EXAMINING THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER IN DUKE MS. GK. 1

USING CONTEMPORARY TEXT-CRITICAL METHODOLOGY

A Thesis
Presented To
the Faculty of
Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the
Master of Theology Degree

by
Jeff Crabtree
May 1993
ABSTRACT

Current text-critical methodology requires thorough knowledge of manuscript documents. An application of this principle shows Duke MS. GK. 1 to be a Greek minuscule MS containing the entire NT with catenae for most books. Done by a skilled scribe, the palaeography of this parchment codex suggests its origin at ca. 1100 AD.

1 Peter of Duke MS. GK. 1 contains several common scribal variations and errors. Variants resulting from moveable nu, itacisms, and manuscript traditions are common. These were determined by comparison of Duke MS. GK. 1 with the critical apparatuses of the following editions of the Greek NT: Nestle/Aland 26, UBS\(^2\), UBS\(^3\), Tischendorf’s eighth edition, and von Soden’s three volume set.

Several variants appear to be unique readings of Duke MS. GK. 1. Errors of expansions of the text, one possible intentional change, haplographies, and errors of the eye and mental fatigue are present and at times result in nonsense readings. Three errors in this letter have been corrected, possibly by the scribe himself.

1 Peter of Duke MS. GK. 1 is part of the Byzantine text tradition. Collation of Duke MS. GK. 1, \(\text{P}^{72}\), \(\text{P}^{74}\), \(\text{M}\), and B against the Textus Receptus shows Duke MS. GK. 1 to be Byzantine in nature. In places of variation, its text exhibits 85.5 percent agreement with that of the Textus Receptus.
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<td>TS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<tr>
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<tr>
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<td>1-2 Cor</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
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<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
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<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
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**General**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Codex Alexandrinus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>Codex Sinaiticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>Alpha, Westcott and Hort’s neutral text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTF</td>
<td>Arbeiten Zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Codex Vaticanus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>Beta, Westcott and Hort’s Syrian text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ca.</td>
<td>Circa, about, approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPM</td>
<td>Claremont Profile Method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>Delta, Westcott and Hort’s Western text</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UBS²  The Greek New Testament (2d ed.; United Bible Societies)

UBS³  The Greek New Testament (3d ed.; United Bible Societies)

viz.  Videlicet, namely

V-S  von Soden, Neuen Testaments
INTRODUCTION

Three fundamental issues face the New Testament scholar in the study of the textual problems in the Greek New Testament: (1) none of the autographs is extant; (2) no two extant documents totally agree; and (3) important MSS of the NT remain unpublished.¹ These three issues require the application of textual criticism to the available MSS of the NT. It is the purpose of this thesis to examine the text of 1 Peter of an unpublished manuscript, Duke MS. GK. 1, in light of contemporary text-critical methodology and to show what this manuscript can contribute to current text-critical studies.²


Chapter One surveys the beginning and growth of NT textual criticism by dividing its history into four periods. The final period receives the greatest attention in order to set forth contemporary text-critical understanding. Four modern methodologies for locating an individual manuscript’s relationship to other NT MSS are presented. Also, three different approaches for deciding originality of variant readings are discussed: rigorous eclecticicism, reasoned eclecticicism, and the Majority Text method. Reasoned eclecticicism is the method presumed in this thesis.

Chapter Two focuses on Duke MS. GK. 1, a Byzantine minuscule manuscript. Discussion of its history and of its codicological characteristics is followed by a thorough paleographical description. Using modern text-critical methodology, ff. 62r,

88r, 101r, and 182r-184r were examined. Paleographical studies and study of art forms present in the manuscript were done by comparison with other medieval manuscripts. Codicological characteristics, signature and page numbering sequence, collation, scribal corrections and scribal errors were determined from the study of the manuscript itself. Codicologically, Duke MS. GK. 1 is an unexceptional Byzantine codex. Paleographically, this manuscript is a carefully written Greek minuscule MS whose letter characteristics suggest the latter part of the eleventh century as the time of its production.

Chapter Three completes the discussion of this manuscript by presenting in summary fashion the differences between 1 Peter of Duke MS. GK. 1 and its collating standards. The collation of ff. 182r-184r (1 Peter) against the TR, P72, P74, A and B reveals that this is a Byzantine manuscript, and it has normal scribal errors. Scribal errors of expansion of the text, intentional change, haplography, and errors caused by fatigue are identified in the text of 1 Peter. Also, errors that have been corrected in the manuscript apparently by the original scribe are also found. The chapter demonstrates that there is value in the study of all NT Greek MSS regardless of their text-type.

Appendices are included as an important part of this thesis. They include collations from which are drawn the conclusions of the final two chapters along with a chart which presents the basis for the conclusions concerning the text-type found in this manuscript. Photocopies of the folios mentioned in this thesis
are also included in the Appendices.

This thesis advances the text-critical study of the Greek NT in the following ways: (1) It presents in summary form the development of textual studies from the second century to the present; (2) it summarizes the four major approaches followed today for locating a single manuscript's relationship to other manuscripts; (3) it shows the strengths and weaknesses of rigorous eclecticism, rational eclecticism, and the Majority Text method, three methods used today for determining which variant is probably the original; (4) it provides a codicological description of Duke MS. GK. 1, an unpublished manuscript, which reveals how some Byzantine NT codices were produced; (5) in describing the paleographical features of this manuscript, this study reveals the state of Greek minuscule script and writing in the eleventh century; (6) it reveals that in Duke MS. GK. 1 Luke, John, and 1 Peter were all written by the same hand; (7) it provides a full collation of 1 Peter of Duke MS. GK. 1 with the TR, P^72, P^74, M, and B, which reveals several scribal weaknesses prominent in manuscripts; (8) it reveals that Duke MS. GK. 1 is a Byzantine manuscript in 1 Peter; and (9) it demonstrates that individual Byzantine manuscripts can include strains of early manuscript tradition; and (10) it provides an extensive bibliography of resources available to the modern text-critic.
CHAPTER I
THE INCEPTION AND GROWTH OF NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Introduction

Because textual criticism is an art as well as a science, a thorough knowledge of the forces that shaped textual criticism is indispensable. What determines which MS, if any, is the "best"? Why is geographical distribution important? When dealing with genealogical relationships, how is the value of a MS decided? These questions concern what textual critics call external evidence. The answers in part come from an understanding of the development of textual criticism.

Internal evidence is no different. Why look for the harder reading? Are there historical developments in New Testament MS transmission that affect how the scribe would have copied a passage? Concerning the authors, did each writer have his own writing style and vocabulary?

These questions illustrate the need for an understanding of the historical development of textual criticism, part of a subfield of New Testament studies also called lower criticism.¹ This chapter summarizes and gives examples of the major forces

that contribute to the present status of New Testament textual criticism.

Five of the early Church Fathers illustrate the growing awareness of textual problems from the second to the fifth centuries. Their critical canons and conclusions show that they not only become more aware of textual variants, but were better able to deal with these textual problems.

Textual criticism from the fifth through the fourteenth centuries declined because of language changes and the changing constituency of the early church. These two changes resulted in a decreased need for Greek MSS and thus a decline in textual criticism during the early Middle Ages. It was not until the Renaissance and the invention of printing with moveable type (ca. 1450) that Greek MSS began again to be an item of scholarly concern.

From the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries, text-critical studies developed in two stages: the publication of editions of Greek New Testaments, and the collection of MS materials. During this period, critical theory began to advance, and scholars increasingly recognized the existence of differing text-types as well as the differences in the value of MSS.

The nineteenth century saw such advancement that it is treated separately from other centuries. New MS discoveries and collations made it possible for scholars to do extensive study of MS relationships and to develop canons of criticism that textual critics still accept today.
Refinement of nineteenth-century conclusions characterized the twentieth century. Scholarly attention concentrated primarily in two areas: the history of MS transmission and the relationship of external to internal evidence. Methodologies have now been developed that aid in finding an individual manuscript's place in the total MS transmission history. Most modern textual critics consider this use of external evidence to be an important factor in deciding the originality of a reading. Thus, in the current state of textual criticism, most textual critics rely on both external and internal canons of criticism to aid in their search for authentic readings.

This historical overview of the development of textual criticism will aid the researcher in understanding current text-critical methodology. Also, knowledge of this history will make the textual critic more skilled in the artful application of this twentieth-century methodology to current MS problems.

Textual Criticism from the Second to the Fifth Centuries

While textual critics recognize that MS differences existed early in the second century, how these differences were a problem to the early church needs to be examined to understand the development of the science of textual criticism. The writings of early church fathers give evidence that differences between MSS were recognized and analyzed. A discussion of five of these church fathers will show their growing awareness of textual differences and the critical canons used to decide which reading is most probably the original.
The earliest report of critical work on the text of the New Testament is recorded by Eusebius (Hist. eccl. 5.28.13-19). Quoting a contemporary source of his day, Eusebius writes about some who dared to challenge Scripture[2] whom Pope Victor (AD 190-202) excommunicated as heretics because they were denying the divinity of Jesus (Hist. eccl. 5.28.6).[3] A cobbler (σωματις) named Theodotus and his followers were given to the use of logic in their study of Scripture, and the text that resulted from their efforts was unlike any of their originals. Though certainty is not possible from Eusebius's account, emendation seems to have been included in Theodotus's methodology of editing a biblical text.[4]

[2]Eusebius writes: "For this cause they did not fear to lay hands on the divine scriptures, saying that they had corrected them. For they cannot even deny that this crime is theirs, seeing that the copies were written in their own hand, and they did not receive the scriptures in this condition from their teachers, nor can they show originals from which they made their copies. Some of them have not thought it necessary even to emend the text, but simply deny the Law and the Prophets, and thus on the pretence of their wicked and godless teaching have fallen to the lowest destruction of perdition (Hist. eccl. 5.28.13-19).

[3]For more information concerning the excommunication of Theodotus of Byzantium, see Karl Baus, From the Apostolic Community to Constantine (New York: Seabury, 1980) 209, 229, 255, 358. Concerning Theodotus Baus writes, "He and his followers tried to prove from scripture, by means of philological textual criticism, their fundamental thesis that Jesus, until his baptism in Jordan, led the life of a simple but very upright man on whom the Spirit of Christ then descended" (255). For a description of Theodotus’s heresy written during that same time period, see Hippolytus Refut. 7.23; 10,19.

Writings of some Church Fathers who were contemporaries of Theodotus and writings of Fathers who followed him suggest an increased awareness of textual variants. Four of the Fathers, Origen, Tertullian, Jerome and Augustine, mention variants and at times reveal their choices between the variants. The different locations and times of these men, their extant writings, and their scholarly care make them the best representatives of early text-critical work.\(^5\)

Sincere efforts to deal with textual differences are especially evident in the works of Origen of Alexandria and Caesarea (ca. AD 185-254) as he began work on the Hexapla (Eusebius Hist. eccl. 6.16.1-4).\(^6\) However, this study concerned only the text of the Old Testament, and he evidently did not edit a New Testament text as such.\(^7\) Nonetheless, his writings

---


\(^6\)Much attention has been directed toward Origen's life and labors. For a bibliographic essay of the most important works done on Origen from 1970-1988, see Henri Cronzel, "The Literature on Origen 1970-1988," To 49 (1988) 499-516.

\(^7\)To those who claim that Origen edited a NT text which resulted in a specific text-type, Fee replies with confidence that Origen was not responsible for any "creation or revision of the text of Egypt" (Gordon D.
illustrate his interest in New Testament textual matters. For example, in his discussion of Matt 27:16-17 he wrestles with the variants "Jesus Barabbas" and "Barabbas." Origen chooses "Barabbas" because he thinks "Jesus" would never be applied to an evil-doer.⁸

Origen's criteria for choosing between variants will not meet contemporary text-critical principles, but his comments are still valuable for several reasons. His identification of variants present in the biblical texts used in the late second and early third centuries helps scholars today identify local texts and more accurately learn the evolution of alternate readings. Also, his comments illustrate his own perspicacity in choosing among variation units and reveal the attitude of some scholars during this time toward the significance of MS

---


⁸Metzger acknowledges Origen's observations concerning "textual phenomena," but he notes that Origen "was quite uncritical in his evaluation of their significance." Metzger continues: "In the majority of cases he was content merely to make the observation that certain other copies present a different reading, without indicating his preference for one or the other variants." Metzger has located twenty-two specific references by Origen to textual variants (ibid. 78-95).
differences.  

Tertullian (ca. 155-240), a contemporary of Origen, was second only to Augustine in his Latin writings as church theologian. His argument that Christ became flesh totally of his own desire shows his awareness of textual variants. Using John 1:13 to support his thesis, he argues that the subject of this verse was originally singular until some tampered with it, wanting to apply it to themselves (Tertullian On the Flesh of Christ 19). Tertullian does not suggest the number, age, or language of those MSS that have the singular reading. Though the situation may have been different in the second century than it is today, and though several witnesses, mainly Latin, have the singular subject, no currently extant Greek MSS have the reading preferred by Tertullian. 

Jerome (ca. 347-420) had a better understanding of textual

---

5 In one instance, Origen laments the large number of variants present in his day. He writes: "And now the differences in the copies have clearly become numerous, whether from the unconcern of some scribes, or through the audacity of others, or lack of skill for correction of what they are copying, or even from their own considerations as they make additions or deletions while editing" (νννι δὲ δηλονότι πολλὴ γέγονεν ἡ τῶν ἀντιγράφων διαφορά, εἶτε ἀπὸ ῥαθυμίας τινῶν γραφέων, εἶτε ἀπὸ τὸλμης τινῶν μοχθηρᾶς τῆς διορέωςεις τῶν γραφομένων, εἶτε καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν τὰ ἐαυτοὶς δοκοῦντα ἐν τῇ διορέωςει προστιθέντων ἢ ἀφαιροῦντων. Commentary on Matthew 15.14).

8 Quasten, Patrology 247.

problems than Origen and Tertullian.\textsuperscript{12} He says that he had done work in the original languages of both the Old and New Testaments, and he concludes that that is the only way one can ascertain the true text (Jerome \textit{Letters} 71.5).\textsuperscript{13}

Like Origen, Jerome complained about careless scribes. He felt that copies of his own works had suffered at their hands and in at least one instance felt compelled to distance himself from any error found by the reader.\textsuperscript{14}

Metzger found twenty-seven times where Jerome mentioned textual variants in copies of Scripture current in his day.\textsuperscript{15} Jerome's discussions of variants in both testaments prove his awareness of errors which can arise when transcribing MSS: errors of homoeoteleuton, confusion over abbreviations, dittography,

\textsuperscript{12}Metzger gives several examples of variants discussed by Jerome which illustrate Jerome's prudence as a textual critic (Metzger, "St Jerome's Explicit References to Variant Readings" 179-190).


\textsuperscript{14}Jerome writes: "As for my poor works which, from no merits of theirs but simply from your own kindness, you say that you desire to have; I have given them to your servants to transcribe, I have seen the paper-copies made by them, and I have repeatedly ordered them to correct them by a diligent comparison with the originals. . . . If then you find errors or omissions which interfere with the sense, these you must impute not to me but to your own servants; they are due to the ignorance or carelessness of the copyists, who write down not what they find but what they take to be the meaning, and do but expose their own mistakes when they try to correct those of others" (Letters 71.5).

haplography, metathesis, assimilation, transpositions, and deliberate emendations by copyists. Jerome’s arguments for what he believes to be the correct readings are variously based, some on intrinsic concerns, others on transcriptional probabilities, the age of a MS, or the superiority of a Greek text over a Latin text.\(^{16}\) He rarely suggested which MS he considered

\(^{16}\) Jerome discusses copyists’ errors in his commentary on Psalm 77 (78). He is considering Matt 13:34,35 when he says,

Consequently, Matthew says: "All these things were done in fulfillment of what was spoken through the prophet Asaph." This is the reading found in all the ancient scrolls, but men in their ignorance changed it. As a result, to this day many versions of the Gospel read: "In fulfillment of what was spoken through the prophet Isaiah, 'I will open my mouth in a parable, I will utter mysteries from of old.'" This is not the utterance of Isaiah, but of Asaph.

Indeed, Porphyry, that unbeliever, exploits this very point in his attack upon us and says: "Your evangelist, Matthew, was so ignorant that he said: 'What is written in Isaiah the prophet: I will open my mouth in parables, I will utter mysteries from of old.'" Let us answer frankly: There is a similar problem in Matthew [27:45] and in John [19:14] where it is written that our Lord was crucified at the sixth hour, whereas in Mark [15:25] it is written that he was crucified the third hour. There seems to be a discrepancy here, but really there is none. The error was on the part of the scribes, for originally in Mark the sixth hour, likewise, was written, but many thought there was a gamma instead of an epsilon, the Greek number sign. Now, just as this was the scribe's error, it was, likewise, their error to write Isaiah instead of Asaph. Hence, when the inexperienced (because the early church was a congregation of ignorant peoples) were reading in the Gospel: "In fulfillment of what was written in Asaph the prophet," the one who first transcribed the Gospel began to ask: Who is this Asaph the prophet? He was not known to the people. And what did the scribe do? While amending an error, he made an error.

Jerome sided with Greek MSS against the Latin when he chose "serving the Lord" instead of "serving the time" for Rom 12:11 (Letters 27.3). According to the old copies, Jerome says, Luke 14:27 includes the words "cannot be my disciple" (Letters 127.6). He also mentions that many of the MSS, both Greek and Latin, contain the pericope de adultera (Against the Pelagians 2.17). For other examples, see Metzger, "St Jerome’s Explicit References to Variant Readings" 180-187; and Dennis Brown, "Saint Jerome as a Biblical Exegete," IBS 5 (1983) 142.
authoritative. This silence causes some disagreement concerning which text-type he relied on most.\textsuperscript{17} His revision of the Latin text was not accepted for several years because he relied on Greek texts and abandoned Old Latin readings in many places.\textsuperscript{18}

Augustine (354-430), best known for his theological pursuits,\textsuperscript{19} is considered "the most important of the Western Church Fathers for his extensive writings and numerous works on biblical exegesis."\textsuperscript{20} Augustine occasionally gave evidence of understanding sound text-critical principles. His preference for the harder reading and the reading which best gives rise to others is seen, for example, in his explanation of Matt 27:9 where Zechariah's prophecy is credited to Jeremiah in some MSS (The Harmony of the Gospels 3.7.29). Augustine states that this ascription to Jeremiah is not included in all the Gospel MSS, and that some simply say that it was spoken "by the prophet." He wants to follow those without the name of Jeremiah but is troubled because Jeremiah's name is in most codices.

\textsuperscript{17}Kenyon believes Jerome's work ends with an Alexandrian flavor which suggests a reliance on texts from Egypt (Frederick G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible [3d ed. revised and augmented by A. W. Adams; London: Duckworth, 1975] 159). Aland, however, says, "... the consensus today favors the view that Jerome used a contemporary manuscript of the early Koine type" in his Vulgate edition (Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 188). The Koine text-type (Hort's Syrian text) is that text-type found in the majority of extant Greek manuscripts. These terms will be defined more fully in the later portion of the present chapter.

\textsuperscript{18}Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible 158-159.

\textsuperscript{19}For a good summary of the life and influence of this Latin theologian, see Edwin A. Blum, "Augustine: The Bishop and Theologian," BSac 138 (1981) 57-67.

\textsuperscript{20}Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 211.
Furthermore, he learned from talking to others who spent much time in the Greek MSS that the name of Jeremiah was present in the more ancient exemplars. He knows of no reason why this addition should have been made to the original text, but clearly understands why it would have been removed when the scribe realized that the words were not those of the writings of Jeremiah. Augustine's preference for Jeremiah in the text shows his preference for the principle of the harder reading.

Theodotus, Origen, Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine illustrate an increasing awareness of textual variants in New Testament MSS during the second to fifth centuries. Theodotus was mentioned because he is credited with the earliest recension of the New Testament text. Origen, Tertullian, Jerome, and Augustine, because of their extant writings and their scholarly accomplishments, serve as the best representatives of the attitudes of their times concerning textual criticism. Though little of Theodotus's work is extant, enough of the writings of Origen, Tertullian, Jerome and Augustine remain to tell of their increased recognition of differences between New Testament MSS. Also, the critical skills of Jerome and Augustine are demonstrably different from the other men mentioned and more nearly match the principles of textual criticism accepted today.

21 Although Augustine does not mention who these others were, this reference does show that Augustine was not alone in his study of Greek manuscripts.
Textual Criticism from the Fifth through the Eighteenth Centuries

The Decline and Revival of Scholarly Interest in Greek Manuscripts

The demand for Greek MSS gradually diminished after AD 200 due to the constituency of the Church. Christianity was increasingly comprised mainly of common people who could not understand Greek. This limitation necessitated the use of regional languages as the medium for preaching the gospel and eventually required that the Scriptures be translated into those languages. These early versions in languages other than Greek dominated from the third and fourth centuries in most of the Church.

As seen above, Augustine mentions that some of his contemporaries studied the more ancient Greek exemplars. Metzger concludes that as many as nine correctors from the fourth through the twelfth centuries contributed to the 14,800 alterations in codex Sinaiticus (a fourth-century Greek uncial MS), which illustrates that work continued on individual MSS at least on a


limited basis. However, along with the dominance of regional languages the importance of Greek MSS declined because of the versions of the NT produced in these regional languages. By the middle of the third century the Church in the West predominantly spoke Latin as the call for Jerome's Vulgate illustrates. Exceptions are found in a few Greek-speaking enclaves such as those in Southern Italy whose work is recognized today in families 1 and 13, MS groups that form a part of the "Caesarean" text-type. The church in the East was also reading its

24 Metzger writes concerning this codex, "In light of such carelessness in transcription, it is not surprising that a good many correctors (apparently as many as nine) have been at work on the manuscript, some contemporary (or identical) with the original scribes . . . , and others as late as the twelfth century. Tischendorf's edition of the manuscript enumerates some 14,800 places where some alteration has been made to the text. By far the most extensive of the corrections are those made by a group of scholars in the seventh century. . . ." (Bruce M. Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible: An Introduction to Greek Palaeography [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981] 77).

25 "A popular form of Greek was currently spoken in the trading quarters of western cities, and for the first two centuries it was the language of the scriptures and liturgy of the Western Church. Meanwhile, tutors from Greek lands had long been engaged in imparting Hellenic culture to the youth of the Roman upper class, some of whom completed their studies at the university of Athens. These were, however, a small minority. Roman education down to its last days remained bilingual, but a first-hand acquaintance with Greek thought became rare, and use was increasingly made of translations and epitomes. The causes of this cultural decline are obscure, but it seems to have been accelerated by the disturbed conditions of the third century" (H. St L. B. Moss, "The Formation of the East Roman Empire: 330-717," The Cambridge Medieval History Vol IV: The Byzantine Empire Part I: Byzantium and Its Neighbours (ed. J. M. Hussey; Cambridge: University Press, 1966) 23.

Scripture in regional languages such as Syriac and Coptic. However, according to Aland, "the main tradition of the Greek text was preserved in the Greek-speaking East, of which Egypt was an integral part... where the official Church remained essentially Greek into the fifth century and later." Text-critical work done on Greek MSS declined from this period until the Renaissance. Also, if extant MSS give an approximate picture, copying of Greek MSS decreased from the third century through the eighth century. The only exception was the sixth century which showed a significant increase over the fifth century. However, the seventh century again shows a drastic decline in Greek MS production. Greek MS production appears much greater in the ninth century and continues at that level until the fourteenth century when decline is evident.

---

27 In the third-century Roman Empire, "Latin [was] the common tongue of the Western Empire..." "It is not however to be supposed that Latin was imposed even in its vulgarised forms on the entire population of the Empire. It is needless to remind the reader of the fact that in the whole eastern half Greek was the language of the educated classes. But both in the East and in the West there were many backward regions in which vernacular speech held its own stubbornly against Greek and Latin. The Copts, Arabs, Syrians, Armenians never gave up their native languages, and the oriental undercurrents continued to play an important part in the social life of Asia and Egypt. There are many vestiges of a similar persistency of barbarian custom and speech in the West" (Paul Vinogradoff, "Social and Economic Conditions of the Roman Empire in the Fourth Century," The Cambridge Medieval History I: The Christian Roman Empire and the Foundation of the Teutonic Kingdoms [eds. H. M. Gwatkin and J. P. Whitney; Cambridge: University Press, 1911] 544-545). See also C. W. Previte-Orton, The Shorter Cambridge Medieval History Vol I: The Later Roman Empire to the Twelfth Century (Cambridge: University Press, 1952) 24-25.


29 This was about the time the Greek minuscule hand was modified so that the Greek script could be written more rapidly and compactly (Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible 25).
The Renaissance beginning in the fourteenth century with its renewed study of Greek led to the scholarly examination of Greek MSS again. In particular, the invention of printing (ca. 1450) contributed to a resumed study of Greek MSS in two ways: the publication of editions of Greek New Testaments, and the collection of MS materials. Scholarly concern toward finding the original text of the New Testament revived after several published editions of a Greek text that was supposed to corroborate a new Vulgate translation. When some of these editions began to include a critical apparatus compiled from several different MSS, scholars became more serious about MS collection and collation, about understanding of text-types, and about developing text-critical principles. These advancements offered a direct challenge to the text-type published with minor changes from 1516 to 1775.

The Publication of Editions of the Greek New Testament

The first printed edition of the Greek New Testament available to the public was edited by Erasmus. He published

---

30 For a list of extant manuscripts by century, see Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 156-159.


32 Though the first printed Greek NT was the Complutensian Polyglot printed in 1514, it was not released to the public until 1522, six years after Erasmus's first edition was made available. In fact, Erasmus's third edition was released in 1522, the same year as the Polyglot. Though the Complutensian Polyglot was an important work, time has shown that the influence of Erasmus's
his Latin and Greek diglot in Basel in 1516. While the printer Johann Froben of Basel was interested in the financial rewards of this endeavor, Erasmus was mainly interested in publishing a Latin text to replace the Vulgate. The accompanying Greek text, according to Erasmus, would substantiate the Latin translation on which he had been working periodically for ten years. His goal, therefore, was not to edit a Greek text as such, but using existing Greek MSS, he sought to edit and improve the Vulgate, the Latin text in use in his day.

When Froben hired Erasmus to produce an edition of the Greek New Testament, Erasmus went to Basel intending to use Greek MSS there to print alongside his own Latin translation. Because the only MSS at Basel required correcting, Erasmus did hasty text-critical work as he prepared the Greek text for this edition. He had been doing textual work in the classics for several years, so text-critical work was not new to him. In his textual work, Erasmus utilized certain principles accepted by modern textual editions far exceeded that of the Polyglot. And even though Erasmus made use of the Complutensian Polyglot for his fourth edition (1527) and introduced several changes into his text, it was Erasmus's text that later generations copied, not that of the Polyglot.


36Erasmus had published his edition of Cicero's De officiis in 1501. For further study on Erasmus and his textual methodology, see John F. D'Amica, Theory and Practice in Renaissance Textual Criticism: Beatus Rhenanus between Conjecture and History (Berkley: University of California, 1988) 30-38.
critics (such as the principle of the harder reading), but his work was limited because he did not have today's tools and criteria. However, the Greek text he produced did serve as corroboration of his Latin translation, which as mentioned above, was his main intent. Erasmus published five editions of his diglot, and the third and fourth editions (1522 and 1527) became the primary bases of major printed editions of the Greek New Testament for the next three hundred years.

Though Erasmus gave primary emphasis to his Latin translation, others were not so inclined. The Greek text almost immediately became the primary object of interest. Those who followed Erasmus's edition and exerted the greatest influence were Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevir brothers.

Robert Estienne (1503-1559), better known by his Latin name Stephanus, published four Greek NT editions (1546, 1549, 1550, 1551). The 1550 edition, the first edition printed with a critical apparatus, relied heavily on Erasmus's text, and became part of the traditional Greek text printed with very few changes down to the nineteenth century. It included variant readings from fifteen MSS, one of which was codex Bezae, a fifth-century

---


39 Ibid. 22; Jonge, "Novum Testamentum a Nobis Versum" 400.

Greek-Latin diglot. 41

Theodore de Beza (1519-1605) published nine editions of the Greek New Testament, which, because of their similarity to Stephanus's work, served to popularize that text-type. The translation of the 1611 King James Version relied heavily on Beza's 1588-89 and 1598 editions. In 1624, the Elzevir brothers, Bonaventure and Abraham, published a Greek NT taken primarily from Beza's smaller 1565 edition. Their 1633 edition contains in its preface the words "You have therefore the text which is now received by all, in which we give nothing altered or corrupt." 42 From this statement the term, "Textus Receptus" came into use, which, because of the similarity of text in these two editions, when used today, refers to both the 1550 edition of Stephanus and the 1633 Elzevir edition. All major Protestant translations in the languages of Europe before 1881 were made from this text. 43

The Collection of Manuscript Materials

From 1550 on, collection of MS materials began to increase. Stephanus had printed textual variants from at least fifteen MSS. However, more extensive collection of MS materials and


appreciation for the value of ancient MSS came when codex Alexandrinus (a fifth-century Greek uncial codex, also designated with the letter A) reached England in 1627.\textsuperscript{44} Brian Walton, using Stephanus’s third edition (1550) as his text, printed readings from Alexandrinus in the lower margins of his eight volume polyglot (1655-57). In a supplement he also listed collations from fifteen other MSS besides those given earlier by Stephanus.\textsuperscript{45} With this publication of the first organized compilation of variant readings, Walton introduced the system of cataloging uncial MSS by capital Latin letters and minuscules by Arabic numbers.\textsuperscript{46}

In 1675 John Fell printed the Elzevir text of 1633 with an apparatus he claimed was drawn from over one hundred MSS. John Mill’s edition of 1707 was, however, of more importance than Fell’s. Beginning with Stephanus’s text and MS sources, Mill produced an apparatus drawn from seventy-eight additional MSS

\textsuperscript{44}Eldon Jay Epp, "Textual Criticism," The New Testament and Its Modern Interpreters (eds. Eldon Jay Epp and George W. MacRae; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) 77. Codex Alexandrinus was evidently brought from Alexandria to Constantinople by Cyril Lucar in 1621. A note at the front of the MS states that it had been a gift to the Patriarchal cell in Alexandria. Cyril Lucar offered it to James I of England as a gift, but James died before receiving the gift and so it was actually received by Charles I in 1627. Kenyon says this manuscript went from Constantinople to Alexandria in the fourteenth century and back to Constantinople in the seventeenth century. For further information on the history and description of this uncial, see Frederick G. Kenyon, Handbook to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament (London: MacMillan, 1912) 72-77; and idem., Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1895; reprinted New York: Harper & Row, 1958) 198-202.

\textsuperscript{45}Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible 85, 174, 175.

\textsuperscript{46}Finegan, Encountering New Testament Manuscripts 49.
including Greek, Old Latin, Vulgate, and Peshitta versions, and whatever patristic sources he could secure which included evidence on more than twenty-one thousand variation units. Mill marks the beginning of the modern discipline of textual criticism. 47

Classification of MSS according to text-type began with J. A. Bengel of Tübingen (1687-1752). He divided the textual witnesses into families and tried to corroborate their correlation and textual characteristics. 48 He discovered two major families of MSS which he called African and Asiatic, the latter being less valuable though largest in number. Bengel then subdivided his African family of MSS into two subgroups which he found represented in Alexandrinus and the Old Latin. 49 Thus, Bengel introduced for the first time the text-critical principle of dividing MSS according to age and quality, of weighing authorities instead of merely numbering them. Bengel printed the TR as his text in his 1734 edition of the Greek New Testament, but he placed his views concerning variant readings in the margins.


Johann Salomo Semler (1725-91), went farther than Bengel by suggesting three groups of MSS. What Semler called his Alexandrian text is that text that comes from Origen and his disciples. This text-type is also preserved in the Syriac, Ethiopic, and Bohairic. The text represented in the MSS of the churches in Antioch and Constantinople (which he credited to a recension prepared by Lucian of Antioch in the early fourth century) Semler designated as his Eastern text. What he called his Western text with its beginning in Origen was that found in the Latin Fathers and versions. Semler considered the mass of later witnesses to be mixed texts and of little significance. Semler did not publish an edition of the Greek NT.

Semler's student, J. J. Griesbach published his edition of the Greek Testament in 1775-77. Following the same groupings as his teacher, he agreed with Bengel and Semler that the mass of late MSS was of inferior value. The Western text, though early, was full of copyists' errors. The Alexandrian text was an effort to edit the Western. Following carefully stated canons of criticism, which in essence had already been formulated by Bengel, Griesbach was the first scholar to produce an edition of the Greek New Testament that did not follow the TR, but was

---

58 Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible 177.
based on the published conclusions of his own studies. The impact of Griesbach’s work was great in that other editors began following his example of abandoning the TR in their printed editions.

Summary

Textual studies declined during the Middle Ages. With the Renaissance and its revival of study in the classics, and with the invention of printing and its ability to produce multiple

---

53 Though Griesbach was the first German Scholar to produce an edition of the Greek NT which did not follow the TR, some scholars in England had in actuality led the way. One example is William Bowyer, Jr. from London who published a critical edition of the Greek NT in 1763. Bowyer introduced some readings into his text which he believed had better MS support than the TR and other passages which he doubted as original he simply bracketed. Bowyer’s work is not discussed in detail in this study because even though his work was important, its impact was limited due to the overpowering influence of the TR and his failure to develop, as Griesbach later did, "a well-rounded theory of textual criticism based on a study of families of texts." Further information on Bowyer may be found in Bruce M. Metzger, "William Bowyer’s Contribution to New Testament Textual Criticism," Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism (Leiden: Brill, 1963) 155-160.

54 Metzger says, "The importance of Griesbach for New Testament textual criticism can scarcely be overestimated. For the first time in Germany a scholar ventured to abandon the Textus Receptus at many places and to print the text of the New Testament in the form to which his investigations had led him" (Bruce M. Metzger, "History of Editing the Greek New Testament," Princ S B 8/3 [1987] 42). Westcott and Hort agree with Metzger’s assessment saying that they venerate his name above that of every other textual critic of the NT. However, they point out that even though Griesbach made great advances for text-critical studies, he still was unable to break from the TR totally. They state, "Yet even Griesbach was content to start from the traditional or revised Erasmian basis, rather than from the MSS in which he himself reposed most confidence" (B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, Introduction to the New Testament in the Original Greek: With Notes on Selected Readings (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1882; reprint, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988) 13, 185. Aland also offered reserved credit to Griesbach for his textual work (Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 9-11). For a good presentation and discussion of Griesbach’s text-critical canons, see Eldon Jay Epp, "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?" HTR 69/3-4 (1976) 225-229.
copies of the Greek NT, scholarly interest was again directed at Greek MSS of the New Testament. Erasmus's printed Latin and Greek diglot for the first time had made a Greek text readily available. The continued publication of this text by Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevir brothers illustrates its continued popularity. With the assistance of the nomenclature "Textus Receptus," this Greek text became imbedded in the minds of the day as the authoritative Greek text.

From the early sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries textual studies became a scholarly concern. Clear advancements were made in the number of MSS collated, in the understanding of MS text-types, and in an understanding of text-critical principles. These advancements laid the foundation for a departure from the TR. This collection of older MSS of different text-types served as the basis for beginning to challenge the TR. Walton's printing of Stephanus's text with variant readings from Alexandrinus opened the door to more questions concerning the TR. Fell's apparatus compiled from over one hundred MSS and Mill's, from ninety-three Greek MSS in addition to readings from other early versions and patristic writings, continued the movement away from the TR. With Bengel and Semler came classification of MSS according to age and type of text, but it was Griesbach who became the first scholar to depart publicly from the TR and to print an edition of the Greek New Testament based on his own published conclusions. With these advancements, the TR encountered serious evidence that suggested it was not the text
closest to the original.

Textual Criticism in the Nineteenth Century

Introduction

The advancements of the sixteenth through the eighteenth centuries became the foundation of nineteenth-century text-critical studies. Several more MSS were discovered and collated with other extant MSS. Also, text-critical theory reached its zenith in the nineteenth century. Because of the advancements, text-critical work done in the nineteenth century has required the attention of all subsequent scholarship concerned with lower criticism. Therefore, special attention will be given to text-critical theory developed during this period.

When the nineteenth century began, the TR, though questioned, was still the dominant text. Griesbach’s willingness, however, to depart from the TR in his printed text and his willingness to publish his canons of criticism was a harbinger of the end of the TR’s dominance.

From Lachmann to Weiss

Karl Lachmann’s revised text of 1831 proved that the work from Mill to Griesbach could be taken seriously. Lachmann, a recognized classical scholar, wished to apply the same principles used in the texts of classical writers to the NT. He ignored

---

55 Kenyon, The Text of Greek Bible 177. Though Lachmann’s text was published in 1831, it was not until his second edition in 1842-1850 that he included a full statement of his principles (Greenlee, Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism 75).
by no other single scholar.\(^6^0\) He discovered eighteen unknown uncials and six unknown minuscules, edited twenty-five uncials for the first time, made new editions of eleven others, transcribed four more and collated thirteen.\(^6^1\) His most important work was his eighth edition of the Greek New Testament.\(^6^2\) Many of his text-critical principles are still followed today, with the major exception being his strict loyalty to codex Sinaiticus, a fourth-century uncial MS now designated with the Hebrew Aleph (\(\text{תא}\)).\(^6^3\)

Tischendorf’s discovery of \(\text{תא}\) and his edition of codex Vaticanus—so called because it is in the Vatican Library at

---

\(^6^0\) Metzger says "the total number of his books and articles, most of them relating to biblical criticism, exceeds 150 (Metzger, History of Editing the Greek New Testament 40.

\(^6^1\) Finegan, Encountering New Testament Manuscripts 63; Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible 179. By way of comparison, Aland tells us Tischendorf used sixty-four uncials where today there are two hundred and fifty-seven. He used one papyrus manuscript fragment where today there are ninety-three papyrus manuscripts. And, he knew of only a few of the two thousand seven hundred and ninety-five minuscule manuscripts now known to exist (Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 13; and, idem, "The Greek New Testament: Its Present and Future Editions," JBL 87/2 (1968) 182.


\(^6^3\) For a list and explanation of Tischendorf’s critical canons, see the introduction to his seventh edition of the Greek New Testament (Constantine Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece: Ad Antiquos Testes Denuo Recensuit Apparatum Criticum Omni Studio Perfectum Apposuit Commentationem Isagogicam Praetexit [Editio septima; Lipsiae: Sumptibus Adolphi Winter, 1859] xxxii-xlv).
Rome—caused new excitement. Vaticanus, which is now designated by the letter "B", is also a fourth-century uncial codex MS. These two texts were obviously older than the MSS supporting the TR, and they agreed with each other against the TR. This gave impetus to the need for a new revised Greek text and a new revision of the Authorized Version, the 1611 English translation of the Textus Receptus. Brooke Foss Westcott (1825-1901) and Fenton John Anthony Hort (1828-1892) addressed both needs. In 1881, the Revised Version, of which they were part of the team of scholars assigned to the task, was published. The result was a translation with an estimated 5,788 readings which differed from the 1611 Authorized Version of King James (KJV).

In that same year Westcott and Hort published in two volumes The New Testament in the Original Greek on which they had both been working for twenty-eight years. The motivation of Westcott and Hort to begin this work came from perplexities encountered when reading the untrustworthy "Received" texts. Finding no real satisfaction in the editions of either Lachmann or Tischendorf to present "an approximation to the apostolic words

---

64 The origin of this MS is unknown. Though believed by many to be from Egypt, Aland says there is no proof of that and gives several reasons supporting his position. For a summary discussion of the origin of the New Testament in Egypt, see Kurt Aland, "The Text of the Church?" Trinity J 8/2 (1987) 138.

65 Hort wrote in 1858 of his desire that his text-critical work would be incorporated into a new translation of the NT (Graham A Patrick, "T. J. A. Hort, 1828-1898: A Neglected Theologian," ExpTim 90/3 (1978) 79.

as [they] could accept with reasonable satisfaction," Westcott and Hort began working to produce their own text.

The first volume of the two volume work contained the Greek text, but not a critical apparatus.67 The second volume, written by Hort, contained an extensive explanation of their methodology and text-critical principles.68 Their clear and full discussions demanded that all subsequent text-critical work take their stated conclusions into account.69 Four major canons are set forth for finding the original text: (1) The Internal Evidence of Readings, (2) The Internal Evidence of Documents,

---

67See Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, The New Testament in the Original Greek (New York: MacMillan, 1946). Aland points out that neither Westcott nor Hort "ever collated a single manuscript but worked completely from published material, i.e. critical editions (viz., Tischendorf)" (Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 22). Aland also remarks that this title seems somewhat presumptuous on their part since they had no direct witness to the NT text earlier than the fourth century (ibid. 14). However, Aland is currently being criticized for feeling a bit overconfident about his own work as well. See Ian A. Mac, "Can We Risk Another Textus Receptus?" JBL 100/4 (1981) 614-618.


69This idea is expressed by Ernest C. Colwell in "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature December 28-30, 1964 (ed. J. Philip Hyatt; Nashville: Abingdon, 1965) 370. Though many textual critics have stated this same idea, Aland believes few have actually read their Introduction. He says, "Indeed we all have grounds to be indebted to the work of Westcott and Hort, not least through our work with Nestle's edition of the Greek NT. But the number of NT scholars who possess a copy of the Westcott-Hort NT edition of 1881--to say nothing of their use of it--could be regarded as insignificant, and few of us will presumably have read their Introduction to that edition, in spite of its primary importance. I do not believe that the situation will be much different on the European Continent" (Kurt Aland, "The Significance of Papyri for Progress in New Testament Research," The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature December 28-30, 1964 [ed. J. Philip Hyatt; Nashville: Abingdon, 1965] 325.
(3) The Genealogical Evidence, and (4) The Internal Evidence of Groups.

In the first canon of criticism, Westcott and Hort tried to decide what the author probably wrote (Intrinsic Probability) by considering which reading makes the best sense grammatically and contextually.\textsuperscript{70} Second, Westcott and Hort tried to decide what later copyists made it seem the author wrote (Transcriptional Probability).\textsuperscript{71} These two determinations are both studied as internal evidence of the text.

When Intrinsic Probability and Transcriptional Probability failed to satisfy the question of originality between variants, Westcott and Hort next looked to "The Internal Evidence of Documents," their second critical canon. Hort wrote that "knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings."\textsuperscript{72} He reasoned that the textual critic should study not only individual readings in MSS, but he should also become familiar with the MS document as a whole by continuous study of the whole or considerable parts. The document that consistently gives the better reading should be considered more probable to have the correct reading in places where "Internal Evidence of

\textsuperscript{70}Westcott and Hort, Introduction to the New Testament 22.

\textsuperscript{71}Hort writes, "Internal Evidence of Readings is of two kinds, which cannot be too sharply distinguished from each other; appealing respectively to Intrinsic Probability, having reference to the author, and what may be called Transcriptional Probability, having reference to the copyists. In appealing to the first, we ask what an author is likely to have written; in appealing to the second, we ask what copyists are likely to have made him seem to write" (ibid. 19-20).

\textsuperscript{72}Ibid. 30-33.
Readings" do not clearly decide.

Determination of genealogical evidence is the third major step in ascertaining the original reading. When good documents contain different readings, the history of the individual texts must be learned. Hort wanted to group MSS according to their genealogy. He felt that the more precisely one can discern each manuscript's attributes and position on a genealogical tree, the more secure the textual critic will be in locating the original text from its consecutive corrupt texts.\(^7\) No stemma done by Westcott or Hort, however, has ever been located.

\(^7\) Hort writes: "It may be laid down then emphatically, as a second principle, that ALL TRUSTWORTHY RESTORATION OF CORRUPTED TEXTS IS FOUND ON THE STUDY OF THEIR HISTORY, that is, of the relations of descent or affinity which connect the several documents." He suggests as an example ten MSS where nine agree against one, but the nine have a common ancestor. In reality, the critic is only dealing with two MSS (ibid. 39-41). Though this was the stated method in theory, it was not their practice. Westcott and Hort did not follow their own genealogical method. Once they were rid of the TR, they relied almost exclusively on the priority of the neutral text-type as seen in Vaticanus. Colwell offers as proof of this statement the following questions: "Where are the charts which start with the majority of late manuscripts and climb back through diminishing generations of ancestors to the neutral and Western texts? The answer is that they are nowhere." All of Westcott and Hort's work in charts was hypothetical. For a good critique of Westcott and Hort's genealogical method, see Ernest C. Colwell, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations," New Testament Tools and Studies IX: Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament (ed. Bruce Metzger; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 63-70. This chapter may also be seen in its original publication as idem, "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and its Limitations," JBL 66 (1947) 109-133.

Epp has further shown that once Westcott and Hort used the genealogical method to separate the Syrian text from the pre-Syrian lines, they then abandoned it for internal evidence. Their reason for abandoning genealogical evidence at this point was to prove the superiority of Vaticanus (representing their Neutral text) over the Western text (found in D) which they admitted was probably older than B (Westcott and Hort, Introduction to the New Testament 120). In short, when the genealogical evidence stood in stark contrast to internal evidence, the genealogical evidence was thrown out. For an excellent presentation of this weakness in Westcott and Hort, and its implications for New Testament textual criticism today, see Eldon Jay Epp, "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism" 232-242.
The fourth step followed in this text-critical process is what Westcott and Hort called "Internal Evidence of Groups." Being a mediating position between "Internal Evidence of Documents" and "Genealogical Evidence," this methodological resource applies the method of the former to groups of MSS. Textual critics should know not only the general characteristics of a single document, but also the characteristics of groups of documents.

Working on the assumption that "community of text implied on genealogical grounds a community of parentage," Westcott and Hort detected and discussed chronologically four text-types: the Western text (designated δ), the Neutral text (designated α), the Alexandrian text (designated γ), and the Syrian text (designated β). Interlaced with examples, Westcott and Hort describe the late second-century Western text as characterized by paraphrase and embellishment. Scribal corruptions prevail: the tendency to smooth out the text by insertion of objects, genitive pronouns, and the insertion or expunging of conjunctions. The taste for assimilation is also obvious in this textual family. This

---

74 Westcott and Hort, Introduction to the New Testament 60.
75 Ibid. 92.
76 Hort says, "The chief and most constant characteristic of the Western readings is a love of paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences were changed, omitted, and inserted with astonishing freedom, wherever it seemed that the meaning could be brought out with greater force and definiteness. They often exhibit a certain rapid vigour and fluency which . . . is apt to ignore pregnancy and balance of sense, and especially those
text is seen mostly though not exclusively in codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis (a fifth-century Greek-Latin diglot now designated with the letter "D"),\(^7^7\) the Old Latin version, and the Latin fathers.

The neutral (\(\alpha\)) text for Westcott and Hort was another of the Pre-Syrian texts.\(^7^8\) This text was the one most free from Western corruptions and evident in both Alexandria and other areas distant from Alexandria. Due to its preservation in various regions separate from Alexandria, these men termed this text neutral instead of Alexandrian. The neutral text was not another local text. It was a text that theoretically could be found in many local texts.

By historical chance, Sinaiticus and Vaticanus are the best representatives of this group and usually should be followed. Westcott and Hort believed that an agreement between these two MSS should be viewed as the true reading until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary.\(^7^9\) Also, no \(\alpha\) \(B\) readings can

---

\(^7^7\) Though Westcott and Hort considered D "often invaluable for the secure recovery of the true text" because of its ancient roots, they do not ascribe to it the position of the text with "the highest quality" as stated by Aland (Aland-Aland, *The Text of the New Testament* 18; Westcott and Hort, *Introduction to the New Testament in Original Greek* 149).

\(^7^8\) Ibid. 127-130.

\(^7^9\) Ibid. 225. Most modern textual critics no longer hold to the neutral text idea. However, continued study has proven that Westcott and Hort were correct in viewing MS B as containing a very pure tradition of a very old
be totally rejected though sometimes it would be proper to consider them as only another alternative reading, especially where they receive no support from Versions or Fathers.

The third group of readings, according to Westcott and Hort, deserves the designation Alexandrian. These readings stem from the other "Non-Western Pre-Syrian" readings and are found mainly in Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, periodically in other Alexandrian Fathers, and the Sahidic and Bohairic versions. When taken together, these facts show that the readings under discussion "belong to a partially degenerate form of the Non-Western Pre-Syrian text, apparently limited in its early range, and apparently originating in Alexandria." It is characterized by an almost entire absence of Western-type corruptions. The changes that are evident were apparently done to correct perceived grammatical errors. These editors were so skillful that the corrections at first appear original.

form. The neutral and Alexandrian texts are today classified under the name Alexandrian. For a summary of recent studies that support this conclusion, see Omanson, "A Perspective on the Study of the New Testament Text," 115.

Ibid. 130-133.

Martini uses Hort’s belief that the Alexandrian text-type originated in Egypt while the neutral text did not, to argue that Hort would object to the division of "proto- and later Alexandrian, where by proto-Alexandrian the ‘Neutral’ text is meant" (Carlo M. Martini, "Is there a Late Alexandrian Text of the Gospels?" NTS 24/3 [1978] 285-296). According to Martini, readings thought today to be late Alexandrian are really Hort’s Alexandrian readings, slightly revised readings which existed alongside not-revised readings, the later being Hort’s neutral text. Though he does not want to return to the designation neutral, Martini does believe that Hort’s understanding of the history of the text in Alexandria where a revised text existed alongside an unrevised text still explains current evidence better than proto-Alexandrian and late Alexandrian designations (ibid. 295-296).
The fourth and chronologically final text-type described by Westcott and Hort is the Syrian text. The three texts already mentioned were for the most part exclusively divergent. However, the scene changes drastically in the fourth century as the three lines of text were brought together to form a new text. Throughout the fourth century, mixture prevails everywhere and the ancient texts disappear almost entirely. Westcott and Hort see this mixture to be the result of an authoritative Syriac revision, which took place in or near Antioch of Syria. This fourth century conflated text became the official text of Constantinople and being widely disseminated throughout the Byzantine Empire became the standard New Testament of the East. Westcott and Hort's Syrian text is today called the Byzantine or Majority text-type, or following the later designation by von Soden (a twentieth-century textual critic), the Koine text.

These conclusions usually led Westcott and Hort to accept the neutral text. The only exceptions were those instances when


83 Ibid. 134-136. For Westcott and Hort's well known description of the Syrian text-type, see ibid. Westcott and Hort cautiously suggested that Lucianus may have contributed to this Syrian revision (ibid.). For a thorough treatment of the Lucianic recension, see Bruce M. Metzger, "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible," *New Testament Tools and Studies IV: Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (ed. Bruce M. Metzger; Leiden: Brill, 1963) 1-41.


85 Hermann Freiherr von Soden (1852-1914) did much work on Byzantine minuscule MSS. His work is discussed more fully on pages 43-45 of this thesis.
they felt the neutral scribes had indeed interpolated longer portions into the text, while Western text scribes who would normally have done the same had resisted the temptation.\textsuperscript{86} These instances they called "Western non-interpolations," evidently because they did not want to speak of the neutral text as including interpolations. The only passages listed as clearly in this category are Matthew 27:49 and portions of the last three chapters of Luke. Eighteen other places drawn from all four gospels are given as possible instances of omission of expected interpolations.\textsuperscript{87}

With these published explanations of their critical methodology, Westcott and Hort completed what had begun in the eighteenth century. For many in the scholarly world, the TR no longer held its place of authority. However, for others, such solid rejection of the Syrian text and thus the TR was denounced. Different scholars rose to challenge Westcott and Hort's critical conclusions, but none was as adamant as John W. Burgon (1813-

\textsuperscript{86}Ibid. 172-177. This almost total rejection of the Western text by Westcott and Hort is not followed by most modern textual critics. Most modern textual critics believe that all pre-Koine text-types deserve scholarly attention for "any one of them may preserve original readings which have been lost to other text-types" (Metzger, \textit{The Text of the New Testament} 214.

\textsuperscript{87}Some textual critics since Hort have disagreed with him at this point. Clark considered all of these "Western non-interpolations" as in the original text. He says Hort was "misled by his principle that where B and D differed and the later omitted the reading the omission represents the true text" (Kenneth W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," \textit{JBL} 85/1 (1966) 10.
1888) who championed the MS tradition behind the TR. He argued that if God dictated Scripture, then surely God would providentially keep the texts from being seriously corrupted during their transmission. Burgon was unable to stop the movement of scholars as they changed alliance from the TR to the text of Westcott and Hort.

Following Westcott and Hort’s publication of their Greek New Testament, Bernhard Weiss (1827-1918) published the fruit of his lifelong endeavor, a Greek New Testament in three volumes (1894-1900), with a second edition in 1902-1905. Weiss approached his study differently than Westcott and Hort in that he relied solely on internal evidence. Using a critical apparatus to identify variation units, he sought to learn from the context which reading was most likely the original. After completing his study, he categorized the different types of variant errors he encountered: (a) harmonizations among the Gospels, (b) the interchange of words, (c) omissions and additions, (d)

---

88Burgon had been an ardent defender of Scripture for several years before the 1881 Revised Version. For a recent recounting of one such instance, see N. M. de S. Cameron, "Dean Burgon and the Bible: An Eminent Victorian and the Problem of Inspiration," Themelios 7/2 (1982) 16-20.


90D. Bernhard Weiss, Die Vier Evangelien im berichtigten Text mit kurzer Erläuterung zum Handgebrauch lei der Schriftlektüre (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902).
alterations of word order, and, (e) orthographical variation.\textsuperscript{91} Weiss then ranked the major MSS according to their comparative freedom from such faults. He decided that Vaticanus was the best of the MSS. The importance of this conclusion is that it is the same as that reached by Westcott and Hort, but it was arrived at from an entirely different procedure.

\textbf{Summary}

Nineteenth-century text-critical studies were ushered in by Karl Lachmann, a classical scholar. Lachmann wanted to locate the text used by the church during the fourth century. His work was followed by the indefatigable textual critic, Constantin von Tischendorf who collected and collated more MSS than any other person. Tischendorf's collation along with those done by others in the previous era such as Fell and Mill, served as a solid foundation for the work of the two men who forever changed the study of textual criticism, Westcott and Hort. While Tischendorf and Tregelles worked independently of each other and collated many MSS, Westcott and Hort spent their lifetimes working together to develop further text-critical theory. Their desire to prove that the MS tradition behind the \textit{Textus Receptus} was corrupt and that Vaticanus represented the purest text-type was successful for most of the scholarly world. Some opposition arose with men like Burgon, but the resistance was not successful in withstanding the conclusions of these two men. Bernard Weiss

\textsuperscript{91}Finegan, \textit{Encountering New Testament Manuscripts} 66.
closed the nineteenth century by showing that Westcott and Hort's assessment of codex Vaticanus was accurate. Using only internal criteria, he arrived at essentially the same text as Westcott and Hort.

Textual Criticism in the Twentieth Century

Introduction

Building on the conclusions formulated in the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, twentieth-century textual critics further advanced and refined the conclusions of their predecessors. The century began with the production of Greek New Testaments with extensive critical apparatuses. Though Tischendorf's eighth edition was monumental and is still a necessary tool for modern textual critics, Greek New Testament editions of the twentieth century went beyond his work by including abundant testimony from the Church Fathers, extensive evidence from Byzantine MSS, and toward the middle of the century, evidence from the texts of newly discovered NT papyri.

Twentieth-century studies also have sought to develop a method of discovering MS history. While Westcott and Hort formulated the genealogical method, modern scholarship recognizes some inadequacies in that method and is seeking to provide other alternatives.

The criteria for locating the original readings from among variant readings have also been critiqued by this century's scholars. Though there are three approaches promoted today, rigorous eclecticism, reasoned eclecticism, and the Majority Text
method, most textual critics rely on a methodology not much different from that developed by Westcott and Hort.

Production of Greek New Testaments with Extensive Apparatuses

The twentieth century began with the compiling of more MS evidence. Alexander Souter advanced the study of textual criticism with his 1910 critical apparatus which included numerous testimonies quoted from Church Fathers. For a discussion of the value and appropriate use of patristic evidence in textual criticism, see Bruce M. Metzger, "Patristic Evidence and the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," *NTS* 18 (1972) 379-400.

Concerning textual theory, Souter felt that Westcott and Hort had made such a major contribution that their work would be foundational to all future studies in textual criticism. Souter was so impressed with the work of Westcott and Hort that he wrote: "It appears to the present writer that a great advance upon the text of Westcott and Hort in the direction of the original autographs is highly improbable, at least in our generation. If they have not said the last word, they have at least laid the foundations which make it comparatively simple to fit later discoveries into their scheme. The discovery of further materials will no doubt sometimes incline the balance towards the reading which on deliberate inspection of the evidence available to them, Westcott and Hort rejected, or put into the margin" (Alexander Souter, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* [New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1917] 138).

However, all did not agree with Souter’s evaluation of Westcott and Hort. One who disagreed with Westcott and Hort especially in their treatment of the Syrian text was Hermann Freiherr von Soden (1852-1914). Von Soden edited the most massive Greek New Testament to be published in the twentieth century (1902-1913). He did extensive pioneer work with Greek
minuscule MSS and like Westcott and Hort, did extensive study on
the history of the Greek text. Also, he was dissatisfied with
the nomenclature used to designate uncial and minuscule MSS and
designed a new method of designation intended to indicate the
age, content, and type of each MS. His system was so complicated
that it was never accepted into use by the scholarly
community.\textsuperscript{95} Many of his conclusions concerning MS history and
families also are fraught with difficulties and have not gained

\textsuperscript{95} Kenyon viewed von Soden’s edition as "a serious obstacle to occasional
reference" (Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible 55). For a good summary
of von Soden’s new nomenclature and a description of the main groups of MSS
discernable among extant MSS according to von Soden, see Kirsopp Lake,
"Professor H. von Soden’s Treatment of the Text of the Gospels," RevThPh 4
(1908-1909) 201-217. A second article by Lake provides a good review of von
Soden’s view of MS history behind his I, H, and K families. Lake disagrees
with von Soden’s use of the evidence and his conclusions (Kirsopp Lake,
"Professor H. von Soden’s Treatment of the Text of the Gospels," RevThPh 4
(1908-1909) 277-295). Another helpful summary of von Soden’s system can be
found in Greenlee whose remarks concerning von Soden’s work are shared by many
scholars. He calls it "perhaps the greatest disappointment in modern textual
criticism" (Greenlee, Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism 83,
109). A more recent work also denounces von Soden’s edition (along with
Tischendorf’s and Augustinus Merk’s) as being so inaccurate that “all the
collating will have to be done again” (W. J. Elliott, "The Need for an
Accurate and Comprehensive Collation of All Known Greek NT Manuscripts with
and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His
137-143. Royse has shown, however, that the problem is not with von Soden as
much as with Elliott’s inability to understand von Soden’s apparatus. There
are inaccuracies in von Soden, but nothing of the magnitude suggested by
Elliott. For a limited discussion of von Soden’s accuracy and usefulness for
modern textual critics, see James R. Royse, "Von Soden’s Accuracy," JTS 30/1
(1979) 166-171. For a more detailed sample of von Soden’s inaccuracies, see
Sanders who found 1443 errors in von Soden’s collation of MS 22 alone in the
Gospels (Henry A. Sanders, "A New Collation of MS 22 of the Gospels," JBL 33
(1914) 92).
acceptance by most scholars.⁹⁶ This does not mean that he wielded no influence in his field of study, for Aland proves that von Soden's work exerted a controlling influence over Vogels, Merk, and Bover, three Roman Catholic scholars who edited separate editions of the Greek NT.⁹⁷ Von Soden's work continues to influence text-critical work today, for his method of classifying MSS gave impetus to the Claremont Profile Method developed by Wisse and McReynolds.⁹⁸

In order to keep von Soden's system from being accepted,

⁹⁶Metzger, The Text of the New Testament 139-143. Metzger lists several of von Soden's textual principles and the negative responses of various scholars to this work. Von Soden's work is noted by textual historians due to the momentous amount of work done by him. However, because of its limited impact on the text-critical studies, detail is omitted from this study. Again, this must not be understood to infer that he has no worth to contemporary textual work. Aland, who says "von Soden's edition was distinctly a failure," also says it is a "necessary tool for textual critics." Much information available in von Soden, especially Part I of the four volume work, is available nowhere else (Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 23). Also, as the collation in Appendix I of this study illustrates, von Soden's apparatus contains information found in no other apparatus. Colwell likewise strongly contends that von Soden deserves a hearing because further study "has substantiated a number of his classifications" set forth in his pioneer work in minuscule manuscripts (Ernest C. Colwell, The Four Gospels of Karahissar I: History and Text [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936] xi).

⁹⁷Aland says the motivation for these three editions was the popularity of the Nestle edition even among the Roman Catholics. To study the impact von Soden exercised over Vogels, Merk, and Bover, see the chart and accompanying discussion in Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 26-27. Also, Metzger discusses José M. Bover's edition of the Greek NT in Bruce M. Metzger, "Recent Spanish Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism (Leiden: Brill, 1963) 135-141.

⁹⁸The Claremont Profile Method utilizes some of von Soden's manuscript categories of Byzantine text-types. This will be discussed later in the present chapter. For a complete discussion, see Frederik Wisse, The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence as Applied to the Continuous Text of the Gospel of Luke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 7-32.
Caspar René Gregory, the author of the "Prolegomena" to the eight edition of Tischendorf's Greek NT, conferred with textual critics in Europe and America and constructed the modified form of Wettstein's system of MS nomenclature still in use today. Papyri are designated by a gothic letter "P" followed by a superscript number. Thick (bold, Clarendon) numbers preceded by a zero signify uncial MSS with the first forty-five retaining their Latin or Greek capital letter denotation and Sinaiticus retaining the only Hebrew designation (￦). Eight letters have double designations: D, E, F, G, H, K, L, P with the duplicates being distinguished as D² or D²aul, etc. Minuscules are represented by successive Arabic numbers. Using Gregory's system, Kurt Aland is currently listing the new MSS and reports that there are now 5,366 MSS on the official registry of the Institute for New Testament Textual Research. However, because of wars and natural disasters, many MSS were lost in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Aland estimates 5,000 MSS are probably in actual existence today.

---

99 This nomenclature was set forth in the third volume of Gregory's three volume work (Caspar René Gregory, Textkritik des Neuen Testamentes [Leipzig: Hinrichs, I, 1900; II, 1902; III, 1909]).

100 Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 74-75. Because many of the editors of Greek New Testaments used their own nomenclature for individual manuscripts, it is difficult if not impossible for the textual critic to find quickly comments on the individual MSS in each of these works. Aland has satisfied a great need by supplying a reference tool to do this. To compare and match MS symbols used by Gregory and von Soden, see Kurt Aland, Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments, 1: Gesamtübersicht (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1963) 334-371. Gregory and Tischendorf's eighth edition of the Greek NT can also be consulted in the same manner (ibid. 321-333).
A desire to make the conclusions of nineteenth-century scholarship available "instead of the still widespread cheap editions of the so-called Textus Receptus, which goes back to Erasmus" led to the publication of what became the most popular pocket edition of the Greek New Testament. Prepared by Eberhard Nestle (1851-1913), the Nestle text was first published in Stuttgart (1898) for the Württemberg Bible Society. Today the *Novum Testamentum Graece* is in its twenty-sixth edition. To produce the type of text he wanted, Nestle took the editions of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and R. F. Weymouth (1886 edition) and constructed a resultant text. When there were disagreements, the reading supported by two was put in the text and the reading of the third was placed in footnotes. When all three differed, Nestle would place "the mean reading" into the


103. Weymouth had studied the critical texts of the most important printed editions of Greek New Testaments since Lachmann. He wanted his *Resultant Greek Testament* to "exhibit in a compact and intelligible form the latest results of textual criticism." Weymouth's text is the text agreed on by the majority of those sources consulted. The sources are presented in the full title of his work which was published in three editions (1886, 1892, 1905), the last being published posthumously (R. F. Weymouth, *The Resultant Greek Testament Exhibiting the Text in which the Majority of Modern Editors are Agreed, and Containing the Reading of Stephens [1550], Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, Ellicott, Alford, Weiss, The Bale Edition [1880], Westcott and Hort and the Revision Committee [3d ed.; London: James Clarke, 1905] ix-xxv).
text. After the third edition of Nestle's text (1901), Bernhard Weiss, who was a noted exegete rather than a paleographer or textual critic, replaced Weymouth. For the most part, this overcame the partiality of Tischendorf toward N and Westcott and Hort toward B.

Eberhard's son, Erwin Nestle, though limiting his research totally to the critical apparatuses of other editions, continually expanded the apparatus so independent judgment could be made on the text. He produced the thirteenth edition (1927) which included in its critical apparatus the readings of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, Weiss, and von Soden. The

---

104 An example of this is Matt 6:8 where Tischendorf omits ὅ θεός. Westcott and Hort have it in their text in brackets, and Weiss has it in his text without brackets. Nestle put ὅ θεός in the text in brackets because this is the "mean" reading between Tischendorf and Weiss (D. Eberhard Nestle, Novum Testamentum Graece: cum Apparatu Critico Curavit, [15th ed.] 41).


106 Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 18-20. The immediate impact of Nestle's edition is debatable. Aland says that the result of Nestle's work was clear. Where Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort had convinced the scholarly world to abandon the TR, Nestle convinced the church to do the same (ibid.). Epp, however, is not convinced that Nestle's impact is accurately assessed by Aland since Nestle's edition of the Greek New Testament presented the conclusions of nineteenth-century scholarship. Furthermore, Nestle offered no canons of criticism, no theory of textual transmission, and paid little attention to MSS as Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort had done. For an excellent critique of Aland's narrow view of the history of textual criticism, see Eldon Jay Epp, "New Testament Textual Criticism Past Present, and Future" 216-223. For a less in-depth but helpful critique, see idem, "An Indispensable but Flawed Tool: (Book Review) The Text of the New Testament: An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism by Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland (translated by Erroll F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987)," Int 44/1 (1990) 71-75.
outcome of this extensive printed evidence was that scholarly consensus at times disagreed with the resultant text followed by Nestle and sometimes replaced it. The sixteenth edition, however, still says that its text "has remained as a whole unchanged, particularly since the research of recent years has not yet led to the establishment of a generally acknowledged N.T. text." It was in the seventeenth edition that Erwin Nestle began to take readings into the text against the Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and Weiss majority.

Where Erwin Nestle had limited his study to the apparatus of earlier editions, in 1952 Kurt Aland became associated with the work for the twenty-first edition and began immediately to collate the evidence in the apparatus against original sources and to include readings from recently discovered papyri. Aland's work has continued up through the twenty-sixth edition of this Nestle text, or as it is now called, the Nestle-Aland Twenty-Six (N/A 26). The apparatus of this edition of the Greek NT contains evidence from all available papyri, major uncials, and important minuscules. Early versions are also cited where

---

107 N/A 26, 40.


relevant, followed by the witness of the Church Fathers.

Locating a Manuscript

Introduction

While Nestle and Aland were collecting MS evidence and continually updating their editions of the Greek New Testament, others were concentrating on better ways to study the history of the Greek text. Von Soden's work, mentioned above as unsatisfactory for many, was regarded by Colwell as accurate in the location of certain text-types.\textsuperscript{111}

Reconstructing the history of the text of the Bible is of major importance because an accurate reconstruction of the text at different times in history gives a picture of when and how corruptions entered the text.\textsuperscript{112} Careful study of each MS must be done to detect not only why each MS is the way it is, but also to discover what its ancestors were like.\textsuperscript{113} Four approaches have been developed in the twentieth century to determine MS history.

\textsuperscript{111}This was mentioned in footnote 94.


The Method of Quantitative Readings

Colwell was at first opposed to Westcott and Hort's genealogical methodology as a way to locate a given reading in the history of the text. He stated with frankness and frustration in 1947 that he had no alternative. However, in 1959, after working for several years on the International Greek New Testament Project (I.G.N.T.), Colwell and M. M. Parvis set forth what was first labeled the "method of Multiple Readings" and later the "method of Quantitative Readings." Their goal was to be able to find quickly the relationship of


115 "Our dilemma seems to be that we know too much to believe the old, we do not yet know enough to create the new" (ibid. 83).

116 The International Greek New Testament Project is the continuation of the work begun by S. C. E. Legg at Oxford. Legg wanted to reproduce Westcott and Hort's text with an enlarged apparatus. After Legg's death, concern was raised about who would complete his work. Legg had finished Mark (published 1935) and Matthew (published 1940) and had begun on Luke. In 1949 the International Greek Project was founded to continue Legg's work (David Parker, "Textual Criticism since B. H. Streeter," NTS 24/1 [1977] 158).

117 Kim remarks that Colwell was teaching the "Multiple Method" in 1945. Kim used it to help erode the concept of a Caesarean text and to demonstrate that Origen's NT text was not a Neutral text (K. W. Kim, "The Matthean Text of Origen in His Commentary on Matthew" JBL 68 [1949] 129, 134-139).

Colwell's methodology included three steps, the last one being the most important. First, he used multiple readings to find related groups. A multiple reading was defined as one in which the minimum support for each of at least three variants forms of the text is either one of the major strands of traditions, or the support of a previously established group (such as Family I, Family II, the Ferrar Group, K, K', K''), or the support of some one of the ancient versions (such as af, it, sy⁵, sy⁶, bo, or sa) or the support of some single manuscript of an admittedly distinctive character (such as D).\(^{119}\)

Second, he developed a list of distinctive readings to show relationship with known MS types noting that "a group is not a group unless it has unique readings." These unique, or singular group readings as he calls them, are readings unique to a group of MSS, not readings unique to a single MS. Singular readings of individual MSS have no genealogical significance for Colwell. These unique group readings reveal relationship.\(^{120}\)

Third, Colwell wanted to corroborate the relationship found in step one and demonstrated in step two. He did this by counting the instances of agreement, looking for a high percentage of agreement (approximately 70 percent) in "the total quantity of readings derived from a representative sample of all


\(^{120}\) E. C. Colwell and E. W. Tune, "Variant Readings: Classification and Use," JBL 83/3 (1964) 260-261; and Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text" 387.
text groups in a specific block of text." The quality of readings is of no concern at this point in the study. Colwell tested his method on Mark 1, John 1:1-4:40, and John 7:18-8:12.

Colwell argued that MS types cannot be learned by noting only variants from an external standard such as the TR. Agreements between several witnesses, whatever their relationship to the TR or to any other standard, determine if a real group exists. There must be a high level of agreement which can be tabulated and then converted to percentages before relationships can be decided.

---

121 Ernest C. Colwell, "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program" 163; idem, "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript" 31.

122 Colwell was not alone in this rejection of the TR for the purpose of determining text-type. Metzger pointed out in 1945 that the discovery of P45 showed not only that the Caesarean text had to be divided into two subgroups, but also that there was a methodological problem in textual studies. He said that textual critics should have been able to see this division without the papyrus. He challenged the use of the TR to reconstruct ancient texts pointing out that the later Byzantine MSS are many times conflated and if the TR is used to point out non-Byzantine readings, what of those readings already in the Byzantine text? How will they be discovered? Metzger called for a new method of locating text-types which would "determine exactly what proportion of the total number of variants of each type of text (and/or of each manuscript) is present in the manuscript to be analyzed" (Bruce M. Metzger, "The Caesarean Test of the Gospels," reprinted in New Testament Tools and Studies 4: Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism [Leiden: Brill, 1963] 70-72).

123 Colwell and Tune conclude that "the quantitative definition of a text-type is a group of MSS that agree more than 70% of the time and is separated by a gap of about 10% from its nearest neighbors" (Colwell and Tune, "The Quantitative Relationships between MS Text-Types" 29).

124 Colwell rejects such ambiguous descriptions as "midway between D and B" noting that most MSS could fit in such a category. He says such descriptions are "weasel words, too slippery, too vague and ambiguous to be used for the location of manuscripts... The midway phrase has earned its right to oblivion." (Colwell, "Method in Locating a Newly-Discovered Manuscript" 37).
Colwell's procedure enjoyed scholarly acceptance but was reversed by researchers in later studies. Because the first two steps could not determine how close one document represents the other in its group tradition, textual critics began with quantitative analysis (Colwell's third step) and then followed up with steps one and two to confirm their findings.

The Claremont Profile Method

A second method of locating a text-type was developed from Colwell's Quantitative Method. Called the Claremont Profile Method (CPM), its goal is to classify MSS into groups only after the total number of variants is considered in any specified

125 Fee, using this method, shows that Codex Sinaiticus has a strong Western ancestry (Gordon D. Fee, "Codex Sinaiticus in the Gospel of John: A Contribution to Methodology in Establishing Textual Relationships," NTS 15/1 [1968] 23-44); that Origen's text was demonstrably Egyptian (idem, "Origen's Text of the New Testament and the Text of Egypt" 348-364); and that there was no recension of the NT text in Alexandria in either the second or fourth centuries (idem, "P73, P81 and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria" 19-45). Also, Hurtado used this method to discredit the idea of a pre-Caesarean text in Mark (Larry W. Hurtado, Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981]). This acceptance was in spite of the warning issued earlier by Zuntz and followed by Parker that "supposing that some day, such a collection [of all variants] should be made available, the first step in using it would still have to be in discarding the overwhelming proportions of chaff which it must unavoidably contain. Criticism begins with selection. Therewith it is implied that the textual criticism of the New Testament cannot be carried out by statistical methods. . . . None but commensurable entities can be reduced to figures, and no two variants are strictly commensurable" (G. Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles: A Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum [London: Oxford University Press, 1953] 58). See also David Parker, "The Development of Textual Criticism Since B. H. Streeter" 157.

portion of text. Colwell had called for MS grouping to be done based on unique group readings. The CPM advances Colwell’s proposal by using the total amount of variation, including both unique group readings and readings shared by other MS groups. Charts were made to record the presence or absence of readings as each MS was checked. Patterns of agreement and disagreement (profiles) emerged from which a group profile was established. A group needs to share two-thirds of all readings in question to be considered a legitimate group. Once each group’s profile is complete, individual MSS need only to be collated and checked against the group profile in readings where membership in one group or another is shown, to find the relationship of the individual MS to a known group. Complete collation is unnecessary and is a major advantage of this method.

While CPM is widely accepted as a generally accurate means of quickly learning a manuscript’s text-type, textual critics continue to call for further refinement in its application not only to individual MSS, but to MS groups as well. It has at least three weaknesses. First, its call for limited collation

127 For a complete explanation of the beginnings and method of the Claremont Profile Method by one its developers, see Frederick Wisse, The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence.

128 Ibid. 37, 40.

Wisse claims that "after some experience, it should be possible to classify a Lucan MS within half an hour" (ibid. vii).

can severely limit detection of block mixture of text-types. Textual critics can overcome this by applying the CPM to the entire MS.\textsuperscript{131} Second, the CPM is limited by its restriction of considering only those readings preserved in two-thirds of known groups' members. Continued studies have shown that more extensive variant data changes some of the CPM's original classifications.\textsuperscript{132} Third, Ehrman and Richards have both shown that Wisse's failure to do a thoroughgoing quantitative analysis led to some erroneous conclusions, such as placing B and D in the same group.\textsuperscript{133} Colwell's quantitative analysis, if done first, would show tentative groups which the CPM could more accurately profile.

The Comprehensive Profile Method

To overcome the shortcomings of the Claremont Profile Method, Ehrman has developed what he termed the "Comprehensive Profile Method."\textsuperscript{134} His method for locating a MS in textual transmission has three steps. It calls for full MS collation,

\textsuperscript{131}Richards did this in his study of 1 John where he noted some of the weaknesses of the CPM (W. L. Richards, "A Critique of a New Testament Text-Critical Methodology--The Claremont Profile Method," \textit{JBL} 96/4 (1977) 555-566.

\textsuperscript{132}Richards showed this to be the case when he reexamined passages used in the original CPM studies (Richards, "An Examination of the Claremont Profile Method in the Gospel of Luke" 52-63; idem, "Manuscript Grouping in Luke 10 by Quantitative Analysis," \textit{JBL} 98/3 (1979) 379-391). The 1979 article is a sequel to the 1980 article and explains the procedure followed to reach the conclusions of the 1980 article.

\textsuperscript{133}Ehrman, "The Use of Group Profiles" 469-470; Richards, "A Critique of a New Testament Text-Critical Method" 555-566.

\textsuperscript{134}Bart D. Ehrman, "The Use of Group Profiles" 471.
not sample passages (like CPM), a complete quantitative analysis (Colwell's third step), and a set of group profiles that includes both (1) "readings found extensively within a known textual group," and (2) "readings found only with any given group." This final step of analyzing characteristics inside the group itself further identifies subgroups more accurately than CPM alone and better locates the manuscript's place in textual transmission.\textsuperscript{135} Ehrman's method has added a significant amount of time required for locating a new MS over the quantitative method and the CPM. However, what is lost in time is gained in accuracy of investigation.

In summary, Colwell classified a new MS according to an agreement of its unique readings with a known MS group's unique readings. The CPM classifies MSS according to all readings, unique or shared, when there is at least two-thirds agreement between group members. The Comprehensive Profile Method does both plus seeks to classify readings which are characteristic of a group, both extensive readings present in a group which may also be shared with other groups, and readings that are only in the group being studied.

\textbf{The One Thousand Readings Method}

The final method currently being used to locate a MS in its transmission history was developed by Kurt Aland and presented in

\textsuperscript{135} For a complete explanation and demonstration of the "Comprehensive Profile Method," see ibid. 465-486. An example of this method applied with slight variation may be seen in T. R. Ralston, "The 'Majority Text' and Byzantine Origins," \textit{NTS} 38/1 (1992) 122-137.
Believing that only two "text-types . . . may be regarded as certain," Aland selected one thousand passages where the Alexandrian text-type and the Byzantine text-type clearly disagree. Aland selected test passages from the following NT books:

- Gospel of Mark - 199
- Gospel of John - 338
- Acts of the Apostles - 105
- Catholic Epistles - 103
- Epistles of Paul - 255

His test passages were intended only to identify and eliminate those MSS with the Byzantine text so he could concentrate on the remaining MSS. He was content to allow someone else to study these discarded MSS to find their histories and relationships.  

Aland now finds three text-types which are "incontestably verified," the Alexandrian, the Koine text, and the D text. Aland's D text is that text-type found in the uncial MS codex Bezae Cantabrigiensiis (D), a fifth-century Greek-Latin diglot. Most modern textual critics view D as an example of the Western text-type, a name Aland refuses to attach to it because it did

---


137 Ibid. 344.

not come from the West. Also, Aland does not acknowledge the existence of a Caesarean text-type saying its existence is purely theoretical with no solid foundation. Some modern textual critics disagree with Aland and believe that while it is no longer acceptable to use the label "Caesarean," it is accurate to say Pre-Caesarean. 139

Aland is still working with test passages, and although he makes no explicit statement concerning a change, the numbers evidently have changed and test passages from all New Testament books are now included. 140 This number change is seen in his recent study of the Catholic epistles where he used ninety-eight test examples. 141 In this study of the Catholic epistles, Aland and his associates collated approximately five hundred and seventy MSS and displayed through MS lists, statistical charts, and profiles of non-Byzantine MSS, relationships between these MSS.

139 Metzger, The Text of the New Testament 214-215. For a historical survey of the development of the concept of a Caesarean text-type, see idem, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospels" 42-72. A recent study done to disprove the belief of a pre-Caesarean text in Mark may be seen in Larry W. Hurtado, Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text. For a study which illustrates the difficulty of labelling any text-type as purely Western or Caesarean, see A. F. J. Klijn, "A Survey of the Researches into the Western Text of the Gospels and Acts: (1949-1959)," NovT 3/1-2 (1959) 1-27.

140 Aland promises to describe this system of determining MS relationship, but so far he has failed to do so (Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 95).

There are similarities between Aland's methodology and that of the CPM mentioned above. Percentages of agreement, actual number of variations, and a profile section portray MS relationships. The major difference between the two approaches is that the CPM charts portray relationships based on actual readings and actual percentages of agreement between MSS. Aland portrays relationships as they relate to what he has already decided to be the original reading. Aland is doing a profile, but it is a profile based on his postulated (original) text, not a profile based entirely on MS agreements as in the CPM. This is a clear weakness of his approach.

Another difference between Aland and the CPM is the type of MSS profiled. The CPM was developed to deal with Byzantine MSS. Aland, however, only collates Byzantine MSS to learn if they are clearly Byzantine. Once that is decided, these MSS are excluded from further study which shows that though the number of test passages has changed, Aland's basic methodology and goal are the same as when he first described it in 1964. Aland's main

---


interest lies in the text-types found in the pre-fourth century papyri.

The total dismissal of Byzantine MSS is unfortunate because, as Zuntz has shown in his study of P⁴⁶ in 1 Corinthians and Hebrews, some readings once thought to be part of only the late Byzantine tradition are clearly and demonstrably part of the early (second century) text tradition. Note carefully Zuntz's statement:

A number of Byzantine readings, most of them genuine, which previously were discarded as 'late', are anticipated by P⁴⁶. Our inquiry has confirmed what was anyhow probable enough: the Byzantines did not hit upon these readings by conjecture or independent error. They reproduced an older tradition. The existence of this tradition was in several cases borne out by some versions or patristic quotations; but where such evidence is not forthcoming, the inference proved no less certain. How then--so one is tempted to go on asking--where no Chester Beatty papyrus happens to vouch for the early existence of a Byzantine reading? Are all Byzantine readings ancient? In the cognate case of the Homeric tradition G. Pasquali answers the same question in the affirmative; and, indeed, it seems to me unlikely that the Byzantine editors ever altered the text without manuscript evidence. They left so many hopelessly difficult places unassailed! Their method, I submit, was selection rather than conjecture. The essential question, however, remains from what evidence they made their selection.

We are not going to resume the hopeless fight of Dean Burgon. The Byzantine is the latest text and it is both natural and evident that it contains the largest proportion of corruptions. Most of the specially Byzantine readings rule themselves out of court without ado. The chance that, even so, they are far older than the manuscripts which attest them is none the less great. Between, say, A.D. 200 and 800 much new corruption could, and did, infect the tradition upon which the Byzantine editors relied. They evidently tended to adopt the smoothest among competing readings and that, as a rule, meant the spurious ones. Even so, we are now warned not to discard the Byzantine evidence
en bloc.\textsuperscript{144}

This is not an argument that the Byzantine text-type is second century, but that Byzantine readings with Western support (geographical) have a high claim to originality.

**Locating the Original Reading**

**Eclecticism: Introduction**

Following Westcott and Hort, an understanding that the original text was not preserved in any particular MS or group of MSS began to prevail.\textsuperscript{145} This conclusion coupled with a general dissatisfaction with the text and methodology of Westcott and Hort helped produce current methods of textual criticism.\textsuperscript{146}


\textsuperscript{145}A statement by Elliott illustrates the problem: "The recent printed editions of the Greek New Testament give a text which never existed as a manuscript of the New Testament. They are all reconstructions based on their editors' choice of readings from the manuscripts they had at their disposal, or which they elected to concentrate on. All these printed editions have a conflated text drawn from various manuscripts. But although each in its own way, using its own methods, attempts to be a reconstruction of the original words of the New Testament authors, none is entirely satisfactory (James Keith Elliott, "Can We Recover The Original New Testament?" *Th* 77 [1974] 341).

When scholars realized that the Westcott-Hort methodology did not answer all questions and that their internal and external evidence failed to point to a single conclusion, it became obvious that either internal evidence or external evidence must serve to decide originality.\(^{147}\) This dichotomy of the evidence encouraged the rise of eclecticism, the text-critical procedure followed by most scholars today. As defined by Epp, eclecticism can be broadly described as the method of NT textual criticism used to locate the original reading that (1) treats each variation-unit individually, (2) selects from accepted canons of criticism those canons that are the most appropriate to the variation-unit being studied, and (3) applies these selected canons in such a way as to choose a reading from those provided by the various MSS.\(^{148}\)

There are different shades of eclecticism which manifest themselves in the eclectic's dependence upon or use of external evidence. One common denominator between all advocates of this approach is their desire to seek the original text without being tied to any particular MS or group of MSS, as Westcott and Hort were to B and the neutral text and Tischendorf was to N. Agreement is not complete, however, for reasoned eclecticists like Fee still believe in the existence of reliable MSS which assist


\(^{148}\) Ibid. 212. Lists of currently accepted canons of criticism may be found in: ibid. 243; Metzger, The Text of the New Testament 209-210; idem, Textual Commentary xxv-xxxviii.
internal criteria. Thoroughgoing eclectics, on the other hand, totally reject even the idea of a reliable MS and trust totally in their own abilities using exclusively internal criteria to find the original. This approach to textual criticism is seen almost exclusively in the writings of Kilpatrick and Elliott. Reasoned eclecticism, which favors reliable MSS, is seen in the works of most other NT textual critics today of which Fee, Epp, and Metzger are representative.

Rigorous Eclecticism

Elliott explains this methodology in his written defense of thoroughgoing eclecticism or what Fee has called rigorous

---


150 Elliott says, "There is no such thing as a 'good' text, only manuscripts with some 'good' readings" (Elliott, "Can We Recover the Original New Testament?" 344).


152 Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism" 197; also, Epp, "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism" 215.
eclecticism.\textsuperscript{153} Internal evidence is considered to the total exclusion of external evidence. The age and number of MSS that support a reading and the MS itself or the text-type it contains are not considered when trying to find the original text. The original reading is assumed to be in existence in a known MS, therefore, conjectural emendation is unnecessary.\textsuperscript{154} An original reading can be in either only one extant MS or in many, in an early MS, or a late one.\textsuperscript{155} Consequently, thoroughgoing eclectics want complete collations of all MSS.\textsuperscript{156}

Questions concerning which variant best accounts for the rise of the other variants, which readings most likely were changed by the copyists, and which reading seems most like the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{153}Elliott, "In Defence of Thoroughgoing Eclecticism" 95-115. It should be noted that Elliott's internal criteria are the same as Westcott and Hort's "Internal Evidence of Readings" mentioned above.

\textsuperscript{154}Kilpatrick says this "rule of thumb" that the original reading does exist somewhere is, for thoroughgoing eclectics, given as a conclusion which is "probable and as one which cannot be proved from the knowledge we have" (Kilpatrick, "Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament" 349). Arguments favoring the use of conjectural emendation in NT textual criticism may be found in John Strugnell, "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament, With a Coda on 1 Cor 4:6," \textit{CBO} 36/4 (1974) 543-558. For a review of contemporary use of conjectural emendation, see Erroll F. Rhodes, "Conjectural Emendation in Modern Translations," \textit{New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis: Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger} (eds. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981) 361-374.

\textsuperscript{155}Elliott, "In Defense of Thoroughgoing Eclecticism" 98-103.

\end{flushleft}
author's general style (all internal criteria) are asked of every variation to the exclusion of questions of "weight, provenance, and alleged authoritativeness of the MSS supporting each variant..." In short, Elliott rejects what he calls the cult of the best MSS for internal criteria. He wants to present decisive internal evidence so that the external evidence is subservient to it. Each variant is treated individually, separately from external considerations.

The major weaknesses of thoroughgoing eclecticism are two. First, its denial of any good MS is an unrealistic view of textual witnesses. Contemporary text-critical methodology proves that some MSS are better than others. The second major weakness of thoroughgoing eclecticism is its subjectivity. Without external MS considerations, there is no objective control. When internal considerations do not satisfy the textual critic and he cannot turn to external evidence for

---


158 Elliott, "In Defense of Thoroughgoing Eclecticism" 96.


160 Proof of this may be seen in Zuntz, The Text of the Epistles, and Fee, "P75, P66, and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria."

161 For the best and most complete analysis of the problems of this position, see Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism--Which?" 174-197. Elliott's article "In Defence of Thoroughgoing Eclecticism" was written in response to this article by Fee and others who have written against Elliott's method of textual criticism.
assistance, the decision must be made according to personal preference, not objectively verifiable data.

**Reasoned Eclecticism.** For the reasoned eclectic (also called rational eclectics), every area of text-critical studies plays an important role in learning which variation-unit is most likely original.¹⁶² Intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities and the date and nature of external evidence all contribute to support a particular reading. As mentioned above, the major division between thoroughgoing eclecticism and reasoned eclecticism is the weight given to external evidence in textual decisions.¹⁶³ Rational eclectics like Fee begin with internal considerations which include intrinsic (what the author probably wrote following his style and vocabulary) and transcriptional (scribal patterns and mistakes, interpolations, conflations) possibilities.¹⁶⁴ When answers to these questions are indecisive, appeals are then made to the relative value of the MSS (external evidence). MSS that are the earliest and consistently have the original readings are considered the best. When these MSS have the reading which best accounts for the rise


¹⁶⁴ Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism--Which?" 197.
of the others, this reading is viewed as most likely the original
over readings that internally are also possible but which are
found in either late or normally not trustworthy MSS.

Reasoned eclectics like Metzger begin with external
evidence, follow with transcriptional probabilities and finally,
intrinsic probabilities. When there is no apparent resolution of
the problem and the two types of evidence do not agree, then, the
weight of external evidence is generally trusted.\textsuperscript{165}

The weakness of rational eclecticism is that the inclusion
of external evidence does not always satisfy textual questions
either. Sometimes external evidence contradicts internal
considerations. If this happens, the textual critic must decide
which is going to be determinative, and according to Epp, this is
not immediately clear to modern textual critics.\textsuperscript{166} Epp calls
this the "crisis of criteria" and points out that in reality
textual critics have reached no consensus on the criteria for
originality of readings.\textsuperscript{167} Metzger's \textit{Textual Commentary}
with its record of decisions bears this out.\textsuperscript{168} There is no single
criterion or list of criteria that will satisfy many textual
problems facing the NT scholar today.

\textsuperscript{165} Metzger, \textit{The Text of the New Testament} 209-219. An example of this
approach may be seen in Juan B. Cortes, "The Greek Text of Luke 18:14a: A


\textsuperscript{167} Epp, "Textual Criticism" 101-103.

\textsuperscript{168} Metzger expresses this same idea (Metzger, \textit{The Text of the New
Testament} 218-219).
Even with its problems, rational eclecticism is the most commonly held method of textual criticism. Proponents believe it is right because it considers both internal and external factors. While some of its adherents, like Epp, are looking for a new method, and others, like Fee, simply want implementation and refinement of rational eclecticism, it is the one method that considers all the evidence available to the textual critic. Therefore, it is the method that holds the most possibility for locating the original text of the New Testament.

The Majority Text Method

The third approach for locating the original reading is advocated mainly by Hodges and is seen in *The Greek New Testament*.

---


171 Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned?" 197.
According to the Majority Text edited by himself and Farstad. These writers believe the original is preserved in the majority of MSS by normal transmission of text, not by divine providence. Hodges has worked hard to give his position an identity separate from those who hold to divine preservation of the original text.


Kilpatrick, a thoroughlygoing eclectic, also rejects the notion that some special providence watched over the text to guarantee that certain MSS contain the original wording and asks, "If this were the case, we might wonder why this providence has not exerted itself a little further to ensure that at each point of variation the original reading would be manifest and immediately demonstrable?" (Kilpatrick, "Conjectural Emendation" 350).

174 There has been considerable confusion at this point, and rightly so for Hodges said in 1971 that the Scripture documents "cannot have had a history wholly like that of secular writings. As they cannot have avoided the attack of supernatural principalities and powers of evil, so they cannot have lacked the superintending providence of the God who authored them" (Zane C. Hodges, "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism," BSac 128/509 [1971] 30). Because of statements like this, some writers have understood Hodges to be part of the movement which says God providentially preserved the original in the majority of MSS. Fee mentions Hodges as being in the same camp as the TR advocates (Gordon D. Fee, "Modern Textual Criticism and the
Using human multiplication probabilities, Hodges believes that the presence of many children strongly suggests the presence of many parents. The reason the Byzantine text-type is preserved in the majority of MSS is because the text-type found in the Byzantine MSS has always been in the majority of texts. He finds it mathematically improbable that eighty-percent of extant MSS came from a single fourth-century MS recension as suggested by Westcott and Hort and their followers. Many MSS require many ancestors.\(^{175}\)

One weakness of this theory of MS multiplication is the absence of early extant MS support. Hodges explains this lack of MSS by appealing to the findings of Lake, Blake, and New. After doing extensive study of MSS in several libraries, they concluded that exemplars were intentionally destroyed after they were copied.\(^{176}\) Hodges accepts this as a major factor for the

---

\(^{175}\) Hodges writes, "... a majority of extant documents presupposes a majority of ancestral documents at every stage of transmission reaching back. Another way of putting this is that the majority text is a majority text in the surviving documents precisely because it has always been the majority text since the autographs themselves began to be copied" (Hodges, "A Response" 147, 152).

\(^{176}\) Lake, Blake, and New write: "This collation covers three of the great ancient collections of MSS; and these are not modern conglomerations, brought together from all directions. Many of the MSS, now at Sinai, Patmos, and
absence of extant Byzantine text-type MSS dating before the fourth century.\textsuperscript{177} Other factors include the lack of favorable climate to preserve the Byzantine MSS as the Egyptian text-types had in Egypt, and normal use and wear of MSS. Hodges feels the Byzantine texts wore out the earliest because they were used more.

Hodges's methodology for deciding which variant is most likely original has two basic premises. First, those readings with the most MS attestation are considered more probably original. Second, development of a variation unit is followed through a reconstructed history of MSS. He says, "Final decisions about readings ought to be made on the basis of a

Jerusalem, must be copies written in the scriptoria of these monasteries. We expected to find that a collation covering all the MSS in each library would show many cases of direct copying. But there are practically no cases. What does this mean?

Before answering the question, it may be well to put another. Why are there only a few fragments (even in the two oldest of the monastic collection, Sinai and St. Saba) which come from a date earlier than the 10th century? There must have been in existence many thousands of manuscripts of the gospels in the great days of Byzantine prosperity, between the fourth and the tenth centuries. There is now extant a pitifully small number. Moreover, the amount of direct genealogy which has been detected in extant codices is almost negligible. Nor are many known MSS sister codices. The Ferrar group and family I are the only reported cases of the repeated copying of a single archetype, and even for the Ferrar group there were probably two archetypes rather than one. . . . There are cognate groups--families of distant cousins--but the manuscripts which we have are almost all orphan children without brothers or sisters.

Taking this fact into consideration along with the negative result of our collation of MSS at Sinai, Patmos, and Jerusalem, it is hard to resist the conclusion that the scribes usually destroyed their exemplars when they had copied the sacred books" (K. Lake, R. P. Blake, and Silva New, "The Caesarean Text of the Gospel of Mark," \textit{HTR} 21 [1928] 348-349).

\textsuperscript{177}Hodges, "A Response" 154-155.
reconstruction of their history in the MS tradition."¹⁷⁸ This was, of course, Hort's third step.

Though much has been written concerning this modern revival of the majority text, most textual critics reject it for several reasons. Wallace has shown that Hodges violates both of his stated premises in The Greek New Testament according to the Majority Text.¹⁷⁹ The readings placed in the text by Hodges are supported by a minority of MSS in fifteen of thirty instances of variant readings in the pericope adulterae (John 7:53-8:11) alone. In Revelation, one hundred and fifty-two minority text readings are adopted based on the evidence of his proposed stemma. This violates his first premise.

The second premise is violated when the genealogical tree is built on readings viewed as superior.¹⁸⁰ When internal criteria alone are used to decide which readings are best, subjectivity reigns.

Hodges, then, has invalidated both premises and constructed a critical text instead of the text present in most extant MSS as the title suggests. For these and other reasons, most modern textual critics reject the Majority Text method for locating the


¹⁸⁰ When describing how to build a stemma, Hodges writes that "there ought to be some readings treated as original which are noticeably superior to their rivals" (Hodges and Farstad, The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text xxv).
original text in favor of reasoned eclecticism.  

Summary

Contemporary textual criticism is the result of continuing advancement and refinement of nineteenth-century methodologies for studying both external and internal evidence of MSS. Scoffer's extensive evidence from the Church Fathers and Gregory's reactionary development of MS nomenclature against von Soden's system set the stage early in the twentieth century for continued advancement and refinement of nineteenth-century conclusions. Greek New Testaments such as Weymouth's and Nestle's were edited not to set forth the editor's own text, but to make the conclusions of nineteenth-century scholarship available. Scholarly acceptance of this approach is seen in the Nestle text, now in its twenty-sixth edition, that has become the most popular hand-held Greek New Testament of all printed editions available today.

Reconstructing the history of the text of the Bible also claimed the attention of twentieth-century textual critics from von Soden's monumental work to the current Comprehensive Profile Method. Aland's One Thousand Readings Method has been influential mainly because of his input into the Nestle-Aland  

181 Other articles which critique this approach are: Daniel B. Wallace, "The Majority Text and the Original Text: Are They Identical?" BSac 148/590 (1991) 151-169; Kurt Aland, "The Text of the Church" 131-144; Carroll D. Osburn, "The Text of the Pauline Epistles in Hippolytus of Rome," SecCent 2/2 (1982) 97-124 (Osburn demonstrates that Hippolytus's text is not the Byzantine text-type as claimed by some Majority Text advocates such as Pickering in The Identity of the New Testament Text 64-75); and Marchant A. King, "Should Conservatives Abandon Textual Criticism?" BSac 130/517 (1973) 35-40.
edition of the Greek New Testament. However, most scholarship
discounts his approach as highly subjective because it is founded
on circular reasoning. Most contemporary studies concerning MS
histories and MS relationships are being done using some form of
the Claremont Profile Method or Ehrman’s later development of
that method, the Comprehensive Profile Method.

Finally, textual critics continue to critique the canons of
criticism developed over the previous centuries. A total
dependance on internal criteria as suggested by thoroughgoing
eclectics and an over-dependance on the evidence of extant MSS as
seen in the Majority Text Method is rejected by most textual
critics today in favor of rational eclecticism which seeks to
balance internal and external criteria. Rational eclectics
consider both evidence essential for deciding which variant is
the original reading.

Conclusion

The science of studying New Testament Greek MSS has a long
and fruitful history. From the first recorded text-critical
efforts found in second- and third-century writers such as
Theodotus, Origen, and Tertullian, MS variants are shown not only
to exist but also to attract the attention of NT scholarship of
that early era. Evidence of continued interest is seen in the
writings of Augustine and Jerome.

The language change in the church from Greek to the
vernacular languages of the people groups converted to
Christianity insured that work on Greek MSS was largely limited
to Greek-speaking enclaves such as those in Southern Italy. An apparent decline in Greek MS production is evident from the fifth to the eighth centuries when the Greek minuscule script was developed to facilitate faster writing. Limited interest in maintaining a pure text continued and is evident in the work done on codex Sinaiticus in the early Middle Ages.

With the invention of printing (ca. 1450), mass production of a Greek text was made possible. The desire for monetary gain by a Basel publisher led to the published edition of the Greek NT which became accepted in the church as equivalent to the original text. Erasmus, Stephanus, Beza, and the Elzevir brothers along with the translation of the KJV of 1611 all contributed to the popularizing of this text which became the text received by all, the TR.

The discovery and collation of older and better MSS prompted scholars of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to begin questioning and challenging the TR. Expanded collations and formation of critical apparatuses by men like Walton, Fell, and Mill, the discovery of text-types by men like Bengel, Semler, and the development and printing of canons of criticism by men like Griesbach laid the foundation for continued scholarly challenge to the priority of the TR.

The nineteenth century saw the demolition of the TR if not in reality, at least in theory. Lachmann proved that the text used by the church in the fourth century was not the text-type of the TR. Tischendorf, with his amazing discoveries and
collations, produced a text much like Lachmann's and provided much of the necessary MS material essential to the theoretical advances of Westcott and Hort. Using collations done by others, Westcott and Hort developed a theory of text transmission, their genealogical method, which they felt proved the TR represented a text-type which resulted from a deliberate Syriac revision. They also decided that the neutral text-type was the purest of the four known text-types, being the one most free from interpolation. Westcott and Hort also developed and articulated an extensive methodology for locating original readings using both internal and external evidence. Both evidences were necessary in Westcott and Hort's procedure, the external evidence serving as a guide for and a protector against the subjectivity of internal evidence. The impact of their work was so extensive that all subsequent textual criticism has to interact continually with their conclusions.

Twentieth-century textual criticism built on the conclusions of nineteenth-century scholarship. Several editions of the Greek NT were published, but the most popular was the one that encapsulated the conclusions of nineteenth-century scholarship. This illustrates the continuing impact of Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort.

One area of concern for twentieth-century textual criticism has been the history of MS transmission. This is seen in von Soden's work on minuscule MSS and on Colwell's work to develop his Method of Multiple Readings. This interest in MS
relationships and the historical development of text-types also led to a further development of Colwell's Method of Multiple Readings into the Claremont Profile Method. Because of the CPM's limited text base, it was further developed by its critics into the Comprehensive Profile Method. Use of these methods allows the textual critic to obtain more closely an accurate and objective determination and demonstration of MS relationships.

The proper use of external and internal criteria in locating the original reading is another area of concern for twentieth-century textual criticism. Strong disagreements have surfaced concerning the importance of external evidence. Thoroughgoing eclectics say it is not needed at all. Majority text advocates rely heavily on external evidence, essentially counting MSS to bolster their claims of originality for the Byzantine text-type (Hort's Syrian text, von Soden's Koine text). Rational eclectics, who believe that external evidence should be used with internal evidence, differ among themselves by not agreeing on where to consider external evidence in their actual practice of textual criticism. Fee and Metzger illustrate this. Even with its problems, however, most textual critics today are rational eclectics.

In brief, this historical overview has shown that modern textual criticism is the result of nearly nineteen centuries of textual work. As a science it has developed from the infantile interest of the second century to the high level of scholarly concern today. Thorough understanding of the contemporary issues
of this science requires familiarity with the issues of the past and the answers produced by former textual critics. Through continued refinement of past and present textual critical methodology, a more accurate assessment of the original text of the NT can be obtained.

As seen in this chapter, according to Westcott and Hort and many rational eclectics today, foundational to the study of individual variants is the study of individual MSS. It has been generally accepted since Westcott and Hort that knowledge of documents should precede final judgment upon readings. In keeping with this, the remainder of this study will concentrate on identifying the characteristics and text-type of an unpublished yet important manuscript.
CHAPTER II
CODICOLOGICAL AND PALEOGRAPHICAL DESCRIPTION
OF DUKE MS. GK. 1

Introduction

In the previous chapter a survey of the history of textual criticism was presented. At the heart of the development of this field of study was the discovery of MSS older and different from those which formed the TR. Each new discovery of another MS required specific investigation to learn how the new MS would contribute to the present understanding of the NT text.

In this chapter Duke MS. GK. 1 is introduced and a portion of it examined. Though this MS includes all twenty-seven books of the NT, only representative folios are examined. A general description of the codex is followed by a paleographical study of these folios. Folios 182r to 184r contain 1 Peter, the collation of which is the topic of the next chapter. Folio 62r is the beginning of Luke's Gospel, f. 88r is the beginning of John's Gospel, and f. 101r contains John 14:31-15:24. These folios serve as the objects of this study to determine the general codicological and paleographical characteristics of this manuscript. The chapter concludes with a suggested date for this
Manuscript History and Present Identification

On February 19, 1931, B. Harvie Branscomb, a professor in Duke Divinity School, purchased a manuscript of the entire NT from the shop of Täuber and Weil in Munich, Germany. After its purchase, it became known as Duke MS. GK. 1.\(^2\) Kenneth Willis Clark came to teach at Duke Divinity School and began to study this manuscript the same year. He discovered that the manuscript had been seen by Kirsopp Lake as early as 1902 in the Monastery of the Twenty Palms at Kosinitza in Northern Greece where it was manuscript 60 in that library.\(^3\)

Duke 1 is number 1780 in the Gregory-Aland catalogue and 5412 in von Soden's system of manuscript denotation.\(^4\) It is one

---

\(^1\) Copies of the folios examined in this thesis are included in Appendix VI.

\(^2\) Durham, N.C. Duke. MS. GK. 1. Hereafter Duke 1. The description of this MS as described in the Duke Catalogue of Greek Manuscripts is included in Appendix III of this thesis.

\(^3\) John L. Sharpe III, "The Kenneth Willis Clark Collection of Greek Manuscripts," Library Notes 51, 52 (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Library, 1985) 51. Nothing more is known of the background of Duke 1. John L. Sharpe III, Academic Librarian for Research Affairs at Duke University, suggests that based on paleography and ornamentation it originated in one of the monasteries of Southern Italy. The plausibility of this suggestion is evident from the manuscript activity known to characterize this area. See the four article series by Lake dealing with monasteries in south Italy and the manuscripts they produced (Kirsopp Lake, "The Greek Monasteries in South Italy: I," JTS 4 [1902-3] 345-368, 517-543; 5 [1902-3] 22-41, 189-202). The presence of interlace, a form of Byzantine artwork found in this manuscript, also points to a possible origin in Southern Italy. For a more complete discussion, see the excellent study by M. Alison Frantz, "Byzantine Illuminated Ornament: A Study in Chronology," ArtBul 16/1 (1934) 51.

of only fifty-eight known manuscripts of the entire Greek New Testament (all twenty-seven books) and is in remarkably good condition.

**Binding Description**

The description of the upper cover is as follows: at the fore edge the board measures 301 mm. from head to tail and is 13 mm. thick; the length of the gutter edge including the endband measures 318 mm.; at the tail it measures 215 mm. from the spine to the fore edge. X-rays of the board reveal six holes along the gutter edge drilled toward the fore edge. Each hole enters the

---


6 Current codicological methodology may be seen in the journal *Codicologica* beginning 1976 to the present. Other sources are: John L. Sharpe III, "The Dakhleh Tablets and Some Codicological Considerations," *Bibliologia* 12 (1992) 127-148; Hans Quecke, *Das Lukasevangelium satdisch: Text der Handschrift PPalau Rib. Inv. Nr. 151 mit den Varianten der Handschrift M 569* (Barcelona: Papyrologica Castroctaviana, 1977); and Hans Martin Schenke, *Das Matthaeus-Evangelium in mittel ägyptischen Dialekt des Koptischen (Codex Scheide)*, "Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur," 127 (Berlin, 1981) 2-3. Though presented in a different order, chapters Two and Three of this study follow the descriptive method set forth in Bentley Layton, *Catalogue of Coptic Literary Manuscripts in the British Library Acquired Since the Year 1906* (London: The British Library, 1987). According to Layton's work, "each catalogue entry has thirteen parts: I. Short Title Entry; II. Physical Description of the MS; III. Related Fragments; IV. Analysis of Contents; V. Colophons; VI. Corrections, Marginal Apparatus, Ancient Annotations; VII. Structure of the MS (Collation); VIII. Writing Materials; IX. Layout of Text; X. Script; XI. Decoration; XII. Present Binding (if in boards); XIII. Modern History of the MS (ibid. LIV). Each of these subjects is discussed in the present study with the exception of numbers III and V."
board at the center of the board edge at the gutter and is angled to emerge on the inside surface of the board at approximately 25.5 mm. from the gutter. At the point where the tunnel emerges on the inside of the board, another hole is drilled through the board (i.e., the board of the cover) from the inside to the outside of the cover. These holes are spaced at intervals (measuring from the head) of 23 mm., 52 mm., 117 mm., 188 mm., 255 mm., and 279 mm. respectively along the gutter edge.

To prepare the board for the attachment of the signatures, each board is "bridled" (i.e., threads are laced through holes in the boards providing a place of attachment for the thread). One half of the total number of signatures will be sown by linkstitch to one cover and the remaining half to the other cover. The board attachment thread follows a path from the gutter edge of the board to the point where it emerges on the inside of the board. At this point it is passed to the outside of the board (through the hole drilled 25.5 mm. from the gutter). The thread runs along the outside of the board through a shallow channel to the point at the gutter where it entered the board and is looped a few times (running from the gutter to the hole through the thickness of the cover) before being routed from the hole through the thickness of the board to the next board attachment station (at the gutter) to begin the next loop. ⁷ These somewhat loose loops of threads together form a loop at the gutter edge of the

---

⁷The number of loops is unknown because the cover obscures the board attachments.
board which serves as the anchor point for the threads used to attach the first and subsequent signatures to the cover.

The lower board has the same hole pattern as the upper board. The only major difference is that on the fore edge of the lower board two triple braided tie clasps have been attached. Though the clasps themselves are missing, the tie clasp anchorages for each tie clasp are preserved on the inside of the board.

When the book was put together, the binder attached the first half of the signatures to the upper board and the last half to the lower board, and then both halves were sewn together at the spine. There are twenty-five signatures in this manuscript each with eight leaves. All two hundred original folios are present. The manuscript is not made of fine parchment; it is thick and sometimes stiff and the edges of the leaves somewhat irregular.

After the signatures were sewn and the two halves joined, a linen cloth was then pasted over the spine, extending over the outer surface of the boards as revealed by X-rays. Next the primary and secondary endbands were attached.

After the spine liner was placed over the spine and onto the upper and lower board, the binder worked the primary endband at both the head and tail, beginning on the edge of the board, continuing across the top of the head and tail and finishing off on the other cover. After the

---

8Again, since the cover is still intact, this part of the process must be assumed. However this was the usual way Byzantine books were assembled (John L. Sharpe III, interview by author, 12 December 1991). In keeping with what can be seen in this manuscript, there is no reason to assume anything different was done in assembling Duke 1.
primary endband was attached to the covers and the signatures of the text block, the secondary endband was then created by wrapping a warp around the primary endband and then weaving (in a variety of patterns) a design through the warp threads to create a kind of chevron effect using several colors of silk threads. Simply put, the secondary endband is woven over a warp which is wrapped around the primary endband. Then the colored silk threads are drawn through and over the supplementary warp that has been applied to the primary endband.  

Fore edge clasps were then attached by being laced through the fore edge of the lower cover and clasping onto pins which were inserted into the fore edge of the upper cover. These are present but have been pushed into the fore edge of the board. The leather cover was then stretched over and pasted to the boards. The decorative tooling of the leather cover was the final step.

The first twenty-five folios contain among other entries, the Synaxarion (ff. 2\textsuperscript{r}-4\textsuperscript{v}), the Menologion (ff. 4\textsuperscript{r}-5\textsuperscript{r}), the letter of Eusebius to Carpianus (ff. 5\textsuperscript{r}-5\textsuperscript{v}), and the Eusebian canon tables (ff. 6\textsuperscript{r}-8\textsuperscript{r}).  

\footnote{The Synaxarion (moveable feasts) is a lectionary of readings for the year which began at Easter and included readings for Saturdays and Sundays. In some instances, schedules were even given for every day of the week. The Menologion readings (the fixed celebrations) start on the first day of September, the beginning of the year, with set readings for feast days, saints’ days, etc. (Metzger, The Text of the New Testament 31). One example of a reading marker is at f. 183\textsuperscript{r}, line 30 which reads: 

[ΤΗΓ ΤΗΣ ΛΕ ΕΤ] κατα [α εφηδ πα] της. This marks the reading for the third day (Γ) of the thirty-third week (Λε). For a good overview of the historical development of lectionaries, see John Reumann, "A History of Lectionaries: From the Synagogue at Nazareth to Post-Vatican II," Int 31/2 (1977) 116-130.}

Matthew through Acts, James, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews, 1 and
2 Peter, 1, 2, 3 John, Jude, and the Apocalypse. Each book was marked with a fore edge marker which was a piece of sewing thread looped through the fore edge of the leaf and tied off with a length of thread left hanging to identify the place. The holes for these fore edge markers are visible though fragments of some remain. The scribe has numbered the signatures in Greek; a modern hand has provided foliation in Arabic numbers.

**Paleographical Description**

**General Description of Duke MS. GK. 1**

The collation and paleographical study for this work was done with folios 62r, 88r, 101r, and 182r to 184r, the latter two being the beginning and ending of 1 Peter. Measurements were taken from f. 185. Writing is on both sides of the parchment, the arrangement being Hair-Hair, Flesh-Flesh. The recto of the first folio of the signature is flesh. Artful ornamentation is present on ff. 62r and 88r where the scribe used brown (two shades, one darker than the other), red and blue ink colors. Ornamental penwork above the book titles and enlarged uncial letters for the titles themselves and for the first letter of the

---

11 For a general description of eight other minuscule codices, see Kenneth W. Clark, *Eight American Praxapostoloi* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941) 6-38.

12 This arrangement of Duke 1 is not unusual, for "A quire in a Greek manuscript of respectable family consists . . . of four double leaves or eight single leaves. . . . The eight leaves must begin with a flesh side and end with a flesh side, and there must be two flesh sides in the middle of the quire, and every two pages that open out together must both be flesh sides or both be hair sides." The hair side is darker, rougher, and absorbs ink more thoroughly than the flesh (Casper René Gregory, *Canon and Text of the New Testament* [New York: Scribner's, 1912] 323-324).
books are present throughout. The rubrics are in red semi-
uncials. The brown ink is strong and very legible in the text
and the catenae. Overall, f. 185 measures 30 cm. (H) (at the gutter edge) and
22 cm. (W) (at the tail). Ruling for the equipment was
included when the page was laid out; the measurements are as

13 The opening letter for both Luke and John is an epsilon. The top line
of this epsilon in Luke is a blue floral ornament; the middle line (parchment
color) is a hand; the bottom line is a blue bird; the left vertical line is
curved with the bottom resting on a heart-shaped finial. This vertical line
is red and the finial is red and blue.
The opening epsilon in John's Gospel is a snake. The top line is a
human hand turned down, the middle line is a serpent's head, and the bottom
line is another serpent's head turned up. The left side of the epsilon is a
snake body. At a point on the bottom line of the epsilon close to the back
line, the top of another snake head facing out toward the reader is pictured
biting the lower line snake. The snake is colored red and blue.

14 For further study of early writing materials, scribal habits, and book
making, the following sources may be consulted with profit. Pliny's Natural
History; An Account by a Roman of What Romans Knew and Did and Valued (ed.
Loyd Haberly; New York: Frederick Ungar, 1957) 78-84; Kenneth W. Clark, "The
Posture of the Ancient Scribe," BA 26/2 (1963) 63-72; J. Harold Greenlee,
Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964)
18-26; idem, Scribes, Scrolls, and Scripture: A Student's Guide to New
Testament Textual Criticism (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985); Frederic G.
Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible (3d edition revised and augmented by A. W.
Adams; London: Duckworth, 1975) 6-11; Vincent Taylor, The Text of the New
Testament: A Short Introduction (2d edition; New York: St Martin's, 1963) 8-
23; Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament 301-324; Colin H. Roberts and
T. C. Skeat, The Birth of the Codex (London: Oxford University Press for The
British Academy, 1987); C. C. McCown, "The Earliest Christian Books," BA 6/2
(1943) 21-31; Colin H. Roberts, "Books in the Graeco-Roman World and in the
New Testament," The Cambridge History of the Bible I (eds. P. Q. Ackroyd and
C. F. Evans; Cambridge: University Press, 1970) 48-66; Netzger, The Text of
the New Testament 260-261; and T. C. Skeat, "Especially the Parchments": A
Note on 2 Timothy iv.13," JTS 30/1 (1979) 173-177. For a complete discussion
of the papyrus plant and its uses, see Naphtali Lewis, Papyrus in Classical

15 For a drawing of this folio layout see Figure 1.
follows: measuring across the leaf from the gutter margin to the first vertical rule is 18 mm. (W). Measuring from this ruling line at 18 mm. from the gutter, the scribe has provided an additional width of 7 mm. (or 25 mm. from the gutter edge) for capital letters. The writing area begins at this second ruled line and is 126 mm. (W), followed by an 8 mm. space which marks the borders for the verso capitals, a 48 mm. space for commentary, a 5 mm. open space, and a space of 8 mm. to the fore edge. The 5 mm. space provided marginal space for rubrics and canon table numbers. Where the 5 mm. horizontal space and the 8 mm. vertical space intersect at the tail section, f. 186^7 has the signature number ω (eleven) in carmine color.\footnote{This manuscript has a double numbering sequence. The scribe's first sequence goes through ten, i.e. the first ten signatures number is from α (alpha) through ι (iota). The scribe's second sequence also begins with α at the Prologue to the Acts of the Apostles at f. 106^7. The first folio of signature ω (eleven) contains the ending of 2 Peter and the hypothesis (ὑπόθεσις) for 1 John.}

From the top to the bottom of the leaf, the measurements are as follows: From the edge of the leaf at the head to the first ruled line is 35 mm.; from the first ruled line to the bottom of the text space is 191 mm.; from the bottom of the text to the next ruled line in 53 mm.; and 5 mm. below this line is the final ruled line after which is a 16 mm. space to the tail edge of the page.\footnote{This ruling form area is similar to Lake I, 51a in Kirsopp and Silva Lake, Dated Greek Minuscule Manuscripts to the Year 1200 A.D. (Monumenta Palaeographica Vetera, First Series, Parts I-X; Boston, 1934-1939); Index Volume (ed. Silva Lake; Boston, 1945) xxxv + 185pp.} There are forty-four ruled lines in the text section.\footnote{}
The hair side of the parchment has a yellowish tone and the flesh side has a cream tone. Folio thickness measures approximately .19 mm. The folio has been ruled with a dry stylus on the hair side.

The margins have catenae on three sides of the single column of text, with a varying number of lines. The writing of the catenae is in a smaller hand than that of the scripture.

19 While this folio has forty-four lines of text, several others within the vicinity of this folio have forty-three lines of text.

20 The thickness of parchment depends upon the age of the animal. The younger the skin, the thinner it is. The scrapers of the workmen can only go so deep. If they go too deep, the skin is spoiled. So age, not workmanship, determines the thickness of parchment (Gregory, Canon and Text of the New Testament 325).

21 Ruling is almost always done on the harder surface of the skin which is the hair side. The groove, then, is on the hair side and the ridge is on the flesh side (Edward Maunde Thompson, An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography [Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912] 54, 55).


22 Folio 101 (John 14:31ff) has commentary written in a cruciform shape. On the fore edge side, the commentary ceases after thirteen lines. The fourteenth line has one word (χωρέων) centered, and is 15 mm. wide. Lines fifteen through eighteen are 43 mm. wide, the normal width of the scholia on this folio, followed by seven lines of 15 mm. width. The next four lines are again 43 mm. wide, followed by three 15 mm. wide, followed by four more lines 43 mm. wide, followed by six lines 15 mm. wide, followed by six lines 43 mm. wide, followed by ten lines each one of which successively tapers in until the last line is 5 mm. wide.
text, though both entries are the work of one hand. Reference marks from the text to the commentary are included. A Greek letter in red ink in the margin beside the text and an identical letter next to the scholia guide the reader to the appropriate comments.

Specific Description of ff. 181v - 184r

1 Peter begins with a short introduction, called the ἰσότροπος, followed by section, or chapter, headings (κεφάλαια). According to Metzger, all of the books of the Bible have traditionally been provided with section divisions; however, in this manuscript the Apocalypse of John lacks them. As for 1 Peter these bear the title: Κεφάλαια πέτρου ἐπιστολῆς α (f. 181v). The scribe used a combination of uncial and minuscule letters to label the section headings. The labels are: α, β, γ, δ (δ includes five subdivisions), ε, and a digamma which marks the last section. This last section has three subdivisions.

The scribal hand of the text of the Epistle is a carefully executed minuscule, evidencing a skilled, professional copyist.

---

23 Folios mentioned earlier were considered. Each of these folios appear to be the work of a single hand and have a full text with no lacunae.

24 This ἩΠΟΘΕΣΙΣ can be seen with minor variation in Cramer, Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum (vol. 8) 41; also Theophylact, in Migne, vol. 125 column 1189.


26 These are the same headings given in Cramer, they are simply labeled differently (Cramer, Catenae Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum 41-83). They may also be seen in Migne, vol. 125, columns 1189, 1192.
Letter grouping suggests that letters were copied in groups of three to five, with the norm clearly being four.\textsuperscript{27} Several mistakes are noticeable.\textsuperscript{28} On f. 181\textsuperscript{v}, in the second line of the headings, the letters σωμα are left out. The line should read: και περὶ σωματικός κ.τ.λ. Instead, it reads: και περὶ σωματικός. Obviously this haplography was encouraged by homoeoteleuton, where the copyist’s eye went from the μι in περὶ to the μι in σωματικός.\textsuperscript{29}

On f. 183\textsuperscript{r} line 24, a corrector has used an inverted caret to show the insertion of a missing eta.\textsuperscript{30} On f. 183\textsuperscript{r}, lines 17 and 18, six letters have been erased, and on f. 183\textsuperscript{r}, line 22, about half the line has been expunged. On f. 183\textsuperscript{r} line 9, a nu has been changed to a sigma by writing the sigma over the nu.

On f. 182\textsuperscript{r}, the title written in uncial reads ΠΕΤΡΟΥ ΕΝ ΧΩΑ ΟΥ. The four letters ΚΘΑΗ are written over the title

\textsuperscript{27}This pattern seems to depend somewhat on the familiarity of the passage being copied by the scribe. On f. 88\textsuperscript{f}, John 1, for example, there is a change between the first few lines of the text and the last lines of the text. A clearer difference is evident between f.88\textsuperscript{f} and f. 182\textsuperscript{r}, 1 Peter 1. The more familiar the scribe was with the text, the more material he copied without taking his eyes off the copied text thus having more letters in each cluster. Errors found in 1 Peter 3:1 and 4:14 support this conjecture. These errors are discussed in Chapter Three of this work, pages 115 and 117.

\textsuperscript{28}Errors found in the text of 1 Peter will be discussed more fully in Chapter Three of this thesis.

\textsuperscript{29}Variants are also evident between the headings in Duke 1 and those recorded in Migne and Cramer. In Duke 1, Α’s first subsection ends with δοξη with a line over the η. Migne has της δια Χριστόν. Cramer omits the article.

\textsuperscript{30}Unless otherwise noted, the line number will be from the first line of the text, not from the first line of the commentary which in this manuscript is sometimes above the text.
letters H KH. It is not uncharacteristic for this scribe to omit letters in an ornamental title.

The writing pattern in Duke 1 is generally square in appearance, i.e. it is mostly perpendicular with an occasional slant to the right. Letters are pendant, i.e. they hang from the ruling line with the top of the letter touching this scribed line.\(^3\) The writing is *scriptio continua* (i.e., words are written continuously, not separated). Words are provided with breathing and accent marks. Both smooth and rough breathing marks are used; for the most part they are round, but occasionally strong square breathing marks are used as seen on f. 183\(^r\), lines 7, 11, and 23. Acute, grave, and circumflex accent marks are also utilized though sometimes they are found over the consonant instead of over a vowel. At times an accent will give the reader a clue that the last letters are not included as when τετραμμέν is written for τετραμμένν on f. 182\(^r\), line 8. Diaereses are seen on f. 88\(^r\) lines 27 and 33 (Ἡσύς). No *iota* subscripts are found on f. 88\(^r\) or 182\(^r\). Though there are no occurrences of *iota* adscript on f. 88\(^r\), two are found on f. 182\(^r\) (lines 16 and 28). The following punctuation is used: on the line -- . . ; and above the line between words the high point . . Space is sometimes left between sentences. Old Testament quotations are

---

\(^3\)According to Wilson, this is characteristic of MSS from the tenth century on (Nigel Wilson, *Mediaeval Greek Bookhands: Examples Selected from Greek Manuscripts in Oxford Libraries: Text* [Cambridge, Mass.: The Mediaeval Academy of America, 1973] 13).
marked with a [>] as can be seen on f. 183f.  

Nomina sacra are used and are listed in Table 1. When the scribe used these abbreviations in the folios examined, he usually placed a horizontal line over the abbreviated word or sacred names to indicate their abbreviated form.

Abbreviations other than the nomina sacra are also common. When a word was longer than space permitted at the end of a line, the copyist either carried the remaining letters to the next line, wrote them in smaller letters above the line, or omitted the letter(s) entirely and showed this with a backward slash (\). Sometimes no mark was used at all. Final sigma and nu are at times omitted with no marking to suggest their absence, while at other times final nu is shown with a horizontal line over the final written letter of the word. Table 2 shows seventeen instances of abbreviation other than nomina sacra that are found in 1 Peter, f. 182f - f. 184f. In all but two occurrences, these are the final letters of the word. Whereas the two exceptions, δεδομένη and δικ σετην in 1:8 and 3:14 respectively, are divided at the end of a line, the other abbreviations are located at several places in the text line. The two exceptions are possible examples of abbreviation by contraction (i.e., "the omission of one or more letters in the central part of the word").

---

32 Wilson calls this mark a diple (ibid. 14. Other markers, such as χ (f. 101f line 2) are also used, apparently to tie the text to the commentary.

33 Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible 31.
### TABLE 1

**Nomina Sacra**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1a</th>
<th>2a</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>1b</th>
<th>2b</th>
<th>3b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἄνθρωπος</td>
<td>ἄνθρωπον</td>
<td>ἄνθρωπον</td>
<td>αὐάς</td>
<td>ἄνοια</td>
<td>ἄνοια</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θεοῦ</td>
<td>θεό</td>
<td></td>
<td>θεύ</td>
<td>θεό</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἰησοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ἰησοῦ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστοῦ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κυρίου</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κυρίου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σῶμα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>σῶμα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πατέρα</td>
<td>πατρός</td>
<td></td>
<td>πάρα</td>
<td>παρε</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνευματικάς</td>
<td>πνευματικὸς</td>
<td>πνεύμα</td>
<td>πνικας</td>
<td>πνε,πνε</td>
<td>πναχυ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σωτηρίαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>σωτηρίαν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νιός</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>νιός</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χριστῷ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Χριστῷ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the lower case letter following the Arabic number in each column is for reference purposes only, e.g., 1a = 1b, 2a = 2b, etc., the "b" columns being the abbreviations found in Duke 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FINAL LETTERS ABBREVIATED</th>
<th>INNER LETTERS OMITTED</th>
<th>HOW ABBREVIATION IS NOTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. 182 line 8 1:4 τετηρημένον</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>mark shaped like an arabic 7 over final letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 182 line 16 1:8 δεδομένη</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>mark shaped like a check mark after xi at end of text line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 182 line 28 1:15 καλέσαν</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>τα written above and between final alpha and nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 182 line 4 1:22 υμῖν</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>circumflex and two dots above and following the mu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 182 line 24 2:8 προσκύματος</td>
<td>ος</td>
<td>superscript omicron for final ος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 182 line 30 2:11 ἄπειθος</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>raised theta with center extended for ην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 182 line 42 2:18 δεσσότοι</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>two apostrophes over ι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 183 line 6 2:22 ἑκοιμᾶτο</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>checkmark over sigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 183 line 20 3:4 ἐνέπιθωσ</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>mark like a backslash after iota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 183 line 23 3:6 φοθόσ</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>μινια written above βου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 183 line 24 3:7 γνωσί</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>final nu shown with a line over the iota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 183 line 37 3:14 δικάιοννυν</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>possible mistake or abbreviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 line 6 3:20 κιβερ</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>raised tau followed by a circumflex accent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 line 14 4:2 χρόνον</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>mark like a backslash for final ον</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183 line 24 4:8 έχον</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>enlarged tau over nu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 line 14 5:8 αντίδικον</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>superscript omicron for final ος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184 line 16 5:9 τα</td>
<td>ην</td>
<td>circumflex accent with a dot over the tau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dating the Hand of Duke MS. GK. 1

The characteristic letter forms used by the scribe of Duke 1 are shown in Table 3. The letter forms are clearly those of the book hand of the middle ages. However, specific dating of manuscripts from this period is, as Colwell states, a well-known difficulty. Lake has assisted the efforts of paleographers greatly by providing a compilation of dated manuscripts to the year AD 1200. A comparison of Duke 1 with handwriting

---

34 Listing MS letter forms is commonplace in paleographical studies. For an example of this, see Young Kyu Kim, "Palaeographical Dating of P to the Late First Century," Bib 69/2 (1988) 248-257.

35 Hanson says a dating technique consisting of three steps has developed from the work of several paleographers. There are: 1. Tracing out the letter forms from a given corpus of material, paying heed not only to the shape of each letter but also to relative size and to the angle at which each one is "hung" from the line. . . . 2. The laying out of similar lines of script from other materials—of known date if possible—from both prior to and after the time of the script concerned in order to see where the script best fits in the evolutionary scheme. 3. Paying most careful attention to letter forms that were obviously in transition at the time of the material concerned in order to calculate as precisely as possible where it is to be placed chronologically (Richard Simon Hanson, "Ancient Scribes and Scripts and the Clues They Leave," BA 48 (1985) 83-84.

36 Colwell writes: "This may be somewhat strongly stated, but it is not too much to say that it is almost impossible to place a manuscript within narrow limits between 1050 and 1350 A.D. The conservatism of the Byzantine minuscule was strongest in biblical manuscripts. The use of the uncial script in lectionaries until the end of the tenth century is a well-known example of this biblical conservatism. Here, more than in any other Byzantine area, questions as to date are hard to answer" (Ernest C. Colwell, "Some Criteria for Dating Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts," Appendix in The Four Gospels of Karahissar, Vol I [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936] 225).

37 Metzger expresses this same sentiment (Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible 50).

Table 3

Letter Forms of Duke 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Α</td>
<td>α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Β</td>
<td>β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Γ</td>
<td>γ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ</td>
<td>δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ε</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζ</td>
<td>ζ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Η</td>
<td>η</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ</td>
<td>θ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ι</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Κ</td>
<td>κ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Μ</td>
<td>μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ν</td>
<td>ν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ξ</td>
<td>ξ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ο</td>
<td>ο</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Π</td>
<td>π</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ρ</td>
<td>ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ</td>
<td>σ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Τ</td>
<td>τ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Υ</td>
<td>υ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Φ</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ</td>
<td>ψ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>Ω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
characteristics seen in these dated manuscripts suggests that Duke 1 is possibly a mid eleventh-century to late twelfth-century manuscript. The characteristics of the individual letters α (α), ξ (ξ), θ (θ), κ (κ), ξ (ξ), and ψ (ψ), and the ligatures ει (ει), δεγ (δεγ), ην (ην), κλ (κλ), ρο (ρο) suggest this as the time of writing.\(^{38}\) Most if not all of these letter forms were used at other periods. However, the use of each of these simultaneously fits the characteristics of manuscripts known to be from the eleventh and twelfth centuries.

Two examples of dated manuscripts which evidence this type minuscule script can be seen in Lake's Dated Manuscripts. They are: Mt. Athos: the Αὐρα. 61 (dated AD 1098), and Mt Athos: the Αὐρα. 146 (dated 1084?). Examples of non-dated manuscripts (i.e., those without colophon dates) which also evidence this script can be found in Hatch, Facsimiles and Descriptions of Minuscule Manuscripts of the New Testament.\(^{39}\) These are: Budapest. Universitäts-Bibliothek. V. Gr. 1 (olim 8) (dated saec. X); Oxford. Bodleian Library. Cod. Laud. Gr. 33 (dated saec. XI); Oxford. Bodleian Library, MS. Cromwell 16. (dated saec. XI); Vatican City. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Cod. Vat. Gr. 756 (dated saec. XI or XII); Oxford, Bodleian

\(^{38}\) Comparison of individual letters was made with paleographical charts in Victor Gardthausen, Griechische Palaeographie, 2 vols. (2te Aufl.; Leipzig, 1911-1913) tafs. 6-10.

\(^{39}\) Hatch, Facsimiles and Descriptions of Minuscule Manuscripts 99, 145, 149, 159, 183, 207.
Library. Cod. Roe 1 (dated saec. XII); Paris. Bibliothèque Nationale, Cod. Gr. 50 (dated saec. XI or XII). Examples of non-biblical manuscripts with this same script may be seen in Wilson's Mediaeval Greek Bookhands: Plates. These are: MS. Barocci. 50, f. 322\(r\) (dated 10th ca.); MS. E. D. Clarke 12, f. 66\(r\) (dated 10th ca.); MS. E. D. Clarke 12, f. 210\(r\) (dated 10th ca.); and MS. Rawlinson G. 199, f. 1\(r\) (dated 1141). This last folio mentioned has artwork which bears strong resemblance to that of Duke 1, f. 62\(r\) (the opening of the Gospel according to Luke).

Other criteria contribute to identifying the date of Duke 1. The xi has already been mentioned as tenth century. Also, there is one instance of a minuscule eta (μ; f. 182\(r\) line 26) and two uses of the iota subscript (f. 182\(r\) lines 16 and 28). The complete absence of iota subscript and rare use of iota adscripts are recognizable characteristics of ninth and early tenth century manuscripts. The TR, an edition of the Greek NT compiled from later MSS of the same textual tradition as Duke 1, has fifteen words with iota subscripts on f. 88\(r\) and thirteen words with iota subscripts on f. 182\(r\).

Breathing marks also give some direction for deciding the copy date for a manuscript. Citing work done by Gardthausen,

---


41 Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible 28.
Metzger notes that square breathing marks are found in manuscripts dating prior to AD 1000, round breathing markers are after AD 1300, with both round and square breathing marks being found between these years.\textsuperscript{42}

In summary, after reviewing all the materials collected for this study, the scribal characteristics of Duke 1 appear to conform mainly to manuscripts dated from ca. AD 1050 to AD 1100.\textsuperscript{43}

**Conclusion**

In the previous chapter, the importance of studying individual manuscripts to help determine text-type and originality of readings was explained. This chapter has presented the findings of a codicological and paleographical analysis of a Byzantine minuscule manuscript, Duke 1. The scripture text of representative folios has been thoroughly studied and shown to contain characteristics normal for manuscripts of that time. Several helps for readers are also part of this manuscript. Commentary by Theophylact (Catenae), chapter divisions (κεφάλαια), punctuation, artistic adornment, and lectionary equipment are all present in Duke 1. Different colors of ink and the legibility of the writing make the text attractive.

\textsuperscript{42}\textsuperscript{42}Ibid. 49.

\textsuperscript{43}\textsuperscript{43}For a brief description and partial collation of another eleventh century minuscule, see Harold S. Murphy, "On the Text of Codices H and 93," JBL 78/3 (1959) 228-237. For a thorough description of an early papyrus manuscript, see Sarah Alexander Edwards, "P\textsuperscript{5} Under the Magnifying Glass," NovT 18/3 (1976) 190-212.
and easy to read.

The carefully executed hand suggests that the scribe was a professional, accomplished in the copying of NT MSS in the Greek minuscule script. The handwriting characteristics and patterns plus the occasional indicators of change (such as square breathing marks and iota adscript) suggest that Duke 1 was possibly copied near the end of the eleventh century.

This chapter has shown the importance of this Byzantine MS for purposes of learning how these Greek NT MSS were made and what they contained. With this information, efforts can now be directed toward identifying the quality of the scribe's copying ability and the type of text which this manuscript contains.
CHAPTER III

COLLATING THE EPISTLE OF 1 PETER IN DUKE 1

Introduction

The final chapter of this study presents the results of a collation of Duke 1. Having introduced Duke 1 in the previous chapter as a manuscript that deserves the attention of text-critics—a carefully written minuscule manuscript that dates around the end of the eleventh century—attention is now directed to the text of 1 Peter in Duke 1 and to the results of the collation of that epistle in Duke 1. This collation of 1 Peter is exhaustive, but the minor details such as itacisms are presented in summary fashion only. The text itself is examined to learn its value for contemporary textual criticism.\(^1\)

The benefits of studying the texts of minuscule MSS are becoming more recognized in text-critical circles.\(^2\) Aland


concludes that about 10 percent contain "a valuable early text that can compete with even the best of the uncials." In order to determine the value of its text, all variants between the TR and 1 Peter of Duke 1 are examined. Those variants that suggest scribal error are discussed first, followed by supporting documentation for the type of text contained in 1 Peter of Duke 1.

Methodology

Duke 1 was collated with the TR, P72, P74, M, and B. The collation with the TR used the accepted standard of the New International Greek Project, the 1873 Oxford edition of the Textus Receptus. This was a complete collation of 1 Peter including itacisms, nu moveable, and corrections using the TR as the standard. The collation with P72, P74, M, and B generally

---

3 The text used for the collation is the 1873 reprint of the 1633 Textus Receptus produced by the Oxford University Press especially for the use of scholars collating texts for the International Greek New Testament Project in the 1960s. The copy used was that owned by the late Professor Kenneth W. Clark, one of the founding directors of the IGNTP (ΜΑΝΗΔΙΑΣΟΥΝΗ [International Greek New Testament Project, Oxford, 1873; reprint, University of Chicago, n.d.]).

Even though all agree that collations are necessary and useful, all do not acknowledge that agreement in error shows a common ancestry. Colwell rejects this saying that "no one has been able to establish the existence of even a small family of New Testament manuscripts by using agreement in error. Error seems to have had a short life in the manuscript period" (Ernest C. Colwell, "Method of Grouping New Testament Manuscripts," New Testament Tools and Studies IX: Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament [ed. Bruce M. Metzger; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969] 20). Maas, however, explains that if it can be shown that the variant common to two MSS is of such a nature that it is highly improbable that the MSS committed the error independently, then a relationship can be established (Paul Maas, Textual Criticism [trans. Barbara Flower; Oxford: Clarendon, 1958] 43). Lake agrees with Maas (Kirsopp Lake, The Text of the New Testament [6th ed. revised by Silva New; London: Rivingtons, 1928] 6).
ignored itacisms, nu moveable, and corrections. Additional manuscript support was gathered from the apparatuses of the N/A 26, UBS², UBS³, Tischendorf's eighth edition, von Soden, and Clark's collation of eight Praxapostoloi.⁴ These were consulted


A recent publication of The Crosby-Schøyen Codex, a third-century Coptic codex which includes 1 Peter, was not considered in this collation because its text-type has not been conclusively determined. Though its exemplar predates P⁴ and though this Coptic 1 Peter shows some similarity to P⁵, according to Willis the Crosby-Schøyen text agrees with only one of the twenty-nine unique readings of P⁴ (William H. Willis, The Letter of Peter [1 Peter]: Coptic
to learn which variation units were found only in Duke 1 and
which were part of a continuing manuscript tradition.

The results of this collation are treated in two major
discussions: all variants and scribal errors are identified,
which becomes the basis for the identification the text-type of 1
Peter in Duke 1. The first section discussing variants is
divided into four separate discussions: (1) Variants that are
clearly the result of a manuscript tradition (i.e., there is
extant MS evidence to show that the variation-unit is present in
other MSS); (2) Variants that simply reflect contemporary usage
of nu moveable; (3) Variants that are itacisms; (4) Variants
that may be readings unique to Duke 1 (i.e., those readings that
are presently known only from Duke 1). These unique readings are
referenced with folio and line number followed by chapter and
verse number so printed Greek texts and the collation in Appendix
I can be compared as needed. A variant for this study is an
individual variant reading which differs from the collating base,

---

Text, Translation, Notes and Variant Readings [Extract from The Crosby-Schøven
Codex, ed. J. E. Goehring et al. (CSCO 521 Subsidia 85, Louvain 1990)] 137).

The intent of this study is not to do a textual commentary on 1 Peter
nor to determine which reading is original. Rather the intent of this study
of 1 Peter of Duke 1 is to identify the type of text present in this MS, to
show the variations between Duke 1 and the TR, and to identify scribal errors.
Because of this limitation, when the collation demonstrates manuscript
tradition as the reason for a reading, study of that particular variant was
discontinued. The collation of Duke 1 included in Appendix I of this paper
confirms that the variants given above are part of a manuscript tradition.

Although the nu moveable is an insignificant part of textual studies, in
order to make the collation complete, the variations in the nu moveable will
be noted. For other collations which include nu moveable and itacisms, see
Clark, Praxapostoloi 39.
the TR.\textsuperscript{7}

**Variants and Scribal Errors**

**Variants Resulting from Manuscript Tradition**

Variants that have MS support besides Duke 1 are found in the following verses: 1:4, 1:7 (twice), 1:11, 1:12 (twice), 1:16, 1:20,\textsuperscript{8} 1:24, 2:3, 2:4, 2:6, 2:7, 2:12, 2:14, 2:17, 2:20, 2:21, 3:1 (twice), 3:4, 3:5, 3:6 (twice),\textsuperscript{9} 3:7, 3:12, 3:16, 3:17, 3:18 (three times), 3:20 (twice), 3:21 (twice) 4:6 (twice), 4:7, 4:8, 4:11 (twice), 4:17, 4:19, 5:7,\textsuperscript{10} 5:8 (twice), 5:10 (twice), and 5:11. Evidence gathered from these variants will be used later in this chapter to learn the text-type of Duke 1.

---


\textsuperscript{8}The absence of the prefix appears to be an accidental omission. The TR along with most other MSS consulted reads, ἰμένοις ἀνθρώπων μῦρος ἄποδεξιμασμένον, παρά δὲ θεον ἐκλεκτόν ("on the one hand rejected by men, but on the other hand chosen by God"). Duke 1 and 2401 read δεδομένοις, i.e., the stone was simply "tested" by men. In all other manuscripts the stone was "rejected" (Ἀποδεχόμενος). This variant illustrates that textual variants can have theological significance. Two good articles which argue that textual variants do have theological significance are Howard Eshbaugh, "Textual Variants and Theology: A Study of the Galatians Text of Papyrus 46," *JSNT* 3 (1979) 60-72; and Kenneth W. Clark, "The Theological Relevance of Textual Variation in Current Criticism of the Greek New Testament," *JBL* 85/1 (1966) 1-16.

\textsuperscript{9}The TR reads ἐγένεσθε, Duke 1 reads ἐγένετο. This same error of dittothography can be seen in John 1:13.

\textsuperscript{10}The TR has μετά, Duke 1 in agreement with several other MSS has ἐμέ. Metzger says the substitution of these synonyms was a common scribal error of the mind (Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (3d enlarged ed.; New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992) 193.
Variants Resulting from the Use of Nu Moveable

A second group of variants is caused by the scribe's use of moveable nu. There are at least fifteen examples, where the presence or absence of the nu varies between the TR and Duke 1. These are: 1:24, 2:7, 2:12, 3:7, 3:18, 3:20, 4:5, 4:6 (twice), 4:7, 4:10, 4:11, 4:13, and 5:14. One of these has no other manuscript support (3:7) and one has only P72 agreeing with Duke 1 (2:12). The presence or absence of the nu at the end of a word has little significance for this study and these fifteen examples are listed only for completeness.11

Variants that are Itacisms

The third group of variants--itacisms--is commonplace in Greek literature.12 The full collation in Appendix I shows that this is true in all of the MSS consulted for this study including Duke 1. The frequency of itacisms may be illustrated by the epsilon and alpha iota interchange common in several MSS collated.

---

11Epp says, "nu-movables ... are 'insignificant' as here defined; they cannot be utilized in any decisive way for establishing manuscript relationships, and they are not substantive in the search for the original text" (Epp, "The Term 'Textual Variant'" 169).

This epsilon and alpha iota interchange is only one of several classes of itacisms in Duke 1. Examples of itacisms in 1 Peter of Duke 1 that have little or no other extant MSS support are: alpha iota and epsilon interchange—γένοςε enactment (1:16), ὑποτάγηται (2:13); and ἀργασθαί αρχασθε (4:17); epsilon iota and iota interchange—ἐν λογισμού (3:9); eta and epsilon iota interchange—ηπείλει (P\textsuperscript{72} has ηπελει (2:23); κληρονομήτερες κληρονομήσει (3:9); eta and

13 Disagreements between the TR and P\textsuperscript{72} are plentiful in this particular itacism.

14 It is important to notice itacisms. According to Lake, "... mistakes in spelling, especially if repeated, often give a hint as to the pronunciation, and so nationality, of the scribe" (Lake, The Text of the New Testament 4). However, itacisms are normally not considered important for determining textual relationships. Examples of studies which set itacisms and other textual trivia aside in the first stages of study may be seen in the following: Carder, "A Caesarean Text in the Catholic Epistles?" 252-270; Ernest C. Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964 (ed. J. Philip Hyatt; Nashville: Abingdon, 1965) 370-389; Epp, "The Term 'Textual Variant'" 169; Thomas C. Geer, "The Two Faces of Codex 33 in Acts," NovT 31/1 (1989) 39-47.

15 Some of these may be little more than nonsense readings. Classifying them as nonsense readings instead of itacisms will make no difference for the stated purposes of this study, for as Epp writes, "This category, the nonsense reading, is clearly established, and the arguments for excluding such readings are sound; few will argue for their originality or even for their retention in the critical apparatus, though the grounds for this exclusion may be variously formulated" (Epp, "The Term 'Textual Variant'" 158). Colwell defines nonsense readings as "words unknown to grammar or lexicon, words that cannot be construed syntactically, or words that do not make sense in the context" (Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri" 375).

16 Metzger mentions that the diphthong αι and the ε came to be pronounced the same (Metzger, The Text of the New Testament 190).
iota interchange—φιμωῦ] φιμωῦ (2:15); νηψατε] νιψατε (4:7); ποικίλης] ποικίλος (4:10); κλέπτης] κλέπτις (4:15); omega andomicron interchange—ἀκρογονιαῖαν] ἀκρογονιαῖον (2:6); λοιδορούμενος] λοιδοροῦμενος (2:23); νεώτεροι] νεότεροι (5:5); and αὐτῷ] αὐτῷ (5:11). 17

Variants Unique to Duke MS. Gk. 1

The fourth type of variant is the reading that may be unique to Duke 1. Also called singular readings, these are readings that are present in a single Greek manuscript and therefore have very little value in the determination of text-type. 18 At this point the apparatuses of The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text and von Soden’s edition of the Greek NT were also consulted to learn if the Byzantine text tradition supported any of these variation units. 19 The absence of extant manuscript support shows that these readings are probably unique readings and are mainly useful for discovering “scribal patterns, purposes, and characteristics.” 20 Sometimes, there are readings

---


18 Huston makes the same observation in his study of P46 that unique readings are unimportant for the study of textual affinities (Hollis W. Huston, “Mark 6 and 11 in P46 and in the Caesarean Text,” JBL 74/4 (1955) 265.


with little extant MS support, a fact that suggests the possibility of scribes committing the same error independent of each other. For this study, however, only manuscripts with no manuscript support will be considered unique readings.

Errors of Expansions of the Text

F. 182 line 5; 1:2 Χάρις ὑμῖν καὶ εἰρήνην ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατρὸς. This has every appearance of an expansion of the text. Since no Greek text consulted records this variant, this portion of the salutation was possibly accidentally added in keeping with the customary Pauline salutations. See Rom 1:7, 1 Cor 1:3, 2 Cor 1:2, Gal 1:3, Eph 1:2, Phil 1:2, Col 1:2, I Thess 1:1, 2 Thess 1:2, 1 Tim 1:2, 2 Tim 1:2, Titus 1:4, and Phlm 1:3 where the TR includes this phrase. However, in all except Gal 1:3 of the TR, ἡμῶν follows πατρὸς, which is in line with the MS tradition of Duke

---

21 Concerning singular readings, Colwell writes, "Since corruption was universal, identical singular readings with only minor scattered support elsewhere should be assumed to be coincidental in these agreements—unless other external evidence establishes relationship" (Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri" 387). Ehrman also discusses separate scribes making the same mistake. He writes, "In only one circumstance can MSS share a reading that does not derive from a common archetype; that is when individual scribes working independently happened to introduce the same corruption of a text. Such 'accidental agreements in error,' while not altogether uncommon, can be expected only where the change of a text seems logical or natural—as in fact happens in other textual modifications of 1 Joh 4:3" (Ehrman, "1 Joh 4:3 and the Orthodox Corruption of Scripture," ZNW 79/3-4 (1988) 225).

22 Some of these readings could be the result of several factors present in the copying process. For this study, errors are discussed under the heading thought to be the major contributing factor to the cause of the error.
1. F. 183⁷ line 24; 4:7 Προσευχάς + ὁμόν. This text expansion is a common NT variant, especially in the Byzantine family.⁴

Προσευχάς ὁμόν is seen in 3:7. Also, the presence of the personal pronoun with προσευχάς is uncontested in several places in the NT (Acts 10:4, Rom 1:10, Eph 1:16, 1 Thess 1:2, Phlm 4, 22).

An Error of Intentional Change

F. 183⁷ line 18; 3:3 Κόσμος] κόσμο[;] or [i]. A supralinear omicron is followed by what appears to be two pen efforts, a dot and a comma, which resembles a question mark (;). A question mark makes no sense in this passage.⁵

---


²⁵A punctuation mark here seems rather trivial. However, such is not always the case. One example where punctuation determines the meaning of the passage is in John 1:3, 4. Does δὲ γέγονεν go with the last part of verse 3 or
If the omicron is followed by an iota, the subject number of the relative clause in this verse apparently was made to agree with the γνωσθείη of verse one and the ὅν of verse three. The presence of the plural ὅν makes this change grammatically unnecessary and the singular ἐστι makes it grammatically incorrect. The absence of extant manuscript evidence supporting the plural ending strengthens the conjecture that this change was intended to correct a perceived grammatical error. The meaning would be unaltered: "whose outward adorning is not to be . . ." (TR) as opposed to "whose outward adornings are not to be . . ." (Duke 1).

the first part of verse 4? Another example is found in Rom 9:5. Is Paul calling ὁ Χριστός God? For a summary review of the evidence for both of these, see Metzger, Textual Commentary 195, 196, 520-523.


Concerning the determination of deliberate changes, Hurtado writes, "It is sometimes difficult to determine whether a variant has been created intentionally or unintentionally. . . . As a basic working principle, we may say that when a variant cannot be attributed to the common scribal mistakes in copying, and especially when the variant can be attributed to a reasonable editorial intention, it is very likely that the variant is an intentional change." Hurtado lists one hundred thirty-four instances where he believes there was deliberate change in W (Larry W. Hurtado, Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981] 68, 81).
errors of Haplography

F. 182\textsuperscript{r} line 1; 1:20 Προεγγαθίζειν̄ Προεγγαθίζειν̄. The scribe inadvertently omitted the \textit{pi}. The \textit{rho} is the first letter of the text on 182\textsuperscript{r}. The last line on the previous folio used only one half the space available. Apparently the scribe intended to add an ornamental uncial \textit{pi} in red ink. This is a clear scribal error.

F. 182\textsuperscript{r} line 43; 2:19 Τούτοις τούς. There is no recognizable abbreviation mark present. Τούτοις is the last word of text on f. 182\textsuperscript{r}, and the text line on the next folio begins with γὰρ. Τούτοις is required for grammatical reasons. Τούτοις γὰρ χάρις ("For this [is] grace, etc.") requires the nominative demonstrative instead of the genitive article. This apparently is another accidental omission.

F. 183\textsuperscript{r} line 29; 3:9 omit] Τούναντιον δὲ εὐλογοῦντες, εἰδότες δι᾽ εἰς τούτο ἐκλήθησι. This error apparently resulted from parablepsis. Forty-nine letters are missing from Duke 1, the approximate number of letters included in each line of this manuscript’s text, which suggests that this may also be the same number of letters in each line of the exemplar. It appears that the scribe omitted one whole line of text. Λαοδορίας ended the preceding line of text, so when the scribe’s eyes went back to the text he picked up the line beginning with ἰνα instead of the one beginning with τούναντιον. As copied in this manuscript, the verse would translate, "Not recompensing evil for evil or insult for
insult, that you might receive a blessing."

F. 183⁵ line 35; 4:13-14 omit] αὐτοῦ χαρῆτε ἀγαλλιώμενοι. Εἰ ὄνειδιζεσθε ἐν ὀνόματι Χριστοῦ μακάριοι ὃι τὸ τῆς δόξης. The scribe accidentally omitted these seventy-three letters when he took his eyes off the exemplar. When he looked again at the exemplar he saw the τῆς δόξης in verse 14 instead of the τῆς δόξης in verse 13. This haplography was clearly caused by homoeoteleuton, a very common scribal problem.²⁷ Though some corrections were made in Duke 1, this omission and the one in 3:9 were not corrected. Perhaps the corrector was fatigued or just careless.²⁸ Or this might suggest an uncontrolled setting, not a scripторium where someone other than the scribe himself would have checked his work. Also, the cause of this error strongly suggests that the exemplar of Duke 1 did not have καὶ δυνάμεως following the second τῆς δόξης as in found in many minuscule MSS.²⁹

Errors of the Eye or Mental Fatigue

F. 183⁵ line 14; 3:1 ὑπὸ τασσόμεναι. The accents

²⁷Clark notes that "the most fertile and most insidious" of all copyists' errors is "omissi ex homoeoteleuto" (A. C. Clark, The Descent of Manuscripts [Oxford: Clarendon, 1918; reprinted, Great Britain: Fletcher and Son, 1969] 1). For an article cautioning against the overuse of homoeoteleuton as a reason to adopt a longer reading, see James R. Royse, "The Treatment of Scribal Leaps in Metzger's Textual Commentary," NTS 29 (1983) 539-551.

²⁸Colwell observed that "correctors did their most intensive work in the beginning of a manuscript" (Colwell, "Method of Grouping New Testament Manuscripts" 23).

²⁹See the textual evidence in each of the editions of the Greek New Testaments mentioned above.
suggest that the Duke 1 scribe accented μῶνο before realizing these three letters were part of one word. This supports the conjecture given in Chapter Two that this scribe was copying in letter groups of three to five.  

F. 183⁷ line 12; 4:1 Ὀπλίσασθε] ὑπλισάμενοι. Possibly due to carelessness, the imperative was changed to a participle because of the influence of two aorist participles in both the preceding verse and in this verse. Peter's regular use of the participle would make the presence of this participle unobtrusive.  

F. 183⁷ line 17; 4:3 Πότοις] τόποις. This is an error of metathesis. The scribe transposed the letters π in and τα. τόποις makes no sense in this verse that lists six sins of the Gentiles.  

F. 183⁷ line 27; 4:10 Ποικίλης] ποικήλος. The change from the feminine ending to the masculine was possibly caused by carelessness or fatigue. Duke 1 says, "as good administrators with the diversified grace of God" (ὡς κολοι σικνόνοι ποικίλοις χάριτος)  

---

30 Though this improper letter division is in this passage insignificant, such is not always the case. An example where letter division affects the understanding of a passage may be seen in Col 4:3 where for two hundred years text-critics have debated between δίο and διό. A good discussion of this may be seen in Markus Bochmuehl, "A Note on the Text of Colossians 4:3," JTS 39/2 (1988) 489-494.  

31 Nida remarks that "not a few changes in manuscripts result from conscious or unconscious adjustments to the immediate context" (Eugene A. Nida, "The 'Harder Reading' in Textual Criticism: An Application of the Second Law of Thermodynamics," BT 32/1 (1981) 104.  

32 Epp contends that such nonsense readings are of little value for text-critical tasks (Epp, "The Term 'Variant Reading'" 159, 168).
This gender change suggests the scribe unthinkingly carried over the omicron iota from the two previous words. This is a common itacism, which is perhaps another reason the scribe inadvertently made the change.\textsuperscript{33} The masculine ending on this adjective is grammatically unsound.

F. 183\textsuperscript{r} line 35; 4:14 κατὰ μέν] Καὶ ἡ μέν. Evidently, as the accents suggest, a misreading of the first minuscule alpha in κατὰ caused the scribe initially to understand these letters as two words. The unaccented ἡ may suggest he realized his error after copying and accenting κατ. This would add support to the conjecture mentioned in Chapter Two and above in the discussion of 3:1 that the scribe of Duke 1 copied in letter groups of three to five.

There is no extant manuscript evidence for καὶ ἡ μέν other than Duke 1. The alpha [ἡ] form can be identical to the alpha iota pattern [ἡ]. The TR reads, κατὰ μέν αὐτῶν βλασφημεῖν ("on the one hand for their part, he is blasphemed"). The reading of Duke 1 ("and on the one hand, the things blaspheme them") makes no sense.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{33}Metzger writes that "in Koine Greek the vowels η, ι, and υ, the diphthongs ει, οι, and ω all came to be pronounced alike" (Metzger, The Text of the New Testament 191).

\textsuperscript{34}This is a variant where there is no variation of letters. An example where meaning is determined by letter division may be found in Mark 10:40. A summary discussion of this variant may be seen in Aland-Aland, The Text of the New Testament 277. Another instance of this was seen on page 116, footnote 30 of this thesis.

Concerning the more important variation-unit in the latter portion of this 1 Peter verse, see Peter R. Rodgers, "The Longer Reading of 1 Peter
errors that have been Corrected

F. 183<sup>f</sup> lines 17 and 18; 3:3 περιθέσεως] + τρεχόν καί.

Apparently the scribe misread the ης before τρεχόν as ως and copied τρεχόν καί a second time and then erased it. This dittography is evident because the erasure is not clean.

F. 183<sup>f</sup> line 24; 3:6 Πτόησιν] πτόσιν. This error was corrected in the manuscript. An insertion mark and an eta stand above the omicron and sigma.<sup>35</sup>

F. 183<sup>f</sup> line 22; 4:6 Σαρκι_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ ζών. This is a corrected error of dittography caused by homoioteleuton. Apparently this erasure was by the scribe himself. Portions of his original writing are still legible. After writing σωρ at the end of line 21, the scribe’s eyes went back to the first part of the same line. Thinking he had just copied the alpha rho in γώρ, he recopied και νεκροίς ευθυγγελίσθη.

Though the scribe erased his mistake, the erasure is not clean, which is perhaps why he did not write in this space again.

These variants may be summarized in the following manner.

1) Two expansions of the text: 1:2, 4:7.
2) One apparent intentional change: 3:3.

4:14," CBQ 43 (1981) 93-95; and Bruce M. Metzger, Textual Commentary 695.

<sup>35</sup>According to Metzger, evidence of a corrector should be noted when a manuscript is collated (Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible 53). For a discussion of correctors found in various papyri, see Colwell, "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri" 382.
4) Five errors of the eye or mental fatigue: 3:1, 4:1, 4:3, 4:10, 4:14.

5) Three errors that have been corrected: 3:3, 3:6, 4:6.

Though several types of variants appear in this copy of 1 Peter, three are very common: itacisms, haplographies, and errors caused by fatigue. The frequency of the first is consistent throughout the epistle. The second and third, however, are worse toward the end of the letter. As previously mentioned, these errors suggest that the scribe may have become weary or careless when he copied portions of 1 Peter.

The multiple errors of haplography suggest that the scribe of Duke 1 regularly lost his place. Of the seven instances of this (four instances of haplography, three corrections), in all but two (3:3, 4:6) the scribe’s loss of place resulted in loss of text.\(^{36}\)

In summary, the scribe of Duke 1 apparently strove for a good copy of his exemplar. However, he regularly succumbed to the weaknesses of scribes who had copied for long hours.\(^{37}\) The substitution of synonyms, the expansions of the text, the nonsense readings, and the regular haplographies point to a sleepy or tired mind that forgets what is to be written in the

---

\(^{36}\) Ross notes that "carelessness would tend to shorten rather than enlarge the text" (Ross, "Some Unnoticed Points in the Text of the New Testament" 60).

\(^{37}\) The importance of understanding a manuscript’s scribe through his writing habits, both good and bad, has long been recognized. For an example of a text critic who views this as important, see Ernest C. Colwell, "Hort Redivivus: A Flea and a Program," New Testament Tools and Studies IX: Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of New Testament Tools and Studies (ed. Bruce M. Metzger; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 161.
short time the eyes travel from the exemplar to the copy.\textsuperscript{38}

Determining the Text-type of Duke 1

The type of text in 1 Peter of Duke 1 was learned by initially examining all units of variation where the TR and accepted Alexandrian witnesses differed.\textsuperscript{39} Three MSS were chosen to represent the Alexandrian text-type and fully collated, two fourth-century uncials—Sinaiticus (M) and Vaticanus (B)—and a third/fourth-century papyrus—P\textsuperscript{72}.\textsuperscript{40} Readings were considered where at least two of the three Alexandrian MSS agreed against the TR. There were sixty-nine units of variation between the Alexandrian text-types and the TR in 1 Peter.

Second, Duke 1 was classified based not on how often it disagreed with the TR, but on how often it agreed with the TR in comparison with how often it agreed with the Alexandrian MSS.

\textsuperscript{38}For a summary description of Byzantine scribes, their work, and constant weaknesses, see Ernest C. Colwell, "The Complex Character of the Late Byzantine Text of the Gospels," JBL 54 (1935) 211-221.

\textsuperscript{39}Colwell contends that for accurate relationships to be established between manuscripts, all variants must be considered, not just those taken from a prescribed "norm" (Ernest C. Colwell and Ernest W. Tune, "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," New Testament Tools and Studies IX: Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament [ed. Bruce M. Metzger; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969] 56). While this is true, it is not the purpose of this study to consider Duke 1 and its relationship to all other MSS. This collation is simply to demonstrate the relationship of Duke 1 to the text-type found in the TR. This can be done without collating against every other manuscript as well.

\textsuperscript{40}The full collation of these MSS is part of the collation mentioned above as being in Appendix I of this paper. The collection of these sixty-nine units-of-variations may be seen in Appendix IV of this thesis. For support of the Alexandrian nature of P\textsuperscript{72}, see F. W. Beare, "The Text of 1 Peter in Papyrus 72," JBL 80 (1961) 253-260.
Duke 1 agreed with the TR fifty-nine times (85.5 percent) and with the Alexandrian ten times (14.5 percent) showing that the text of 1 Peter in Duke 1 is Byzantine.

This conclusion was checked two ways. The text of 1 Peter was compared with fifty-nine units of variation in 1 Peter where the TR and four MSS proven to be Alexandrian (01, 02, 03, 04) disagreed. These units of variation were gathered by Richards for his study of Gregory 1175.\(^{41}\) Using Richards’s list, comparison was made with the collation of 1 Peter of Duke 1. Omitting the times the Alexandrian witnesses split two and two, fifty-two units-of-variation remain. Duke 1 agrees with the TR forty-four of the fifty-two times (84.62 percent). In all seven instances the Alexandrian witnesses split, Duke 1 also agrees with the TR.\(^{42}\)

Aland’s findings concerning Duke 1 were considered also. He found that in ninety-five test examples from all the Catholic Epistles together that this MS disagreed with the majority text once, and agreed with what he considered the original reading nine times. In 1 Peter alone, all thirteen test examples contain the majority text reading.\(^{43}\)

\(^{41}\) W. Larry Richards, "Gregory 1175: Alexandrian or Byzantine in the Catholic Epistles?" \textit{AUSS} 21/2 (1983) 153-168.

\(^{42}\) The table by Richards is included in Appendix V. One column has been added to show the readings of Duke 1 (MS1).

\(^{43}\) Aland’s work is much too expansive to duplicate here. The verse references and portions of the Greek text will alert the reader concerning the location of Aland’s thirteen test examples in 1 Peter. These are: 1:22 διὰ πνεύματος; 1:22 καθάρας; 1:23 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; 2:21 επάθεν υπὲρ υμῶν υμῖν; 3:8
Using the collation of Duke 1 and evidence gathered from the apparatuses of the N/A 26, UBS², UBS³, and Tischendorf's eighth edition of the Greek NT, other corroboration supporting the Byzantine nature of Duke 1 is also evident. Where Duke 1 diverges from the TR, it agrees with W A B C in about one-half the variants cited. Strongest disagreement is seen between Duke 1 and W, an eighth/ninth-century codex which according to Metzger is an Alexandrian witness in the Catholic epistles.\footnote{44}

Strongest agreement is seen between Duke 1 and 049, a ninth-century manuscript with a Byzantine text-type.\footnote{45} Eleven of the thirteen times where 049 is cited, there is agreement with Duke 1. Other manuscripts checked for their agreement with Duke 1 were: (The first number is the number of times the manuscript agreed with Duke 1 against the TR. The second number is the number of times this manuscript disagreed with Duke 1.) K (23/11), L (20/16), P (25/9), 33 (10/6), 69 (6/6).\footnote{46} Aland

\footnote{44} Metzger, The Text of the New Testament 216.

\footnote{45} Ibid. 213.

\footnote{46} These numbers must be qualified for two reasons. (1) At times more than two variations occur within a variation unit. To say then, that a certain manuscript disagrees or agrees with Duke 1 does not mean that there are only two variants. At times there are three and four. (2) Since this study relies totally on the apparatuses of others, there is no guarantee of total and consistent citing of manuscript evidence in every instance where a variant is mentioned. In other words, since the combined textual apparatuses
classifies K L P and 69 predominantly Byzantine in the Catholic epistles. 47 Manuscript 33, however, the "Queen of the minuscules," is mainly Alexandrian in the Catholics. 1 Peter of Duke 1 is clearly a Byzantine text. 48

Conclusion

The collation of Duke 1 reveals that this is an unexceptional Byzantine codex. Most remarkable are the unique readings that show Duke 1 to be normal in scribal habits, good and bad. Itacisms characteristic of minuscule manuscripts are commonplace. Other types of mistakes are also seen in this text that reveal the writing and copying habits of Byzantine scribes. Errors caused by faulty memory and fatigue are most common, followed by accidental omission of letters and whole words (1:8, 1:20, etc.). At times letters and words have been added (1:2, 2:20, 3:6, 4:7) and endings changed (3:3).

The collation also reveals that Duke 1 is part of the

of Tischendorf's 8th edition, UBS 2, UBS 3, and N/A 26 illustrate that none of these gives a complete collation, or cites the reading of witnessing MSS for every variation unit, it is also clear that all four together do not supply the reader with a complete collation.


48 These findings do not cover other portions of this manuscript, for as Kenyon notes, "It cannot be assumed that the text type of any manuscript is uniform throughout, since it may vary not only from book to book, but even within individual books (Frederic G. Kenyon, The Text of the Greek Bible [3d ed. revised and augmented by A. W. Adams; London: Duckworth, 1975] 29). The study cited earlier by Richards showed that 1175 changed text-types in the Catholic Epistles. James and 1-2 Peter are Alexandrian, and 1-3 John and Jude are Byzantine. See Richards, "Gregory 1175" 161. Geer found the same to be true in his study of Codex 33 in Acts (Geer, "The Two Faces of Codex 33" 39-47). Colwell found this to be characteristic of certain MSS he collated as well (Colwell, "The Complex Character of the Late Byzantine Text" 214-216).
Byzantine text tradition. Its high percentage of agreement with the TR and its low percentage of agreement with known Alexandrian manuscripts are evidence of the Byzantine nature of this manuscript. While this study shows that Duke 1 is part of the tradition, it does not show whether the readings of the TR or of the other text-types are closest to the original. Determination of the original text remains to be done and requires the attention of another study. However, in keeping with Westcott and Hort's premise that knowledge of documents should precede final judgment upon readings, it is now clear that Duke 1 is part of the Byzantine tradition of MSS and therefore not a serious contender for originality in most textual variants. This does not mean it has no value, for as was shown above by Zuntz, some Byzantine readings are strong contenders for originality. The value of Duke 1 is mainly in what it can tell about Byzantine codicology and scribal habits, more so than in the type of scripture text it contains.

Finally, study of this manuscript has underscored the need for full collations of all MSS as suggested above.\textsuperscript{43} This is essential if MS relationships and accurate MS history are to be learned. The grouping together of all Byzantine MSS into one category as in N/A 26 and UBS\textsuperscript{3} does little to help identify relationships between individual MSS. The only way an accurate MS history can be determined is through thorough and accurate collations of all MSS.

\textsuperscript{43}See Chapter One, pages 56, 57, 60, 61, 65.
CONCLUSION

This study has offered a historical overview of the field of NT textual criticism and has applied the findings of modern text-critical methodology to a small portion of Duke 1. Chapter One surveyed the beginnings and growth of NT textual criticism. From the second to the fifth centuries, early church fathers displayed through their writings an appreciating understanding of textual criticism, noting the presence of variations between NT MSS, and offering solutions. Scholarly interest declined from the fifth century until the Renaissance, the time of the invention of printing and of the printing of Greek New Testaments.

Printed editions of the Greek New Testament and renewed interest in the languages of the classics during the early sixteenth century provided the needed stimuli for a revived study of Greek NT MSS. The next two hundred years produced extensive collations and collection of MS materials. It was especially during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that modern textual criticism was born, and scholars began to identify and classify MSS according to textual families. Bengel's studies led him to conclude that MSS ought not be merely counted, but instead divided by age and quality. Following Bengel's findings, Griesbach published the conclusions of his own studies and published an edition of the Greek NT that did not follow the TR.
The efforts of men like them laid the groundwork for the dethronement of the TR in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

During the nineteenth century, Tischendorf and Tregelles discovered other MSS, and Westcott and Hort advanced and refined the science of textual criticism. Using the collations of others, Westcott and Hort sought to develop text-critical theory that would prove that the TR was corrupt and that Vaticanus represented the purest text-type. Most of the scholarly world accepted their conclusions, so much so that the twentieth century has served mainly to refine further the conclusions of Westcott and Hort.

The twentieth century began with the production of editions of the Greek New Testament with extensive apparatuses. While the most massive edition was done by von Soden, the most popular was the Nestle’s. Today in its twenty-sixth edition, the Nestle-Aland text is still the most popular Greek NT for scholars.

Considerable work has also been done in the twentieth century in the area of manuscript relationships. Four approaches have been discussed: The Quantitative Reading Method, the Claremont Profile Method, the Comprehensive Profile Method, and the One Thousand Readings Method. The Comprehensive Profile Method results from further development of the first two methods and is the most thorough and objective of the four methods discussed. Most modern text-critics use some form of either the Claremont Profile Method or the Comprehensive Profile Method.

In the final section of the first chapter, current methods
for deciding originality of variants were presented. Most contemporary text critics desire balance in the use of internal and external criteria. They reject the overemphasis on internal criteria by thoroughgoing eclectics and the overemphasis on the external by Majority Text advocates. Reasoned eclecticism, an approach that views both internal and external criteria as essential to the discovery of the original reading, is the approach followed by most today.

Chapter Two pursued a subject introduced in the first chapter: the examination of individual MSS to learn their relationships to other extant MSS. Representative folios of Duke 1 were examined codicologically and paleographically. Duke 1 is a Byzantine codex whose carefully written Greek minuscule letter characteristics suggest the latter part of the eleventh century as the time of its production. The excellent condition of this manuscript gives a clear presentation of the way Byzantine codices were made and what they contained in the way of helps for readers.

Chapter Three continued the examination of Duke 1 by a collation of its text of 1 Peter. All variants and scribal errors were given with the scribal errors grouped and discussed according to the type and cause of the error present. Second, a collation against the TR and known Alexandrian texts showed that Duke 1 has a Byzantine type of text.

In summary, according to modern text-critical methodology, the value of Duke 1 lies not in its text-type and the support of
various readings it can provide, but in the information it contains about Byzantine codices. The way codices were produced, helps that were provided for readers, and weaknesses of scribes evident in their errors all make this a very valuable manuscript from the perspective of the information it contains. Continued study of this and other MSS is necessary to an enduring growth in understanding of scribal habits. The study of already known MSS must proceed, while the recent discovery at St. Catherine's Monastery illustrates that work will be necessary on newly discovered MSS, work that each succeeding generation will continue.¹

¹According to Charlesworth, on May 26, 1975 ten almost complete and over fifty incomplete codices were discovered making this the largest collection of uncials in the world" (James H. Charlesworth, "The Manuscripts of St Catherine's Monastery," BA (1980) 27-28.
APPENDIX I

COLLATION OF DUKE MS. GK. 1, P^{72}, P^{74}, M, AND B

Introduction: Methodology

Duke MS. GK. 1 (Duke 1) will be shown as MS1. N/A is


UBS³ is The Greek New Testament, second edition (1968). UBS³ is


Tischendorf’s eighth edition the Greek NT.¹

¹Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, eds., Nestle-Aland: Novum Testamentum
Graece (post Eberhard Nestle et Erwin Nestle communiter ediderunt Kurt Aland,
Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce H. Metzger, Allen Wikgren; 26th ed.,
4th revision; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1981); Kurt Aland,
Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce H. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds.,
Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1968); Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M.
Martini, Bruce H. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds., The Greek New Testament
Societies, 1975); Constantinus Tischendorf, Novum Testamentum Graece: Ad
Antiquissimos Testes Denuo Recensuit Apparatum Criticum Omne Studio Perfectum
Apposuit Commentationem Isagogicam Praetexuit (Editio Octava Critica Maior,
Vol. II; Lipsiae: Giesecke & Devrient, 1869-1872); Hermann Freiherr von Soden,
Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt
hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte (1.1, Berlin: Verlag von Alexander
Duncker, 1902; 1.2, Berlin Verlag von Arthur Glaue, 1907; 1.3, Berlin: Verlag
von Arthur Glaue, 1910; 2.1, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1913;
Kenneth W. Clark, Eight American Praxapostoloi (Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 1941). The source for P^{72} was Papyrus Bodmer VII-IX; VII: L’Epttre de
Jude; VIII: Les deux Epttres de Pierre; IX: Les Psaumes 33 et 44 (Publié par
Miche) Testuz; Genève, Switzerland: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1959). The source
for P^{74} was Papyrus Bodmer XVII: Actes des Apôtres, Epttres de Jacques,
Pierre, Jean et Jude (Publié par Rodolphe Kasser; Genève, Switzerland;
Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1961). Sinaiticus (M) was collated from Codex
Sinaiticus Petropolitanus: The New Testament (Reproduced in Facsimile from
photographs by Helen and Kirsoff Lake with a Description and Introduction to
the history of the Codex by Kirsoff Lake; Oxford: Claredon Press, 1911;
reproduced Detroit: Brown & Thomas, 1982. Vaticanus (B) was collated from
Bibliorum Sacrorum Graecus Codex Vaticanus (Auspice Pio IX. Pontificie Maximo,
W. Clark's *Eight American Praxapostoli*. V-S is von Soden's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. TR is the 1873 Oxford edition of the Textus Receptus used as the collating standard.

The project was a complete collation of Duke 1 including itacisms, *nu* moveable, and corrections. P72, P74, *M*, B were also collated, but itacisms, *nu* moveable, and corrections were generally not included. Additional manuscript evidence was obtained from the five Greek NT editions mentioned above and is listed in the collation with its source. Errors and disagreements between the apparatuses of these editions of the Greek New Testament are noted throughout the collation.

Evidence from Clark's collation of eight medieval minuscule Praxapostoloi (originally included Acts plus the Epistles) was used to help identify variants found in Duke 1 that appear to have only medieval MS support. Examples are as follows: ἀπηγγέλη (1:12), δεδοκιμασμένον (2:4), ὑποτάγηται (2:13), φησιούν (2:15), γὰρ (2:20), etc. Evidence from von Soden was included only when there was little or no MS evidence found in the other sources consulted. Variants whose support was found in von Soden are in: 1:12, 1:20, 2:20, 3:4, 3:6, and 5:7.

This collation was intended to show which Duke 1 variants are part of an obvious manuscript tradition and which variants appear to be scribal errors. Manuscript support for a given variation unit was recorded in the following order: Duke 1, P72, *M*, B.
$^{74}$, $^M$, and $^B$. Information found in N/A 26 was then recorded, followed by additional manuscript support found in UBS\(^2\), UBS\(^3\), Tischendorf's eighth edition, evidence from Clark's collations of 223, 876, 1022, 1799, 2401, 2412, and 2423\(^2\), and last, von Soden. The manuscript evidence included in this collation is quoted from the apparatuses mentioned above, i.e., each apparatus is cited according to its own style. For example, von Soden lists MSS by group. So, $I^3$ equals a type of text. The MSS which follow are witnesses from that group which support the variant. Comparison of Tischendorf's and von Soden's nomenclatures with Gregory's system may be seen in Appendix II. Tischendorf followed the older system of numbering and von Soden developed his own system, which means that references to many MSS must be changed to the Gregory number for present day use.

Though the collations of Duke 1, $F^{72}$, $F^{74}$, $^M$, and $^B$ are complete, evidence from the editions of Greek NT editions was included only when variants appeared between Duke 1 and TR. All collated MSS agree with TR unless otherwise noted. The only exceptions are those frequent itacisms which were found in all the MSS collated. Itacisms found in Duke 1 were included for completeness and as examples for the discussions of Chapters Two and Three of this paper. Most itacisms from the other MSS have been omitted.

Underlined superscript letters followed by an asterisk were

---

$^2$The eighth manuscript collated by Clark, MS 1960, is now lacking among other portions 1 Peter (Clark, Praxapostoloi, 5).
superscript in the source material (as in 3:7 \textit{cop}^{bovid} \textit{)}. The computer program used for this project was unable to do a double superscript, so underlining followed by an asterisk was used in these few instances where it was required. Normally in text critical nomenclature, a single asterisk indicates the first hand of the MS. In these few instances in this collation it does not. The following verses contain these special asterisks: 2:21, 3:7 (two times), 3:16, 3:18, and 4:14. Also, Clark shows the corrector's hand by asterisks as well. Thus, two asterisks show the reading to be the work of the first corrector, i.e., the second hand of the manuscript.

\textbf{Collation}

\begin{verbatim}
1.1 ἐκλεκτοὶς] + καὶ

N/A Μ* [καὶ is not visible in the facsimile of Μ used for this collation.]

παρεπιδήμοις] P^{72} παρεπιδήμοις

γαλατίας καππαδοκίας Ἀσίας] P^{72} γαλατείας καππαδοκείας Ασσίας

Μ - Άσιας

B - και Βιθνινας

1.2 χαρις] P^{72} χαρις

εἰρήνη] + MS1 ἀπὸ θεοῦ πατροῦ

1.3 αὐτοῦ ἔλεος] P^{72} ἐλεος αυτου

P^{72} - το
\end{verbatim}
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κβ
N/A Θ48. 33. 69. 323. 614. 630. 1505. 2495 ΑL.

T-8 162

Clark 1799

P72 - ἡμᾶς
P72 ελπίδαν

Μ αμαραντον και αμιαντον

1.4 ἀμιαντον και ἀμαραντον]

B
tetpriemēνιν]
sφρανοις]
ήμας]
P72

N/A pc vgς

T-8 cum minusc ut vdtr vix mu(ut 5. 38* 42. cςortion) harlcop Thphyl

T-8 cum A C K L P al longe plu cat s vg(et. Hier Aug etc) syρς/ς arm

Clark 223 2412 2423

1.5

πιστεως]

έτοιμην]

B
kαιρό]

1.6 ἐν φ ἀγαλλιασθε ὀλίγων]

ἐστι]

P72 - θεοῦ
P72 πειστεως
P72 ετωμην
P72 ετοιμως
P72 κερω
P72 αγαλλειασαντες ολιγω
P72 εστιν
λυπηθέντες]

ποικίλοις]

[ina]

dοκίμιον]

π Β

UBS² A C K P Ψ 048 049
056 0142 33 81 88 104
181 326 330 436 451 614
629 630 945 1241 1505
1739 1877 2127 2412 2492
2495 Byz Lect it clο, c, dem, div, l, p, 8
vg arm

UBS² 429 it 4 vg 885

UBS³ 206 (omits P74)

Clark 2423

τιμῶν τῆς πίστεως]

π74 Β

χρυσίου]

πολύ τιμιώτερον]

T-8 K (L) al plu cat Thphyl
Oec, item ut editi sunt
Clem Or

T-8 A B C P al plus 25

Clark 876

P72 B poluteimóteron

άπολλυνένοιν]

καὶ

P72 - δὲ

P74 Β

επαινον]
B καὶ τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν]

MS1 καὶ τιμὴν καὶ εἰς δόξαν

N/A 1. 945. 1241. 1739. 2298. al

N/A P Maj.

T-8 al plu (syr\textsuperscript{sch} rid)
Thphyl Oec

T-8 sed K L P al\textsuperscript{20}

Clark 223 1022

F\textsuperscript{72} P\textsuperscript{74} & B καὶ δόξαν καὶ τιμὴν

N/A C ψ 33. 69. 81. 614. 630. 2495 al lat sy\textsuperscript{h} co

T-8 A al\textsuperscript{20} cat vg cop syr\textsuperscript{g} arm Or\textsuperscript{1,380}

Clark 1799 2412

1.8 εἰδόντες]

P\textsuperscript{72} P\textsuperscript{74} & B εἰδόντες (N/A εἰδόντες)

N/A A P ψ Maj bo; Cl (Aug)

N/A C 323. 630. 945. 1739 al latt sy sa; lat\textsuperscript{lat}

UBS\textsuperscript{2} K 049 056 0142 33 81 88
104 181 326 330\textsuperscript{c} 436 614
629 1241 1505 1877 2127
2412 2492 2495 Byz Lect

UBS\textsuperscript{2} 048\textsuperscript{rid?} 330\textsuperscript{a} 451 945 1\textsuperscript{f}

ir, c, des, div, ρ, q, s, t vg syr\textsuperscript{b}

cop\textsuperscript{84} arm eth Polycarp

Irenaeus lat

Theophylact

T-8 L al longe plu cat
cop Clem\textsuperscript{622} Cyr\textsuperscript{nest}
Euthal\textsuperscript{part}

T-8 (εἰδόντες) 7. 27. 29. 66**

76. 80** lect ject orect al pauc s syr\textsuperscript{utr}

arm aeth\textsuperscript{utr} Polyc\textsuperscript{c} Ir\textsuperscript{lat} 238. 361

φάντασις]

P\textsuperscript{72} φάντασις

P\textsuperscript{74} & B

άγαλλιασθεί]

Ν άγαλλιασθεί

B άγαλλιασθε
\( \chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\)  
\text{MS1} \chi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}  
\text{P}^{72} \chi\alpha\rho

\( \acute{\eta}\nu\kappa\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\varphi\)  
\text{MS1} \acute{\eta}\nu\kappa\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\varphi  
\text{P}^{72} \acute{\eta}\nu\kappa\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\varphi

1.9 \( \imath\mu\omicron\omicron\)  
\text{N}  
\text{N/A A C P \( \Psi \) 048 Maj latt sy}  
\text{N/A 1 pc sa; Cl Hier Aug}

\text{T-8 K L al fere omn}  
\text{T-8 45. Clem}^{622} \text{ Or}^{\text{ist}} 3,282 \text{ Ath}^{1,522} \text{ Cyr}^{\text{rest}} \text{ 112 Aug}

1.10 \( \omicron\omicron\)  
\text{P}^{72} \omicron

1.11 \( \acute{\eta}\rho\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\epsilon\zeta\)  
\text{N}  
\text{N/A \( \Lambda \) \( \Psi \) 049. 33. 69. 1243. 1852. 2464. al sy\( ^b \) (sine acc. \text{P}^{72} \text{N A B C K P 048})}

\( \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\omicron\)  
\text{P}^{72} \kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\omicron

1.10 \( \omicron\omicron\)  
\text{N}  
\text{N/A A C P \( \Psi \) 049. 1 al; Cyr}

\text{Clark 223 1799}

\( \tau\alpha\upsilon\alpha\)  
\text{P}^{72} \tau\alpha\upsilon\alpha

\( \delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}\omicron\)  
\text{MS1 \delta\omicron\xi\acute{\alpha}}
1.12 ἡμῖν

N/A 945. 1241. al vg⁵⁸ (sy⁹);
Hier

T-8 K al plu syr sch cop arm
Cyr glyphs 164 et
Thphyl Oec

MS1 φιλεὶ

W

T-8 A C L P al⁵⁸ cat vg
syr⁹ aeth⁹ [Note: N/A shows
syr⁹ for ἡμῖν]

Clark 223 1022 2412 2423**

P⁷² ἡμεῖν

P⁷² ἡμεῖν

 ámbῆλη

P⁷² ἄπηγγέλη

MS1 ἄπηγγέλη

Clark 1022 2423
V-S ¹²³ ²⁵⁴, ²⁹² ²⁹⁹, ²⁵⁸

P⁷² B - ev

N/A C P Maj (s?)

N/A A ῥ ³³ 623*. 1852. 2464. pc lat

UBS² K 049 056 0142 81 88 104
181 326 330 451 641 629
630 945 1241 1505 1739 1877
1881 2127 2412 2492 2495
Byz Lect Vigilius Ps-Oecumenius
Theophylact

UBS³ omits 2495

T-8 L al pi er cat cop Vig argin ⁷¹

T-8 ¹³. ⁷³. ¹³³. vg Did⁷¹ tri ²,⁶,¹⁵
Cyr best ⁴²

1.14 συνοχηματιζόμενοι

P⁷² συνοχηματιζόμενοι

Μ

B συνοχηματιζόμενοι

ταῖς

P⁷² ταῖς
επικαλείσθη}

απροσωπολήμενος

φόβοι]

θαρτοῖς]

ματαιάς}
1.20 προεγνωσμένου]

MS1 προεγνωσμένον

P72 προεγνωσμένον

πρό]

MS1 ἀπο

V-S 322 175

έσχάτων τῶν χρόνων]

N/A εσχατος του χρονου

N/A P Maj latt sy9

B εσχατος των χρονων

[N/A txt έσχατο τῶν χρόνων W2 A C 33. 81. 323. 614. 945. 1241. 1739. 2495 al sy1 co]

Clark 876 2412

P72 - τῶν

1.21 πιστεύοντας]

B πιστως

καί]

P72 την

N/A 1243.

1.22

N/A P Maj 1vid vg88;Prisc Spec N/A A C ψ 33. 81. 323. 945.

1241. 1739. al vg sy co

UBS2 K 049 056 0142 88 104 181 UBS2 436 629 945 1241 1739

326 330 451 614 630 1505 1881 2492 syr6,b

1877 2127 2412 2495 Byz Lect cop88,b0 Clement

it1 arm Priscillian Vigilius

Gildas Ps-Oecumenius Theophylact

UBS3 adds vid after it1 (it1vid)

B - καθαρας

έκτενως] +

P72 ας

1.23 ἀναγεγεννημένωι]

MS1 ἀναγεγεννημένοι

P72 - ex
σποράς)

1.24 διότι]

άνθρώπου]

έξεσεν]

1.25 έστι]

εὐαγγελισθέν εἰς υμᾶς]

2.1 πάντα]

2.2 αὐξηθήτε]

εἰς σωτηρίαν

140

Μ Ἰθορᾶς

P72 Μ Б - εἰς τον αἰωνα

N/A A C Ψ 33. 81. 323. 945. 1241. 1505. 1739. 2495. al vgст syδ co; Hier

P72 οτι

P72 Μ Б αὐτης

N/A A C 33. 81. 514. 945. 1241. 1739. 2495. al lat sy bo

Clark 1799 2412

P72 - ξορτου

P72 Μ Б - αὐτον

N/A C P Maj 1νδ t vgс1 co

N/A A ψ 33. 81. 1505. 2495. al vgст sy

Clark 876 1799

MS1 Μ εξέσεν

Clark 1022*

P72 Μ Б εστιν

Clark 1022

P72 εἰς υμᾶς εὐαγγελισθέν

N/A 1 vgмсс

P72 παν

B υποκρίσιν

B φόνος
2.3 εἴπερ]

N/A Maj

N/A Maj 1 vg;

N/A Maj 1 vg; Cyril

UBS2 K 049 056 0142 (33 εἴπερ)
81 88 104 181 326 330 436
451 614 629 630 945 1241
1505 1739 1877 1881 2127
2412 2492 2495 Byz Lect
it ar, c, dst, p, (z) vg syr Cyril
Ps-Oecumenius Theophylactus

2.4 ἀποδεδοκιμασμένον]

N/B

N/A Maj sy

N/A K L 049. 33. 69. 614. 1241.
1243. 1852. 2298. 2464. al

T-8 K L al30 Clem124
[Note: K L are given as evidence for both readings.]

2.5 οἰκοδομεῖσθε]

N/B

N/B εἰς εἰκοδομεῖσθαι

πνευματικός]

P72 N B εἰς
άνενέκκαι]

π72 ανενέκκαι

κ - πνευματικός

π72 - θυσίας

Μ* Β - τι

2.6 διὸ καὶ]

MS1 Π72 Μ Β διὸ δι

T-8 cum minusc ut vetr pauc Oec

T-8 A C K L P h al fere cat
vg cop syr arm aeuth Thphyl

Clark 223 876 1022 1799 2401 2412
2423

π72 Μ Β - τι

N/A Π Maj

άξρογονιαίον ἐκλεξτόν]

Μ

π72 αξρογονίειον εγλεκτον

B εκλεκτον αξρογονιαων

Αὐτῷ]

Μ* αὐτον

Clark 2401 2423

2.7 τιμίν]

π72 οἱ μείν

Μ* ημίν

Β

άπειθοῦσιν]

MS1 ἀπειθοῦσιν

N/A Α Π Maj sy

T-8 K L al pler cat Thphyl Oec

π72 απειστοῦσει
λίθον]

Ν/Α  C² P Ψ Maj 1

νγ⁷⁸ sa

2.8 προσκόμματος]

N/A  C² P Ψ Maj 1

νγ⁷⁸ sa

2.9 εκλεκτον]

Ν/Α  C² P Ψ Maj 1

νγ⁷⁸ sa

2.10 παροίκους]
2.11 ἀπέχεσθαι

Μ Β

N/A Ψ 049 Maj lat sa

T-8 K plu ut\textsuperscript{rid} cat vg Clem\textsuperscript{544} Dam\textsuperscript{2,519} Thphyl Oec

2.12 ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔχοντες καλήν

Μ (νμιν)

T-8 A C 13 al sat mu vg Clem\textsuperscript{263} Thphy

2.13 ἑποτάγησεν

Ν/A Ψ Maj vg\textsuperscript{85} sy\textsuperscript{b}

MS1 ἀπέχεσθαι

P\textsuperscript{72} ἀπέχεσθε

144

MS1 άπέχεσθ

N/A A C L P 33. 81. 623. 1241. 1243. 1852. 1881. al vg\textsuperscript{885} sy\textsuperscript{b} bo?; Cyp

T-8 al\textsuperscript{25} syr\textsuperscript{utr} cop aeth\textsuperscript{utr} Did\textsuperscript{trit,1} Cyp\textsuperscript{12,300} Zeno Leo

Clark 2401

ΝΑ [ψμων] ἔχοντες καλὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν

P\textsuperscript{72} [ψμων] ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καλὴν εχοντες

B ψμων ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καλὴν εχοντης

P\textsuperscript{72} Μ B επετεύκουτες

εποτεύκουτες

σοτάσωσιν

MS1 σοτάσωσιν (P\textsuperscript{72} + ψμων)

Ν οστάσωσιν . . . . . . ent\textsuperscript{rid}

2.13 ὑποτάγηται

Ν/Α Ψ Maj vg\textsuperscript{85} sy\textsuperscript{b}

MS1 ὑποτάγηται

Clark 1799

P\textsuperscript{72} Μ B - ουν

N/A A C Ψ 33. 69. 81 pc lat sy\textsuperscript{b} co

N/A A C L P 33. 81. 623. 1241. 1243. 1852. 1881. al vg\textsuperscript{885} sy\textsuperscript{b} co

Clark 2401

άνθρωπινην

P\textsuperscript{72} ανθρωπειν
2.14

Μ - ανθρώπινη

MS1 P\textsuperscript{72} Μ B - μὲν

T-8 C\textsuperscript{rid} al plu\textsuperscript{rid} cat syr\textsuperscript{p} c.\textsuperscript{*} Dam\textsuperscript{2,343} Thphyl Oec

T-8 A K L h al\textsuperscript{30} vg m\textsuperscript{90} syr\textsuperscript{sch} et\textsuperscript{3} tr\textsuperscript{10} cop arm Ant\textsuperscript{86}

Clark 1022 2423

επαινον]

Μ B

2.15 φημοῖν]

MS1 φημοῖν

Clark 876

Μ

P\textsuperscript{72} φημοῖν

B φημοῖν

άγνωσίαν]

Μ B

2.16 δούλοι θεοῦ]

MS1 P\textsuperscript{72} Μ B θεοῦ δούλοι

N/A A P Maj lat; Cl

N/A C K Ψ 69. 81. 323. 945 1241. 1739 al vg\textsuperscript{83}

2.17 τιμήσατε]

MS1 τιμίσατε

Μ B

άγαπάτε]

MS1 άγαπήσατε

Μ B

T-8 A C P etc

N/A K L 049*. 69. 2464 Maj

T-8 K L h 31. 40. 6** al\textsuperscript{40}

Clark 1022** 2401 2423
2.18 ιποτασσόμενοι ἐν παντὶ φόβῳ

dεσπόταις]

dεχόκαίς] +

B

P²  δὲ

N/A Spec

N/A εν παντὶ φόβῳ ιποτασσόμενοι

MS1 δεσπότ

N/A ημῶν

P² - καὶ²

N/A 69. 81. 614. 2464 pc

2.19 Τόθο]

συνειδησιν] +

N/B

N/A A² P 049 Maj lat co ιθαθην

P² - καὶ¹

N/A (A* 33 θεου αγαθην). 81

2.20 κολαφιζόμενοι]

P² κολαζόμενοι

N/B

N/A A C Maj vg co

N/A ύπομενετε¹)

N/A ύπομενετε

N/A A C P 049 Maj lat

N/A ύπομενετε
ἐπομενεῖτε

Μ B

N/A P 81 A C P 049 Maj lat (C illeg., L 323. 1241 h., t.)

N/A Ψ 69. 945. 1739. 1881. 2298. pc

τούτοις

MS 1 γάρ

Clark 2412

V-S M 448, 74, H, I, 2 al 11, 2, 252f; 33 172, 845; 12 364 470

2.21 γαρ +

P 72 καί

N/A 323. 630. 945. 1241. 1505. 1739. 2495 al

Clark 2401

ἐπαθέν

Μ απέθανεν

P 72 B

υπήρ

P 72 πέρι

Μ B

N/A (πέρι) A

ἡμῶν ἡμῖν

P 72 Μ B ὑμῶν ὑμῖν

N/A 614. 1243. 1505. 2495. al r sy δ bo; Aug

N/A Ψ 69. 81. 945. 1241. 1739 al lat sy δ sa

UBS 2 629 1505 2412 2495 syr δ cop δ Augustine John-Damascus

UBS 2 2127 it δ, c, dem, div δ, vg W syr h cop δ arm eth Ambrose John- Damascus Ps-Oecumenius

T-8 2. 4. 18. 45. 47. 69. 93. 99. 105. 137. δ scr al all q syr δ scr cop Dam nest 561 Aug 108 21

T-8 31. δ scr k scr al sat mu 14th am fu corr demid tol hari sah syr δ arm aeth δ str Dam paris Oec Amb
MS1 ἡμῶν ψεῦδιν

N/A P Maj vg cl sa38; Tert

UBS3 it4 [Note: This is a from UBS2]

UBS2 K P 049 056 0142 33 88 104 181 326 330 436 451 630 1881 Byz Lect it9,14 vg cl cop Tertullian Cyprian Theophylact

T-8 K L P 13. al fere48 cat vg cl fu* Tert48 12 Cyp 250. 259 (al ap Sab) Thyphl [Note: T-8 has these witnesses following a second ψεῦδιν ψεῦδιν. This fact plus the comparison of witnesses with UBS2 suggests an error in T-8, i.e. that those witnesses really support ἡμῶν ὑμῖν instead of ψεῦδιν ψεῦδιν.]

Clark 876 1799 2401 2423

ταπολιμπάνων] MS1 ἀπολιμπάνων

Clark 876

P72 ἀποστιμπάνων

2.22 ἐποίησεν] MS1 ἐποίησε

2.23 λοιδοφορόμενος] MS1 λοιδοφορόμενος

Ν B

ἡπιλει] MS1 ἡπιλη

Clark 2412

B

P72 ἡπιλει

Ν ἡπιλει

P72 - δε
2.24 ἡμῶν]

P72 B ἡμῶν

N/A P 61 A C P Ψ 093 Maj lat t sy co

P71 B ev

P72 B - αὐτοῦ 2

N*

P 049 Maj

N/A P 61lid Μ 6 A C K Ψ 33. 81.
323. 614. 630. 1241. 1739. 2495 lat(t)

Clark 876 1799 2412

2.25

πλανῶμενα]

B πλανῶμενοι

N (not -νοι as N/A records)

3.1 αἰ]

P72 ε

N* B - αἰ

N/A Μ2 C P Ψ 093 Maj vg st

T-8 K L al omn' id cat Thphyl Oec

τιμοτασσόμεναι]

MS1 όχι τιμοτασσόμεναι

P72 τιμοτασσόμενε

MS1 B - καὶ
κερδηθήσονται]

3.2 ἐπικτεύσαντες]

B
N/A μόνον A C P ψ Maj

N/A 614. 630. al ῥ z vg רמ燊 sy א
co; Spec

T-8 57. 69. 104. arm cop
Ps-Ath 1257 Fulg

Clark 1799 2412

MS1 μ B κερδηθήσονται

Clark 223 1022** 2401 2412

p72 μ* επικτεύσαντες

3.3

μ B

N/A A P Maj 1 r vg רמ燊 sy bo

κόσμοι]

μ B

N/A C ψ 1852 pc sa; Cl

p72 - τριχων

3.4

μ B

άφθορτοι]

μ B

p72 φθαρτω

μ* - και

πραέος και ἡσυχίον]

B ησυχίου και πραες

ἐνέσιον]

MS1 ἐνέσιον

MS1 -τού2
3.5 οὕτως]

γυναικες αι ἐλπιζουσι τὸν θεόν ἐκόσμουν]

Β

ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν]

Μ

N/A 2464 pc

T-8 69 aocr cocr al plu cat Oec

N/A  P Maj

T-8  A C K L al fere20  Dam2,406 Thphyl

P72  P74  B εἰς θεόν

N/A  A C Ψ 33. 81. 945. 1241. 1739. 2495. al

T-8  13. 15. 27. 36. 69. 104. aocr cocr docr cat Dam2,406 Thphyl

Clark 876 1799 2412

3.6 ἡκοῦσα]

ἱπποκοῦσα τῷ Ἀβραὰμ]

ἐγεννήθησα]

MS1 P72 ὑπέκουσεν

P72 τῷ Ἀβραὰμ ὑπέκουσεν

Β ὑπεκουσέν τῷ Ἀβραὰμ

MS1 P72 ἐγεννήθησε

Clark 223 876 1022 1799 2412

V-S Ι488, 746, Ιa1 2646, Ιa2 4536, 175, 8459; Ιa3 64, Ιa56, 170, 8254, 397, 806;
φοβούμενοι] φοβού
κ Β
πτόσιν]
κ Β

MS1 φοβοῦ
p72 φοβοῦμενε

MS1* πτόσιν (corrected to πτώσιν)
N/A πτώσιν P 33 pc
T-8 πτώσιν P 13. 18. 40.

B - οι

N/A A C P ψ Maj; Hier

N/A p81 ψ 33. 69. 323. 1241.
1739. al vg; Aug

UBS2 K 049 056 0142 81 88 104
181 326 330 436 451 614
629 630 945 1505 1877
2412 2495 Byz Lect syr

Ambrose Augustine
Cassiodorus Ps-Oecumenius
Theophylact

UBS3 Ambrose has been placed in parenthesis (Ambrose)

Clara 876 2412
3.8 φιλόφρονες}
N/A P 049 Maj

3.9 λοιδορίας}
N/A P Maj syh Μγ

eιλογίαν κληρονομήσητε]

3.10 καυσάκω
Μ B
tὸν γλῶσαν]
Μ B

153

p72 εσωνιον (αιωνιον N/A syrp)

MS1 εγκόπτεσθαι

p72 εκκόπτεσθε

B14 εγκόπτεσθαι

Μ ενκόπτεσθαι

p72 Μ B ταπεινοφρονες

N/A A C Ψ 33. 81. 323. 614.
630. 1241. 1739. al latt sy co
(2495 h.t.)

Clark 876 1799 2401 2423**

p72 λοιδορίας

MS1 - τοιχαντιον δε ευλογούντες, ειδότες
ὅτι εἰς τούτο ἐκλήθητε

p72 Μ B - ειδότες

N/A P81 A C K Ψ 33. 81. 323.
945. 1241. 1505. 1739. 2495. al
latt sy co

MS1 ευλογείαν κληρονομήσειτε

p72 ευλογείαν κληρονομήσητε

p72 καυσάκωθαι

p72 τὴ γλῶσαν

p72 Μ B - αὐτοῦ
και χειλη]

3.11 ἐκκλινότεω +

3.12 Τ-8 ζ al sat mu cat Oec

3.13 ἦνω]

μιμηται]

γένησε]

N/A P Maj lat sy N/A $^p$ A C Ψ 33. 81. 323. 945. 1241. 1739. al vg $^s$

N/A P Maj lat sy $^p$ N/A A C K Ψ 33. 81. 323. 614. 630. 945. 1241. 1505. 1739. 2495 al vg $^s$ sy $^h$

P$^{72}$ Μ B - ο οι T-8 A C* K L P h al plus $^{50}$ arm Thphyi

Clark 876 1799 2401 2412 2423

N/A A C* 69. 81. 614. 630. 1505. 2495 al lat sy $^h$

N/A C $^{211}$d P Ψ Maj vg $^m$s sy $^p$ co

N/A K L P 69 Maj vg $^m$s

Clark 876 1799 2412

N/A B ζ

N/A BC
3.14 δικαιοσύνην\]

μακάριοι\] +

N/A A C P Ψ Maj lat sy

N/A L; Hier

3.15 θεον\]

N/A P Maj

N/A A C Ψ 33. 614. 630. 945.

1739. al latt sy co; Cl

UBS² K 049 056 0142 81 88 104
181 326 lat 330 436 451 1241
1505 1877 2127 2492 2495

Byz Lect Ps-Decumenius
Theophylact

UBS³ L

Clark 1799 2412

3.15, 16 ἐλπίδος\] +

N/A P 049 Maj sy²; Spec

N/A A C Ψ 33. 81. 323. 614. 630.

630. 1241. 1739. 2495. al lat sy¹ co

Clark 876 1799 2412

3.16 πραβτητος\]

MS1 πραβτητο
καταλαλούσιν]  MS1 Ν καταλαλούσιν

N/A L pm  N/A A C P Maj it vg88 sy bo; Beda

UBS2  056 0142 88 104 181 326 436 1877 2127 Byz.1384  UBS2  K 049 33 81 330 451 629 945 4922 Lect it des, dir, (n)

T-8 al pler cat tol harl cop syr27 aeth Thphyl Oec Bed27  T-8 K al25

Clark 223

ε72 B καταλαλείσθη  

N/A  Ψ 614. 630. 1241. 1739. 2495. al (vg) sa; Cl (Spec)

UBS2  1505 1831 2412 2495 (syrl)  cop88

T-8  69. 137, aCcr. cCcr syr9 ut et2g  Clement355  

Clark 876 1799 2412

ε72 B - ἁμαν ας κακομαν

N  

N/A A C P Maj it vg88 sy bo; Beda  N/A  Ψ 614. 630. 1241. 1739. 2495. al (vg) sa; Cl (Spec)

UBS2  K P 049 33 81 330 451 629 945 4922 Lect it35, aPb, t syrPb, b11 co82  

eth Bede Ps-Oecumenius Theophylact

UBS2  1505 1881 2412 2495 (syr1)  cop88 Clement

Clark 876 1799 2412

κατασκυληθὲσιν]  

p72 εσχυνθεσιν (N/A ασχυνθεσιν?)

ἁγαθὴν εν Χριστῷ]  

p72 εν Χριστῳ ἁγαθὴν
3.17 θέλει] T-8 *cum minusc vix mu

3.18 καί]

θέλει] + άμαρτησάν] +

έκαθεν]

N/A A Maj

UBS² K 049 056 0142 181 326* 330 451 1877 2127
Byz Lect vg copy Cyprian Cyril
Ps-Oecumenius Theophylact

UBS² 1505

UBS³ 206 429 441 1241 1505 2495
arm [Note: The apparatus for this variation unit has been thoroughly redone.]

Clark 1799

έκαθεν]

N/A A 1241. 2495 al

UBS² 1505

UBS³ 206 429 441 1241 1505 2495

Clark 876 2423
N/A P Maj 81 pc

UBS² K 049 056 0142 104 181 326⁸¹⁷ν
330 451 1877 2127 2492 Byz
Lect Augustine Ps-
Oecumenius Theophylact

T-8 L al pler cat Aug⁸⁹ec mer
Thphyl⁸⁸ 0ec

p²² ιπεθανεν

N/A A C²⁰⁰id LΨ 33. 614. 630.
945. 1241. 1739. (2495) al syh
bo [Note: T-8 and N/A
differ concerning "L".]

UBS² Ψ 88 326⁸⁸ 436 629 1505 1739
1181 2412 2495 it⁸⁹,c,deu,div,p,7
vg syr⁰,h cop⁸⁸,8⁸ arm eth
Cyprian Didymus Augustine
Cyril Severus Theophylact⁸⁹

T-8 5. 7. 11. 13. 27. 29. 68. 69.
73. 137. 1¹⁰ct a⁸⁶ cr k⁸⁶ cr vg
syr⁸⁶,⁸⁶ arm et Dids³⁴,⁶,6
et,7,1² Cyril⁸⁶,⁸⁶ Sev⁸⁶ cat 71
Thphyl⁸⁶ Cyp⁸⁸ 876 Aug⁸⁶,⁸⁶

Clark -v 876 1799 2412

ημαζει)]

MSI P²² B ιπεζει

N/A Β² A C K L 33. 81. 614.
630. 945. 1739. al vag
sy⁸⁸,⁸⁸; Cyp Cyr

UBS² 056 0142 88 104 436 629
1881 2127 2412 Byz⁸⁶ Lect
it⁸⁶,c,deu,div,p,7 vg syr⁰,h
Cop⁸⁸,⁸⁸,⁸⁸,⁸⁸ Cyprian Peter-
Alexandria Didymus Cyril
Ps-Cecumenius Theophylact

T-8 al longe plu cat vg cop

T-8 3. 31. 33. 69. 95. 1¹⁰ct a⁸⁶ cr
syr\textsuperscript{a} Bry Cyp\textsuperscript{255} Petri\textsuperscript{4,46} Did\textsuperscript{tri,72} Cyr\textsuperscript{act,57} Thphyl Oec

\textsuperscript{al}scy\textsuperscript{sch} et\textsuperscript{te} in arm

[Note: N/A also shows 33 with ημας.]

N
- ημας
B - το θεο
P\textsuperscript{72} - μεν

N/A
A\textsuperscript{C} P Maj vg\textsuperscript{51} sy\textsuperscript{h} co

T-8
Petr Did\textsuperscript{tri} Ath\textsuperscript{5,167} Cyr\textsuperscript{act}

\textsuperscript{de} το

N/A
81\textsuperscript{ridd}

T-8
\textit{cum} minusc vix Epiph 448. 1026

T-8
A C K L P h al longe plu cat arm Or\textsuperscript{4, 135} Petri\textsuperscript{4,133} Did\textsuperscript{tri} 2,1,2 Ath\textsuperscript{5,167} Epiph\textsuperscript{75} et\textsuperscript{2, 49, 97} Cyr\textsuperscript{act} 57 et\textsuperscript{graphe 357}

Clark 223 876 1799 2401 2423

P\textsuperscript{72} \textit{de} ev

N/A
Or\textsuperscript{lat}

3.19 φυλακή]
πνεύμασι]

MS1 φυλακί

P\textsuperscript{72} πνευματι

B πνευμασιν

Clark 1022

3.20 ἄπειθήσασι]

MS1 πράξ εξελέχετο]

MS1 πράξ εξελέχετο
160

N/A K 69\textsuperscript{vid} al

T-8 sine cod ut vdtr

T-8 2. 29. 31. 33. 47. 59. al\textsuperscript{1} ar\textsuperscript{8}

P\textsuperscript{72} M B απεξεδεχετο

T-8 A C I L P h al fere\textsuperscript{66} cat
Or\textsuperscript{2}, 553, 4,135 cod

Clark 223 876 1022 1799 2401 2412 2423

Μ την

κιβωτος\textsuperscript{1}

MS1 κιβωτ

P\textsuperscript{72} κιβωτος

P\textsuperscript{72} M B ολιγοι

N/A C P ψ Maj vg\textsuperscript{88} sh\textsuperscript{h}

T-8 K L al pler cat syr\textsuperscript{9}
Corinth\text{86} Dam\textsuperscript{2}, 386
Thphyl Oec

toutestin\textsuperscript{1}

Μ B

3.21 φ]

N/A 241?. 630 al

N/A A 049 cc lat

N/A A 049 pc lat

T-8 3. 5. 8. 17. 73. 95\textsuperscript{a} vg Or\textsuperscript{2}, 553
et\textsuperscript{1} 1, 88. 3, 922 Cyp\textsuperscript{142}, 157
Aug\textsuperscript{6} 165, 164

P\textsuperscript{72} touto estin

P\textsuperscript{72} - oxtε

MS1 B δ

UBS\textsuperscript{2} Μ\textsuperscript{5} A C K P ψ 049 056

0142 33 81 88 104 181 326 330
451 614 945 1241 1505 1739
1877 1881 2127 2412 2492 2495
Byz Lect it\textsuperscript{tr,c,dr,div},p,i, vg
(syr\textsuperscript{p,h}) arm Cyprian Origen\textsuperscript{1}st
Didymus Augustine Cyril
John-Damascus Ps-Oecumenius
Theophylact
καὶ ἡμᾶς ἀντίτυπον
νῦν σέζει βάπτισμα]

3.22 òξ] B

4.1 παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν]

N/A 69 206 216 241
UBS3 69 206 216 241
T-8 cum minuxt urid mu (ut 104. bscr al4scr)
T-8 L h al fere55 cat vg arm Didtri 2,14 Cyrglaph 36 et est 18
Thphly Oec Or 1st 1, 85 Cyp142. 152
Clark 876 1022 1799 2401 2423

p72 ἵμα - o
N/A pc sa
UBS2 436 eth
UBS3 255
T-8 73. aeth

MS1 ἀντίτυπον νῦν καὶ ἡμᾶς σέζει βάπτισμα

N/A {ἡμᾶς} C L 614. 630.
1241. 2495* al vg 86 Maj

3.22 ὡν]

B

N/A N² A P Maj syh bo;

N/A C ψ 323. 1739 pc sa?; Nic
Cyr Did Augpt

UBS²  K 056 0142 33 81 88
104 181 326 436 614
1241 1877 2127 2412
2492 Byz Lect syr
arm eth Athanasius
Basil Didymus
Ps-Athanasius Epiphanius
Jerome Augustine Cyril
Theodoret

UBS³ Augustinept

ὁπλίσασθε] MS1 ὀπλισάμενοι
Μ B

P² P B - εν

N/A K P 69 Maj z vg

ἀμαρτιάς] B αμαρτιας
Μ

N/A Μ²

4.2 ἄθροισαν] Μ άθροισαν
Θοο] Μ άθροισαν

P² σεσαι

χρόνον] MS1 χρόνι

N/A Μ

4.3 ήμιν] Clark 223 2412

P² B - ήμιν

N/A C K L P 049. 69. 623c
2298 pm; Hler

UBS² 056 0142 181 326 1877

UBS² 049² 330 451 1739 1881
it ir c des dir p t vg cop
Athanasius Ambrose Niceta
Augustine Theodoret
Fulgentius John-Damascus
Ps-Oecumenius

N/A Μ² Ψ A 81. 323. 614. 945.
1241. 1505. 1739. 2495 al latt
sy sa; Cl (33 illeg.)
2492  *Byz* 147 Jerome
Ps-Oecumenius

163

лат, с, dem, div, а, т vg syr P, h cop א
arm Clement Augustine

UBS 3 cop א

Clark 876 2412

παρελημνθετζ Ρ72 παρελημνθενς

χρινς MS1 χρυνο

Ρ72 B - του βιου

N/A P 049 Maj

N/A A C Ψ 33. 81. 323. 614. 630. 1241. 1739. 2495 al lat(t) sy co

Clark 1799 2412

Θελμα P72 βουλημα

N/A P Maj

N/A A B C Ψ 81. 323. 630. 945. 1241. 1739 al, Cl

Clark 1799

κατεργασαθαι P72 B καταργασθαι

κατεργασθαι

Clark 1799 2412

πεπορευμενους W πορευομενους

B Clark 876

οινοθεληγιαις P72 οινοφρεκειαις

B οινοφλυγιοις

ποτοίς MS1 τόποις

4.4 Ρ72 ο

ανάχωσιν + W ו και
4.5 ἀποδέδωσαι] 164
   MS1 P^{72} ἀποδέδωσαι
   Clark 2401*
   P^{72} - λογον
   Ν/A Ν' A B C P Ψ
   latt sy co
   Ν" - οἱ ἀποδέδωσαι λογον
   P^{72} etoima
   P^{72} B - εχοντι

4.6 κριθείσαι] Ν/A A C^2 P Maj
   κρίναι] Ν/A 945. 1241. 1739. 1881. pc co?
   Ν/Α B kreiνonti

4.7 ἡγγικε] MS1 κριθεῖσιν
   Ν/Α B
   Τ-8 L
   [έσι] MS1 ζέσιν,
   Ν/Α B
   Τ-8 L
   Τ-8 P
   P^{72} [εσει

4.8 νίψατε] MS1 P^{72} Ε B ἡγγικεν
   Clark 1022
   νψατε] MS1 νψατε
   Ν/Α B
   P^{72} Ν B - τας

N/A P 049 Maj
N/A A Ψ 33. 81. 323. 614. 630.
προσευχήσας +

Μ Β

4.8

N/A P Maj t vg cl sy b sa ss

bo; Spec

καυσοίς]

εχοντες]

T-8 cum minusc permu Cyr trin 676

Antioch 1100 Thphys

καλώσει]

4.9 γογγασμάν]

N/A P 049 Maj vg

B kaluktei

Clark 876 1799 2401 2412 2423

P72 γογγασμόν

Μ Β γογγασμόν

165

1241. 1739. 2495. αλ

T-8 5. 29. 69. 137. c scr αλ 5 scr

Cyr trin 676

Clark 876 1799 2412

MS1 θμον

P72 Μ Β - δε

N/A A vid Ψ 33 pc lat sa ss

P72 αυτοὺς

N/A 623. 2464 pc

MS1 εξον

MS1 P72 Μ Β - ή

T-8 Μ A B K L P al plu cat

Clem 41 Clem 306. 613 item 463

Chr 41, 243 et 3, 340 Oec

B kaluktei

Clark 8799 2401 2412 2423

P72 γογγασμόν

Μ Β γογγασμόν

4.10 ἐλαβει]

ποικιλῆσι]

MS1 P72 Μ Β ἐλαβειν

MS1 ποικίλοις
4.11 ἦς]

Μ B

N/A A (Ψ) 33. 323. 945. 1241. 1739. al lat

T-8 plu vg

[να]  

Π B  

Ν/Α P Maj

T-8 K L h al plus  

Clark 223 1022

[να]

πᾶσι]  

P72 εϊν

Ν/Α B πᾶσιν

Clark 1799 2412

δοξάζουσι]  

Μ δοξάζησε

B  

Φ]  

P72 ας

P72 - η

P72 - το

P72 - τον αιωναν

Μ B  

N/A 69. 614. 630. 945. 1505. 1739. 2495 al r vg w (sy) sa bss bo pt

Clark 1799 2412

4.12 ἕξενίζεσθε]

Μ B  

ΜS1 ἕξενίζεσθαι

[να]

[να]

P72 εκεί

N/A pc
συνβαίνοντος]

4.13 παθήμασι]

4.13, 14

4.14 ονειδίζεσθε]

καὶ] +

ἀνακαθιστάι]

N* B

N/A P Maj lat; Tert Cl

UBS2 ὀ 056 dehy 436 629*hid 1739 it,de, div, (gig) vg,1 syr,2 cop,3 bo arm eth Tertullian Origen

κατὰ μὲν]

MS1 καὶ τα μὲν

p72 N B - κατὰ μὲν αὐτοῦς βλασφημεῖται, κατὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς δοξαζέται

N/A P W Maj r t z vg w

sy,4 sa (bo,5); Cyp

N/A A 049. 33. 81. 323. 614. 630. 945. 1241. 1739. al vg sy,6

bo; Tert

UBS2 K 104 181 326itates 330 451 629e (1877 ἡμᾶς) 2127 Byz l
tit,de,div,(gig) vg,1 syr,2 vit,3
cop,4,(bo,5) Cyprian Ps-
Oecumenius Theophylact

UBS3 L

T-8 L al longe plu am harl tol

T-8 3. 4*. 13. 17. 27. 29. 65. 66**
4.15 η' +

M B

N/A A K L P Ψ 33. 81.
323. 614. 630. 1241.
1739. 2495. al latt
syr b sa

κλέπτης]

MS1 κλέπτης

M

η' +

M B

N/A A K L P Ψ 33. 81.
323. 614. 630. 1241.
1739. 2495. al latt
syr b sa

άλλοφροεισισκός]

P72 αλλοφροεισισκός

B

N/A P Maj

4.16

Χριστιανός]

M Χριστιανός

αἰσχυνέσθω]

MS1 αἰσχυνέσθω

M B

μέρει]

P72 M B oνοματι

N/A P 049 Maj

N/A A Ψ 33. 81. 323. 614.
1241. 1739. 2495 al latt sy co

Clark 876 2412

MS1 Μ - φ

N/A A 33. 81. 1852 al

T-8 104. cscr cscr Jscr

Clark 2401

N/A h vg₃

B ἀπο

N/A υμεν

N/A λογα

B  δε

Clark 2412

N/A 945 pc h r t w bo

(N/A shows p72 with both readings. p72 has the reading given in this collation.)

Clark 1799

και ἀφαθολος]

p72 ἀμαρταλος και ασηθης

Clark 2423
4.19

καραθεσθαισαν τάς]
κατανών]

N/A ψ. 69. 945. 1241.
(1852). 1739 al
T-8 cum minusc mu

170

P72 μ B - ος

MS1 καπαθεσθαισανται
MS1 P72 μ αντων

T-8 A K L P h al fere50 cat
Thphyl Oec

Clark 223 876 1022 1799 2401 2412 2423

B - κατων

P72 αγαθοκοινωνιας

5.1 τοις]

N/A P ψ Maj

P72 B σον

N/A A 33. 81. 323. 945. 1241.
1739. al lat

p72 B σον τοις

N/A 614. 630 pc; Hier
Clark 1799 2412

N/A 623. 2464. pc h vg
Clark 876

Χριστού]

μ B

P72 θεου

μ B

P72 - της

P72 αποκαλυπτεστε της
5.2 τῷ ἡμῖν ποιμνίον

ποιμνίον]

N/A Ν' 171

Μ' τομον

P72 ποιμνίον

Μ Β - εἰσικοποιοῦντες

P72 Μ κατά θεον

5.3

B οικοι

p72 οικοι

Ν τοιχιοι

5.5 ο大型多人]

Νεότεροι]

δέ] +

N/A Ν/ P Maj

N/A Α 33. 81. 323. 945. 1241.

1739. al lat sy b co

p72 B - ὁ
\[\text{N/A A P } \Psi \text{ Maj}
\]

\[\text{N/A 33 } \text{pc}
\]

\[\text{p}^7 \text{ αντι}
\]

\[\text{p}^7 \text{ απορεισαντες}
\]

\[\text{MS1 } \text{τωρ}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Clark} & \quad 223 \ 1799 \ 2412 \\
\text{V-S} & \quad H^\text{448}, \ T^\text{1, 1f}, \ pm^\text{80}, \ \tau^\text{2, 459} \\
& \quad \tau^\text{1, 116f}, \ \tau^\text{2, 364, 8299, 238}.
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{τμῶν}]

\[\text{Μ* ημων}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{5.8} \\
\text{N/A } \text{M² L } \Psi \text{ 049* 33. 69.} \\
& \quad 323. \ 614. \ 630. \ 945. \\
& \quad 1241. \ 1505. \ 1739. \ 2495. \\
& \quad \text{al latt sy co}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{T-8} & \quad 13. \ 31. \ a^\text{scr} \ \text{c^ocr al permu} \\
& \quad \text{vg syr.}^\text{ur} \ \text{cop arm aeth} \\
& \quad \text{Antioch.}^\text{1027} \ \text{Dam², 459} \\
& \quad \text{Oec}^\text{Or², 164, 195} \ \text{Cyp², 256} \ \text{Cass²}^\text{18}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{άντιδικος}]

\[\text{τμῶν}]

\[\text{B}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{B - τίνα}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{κατακήισ}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{N/A A (33). 614. 630. 945.} \\
& \quad 2298 \ \text{pm}
\end{align*}
\]
UBS² 056 436 2412 2492 Byz

T-8 al sat mu cat Or³, 162 et 315
Eus2 35 Ephr 304 Cyr 381. 310
Chr1, 740 3, 64. 510 Cyr 382
Thdr2, 317 Dam 2, 450

UBS² 61 (P 1357 τινα) (K 049 τινά)

UBS³ (1739 τινα) Byz

T-8 L 3. 5. 6. 8. 10. 14** 15.

5.9

στερεοὶ]

εἰδότες] +

cp

εὐ] +

Clark 2423

N/A κατασκευά

P72 - φ

P72 εἰδει

N/A (P72 εἰδειαίοι)

P72 ον

N/A 614. 630. 1505. 2495. PC

Clark 876 1799 2412

P72 B το

N/A 2 A P Ψ 0206 Maj

P72 εκτελεσθαι

N/A PC

επί B*

Clark 1799 2412
5.10 ἡμᾶς]
N/A 0206. 1881. al t vg
sy9 bo
T-8 K al plur vg syxch
DidTHJ23 Oec auct voc gent
T-8 A L P al5 cat demid cop
sy9 arm aeth Thphyl
Clark 223 876 1022 2412 2423
B το
B B - Ἰησοῦν
Clark 1799 2412
καταρτίσαι ἡμᾶς, στηρίξαι
σθενάσαι, θεμελιώσαι]
N/A (−ἡμᾶς) 614. 630. 1505.
2495 al
UBS2 [σθενάσαι, θεμελιώσαι]
2412 Ps-Oecumenius
Theophylact
UBS2 [σθενάσαι, θεμελιώσαι] Μ K 049
056 0142 88 104 181 326 330
436 451 629 945 1241 1739
1877 1881 2127 2492 Byz Lect8
sy9 Α cop58,80 arm
T-8 L P al cat
p71 καταρτεισει στηριξει θεμελιώση
(Note: - ἡμᾶς & σθενάσαι)
N/A 81 r t vg MSS (sy9)
Μ καταρτεισει στηριξει σθενάσει
(Note: UBS2 is not entirely accurate concerning Μ)
B καταρτεισει στηριξει σθενάσει

5.11 αὐτῷ]
ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος]
Μ
MS1 αυτο
MS1 ἡ δόξα κράτος
N/A K 049 al

UBS² 88 104 181 326 1877
2492 Byz it⁺,des,div,ρ,ζ vg cl
cop⁺⁺ eth⁺⁺ (Ps-Oecumenius
omit τό) Theophylact

T-8 al⁴ plu cat vg cl⁴ demid
harl toi aeth⁴⁴ Thphyyl

Clark 1022 2423

B (+to) - η δοξα και το

N/A (+ to) A Ψ PC vg it⁴⁴

UBS² it⁴⁴ vg w eth⁰

T-8 23. am fu aeth⁰

αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων]
P 72 εἰῶνας

και

B αἰῶνας

N/A K 049 056 0142 33 81 88
104 181 326 330 436 451
614 629 630 945 1241 1505
1739 1877 1881 2127 2412
2492 2495 Byz Lecta
it⁺⁺, des, div, ρ, ζ vg syr⁺⁺,h
cop⁺⁺, bo⁴⁺⁺ eth Ps-Oecumenius
Theophylact

5.12 Σιλβανοῦ]
P 72 Σιλβανοῦ

ολίγων]
P 72 βραχεῖν

και

P 72 - τοι
\[\text{έστησανε]\]

\[\text{N/A P Maj h r vg}^\text{cl}\]

5.13

\[\text{B}\]

\[\text{Βαβυλώναι} +\]

\[\text{B}\]

5.14 \[\text{πάσιν}\]

\[\text{B}\]

\[\text{MS1 N πάσιν}\]

\[\text{P}^72 - \text{εἰρήνη μὴν πασιν, τοις εν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ}\]

\[\text{N/A P Maj h vg}^\text{cl} \text{ sy}^h \text{ sa}^\text{MS} \text{ bo}\]

\[\text{UBS}^2 \ K 049 056 0142 81 88\]
\[104 181 326 330 436 451\]
\[614 630 945 1241 1505\]
\[1739 1877 1881 2127 2412\]
\[2492 2495 \text{Byz Lect}^h \text{ it}^\text{div,h}^p \text{ vg}^\text{cl} \text{ syr}^h \text{ cop}^b\]
\[\text{arm Ps-Oecumenius}\]
\[\text{Theophylact}\]

\[\text{UBS}^3 \text{ cop}^5^8 \text{ MSS}\]

\[\text{B - Ἰησοῦ}\]

\[\text{P}^72 \text{ B - αὕτην}\]

\[\text{N/A P Maj h vg}^\text{wv} \text{ sy bo}^\text{MSS}\]

\[\text{N/A A ψ 33}^\text{vid} . 81 \text{ vid} . 323. 945. 1241 \text{ pc vg}^\text{at} \text{ co}\]
UBS² K 049 056 0142 88 104
181 326 330 436 451 614
630 1505 1739 1877 2127
2412 2492 2495 Byz. Lect.¹
it, c, de, ar, b, p, q vg syr.ᵃ copᵇ,ᵇᵇ,ᵇᵇᵇ
arm Ps-Oecumenius
Theophylact
APPENDIX II
COMPARISON BETWEEN VON SODEN AND GREGORY

This material was gathered from Kurt Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments 1: Gesamtübersicht* (ANTF 1; Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1963) 350-371.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>von Soden</th>
<th>MS #</th>
<th>Gregory #</th>
<th>von Soden</th>
<th>MS #</th>
<th>Gregory #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>02</td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>548</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5156</td>
<td>226</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
<td>440</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5180f</td>
<td>1319</td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
<td>1315</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5203</td>
<td>808</td>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5206</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td>264</td>
<td>536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5250</td>
<td>2191</td>
<td></td>
<td>265</td>
<td>1390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5251</td>
<td>927</td>
<td></td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5252</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5253</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
<td>431</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5254f</td>
<td>1eep</td>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
<td>1251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5255</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5256</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td></td>
<td>298</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5257</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>299</td>
<td>2147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>von Soden MS#</td>
<td>Gregory #</td>
<td>von Soden MS #</td>
<td>Gregory#</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ300</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ376</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ453f</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>470f</td>
<td>913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ457</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>np11</td>
<td>307</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ459</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>np40</td>
<td>453</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ505</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ602f</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7f</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74f</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116f</td>
<td>2138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>1311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>1838</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>1873</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>353</td>
<td>383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>614</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX III

COMPARISON BETWEEN TISCHENDORF AND GREGORY

This material was taken from Aland, Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments 321-333. Note: These manuscript numbers are for the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11st</td>
<td>1 6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2298</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15[1st]</td>
<td>1 1311</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

180
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
<th>Tischendorf</th>
<th>Gregory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>241</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV

DUKE MS. GK. 1. AS DESCRIBED IN THE DUKE CATALOGUE

OF GREEK MANUSCRIPTS


Contents: f. 1r-v: unidentifed (free endsheet); ff. 2v-4r: Synaxarion; ff. 4r-5r: Menologion.; ff. 5r-v: The Letter of Eusebius to Carpianus; ff. 6r-8r: Eusebian Canon Tables; ff. 9r-25v: Unidentified commentary on Matthew; ff. 26r-46v: Matthew with chapter list, prologue, verses, and full commentary; ff. 47r-61r: Mark with chapter list, prologue, verses, and full commentary; ff. 61r-87r: Luke with chapter list, prologue, verses, and full commentary; ff. 87r-105v: John with chapter list, prologue, verses, and full commentary; ff. 106r-124v: Acts of the Apostles, with chapter list and prologue of Euthalius, and commentary on selected verses; ff. 124v-127r, 181v-190v: Catholic Epistles, with Euthalian prologue to the corpus, prologues for each epistle, chapter lists and marginal commentary which varies with each epistle; (ff. 125v-127r: James. At the end of the epistle the scribe commences the materials associated with the Pauline corpus; see the note below on the end of Hebrews at f. 181v.); ff. 127v-181v: The Pauline Epistles, with Euthalian prologue to the corpus, prologues for each epistle, chapter lists, and marginal commentary. The Euthalian prologue includes the Vita, the Peregrinatio, the De Epistulis, and the Chronotaxis. (ff. 174r-181v: Hebrews with prologue, chapter list, and full marginal commentary. At the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews on f. 181v, the scribe has inserted a note between the subscription to Hebrews and the prologue to the Epistle of Peter which instructs the reader where to find the Epistle of James.); ff. 191r-192r: De Sanctis 7 Synodis; ff.192r-200v: The Apocalypse of John, with prologue.
APPENDIX V

DUKE MS. GK. 1 COMPARED TO ALEXANDRIAN AND BYZANTINE TYPE TEXTS

The following table shows a list of sixty-nine variants where the TR, representing the Byzantine text-type, and accepted representatives of the Alexandrian text-type—P^{72}, ℗, and B—disagree. Parentheses indicate the presence of minor differences. As in the collation found in Appendix I of this paper upon which this table is based, Duke MS. GK. 1 (Duke 1) is shown as MS1. Readings were considered where at least two of the three Alexandrian MSS agreed against the TR.

The variant readings are in the center column with the support for each given on each side. The TR reading is given first, followed by the reference, and last by the reading found in the Alexandrian MSS. Duke 1 agreed with the TR fifty-nine times (85.5 percent) and with the Alexandrian ten times (14.5 percent) demonstrating that the text of 1 Peter in Duke 1 is Byzantine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Byzantine</th>
<th>1 Peter - Units of Variation</th>
<th>Alexandrian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>τιμην και δόξαν 1.7 δόξαν και τιμην</td>
<td>℗ P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>εἰδότες 1.8 εἰδόντες (ἰδόντες)</td>
<td>℗ P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 ℗</td>
<td>1.9 - ὅμων</td>
<td>℗ P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>ἵμαν 1.12 ὅμων</td>
<td>MS1 P^{72} ℗ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 ℗</td>
<td>1.12 - εν</td>
<td>℗ P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>1 Peter - Units of Variation</td>
<td>Alexandrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>γένεσα 1.16 ἐπέσαθε</td>
<td>P72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 B</td>
<td>1.16 διότι</td>
<td>Π72 Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 P72</td>
<td>ἐσχάτων 1.20 ἐσχάτων</td>
<td>ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>1.22 - διά Πνεύματος</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>1.23 - εἰς τόν αἰῶνα</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἀνθρώπων 1.24 αὐτῆς (Μ* αὐτοῦ)</td>
<td>Π72 Β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>αὔξηθε 2.2 + εἰς σωτηριαν</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>εἴπερ 2.3 εἰ</td>
<td>Π72 Μ*Β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>πνευματικός 2.5 + εἰς</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>διὸ καὶ 2.6 διὶ δτὶ (διὸτι Μ Β)</td>
<td>MS1 Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>2.6 - τῇ</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἀπειθοῦσιν 2.7 ἀπειστοῦσει (σιν)</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 Μ</td>
<td>λίθον 2.7 λίθος</td>
<td>Π72 Β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>2.13 - σον</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>2.14 - μέν</td>
<td>MS1 Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>δοῦλοι θεοῦ 2.16 θεοῦ δοῦλοι</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 Μ</td>
<td>ἡμᾶν 2.24 ὑμᾶν</td>
<td>Π72 Β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 Μ*</td>
<td>2.24 - αὐτοῦ^2</td>
<td>Π72 Β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>3.1 - αἱ (Π72 ε)</td>
<td>Μ* Β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 B</td>
<td>ἐκπαιδευόμενες 3.2 ἐκπαιδευόμενες</td>
<td>Π72 Μ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR (Μ)</td>
<td>ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν 3.5 εἰς θεὸν</td>
<td>Π72 Β</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- τὸν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>συγκληρονόμοι 3.7 συγκληρονόμοις</td>
<td>Π72 (Β)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>φιλόφοις 3.8 ταπεινόφοις</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>3.9 - εἰδότες</td>
<td>Π72 ΜΒ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>1 Peter - Units of Variation</td>
<td>Alexandrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>3.10 - αὐτοῦ^{1}</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>3.10 - αὐτοῦ^{2}</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἕκκλινάτω 3.11 + δὲ</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>3.12 - οἱ</td>
<td>MS1 P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>μιμηταὶ 3.13 ζηλωταὶ</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>3.14 - μηδὲ ταραχθῆτε</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>θεόν 3.15 Χριστὸν</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>3.15 - δὲ</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἐλπίδος 3.15,16 + ἄλλα</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(TR)MS1</td>
<td>3.16 - ὑμῶν ὡς κακοκοιόν</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>θέλει 3.17 θέλοι</td>
<td>MS1 P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἁμαρτίαν 3.18 + ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἐπαθε[ν] 3.18 ἀπέβανεν</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>ημᾶς 3.18 ημᾶς</td>
<td>MS1 P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>3.18 - τῷ^{2}</td>
<td>MS1 P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ὀλίγαι 3.20 ὀλίγοι</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ημᾶς 3.21 ὑμᾶς</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.1 - ὑπὲρ ημῶν</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.1 - ἐν</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.3 - ἡμῖν</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.3 - τοῦ βίου</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>θέλημα 4.3 βούλημα</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.5 - λόγον</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.5 - ἑξοντι</td>
<td>P^{72} B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byzantine</td>
<td>1 Peter - Units of Variation</td>
<td>Alexandrian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.7 - τάς</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.8 - δέ</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>γογγυσμών 4.9 γογγυσμοῦ</td>
<td>Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(P72 γογγυσμοῦ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR (MS1)</td>
<td>4.14 - κατά μὲν αὐτοὺς βλασφήμεται,</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>κατά δὲ ὑμᾶς δοξάζεται</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>μέρει 4.16 ὀνόματι</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>4.19 - ἄς</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>ἕαντων 4.19 αὐτῶν</td>
<td>MS1 P72 Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>τοῦς 5.1 οὖν</td>
<td>P72 Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 B</td>
<td>ἐκουσίας 5.2 + κατὰ θεόν</td>
<td>P72 Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>5.5 - ῥοποτασσόμενοι</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 Μ</td>
<td>5.5 - ὁ</td>
<td>P72 Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR P72</td>
<td>5.8 - ὅτι</td>
<td>MS1 Μ* B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἐν 5.9 + τῷ</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>ἡμᾶς 5.10 ἡμᾶς</td>
<td>MS1 P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1 Μ</td>
<td>αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων 5.11 εἰςα ἅνας [αἰώνας]</td>
<td>P72 Μ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR MS1</td>
<td>ἐστήκατε 5.12 στήκε</td>
<td>P72 Μ B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX VI

DUKE MS. GK. 1 COMPARED TO ALEXANDRIAN AND BYZANTINE TYPE TEXTS

USING RICHARDS’S TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Unit of Variation</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>MS1</th>
<th>1175</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:7</td>
<td>τιμην και δοξαν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>δοξαν και τιμην</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:8</td>
<td>ειδους</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ειδοντες</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:12</td>
<td>εν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:16</td>
<td>γενεσθε</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εσεσθε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>δια πνευματος</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:22</td>
<td>Καθαρας</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1With the exception of the column showing the readings of Duke MS. GK. 1 (MS1), this table is taken in its entirety from W. L. Richards, “Gregory 1175: Alexandrian or Byzantine in the Catholic Epistles?” AUSS 21/2 (1983) 163-165. Richards compared manuscript 1175 to four key MSS known to be Alexandrian: MS 01 (Sinaiticus), MS 02 (Alexandrinus), MS 03 (Vaticanus), and MS 04 (Ephraemi). Wherever two of these agreed against the TR, the reading was considered. Of the fifty-two times the Alexandrian witness did not split two and two over a reading, 1175 agreed with the Alexandrian witnesses thirty-five times (67 percent agreement). Out of the seven times the Alexandrian witnesses split, 1175 agrees with the TR five times, which, however, did not change Richard’s classification of 1175 as Alexandrian in 1 Peter (ibid. 158, 163-165). ("ΟΜ" in Richards’s table means "omit.")

Duke 1 agrees with the TR forty-four of the fifty-two times (84.62 percent) the Alexandrian witnesses do not split two and two over a reading. In all seven instances where the Alexandrian witnesses split, Duke 1 agrees with the TR. Duke 1 is clearly a Byzantine MS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Unit of Variation</th>
<th>TR</th>
<th>MS1</th>
<th>1175</th>
<th>01</th>
<th>02</th>
<th>03</th>
<th>04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1:23 σπορας</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>φθορας</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1:23 εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΗ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2:12 ανέξηθεν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ εἰς σωτηρίαν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>2:13 εἰκερο</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εί</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2:5 λίθοι ξαντες</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>λιθον ξαντα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>2:5 οικοδομεισθε</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εποικοδομεισθε</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2:6 διο και</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>διοτι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>2:6 ακρογονιαιον εκλεκτον</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εκλεκτον ακρογονιαιον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2:12 εποπτευσαντες</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εποπτευνοντες</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2:13 οων</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΗ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>2:14 μεν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΗ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>2:16 δουλοι θεου</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>θεου δουλοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>2:24 αυτον</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΗ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>2:25 πλανωμενα</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>πλανωμενοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>3:1 αi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΗ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>3:5 επι τον θεον</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εις θεον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>3:7 συγκλησιονμοι</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ ποικιλης</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Unit of Variation</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. 3:7</td>
<td>εκκοπτεσθαι</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εγκοπτεσθαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. 3:8</td>
<td>φιλοφορονές</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>τακεινοφορονές</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. 3:9</td>
<td>εἰδοτες</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. 3:10</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ (1)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. 3:10</td>
<td>αὐτοῦ (2)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. 3:11</td>
<td>ἐκκλίνατο + δὲ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. 3:12</td>
<td>οἱ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. 3:13</td>
<td>μιμηται</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ζηλωται</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. 3:15</td>
<td>δὲ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. 3:15</td>
<td>θεον</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>χριστον</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. 3:17</td>
<td>θελει</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>θελοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. 3:18</td>
<td>εκαθε</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὑπὲρ ἡμιν ακεθανεν</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. 3:20</td>
<td>ἀκαθ εξεδεχετο</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπεξεδεχετο</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. 3:20</td>
<td>ολιγαι</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ολιγοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. 4:1</td>
<td>ὑπὲρ ἡμιν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. 4:1</td>
<td>εν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ΟΜ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. 4:3</td>
<td>τοῦ βίου το θελημα</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>το βουλημα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Unit of Variation</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>4:14 βλασφημοντες και βλασφημουσιν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>4:17 τας</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>4:18 δε</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>4:18 ἢ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>4:18 καλογει καλυπτει</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>4:19 γογγυσμων γογγυσμων</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>4:14 δοξης + και δυναμεως</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>4:14 κατα μεν αυτους βλασφημειται κατα δε ὑμας δοξαζεται</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>4:16 μερει ονοματι</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>4:17 ὁ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>4:19 ὃς</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>5:1 πρεσβυτερος + ουν</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>5:1 τους</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>5:2 εκουσιας + κατα θεον</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>5:5 ὑψοτασσομενοι ΟΥ</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>5:8 ὁπι</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Unit of Variation</td>
<td>TR</td>
<td>MS1</td>
<td>1175</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>5:11 η δοξα και</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>(X)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>5:12 έστηκατε στης</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>5:14 αμην</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: From 4:5 to the end of 1 Peter, textual evidence in MS 04 is lacking.
APPENDIX VII

MANUSCRIPT FOLIOS FROM DUKE MS. GK. 1.
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