1160	1071	XII	/69	XII	π	650
036	X	83	XI	1077	X	/ 333	XIII	q	600
037	IX	115	X	1079	X	/ 513	XII	r1	600
038	IX	118	XIII	1080	XIV	/ 852	XII	s	600
039	IX	123	1000	1187	XIII	/ 853	XI	Lvg	450-650
040	VI	124	XII	1192	XIV	/ 867	XII		
041	IX	131	XIV	1194	XIII	/ 991	X/XI	Ss	IV
044	IX/X	157	1122	1195	XIV	/ 995	XI	Sc	V
045	IX	158	XI	1200	XII	/ 1084	1292	Sp	V
028	949	161	X	1203	X	/ 1750	XI	Sh	VII
047	VIII	174	1052	1210	XI	/ 10	XIII	Sj	1030
053	IX	179	XII	1215	XIII	/ 12	XIII	Dta	XI
063	IX	205	XV	1216	XI	/ 32	XI	Dtp	XIII
070	VI	209	XIV	1219	XI	/ 48	1055	Cs	III/IV
0102	VII	213	XI	1220	X	/ 70	XII	Cb	IV
0108	VII	229	1140	1223	X	/ 76	XII	Ar	V
0113	V	230	1013	1229	XIII	/ 80	XII	Gg I	897
0115	IX/X	262	X	1241	XII	/ 150	995	Gg II.1	913
0117	IX	265	XII	1242	XIII	/ 184	1319	Gg II.2	936
0124	VI	267	XII	1247	XV	/ 211	XII	Gg II.3	973
0130	IX	343	XI	1295	IX	/ 253	1020	Gg II.4	995
0135	IX	346	XII	1313	XI	/ 292	IX	Gg III	XI
0139	V	348	1022	1319	XII	/ 299	XIII	Et	V
0147	VI	349	1322	1338	XII	/ 524	XII	Go	IV
0171	III/IV	372	XVI	1342	XIII/XIV	/ 547	XIII	OS	IX
0177	X	399	IX/X	1347	X	/ 854	1167		
0178	VI	443	XII	1351	X	/ 859	XI		

Appendix 4: Result of Quantitative Analysis from Luke chapters 1-24

CH1	P4	P42	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	019	032	038*	1	18	33	1349	2860*	NA28
P4		-	18/25	17/25	9/26	9/26	22/26	21/26	10/26	10/26	10/26	-	17/26	9/26	-	8/26	14/26	-	9/26	21/26
P42	-		2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	1/2	1/2	2/2	-	2/2	2/2	-	1/2	2/2	-	1/2	2/2
01*	72,00%	100,00%		86/91	56/91	58/91	74/91	72/91	55/89	55/89	41/88	3/4	35/51	50/91	23/35	52/91	26/36	40/45	54/91	79/91
01c	68,00%	100,00%	94,51%		59/93	61/93	75/93	75/93	62/91	62/91	44/90	3/4	36/52	55/93	24/35	59/93	29/37	40/45	61/93	80/93
02*	34,62%	100,00%	61,54%	63,44%		91/93	53/93	53/93	59/91	67/91	36/90	2/4	27/52	71/93	19/36	79/93	29/37	29/46	77/93	53/93
02c	34,62%	100,00%	63,74%	65,59%	97,85%		55/93	55/93	61/91	69/91	58/90	2/4	26/52	73/93	20/36	81/93	29/37	31/46	79/93	55/93
03*	84,62%	100,00%	81,32%	80,65%	56,99%	59,14%		87/93	52/91	51/91	40/90	3/4	38/52	51/93	22/36	54/93	26/37	43/46	56/93	89/93
03c	80,77%	100,00%	79,12%	80,65%	56,99%	59,14%	93,55%		54/91	55/91	41/90	3/4	38/52	57/93	22/36	58/93	27/37	40/46	58/93	85/93
04*	38,46%	50,00%	61,80%	68,13%	64,84%	67,03%	57,14%	59,34%		76/91	45/88	1/3	25/51	59/91	19/35	64/91	24/37	26/45	61/91	53/91
04c	38,46%	50,00%	61,80%	68,13%	73,63%	75,82%	56,04%	60,44%	83,52%		39/88	1/3	25/51	69/91	18/35	74/91	28/37	27/45	73/91	52/91
05*	38,46%	100,00%	46,59%	48,89%	40,00%	64,44%	44,44%	45,56%	51,14%	44,32%		2/4	16/51	39/90	14/34	42/90	21/37	23/44	42/90	43/90
019	-	-	75,00%	75,00%	50,00%	50,00%	75,00%	75,00%	33,33%	33,33%	50,00%		-	2/4	2/4	2/4	2/4	3/4	1/4	3/4
032	65,38%	100,00%	68,63%	69,23%	51,92%	50,00%	73,08%	73,08%	49,02%	49,02%	31,37%	-		23/52	-	23/52	20/37	3/5	24/52	39/52
038*	34,62%	100,00%	54,95%	59,14%	76,34%	78,49%	54,84%	61,29%	64,84%	75,82%	43,33%	50,00%	44,23%		18/36	76/93	26/37	23/46	74/93	51/93
1	-	-	65,71%	68,57%	52,78%	55,56%	61,11%	61,11%	54,29%	51,43%	41,18%	50,00%	-	50,00%		22/36	-	22/36	20/36	22/36
18	30,77%	50,00%	57,14%	63,44%	84,95%	87,10%	58,06%	62,37%	70,33%	81,32%	46,67%	50,00%	44,23%	81,72%	61,11%		27/37	31/46	85/93	55/93
33	53,85%	100,00%	72,22%	0,78%	78,38%	78,38%	70,27%	72,97%	64,86%	75,68%	56,76%	50,00%	54,05%	70,27%	-	72,97%		-	28/37	27/37
1349	-	-	88,89%	88,89%	63,04%	67,39%	93,48%	86,96%	57,78%	60,00%	52,27%	75,00%	60,00%	50,00%	61,11%	67,39%	-		33/46	46/46
2860*	34,62%	50,00%	59,34%	65,59%	82,80%	84,95%	60,22%	62,37%	67,03%	80,22%	46,67%	25,00%	46,15%	79,57%	55,56%	91,40%	75,68%	71,74%		58/93
NA28	80,77%	100,00%	86,81%	86,02%	56,99%	59,14%	95,70%	91,40%	58,24%	57,14%	47,78%	75,00%	75,00%	54,84%	61,11%	59,14%	72,97%	100,00%	62,37%	

CH2	P4	P42	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032	038*	038c	18	33	2860*	NA28
P4	-		1/2	2/2	1/2	1/2	2/2	2/2	1/1	1/1	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	1/2	1/2	2/2	2/2
P42		-	1/1	1/1	0/1	0/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1	0/1	1/1	1/1
01*	50,00%	100,00%		92/124	74/124	75/124	93/123	91/123	19/34	21/36	45/123	45/123	87/121	72/124	71/124	74/124	71/123	74/124	98/124
01c	100,00%	100,00%	74,19%		79/125	80/125	97/124	97/124	26/35	27/37	51/124	49/124	94/123	83/125	82/125	77/125	88/124	78/125	108/125
02*	50,00%	0,00%	59,68%	63,20%		125/126	80/125	79/125	29/36	32/38	44/125	43/125	77/124	95/126	94/126	108/126	97/126	108/126	86/126
02c	50,00%	0,00%	60,48%	64,00%	99,21%		81/125	80/125	29/36	32/38	45/125	44/125	78/124	96/126	95/126	109/126	98/126	109/126	87/126
03*	100,00%	100,00%	75,61%	78,23%	64,00%	64,80%		123/125	24/36	32/37	51/124	51/124	103/123	82/125	81/125	82/125	83/125	83/125	118/125
03c	100,00%	100,00%	73,98%	78,23%	63,20%	64,00%	98,40%		24/36	32/38	50/124	50/124	101/123	82/125	81/125	83/125	81/125	84/125	116/125
04*	100,00%	100,00%	55,88%	74,29%	80,56%	80,56%	66,67%	66,67%		29/36	12/35	12/35	21/36	28/36	28/36	29/36	30/36	28/36	25/36
04c	100,00%	100,00%	58,33%	72,97%	84,21%	84,21%	86,49%	84,21%	80,56%		14/37	14/37	20/38	31/38	31/38	34/38	29/38	33/38	26/38
05*	100,00%	100,00%	36,59%	41,13%	35,20%	36,00%	41,13%	40,32%	34,29%	37,84%		119/125	47/123	50/125	49/125	47/125	48/125	48/125	57/125
05c	100,00%	100,00%	36,59%	39,52%	34,40%	35,20%	41,13%	40,32%	34,29%	37,84%	95,20%		45/123	52/125	51/125	48/125	47/125	49/125	57/125
032	100,00%	100,00%	71,90%	76,42%	62,10%	62,90%	83,74%	82,11%	58,33%	52,63%	38,21%	36,59%		76/124	75/124	73/124	77/124	73/124	103/124
038*	100,00%	100,00%	58,06%	66,40%	75,40%	76,19%	65,60%	65,60%	77,78%	81,58%	40,00%	41,60%	61,29%		125/126	104/126	96/126	105/126	87/126
038c	100,00%	100,00%	57,26%	65,60%	74,60%	75,40%	64,80%	64,80%	77,78%	81,58%	39,20%	40,80%	60,48%	99,21%		103/126	95/126	104/126	86/126
18	50,00%	100,00%	59,68%	61,60%	85,71%	86,51%	65,60%	66,40%	80,56%	89,47%	37,60%	38,40%	58,87%	82,54%	81,75%		96/126	122/126	88/126
33	50,00%	0,00%	57,72%	70,97%	76,98%	77,78%	66,40%	64,80%	83,33%	76,32%	38,40%	37,60%	62,10%	76,19%	75,40%	76,19%		96/126	91/126
2860*	100,00%	100,00%	59,68%	62,40%	85,71%	86,51%	66,40%	67,20%	77,78%	86,84%	38,40%	39,20%	58,87%	83,33%	82,54%	96,83%	76,19%		89/126
NA28	100,00%	100,00%	79,03%	86,40%	68,25%	69,05%	94,40%	92,80%	69,44%	68,42%	45,60%	45,60%	83,06%	69,05%	68,25%	69,84%	72,22%	70,63%	

CH3	P4	P75	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032	038*	18	33	2860*	2860c	NA28
P4		6/8	47/52	44/53	31/54	51/54	51/54	27/37	22/37	14/48	14/48	25/37	34/54	30/53	37/53	8/16	7/16	50/54
P75	75,00%		5/8	5/9	2/9	8/9	8/9	2/5	2/5	8/9	8/9	1/6	5/9	4/9	4/9	2/3	1/3	7/9
01*	90,38%	62,50%		60/70	43/70	62/70	61/69	40/54	37/54	21/64	23/64	39/54	42/70	44/70	48/69	23/32	22/32	61/70
01c	83,02%	55,56%	85,71%		53/71	60/71	59/70	47/54	44/54	27/65	29/65	45/55	52/71	55/71	59/70	27/33	26/33	63/71
02*	57,41%	22,22%	61,43%	74,65%		48/72	47/71	47/55	48/55	25/67	27/67	38/55	54/72	63/72	60/71	27/33	28/33	49/72
03*	94,44%	88,89%	88,57%	84,51%	66,67%		70/71	44/55	39/55	23/66	24/67	39/55	49/72	49/72	54/71	25/33	24/33	68/72
03c	94,44%	88,89%	88,41%	84,29%	66,20%	98,59%		43/54	38/54	23/65	24/66	39/55	48/71	48/71	53/70	24/32	23/32	67/71
04*	72,97%	40,00%	74,07%	87,04%	85,45%	80,00%	79,63%		50/55	20/52	22/52	36/48	42/55	49/55	50/54	23/24	22/24	46/55
04c	59,46%	40,00%	68,52%	81,48%	87,27%	70,91%	70,37%	90,91%		20/52	22/52	33/48	41/55	50/55	47/54	24/24	23/24	41/55
05*	29,17%	88,89%	32,81%	41,54%	37,31%	34,85%	35,38%	38,46%	38,46%		65/66	17/50	24/67	25/67	28/67	17/32	18/32	27/67
05c	29,17%	88,89%	35,94%	44,62%	40,30%	35,82%	36,36%	42,31%	42,31%	98,48%		17/50	26/67	27/67	30/67	19/32	20/32	29/67
032	67,57%	16,67%	72,22%	81,82%	69,09%	70,91%	70,91%	75,00%	68,75%	34,00%	34,00%		34/55	36/55	38/54	17/24	17/24	39/55
038*	62,96%	55,56%	60,00%	73,24%	75,00%	68,06%	67,61%	76,36%	74,55%	35,82%	38,81%	61,82%		57/72	58/71	28/33	27/33	52/72
18	56,60%	44,44%	62,86%	77,46%	87,50%	68,06%	67,61%	89,09%	90,91%	37,31%	40,30%	65,45%	79,17%		60/71	31/33	32/33	52/72
33	69,81%	44,44%	69,57%	84,29%	84,51%	76,06%	75,71%	92,59%	87,04%	41,79%	44,78%	70,37%	81,69%	84,51%		29/33	30/33	57/71
2860*	50,00%	66,67%	71,88%	81,82%	81,82%	75,76%	75,00%	95,83%	100,00%	53,13%	59,38%	70,83%	84,85%	93,94%	87,88%		32/33	27/33
2860c	43,75%	33,33%	68,75%	78,79%	84,85%	72,73%	71,88%	91,67%	95,83%	56,25%	62,50%	70,83%	81,82%	96,97%	90,91%	96,97%		26/33
NA28	0,93%	77,78%	0,87%	88,73%	68,06%	94,44%	94,37%	83,64%	74,55%	40,30%	43,28%	70,91%	72,22%	72,22%	80,28%	81,82%	78,79%	

CH4	P4	P7	P75	01*	01c	02*	03*	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	038*	038c	18	33	2860*	NA28
P4		3/3	5/6	9/9	9/9	4/9	9/9	3/6	3/6	6/9	7/9	9/9	4/9	4/9	4/9	7/9	3/9	9/9
P7	100,00%		3/3	4/4	4/4	1/4	4/4	-	-	3/4	3/4	4/4	2/4	2/4	2/4	2/4	1/4	4/4
P75	83,33%	100,00%		22/30	22/31	18/31	28/31	18/28	19/28	16/31	18/31	25/31	18/31	18/31	18/31	21/30	18/31	29/31
01*	100,00%	100,00%	73,33%		96/103	53/103	81/103	30/44	31/44	35/99	38/102	81/101	57/103	56/103	60/103	71/102	57/103	87/103
01c	100,00%	100,00%	70,97%	93,20%		59/104	85/104	33/45	34/45	39/100	42/103	84/102	64/104	63/104	65/104	78/103	61/104	90/104
02*	44,44%	25,00%	58,06%	51,46%	56,73%		64/104	31/45	32/45	32/100	34/102	55/102	79/104	78/104	88/104	75/103	91/104	76/104
03*	100,00%	100,00%	90,32%	78,64%	81,73%	61,54%		31/45	32/45	49/100	51/102	82/102	62/104	61/104	64/104	73/103	65/104	99/104
04*	50,00%	-	64,29%	68,18%	73,33%	68,89%	68,89%		44/45	17/45	19/45	28/45	34/45	34/45	32/45	34/44	32/45	33/45
04c	50,00%	-	67,86%	70,45%	75,56%	71,11%	71,11%	97,78%		17/45	19/45	29/45	35/45	35/45	33/45	35/44	33/45	34/45
05*	66,67%	75,00%	51,61%	35,35%	39,00%	32,00%	49,00%	37,78%	37,78%		97/100	47/98	33/100	32/100	35/100	42/99	36/100	48/100
05c	77,78%	75,00%	58,06%	37,25%	40,78%	33,33%	50,00%	42,22%	42,22%	97,00%		50/101	36/103	35/103	38/103	44/102	39/103	51/103
032*	100,00%	100,00%	80,65%	80,20%	82,35%	53,92%	80,39%	62,22%	64,44%	47,96%	49,50%		54/102	53/102	54/102	70/101	54/102	84/102
038*	44,44%	50,00%	58,06%	55,34%	61,54%	75,96%	59,62%	75,56%	77,78%	33,00%	34,95%	52,94%		103/104	78/104	76/103	82/104	66/104
038c	44,44%	50,00%	58,06%	54,37%	60,58%	75,00%	58,65%	75,56%	77,78%	32,00%	33,98%	51,96%	99,04%		77/104	75/103	81/104	65/104
18	44,44%	50,00%	58,06%	58,25%	62,50%	84,62%	61,54%	71,11%	73,33%	35,00%	36,89%	52,94%	75,00%	74,04%		73/103	99/104	68/104
33	77,78%	50,00%	70,00%	69,61%	75,73%	72,82%	70,87%	77,27%	79,55%	42,42%	43,14%	69,31%	73,79%	72,82%	70,87%		72/103	74/103
2860*	33,33%	25,00%	58,06%	55,34%	58,65%	87,50%	62,50%	71,11%	73,33%	36,00%	37,86%	52,94%	78,85%	77,88%	95,19%	69,90%		70/104
NA28	100,00%	100,00%	93,55%	84,47%	86,54%	73,08%	95,19%	73,33%	75,56%	48,00%	49,51%	82,35%	63,46%	62,50%	65,38%	71,84%	67,31%	

CH5	P4	P75	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	038*	0312	18	33	2860*	NA28
P4		-	29/43	36/44	28/44	28/44	41/44	32/44	30/44	15/37	15/37	34/43	29/44	1/3	28/44	35/44	25/39	39/44
P75	-		33/44	40/46	29/46	29/46	44/46	30/46	29/46	14/36	14/37	34/45	31/46	-	30/46	31/46	28/41	44/46
01*	67,44%	75,00%		106/121	65/120	66/120	78/121	74/120	69/120	35/105	35/107	77/120	71/121	3/6	67/121	78/120	64/116	82/121
01c	81,82%	86,96%	87,60%		75/122	76/122	93/123	84/122	79/122	39/106	39/108	85/122	82/123	3/6	78/123	85/122	74/118	96/123
02*	63,64%	63,04%	54,17%	61,48%		121/122	81/122	96/121	96/121	35/106	35/107	82/121	98/122	5/6	112/122	101/121	105/117	84/122
02c	63,64%	63,04%	55,00%	62,30%	99,18%		82/122	97/121	97/121	34/106	34/107	83/121	99/122	5/6	113/122	102/121	106/117	85/122
03*	93,18%	95,65%	64,46%	75,61%	66,39%	67,21%		84/122	93/121	38/106	38/108	95/122	83/123	5/6	82/123	93/122	80/118	118/123
04*	72,73%	65,22%	61,67%	68,85%	79,34%	80,17%	68,85%		110/122	46/105	46/107	86/121	97/122	4/6	99/122	103/122	92/117	88/122
04c	68,18%	63,04%	57,50%	64,75%	79,34%	80,17%	76,86%	90,16%		43/105	44/107	81/121	101/122	4/6	103/122	104/122	95/117	84/122
05*	40,54%	38,89%	33,33%	36,79%	33,02%	32,08%	35,85%	43,81%	40,95%		105/106	41/105	37/106	2/6	33/106	40/106	33/104	40/106
05c	40,54%	37,84%	32,71%	36,11%	32,71%	31,78%	35,19%	42,99%	41,12%	99,06%		41/107	37/108	2/6	33/108	40/108	33/106	40/108
032*	79,07%	75,56%	64,17%	69,67%	67,77%	68,60%	77,87%	71,07%	66,94%	39,05%	38,32%		83/122	3/6	82/122	94/121	81/118	99/122
038*	65,91%	67,39%	58,68%	66,67%	80,33%	81,15%	67,48%	79,51%	82,79%	34,91%	34,26%	68,03%		3/6	108/123	100/122	99/118	88/123
0312	33,33%	-	50,00%	50,00%	83,33%	83,33%	83,33%	66,67%	66,67%	33,33%	33,33%	50,00%	50,00%		5/6	3/6	5/6	6/6
18	63,64%	65,22%	55,37%	63,41%	91,80%	92,62%	66,67%	81,15%	84,43%	31,13%	30,56%	67,21%	87,80%	83,33%		100/122	111/118	87/123
33	79,55%	67,39%	65,00%	69,67%	83,47%	84,30%	76,23%	84,43%	85,25%	37,74%	37,04%	77,69%	81,97%	50,00%	81,97%		95/117	96/122
2860*	64,10%	68,29%	55,17%	62,71%	89,74%	90,60%	67,80%	78,63%	81,20%	31,73%	31,13%	68,64%	83,90%	83,33%	94,07%	81,20%		84/118
NA28	88,64%	95,65%	67,77%	78,05%	68,85%	69,67%	95,93%	72,13%	68,85%	37,74%	37,04%	81,15%	71,54%	100,00%	70,73%	78,69%	71,19%	

CH6	P4	P45	P75	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	038*	18*	18c	33	2860*	NA28
P4	-	18/21	49/63	46/63	27/63	61/63	61/63	7/15	6/15	21/56	22/56	46/63	32/63	22/63	23/63	40/61	-	57/63	
P45	-	34/42	29/43	27/43	23/43	37/43	35/43	16/28	16/28	26/40	27/40	24/43	25/43	23/43	23/43	20/34	24/43	37/43	
P75	85,71%	0,81%	97/126	94/126	73/126	118/126	117/126	38/62	36/62	44/117	45/117	93/126	71/126	70/126	71/126	66/99	34/65	117/126	
01*	77,78%	67,44%	76,98%	157/171	93/171	132/171	131/171	39/64	40/64	59/156	58/156	123/171	91/171	85/171	86/171	89/142	36/66	140/171	
01c	73,02%	62,79%	74,60%	91,81%	97/171	129/171	130/171	40/64	41/64	59/156	58/156	121/171	94/171	89/171	90/171	98/142	37/66	136/171	
02*	42,86%	53,49%	57,94%	54,39%	56,73%	92/171	93/171	50/64	56/64	64/156	65/156	85/171	132/171	152/171	153/171	102/142	59/66	103/171	
03*	96,83%	86,05%	93,65%	77,19%	75,44%	53,80%	168/171	38/64	36/64	57/156	58/156	124/171	96/171	87/171	88/171	92/142	35/66	158/171	
03c	96,83%	81,40%	92,86%	76,61%	76,02%	54,39%	98,25%	40/64	38/64	58/156	59/156	123/171	97/171	88/171	89/171	92/142	37/66	159/171	
04*	46,67%	57,14%	61,29%	60,94%	62,50%	78,13%	59,38%	62,50%	58/64	20/56	20/56	34/64	45/64	52/64	53/64	27/37	44/49	44/64	
04c	40,00%	57,14%	58,06%	62,50%	64,06%	87,50%	56,25%	59,38%	90,63%	22/56	22/56	36/64	48/64	56/64	57/64	29/37	44/49	42/64	
05*	37,50%	65,00%	37,61%	37,82%	37,82%	41,03%	36,54%	37,18%	35,71%	39,29%	154/156	67/156	62/156	59/156	59/156	69/132	26/61	66/156	
05c	39,29%	67,50%	38,46%	37,18%	37,18%	41,67%	37,18%	37,82%	35,71%	39,29%	98,72%	69/156	63/156	61/156	61/156	70/132	27/61	68/156	
032*	73,02%	55,81%	73,81%	71,93%	70,76%	49,71%	72,51%	71,93%	53,13%	56,25%	42,95%	44,23%	87/171	80/171	81/171	82/142	31/61	128/171	
038*	50,79%	58,14%	56,35%	53,22%	54,97%	77,19%	56,14%	56,73%	70,31%	75,00%	39,74%	40,38%	50,88%	135/171	136/171	103/142	54/66	102/171	
18*	34,92%	53,49%	55,56%	49,71%	52,05%	88,89%	50,88%	51,46%	81,25%	87,50%	37,82%	39,10%	46,78%	78,95%	170/171	102/142	63/66	96/171	
18c	36,51%	53,49%	56,35%	50,29%	52,63%	89,47%	51,46%	52,05%	82,81%	89,06%	37,82%	39,10%	47,37%	79,53%	99,42%	103/142	63/66	97/171	
33	65,57%	58,82%	66,67%	62,68%	69,01%	71,83%	64,79%	64,79%	72,97%	78,38%	52,27%	53,03%	57,75%	72,54%	71,83%	72,54%	33/39	101/142	
2860*	-	55,81%	52,31%	54,55%	56,06%	89,39%	53,03%	56,06%	89,80%	89,80%	42,62%	44,26%	50,82%	81,82%	95,45%	95,45%	84,62%	40/66	
NA28	90,48%	86,05%	92,86%	81,87%	79,53%	60,23%	92,40%	92,98%	68,75%	65,63%	42,31%	43,59%	74,85%	59,65%	56,14%	56,73%	71,13%	60,61%	

CH7	P3	P45	P75*	P75c	P82	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	038c	0312	18	33	2860*	NA28
P3		-	12/15	12/15	4/6	24/26	24/27	15/27	21/27	22/27	-	-	9/27	9/27	21/27	21/27	15/27	15/27	-	13/27	-	13/27	22/27
P45	-		13/16	13/16	-	9/16	10/16	10/15	13/16	13/16	11/16	10/16	6/13	6/13	12/16	12/16	10/16	10/16	-	12/16	-	12/16	13/16
P75*	80,00%	81,25%		108/109	3/4	78/107	86/108	69/108	105/109	105/109	30/45	28/45	37/94	38/94	83/108	84/108	71/108	71/108	5/8	71/109	4/6	75/108	108/109
P75c	80,00%	81,25%	99,08%		3/4	79/107	87/108	70/108	106/109	106/109	30/45	28/45	38/94	39/94	82/108	83/108	70/108	70/108	5/8	72/109	4/6	76/108	109/109
P82	66,67%	-	75,00%	75,00%		7/10	8/10	2/10	9/10	9/10	-	-	4/6	4/6	8/10	8/10	5/10	5/10	-	4/10	-	4/10	9/10
01*	92,31%	56,25%	72,90%	73,83%	70,00%		115/126	66/124	94/126	95/126	28/45	28/45	40/117	41/117	86/125	86/125	66/125	66/125	5/8	67/126	4/6	65/126	97/126
01c	88,89%	62,50%	79,63%	80,56%	80,00%	91,27%		72/125	101/127	102/127	31/45	31/45	46/118	47/118	93/126	93/126	75/126	75/126	5/8	74/127	4/6	74/127	104/127
02*	55,56%	66,67%	63,89%	64,81%	20,00%	53,23%	57,60%		78/127	79/127	34/44	30/44	38/117	38/117	67/126	68/126	97/126	96/126	5/8	106/127	5/6	110/126	82/127
03*	77,78%	81,25%	96,33%	97,25%	90,00%	74,60%	79,53%	61,42%		127/128	29/45	27/45	42/118	43/118	93/127	94/127	77/127	77/127	5/8	77/128	4/6	80/127	124/128
03c	81,48%	81,25%	96,33%	97,25%	90,00%	75,40%	80,31%	62,20%	99,22%		29/45	27/45	43/118	44/118	94/127	95/127	78/127	78/127	5/8	78/128	4/6	81/127	125/128
04*	-	68,75%	66,67%	66,67%	-	62,22%	68,89%	77,27%	64,44%	64,44%		41/45	14/39	14/39	27/44	27/44	30/44	29/44	3/6	37/45	-	36/45	30/45
04c	-	62,50%	62,22%	62,22%	-	62,22%	68,89%	68,18%	60,00%	60,00%	91,11%		13/39	13/39	25/44	25/44	29/44	31/44	3/6	37/45	-	34/45	28/45
05*	33,33%	46,15%	39,36%	40,43%	66,67%	34,19%	38,98%	32,48%	35,59%	36,44%	35,90%	33,33%		117/118	45/117	45/117	37/118	36/118	5/7	41/118	2/6	41/117	45/118
05c	33,33%	46,15%	40,43%	41,49%	66,67%	35,04%	39,83%	32,48%	36,44%	37,29%	35,90%	33,33%	99,15%		46/117	46/117	38/118	37/118	5/7	41/118	2/6	41/117	46/118
032*	77,78%	75,00%	76,85%	75,93%	80,00%	68,80%	73,81%	53,17%	73,23%	74,02%	61,36%	56,82%	38,46%	39,32%		126/127	66/126	66/126	5/7	71/127	4/6	68/126	95/127
032c	77,78%	75,00%	77,78%	76,85%	80,00%	68,80%	73,81%	53,97%	74,02%	74,80%	61,36%	56,82%	38,46%	39,32%	99,21%		67/126	67/126	5/7	72/127	4/6	69/126	96/127
038*	55,56%	62,50%	65,74%	64,81%	50,00%	52,80%	59,52%	76,98%	60,63%	61,42%	68,18%	65,91%	31,36%	32,20%	52,38%	53,17%		126/127	3/7	100/127	3/6	103/126	82/127
038c	55,56%	62,50%	65,74%	64,81%	50,00%	52,80%	59,52%	76,19%	60,63%	61,42%	65,91%	70,45%	30,51%	31,36%	52,38%	53,17%	99,21%		3/7	99/127	3/6	102/126	82/127
0312	-	-	62,50%	62,50%	-	62,50%	62,50%	62,50%	62,50%	62,50%	50,00%	50,00%	71,43%	71,43%	71,43%	71,43%	42,86%	42,86%		6/8	-	6/8	5/8
18	48,15%	75,00%	65,14%	66,06%	40,00%	53,17%	58,27%	83,46%	60,16%	60,94%	82,22%	82,22%	34,75%	34,75%	55,91%	56,69%	78,74%	77,95%	75,00%		5/6	122/127	81/128
33	-	-	66,67%	66,67%	-	66,67%	66,67%	83,33%	66,67%	66,67%	-	-	33,33%	33,33%	66,67%	66,67%	50,00%	50,00%	-	83,33%		5/6	4/6
2860*	48,15%	75,00%	69,44%	70,37%	40,00%	51,59%	58,27%	87,30%	62,99%	63,78%	80,00%	75,56%	35,04%	35,04%	53,97%	54,76%	81,75%	80,95%	75,00%	96,06%	83,33%		84/127
NA28	81,48%	81,25%	99,08%	100,00%	90,00%	76,98%	81,89%	64,57%	96,88%	97,66%	66,67%	62,22%	38,14%	38,98%	74,80%	75,59%	64,57%	64,57%	62,50%	63,28%	66,67%	66,14%	

CH8	P75	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	038*	038c	18	2860*	NA28
P75		130/175	137/176	109/176	110/177	169/176	54/89	56/89	62/158	62/157	104/174	106/177	105/177	107/177	59/85	163/181
01*	74,29%		159/180	111/178	112/179	135/178	51/87	55/87	63/161	63/160	102/176	110/179	109/179	107/179	57/88	142/180
01c	77,84%	88,33%		124/179	125/180	144/179	56/89	58/89	67/162	67/161	116/177	123/180	122/180	120/180	66/89	153/181
02*	61,93%	62,36%	69,27%		180/180	120/179	63/89	70/89	68/161	68/160	142/177	140/180	139/180	164/180	78/88	132/180
02c	62,15%	62,57%	69,44%	100,00%		121/180	63/89	70/89	68/162	68/161	142/178	141/181	140/181	165/181	79/89	133/181
03*	96,02%	75,84%	80,45%	67,04%	67,22%		55/89	57/89	66/161	66/160	109/177	111/180	110/180	116/180	64/89	171/180
04*	60,67%	58,62%	62,92%	70,79%	70,79%	61,80%		78/89	32/81	32/80	61/86	65/89	65/89	67/89	32/44	59/89
04c	62,92%	63,22%	65,17%	78,65%	78,65%	64,04%	87,64%		30/81	30/80	68/86	72/89	72/89	78/89	39/44	61/89
05*	39,24%	39,13%	41,36%	42,24%	41,98%	40,99%	39,51%	37,04%		160/161	69/162	60/162	59/162	64/162	32/82	72/162
05c	39,49%	39,38%	41,61%	42,50%	42,24%	41,25%	40,00%	37,50%	99,38%		69/161	60/161	59/161	64/161	32/82	72/161
032*	59,77%	57,95%	65,54%	80,23%	79,78%	61,58%	70,93%	79,07%	42,59%	42,86%		126/178	125/178	138/178	71/89	119/178
038*	59,89%	61,45%	68,33%	77,78%	77,90%	61,67%	73,03%	80,90%	37,04%	37,27%	70,79%		180/181	135/181	68/89	121/181
038c	59,32%	60,89%	67,78%	77,22%	77,35%	61,11%	73,03%	80,90%	36,42%	36,65%	70,22%	99,45%		134/181	68/89	120/181
18	60,45%	59,78%	66,67%	91,11%	0,91%	64,44%	75,28%	87,64%	39,51%	39,75%	77,53%	74,59%	74,03%		85/89	126/181
2860*	69,41%	64,77%	74,16%	88,64%	88,76%	71,91%	72,73%	88,64%	39,02%	39,02%	79,78%	76,40%	76,40%	95,51%		69/89
NA28	90,06%	78,89%	84,53%	73,33%	73,48%	95,00%	66,29%	68,54%	44,44%	44,72%	66,85%	66,85%	66,30%	69,61%	77,53%	

CH9	P45*	P45c	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	0181	18	45	2860*	NA28
P45*		87/87	60/88	60/88	49/87	48/87	39/87	39/87	62/87	63/87	47/86	41/86	34/82	34/82	40/86	40/86	40/85	6/7	40/87	9/17	29/49	62/87
P45c	100,00%		61/89	61/89	49/88	48/88	39/88	39/88	63/88	64/88	47/87	42/87	34/82	34/82	40/87	40/87	40/86	6/7	40/88	10/18	29/50	63/88
P75*	68,18%	68,54%		163/164	112/164	119/164	97/163	97/164	138/164	139/164	109/162	102/163	68/154	68/154	99/163	98/163	102/162	7/8	97/164	19/20	78/120	147/164
P75c	68,18%	68,54%	99,39%		112/165	119/165	99/164	99/165	140/165	141/165	111/163	104/164	68/155	68/155	99/164	98/164	102/163	7/8	97/165	19/20	79/121	149/165
01*	56,32%	55,68%	68,29%	67,88%		155/176	99/175	99/176	130/176	133/176	105/173	96/174	62/166	63/166	94/175	93/175	99/174	4/8	93/174	17/20	72/132	135/176
01c	55,17%	54,55%	72,56%	72,12%	88,07%		102/175	102/176	129/176	131/176	117/173	108/174	69/166	70/166	102/175	101/175	106/174	3/8	103/174	17/20	80/132	138/176
02*	44,83%	44,32%	59,51%	60,37%	56,57%	58,29%		175/175	107/175	110/175	125/172	126/173	76/165	76/165	142/174	143/174	143/173	3/8	146/175	13/20	113/131	120/175
02c	44,83%	44,32%	59,15%	60,00%	56,25%	57,95%	100,00%		107/176	110/176	125/173	127/174	77/166	77/166	143/175	144/175	144/174	3/8	147/176	13/20	114/132	120/176
03*	71,26%	71,59%	84,15%	84,85%	73,86%	73,30%	61,14%	60,80%		173/176	119/173	111/174	69/116	69/116	107/175	106/175	107/174	5/8	104/176	20/20	87/132	161/176
03c	72,41%	72,73%	84,76%	85,45%	75,57%	74,43%	62,86%	62,50%	98,30%		120/173	112/174	70/116	70/116	108/175	107/175	110/174	6/8	106/176	20/20	88/132	164/176
04*	54,65%	54,02%	67,28%	68,10%	60,69%	67,63%	72,67%	72,25%	68,79%	69,36%		156/173	81/163	82/163	121/172	120/172	122/171	3/8	125/173	14/20	97/129	126/173
04c	47,67%	48,28%	62,58%	63,41%	55,17%	62,07%	72,83%	72,99%	63,79%	64,37%	90,17%		76/164	77/164	118/173	117/173	121/172	3/8	130/174	13/20	100/131	120/174
05*	41,46%	41,46%	44,16%	43,87%	37,35%	41,57%	46,06%	46,39%	59,48%	60,34%	49,69%	46,34%		164/166	69/165	68/165	81/164	2/6	68/166	8/18	55/126	79/166
05c	41,46%	41,46%	44,16%	43,87%	37,95%	42,17%	46,06%	46,39%	59,48%	60,34%	50,31%	46,95%	98,80%		69/165	68/165	81/164	2/6	68/166	8/18	55/126	79/166
032*	46,51%	45,98%	60,74%	60,37%	53,71%	58,29%	81,61%	81,71%	61,14%	61,71%	70,35%	68,21%	41,82%	41,82%		174/175	141/173	2/8	140/175	13/20	111/132	115/175
032c	46,51%	45,98%	60,12%	59,76%	53,14%	57,71%	82,18%	82,29%	60,57%	61,14%	69,77%	67,63%	41,21%	41,21%	99,43%		140/173	2/8	141/175	13/20	111/132	114/175
038*	47,06%	46,51%	62,96%	62,58%	56,90%	60,92%	82,66%	82,76%	61,49%	63,22%	71,35%	70,35%	49,39%	49,39%	81,50%	80,92%		3/7	142/174	13/20	109/131	119/174
0181	85,71%	85,71%	87,50%	87,50%	50,00%	37,50%	37,50%	37,50%	62,50%	75,00%	37,50%	37,50%	33,33%	33,33%	25,00%	25,00%	42,86%		3/8	-	1/2	6/8
18	45,98%	45,45%	59,15%	58,79%	53,45%	59,20%	83,43%	83,52%	59,09%	60,23%	72,25%	74,71%	40,96%	40,96%	80,00%	80,57%	81,61%	37,50%		13/20	126/132	113/176
45	52,94%	55,56%	95,00%	95,00%	85,00%	85,00%	65,00%	65,00%	100,00%	100,00%	70,00%	65,00%	44,44%	44,44%	65,00%	65,00%	65,00%	-	65,00%		12/20	20/20
2860*	59,18%	58,00%	65,00%	65,29%	54,55%	60,61%	86,26%	86,36%	65,91%	66,67%	75,19%	76,34%	43,65%	43,65%	84,09%	84,09%	83,21%	50,00%	95,45%	60,00%		94/132
NA28	71,26%	71,59%	89,63%	90,30%	76,70%	78,41%	68,57%	68,18%	91,48%	93,18%	72,83%	68,97%	47,59%	47,59%	65,71%	65,14%	68,39%	75,00%	64,20%	100,00%	71,21%	

CH10	P3	P45	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	038c	0181	18	2860*	NA28
P3		9/15	12/15	12/15	13/15	16/16	7/16	7/16	13/16	9/16	11/15	9/16	3/14	3/14	7/16	7/16	6/16	5/16	-	6/16	-	13/16
P45	60,00%		75/100	74/99	67/100	70/102	51/100	51/101	69/100	67/100	58/101	58/102	47/95	47/96	55/97	54/97	56/101	55/101	4/5	59/101	18/31	75/101
P75*	80,00%	75,00%		127/127	101/125	105/127	69/126	69/127	118/126	113/126	82/127	75/127	49/118	49/120	67/123	68/123	71/127	70/127	14/16	74/127	21/34	112/127
P75c	80,00%	74,75%	100,00%		101/124	105/126	69/125	69/126	118/125	113/125	82/126	75/126	49/118	49/120	67/122	68/122	71/126	70/126	14/16	74/126	21/34	112/126
01*	86,67%	67,00%	80,80%	81,45%		119/126	74/125	74/126	97/126	91/126	84/125	80/125	58/117	60/119	74/122	75/122	80/126	79/126	13/17	80/126	22/33	104/126
01c	100,00%	68,63%	82,68%	83,33%	94,44%		81/127	81/128	98/127	93/127	90/127	87/127	58/119	60/121	81/124	82/124	86/128	85/128	13/17	86/128	24/34	108/128
02*	43,75%	51,00%	54,76%	55,20%	59,20%	63,78%		127/127	65/126	70/126	99/126	104/126	44/118	44/120	104/123	105/123	101/127	102/127	8/17	113/127	25/33	75/127
02c	43,75%	50,50%	54,33%	54,76%	58,73%	63,28%	100,00%		65/127	70/127	99/127	104/127	44/119	44/121	104/124	105/124	101/128	103/128	8/17	113/128	25/34	75/128
03*	81,25%	69,00%	93,65%	94,40%	76,98%	77,17%	51,59%	51,18%		120/127	79/126	73/126	51/118	51/120	65/123	66/123	70/127	69/127	13/17	71/127	20/34	118/127
03c	56,25%	67,00%	89,68%	90,40%	72,22%	73,23%	55,56%	55,12%	94,49%		78/126	76/126	50/118	50/120	68/123	69/123	73/127	74/127	13/17	75/127	21/34	111/127
04*	73,33%	57,43%	64,57%	65,08%	67,20%	70,87%	78,57%	77,95%	62,70%	61,90%		118/127	48/118	47/120	100/123	101/123	96/127	95/127	11/17	102/127	25/34	89/127
04c	56,25%	56,86%	59,06%	59,52%	64,00%	68,50%	82,54%	81,89%	57,94%	60,32%	92,91%		53/118	52/120	103/123	104/123	103/127	102/127	11/17	109/127	27/34	82/127
05*	21,43%	49,47%	41,53%	41,53%	49,57%	48,74%	37,29%	36,97%	43,22%	42,37%	40,68%	44,92%		118/119	45/115	46/115	51/119	51/119	7/14	52/119	16/33	59/119
05c	21,43%	48,96%	40,83%	40,83%	50,42%	49,59%	36,67%	36,36%	42,50%	41,67%	39,17%	43,33%	99,16%		45/117	46/117	53/121	53/121	7/15	52/121	17/33	59/121
032*	43,75%	56,70%	54,47%	54,92%	60,66%	65,32%	84,55%	83,87%	52,85%	55,28%	81,30%	83,74%	39,13%	38,46%		127/128	101/124	100/124	11/17	108/124	24/33	73/128
032c	43,75%	55,67%	55,28%	55,74%	61,48%	66,13%	85,37%	84,68%	53,66%	56,10%	82,11%	84,55%	40,00%	39,32%	99,22%		102/124	101/124	11/17	109/124	25/33	74/128
038*	37,50%	55,45%	55,91%	56,35%	63,49%	67,19%	79,53%	78,91%	55,12%	57,48%	75,59%	81,10%	42,86%	43,80%	81,45%	82,26%		127/128	8/17	107/128	26/34	78/128
038c	31,25%	54,46%	55,12%	55,56%	62,70%	66,41%	80,31%	80,47%	54,33%	58,27%	74,80%	80,31%	42,86%	43,80%	80,65%	81,45%	99,22%		8/17	108/128	26/34	77/128
0181	-	80,00%	87,50%	87,50%	76,47%	76,47%	47,06%	47,06%	76,47%	76,47%	64,71%	64,71%	50,00%	46,67%	64,71%	64,71%	47,06%	47,06%		12/17	-	12/17
18	37,50%	58,42%	58,27%	58,73%	63,49%	67,19%	88,98%	88,28%	55,91%	59,06%	80,31%	85,83%	43,70%	42,98%	87,10%	87,90%	83,59%	84,38%	70,59%		31/34	80/128
2860*	-	58,06%	61,76%	61,76%	66,67%	70,59%	75,76%	73,53%	58,82%	61,76%	73,53%	79,41%	48,48%	51,52%	72,73%	75,76%	76,47%	76,47%	-	91,18%		21/34
NA28	81,25%	74,26%	88,19%	88,89%	82,54%	84,38%	59,06%	58,59%	92,91%	87,40%	70,08%	64,57%	49,58%	48,76%	57,03%	57,81%	60,94%	60,16%	70,59%	62,50%	61,76%	

CH11	P45	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	18	NA28
P45		103/144	103/144	85/143	85/145	81/144	80/144	97/145	97/145	81/145	82/145	50/131	50/132	85/145	85/145	69/144	75/145	101/145
P75*	71,53%		169/171	123/169	131/171	115/170	114/170	156/171	153/171	113/170	115/171	59/155	59/156	116/171	116/171	103/170	111/171	156/171
P75c	71,53%	98,83%		124/169	132/171	117/170	116/170	158/171	155/171	115/170	117/171	61/155	61/156	118/171	118/171	105/170	113/171	158/171
01*	59,44%	72,78%	73,37%		151/170	110/169	109/169	130/170	129/170	114/169	116/170	59/154	59/155	107/170	107/170	104/169	106/170	134/170
01c	58,62%	76,61%	77,19%	88,82%		113/171	112/171	140/172	139/172	120/171	120/172	61/156	61/157	109/172	109/172	109/171	117/172	142/172
02*	56,25%	67,65%	68,82%	65,09%	66,08%		170/171	119/171	117/171	126/170	128/171	63/155	64/156	146/171	147/171	127/170	139/171	123/171
02c	55,56%	67,06%	68,24%	64,50%	65,50%	99,42%		118/171	116/171	127/170	129/171	63/155	64/156	147/171	148/171	128/170	140/171	124/171
03*	66,90%	91,23%	92,40%	76,47%	81,40%	69,59%	69,01%		169/172	121/170	123/171	61/156	61/157	118/172	118/172	111/171	119/172	165/172
03c	66,90%	89,47%	90,64%	75,88%	80,81%	68,42%	67,84%	98,26%		122/170	124/171	61/156	61/157	116/172	117/172	114/171	121/172	162/172
04*	55,86%	66,47%	67,65%	67,46%	70,18%	74,12%	74,71%	71,18%	71,76%		170/171	57/155	57/156	130/171	129/171	121/170	132/171	126/171
04c	56,55%	67,25%	68,42%	68,24%	69,77%	74,85%	75,44%	71,93%	72,51%	99,42%		58/156	58/157	132/172	131/172	123/171	134/172	128/172
05*	38,17%	38,06%	39,35%	38,31%	39,10%	40,65%	40,65%	39,10%	39,10%	36,77%	37,18%		156/156	63/156	63/156	57/155	61/156	66/156
05c	37,88%	37,82%	39,10%	38,06%	38,85%	41,03%	41,03%	38,85%	38,85%	36,54%	36,94%	100,00%		64/157	64/157	58/156	62/157	66/157
032*	58,62%	67,84%	69,01%	62,94%	63,37%	85,38%	85,96%	68,60%	67,44%	76,02%	76,74%	40,38%	40,76%		171/172	127/171	142/172	123/172
032c	58,62%	67,84%	69,01%	62,94%	63,37%	85,96%	86,55%	68,60%	68,02%	75,44%	76,16%	40,38%	40,76%	99,42%		126/171	141/172	123/172
038*	47,92%	60,59%	61,76%	61,54%	63,74%	74,71%	75,29%	64,91%	66,67%	71,18%	71,93%	36,77%	37,18%	74,27%	73,68%		130/171	117/171
18	51,72%	64,91%	66,08%	62,35%	68,02%	81,29%	81,87%	69,19%	70,35%	77,19%	77,91%	39,10%	39,49%	82,56%	81,98%	76,02%		125/172
NA28	69,66%	91,23%	92,40%	78,82%	82,56%	71,93%	72,51%	95,93%	0,94%	73,68%	74,42%	42,31%	42,04%	71,51%	71,51%	68,42%	72,67%	

CH12	P45	P75	P75c	01*	01c	02*	03*	04*	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	18	NA28
P45		73/117	75/117	66/120	67/121	67/120	73/121	4/7	41/113	42/113	67/117	68/118	64/121	76/121	78/121
P75	62,39%		145/148	108/146	116/147	93/146	130/147	5/7	54/136	54/136	89/140	91/141	99/147	95/147	134/148
P75c	64,10%	97,97%		107/147	116/148	95/147	133/148	5/7	56/137	56/137	91/141	93/142	101/148	97/148	137/149
01*	55,00%	73,97%	72,79%		138/150	93/149	111/150	5/7	55/138	54/138	86/143	88/144	92/150	89/150	115/150
01c	55,37%	78,91%	78,38%	92,00%		108/150	121/151	5/7	57/139	56/139	96/144	97/144	105/151	104/151	125/151
02*	55,83%	63,70%	64,63%	62,42%	72,00%		96/150	6/7	56/138	57/138	118/143	122/144	118/150	127/150	103/150
03*	60,33%	88,44%	89,86%	74,00%	80,13%	64,00%		5/7	55/139	54/139	93/144	95/145	102/151	97/151	141/151
04*	57,14%	71,43%	71,43%	71,43%	71,43%	85,71%	71,43%		4/7	4/7	6/7	6/7	5/7	6/7	5/7
05*	36,28%	39,71%	40,88%	39,86%	41,01%	40,58%	39,57%	57,14%		137/139	51/133	53/134	55/139	58/139	61/139
05c	37,17%	39,71%	40,88%	39,13%	40,29%	41,30%	38,85%	57,14%	98,56%		52/133	54/134	56/139	59/139	60/139
032*	57,26%	63,57%	64,54%	60,14%	66,67%	82,52%	64,58%	85,71%	38,35%	39,10%		141/144	108/144	122/144	98/144
032c	57,63%	64,54%	65,49%	61,11%	67,36%	84,72%	65,52%	85,71%	39,55%	40,30%	97,92%		110/145	123/145	100/145
038*	52,89%	67,35%	68,24%	61,33%	69,54%	78,67%	67,55%	71,43%	39,57%	40,29%	75,00%	75,86%		112/151	111/151
18	62,81%	64,63%	65,54%	59,33%	68,87%	84,67%	64,24%	85,71%	41,73%	42,45%	84,72%	84,83%	74,17%		104/151
NA28	64,46%	90,54%	91,95%	76,67%	82,78%	68,67%	93,38%	71,43%	43,88%	43,17%	68,06%	68,97%	73,51%	68,87%	

CH13	P45	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	05*	032*	038*	038c	18*	18c	NA28
P45		44/66	45/66	46/66	49/66	38/66	45/66	46/66	32/64	39/65	30/64	30/64	40/66	40/66	46/66
P75*	66,67%		90/92	68/91	71/90	60/92	76/92	77/92	38/89	58/91	49/90	49/90	55/88	58/92	79/92
P75c	68,18%	97,83%		69/91	72/90	60/92	78/92	79/92	38/89	58/91	51/90	51/90	55/88	58/92	81/92
01*	69,70%	74,73%	75,82%		85/92	62/92	74/91	74/92	37/88	58/91	55/90	55/90	53/88	55/92	78/92
01c	74,24%	78,89%	80,00%	92,39%		65/91	76/92	77/91	43/89	62/90	58/90	58/90	56/87	60/91	81/91
02*	57,58%	65,22%	65,22%	67,39%	71,43%		58/93	59/93	38/90	76/92	63/91	63/91	77/89	81/93	64/93
03*	68,18%	82,61%	84,78%	81,32%	82,61%	62,37%		90/93	34/89	59/92	51/91	51/91	58/89	61/93	86/93
03c	69,70%	83,70%	85,87%	80,43%	84,62%	63,44%	96,77%		36/90	62/92	54/91	54/91	61/89	64/93	87/93
05*	50,00%	42,70%	42,70%	42,05%	48,31%	42,22%	38,20%	40,00%		37/89	34/89	34/89	36/86	38/90	40/90
032*	60,00%	63,74%	63,74%	63,74%	68,89%	82,61%	64,13%	67,39%	41,57%		57/90	57/90	75/88	79/92	62/92
038*	46,88%	54,44%	56,67%	61,11%	64,44%	69,23%	56,04%	59,34%	38,20%	63,33%		89/91	59/87	63/91	58/91
038c	46,88%	54,44%	56,67%	61,11%	64,44%	69,23%	56,04%	59,34%	38,20%	63,33%	97,80%		59/87	63/91	58/91
18*	60,61%	62,50%	62,50%	60,23%	64,37%	86,52%	65,17%	68,54%	41,86%	85,23%	67,82%	67,82%		89/89	60/89
18c	60,61%	63,04%	63,04%	59,78%	65,93%	87,10%	65,59%	68,82%	42,22%	85,87%	69,23%	69,23%	100,00%		63/93
NA28	69,70%	85,87%	88,04%	84,78%	89,01%	68,82%	92,47%	93,55%	44,44%	67,39%	63,74%	63,74%	67,42%	67,74%	

CH14	P45	P75*	P75c	P97	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	05*	032*	038*	18	NA28
P45		57/81	60/81	8/11	61/79	63/80	53/81	53/81	63/80	30/76	52/81	50/80	56/81	64/81
P75*	70,37%		102/105	17/23	78/101	79/104	57/105	57/105	85/104	33/98	52/105	62/103	56/105	85/105
P75c	74,07%	97,14%		17/23	79/101	82/104	60/105	60/105	88/104	34/98	55/105	63/103	59/105	88/105
P97	72,73%	73,91%	73,91%		18/22	19/22	18/23	18/23	21/23	11/22	19/23	17/22	19/23	22/23
01*	77,22%	77,23%	78,22%	81,82%		91/102	62/101	62/101	83/100	39/94	59/101	68/99	59/101	84/102
01c	78,75%	75,96%	78,85%	86,36%	89,22%		70/104	70/104	88/103	45/97	63/104	74/102	67/104	90/105
02*	65,43%	54,29%	57,14%	78,26%	61,39%	67,31%		104/105	70/104	40/98	85/105	67/103	87/105	73/105
02c	65,43%	54,29%	57,14%	78,26%	61,39%	67,31%	99,05%		70/104	41/98	84/105	68/103	86/105	73/105
03*	78,75%	81,73%	84,62%	91,30%	83,00%	85,44%	67,31%	67,31%		38/97	63/104	69/102	64/104	102/104
05*	39,47%	33,67%	34,69%	50,00%	41,49%	46,39%	40,82%	41,84%	39,18%		45/98	42/97	39/98	41/98
032*	64,20%	49,52%	52,38%	82,61%	58,42%	60,58%	80,95%	80,00%	60,58%	45,92%		63/103	91/105	70/105
038*	62,50%	60,19%	61,17%	77,27%	68,69%	72,55%	65,05%	66,02%	67,65%	43,30%	61,17%		69/103	74/103
18	69,14%	53,33%	56,19%	82,61%	58,42%	64,42%	82,86%	81,90%	61,54%	39,80%	86,67%	66,99%		69/105
NA28	79,01%	80,95%	83,81%	95,65%	82,35%	85,71%	69,52%	69,52%	98,08%	41,84%	66,67%	71,84%	65,71%	

CH15	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	05*	05c	032*	038*	038c	18	NA28
P75*		78/79	62/79	60/79	45/79	68/79	69/79	28/74	31/75	43/77	48/79	47/79	44/79	70/79
P75c	98,73%		63/79	61/79	46/79	69/79	70/79	28/74	31/75	44/77	48/79	47/79	49/79	71/79
01*	78,48%	79,75%		77/80	46/80	63/80	64/80	33/75	34/76	44/78	54/80	52/80	50/80	65/80
01c	75,95%	77,22%	96,25%		47/80	64/80	65/80	30/75	31/76	42/78	53/80	51/80	49/80	64/80
02*	56,96%	58,23%	57,50%	58,75%		49/80	50/80	25/75	25/76	53/78	54/80	53/80	58/80	52/80
03*	86,08%	87,34%	0,79%	80,00%	61,25%		79/80	35/75	36/76	43/78	47/80	45/80	46/80	77/80
03c	87,34%	88,61%	80,00%	81,25%	62,50%	98,75%		34/75	35/76	44/78	48/80	46/80	47/80	78/80
05*	37,84%	37,84%	44,00%	40,00%	33,33%	46,67%	45,33%		72/75	24/73	33/75	31/75	30/75	32/75
05c	41,33%	41,33%	44,74%	40,79%	32,89%	47,37%	46,05%	96,00%		26/74	33/76	31/76	32/76	33/76
032*	55,84%	57,14%	56,41%	53,85%	67,95%	55,13%	56,41%	32,88%	35,14%		56/78	54/78	63/78	46/78
038*	60,76%	60,76%	67,50%	66,25%	67,50%	58,75%	60,00%	44,00%	43,42%	71,79%		78/80	73/80	52/80
038c	59,49%	59,49%	65,00%	63,75%	66,25%	56,25%	57,50%	41,33%	40,79%	69,23%	97,50%		71/80	50/80
18	55,70%	62,03%	62,50%	61,25%	72,50%	57,50%	58,75%	40,00%	42,11%	80,77%	91,25%	88,75%		49/80
NA28	88,61%	0,90%	81,25%	80,00%	65,00%	96,25%	97,50%	42,67%	43,42%	58,97%	65,00%	62,50%	61,25%	

CH16	P75	01*	01c	02*	03*	05*	05c	032*	038*	18	NA28
P75		47/64	48/64	39/64	58/65	29/62	30/63	31/64	36/64	38/65	58/65
01*	73,44%		58/65	37/64	50/65	23/62	23/63	28/64	39/64	35/65	52/65
01c	75,00%	89,23%		40/64	51/65	26/62	26/63	33/64	40/64	40/65	53/65
02*	60,94%	57,81%	62,50%		43/65	25/62	26/63	53/64	52/64	58/65	47/65
03*	89,23%	76,92%	78,46%	66,15%		28/63	29/64	34/65	39/65	39/66	62/66
05*	46,77%	37,10%	41,94%	40,32%	44,44%		63/63	19/62	28/62	22/63	31/63
05c	47,62%	36,51%	41,27%	41,27%	45,31%	100,00%		20/63	29/63	23/64	32/64
032*	48,44%	43,75%	51,56%	82,81%	52,31%	30,65%	31,75%		46/64	55/65	38/65
038*	56,25%	60,94%	62,50%	81,25%	60,00%	45,16%	46,03%	71,88%		50/65	44/65
18	58,46%	53,85%	61,54%	89,23%	59,09%	34,92%	35,94%	84,62%	76,92%		43/66
NA28	89,23%	80,00%	81,54%	72,31%	93,94%	49,21%	50,00%	58,46%	67,69%	65,15%	

CH17	P75*	P75c	P111	01*	01c	02*	03*	05*	032*	032c	038*	18	NA28
P75*		88/89	8/12	72/86	74/88	49/89	84/89	34/85	47/88	48/88	47/89	51/89	81/89
P75c	98,88%		8/12	73/86	75/88	49/89	85/89	34/85	47/88	48/88	47/89	51/89	82/89
P111	66,67%	66,67%		6/10	7/11	8/12	7/12	4/12	8/12	8/12	8/12	9/12	10/12
01*	83,72%	84,88%	60,00%		99/102	59/101	87/101	32/98	62/100	63/100	59/101	64/101	89/102
01c	84,09%	85,23%	63,64%	97,06%		62/103	90/103	34/99	64/102	65/102	61/103	67/103	92/104
02*	55,06%	55,06%	66,67%	58,42%	60,19%		58/104	31/100	84/103	85/103	65/104	84/104	62/104
03*	94,38%	95,51%	58,33%	86,14%	87,38%	55,77%		37/99	60/103	61/103	58/104	63/104	99/104
05*	40,00%	40,00%	33,33%	32,65%	34,34%	31,00%	37,37%		26/99	27/99	33/100	30/100	39/100
032*	53,41%	53,41%	66,67%	62,00%	62,75%	81,55%	58,25%	26,26%		102/103	73/103	89/103	73/103
032c	54,55%	54,55%	66,67%	63,00%	63,73%	82,52%	59,22%	27,27%	99,03%		74/103	90/103	74/103
038*	52,81%	52,81%	66,67%	58,42%	59,22%	62,50%	55,77%	33,00%	70,87%	71,84%		73/104	61/104
18	57,30%	57,30%	75,00%	63,37%	65,05%	80,77%	60,58%	30,00%	86,41%	87,38%	70,19%		68/104
NA28	91,01%	92,13%	83,33%	87,25%	88,46%	59,62%	95,19%	39,00%	70,87%	71,84%	58,65%	65,38%	

CH18	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	18	NA28
P75*		32/33	29/33	29/33	18/33	29/33	29/33	15/33	15/33	20/32	20/32	19/33	19/33	29/33
P75c	96,97%		30/33	30/33	19/33	30/33	30/33	16/33	16/33	21/32	21/32	20/33	20/33	30/33
01*	87,88%	90,91%		91/100	62/99	79/100	78/100	32/97	32/98	58/99	59/99	55/99	63/100	85/100
01c	87,88%	90,91%	91,00%		64/99	80/100	81/100	35/97	35/98	60/99	61/99	58/99	67/100	89/100
02*	54,55%	57,58%	62,63%	64,65%		55/99	56/99	29/96	30/97	81/99	82/99	76/98	87/99	66/99
03*	87,88%	90,91%	79,00%	80,00%	55,56%		99/100	38/97	38/98	57/99	58/99	53/99	58/100	88/100
03c	87,88%	90,91%	78,00%	81,00%	56,57%	99,00%		39/97	39/98	58/99	59/99	54/99	59/100	89/100
05*	45,45%	48,48%	32,99%	36,08%	30,21%	39,18%	40,21%		97/97	32/96	33/96	27/96	32/97	39/97
05c	45,45%	48,48%	32,65%	35,71%	30,93%	38,78%	39,80%	100,00%		33/97	34/97	28/97	33/98	39/98
032*	62,50%	65,63%	58,59%	60,61%	81,82%	57,58%	58,59%	33,33%	34,02%		98/99	71/98	89/99	67/99
032c	62,50%	65,63%	59,60%	61,62%	82,83%	58,59%	59,60%	34,38%	35,05%	98,99%		72/98	90/99	68/99
038*	57,58%	60,61%	55,56%	58,59%	77,55%	53,54%	54,55%	28,13%	28,87%	72,45%	73,47%		75/99	61/99
18	57,58%	60,61%	63,00%	67,00%	87,88%	58,00%	59,00%	32,99%	33,67%	89,90%	90,91%	75,76%		69/100
NA28	87,88%	90,91%	85,00%	89,00%	66,67%	88,00%	89,00%	40,21%	39,80%	67,68%	68,69%	61,62%	69,00%	

CH19	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	0182	18	NA28
01*		115/123	77/123	105/122	106/122	13/20	13/20	29/115	29/117	72/123	71/123	68/112	7/10	74/123	112/123
01c	93,50%		81/125	107/124	108/124	14/20	14/20	31/117	31/119	74/125	73/125	72/114	7/10	77/125	114/125
02*	62,60%	64,80%		78/124	79/124	16/20	15/20	33/117	34/119	105/125	104/125	85/114	8/11	111/125	84/125
03*	86,07%	86,29%	62,90%		123/124	13/20	13/20	31/116	32/118	74/124	73/124	69/113	8/11	76/124	119/124
03c	86,89%	87,10%	63,71%	99,19%		13/20	13/20	31/116	32/118	75/124	74/124	70/113	8/11	77/124	120/124
04*	65,00%	70,00%	80,00%	65,00%	65,00%		19/20	4/19	4/19	15/20	15/20	6/9	-	15/20	14/20
04c	65,00%	70,00%	75,00%	65,00%	65,00%	95,00%		3/19	3/19	14/20	14/20	6/9	-	14/20	14/20
05*	25,22%	26,50%	28,21%	26,72%	26,72%	21,05%	15,79%		116/117	31/117	32/117	24/106	3/11	32/116	30/117
05c	24,79%	26,05%	28,57%	27,12%	27,12%	21,05%	15,79%	99,15%		32/119	33/119	24/108	3/11	33/118	31/119
032*	58,54%	59,20%	84,00%	59,68%	60,48%	75,00%	70,00%	26,50%	26,89%		124/125	73/114	9/11	103/125	75/125
032c	57,72%	58,40%	83,20%	58,87%	59,68%	75,00%	70,00%	27,35%	27,73%	99,20%		72/114	8/11	104/125	74/125
038*	60,71%	63,16%	74,56%	61,06%	61,95%	66,67%	66,67%	22,64%	22,22%	64,04%	63,16%		8/11	82/114	73/114
0182	70,00%	70,00%	72,73%	72,73%	72,73%	-	-	27,27%	27,27%	81,82%	72,73%	72,73%		6/11	8/11
18	60,16%	61,60%	88,80%	61,29%	62,10%	75,00%	70,00%	27,59%	27,97%	82,40%	83,20%	71,93%	54,55%		77/125
NA28	91,06%	91,20%	67,20%	95,97%	96,77%	70,00%	70,00%	25,64%	26,05%	60,00%	59,20%	64,04%	72,73%	61,60%	

CH20	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	032*	032c	038*	18	NA28
01*		114/121	69/121	100/121	101/121	39/74	42/74	38/115	63/118	66/118	44/82	76/121	103/121
01c	94,21%		72/123	103/123	104/123	40/74	43/75	40/117	65/120	68/120	46/83	78/123	106/123
02*	57,02%	58,54%		77/123	78/123	45/74	48/75	28/117	94/120	97/120	64/83	104/123	82/123
03*	82,64%	83,74%	62,60%		122/123	39/74	42/75	38/117	70/120	73/120	48/83	77/123	115/123
03c	83,47%	84,55%	63,41%	99,19%		40/74	43/75	39/117	71/120	74/120	49/84	78/123	116/123
04*	52,70%	54,05%	60,81%	52,70%	54,05%		71/74	27/71	44/73	46/73	23/45	53/74	42/74
04c	56,76%	57,33%	64,00%	56,00%	57,33%	95,95%		26/72	48/74	50/74	25/45	57/74	45/75
05*	33,04%	34,19%	23,93%	32,48%	33,33%	38,03%	36,11%		36/114	39/114	30/79	36/117	39/117
032*	53,39%	54,17%	78,33%	58,33%	59,17%	60,27%	64,86%	31,58%		117/120	63/80	101/120	77/120
032c	55,93%	56,67%	80,83%	60,83%	61,67%	63,01%	67,57%	34,21%	97,50%		65/80	104/120	80/120
038*	53,66%	55,42%	77,11%	57,83%	58,33%	51,11%	55,56%	37,97%	78,75%	81,25%		62/83	50/83
18	62,81%	63,41%	84,55%	62,60%	63,41%	71,62%	77,03%	30,77%	84,17%	86,67%	74,70%		80/123
NA28	85,12%	86,18%	66,67%	93,50%	94,31%	56,76%	60,00%	33,33%	64,17%	66,67%	60,24%	65,04%	

CH21	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	038c	18*	18c	NA28
01*		82/89	53/89	53/89	76/89	76/89	29/47	32/47	50/88	50/89	43/88	45/88	51/89	52/89	48/88	49/89	79/89
01c	92,13%		52/90	52/90	74/90	74/90	28/47	30/47	51/89	51/90	46/89	48/89	49/90	50/90	48/89	49/90	77/90
02*	59,55%	57,78%		90/90	54/90	54/90	36/47	37/47	34/89	34/90	65/89	67/89	66/90	67/90	69/89	70/90	55/90
02c	59,55%	57,78%	100,00%		54/91	54/91	36/47	37/47	34/89	34/90	66/90	68/90	67/91	68/91	70/90	71/91	55/91
03*	85,39%	82,22%	60,00%	59,34%		89/91	28/47	30/47	45/89	45/90	45/90	47/90	48/91	49/91	44/90	46/91	84/91
03c	85,39%	82,22%	60,00%	59,34%	97,80%		29/47	31/47	44/89	44/90	44/90	46/90	50/91	51/91	46/90	48/91	82/91
04*	61,70%	59,57%	76,60%	76,60%	59,57%	61,70%		44/47	17/46	17/47	27/46	27/46	38/47	38/47	35/46	37/47	31/47
04c	68,09%	63,83%	78,72%	78,72%	63,83%	65,96%	93,62%		18/46	18/47	28/46	28/46	41/47	41/47	38/46	40/47	33/47
05*	56,82%	57,30%	38,20%	38,20%	50,56%	49,44%	36,96%	39,13%		89/89	29/88	30/88	28/89	29/89	30/88	31/89	49/89
05c	56,18%	56,67%	37,78%	37,78%	50,00%	48,89%	36,17%	38,30%	100,00%		29/89	30/89	28/90	29/90	30/89	31/90	49/90
032*	48,86%	51,69%	73,03%	73,33%	50,00%	48,89%	58,70%	60,87%	32,95%	32,58%		88/90	66/90	67/90	64/89	66/90	47/90
032c	51,14%	53,93%	75,28%	75,56%	52,22%	51,11%	58,70%	60,87%	34,09%	33,71%	97,78%		66/90	67/90	64/89	66/90	49/90
038*	57,30%	54,44%	73,33%	73,63%	52,75%	54,95%	80,85%	87,23%	31,46%	31,11%	73,33%	73,33%		90/91	70/90	72/91	53/91
038c	58,43%	55,56%	74,44%	74,73%	53,85%	56,04%	80,85%	87,23%	32,58%	32,22%	74,44%	74,44%	98,90%		71/90	73/91	54/91
18*	54,55%	53,93%	77,53%	77,78%	48,89%	51,11%	76,09%	82,61%	34,09%	33,71%	71,91%	71,91%	77,78%	78,89%		89/90	49/90
18c	55,06%	54,44%	77,78%	78,02%	50,55%	52,75%	78,72%	85,11%	34,83%	34,44%	73,33%	73,33%	79,12%	80,22%	98,89%		51/91
NA28	88,76%	85,56%	61,11%	60,44%	92,31%	90,11%	65,96%	70,21%	55,06%	54,44%	52,22%	54,44%	58,24%	59,34%	54,44%	56,04%	

CH22	P69	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	0171	18*	18c	NA28
P69		15/23	15/23	15/22	15/22	14/23	14/23	16/23	16/23	-	-	7/21	7/21	14/23	14/23	14/22	10/12	14/22	14/22	17/22
P75*	65,22%		155/158	126/155	135/158	96/158	97/158	148/158	147/158	24/34	24/34	45/150	46/150	94/158	95/158	98/157	29/42	96/158	97/158	148/158
P75c	65,22%	98,10%		128/155	137/158	98/158	99/158	150/158	149/158	24/34	24/34	46/150	47/150	96/158	97/158	100/157	29/42	98/158	99/158	150/158
01*	68,18%	81,29%	82,58%		155/165	101/162	101/162	135/162	136/162	24/40	24/40	42/155	44/155	99/162	100/162	101/164	27/42	104/165	105/165	145/165
01c	68,18%	85,44%	86,71%	93,94%		106/165	107/165	144/165	145/165	27/41	27/41	47/158	49/158	105/165	106/165	108/167	29/42	108/168	109/168	154/168
02*	60,87%	60,76%	62,03%	62,35%	64,24%		164/166	104/166	107/166	23/41	23/41	40/156	40/156	137/166	139/166	127/165	23/42	139/166	139/166	110/166
02c	60,87%	61,39%	62,66%	62,35%	64,85%	98,80%		105/166	108/166	23/41	23/41	41/156	41/156	138/166	140/166	129/165	23/42	140/166	140/166	111/166
03*	69,57%	93,67%	94,94%	83,33%	87,27%	62,65%	63,25%		162/166	26/41	26/41	48/156	49/156	101/166	102/166	103/165	30/42	102/166	103/166	158/166
03c	69,57%	93,04%	94,30%	83,95%	87,88%	64,46%	65,06%	97,59%		26/41	26/41	48/156	49/156	104/166	105/166	106/165	30/42	105/166	106/166	159/166
04*	-	70,59%	70,59%	60,00%	65,85%	56,10%	56,10%	63,41%	63,41%		40/41	7/37	7/37	20/41	20/41	24/41	-	24/41	24/41	26/41
04c	-	70,59%	70,59%	60,00%	65,85%	56,10%	56,10%	63,41%	63,41%	97,56%		7/37	7/37	21/41	21/41	24/41	-	25/41	25/41	25/41
05*	33,33%	30,00%	30,67%	27,10%	29,75%	25,64%	26,28%	30,77%	30,77%	18,92%	18,92%		157/159	42/156	43/156	50/158	21/40	50/159	51/159	50/159
05c	33,33%	30,67%	31,33%	28,39%	31,01%	25,64%	26,28%	31,41%	31,41%	18,92%	18,92%	98,74%		42/156	43/156	50/158	21/40	50/159	51/159	51/159
032*	60,87%	59,49%	60,76%	61,11%	63,64%	82,53%	83,13%	60,84%	62,65%	48,78%	51,22%	26,92%	26,92%		163/166	128/165	19/42	136/166	137/166	107/166
032c	60,87%	60,13%	61,39%	61,73%	64,24%	83,73%	84,34%	61,45%	63,25%	48,78%	51,22%	27,56%	27,56%	98,19%		130/165	19/42	138/166	138/166	108/166
038*	63,64%	62,42%	63,69%	61,59%	64,67%	76,97%	78,18%	62,42%	64,24%	58,54%	58,54%	31,65%	31,65%	77,58%	78,79%		22/42	140/168	141/168	112/168
0171	83,33%	69,05%	69,05%	64,29%	69,05%	54,76%	54,76%	71,43%	71,43%	-	-	52,50%	52,50%	45,24%	45,24%	52,38%		20/42	20/42	30/42
18*	63,64%	60,76%	62,03%	63,03%	64,29%	83,73%	84,34%	61,45%	63,25%	58,54%	60,98%	31,45%	31,45%	81,93%	83,13%	83,33%	47,62%		168/169	112/169
18c	63,64%	61,39%	62,66%	63,64%	64,88%	83,73%	84,34%	62,05%	63,86%	58,54%	60,98%	32,08%	32,08%	82,53%	83,13%	83,93%	47,62%	99,41%		113/169
NA28	77,27%	93,67%	94,94%	87,88%	91,67%	66,27%	66,87%	95,18%	95,78%	63,41%	60,98%	31,45%	32,08%	64,46%	65,06%	66,67%	71,43%	66,27%	66,86%	

CH23	P75*	P75c	01*	01c	02*	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	18*	18c	NA28
P75*		146/148	114/146	119/148	76/148	128/148	129/148	57/85	41/86	44/129	43/129	71/144	71/144	72/147	75/148	76/148	131/148
P75c	98,65%		114/146	119/148	78/148	127/148	128/148	59/85	43/86	45/129	44/129	73/144	73/144	74/147	77/148	78/148	131/148
01*	78,08%	78,08%		134/147	70/146	111/146	112/146	57/85	50/86	42/127	43/127	67/142	67/142	71/145	73/146	74/146	122/147
01c	80,41%	80,41%	91,16%		81/148	118/148	119/148	60/85	52/86	49/129	50/129	79/144	79/144	81/147	84/148	85/148	132/149
02*	51,35%	52,70%	47,95%	54,73%		80/148	81/148	39/85	49/86	47/129	48/129	120/144	121/144	115/147	127/148	128/148	82/148
03*	86,49%	85,81%	76,03%	79,73%	54,05%		147/148	56/85	41/86	47/128	46/128	69/144	69/144	76/147	74/148	75/148	131/148
03c	87,16%	86,49%	76,71%	80,41%	54,73%	99,32%		56/85	41/86	48/128	47/128	70/144	70/144	77/147	75/148	76/148	132/148
04*	67,06%	69,41%	67,06%	70,59%	45,88%	65,88%	65,88%		60/85	23/74	24/74	40/82	40/82	40/85	41/85	42/85	60/85
04c	47,67%	50,00%	58,14%	60,47%	56,98%	47,67%	47,67%	70,59%		21/75	22/75	52/83	52/83	54/86	58/86	59/86	44/86
05*	34,11%	34,88%	33,07%	37,98%	36,43%	36,72%	37,50%	31,08%	28,00%		127/129	42/125	42/125	40/128	44/129	45/129	48/129
05c	33,33%	34,11%	33,86%	38,76%	37,21%	35,94%	36,72%	32,43%	29,33%	98,45%		41/125	41/125	39/128	45/129	46/129	49/129
032*	49,31%	50,69%	47,18%	54,86%	83,33%	47,92%	48,61%	48,78%	62,65%	33,60%	32,80%		143/144	113/143	126/144	127/144	79/144
032c	49,31%	50,69%	47,18%	54,86%	84,03%	47,92%	48,61%	48,78%	62,65%	33,60%	32,80%	99,31%		114/143	127/144	128/144	79/144
038*	48,98%	50,34%	48,97%	55,10%	78,23%	51,70%	52,38%	47,06%	62,79%	31,25%	30,47%	79,02%	79,72%		115/147	116/147	79/147
18*	50,68%	52,03%	50,00%	56,76%	85,81%	50,00%	50,68%	48,24%	67,44%	34,11%	34,88%	87,50%	88,19%	78,23%		147/148	81/148
18c	51,35%	52,70%	50,68%	57,43%	86,49%	50,68%	51,35%	49,41%	68,60%	34,88%	35,66%	88,19%	88,89%	78,91%	99,32%		82/148
NA28	88,51%	88,51%	82,99%	88,59%	55,41%	88,51%	89,19%	70,59%	51,16%	37,21%	37,98%	54,86%	54,86%	53,74%	54,73%	55,41%	

CH24	P75	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c	032*	032c	038*	18	33	NA28
P75		104/120	106/120	82/132	81/132	120/131	122/132	35/47	27/47	41/121	43/122	82/131	82/131	64/106	81/132	66/103	120/132
01*	86,67%		123/131	83/131	82/131	104/130	106/131	37/47	28/47	37/121	38/121	81/130	81/130	67/106	82/131	69/82	110/131
01c	88,33%	93,89%		86/131	85/131	108/130	110/131	36/47	29/47	37/121	38/121	83/130	83/130	72/106	87/131	74/82	112/131
02*	62,12%	63,36%	65,65%		132/133	85/131	87/132	29/47	40/47	32/122	33/123	109/132	111/132	86/107	117/133	67/94	93/133
02c	61,36%	62,60%	64,89%	99,25%		84/131	86/132	29/47	40/47	32/122	33/123	110/132	112/132	87/107	118/133	68/94	92/133
03*	91,60%	80,00%	83,08%	64,89%	64,12%		131/132	37/47	29/47	39/121	41/122	79/131	79/131	63/105	83/132	68/94	123/132
03c	92,42%	80,92%	83,97%	65,91%	65,15%	99,24%		37/47	29/47	40/122	42/123	81/132	81/132	65/106	85/133	68/94	125/133
04*	74,47%	78,72%	76,60%	61,70%	61,70%	78,72%	78,72%		32/47	13/46	13/46	29/47	29/47	14/25	29/49	18/25	38/47
04c	57,45%	59,57%	61,70%	85,11%	85,11%	61,70%	61,70%	68,09%		9/46	9/46	37/47	38/47	20/25	40/49	19/25	30/47
05*	33,88%	30,58%	30,58%	26,23%	26,23%	32,23%	32,79%	28,26%	19,57%		121/122	39/131	39/131	23/96	33/122	22/89	43/122
05c	35,25%	31,40%	31,40%	26,83%	26,83%	33,61%	34,15%	28,26%	19,57%	99,18%		40/132	40/132	24/97	34/123	23/90	45/123
032*	62,60%	62,31%	63,85%	82,58%	83,33%	60,31%	61,36%	61,70%	78,72%	29,77%	30,30%		130/132	89/106	116/132	70/93	89/132
032c	62,60%	62,31%	63,85%	84,09%	84,85%	60,31%	61,36%	61,70%	80,85%	29,77%	30,30%	98,48%		90/106	118/132	71/93	89/132
038*	60,38%	63,21%	67,92%	80,37%	81,31%	60,00%	61,32%	56,00%	80,00%	23,96%	24,74%	83,96%	84,91%		93/107	57/68	69/107
18	61,36%	62,60%	66,41%	87,97%	88,72%	62,88%	63,91%	59,18%	81,63%	27,05%	27,64%	87,88%	89,39%	86,92%		73/94	90/133
33	64,08%	84,15%	90,24%	71,28%	72,34%	72,34%	72,34%	72,00%	76,00%	24,72%	25,56%	75,27%	76,34%	83,82%	77,66%		71/94
NA28	90,91%	83,97%	85,50%	69,92%	69,17%	93,18%	93,98%	80,85%	63,83%	35,25%	36,59%	67,42%	67,42%	64,49%	67,67%	75,53%	

Appendix 5: Total result of Quantitative Analysis of Luke

Total	P3	P4	P7	P42	P45*	P45c	P69	P75*	P75c	P82	P97	P111
P3	-	-	-	-	9/15	9/15	-	24/30	24/30	4/6	-	-
P4	-	-	3/3	-	-	-	-	29/35	29/35	-	-	-
P7	-	100,00%	-	-	-	-	-	3/3	3/3	-	-	-
P42	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
P45*	60,00%	-	-	-	-	660/660	-	459/654	464/653	-	8/11	-
P45c	60,00%	-	-	-	100,00%	-	-	460/655	465/654	-	8/11	-
P69	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15/23	15/23	-	-	-
P75*	80,00%	82,86%	100,00%	-	70,18%	70,23%	65,22%	-	1993/2013	3/4	17/23	8/12
P75c	80,00%	82,86%	100,00%	-	71,06%	71,10%	65,22%	99,01%	-	3/4	17/23	8/12
P82	66,67%	-	-	-	-	-	-	75,00%	75,00%	-	-	-
P97	-	-	-	-	72,73%	72,73%	-	73,91%	73,91%	-	-	-
P111	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	66,67%	66,67%	-	-	-
01*	90,24%	78,87%	100,00%	100,00%	63,00%	62,90%	68,18%	76,64%	77,01%	70,00%	81,82%	60,00%
01c	93,02%	78,57%	100,00%	100,00%	63,48%	63,39%	68,18%	79,24%	79,75%	80,00%	86,36%	63,64%
02*	51,16%	50,51%	25,00%	66,67%	55,18%	55,10%	60,87%	59,77%	60,54%	20,00%	78,26%	66,67%
02c	51,16%	50,51%	25,00%	66,67%	54,95%	54,86%	60,87%	59,68%	60,45%	20,00%	78,26%	66,67%
03*	79,07%	93,94%	100,00%	100,00%	69,76%	69,80%	69,57%	90,32%	91,12%	90,00%	91,30%	58,33%
03c	72,09%	93,43%	100,00%	100,00%	69,45%	69,50%	69,57%	90,07%	90,88%	90,00%	91,30%	58,33%
04*	73,33%	62,02%	-	66,67%	56,66%	56,51%	-	65,82%	66,48%	-	-	-
04c	56,25%	55,81%	-	66,67%	54,95%	55,06%	-	61,43%	62,09%	-	-	-
05*	29,27%	38,20%	75,00%	100,00%	43,32%	43,32%	33,33%	38,83%	39,28%	66,67%	50,00%	33,33%
05c	29,27%	39,33%	75,00%	100,00%	43,51%	43,51%	33,33%	39,25%	39,69%	66,67%	50,00%	33,33%
019	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
032*	65,12%	73,89%	100,00%	100,00%	57,54%	57,45%	60,87%	61,15%	61,73%	80,00%	82,61%	66,67%
032c	65,12%	73,89%	100,00%	100,00%	57,45%	57,36%	60,87%	61,38%	61,95%	80,00%	82,61%	66,67%
038*	48,84%	55,56%	50,00%	100,00%	52,60%	52,52%	63,64%	59,46%	59,99%	50,00%	77,27%	66,67%
038c	46,51%	55,56%	50,00%	100,00%	52,45%	52,37%	63,64%	59,31%	59,84%	50,00%	77,27%	66,67%
0171	-	-	-	-	-	-	83,33%	69,05%	69,05%	-	-	-
0181	-	-	-	-	83,33%	83,33%	-	87,50%	87,50%	-	-	-
0182	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0312	-	33,33%	-	-	-	-	-	62,50%	62,50%	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18*	44,19%	47,21%	50,00%	66,67%	57,73%	57,64%	63,64%	59,48%	60,35%	40,00%	82,61%	75,00%
18c	44,19%	47,72%	50,00%	66,67%	57,73%	57,64%	63,64%	59,66%	60,53%	40,00%	82,61%	75,00%
33	-	68,72%	50,00%	66,67%	58,82%	58,82%	-	65,53%	65,53%	-	-	-
45	-	-	-	-	52,94%	55,56%	-	95,00%	95,00%	-	-	-
1349	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2860*	48,15%	51,09%	25,00%	66,67%	59,71%	59,29%	-	64,68%	64,96%	40,00%	-	-
2860c	48,15%	50,00%	25,00%	66,67%	59,71%	59,29%	-	64,48%	64,75%	40,00%	-	-
NA28	81,40%	89,90%	100,00%	100,00%	72,12%	72,16%	77,27%	90,31%	91,16%	90,00%	95,65%	83,33%

Total	01*	01c	02*	02c	03*	03c	04*	04c	05*	05c
P3	37/41	40/43	22/43	22/43	34/43	31/43	11/15	9/16	12/41	12/41
P4	153/194	154/196	100/198	100/198	186/198	185/198	80/129	72/129	68/178	70/178
P7	4/4	4/4	1/4	1/4	4/4	4/4	-	-	3/4	3/4
P42	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3	3/3	3/3	2/3	2/3	3/3	3/3
P45*	412/654	419/660	362/656	361/657	459/658	457/658	217/383	211/384	266/614	268/616
P45c	412/655	419/661	362/657	361/658	460/659	458/659	217/384	212/385	266/614	268/616
P69	15/22	15/22	14/23	14/23	16/23	16/23	-	-	7/21	7/21
P75*	1509/1969	1576/1989	1196/2001	1196/2004	1810/2004	1806/2005	597/907	559/910	718/1849	728/1855
P75c	1517/1970	1587/1990	1212/2002	1212/2005	1827/2005	1823/2006	603/907	565/910	727/1851	737/1857
P82	7/10	8/10	2/10	2/10	9/10	9/10	-	-	4/6	4/6
P97	18/22	19/22	18/23	18/23	21/23	21/23	-	-	11/22	11/22
P111	6/10	7/11	8/12	8/12	7/12	7/12	-	-	4/12	4/12
01*		2658/2925	1718/2908	1721/2911	2284/2912	2281/2913	843/1324	822/1329	1007/2723	1019/2736
01c	90,87%		1848/2936	1852/2939	2375/2941	2381/2940	916/1337	891/1343	1085/2751	1095/2764
02*	59,08%	62,94%		2940/2949	1814/2942	1831/2942	953/1334	1007/1340	983/2749	994/2761
02c	59,12%	63,01%	99,69%		1818/2946	1835/2946	957/1336	1012/1342	1008/2752	1019/2764
03*	78,43%	80,75%	61,66%	61,71%		2911/2952	880/1337	860/1341	1060/2697	1069/2711
03c	78,30%	80,99%	62,24%	62,29%	98,61%		886/1336	872/1341	1066/2698	1075/2712
04*	63,67%	68,51%	71,44%	71,63%	65,82%	66,32%		1203/1339	487/1237	492/1242
04c	61,85%	66,34%	75,15%	75,41%	64,13%	65,03%	89,84%		473/1243	479/1248
05*	36,98%	39,44%	35,76%	36,63%	39,30%	39,51%	39,37%	38,05%		2729/2758
05c	37,24%	39,62%	36,00%	36,87%	39,43%	39,64%	39,61%	38,38%	98,95%	
019	75,00%	75,00%	50,00%	50,00%	75,00%	75,00%	33,33%	33,33%	50,00%	50,00%
032*	61,06%	64,42%	75,11%	75,17%	63,66%	64,06%	66,56%	68,28%	36,54%	36,76%
032c	61,36%	64,70%	75,74%	75,81%	63,99%	64,42%	66,64%	68,43%	36,90%	37,12%
038*	58,79%	63,10%	76,05%	76,36%	60,25%	61,31%	69,84%	74,18%	36,55%	36,91%
038c	58,61%	62,93%	75,94%	76,29%	60,08%	61,21%	69,68%	74,26%	36,36%	36,73%
0171	64,29%	69,05%	54,76%	54,76%	71,43%	71,43%	-	-	52,50%	52,50%
0181	68,00%	64,00%	44,00%	44,00%	72,00%	76,00%	56,00%	56,00%	45,00%	42,86%
0182	70,00%	70,00%	72,73%	72,73%	72,73%	72,73%	-	-	27,27%	27,27%
0312	57,14%	57,14%	71,43%	71,43%	71,43%	71,43%	58,33%	58,33%	53,85%	53,85%
1	65,71%	68,57%	52,78%	55,56%	61,11%	61,11%	54,29%	51,43%	41,18%	41,18%
18*	58,51%	63,05%	85,43%	85,62%	60,58%	61,57%	73,96%	80,00%	36,27%	36,71%
18c	58,62%	63,22%	85,52%	85,71%	60,75%	61,73%	74,20%	80,24%	36,39%	36,82%
33	67,06%	75,07%	76,57%	77,00%	70,43%	70,24%	80,56%	81,51%	41,15%	41,53%
45	85,00%	85,00%	65,00%	65,00%	100,00%	100,00%	70,00%	65,00%	44,44%	44,44%
1349	88,89%	88,89%	63,04%	67,39%	93,48%	86,96%	57,78%	60,00%	52,27%	52,27%
2860*	57,52%	63,19%	86,48%	86,85%	64,60%	65,43%	76,55%	81,23%	39,77%	40,46%
2860c	57,41%	63,08%	86,59%	86,96%	64,50%	65,33%	76,38%	81,07%	39,89%	40,57%
NA28	81,98%	84,90%	66,33%	66,44%	93,94%	93,77%	69,83%	66,47%	41,45%	41,74%

Total	019	032*	032c	038*	038c	0171	0181	0182	0312
P3	-	28/43	28/43	21/43	20/43	-	-	-	-
P4	-	133/180	133/180	110/198	110/198	-	-	-	1/3
P7	-	4/4	4/4	2/4	2/4	-	-	-	-
P42	-	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3	-	-	-	-
P45*	-	374/650	374/651	344/654	343/654	-	10/12	-	-
P45c	-	374/651	374/652	344/655	343/655	-	10/12	-	-
P69	-	14/23	14/23	14/22	14/22	10/12	-	-	-
P75*	-	1209/1977	1214/1978	1172/1971	1169/1971	29/42	21/24	-	5/8
P75c	-	1221/1978	1226/1979	1183/1972	1180/1972	29/42	21/24	-	5/8
P82	-	8/10	8/10	5/10	5/10	-	-	-	-
P97	-	19/23	19/23	17/22	17/22	-	-	-	-
P111	-	8/12	8/12	8/12	8/12	-	-	-	-
01*	3/4	1725/2825	1734/2826	1666/2834	1661/2834	27/42	17/25	7/10	8/14
01c	3/4	1838/2853	1846/2853	1806/2862	1801/2862	29/42	16/25	7/10	8/14
02*	2/4	2145/2856	2164/2857	2175/2860	2172/2860	23/42	11/25	8/11	10/14
02c	2/4	2150/2860	2169/2861	2187/2864	2185/2864	23/42	11/25	8/11	10/14
03*	3/4	1820/2859	1830/2860	1725/2863	1720/2863	30/42	18/25	8/11	10/14
03c	3/4	1832/2860	1843/2861	1756/2864	1753/2864	30/42	19/25	8/11	10/14
04*	1/3	850/1277	851/1277	889/1273	887/1273	-	14/25	-	7/12
04c	1/3	876/1283	878/1283	948/1278	949/1278	-	14/25	-	7/12
05*	2/4	979/2679	989/2680	978/2676	973/2676	21/40	9/20	3/11	7/13
05c	2/4	990/2693	1000/2694	993/2690	988/2690	21/40	9/21	3/11	7/13
019	-	-	-	2/4	2/4	-	-	-	-
032*	-	-	2848/2869	1924/2776	1919/2776	19/42	13/25	9/11	8/13
032c	-	99,27%	-	1933/2777	1928/2777	19/42	13/25	8/11	8/13
038*	50,00%	69,31%	69,61%	-	2712/2722	22/42	11/24	8/11	6/13
038c	50,00%	69,13%	69,43%	99,63%	-	22/42	11/24	8/11	6/13
0171	-	45,24%	45,24%	52,38%	52,38%	-	-	-	-
0181	-	52,00%	52,00%	45,83%	45,83%	-	-	-	-
0182	-	81,82%	72,73%	72,73%	72,73%	-	-	-	-
0312	-	61,54%	61,54%	46,15%	46,15%	-	-	-	-
1	50,00%	-	-	50,00%	50,00%	-	-	-	-
18*	50,00%	76,12%	76,58%	78,28%	78,15%	47,62%	60,00%	54,55%	78,57%
18c	50,00%	76,30%	76,73%	78,45%	78,32%	47,62%	60,00%	54,55%	78,57%
33	50,00%	67,11%	67,26%	76,89%	76,59%	-	-	-	50,00%
45	-	65,00%	65,00%	65,00%	65,00%	-	-	-	-
1349	75,00%	60,00%	60,00%	50,00%	50,00%	-	-	-	-
2860*	25,00%	64,34%	64,58%	81,30%	80,98%	-	50,00%	-	78,57%
2860c	25,00%	64,34%	64,58%	81,20%	80,87%	-	50,00%	-	78,57%
NA28	75,00%	67,79%	68,12%	64,74%	64,58%	71,43%	72,00%	72,73%	78,57%

Total	1	18*	18c	33	45	1349	2860*	2860c	NA28
P3	-	19/43	19/43	-	-	-	13/27	13/27	35/43
P4	-	93/197	94/197	134/195	-	-	47/92	46/92	178/198
P7	-	2/4	2/4	2/4	-	-	1/4	1/4	4/4
P42	-	2/3	2/3	2/3	-	-	2/3	2/3	3/3
P45*	-	381/660	381/660	20/34	9/17	-	83/139	83/139	476/660
P45c	-	381/661	381/661	20/34	10/18	-	83/140	83/140	477/661
P69	-	14/22	14/22	-	-	-	-	-	17/22
P75*	-	1192/2004	1198/2008	192/293	19/20	-	315/487	314/487	1818/2013
P75c	-	1210/2005	1216/2009	192/293	19/20	-	317/488	316/488	1836/2014
P82	-	4/10	4/10	-	-	-	4/10	4/10	9/10
P97	-	19/23	19/23	-	-	-	-	-	22/23
P111	-	9/12	9/12	-	-	-	-	-	10/12
01*	23/35	1705/2914	1711/2919	456/680	17/20	40/45	524/911	523/911	2398/2925
01c	24/35	1855/2942	1863/2947	515/686	17/20	40/45	582/921	581/921	2507/2953
02*	19/36	2515/2944	2522/2949	536/700	13/20	29/46	793/917	794/917	1956/2949
02c	20/36	2524/2948	2531/2953	539/700	13/20	31/46	799/920	800/920	1962/2953
03*	22/36	1786/2948	1794/2953	493/700	20/20	43/46	595/921	594/921	2774/2953
03c	22/36	1815/2948	1823/2953	491/699	20/20	40/46	602/920	601/920	2769/2953
04*	19/35	991/1340	995/1341	286/355	14/20	26/45	470/614	469/614	935/1339
04c	18/35	1076/1345	1080/1346	291/357	13/20	27/45	502/618	501/618	894/1345
05*	14/34	999/2754	1004/2759	272/661	8/18	23/44	346/870	347/870	1144/2760
05c	14/34	1016/2768	1021/2773	277/667	8/18	23/44	354/875	355/875	1158/2774
019	2/4	2/4	2/4	2/4	-	3/4	1/4	1/4	3/4
032*	-	2177/2860	2186/2865	455/678	13/20	3/5	554/861	554/861	1945/2869
032c	-	2191/2861	2199/2866	456/678	13/20	3/5	556/861	556/861	1955/2870
038*	18/36	2245/2868	2254/2873	519/675	13/20	23/46	748/920	747/920	1860/2873
038c	18/36	2242/2869	2251/2874	517/675	13/20	23/46	745/920	744/920	1856/2874
0171	-	20/42	20/42	-	-	-	-	-	30/42
0181	-	15/25	15/25	-	-	-	1/2	1/2	18/25
0182	-	6/11	6/11	-	-	-	-	-	8/11
0312	-	11/14	11/14	3/6	-	-	11/14	11/14	11/14
1		22/36	22/36	-	-	22/36	20/36	20/36	22/36
18*	61,11%		2953/2957	536/701	13/20	31/46	875/922	876/922	1922/2957
18c	61,11%	99,86%		537/701	13/20	31/46	875/922	876/922	1930/2962
33	-	76,46%	76,60%		-	-	358/461	359/461	521/701
45	-	65,00%	65,00%	-		-	12/20	12/20	20/20
1349	61,11%	67,39%	67,39%	-	-		33/46	33/46	46/46
2860*	55,56%	94,90%	94,90%	77,66%	60,00%	71,74%		921/922	636/922
2860c	55,56%	95,01%	95,01%	77,87%	60,00%	71,74%	99,89%		577/829
NA28	61,11%	65,00%	65,16%	74,32%	100,00%	100,00%	68,98%	69,60%	