1. Introduction: The Manuscript and its Identification

Early in 2003 a private collector purchased a collection of small pieces of vellum from a London dealer in old books and manuscripts. These were originally described as ‘tiny scraps, in Greek, on vellum’ and were part of a group with some Latin texts (which were the focus of interest for the collector). He sent me a photocopy of the pieces with the suggestion that I might be interested in looking at the Greek pieces, which, he thought, were ‘likely to be Christian texts’ on the basis of a mention of ‘deacons’ in one of them, and with the fervent hope that ‘some, at least, might be biblical’. The collection of small pieces of vellum turned out to contain portions of six different manuscripts of the Greek Bible.¹

Evidence of provenance for individual pieces is lacking, although it was reported to me that the dealer ‘believes they [i.e. the whole collection] were part of a pre-War Armenian collection of antiquities and Armenian manuscripts in France’. From the nature of the manuscripts—all in small pieces with glue and other damage—it is pretty clear that they were cut up into small pieces some time in the distant past (with a pattern of wear after the cutting) and used in the repair or bindings of other manuscripts (hence the glue marks, generally on the hair side). It might be therefore that the fragments were extracted at some point from Armenian bindings, but there is no solid evidence for their original provenance, nor is there definite proof that the separate pieces are related in their provenance. The

Greek manuscripts range in date from the 5th to the 8th century. They differ considerably, not only in date and extant text, but also in style, original format (large format, single column, double column, etc.) and textual features (spelling, text-type broadly defined etc.). Beyond their presence in the same collection there is no obvious evidence which would connect the pieces.2

One of these fragments stood out immediately from the others, a very small piece of thin vellum (16 × 1–1.5 cm) with damaged edges, tiny letters, a central fold line, and a text which could immediately be identified as part of Luke 7 even though much of the rest was quite unclear to the naked eye. After further study, detailed analysis using ultra-violet and infra red lamps, various levels of magnification and long exposure ultra-violet photographs, the information which emerged still left this particular manuscript uniquely important compared with the others and deserving of a fuller treatment than the publication in the editio princeps could provide.

It is probably worth laying down the different stages in the process of identification and study explicitly. There was a complex interaction between advances in transcription and advances in identification and understanding of the manuscript as a whole.

(1) The first stage, on the basis of a photocopy of the manuscript provided by the new owner, involved the reading of the name of John and the mention of the disciples in the most legible column of the manuscript. This quickly led to Luke 7:18 and the rest of the left hand column could immediately be identified and almost completely transcribed (including material as well from verse 17). This column is now designated as page D (containing Luke 7:17–18).

(2) The second stage, on the basis of the first visual inspection of the manuscript, involved the initial transcription and identification of a further column as containing Luke 7:9–10 (now designated as page C).

(3) The third stage involved the initial transcription and unsuccessful attempts at identification of the other two columns.3 At this

---

2 P.M. Head, “A New Manuscript of Jeremiah in Greek according to the Lucianic Recension (de Hamel MS 391; Rahlfis 897),” BIOSCS 36 (2003) 27–37 [publication date 2004] (the opening two paragraphs cover similar ground).

3 Thanks to Dr L. McFall who, without advancing the identification directly, made a careful independent transcription at this stage (4.3.03).
stage the significance of the middle fold mark as evidence for the initial format of the codex was not yet recognized and I was really trying (unsuccessfully) to fit the extant text into Luke 7 somewhere. It is perhaps worth admitting that with a difficult to read manuscript whose basic content has been identified one is basically proposing various hypotheses and then seeking to test the hypotheses against the evidence ('Is this an alpha?'—because if this is a copy of the text I think it is it should be an alpha). Effectively this stage involved unsuccessful testing which served to problematise the hypothesis that these columns probably contained material from Luke 7.

(4) The fourth stage involved the inspection of manuscript with UV light and hand-held magnification (12/3/03). This provided additional information on the two columns already identified and enabled the production of corrected transcriptions of these, followed by the identification of the other two columns as portions of Luke 5.4 This in turn led to recognition of the importance of the fold and the whole question of the format of the codex represented by this small piece. Once the initial hypothesis—that the two columns represented two columns on each page—has been rejected it is necessary to gain more information by observation and then construct a new hypothesis which fits all the available evidence—the manuscript provides evidence for four small pages with internal margins and fold.

(5) The final stage involved procuring high-quality long-exposure UV photographs which were studied alongside further visual inspection of the manuscript using UV light and hand-held magnification.5 This allowed for the completion of the transcript as it has now been published and the final identification of the extant portions of the manuscript.

To summarise briefly, what emerged is a relatively early majuscule manuscript of Luke in an interesting format with an unusual text. The remainder of this paper will fill out the details on these three features.

4 Thanks are due to G. Waller and the staff in the manuscript room of the Cambridge University Library for the use of their facilities.
2. PAGE LAYOUT: ANALYSIS AND RECONSTRUCTION

First, the page layout. As I have already noted, on first viewing the fragment appeared to be a portion of a two-columned manuscript page (although not many letters and practically no complete words could be read on the back with the naked eye, the two columns were easily seen). This initial assumption had to be rejected once all the material could be read. Then the fold in between the two columns could be recognized as the original fold in the codex. What we have is not two columns on two pages, but individual columns on four pages—the surviving fragment represents a portion of a complete sheet of the original manuscript. The four pages can then be labeled as pages A (Luke 5:23–24), B (Luke 5:30–31), C (Luke 7:9), and D (Luke 7:17–18), with the following portions of text extant on each page:

Page A: Luke 5:23–24 (hair)

Page B: Luke 5:30–31 (flesh)

Page C: Luke 7:9 (flesh)

Page D: Luke 7:17 (end)—18 (hair)

The next stage in analyzing the format of the manuscript was to calculate how large the pages were and what type of page layout was represented in this manuscript. This can then be used for comparative purposes—what other manuscripts are similar?—and for then further calculations about how many pages there might be.
between page B and page C, which might in turn prompt reflections on the potential size and scope of this manuscript in its original format.

As can be seen on the transcript the lines average c. 26 letters. Between Luke 5:24 (assuming the next line after the extant text begins with ἐκεῖ of Luke 5:24) and 5:30 (assuming that καὶ παντεῖ was read at the start of the extant line) there are 609 letters (counted using NA27 and allowing for nomina sacra), suggesting that there would have been 24 lines between the two texts. Similarly, between Luke 7:10 (assuming a short line for the final extant line) and 7:17 (assuming a line ending with περὶ ὑπὸ preceding the extant line) there are 615 letters (again NA27 assuming nomina sacra), confirming that there would probably have been 24 lines between the two texts.

Both these calculations confirm the picture of a page of 28 lines (+/−1), averaging around 26 (+/−1) letters on each line. Although we lack outer margins, we have complete lines of text which are 6.5–7.0 cm wide, with an inner margin of 1.0–1.5 cm. Given that each page had approximately 27 lines of text; because of the closeness of the writing—3 lines per cm—the height of the text column on each page would be around 9 cm. So text occupies 9 × 7 cm on each page with probably at most 2 cm of margin at any edge (it would be rather anomalous for such a compact text to have spacious margins; rather I am assuming that the external margins would be congruent with the obvious space constraints of the text layout). We might therefore estimate that the each page measured approximately 12 (+/−1) × 10 (+/−1) cm.

Layouts of this type were very common for parchment codices of literary texts from the third to the sixth century. Among Christian texts in particular we find a number of close parallels in terms of

---

5 Thanks for the photographs are due to M. Scudder of the photographic department of the Cambridge University Library.
6 609 letters at an average of 26 (+/−1) letters per line gives 23.4 (22.6–24.4). Averaging up (to allow for occasional short lines) suggests 24 lines (+/−1). This is clearly only an approximation—assuming a certain type of text and a relatively uniform layout and a normal distribution of narrow and wide letters. As a point of comparison we might note that Codex Bezae has 612 letters in the same (assumed) gap.
7 615 letters at an average of 26 (+/−1) letters per line gives 23.7 (22.8–24.6). Once again averaging up suggests 24 lines (+/−1). Codex Bezae has 618 letters in the same (assumed) gap.
8 E.G. Turner attempted (somewhat arbitrarily it must be said), to group early codices by size patterns in his *The Typology of the Codex* (Haney Foundation Series 18; Pennsylvania 1977). This manuscript corresponds to Turner’s Group XI—
size and content, details of which will be found in the following table. In addition to date and content, the three later columns provide information on the size of the codex (if available through pagination on the extant page or by simple calculation), the size of each page and the number of lines per page (they are all single column codices).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Pagination</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0232 = P.Ant. I 12\textsuperscript{9}</td>
<td>III–IV</td>
<td>2John</td>
<td>164, 165</td>
<td>9.9 × 8.8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0206 = P.Oxy. XI 1353\textsuperscript{10}</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>1Peter 5.5–13</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>13.5 × 10.1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. XV 1783\textsuperscript{11}</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Herm., Mand. 9</td>
<td>13 × 9.3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.Oxy. VI 849\textsuperscript{11}</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Acts of Peter</td>
<td>167, 168</td>
<td>9.8 × 9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0169 = P.Oxy. IV Rev 3:19–20 \textsuperscript{11}</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Rev 3:19–4:2</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
<td>9.5 × 7.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII 1080\textsuperscript{11}</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Rev 16:17–20</td>
<td>[c. 170 p.]</td>
<td>10 [+ mg] × 9</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0163 P.Oxy. VI 848\textsuperscript{12}</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Gal 3:16–25</td>
<td>c. 12 × 7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 breadth of 11/10 cm and ‘square’ (Typology, 29)—which he describes as a common format (Typology, 25; cf. 29–30 for a list of evidence). Cf. also M.J. Kruger, “P. Oxy 840: Amulet or Miniature Codex?,” \textit{JTS} 53 (2002) 81–94, esp. 89–92, who focuses on Turner’s (related) group XIV—those with a breadth of less than 10cm (Typology, 29–30).


\textsuperscript{10} C.H. Roberts, \textit{The Antinoopolis Papyri. Volume One} (London 1950) 24–26: “the volume was of considerable compass” (24).


\textsuperscript{12} B.P. Grenfell—A.S. Hunt, \textit{The Oxyrhynchus Papyri} XV (London 1922) 15–17.

\textsuperscript{13} B.P. Grenfell—A.S. Hunt, \textit{The Oxyrhynchus Papyri} VI (London 1908) 6–12.

\textsuperscript{14} B.P. Grenfell—A.S. Hunt, \textit{The Oxyrhynchus Papyri} VIII (London 1911) 14–16. A single page of this manuscript (counting from line 3 recto = Rev 16:17–18 \(\gamma\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\iota\rho\varepsilon\) to line 2 verso = Rev 16:19 \(\pi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\digamma\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\) corresponds to 7 lines of text in NA\textsuperscript{15}. Revelation takes up approximately 1,200 lines, hence this manuscript would probably have had around 170 pages.

\textsuperscript{15} Grenfell—Hunt, \textit{The Oxyrhynchus Papyri} VI, 6. A single page of this manuscript (counting from line 3 recto = Rev 16:17–18 \(\gamma\epsilon\rho\omega\nu\varepsilon\varsigma\iota\rho\varepsilon\) to line 2 verso = Rev 16:19 \(\pi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\digamma\omicron\delta\omicron\omicron\) corresponds to 6 lines of text in NA\textsuperscript{15}. Revelation takes up approximately 1,200 lines, hence this manuscript would probably have had around 200 pages.

\textsuperscript{16} E. Pistelli, \textit{Papiri Greci e Latini Volume Terzo (III)} (PSI; Firenze—Roma, 2004 reprint of 1914) 108–110 (No. 251).
It is firstly notable that these codices made up of small pages could nevertheless be quite thick; indeed, all but one of the parallel samples we noted provide evidence for quite large codices, some comprising multiple books, others comprising single volumes of quite large books (*Acts of Peter, Revelation*). None of these comparable manuscripts have writing as small and compact as that exhibited in our manuscript—typically the manuscripts listed above might have 2 lines of writing per centimeter, whereas we have calculated that this manuscript had around 27 lines of text per page, or (for 9 cm of writing space), 3 lines of writing per centimeter. Indeed, among the compact writing evident in Christian texts, very few manuscripts contain writing smaller than 2 lines per centimeter: taking account of the margins, P.Ant. I 12, P. Oxy. VI 849 and PSI III 251, all listed above, manage more than 2 lines per centimeter, as does Codex Vaticanus Gr 1209 (B 03), which has 42 lines of text within columns of 18 cm in height (set within very wide margins). Among NT papyrus manuscripts, we find some examples at the 2 lines per centimeter rate, but none smaller. These include *P*75 (P. Bodmer XIV & XV), where a column of text around 21 cm in height has between 38—45 lines (average 42); and others such as *P*4 (18 cm height with 36 lines per column);*P*37 (P. Oxy. XI 1355, frag. 1 is 10 cm in height with 19 lines); *P*18 (c. 25 cm in height with 42–47 lines); and *P*110 (c. 22 cm in height with 40–43 lines).

Smaller writing is found, but not, as far as my searches have located, among biblical manuscripts. One impressive example is P. Oxy. VI 840, a non-canonical gospel manuscript from the fourth century, which—in a vellum page measuring 8.8 × 7.4 cm—has 22 lines of writing on one side and 23 lines on the other. The height

17 Cf. Kruger: “Despite their small size, some [miniature codices] could contain a surprising number of pages” in “P. Oxy 840: Amulet or Miniature Codex?,” 89 and referring to P. Oxy 849 (*Acts of Peter*) and the *Mani Codex* which has 192 pages measuring only 3.5 × 4.5 cm (see note 38 on pp. 89–90).
18 K. Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (ANTTF 1; Berlin—New York 1994) 3 (similar, although not identical, figures are given for *P*64+67, which is sometimes thought to belong to the same original manuscript: c. 20 cm high with 38–39 lines; *Liste*, 12).
measurement of 8.8 cm includes upper and lower margins; and the 22 lines of text take up only 5.5 cm or four lines per centimeter. All of this suggests that while the format of our manuscript is not unusual, and could be used for fairly thick codices exceeding two hundred pages, the small size of the writing is unusual, even unique, among biblical manuscripts. We shall need to bear this comparative information in mind as we attempt to reconstruct the codex format of the original manuscript represented by our small fragment.

3. Codex Format: Calculation and Exploration

If we return to our general conclusion that a page in our manuscript would have contained 28 lines (+/–1), averaging around 26 (+/–1) letters on each line, we can calculate that each page would, on average, have around 728 (+/–50) letters. The space between the extant text on page B (Luke 5:31) and that on page C (Luke 7:9) is approximately 6,450 letters (c. 150 lines of NA at c. 43 letters per line). 6,450 letters corresponds to nine pages of content on this scale. These nine pages would comprise two portions amounting to one whole page on the bottom of page B and the top of page C, and eight additional pages, between page B and page C. This is an extremely plausible solution, since eight pages would comprise four leaves of vellum or two whole sheets.

The most likely conclusion to be drawn from this is therefore that the eight missing pages would have comprised the two innermost sheets of a quire, while our four page sheet would represent the third sheet from the inside of the quire. Since most codices are made up from four sheet quires it follows that the most likely scenario would have an outer sheet, our sheet as the second sheet, and two internal sheets making up the quire. Confirmation of this view of things comes from the observation that in this case pages A&D are written on the hair-side of the vellum, while pages B&C are on the

---


23 6,450 divided by our page size of 728 (+/– 50) letters equals 9 pages of intervening material [more precisely: 8.9 [range 8.3–9.6]].
flesh-side.24 This corresponds to what would be expected, since most quires come to have a standard format, known as Gregory’s rule, whereby the outside of the quire consists of the flesh-side of the external vellum sheet and the sheets are laid on top of each other matching hair-sides and flesh-sides and leaving a flesh-side opening in the center—this results in each opening alternating between hair-sides and flesh-sides, providing a consistency of colour and texture within each opening.25 As the second sheet of a four-sheet quire our sheet fits with the expected format: pages A and D are hair-side (and would presumably have faced the hair-side of the external sheet), while pages B and C are flesh-side (and would presumably have faced the flesh-side of the third sheet). A simple diagram may demonstrate the structure of the quire on this understanding:

If we were to take this attempted reconstruction one step further we could calculate that such a quire, incorporating sixteen pages of text, would have around 11,650 letters (+/–800). If for the sake of

---

24 It is notable that although in antiquity the flesh-side of vellum seems to have been the prestige side—with the best surface for writing and reading; it is normally the hair side which preserves the text best.

argument we assume for a moment that our piece comes in the middle of a page then the portion of text taken up on this quire would be around 1,800 letters before and after the extant portions of pages A and D (two and a half pages). Mapping this against the NA\textsuperscript{27} text of Luke (taking 1,800 letters as corresponding to c. 42 lines of text in NA\textsuperscript{27}), suggests that the quire would have extended from around Luke 5:6 through to 7:38.

Further extrapolation becomes increasingly speculative. If a four-sheet quire contains 11,650 (+/−800) letters and Luke’s Gospel contains approximately 97,714 letters, then this would suggest that the whole of Luke’s Gospel would need between eight and nine quires (calculation gives: 8.4 quires with range: 7.85–9.0). Eight quires would require 128 pages, while nine quires would require 144 pages—both of these are well within the range for this type of codex and suggest that the most likely scenario is a multiple quire but small format codex containing the whole gospel of Luke. Indeed the space requirements for Luke are so far within the range provided by the other examples that it would not be impossible to rule out the presence of some other text with Luke in such a codex—another gospel like John (à la $\pmb{\gamma}$\textsuperscript{79}) which on these figures would require six quires (range: 5.6—6.5) or 96 further pages, or perhaps the Acts of the Apostles which would require eight quires (range: 7.55–8.65) or 128 further pages—although a four-gospel codex would seem to be ruled out as requiring in total an unparalleled twenty-seven quires or 432 pages.\textsuperscript{26}

4. Palaeographical Analysis: Dating

To some extent this discussion has already provided some comparative evidence for dating our manuscript. Ultimately any dating depends on the palaeographical analysis of the hand or script of the

\textsuperscript{26} We have used the following figures for the number of letters in each book: Matthew: 89,925; Mark: 53,530; Luke: 97,714; John: 70,210; Acts: 94,000, supplied by E. Nestle, *Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the Greek New Testament* (ET E. Edie; London 1901) 48–49 (this material additional to the German second edition) on the basis of counting by Graux (in *Revue de Philologie*, II) reported by Zahn. It should be obvious that the approach we are taking does not hinge on the absolute accuracy of these figures.
A NEWLY DISCOVERED MANUSCRIPT OF LUKE’S GOSPEL

manuscript. In this connection the small size of the hand creates some difficulties.

The hand is a ‘biblical majuscule’—the letters are upright and formally produced, most of the letter forms can fit within squares, there are contrasts between thick strokes for vertical lines downward diagonals to the right and thin strokes for horizontal lines and upward diagonals, *rhos* and *upsilon* have tails that descend below the line. There are some decorative elements at the tips of horizontal lines (in *tau* and *gamma*, but not in *pi*), and on *upsilon*. The *kappa* remains attached.

In terms of dating the crucial clues are the decorative elements and the pronounced contrasts between thin and thick strokes, both of which characterize the ‘biblical majuscule’ in the fifth century. We have a manuscript from early in the sixth century, the *Vienna Dioscurides*, dated to AD 513, which provides the major chronological marker to the end of this period. Compared to our manuscript, the *Vienna manuscript* has a rather more stylized and elaborate presentation, the arms of the *kappa* are detached from the vertical line, decorative elements are more prevalent (at the bottom of descenders in *rho*, *phi*, *upsilon*; at the end of horizontal lines in *pi*, *zeta*, *delta*, *xi*; and at the end of curved strokes in *eta* and *sigma*). Our manuscript must clearly be dated earlier than this.

A fairly close parallel in terms of size and subject matter is NT manuscript 0176, already mentioned in our list of similar sized codices above, and generally dated to the fifth century. In many ways this is a close match, as 0176 also has decorative elements, but they are

---

less distinct and less common than in our manuscript; and in general there is less clear cut distinctions between the thickness of strokes than in our manuscript, which is probably later than this example.

Among manuscripts in this style generally placed in the second half of the fifth century there are two which appear close enough to our manuscript to support this dating. The “Cotton Genesis” (British Library, Cod. Cotton Otho B.VI) and the Vatican manuscript of Cassius Dio (Vat. Gr. 1288), although both represent much larger and more formal books than our small codex, nevertheless represent a basically similar stage in the development of the ‘biblical majuscule’.30

We might thus conclude that as far as palaeographical comparisons go, our manuscript is to be dated in the second half of the fifth century.31

5. Textual and Other Questions

Scribal Features: The scribe uses a dieresis over the initial iota in ωουν (7:18); but otherwise there is no evidence of accentuation. Evidence of punctuation is present on each of the surviving pages of the manuscript—four examples involving two different levels of punctuation or text division. In three places (at the ends of Luke 5:23; 5:30 and 7:9 corresponding to the modern verse division) a middle point is visible. These all correspond to minor breaks in the thought of the passage—5:24 introduces a parenthetical remark; 5:31 introduces a saying of Jesus (involving a change of speaker); while 7:10 represents a transition from Jesus’ words to narration—and are normally punc-

30 For Brit. Lib, Cod. Cotton Otho B.VI see Cavallo—Maehler, Greek Bookhands, 24a (pp. 56–7) or K. Weitzmann—H.L. Kessler, The Cotton Genesis (Princeton Monographs in Art and Archaeology 45; Princeton 1986); for Vat. Gr. 1288 see Cavalieri—Lietzmann, Specimina codicum graecorum vaticanorum, 2; Cavallo, Ricerche, plate 67. Other comparable biblical manuscripts from this period include Codex Alexandrinus (Brit. Lib., Royal I.D.v–viii), see Metzger, Manuscripts, 18 (pp. 86–87); Thompson, Palaeography, facs. 46 (pp. 206–7); Cavallo, Ricerche, plates 64–65; Hatch, Principal Uncial Manuscripts, plates XVII–XIX, and the Freer Manuscript of Deuteronomy and Joshua (Washington, Freer Gallery, Cod. Wash. 1), see Metzger, Manuscripts, 17 (pp. 84–85); cf. also T.J. Kraus, “P.Vindob.G 39756 + Bodl. MS Gr. th. f. 4 [P]: Fragmente eines Codex der griechischen Petrus-Apokalypse,” BASP 40 (2003) 45–61, esp. 50.

31 In a letter dated 4 Sept 2003 Prof. Herwig Maehler suggested ‘late V rather than early VI’.
tuated as new sentences in modern editions. The fourth example involves a more major paragraph division marker in which the end of the line is left blank after the completion of 7:17. This corresponds to a relatively major transition of thought in the text and corresponds to the end of a paragraph in other ancient manuscripts, the Ammonian-Eusebian Sections, and in modern editions. Given that these four examples correspond to widely recognized text-divisions, and that they represent all the potential punctuational points in the entire textual sample, it seems fair to conclude that our manuscript was thoroughly and conventionally punctuated throughout.

Nomina sacra are used for the name of Jesus (the two letter form—5:31; 7:9); but not for ‘the Son of Man’ in Luke 5:24.32 Abbreviations for ‘the Son of Man’ can and do vary a lot both within and between manuscripts. At this point, for example, while many manuscripts abbreviate both of the key words (e.g. C f Θ), others abbreviate only one of the two words (e.g. 01 has ανθρωπου in full; ΓΘ and f have ως in full and ανθρωπου), and some others, like our manuscript, have the two words written out in full here at this point (so B and W).33 A single example is insufficient to prove that this was the standard practice throughout the manuscript—B never abbreviates ‘the Son of Man’ in Luke’s Gospel; while W varies between the full form and one using ανθρωπου in a pattern that is not obvious.34

There is only one singular reading in the extant material. This is the omission of στραφετς in 7:9. A single singular reading hardly allows any generalizing deductions, especially since this occurs in the context of a passage in which our manuscript has several readings

34 Although initial soundings were taken using Swanson, the situation was confirmed (for Luke) at least using facsimiles of the two manuscripts: C.M. Martini, Novum Testamentum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 1209 (Codex B) tertia vero phototypice expressum (Vatican City 1968) and H.A Sanders, Facsimile of the Washington Manuscript of the four Gospels in the Freer Collection (Ann Arbor 1912). For W we find the full form in 5:24; 6:5.22; 7:34; 9:22.26.44; then with ανθρωπου in 9:58; then the full form in 11:30; 12:8.10.40; then with ανθρωπου in 17:22.24.26.30; 18:8.31; 19:10; 21:27; then the full form in 21:36; using ανθρωπου in 22:22; the full form in 22:48; then using ανθρωπου in 22:69 and 24:7.
which have only relatively minor support. The passage reveals a paraphrastic tendency with some parallels with Codex Bezae. 7:9 in our manuscript seems to read as follows:

\[
\text{akousas de tauta o } \text{Ihsouw eyaumasen kai eipen } \text{tv akolou\-younti oxlv legv umin oude en } \text{tv [israhl] tosaautin pistin evron:}
\]

With this we might compare two other versions of the verse: 35 Codex Vaticanus (with wide-ranging support including }\text{D}^{\circ}, \text{although fragmentary at this point, and Sinaiticus, reflected in }\text{NA}):

\[
\text{akousas de tauta o Ihsouw eyaumasen auton, kai strafei } \text{tv akolou\-younti autv oxlv eipov, legv umin, oude en } \text{tv Israhl tosaautin pistin evron}
\]

Codex Bezae:

\[
\text{akousas de tauta o Ihsouw eyaumasen kai strafei eipen } \text{tv akolou-
younti oxlv amhn legv umin oudepote tosaautin pistin evron en } \text{tv israhl}
\]

To summarise the evidence of this verse, we find that our manuscript agrees in the omission of }\text{auton} with only }\text{D }\Theta \text{ and 700, and then uniquely omits }\text{strafei}. It then fronts }\text{eipen} and omits }\text{autv} in the following clause, resulting in a close parallel with Codex Bezae (which agrees almost uniquely in both these respects): }\text{eipen }\text{tv akolou-
younti oxlv}. 36 In the final part of the verse, the saying of Jesus, our manuscript definitely doesn’t follow the text represented by Bezae, rather following the text represented by Vaticanus. Our text therefore represents a somewhat paraphrastic rendering of the introduction, with connections to the text of Codex Bezae. But how significant are the connections with Codex Bezae?

On the positive side we could note that three agreements in close context, two of which are paralleled only in Bezae (in a four-word agreement that has hitherto been regarded as a singular reading in Bezae), are definitely suggestive. 37 But a direct literary connection

---

35 Evidence drawn initially from Swanson, }\text{Luke}, 118; then checked against the two facsimiles.

36 }W\text{ lacks }\text{tv akolou\-younti autv, thus coincidentally agreeing in the omission of }\text{autv}.

37 In 7:17 we have a further agreement with Bezae— }\text{kai ex pias }\text{tis perixwor— albeit here the reading is also shared among other important supporting witnesses: }\text{A }\text{D E9}.
with Codex Bezae seems unlikely given the lack of agreement with several other Bezan readings in the saying of Jesus in 7:9 and in the other texts extant in our manuscript. In this respect we should note the following:

1. in 5:23 0312 has σοι αι ἁμαρτίαι σου (with B, A, C, L, U, Δ Λ Μ f1 f15 33.1346, etc.), against σου αι ἁμαρτίαι (01 D W Θ);
2. in 5.31 0312 has καὶ αποκρθεῖς (with all other witnesses) against αποκρθεῖς δε (D—a singular reading);
3. in 7:18a 0312 has καὶ ἀπηγγέλαν ἡλανην οἱ μαθηταὶ σου περὶ παντῶν τούτων (with other witnesses) against εν οἷς καὶ μερι ἡλανου του βαπτιστου ος (D—a singular reading);
4. in 5.18b 0312 also reads τινας against Bezae.

As in other respects, but more so in relation to the actual text, if we possessed more we could know. The agreements could easily be the coincidental product of similarly paraphrastic tendencies: fronting the verb of speech and dropping the redundant pronoun. On the other hand we know that a text sharing many characteristics of the Bezan text had a relatively wide distribution in the early church, so it would not be surprising to find other evidence for it. The question remains intriguing but we cannot really expect to resolve it decisively given the amount of extant text available for study. In my opinion the general divergences from the text of Codex Bezae make it more plausible to think of this as a coincidentally parallel paraphrastic rendering of the passage.

Some other evidence that might offer support for a paraphrastic or free tendency in 0312 is found in 5:30. Unfortunately the text is pretty obscure, but it is quite clear that this verse ends here in 0312 with ἐσθήσατα (the previous word or two should be present but are obscured by glue and general wear and are indecipherable). This suggests that 0312 either lacked καὶ πινετε (an agreement with K), or had a different word order from other texts.

Concluding Reflections

It is inevitable that the discovery of small fragments of a NT manuscript will leave many questions unanswered and unanswerable. Nevertheless it is also obvious that the small fragments add to our knowledge of the NT text and its transmission incrementally. In
addition, we were able to deduce a fair bit about the layout, format and structure of our manuscript, and from that other deductions could follow. For example, one feature of the small codex format that we have not previously noted is the fact that a relatively high proportion of such small codices contain texts from beyond the edge of the canon. Is this relevant to the question of care of copying? Perhaps this format, apparently for personal use rather than public reading, was also characterised by somewhat paraphrastic or free textual renderings. But that is a question for further study and cannot be entered into here.

——

38 Kruger, “P.Oxy 840: Amulet or Miniature Codex?,” noted that of the 45 miniature codices listed in Turner (Typology, 29–30), most of them were Christian, and they included texts such as Hermas, Acts of Peter, an apocryphal Gospel, Acts of Paul and Thecla, Protevangelium of James, 6 Ezra, Didache.