

Scribal Habits in \mathfrak{P}^{127} (P.Oxy. 74.4968)

Alan Taylor Farnes, University of Birmingham

Abstract: The scribal habits in \mathfrak{P}^{127} confirm James R. Royse’s findings that early New Testament scribes omit more than they add. Although \mathfrak{P}^{127} reflects more omissions than additions, the scribe’s habits are nevertheless strikingly different than Royse’s scribes. Royse also wonders if scribal conventions may have changed, becoming more fixed in post-Constantine Christianity. Such a question would require an investigation of many later manuscripts. \mathfrak{P}^{127} , however, does not represent a fixed, more stable text. Rather, the opposite is true: \mathfrak{P}^{127} displays a high degree of textual variance. More studies of this type are needed to determine if \mathfrak{P}^{127} is indicative of the fifth century or if other fifth-century witnesses exhibit textual fixity.

James R. Royse, in his 2008 *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, calls upon New Testament text critics to reexamine New Testament witnesses according to what he calls the “Colwell method.” This method was pioneered and popularized by Ernest C. Colwell in a groundbreaking study from 1969.¹ Colwell’s method analyzes the singular readings of a manuscript—readings which exist in only one manuscript. It is then assumed that a singular reading is the invention of the copyist of the manuscript.² Royse calls upon text critics to assist in this work, saying

Ideally, of course, all the major witnesses to the text of the New Testament—that is, the continuous-text Greek manuscripts, the lectionaries, the versional manuscripts, and the Fathers—would be studied in detail in order to provide this same kind of information concerning scribal

¹ Ernest C. Colwell, “Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits: A Study of \mathfrak{P}^{45} , \mathfrak{P}^{66} , \mathfrak{P}^{75} ,” in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism*, NTTS 9 (Leiden: Brill, 1969), 108: “this study is restricted to singular readings (readings without other manuscript support) on the assumption that these readings are the creation of the scribe. The restriction of this study to singular readings can be made with confidence in view of the wealth of manuscript attestation for the Greek New Testament. A singular reading has been defined as a reading which has no Greek support in the critical apparatus of Tischendorf’s 8th edition.”

² James R. Royse, *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, NTTSD 36 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 39: “[Colwell’s] view is that the singular readings of a manuscript are the textual creations of the scribe, and thus that an analysis of the patterns found within these singular readings will reveal the habits of the scribe.”

habits, translational tendencies, and so on. One's assertions could then be based on empirical evidence about the witnesses.³

He then entreats text critics to systematically and methodically reanalyze all of the witnesses of the New Testament with respect to singular readings in order to ascertain each scribe's tendencies.⁴ He invites his fellow text critics to perform the same type of analysis of the witnesses as the study he performed on the six extensive early Greek papyri. To Royse, such an undertaking is imperative in order to determine the very foundational principles of textual criticism.⁵ Royse attempts to move away from previous general assumptions in order to base text-critical decisions on known data. Royse's massive work attempted to overturn, at least with respect to the six early papyri which he analyzed, the long-held text-critical maxim *lectio brevior potior*. In its place Royse concludes that, *ceteris paribus*, the early New Testament scribes who he studied tended to omit rather than to add.⁶ Therefore, if a canon is to be set in place, it should be *lectio longior potior*.⁷ Royse is cautious, however, to warn against any categorical canon because it is likely that some scribes acted one way and others acted another. Therefore, because broad generalizations from some scribes should not be projected onto the habits of other scribes, a methodical study of the habits of each scribe must be carried out. Only after we understand each scribe's tendencies can we then use these data to assist in evaluating readings.

Royse's Reception

Royse's theory has been widely accepted by text critics, and many have used this method in similar studies.⁸ Juan Hernández Jr. applauds Royse's work: "I do think that Royse has not only fulfilled Colwell's wish for a commentary on the singular readings, but that he has sur-

³ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 13. See also his earlier work: James R. Royse, "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, SD 46 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 239–52 = James R. Royse, "Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament," in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis: Second Edition*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 461–78.

⁴ The need for these studies is emphasized by Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 4: "The general habits serve, then, as the basis of our knowledge of transcriptional probability (and improbability): what sorts of alterations scribes are likely (or unlikely) to have made in the text." Quoting Colwell, Royse urges text critics to "begin at the beginning" and "commence with the oldest witnesses and work down the stream of tradition" (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 14). Here he quotes Ernest C. Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," in *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, 159. Again, Royse reemphasizes, "The scribal (and translational) peculiarities of all the major sources for the New Testament should be catalogued" (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 738).

⁵ "We wish to find a way to characterize the habits of scribes that will avoid, as far as is possible, both any question-begging assumptions about scribal behavior and any controversial presuppositions about the history of the text. Some presuppositions are, as we shall see, necessary; but they should be as limited as possible in order that the results attained can be used with confidence in deciding textual issues" (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 31).

⁶ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 719–20.

⁷ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 734.

⁸ For additional studies that use Royse's method, see Peter M. Head, "Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the 'Scribal Habits,'" *Bib* 71 (1990): 240–47; Peter M. Head, "The Habits of New Testament Copyists: Singular Readings in the Early Fragmentary Papyri of John," *Bib* 85 (2004): 399–408; Thomas A. Wayment, "The Scribal Characteristics of the Freer

passed it by producing a veritable *encyclopedia* on them—an encyclopedia that deserves to take its rightful place as *the* canonical standard for *any* study of scribal habits for generations to come.”⁹ Hernández’s own study of the scribal habits in witnesses of the book of Revelation supports Roysse’s findings: “On the basis of careful study of the singular readings of each MS, it is clear that the scribes of these MSS tended to omit far more often than they added to their texts.”¹⁰

Peter M. Head, after conducting his own study of early papyri, comments that his findings agree with Roysse’s and that “most fundamental is the support given to the conclusion that omission is more common than addition.”¹¹ Head then performed a second study of this same type with the same results saying that “in general, omission was more common than addition.... Broadly speaking these results serve to confirm the picture presented in our previous study of the early manuscripts of the synoptic gospels, and thus serve as further confirmation of the much fuller study of Roysse.”¹² Lastly, Head reaffirms that “once again it seems that the evidence suggests that most early scribes are more likely to omit than to add material.”¹³

David C. Parker voices two questions concerning the singular readings method. First, due to incomplete collations, some supposed singular readings may not in fact be singular.¹⁴ Second, singular readings are only singular readings until another manuscript is found which contains the same reading. In such a case, the reading is no longer singular.¹⁵ Parker accepts,

Pauline Codex,” in *The Freer Biblical Manuscripts: Fresh Studies of an American Treasure Trove*, ed. Larry Hurtado, TCS 6 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 251–62; Juan Hernández Jr., *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse: The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT 2/218 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Dirk Jongkind, *Scribal Habits of Codex Sinaiticus*, TS 5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2007); Daniel B. Sharp, “Early Coptic Singular Readings in the Gospel of John” (PhD diss., Claremont Graduate University, 2012); Peter Head, “The Early Text of Mark,” in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. Charles E. Hill and Michael J. Kruger (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 108–20; Juan Hernández, “The Early Text of Luke,” in Hill and Kruger, *Early Text of the New Testament*, 121–39; Peter Malik, “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus: A Test Case from the Gospel of Mark,” *BASP* 50 (2013): 207–54.

⁹ Juan Hernández Jr., Peter M. Head, Dirk Jongkind, and James R. Roysse, “Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri: Papers from the 2008 SBL Panel Review Session,” *TC* 17 (2012): 8, emphasis in original. See also Tommy Wasserman, “Criteria for Evaluating Readings in New Testament Textual Criticism,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed., NTTSD 42 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 589: “The ‘shorter reading’ criterion ... is one of the most debated criteria and has proven to be in such need of qualification that some regard it as relatively useless, in particular for the early papyri.” See also Kim Haines-Eitzen, “The Social History of Early Christian Scribes,” in Ehrman and Holmes, *Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research*, 2nd ed., 488: “Roysse’s work sheds important light on the tendencies of scribes and works to counter some of the maxims of textual criticism (e.g., the preference for the shorter reading).”

¹⁰ Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse*, 194.

¹¹ Head, “Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels,” 246.

¹² Head, “Habits of New Testament Copyists,” 407.

¹³ Head, “Habits of New Testament Copyists,” 408.

¹⁴ David C. Parker, review of *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*, by James R. Roysse, *BASP* 46 (2009): 256.

¹⁵ Parker, review of *Scribal Habits*, 256. Such is the case in my analysis of Ψ^{127} . Many readings which were previously singular readings in Codex Bezae (05) are no longer singular because of their support by Ψ^{127} . Examples are Acts 10:33: παρακαλων ελθειν προς ημας; Acts 10:33: εν ταχει; Acts 10:33: ιδου; Acts 10:41: συνανεστραφημεν; Acts 10:41: ημερας; Acts 11:2: ποιουμενος δια των

however, that such difficulties may not be fatal and that “it has to be acknowledged that such tendencies do emerge, and with them evidence about the way in which scribes went about their work.”¹⁶ Parker questions Roysse’s conclusion that *lectio brevior* be reversed in favor of the longer reading on a grand scale but accepts Roysse’s findings with respect to the early papyri. Parker wants to be sure that Roysse’s findings are not expanded outside of their proper time frame unless further research is conducted.

My recent dissertation at the University of Birmingham analyzed manuscripts for which a known exemplar exists.¹⁷ I analyzed these manuscripts both by their actual scribal habits—how accurately the scribes copied the known exemplar—but also by their singular readings. In this way, the analysis served as a way to check Roysse’s method by comparing actual habits against habits found using Roysse’s singular readings method. I found that his method identified about 93 percent of one scribe’s total variants but only about 56 percent of another scribe’s total variants. Additionally, there was no constant rate at which Roysse’s method fell short so I was unable to apply a coefficient to determine actual error rates using the singular reading method. I was, however, with respect to the scribes studied in my study, able to confirm Roysse’s rejection of *lectio brevior*. None of the scribes I studied added words on the whole. But I could not confirm Roysse’s *lectio longior*. Some of the scribes I studied neither added nor omitted while some did omit as did Roysse’s scribes. So, while I could confirm Roysse’s rejection of *lectio brevior*, with respect to the scribes I studied, I was not able to confirm Roysse’s *lectio longior*.

Elijah Hixson has recently completed a PhD at the University of Edinburgh.¹⁸ His dissertation, among other things, asked many of the same questions as mine but used a different procedure to check Roysse’s method. Instead of finding manuscripts with a known exemplar as I did, Hixson found a group of sixth-century sibling manuscripts—manuscripts which were all copied from the same exemplar but whose exemplar no longer survives. Using these three sibling manuscripts, 022, 023, and 042, Hixson could confidently reconstruct what the exemplar most likely read. He also analyzed the scribe’s habits according to actual scribal habits and their habits according to Roysse’s singular reading method and, like me, found that Roysse’s method falls short, saying: “It is clear that *with respect to the three manuscripts of this study*, the *singular readings method* fails to reveal the tendencies of a manuscript’s scribe.”¹⁹ But Hixson is careful not to throw Roysse’s method away entirely, writing:

Even if the *singular readings method* fails with respect to the sixth-century Greek purple Gospel manuscripts, it is entirely possible that it could provide a sufficiently accurate assessment of the scribes of earlier manuscripts.²⁰

Another problem with Roysse’s method is that it necessitates the use of hypothetical and reconstructed exemplars since his method must reconstruct hypothetically what the exemplar of the manuscript in question may have said. Roysse concedes that the method is not perfect and that

$\chi\omega\rho\omega\nu$ διδασκων αυτους ος και κατηντησεν; Acts 11:2: και απηγγειλεν αυτοις την χαριν του θεου; Acts 11:2: αδελφοι ... προς αυτον; Acts 12:1: τας χειρας (transposition); Acts 12:3: η επιχειρησει αυτου επι τους πιστους; Acts 12:7: τω πετρω; Acts 15:34: μονος δε ιουδας επορευθη; Acts 15:35: ο δε παυλος. These readings were previously only present in 05 and were therefore called singular readings of 05 before the discovery of Ψ^{127} but are now no longer singular readings.

¹⁶ Parker, review of *Scribal Habits*, 256–57.

¹⁷ Alan Taylor Farnes, “Selected Habits in New Testament Manuscripts, Including those with Surviving Exemplars” (PhD diss., University of Birmingham, 2017).

¹⁸ Elijah Michael Hixson, “The Gospel of Matthew in a Sixth-Century Manuscript Family: Scribal Habits in the Purple Codices 022, 023 and 042” (PhD diss., University of Edinburgh, 2017).

¹⁹ Hixson, “Scribal Habits in the Purple Codices,” 229, emphasis in original.

²⁰ Hixson, “Scribal Habits in the Purple Codices,” 230, emphasis in original.

not all scribally created readings will be found among the singular readings.²¹ Additionally, there is no way to know if a singular reading is indeed scribally created or if the scribe inherited the reading from a now lost exemplar.²² Royse's method is indeed one of the best and most fruitful methods available but it is not without its flaws. It remains, nonetheless, perhaps the best method for determining scribal habits when the exemplar of a manuscript is not known.

\mathfrak{P}^{127}

Although \mathfrak{P}^{127} is a fifth-century fragmentary witness of Acts, a study analyzing its scribal habits and its singular readings will still be useful and should follow Royse's method in order to compare the resulting statistics to those of Royse's scribes. Additionally, Peter Head has used Royse's method on a manuscript as small and fragmentary as \mathfrak{P}^{52} . D. C. Parker and S. R. Pickering explicitly state that such a study is needed: "A number of these [distinctive] readings were previously singulars in Codex Bezae. The task of analysing the differences between them in these distinctive readings will be an important task in the re-examination of the tradition."²⁴ \mathfrak{P}^{127} is especially deserving of such an analysis because it has received the high praise that it is "the most significant new addition to the Greek evidence since the publication in 1927 of P.Mich.inv.1571, containing 18:27–19.6, 19:12–16 (Gregory–Aland \mathfrak{P}^{38})." Lastly, Georg Gäbel comments that Acts is "among the most fascinating problems of New Testament textual scholarship. Every fresh piece of evidence that allows us to gain new insight into this problem will therefore be most welcome."²⁶

The resulting data of this analysis will be used to determine whether the scribe of this fifth-century manuscript tended to add or omit and to determine the other general tendencies of this scribe (see the appendix for the complete compilation of the singular readings of \mathfrak{P}^{127}). More analyses on other fifth-century witnesses will be needed in order to determine whether the habits of the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} represents most fifth-century witnesses or if \mathfrak{P}^{127} is an anomaly.

²¹ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 42.

²² Royse counters this problem by discussing the concept of a complex scribe where all the variants from potential lost exemplars can be grouped under the single scribe in question. Royse also appeals to Ockham's razor so as to not unnecessarily multiply potential lost exemplars. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 50–55. Royse's discussion of the complex scribe is confusing and overly complicated. Royse states himself that "there is one respect in which the existence of a complex scribe could perhaps skew our conclusions. This is the judgment, in some absolute terms, of the accuracy of the scribe" (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 54). We are mostly concerned with the accuracy of the individual scribe, and therefore Royse's notion of a "complex scribe" is not useful for our purposes. We want to know, inasmuch is possible, exactly how accurately the single scribe themselves copied the text from their exemplar.

²³ Head, "Habits of New Testament Copyists," 399–408.

²⁴ D. C. Parker and S. R. Pickering, "4968. Acta Apostolorum 10–12, 15–17," in *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXXIV*, ed. D. Leith et. al. (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2009), 13.

²⁵ Parker and Pickering, "4968," 3.

²⁶ Georg Gäbel, "The Text of \mathfrak{P}^{127} and Its Relationship with the Text of Codex Bezae," *NovT* 53 (2011): 107–8. Gäbel accepts Royse's findings that the scribes tended to omit more than they added. See Gäbel, "Text of \mathfrak{P}^{127} ," 118 n. 16, 127, 138, 144.

Methodology

On the whole, I follow Royse's method as closely as possible. For the transcription of this papyrus I rely wholly on Parker and Pickering's transcription without questioning their reading of the papyrus or their reconstruction of the text. I will follow the methodology outlined by Royse for determining singular readings;²⁷ specifically, I will restrict collation to continuous-text Greek manuscripts.²⁸ For the purposes of this paper I will compile statistics for all singular readings as found in the *editio princeps*. Even if a singular reading is found in a lacuna, I will trust the reconstructed transcription by the editors.²⁹ Diverging slightly from Royse's model, this study has omitted "asterisked readings"³⁰ because, for the purposes of this paper, I am interested only in actual singular readings.

The Manuscript

Ψ^{127} (P.Oxy. 74.4968) is the "remains of eight leaves from two gatherings of a papyrus codex." It contains Acts 10–12, 15–17 and is dated to the fifth century. Although the codex is fragmentary it is still quite extensive and fits within Eric G. Turner's aberrants of group six.³² The manuscript employs seven nomina sacra to abbreviate the following nouns: θεός, πνεῦμα, πατήρ, κύριος, Ἰησοῦς, Χριστός, and ἄνθρωπος. The hand is a relaxed biblical majuscule with brown ink and generally follows Maas's law to a slight degree in that the text of the page slants down and to the left. The folia survive in varying degrees of preservation; most of the beginning is highly lacunose, but then it is better preserved toward the end of the manuscript. Ψ^{127} is notable because it is one of only seven extant New Testament papyri to be written in two columns.³³ Folio 7a displays a page number ($\overline{\rho\iota\beta} = 112$) which suggests that the manuscript contained only Acts.³⁴ The manuscript also retains the remnants of binding ties and binding holes. In addition, our fragment contains some of the most interesting passages in Acts: Cornelius's baptism, James of Zebedee's death by Herod, Peter's miraculous escape from prison, the end of the Jerusalem council, Paul's separation from Barnabas, a "we" passage, and, the best-preserved passage in this manuscript, Paul and Silas's seismic escape from jail.

²⁷ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 39–101.

²⁸ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 73.

²⁹ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 93.

³⁰ Royse explains the importance of asterisked readings to determine a possible *Vorlage* and related mss: "Readings that are singular according to the evidence in Tischendorf, but find support from other sources consulted, are removed from consideration by being prefixed with '*'. These readings, while *not properly part of our investigation*, are nevertheless of interest since the support is usually slender and, I believe, often likely to be coincidental. Thus I have attempted to indicate the origin of these readings as with the singular readings, and have cited them as supplementary evidence" (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 94, emphasis added). See also Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 67. Unlike the papyri studied by Royse, Ψ^{127} shares a very large number of readings with other mss (to a very high degree with Codex Bezae [05] but also to a lower degree with Vaticanus [03]), as noted by Parker and Pickering, "4968," 13. Perhaps a future study would analyze readings shared with manuscripts other than Bezae. For the purposes of this paper, we are only concerned with singular readings.

³¹ Parker and Pickering, "4968," 1.

³² Eric G. Turner, *The Typology of the Early Codex* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1977), 18. See also, Parker and Pickering, "4968," 1.

³³ Parker and Pickering, "4968," 2.

³⁴ Parker and Pickering, "4968," 3.

Scribal Habits of \mathfrak{P}^{127}

Corrections

A total of twelve corrections can be seen in \mathfrak{P}^{127} (at 12:2; 12:3b;³⁵ 16:13a; 16:16d; 16:16e; 16:16f; 16:30; 16:38c; 16:40; 17:1; 17:4d; 17:7c). None of the corrections is an *in scribendo* correction, and Hand 1 made only one of the corrections (Acts 12:3b). Therefore only this one correction will concern us. Royse argues that when the original scribe corrects an original reading, the final reading is evaluated. Since our aim is to get an idea of the original scribe's habits, if they³⁵ correct their own mistake then that is part of their own habit and the correction is the text that will stand. However, if the text is corrected by a different, later hand then the text of the first hand will stand. In sum, the latest version of the text as written by the original scribe will be the text that is evaluated for a singular reading. Royse explains: "I have decided to treat all corrections by someone other than the scribe simply as corrections by a later hand, and have thus ignored them when considering the habits of the scribe. In fact, such corrections should be treated simply as another manuscript."³⁶ Therefore, we will only discuss corrections made by the first hand in this section. We will however discuss singular readings that were not corrected by Hand 1 in the "Accuracy and Copying Technique" section.

Corrections to a Singular Reading

There are no places in our papyrus where the original scribe corrects one of their singular readings to a nonsingular reading. One possible correction is found in the insertion of $\kappa(\alpha\iota)$ at 16:13a. However, due to the thickness of the reed, the darkness of the ink, and the ductus (the bottom angled stroke of the κ attaches to the *hasta* whereas most of the time our scribe writes a κ with the final angled stroke touching the first angled stroke) this correction was most likely

³⁵ Throughout this paper I will employ the gender-neutral singular "they" pronoun when referring to a scribe whose preferred personal gender pronoun is unknown since ancient scribes were not in all cases male. This may sound awkward at times, but I will not assume that all scribes in this study were male. On the use of the singular "they," see Amy Warena, "They," *Writing Across the Curriculum* 4 (1993): 99 and Julie Foertsch and Morton Ann Gernsbacher, "In Search of Gender Neutrality: Is Singular *They* a Cognitively Efficient Substitute for Generic *He*?," *Psychological Science* 8.2 (1997): 106. On female scribes see Kim Haines-Eitzen, "'Girls Trained in Beautiful Writing': Female Scribes in Roman Antiquity and Early Christianity," *J ECS* 6 (1998): 629–46. The fact that it is a possibility that a woman was a scribe should be tempered by the fact that most scribes were indeed men. See, for example, Georgi Parpulov's statement: "All but a few scribes were men, yet Hagiopetrites had a daughter who inherited the profession." Georgi R. Parpulov, "The Bibles of the Christian East," in *From 600–1450*, vol. 2 of *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*, ed. Richard Marsden and E. Ann Matter (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), 313.

³⁶ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 77. Also, "Colwell in fact examines the readings of his manuscripts *before* correction, and thus includes as singular readings many errors that the scribes themselves corrected. However, in my opinion this practice is unjustified, and may give a very misleading impression of a scribe's activity" (Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 74, emphasis in original). Lastly, Larry W. Hurtado, *The Earliest Christian Artifacts: Manuscripts and Christian Origins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 186: "It is important to distinguish between corrections made by the original scribe, corrections made by another scribe but in a contemporary hand, and corrections that appear to be from a later hand. The last sort of corrections may offer important indications of how readers later than the time of the original scribe read a given text, and what sorts of readings they preferred. Corrections in the hand of the original scribe, however, tell us more about the attitude of that scribe toward the task of copying, and how concerned the scribe was to produce a satisfactory copy."

not performed by the original scribe. Therefore, although this is the original scribe's best candidate for a correction, I believe this is a correction by a later hand.

Attempted Corrections to a Singular Reading

One singular reading exists at **Acts 12:3b** where the original scribe “corrected” from a singular to another singular reading. Hand 1 expunges (with expunging dots placed above the characters) $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma$ in $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma[\lambda]\alpha\beta\epsilon\theta\alpha$ and replaces the prefix with $c[\upsilon\lambda]$ resulting in $c[\upsilon\lambda\lambda]\alpha\beta\epsilon\theta\alpha$. This changes the word from $\pi\rho\omicron\varsigma[\lambda]\alpha\beta\epsilon\theta\alpha$, a singular reading, to $c[\upsilon\lambda\lambda]\alpha\beta\epsilon\theta\alpha$ which is also a singular reading. The references below constitute readings that are found only in \mathfrak{P}^{127} and in no other known Greek manuscript. See the appendix for a full apparatus of each singular reading.

Insignificant Singulars

Royse classifies orthographic singulars and nonsense singulars as insignificant singular variants. When a distinction is made between significant and insignificant singular readings the significant singular readings are the total number of singular readings without the orthographic and nonsense singular readings.³⁷

Orthographic Singulars

Out of a total of 209 singular variants found in \mathfrak{P}^{127} , a total of two orthographic singular readings are found, which are divided into two parts: proper names and all others. Two orthographic variants exist for proper names at **16:25b** and **16:29b** (which will be tabulated under substitutions; see below, “Proper Names”). Concerning orthographic singular variants, Royse states: “In order to reduce the material involved in the present study to a more manageable level, I have decided to ignore certain common orthographic variations throughout the collation: interchanges of ϵ / ι , α / ϵ , and \omicron / υ , presence or absence of movable ν ...”³⁸ Ignoring common orthographic variations is also important because most printed editions correct common orthographic variants with the result that in order to determine a true orthographic variant, one must consult each manuscript itself individually rather than an edition of the manuscript. The other orthographic singular readings are at 15:38a and 16:19a. The two orthographic singular variants are calculated as a group of their own and not as a substitution and constitute 1 percent of all singular readings.

Other Orthographic Singular Variants

15:38a $\eta\beta\omicron[\upsilon\lambda\epsilon]\tau\omicron$ $\epsilon \rightarrow \eta$ ³⁹

³⁷ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 81.

³⁸ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 81.

³⁹ See Francis Thomas Gignac, *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino – La Goliardica, 1976), 2:228–30 for a discussion of the augment of $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha$. “ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha$... regularly augmented η - in the Ptolemaic papyri, show[s] a reversion to the classical ϵ - augment in different degrees,” and “ $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha$ has the η - augment only sporadically and early; the ϵ - augment occurs very frequently” (Gignac, *Grammar*, 2:228–29). Gignac’s use of “very frequently” signifies “in very many instances (over 200 examples” and “sporadically” signifies “1–5 examples” (Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:50). For general substitutions of ϵ with η , see Gignac, *Grammar*, 1:244–47.

for **17:10b** which will be treated as a substitution below). Only two other times in all extant witnesses of the book of Acts is $\text{C}\iota\lambda\alpha\epsilon$ spelled with ϵ following the λ , and these two times are both in $\text{o}\varsigma$.⁴⁵ Also, no extant Greek text (according to the *TLG*, which may not include all orthographic variants) uses this spelling either. An alternate spelling of $\text{C}\iota\lambda\alpha\epsilon$ exists in the form of $\text{C}\epsilon\iota\lambda\alpha\epsilon$, which is quite common but $\text{C}\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha\epsilon$ is extraordinarily rare outside of \mathfrak{P}^{127} . Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk posit that this form comes from “perhaps Grecized and Latinized forms of the same Semitic name.”⁴⁶

Proper Name Orthographic but Significant Singular Variants

16:25b	$\text{C}\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha\epsilon$	$\alpha \rightarrow \epsilon\alpha$
16:29b	$\text{C}\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha$	$\alpha \rightarrow \epsilon\alpha$

In addition to the proper name orthographic singular variants, two other proper name substitution singular variants are found in \mathfrak{P}^{127} . At **16:2b**, \mathfrak{P}^{127} reads $[\Lambda\nu]\text{c}\tau[\rho]\eta$ where all others read $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\iota\epsilon$ (except 330 which reads $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega$). Perhaps a better reading here in \mathfrak{P}^{127} would be $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\eta$. Since most early manuscripts, including \mathfrak{P}^{127} , did not employ iota adscript or subscript or accents, the dative singular and the nominative singular are identical. Therefore, similarly to 330, perhaps our scribe changed the text to a dative singular rather than a dative plural.⁴⁷

At **17:10b** we find another example of a singular reading of the name Silas. However, in this occasion, although it is an orthographic variant, it will be counted instead as a substitution in order to follow Epp’s suggestion. In addition to including the same aberrant orthography as discussed above, in this verse \mathfrak{P}^{127} also changes the case of the name Silas from $\text{C}\iota\lambda\tilde{\alpha}\nu$ (accusative) to $\text{C}\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha$ (dative). Such a substantive change qualifies as a substitution rather than simply an orthographic variant. Additionally, since it is a proper name it will be counted as a substitution.

Proper Name Other Singular Variants

16:2b	$[\Lambda\nu]\text{c}\tau[\rho]\eta$
17:10b	$\text{C}\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha$

Accuracy and Copying Technique

Addition

There are 35 significant singular additions which constitute 17.2 percent of the total significant singular readings. A total of 56 words were added resulting in an average of 1.6 words per addition.

⁴⁵ The fact that no other manuscript has this orthography is according to Swanson, who is careful to include all orthographic variants. These two instances are at 15:34 in $\text{o}\varsigma$ ($\text{C}\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha$) and a correction at 17:4 in the margin of $\text{o}\varsigma$ ($\text{C}\iota\lambda\epsilon\alpha$).

⁴⁶ BDF §125.2. See also BDF §52.2.

⁴⁷ Because the dative form of $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\alpha$ is only properly extant in the plural, any attempt to change it to the singular is difficult. 330 substitutes $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega$ whereas, if I am correct, \mathfrak{P}^{127} substitutes $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\eta$. $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\alpha$ would be another possible option for the dative singular as found in Epiphanius, *Index discipulorum*, 124.18; John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the First Epistle to Timothy*, 62.501, 556; John Chrysostom, *Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 63.184. Neither $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omega$ nor $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\eta$ is found in any extant Greek literature (according to the *TLG*). For the declension of $\Lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\alpha$, see BDF §57.

Omission

There are 62 significant singular omissions which comprise 30.5 percent of the significant singular readings. A total of 104 words were omitted with an average of 1.68 words per omission. When compared with the additions and substitutions we find a net loss of 50 words.

Transposition

There are 32 significant singular transpositions representing 15.8 percent of the significant singular readings.

Substitution

There are 74 significant singular substitutions which account for 36.5 percent of all significant singular readings. Concerning Royse's precise criteria of what qualifies as a substitution and how it differs from an addition or omission, Royse comments: "It is often observed in the literature on linguistic errors that substitutions tend to be of the same grammatical category; e.g., a noun is substituted for a noun, not for a preposition."⁴⁸ I have followed this practice. Unlike Royse, however, I will include the total numbers of words lost or gained into the statistics of net words lost. Ψ^{127} substitutes often and erratically with 74 substitutions and a net loss of two words.

Table 1. Ψ^{127} 's Omissions and Additions in Comparison with Other Studies⁴⁹

	Significant Singulars		Words in Additions		Average Words		Omissions		Words in Omissions		Average Words		Words in Omissions / Words in Additions		Substitutions		Net Words Gained / Lost in Substitutions		Net Words Lost		Net Words Lost Per Significant Singular Transpositions	
Ψ^{45}	210	29 (13.8%)	36	1.2	60 (29%)	126	2.1	2.1	73 (35%)			90	.43	48 (23%)								
Ψ^{46}	452	52 (11.5%)	54	1.04	161 (36%)	298	1.9	3.1	195 (43%)			245	.54	35 (7.7%)								
Ψ^{47}	53	6 (12%)	6	1.5	15 (28%)	37	2.5	2.1	28 (53%)			29	.55	2 (3.8%)								
Ψ^{66}	109	16 (15%)	18	1.1	20 (18%)	36	1.8	1.2	54 (50%)			16	.15	18 (16.5%)								
Ψ^{72}	74	14 (18.9%)	17	1.2	22 (30%)	44	2.0	1.6	30 (41%)			26	.35	7 (9.5%)								
Ψ^{75}	106	11 (10.4%)	12	1.1	34 (32%)	44	1.3	3.1	49 (46%)			32	.30	11 (10.4%)								
Revelation 01 ⁵⁰	158	40 (25.3%)	66	1.65	49	116	2.37					50	.32									
Revelation 02	60	12 (20%)	13	1.08	17	34	2					21	.35									
Revelation 04	43	5 (11.6%)	6	1.2	21	30	1.43					24	.56									
Ψ^{127}	203	35 (17.2%)	56	1.6	62 (30.5%)	104	1.68	1.86	74 (36.5%)	Lost 2	50	.246	32 (15.8%)									

⁴⁸ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 94 n. 95.

⁴⁹ See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 719, 730–31 for the model for this table. See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 719, 730–31, 903.

⁵⁰ See Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, 154 for his figures for this table.

Table 2. \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's Orthographic Phenomena in Comparison with Other Studies⁵¹

	Total Singulars	Orthographic Singulars	Percentage	Orth. Sings. / NA Page	Orth. Sings. / 1,000 Words	Nonsense Singulars	Percentage	Nons. Sings. / NA Page ⁵²	Nons. Sings. / 1,000 Words
\mathfrak{P}^{45}	226	8	3.5%	.19		9	4%		
\mathfrak{P}^{46}	639	124	19.4%	.97		63	9.9%		
\mathfrak{P}^{47}	76	18	23.7%	1.14		5	6.6%		
\mathfrak{P}^{66}	128	14	10.9%	.23		5	3.9%		
\mathfrak{P}^{72}	150	64	42.7%	3.32		12	8%		
\mathfrak{P}^{75}	166	33	19.9%	.38		27	16.3%		
Revelation o1 ⁵³	201	19	9.45%			24	11.94%		
Revelation o2	81	9	11.11%			12	14.81%		
Revelation o4	77	12	15.58%			22	28.57%		
\mathfrak{P}^{127}	209	2	1%	.325	1.759	4	1.9%	.65	3.518

Table 3. \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's Error Rate in Relation to Other Studies

	NA Lines	Words	Adjustment Factor	Singulars	Singulars / NA Page	Singulars / 1,000 Words
\mathfrak{P}^{45}	1894		.57	227	5.3	
\mathfrak{P}^{46}	3592		.89	632	4.9	
\mathfrak{P}^{47}	439		.90	76	4.8	
\mathfrak{P}^{66}	1688		.83	128	2.3	
\mathfrak{P}^{72}	474		1.00	150	7.9	
\mathfrak{P}^{75}	2683		.82	161	1.8	
\mathfrak{P}^{127}	154	1137	1.00 ⁵⁴	209	33.93	183.82

⁵¹ See Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 885, 902 for a model for this table. I have copied his data from this same source.

⁵² Royse does not provide this figure.

⁵³ See Hernández, *Scribal Habits*, for figures for this table.

⁵⁴ While Royse has attempted to calculate an “adjustment factor” in his study, I have not done so. As stated above, I rely entirely on the transcription by the editors. The editors have reconstructed, to the best of their ability, the full text of the fragments. That is to say that with the reconstruction by the editors there are no lacunae in the continuous sections of \mathfrak{P}^{127} . Royse admits that his method is not perfect: “Since the papyri ... are more or less lacunose, we need to adjust the number of line to reflect the fragmentary nature of the texts. This is admittedly problematic. An orthographic variation could occur at any letter or pair of letters, and so we could only get an estimate of how many such singular readings existed in the lacunae by counting extant letters and missing letters; I have not done that. On the other hand, some kinds of variation, transpositions for example, might be detectable even if only a few letters were extant. What I have done is to estimate adjustment factors for the papyri or even for sections of the papyri, which are meant to represent how many of the once existing singular readings are now visible. I can but hope that the many arbitrarinesses in such an undertaking will skew the figures for all the papyri more or less equitably, so that the results will still allow reasonable comparisons. Finally, in order to have more manageable figures, I have arbitrarily considered twenty-five NA lines to be one ‘NA page,’ and calculated the rates of error per NA page” Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 899. The editors of \mathfrak{P}^{127} have reconstructed numerous singular readings. In short, since I am treating the reconstruction with full confidence, I have not felt the need to follow Royse’s arbitrary method.

\mathfrak{P}^{127} contains 209 singular readings. \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's overall error rate of 33.93 singular readings per NA page is extremely high when compared to the error rates for the scribes studied by Royse.⁵⁶ His scribes ranged from 1.8 to 7.9.

Many of \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's singular readings are an attempt to explain the text in order to aid reading and comprehension. One example can be seen in **Acts 10:44b** which reads: "While Peter was still speaking, the Holy Spirit fell upon all who heard the word." Our scribe singularly substituted "them" in place of "all who heard the word" likely because the scribe felt that this phrase is obvious and redundant. Another example can be seen at **Acts 10:34** which reads literally "And Peter, after opening his mouth, said ..." The scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} instead writes "And Peter answering said ..." In both of these examples there is hardly any change in meaning but less words are used and the text is perhaps even more intelligible. In the same way, sometimes our scribe will make explicit prepositions that are implied by the case of the noun. For example, **Acts 12:2** reads that Herod had James killed "with the sword" using a single word in the dative case to indicate the entire phrase reading simply $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\rho\eta$. Our scribe, however, wrote $[\epsilon\nu] \mu\alpha[\chi\alpha\iota\rho\alpha]$ in order to make the preposition explicit.

Parker and Pickering comment about our scribe's "extreme tendency to abbreviate."⁵⁷ Our scribe surely loses more words than they gain (see table 1). Parker and Pickering also posit that \mathfrak{P}^{127} displays two offsetting characteristics: "against expansions similar to those found in Codex Bezae ... may be set a habit of tersely summarizing whole phrases."⁵⁸ Concerning the main question at hand, whether or not the scribe omits more than they add, we can conclude that, on the whole, this scribe does indeed omit more than they add. In total, \mathfrak{P}^{127} lost 50 words omitting 8.12 words per NA page.

Royse also wondered if perhaps witnesses from later centuries (e.g., post-Constantine) would become much more regular and uniform. We can conclusively say that \mathfrak{P}^{127} does not exhibit a uniform or strict text. In fact, \mathfrak{P}^{127} seems to be a narrative rewriting of Acts. That is to say that the types of singular variants in \mathfrak{P}^{127} do not seem to be theological changes but rather changes made in order to aid the story. Parker and Pickering note that many of \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's distinctive readings "contain strong echoes"⁶⁰ from other parts of the book of Acts. This scribe exhibits drastic textual differences from any other Greek witness. Parker and Pickering have shown that this papyrus agrees with Bezae (05) often.⁶¹ This is true for the most part but there are many readings (209 of them at least) where our scribe does not agree with Bezae or any other known manuscript. It has long been assumed that Acts was transmitted basically as two texts: a shorter text represented by Codex Vaticanus (03) and a longer form represented by Codex

⁵⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 898–99 for his formula.

⁵⁶ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 900. See also table 3.

⁵⁷ Parker and Pickering, "4968," 42.

⁵⁸ Parker and Pickering, "4968," 8. They later restate that here we have an "expanding free text that has a strong tendency to omit. That this is a common feature in manuscripts is undeniable. That it is especially marked in \mathfrak{P} is evident. This makes a striking contrast with Codex Bezae, which rarely omits" (Parker and Pickering, "4968," 12).

⁵⁹ Gäbel: "A more detailed, more realistic, more logical rendering of events, additional information about times and places, thoughts and emotions, verbatim rendering of quotations instead of abbreviations that presuppose the author's and readers' perspective, the resolution of ambiguities in the text and generally increased narrative coherence—all these changes may be best described in terms of narrative criticism" (Gäbel, "Text of \mathfrak{P}^{127} ," 148).

⁶⁰ Parker and Pickering, "4968," 13.

⁶¹ "A number of these readings were previously singulars in Codex Bezae" (Parker and Pickering, "4968," 13). See n. 15 above for a list of some of the previously singular readings of 05 that were shown by the discovery of \mathfrak{P}^{127} not to be singular readings.

Bezae. But Parker and Pickering point out that \mathfrak{P}^{127} “offers a strong challenge to this view, leading rather to the recognition that if a text could exist in one free version, it could exist in many. The fact is that \mathfrak{P} offers a new free version. Although it differs greatly from Codex Vaticanus, it also presents a strikingly different version from that found in Codex Bezae.”⁶² They conclude that “it is hard to see how the bipolar concept of a two-text form of Acts can continue to be maintained.”⁶³ Concerning the relationship between Codex Bezae and \mathfrak{P}^{127} they comment: “Like Codex Bezae, [\mathfrak{P}^{127}] is somewhat longer than Codex Vaticanus, and like Codex Bezae its wording often varies from Codex Vaticanus. But its variations from it are by no means identical with those of Codex Bezae.”⁶⁴

Conclusions

One surprising conclusion to this study is how matter of fact many of the singular readings are. Most of the singular readings are a word here and a word there with no significant change to meaning but rather to smooth out the text.

At first glance the statistics concerning the scribal habits of \mathfrak{P}^{127} seem to imply that the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} acted very similarly to the scribes studied by Royse. In table 1 we see that \mathfrak{P}^{127} had 203 significant singular readings with 35 additions and 62 omissions. These statistics look strikingly similar to those of \mathfrak{P}^{45} 's scribe who had 210 significant singular readings with 29 additions and 60 omissions. Indeed, all of Royse's scribes' additions were about 10–20 percent of their total significant singular readings—just like \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's 17 percent. Similarly, their omissions constituted about 30 percent of their significant singular readings just like \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's 30.5 percent. So there appear to be striking similarities between Royse's scribes and the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} . But upon closer examination we find that \mathfrak{P}^{45} made these 210 significant singular readings over 1,894 NA lines or about 75 NA pages (table 3). Additionally, \mathfrak{P}^{46} made 452 significant singular readings over 3,592 NA lines or about 143 NA pages. The scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} made their 203 significant singular readings over just six NA pages. So, while the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} acted similarly to Royse's scribes in relation to the ratio of additions, omissions, and substitutions, they did so much more often. Put another way, we see in table 3 that \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's error rate was more than four times greater than the next closest scribe's error rate in \mathfrak{P}^{72} and is more than six times greater than the error rates in \mathfrak{P}^{45} , \mathfrak{P}^{46} , and \mathfrak{P}^{47} . \mathfrak{P}^{127} created a singular reading thirty-three times per NA page. Royse estimates that an NA page is about twenty-five lines on average.⁶⁵ \mathfrak{P}^{127} , therefore, created a significant singular reading more than once per line of NA text. \mathfrak{P}^{127} did act similarly to Royse's scribes but to a very extreme degree.

But it is notable that \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's text did not win out—the free expansions found in \mathfrak{P}^{127} and 05 are not carried on. These manuscripts have such a high number of singular readings *because* no other manuscript copied the singular readings. They did not win out. The fact that one scribe, patron, or reader created such an aberrant text means nothing for the overall transmission of the New Testament. That these readings were not carried on is actually further evidence of the strict transmission of the New Testament.

But the blame for a text with such an extreme degree of variation as seen in \mathfrak{P}^{127} should not be placed upon the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} alone. While Royse's method posits that singular readings are the creation of the scribe, I am not so sure. It is possible that many of these singular readings stood in \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's *Vorlage* and that \mathfrak{P}^{127} copied the text with close fidelity. We simply have

⁶² Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 6.

⁶³ Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 8.

⁶⁴ Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 6.

⁶⁵ Royse, *Scribal Habits*, 899.

no reliable means of determining exactly what text stood in \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's *Vorlage* at certain places of variation. That the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} was not the creator of many of these variants is underscored when compared to the similar textual tradition in 05.⁶⁶ That is to say, since 05 has many of these same types of variants, it is certain that the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} was not the originator of these types of expansive variants.

We must also recognize that a patron may have instructed the scribe—either of \mathfrak{P}^{127} or of its antecedents—to create an explanatory text. Above we quoted Parker and Pickering who wrote that \mathfrak{P}^{127} both summarizes and expands material. Gäbel has shown that “many variants shared by \mathfrak{P}^{127} and D05 show an interest in a more elaborate, smoother, more coherent text.” Also, it is possible that the explanatory variants found in \mathfrak{P}^{127} were explanatory glosses in the margin of the *Vorlage* of \mathfrak{P}^{127} made by a reader of the *Vorlage*. These glosses obscured the text to the point where it was difficult to read the text in the manuscript and the intended explanation (see Acts 12:3b). In light of this study we must accept that it is possible that a high degree of \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's substantive variants were the result of a patron who desired an explanatory text. Likewise, it is also possible that some of \mathfrak{P}^{127} 's substantive variants were the result of explanatory glosses in the *Vorlage* made by a reader and then incorporated by the scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} as has been seen in \mathfrak{P}^{75} . Larry Hurtado has written that “we should view most *intentional* changes to the text as more likely made by readers, not copyists.”⁷⁰

Of importance is that this study has reinforced Roysse's findings concerning *lectio brevior*. The scribe of \mathfrak{P}^{127} does indeed omit more than they add and their habits are within the same range of omission as Roysse's scribes. The text as contained in \mathfrak{P}^{127} , however, does not depict a greater level of fixity. In fact, with respect to \mathfrak{P}^{127} only, \mathfrak{P}^{127} suggests that the opposite is true since we see much greater textual variation in this late witness. Since conclusions concerning fifth-century scribal habits as a whole cannot be made based on one manuscript, further analysis of contemporary manuscripts is needed. We can only hope that more data sets will be available to us when more papyri from the fifth century are found and analyzed.

⁶⁶ Georg Gäbel, “Western Text, ‘D-Text Cluster,’ ‘Bezan Trajectory,’ Or What Else?—A Preliminary Study,” in *Novum Testamentum Graecum Editio Critica Maior*, ed. Holger Strutwolf, Georg Gäbel, Annette Hüffmeier, Gerd Mink and Klaus Wachtel, vol. 3.3 (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2017), 92: “These two manuscripts [05 and \mathfrak{P}^{127}] may be derived from an earlier free form of text, therefore showing many differences between each other beside obvious agreements.”

⁶⁷ Parker and Pickering, “4968,” 8.

⁶⁸ Gäbel, “Text of \mathfrak{P}^{127} ,” 146.

⁶⁹ Schmid provides an example from \mathfrak{P}^{75} that an addition is made by a reader rather than a scribe due to the documentary hand used as opposed to a literary book hand. He shows that these types of readers' notes could be incorporated into a copy as part of the actual text. Schmid concludes: “Not everything we find in our manuscripts is the product of scribes. Some material is derived from readers and has been at times clumsily picked up by a scribe, thereby entering part of the tradition.... What actually reaches us is a complex editorial decision mediated by the scribes but not inaugurated by them in the course of the copying process.” Ulrich Schmid, “Scribes and Variants—Sociology and Typology,” in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton and David C. Parker, TS 3.5 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2008), 23.

⁷⁰ Larry W. Hurtado, “God or Jesus? Textual Ambiguity and Textual Variants in Acts of the Apostles,” in *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliott*, ed. Jeffrey J. Kloha and Peter Doble, NTTSD 47 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 239, emphasis in original. For a more complete discussion concerning possible sources of variation other than the scribe of a given manuscript see Farnes, “Scribal Habits in Selected New Testament Manuscripts,” 4–7.

Appendix: List of Singular Readings of \mathfrak{P}^{127}

- 10:33a $\epsilon\upsilon \tau\epsilon$ NA²⁸ | [και] $\epsilon\upsilon$ \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | $\epsilon\upsilon \delta\epsilon$ 05 044 323
- 10:33b παραγενομενος NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 10:33c νυν NA²⁸ | και ν[υν] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 10:34a ανοιξας NA²⁸ | απ[ο]κριθ[εις] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 10:34b το στομα NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 10:40 εδωκεν NA²⁸ | [εποι]ησεν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 10:41a λαω NA²⁸ | [κοσμ]ω \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 10:41b μαρτυειν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 10:41c συνεπιομεν αυτω NA²⁸ | συνεπιομεν α[υτ]ω και συν[ανε]στρα[φημεν α]υτω \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
| συνεπιομεν αυτω και συνεστραφημεν 05* | και συνανεστραφημεν 05^c
- 10:41d νεκρων NA²⁸ | [νε]κρων $\bar{\mu}$ [ημερα]ς \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr} | νεκρων ημερας $\bar{\mu}$ 05
- 10:42a τω λαω και διαμαρτυρασθαι NA²⁸ | και δια[μαρτυ]ρασθαι τ[ω] λαω \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
- 10:42b υπο NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 10:42c του NA²⁸ | [τη βουλη και] π[ρο]γινωσει του \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+4]}
- 10:43 τουτω παντες NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 10:44a επεπεσεν το πνευμα το αγιον NA²⁸ | [το] $\bar{\pi}$ [να το αγιον επεπ]εσεν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
- 10:44b τους ακουοντας τον λογον NA²⁸ | αυ[τους] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[-3]}
- 11:2 περιτομης NA²⁸ | [περιτ]ο[μης οντες] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 11:3a ειςηλθες NA²⁸ | [εισελθων] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 11:3b και NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 11:3c αυτοις NA²⁸ | με[τα αυτων] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[+1]} | συν αυτοις 05* | αυτοις 05^c
- 11:4a αρξαμενος NA²⁸ | [α]πο[κριθεις] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 11:4b λεγων NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 11:5 πολει NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 12:2 μαχαιρη NA²⁸ | [εν] μα[χαιρα] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add} | μαχαιρα 03^c (man 2) 05* 08 020 044 18 323 424
614 945 1241 1505 1739
- 12:3a προσεθετο NA²⁸ | ηθε[λησ]εν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 12:3b συλλαβειν και πετρον NA²⁸ | και τον [πε]τρον προς[λ]αβεισθαι \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Sub, Add} | και
τον [πε]τρον σ[υλ]αβεισθαι \mathfrak{P}^{127c} (man 1)
- 12:5 υπο της εκκλησιας προς τον θεον περι αυτου NA²⁸ | [προς] το[ν $\bar{\theta}$]ν περι αυτου] $\bar{\upsilon}$ π[ο
της εκκλησιας] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
- 12:7a φως NA²⁸ | το [φως] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 12:7b του Πετρου NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 12:7c ηγειρεν αυτον NA²⁸ | [α]υτου [ηγειρεν] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub, Tr}
- 12:7d ταχει και NA²⁸ | τα[χει και ιδ]ου \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 12:7e εξεπεσαν αυτου αι αλυσεις εκ των χειρων NA²⁸ | αι α[λυσεις εκ] των [χειρων αυ]του
[εξεπεσα]ν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
- 12:8a προς αυτον NA²⁸ | [τω Π]ερτω \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 12:8b κανδαλια NA²⁸ | υπο[δηματα] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 12:8c εποιησεν δε ουτως NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-3]}
- 12:8d λεγει αυτω NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 12:8e και ακολουθει NA²⁸ | [και λαβο]μενος [τον Πετρον] προ[ηγαγεν εκ]ξω ειπων [ακ]
ολουθει \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+6]}
- 12:8f περιβαλου NA²⁸ | κ(αι) [περιβαλ]ου \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 12:9a και εξελθων NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 12:9b ηκολουθει NA²⁸ | [ο] δε Πετρος η[κο]λουθει \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+3]}

- 12:9c και ουκ ηδει οτι NA²⁸ | μη [ει]δωσ ει \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[-1]}
- 15:29 ερρωσθε NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 15:30a οι μεν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 15:30b ουν απολυθεντες κατηλθον NA²⁸ | [εν ο]λιγαις [δε ημε]ραις \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Add} | ουν απολυθεντες εν ημεραις ολιγαις κατηλθον 05* | ουν απολυθεντες κατηλθον 05^{ci}
- 15:30c την επιστολην NA²⁸ | [τα γραμ]ματα \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 15:36 μετα δε τινας ημερας ειπεν NA²⁸ | ειπεν δε \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-3], Tr}
- 15:38a ηξιου NA²⁸ | ουκ ηβο[υλε]το λεγων \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Orth} | ουκ εβουλετο λεγων 05
- 15:38b εργον NA²⁸ | εργον εφ ο επεμφθησαν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | εργον εις ο επεμφθησαν 05
- 15:38c τουτον NA²⁸ | τουτον μη [cυν]ειναι \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[-1]} | τουτον μη ειναι cυν 05
- 15:39 δε NA²⁸ | εκ τουτου \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[+1]} | ουν 04 08 020 044 18 323 424 614 945 1241 1505 1739
- 15:41a την Κυριαν NA²⁸ | Κυρο[φοινηκ]ην \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om, Sub}
- 15:41b και NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 15:41c Κιλικιαν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 15:41d εκκλησιας NA²⁸ | [εκκλη]σιας πα[ραδιδο]υς τας [εντολ]ας φυλας[ceιν] των απο[στολων] και των [πρεσβ]υτερων \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+4]} | εκκλησιας παραδιδους τας εντολας των πρεσβυτερων 05
- 16:1 γυναικος NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 16:2a υπο NA²⁸ | περι \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:2b Λυτρωις NA²⁸ | [Λυ]ct[ρη] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {PropName} | Λυτρω 33
- 16:2c αδελφων NA²⁸ | μ[αθητων] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:3a ο Παυλος NA²⁸ | Παυλος \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 16:3b cυν αυτο εξελθειν NA²⁸ | [cυν]εξελθ[ειν αυτο] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub[-1]}
- 16:3c εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ απαντες οτι ελλην ο πατηρ αυτοις υπηρχεν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-8]} | εκεινοις γαρ απαντες τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις εστι ελλην υπηρχεν 2774 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ απαντες τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις οτι ελλην ην 1127 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ απαντες οτι Ελλην ο πατηρ αυτοις υπηρχεν 01 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ απαντες οτι Ελλην ο $\overline{\text{πηρ}}$ αυτοις υπηρχεν 33 | εκεινοις ιδησαν γαρ απαντες οτι Ελλην ο $\overline{\text{πηρ}}$ αυτοις υπηρχεν 2344 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ παντες οτι Ελλην ο πατηρ αυτοις υπηρχεν \mathfrak{P}^{74} | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ παντες οτι Ελλην ο $\overline{\text{πηρ}}$ αυτοις υπηρχεν 04 | εκεινω ηδεισαν γαρ παντες οτι Ελλην ο $\overline{\text{πηρ}}$ αυτοις υπηρχεν 69 1175 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ παντες τον πατερα αυτοις οτι Ελλην υπηρχεν 05 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ παντες τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις οτι Ελλην υπηρχεν 1646 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις απαντες οτι Ελλην υπηρχεν 614 1505 1611 2147 2412 2495 | εκεινοις ειδησαν γαρ απαντες τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις οτι Ελλην υπηρχεν 020 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ απαντες τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις οτι Ελλην υπηρχεν 226* | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ απαντες τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις οτι Ελλην υπηρχεν 330 618 1243 | εκεινοις ηδεισαν γαρ απαντες τον $\overline{\text{πρα}}$ αυτοις οτι Ελλην υπηρχεν 08 014 025 049 056 1 88 104 226^c 323 440 547 927 1241 1245 1270 1854 2492
- 16:4 παρεδιδουσαν αυτοις NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 16:13a και NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Om} | κ(αι) \mathfrak{P}^{127c}
- 16:13b ελεαουμεν NA²⁸ | cυν[ε]λαλο[υ]ν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | ωμιλουμεν 547
- 16:14a τις NA²⁸ | ην τις \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 16:14b ηκουεν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 16:14c ονοματι λυδια πορφυροπωλις πολειως θυγατριων εβομενη τον θεον NA²⁸ | [εβομ]ην τον [θ]ονο[μα]τι λυ[δια] πο[ρφυρο]πωλις θυγατριων \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Om, Sub}
- 16:14d προσεχειν NA²⁸ | [ινα πι]cτ[ε]υση \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[+1]}
- 16:14e λαλουμενοις NA²⁸ | [λε]γ[ο]με[ν]οις \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:15a ως δε NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}

- 16:15b εβαπτισθη NA²⁸ | ητις [εβαπτισ]θη \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
 16:15c τω κυριω NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]} | τω θεω 05
 16:16a εγενετο NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 16:16b δε πορευομενων NA²⁸ | [π]ορευομενων [δ]ε \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
 16:16c εις την προσευχην NA²⁸ | εν τη προσευχη \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 16:16d παιδικην NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Om} | παιδικη \mathfrak{P}^{127c} 81
 16:16e πυθωνα NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Om} | πυ[θ]ωνος \mathfrak{P}^{127c}
 16:16f τινα NA²⁸ | ητις \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Sub} | τις \mathfrak{P}^{127c}
 16:16g υπαντησαι ημιν NA²⁸ \mathfrak{P}^{74} 01^c 03^{*} 04 08 044 33 81 1175 | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]} | απαντησαι ημιν 02 03^c 020 025 020 049 056 1 18 69 88 104 226 323 330 424 440 547 614 618 927 945 1241 1243 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1739 1828 1837 1854 1891 2147 2412 2492 2495 | απαντησαι ημειν 05 | υπαντησαι υμιν 01^{*} | υπαντικαι ημιν 2344
 16:16h ητις εργασιαν πολλην NA²⁸ | ητις πολ[λ]ην εργασιαν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
 16:17a Παυλω και ημιν NA²⁸ | πολ[λα] ημων \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[-1]}
 16:17b αυτη κατακολουθουσα NA²⁸ | κατακολουθο[υ]σα α[υ]τ[η] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
 16:18a τουτο δε NA²⁸ | κ(αι) τουτο \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub}
 16:18b επι πολλας ημερας NA²⁸ | ημεραις ικαναις \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub[-1]} | *om.* 2492
 16:18c και εξηλθεν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
 16:19a ιδοντες δε NA²⁸ | [δε ει]δο[ν] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Orth} | δε ειδαν 05
 16:19b ειλικυαν NA²⁸ \mathfrak{P}^{74} 01 02 03 05 014 020 025 044 049 056 1 69 81 88 104 226 323 330 440 547 614 618 927 945 1175 1241 1245 1270 1505 1611 1739 1828 1837 1854 1891 2147 2344 2412 2492 2495 | ηγα[γο]ν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | ηλικυαν 04 1243 1646 | εκυραν 08
 16:19c επι τους αρχοντας NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-3]}
 16:20a προσαγαγοντες NA²⁸ | ενεφαν[ι]σαν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 16:20b ειπαν NA²⁸ | λεγο[ν]τε \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 16:20c ουτοι οι ανθρωποι NA²⁸ | οτι οι αν[οι] ουτοι \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add, Tr}
 16:20d εκταρασσουσιν NA²⁸ | ταρα[σ]σουσι[ν] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 16:21 εξεστι ημιν NA²⁸ | [η]μιν [εξε]στιν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
 16:22a κατ αυτων NA²⁸ | κ[ατ αυτ]ων [επικραζο]ντες \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | κατ αυτων κραζοντες 05
 16:22b περιρηξαντες αυτων τα ιματια NA²⁸ | [τα ιματι]α περιρηξαντες \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om, Tr}
 16:23a πολλας τε NA²⁸ | κα[ι] πολ[λα]ς \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub} | πολλας 81 1175
 16:23b αυτοις NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 16:23c αυτοις NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 16:24a ος NA²⁸ | ο δε δεσμοφυ[λα]ξ \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add} | ο δε 05
 16:24b παραγγελιαν τοιαυτην NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
 16:24c λαβων NA²⁸ | παρ[α]λαβ[ων] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 16:24d εβαλεν αυτοις NA²⁸ | [α]υτους εβαλεν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
 16:24e την εσωτεραν φυλακην NA²⁸ | την φυλακην την εσωτερω \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add, Tr, Sub, Nons}
 16:24f το NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 16:25a μεσονυκτιον NA²⁸ 05^c | μεσην νυκτα \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | μεσον της νυκτος 05^{*}
 16:25b Cιλας NA²⁸ | Cιλεας \mathfrak{P}^{127} {PropName} | Cειλας 03
 16:25c δεσμοι NA²⁸ 05^c | δεσμωτα[ι] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | δεσμοι 05^{*}
 16:26a αφνω δε NA²⁸ | [κ]α[ι] εξαπ[ι]νης \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub}
 16:26b εις εγενετο NA²⁸ | [εγ]γενετο εις ο[ς] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr} | εις εγενετο 01 02 08 614 1175 1243
 16:26c καλυθηναι NA²⁸ | κα[ι] εκ[α]λυθ[η] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add, Sub}
 16:26d του δεσμωτηριου NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
 16:26e ηνεωχθησαν NA²⁸ | π[αντα κ]αι ηνεωχθησαν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+2]}

- 16:26f δε NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om} | τε 04 014 020 P 044 049 056 226* 323 330 440 547 618 1241 1243 1245 1270 1646 1828 1854 2492
- 16:27a επακαμενος NA²⁸ | πασας [c]πασαμενος \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 16:27b ημελλεν NA²⁸ | ηθεληξε[v] \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | εμελλεν 05 014 049 056 1 33 69 88 945 104 226 323 330 440 614 618 927 1241 1243 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1739 1828 1837 1854 1891 2147 2412 2492 2495
- 16:27c αναρειν NA²⁸ 81^c | κατακ .[.]cai \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | ανελειν 04* | ανερειν 04^c 81* 1243 1646 | ανεριν 08
- 16:28a μεγαλη φωνη NA²⁸ | αυτον \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:28b μηδεν πραξης NA²⁸ | μη ταρασσον \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:28c σεαυτω κακον NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 16:29a προσεπεσεν NA²⁸ | επιπεσων \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:29b Cιλα NA²⁸ | Cιλεα \mathfrak{P}^{127} {PropName} | Cειλα 03
- 16:30a και NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 16:30b εξω NA²⁸ | εξω τους λοιπους ασφαλιας \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | εξω τους λοιπους ασφαλιαμενος 05
- 16:30c εφη NA²⁸ | προελθων εφη \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 16:31 πιστευσον NA²⁸ | [αυ]τω πιςτευς[ο]γ {Add}
- 16:32a αυτω NA²⁸ | αυτοις \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:32b συν πασιν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 16:32c τη οικια NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 16:33a παραλαβων αυτους εν εκεινη τη ωρα NA²⁸ | εκεινη τη [ω]ρα παραλαβοντες αυτους \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub, Tr}
- 16:33b οι αυτου παντες παραχρημα NA²⁸ | παντες οι παρ αυτου \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub, Tr}
- 16:35a ημερας δε γενομενης NA²⁸ | γενομενης δε ημερας \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr}
- 16:35b ραβδουχου NA²⁸ | αποστελ[λο]υσι τους ραβδουχου \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | απεστειλαν τους ραβδουχου 05
- 16:35c στρατηγοι NA²⁸ | ετρατηγοι επ[ι τ]ο εις την αγορα[v] και [αν]αμνησθεντες το[v] γενομενου σειμου \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub[-1]} | στρατηγοι επι αυτο εις την αγοραν και αναμνησθεντες τον σειμον τον γεγονοτα 05
- 16:35d λεγοντες NA²⁸ | λεγοντες τω δεσμοφυλακι \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+2]}
- 16:36a τους λογους NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 16:36b τον Παυλον NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]} | τω Παυλω 044
- 16:36c οτι NA²⁸ | αυτοις οτι \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 16:36d στρατηγοι ινα απολυθητε NA²⁸ | ετρατηγοι απολυθηγα[ι] υμας απολυθητε \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[+1]}
- 16:36e νυν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
- 16:36f εξελθοντες πορευεσθε NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
- 16:37a εφη προς αυτους NA²⁸ | προς αυτους ειπεν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub}
- 16:37b δειραντες NA²⁸ | ακαταιτιατους δειραν[τ]εσ \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub, Nons} | ανατειους δειραντες 05
- 16:37c φυλακην NA²⁸ | την φυλακην \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 16:37d αυτοι NA²⁸ | ουν αυτοι \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
- 16:37e ημας εξαγαγετωσαν NA²⁸ | επαγαγετωσαν ημας \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub, Tr}
- 16:38a ρηματα NA²⁸ | ρηθεντα \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
- 16:38b τοις στρατηγοις NA²⁸ | υπο του Παυλου τοις στρατηγοις \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+3]}
- 16:38c Ρωμαιοι NA²⁸ | Ρωμαιος \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Sub} | Ρωμαιοις \mathfrak{P}^{127c}
- 16:38d εις NA²⁸ | αυτους απεκαλουν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[+1]}
- 16:39a και ελθοντες παρεκαλεσαν NA²⁸ | παραγενομενοι τε μετα ικανον φιλων επι την φυλακην παρεκαλε[σ]αν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Tr, Sub} | και παραγενομενοι μετα φιλων πολλων εις την φυλακην παρεκαλεσαν 05

- 16:39b της πολεως NA²⁸ | ταυτης δε πολεως \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add, Tr} | της πολεως ταυτης ο5
 16:40a εξελθοντες NA²⁸ | απολυθεντες \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 16:40b απο της φυλακης NA²⁸ ο1 ο3 945 1739 1891 | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-3]} | εκ της φυλακης \mathfrak{P}^{74} Αο2
 ο5 ο8 ο14 ο20 ο25 ο44 ο49 ο56 1 33 69 81 88 104 226 323 330 440 547 614 618 927 1175
 1241 1243 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1828 1854 2147 2412 2492 2495 | εκ της πολεως 1837
 16:40c εξηλθαν NA²⁸ ο1 ο5 | εξησαν \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | εξηλθον \mathfrak{P}^{74} ο2 ο3 ο8 ο14 ο20 ο25 ο44 ο49 ο56
 1 33 69 81 88 104 226 323 330 440 547 618 927 1175 1245 1270 1505 1611 1646 1828 1854 2412
 2492 2495
 17:1a διοδευσαντες δε NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
 17:1b την Αμφιπολιν NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-2]}
 17:1c εις NA²⁸ | εκειθεν δε εις \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add, Sub} | κακειθεν εις ο5
 17:1d οπου ην συναγωγή NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om[-3]}
 17:1e Ιουδαιων NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 17:2a τω Παυλω NA²⁸ | Παυλος \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om} | ο Παυλος ο5
 17:2b προς αυτους και NA²⁸ | ειρηλθεν εις την συναγωγήν των Ιουδαιων {Sub[+3]} | προς
 αυτους ο5
 17:2c διελεξατο NA²⁸ ο1 ο2 ο3 33 81 88 945 1739 1891 | δια[λεγο]μενος \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | διελεξατο
 1175 | διελεχθη ο5 ο8 ο44 1505 1611 2495 | διελεγετο ο14 ο20 ο25 ο49 ο56 1 69 104 226
 323 330 440 547 618 927 1241 1243 1245 1270 1646 1828 1837 1854 2492 | διηλεχθη 2147
 | διηλεχθη 614 2412
 17:3a διανοιγων NA²⁸ | και διανοιγων {Add}
 17:3b εκ νεκρων NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127vid} {Om[-2]}
 17:4a εξ NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127vid} {Om}
 17:4b τω Παυλω και NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127vid} {Om[-3]}
 17:4c Cιλα NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127vid} {Om} | Cειλα ο3
 17:4d ολιγα NA²⁸ | ολιγα \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Nons} | ολιγα \mathfrak{P}^{127c}
 17:5 πονηρους NA²⁸ | [πολ]λους \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 17:6 αναστατωσαντες NA²⁸ | [αν]αστατουντες \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 17:7a υποδεδεκται NA²⁸ \mathfrak{P}^{74} ο1 ο2 ο3 ο5 ο14 ο20 ο25 ο44 ο56 1 69 81 88 104 226 323 330 440 547
 614 945 1175 1241 1245 1270 1505 1611 1739 1828 1837 1854 1891 2147 2344 2412 2492 2495
 | υποδε[δ]εκ[α]τος \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub} | υποδεδετε 1646* | υποδεδεκτη ο8 1646^c | αποδεδεκται
 618
 17:7b Ιαων NA²⁸ | ο Ιαων \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
 17:7c πρασσειν NA²⁸ | πρασσο \mathfrak{P}^{127*} {Nons} | πρασσειν \mathfrak{P}^{127c}
 17:7d βασιλεα NA²⁸ | [ω]ς βασιλεα \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add}
 17:7e ετερον NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 17:7f εινα NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 17:7g Ιησουν NA²⁸ | τινα ποτε $\bar{\Gamma}\nu$ \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Add[+2]}
 17:8 εταραξαν δε NA²⁸ | ενεπλησαν τε θυμου \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub[+1]}
 17:9a και λαβοντες το ικανον NA²⁸ | οι μεν ουν π[ολι]ταρχαι ικανον λαβοντες {Add[+4],
 Om[-2], Tr}
 17:9b αυτους NA²⁸ | *om.* \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Om}
 17:10a ευθεως NA²⁸ | απελυον \mathfrak{P}^{127} {Sub}
 17:10b και τον Cιλαν NA²⁸ | ευ[ν] τω Cιλεα \mathfrak{P}^{127} {PropName} | και τον Cειλαν \mathfrak{P}^{45} ο3 ο5