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The present volume is designed to serve as a companion to the third edition of the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament, edited by Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren.

One of the chief purposes of the commentary is to set forth the reasons that led the Committee, or a majority of the members of the Committee, to adopt certain variant readings for inclusion in the text and to relegate certain other readings to the apparatus. On the basis of a record of the voting of the Committee, as well as, for most sessions, more or less full notes of the discussions that preceded the voting, the present writer has sought to frame and express concisely (a) the main problem or problems involved in each set of variants and (b) the Committee’s evaluation and resolution of those problems. In writing the commentary it was necessary not only to review what the Committee had done, but also to consult once again the several commentaries, concordances, synopses, lexicons, grammars, and similar reference works that had been utilized by members of the Committee during their discussions. More than once the record of the discussion proved to be incomplete because, amid the lively exchange of opinions, the Committee had come to a decision without the formal enunciation of those reasons that appeared at the time to be obvious or self-evident. In such cases it was necessary for the present writer to supplement, or even to reconstruct, the tenor of the Committee’s discussions.

The general Introduction to the commentary includes an outline of the chief kinds of considerations that the Committee took into account in choosing among variant readings. By becoming acquainted with these criteria (pp. 10*–14*) the reader will be able to understand more readily the presuppositions that underlie the Committee’s evaluations of the divergent readings.

In addition to the 1440 sets of variant readings supplied in the apparatus of the Bible Societies’ edition, the selection of which was made chiefly on the basis of their exegetical importance to the

translator and student, the Committee suggested that certain other readings also deserved discussion in the supplementary volume. The author has therefore included comments on about 600 additional sets of variant readings, scattered throughout the New Testament; the majority of them, it will be noted, occur in the book of Acts, which, because of its peculiar textual problems, seemed to demand special attention (see the Introduction to the book of Acts).

In the comments on the variant readings for which the text-volume supplies an apparatus, it was considered sufficient to cite merely the more important manuscript witnesses; the reader of the commentary will be able to supplement the partial citation of evidence by consulting the fuller apparatus in the text-volume. On the other hand, occasionally the discussion in the commentary supplements the apparatus in the text-volume by the citation of additional witnesses, a few of which were not known at the time of the Committee’s work, and others of which had been deemed unimportant for citation in the apparatus. Since the present volume is designed to assist translators and students who may not have available an extensive library, the comments on the 600
additional sets of variant readings are accompanied by a more or less full citation of evidence, drawn from such standard apparatus critici as those of Tischendorf, von Soden, Nestle, Merk, Bover, Souter, Hoskier (for Revelation), and Wordsworth and White, as well as from editions of individual manuscripts.

The writing of the commentary was begun during 1964, when the author, on sabbatical leave from his usual academic duties, was a member of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. During the following years, as the first draft of each major section was completed, it was circulated among the other members of the Committee to make certain that the comments reflected adequately the Committee’s deliberations. Frequently it had happened that the members of the Committee differed in their evaluation of the textual evidence, and thus many readings were adopted on the basis of a majority vote. In special cases, when a member holding a minority opinion had strong feelings that the majority had seriously gone astray, opportunity was given for him to express his own point of view. Such occasional comments, identified by the writer’s initials and enclosed within square brackets, are appended to the main discussion of the textual problem in question.

The author is grateful to Professors Black, Martini, and Wikgren who, having read the typescript of the commentary, made several suggestions, corrections, and additions which have been incorporated into the volume; for the errors that remain he alone, of course, is responsible. Appreciation must also be expressed to Dr. Robert P. Markham for his capable and courteous assistance given at all stages of the work. The formidable task of typing the handwritten copy of the manuscript was executed with exceptional accuracy by Mrs. Richard E. Munson. Similarly the craftsmen of the firm of Maurice Jacobs, Inc., deserve commendation for the high quality of their work, which included the preparation of a special font of Greek type to represent the script used in uncial manuscripts. Assistance in the onerous task of proofreading was given by Dr. Markham, Mr. Stanley L. Morris, Mrs. Munson, Dr. Erroll Rhodes, and Professor Wikgren. Finally, I wish to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Eugene A. Nida of the American Bible Society for having invited me to prepare this companion to our Greek text. Although the writing of the volume proved to be a far greater and much more exacting task than it appeared when I accepted the invitation, now that it is completed I am grateful to him for having given me the opportunity of enlarging, as one may hope, the usefulness of the United Bible Societies’ edition of the Greek New Testament.

BRUCE M. METZGER

Princeton Theological Seminary
September 30, 1970

Abbreviations

1. Modern Authors and Editors


Moulton and Milligan = The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources, by James Hope Moulton and George Milligan (London, 1930).


Turner (see Moulton-Turner).

Weiss, Der Codex D = Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte; Text-kritische Untersuchungen, by Bernhard Weiss (Texte und Untersuchungen, Neue Folge, 8. Band, Leipzig, 1899).


Zuntz = The Text of the Epistles; a Disquisition upon the Corpus Paulinum, by G. Zuntz (London, 1953).

---

2. OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

 ad loc. = ad locum (at the passage)
 al = alia (other witnesses)
 ASV = American Standard Version (1901)
 AV = Authorized or King James Version (1611)
 bis = twice
 cf. = confer (compare)
 e.g. = exempli gratia (for example)
 hiat = is lacking (used of a passage in a fragmentary manuscript)
 i.e. = id est (that is)
 NEB = New English Bible (New Testament, 1961)
 NRSV = New Revised Standard Version (1990)
 REB = Revised English Bible (1989)
 s.v. = sub voce (under the word)
 ter = three times

vid = videtur (it seems; used to indicate that the reading is not certain, especially in a damaged manuscript)


N. B.: When the siglum of a manuscript is enclosed within parentheses, this means that the manuscript supports the reading in most respects but differs in some unimportant detail or details.

It should be observed that, in accord with the theory that members of $f^1$ and $f^{13}$ were subject to progressive accommodation to the later Byzantine text, scholars have established the text of these families by adopting readings of family witnesses that differ from the Textus Receptus. Therefore the citation of the siglum $f^1$ or $f^{13}$ may, in any given instance, signify a minority of manuscripts (or even only one) that belong to the family.
I. HISTORY OF THE TRANSMISSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXT

In the earliest days of the Christian church, after an apostolic letter was sent to a congregation or an individual, or after a gospel was written to meet the needs of a particular reading public, copies were made in order to extend its influence and to enable others to profit from it as well. It was inevitable that such handwritten copies would contain a greater or lesser number of differences in wording from the original. Most of the divergencies arose from quite accidental causes, such as mistaking a letter or a word for another that looked like it. If two neighboring lines of a manuscript began or ended with the same group of letters or if two similar words stood near each other in the same line, it was easy for the eye of the copyist to jump from the first group of letters to the second, and so for a portion of the text to be omitted (called harmonization or assimilation). Thus, the scribe might go back from the second to the first group and unwittingly copy one or more words twice (called dittography). Letters that were pronounced alike were sometimes confused (called itacism). Such accidental errors are almost unavoidable whenever lengthy passages are copied by hand, and would be especially likely to occur if the scribe had defective eyesight, or was interrupted while copying, or, because of fatigue, was less attentive to his task than he should have been.

Other divergencies in wording arose from deliberate attempts to smooth out grammatical or stylistic harshness, or to eliminate real or imagined obscurities of meaning in the text. Sometimes a copyist would substitute or would add what seemed to him to be a more appropriate word or form, perhaps derived from a parallel passage (called harmonization or assimilation). Thus, during the years immediately following the composition of the several documents that eventually were collected to form the New Testament, hundreds if not thousands of variant readings arose.

Still other kinds of divergencies originated when the New Testament documents were translated from Greek into other languages. During the second and third centuries, after Christianity had been introduced into Syria, into North Africa and Italy, into central and southern Egypt, both congregations and individual believers would naturally desire copies of the Scriptures in their own languages. And so versions in Syriac, in Latin, and in the several dialects of Coptic used in Egypt were produced. They were followed in the fourth and succeeding centuries by other versions in Armenian, Georgian, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Nubian in the East, and in Gothic, Old Church Slavonic, and (much later) Anglo-Saxon in the West.

The accuracy of such translations was directly related to two factors: (a) the degree of familiarity possessed by the translator of both Greek and the language into which the translation was made, and (b) the amount of care he devoted to the task of making the translation. It is not surprising that very considerable divergencies in early versions developed, first, when different persons made different translations from what may have been slightly different forms of Greek text; and, second, when these renderings in one or another language were transmitted in handwritten copies by scribes who, familiar with a slightly different form of text (either a divergent Greek text or a divergent versional rendering), adjusted the new copies so as to accord with what they considered the preferable wording.
During the early centuries of the expansion of the Christian church, what are called “local texts” of the New Testament gradually developed. Newly established congregations in and near a large city, such as Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, Carthage, or Rome, were provided with copies of the Scriptures in the form that was current in that area. As additional copies were made, the number of special readings and renderings would be both conserved and, to some extent, increased, so that eventually a type of text grew up that was more or less peculiar to that locality. Today it is possible to identify the type of text preserved in New Testament manuscripts by comparing their characteristic readings with the quotations of those passages in the writings of Church Fathers who lived in or near the chief ecclesiastical centers.

At the same time the distinctiveness of a local text tended to become diluted and mixed with other types of text. A manuscript of the Gospel of Mark copied in Alexandria, for example, and taken later to Rome would doubtless influence to some extent copyists transcribing the form of the text of Mark heretofore current at Rome. On the whole, however, during the earliest centuries the tendencies to develop and preserve a particular type of text prevailed over the tendencies leading to a mixture of texts. Thus there grew up several distinctive kinds of New Testament text, the most important of which are the following.

The Alexandrian text, which Westcott and Hort called the Neutral text (a question-begging title), is usually considered to be the best text and the most faithful in preserving the original. Characteristics of the Alexandrian text are brevity and austerity. That is, it is generally shorter than the text of other forms, and it does not exhibit the degree of grammatical and stylistic polishing that is characteristic of the Byzantine type of text. Until recently the two chief witnesses to the Alexandrian text were codex Vaticanus (B) and codex Sinaiticus (א), parchment manuscripts dating from about the middle of the fourth century. With the acquisition, however, of the Bodmer Papyri, particularly 79 and 82, both copied about the end of the second or the beginning of the third century, evidence is now available that the Alexandrian type of text goes back to an archetype that must be dated early in the second century. The Sahidic and Bohairic versions frequently contain typically Alexandrian readings.

The so-called Western text, which was widely current in Italy and Gaul as well as in North Africa and elsewhere (including Egypt), can also be traced back to the second century. It was used by Marcion, Tatian, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyprian. Its presence in Egypt is shown by the testimony of P. 308 (about A.D. 300) and P. 309 (about the end of the third century). The most important Greek manuscripts that present a Western type of text are codex Bezae (D) of the fifth century (containing the Gospels and Acts), codex Claromontanus (D) of the sixth century (containing the Pauline epistles), and, for Mark 1:1 to 5:30, codex Washingtonianus (W) of the fifth century. Likewise the Old Latin versions are noteworthy witnesses to a Western type of text; these fall into three main groups, the African, Italian, and Hispanic forms of Old Latin texts.

The chief characteristic of Western readings is fondness for paraphrase. Words, clauses, and even whole sentences are freely changed, omitted, or inserted. Sometimes the motive appears to have been harmonization, while at other times it was the enrichment of the narrative by the inclusion of traditional or apocryphal material. Some readings involve quite trivial alterations for which no special reason can be assigned. One of the puzzling features of the Western text (which generally is longer than the other forms of text) is that at the end of Luke and in a few other places in the New Testament certain Western witnesses omit words and passages that are present in other forms of text, including the Alexandrian. Although at the close of the last century certain scholars were disposed to regard these shorter readings as original (Westcott and Hort called them “Western non-interpolations”), since the acquisition of the Bodmer Papyri many scholars today are inclined to regard them as aberrant readings (see the Note on Western Non-Interpolations, pp. 164–166).

In the book of Acts the problems raised by the Western text become most acute, for the Western text of Acts is nearly ten percent longer than the form that is commonly regarded to be the original text of that book. For this reason the present volume devotes proportionately more space to variant readings in Acts than to those in any other New Testament book, and a special Introduction to the textual phenomena in Acts is provided (see pp. 222–236).

An Eastern form of text, which was formerly called the Caesarean text, is preserved, to a greater or lesser extent, in several Greek manuscripts (including 6, 565, 700) and in the Armenian and Georgian versions. The text of these witnesses is characterized by a mixture of Western and Alexandrian readings. Although recent research has tended to question the existence of a specifically Caesarean text-type, the individual manuscripts formerly considered to be members of the group remain important witnesses in their own right.

Another Eastern type of text, current in and near Antioch, is preserved today chiefly in Old Syriac witnesses, namely the Sinaitic and the Curetonian manuscripts of the Gospels and in the quotations of Scripture contained in the works of Aphraates and Ephraem.

The Byzantine text, otherwise called the Syrian text (so Westcott and Hort), the Koine text (so von Soden), the Ecclesiastical text (so Lake), and the Antiochian text (so Ropes), is, on the whole, the latest of the several distinctive types of text of the New Testament. It is characterized chiefly by lucidity and completeness. The framers of this text sought to smooth away any harshness of language, to combine two or more divergent readings into one expanded reading (called conflation), and to harmonize divergent parallel passages. This conflated text, produced perhaps at Antioch in Syria, was taken to Constantinople, whence it was distributed widely throughout the Byzantine Empire. It is best represented today by codex Alexandrinus (in the Gospels; not in Acts, the Epistles, or Revelation), the later uncial manuscripts, and the great mass of minuscule manuscripts. Thus, except...
for an occasional manuscript that happened to preserve an earlier form of text, during the period from about the sixth or seventh century down to the invention of printing with moveable type (A.D. 1450–56), the Byzantine form of text was generally regarded as the authoritative form of text and was the one most widely circulated and accepted.

After Gutenberg’s press made the production of books more rapid and therefore cheaper than was possible through copying by hand, it was the debased Byzantine text that became the standard form of the New Testament in printed editions. This unfortunate situation was not altogether unexpected, for the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament that were most readily available to early editors and printers were those that contained the corrupt Byzantine text.

The first published edition of the printed Greek Testament, issued at Basel in 1516, was prepared by Desiderius Erasmus, the Dutch humanist scholar. Since Erasmus could find no manuscript that contained the entire Greek Testament, he utilized several for the various divisions of the New Testament. For the greater part of his text he relied on two rather inferior manuscripts now in the university library at Basel, one of the Gospels and one of the Acts and Epistles, both dating from about the twelfth century. Erasmus compared them with two or three others, and entered occasional corrections in the margins or between the lines of the copy given to the printer. For the book of Revelation he had but one manuscript, dating from the twelfth century, which he had borrowed from his friend Reuchlin. As it happened, this copy lacked the final leaf, which had contained the last six verses of the book. For these verses Erasmus depended upon Jerome’s Latin Vulgate, translating this version into Greek. As would be expected from such a procedure, here and there in Erasmus’s reconstruction of these verses there are several readings that have never been found in any Greek manuscript – but which are still perpetuated today in printings of the so-called Textus Receptus of the Greek New Testament (see the comment on Rev. 22.19). In other parts of the New Testament Erasmus also occasionally introduced into his Greek text material derived from the current form of the Latin Vulgate (see the comment on Acts 6:5–6).

So much in demand was Erasmus’s Greek Testament that the first edition was soon exhausted and a second was called for. It was this second edition of 1519, in which some (but not nearly all) of the many typographical blunders of the first edition had been corrected, that Martin Luther and William Tyndale used as the basis of their translations of the New Testament into German (1522) and into English (1525).

In the years following many other editors and printers issued a variety of editions of the Greek Testament, all of which reproduced more or less the same type of text, namely that preserved in the later Byzantine manuscripts. Even when it happened that an editor had access to older manuscripts – as when Theodore Beza, the friend and successor of Calvin at Geneva, acquired the fifth-century manuscript that goes under his name today, as well as the sixth-century codes Claromontanus – he made relatively little use of them, for they deviated too far from the form of text that had become standard in the later copies.

Noteworthy early editions of the Greek New Testament include two issued by Robert Etienne (commonly known under the Latin form of his name, Stephanus), the famous Parisian printer who later moved to Geneva and threw in his lot with the Protestants of that city. In 1550 Stephanus published at Paris his third edition, the editio Regia, a magnificent folio edition. It is the first printed Greek Testament to contain a critical apparatus; on the inner margins of its pages Stephanus entered variant readings from fourteen Greek manuscripts, as well as readings from another printed edition, the Complutensian Polyglot. Stephanus’s fourth edition (Geneva, 1551), which contains two Latin versions (the Vulgate and that of Erasmus), is noteworthy because in it for the first time the text of the New Testament was divided into numbered verses.

Theodore Beza published no fewer than nine editions of the Greek Testament between 1565 and 1604, and a tenth edition appeared posthumously in 1611. The importance of Beza’s work lies in the extent to which his editions tended to popularize and stereotype what came to be called the Textus Receptus. The translators of the Authorized or King James Bible of 1611 made large use of Beza’s editions of 1588–89 and 1596.

The term Textus Receptus, as applied to the text of the New Testament, originated in an expression used by Bonaventura and Abraham Elzevir (Elzevier), who were printers in Leiden. The preface to their second edition of the Greek Testament (1633) contains the sentence: Textum ergo habes, nunc ab omnibus receptum, in quo nihil immutatum aut corruptum damus ("Therefore you [dear reader] have the text now received by all, in which we give nothing changed or corrupted"). In one sense this proud claim of the Elzevirs on behalf of their edition seemed to be justified, for their edition was, in most respects, not different from the approximately 160 other editions of the printed Greek Testament that had been issued since Erasmus’s first published edition of 1516. In a more precise sense, however, the Byzantine form of the Greek text, reproduced in all early printed editions, was disfigured, as was mentioned above, by the accumulation over the centuries of myriad scribal alterations, many of minor significance but some of considerable consequence.

It was the corrupt Byzantine form of text that provided the basis for almost all translations of the New Testament into modern languages down to the nineteenth century. During the eighteenth century scholars assembled a great amount of information from many Greek manuscripts, as well as from versional and patristic witnesses. But, except for three or four editors who timidly corrected some of the more blatant errors of the Textus Receptus, this debased form of the New Testament text was reprinted in edition after edition. It was only in the first part of the nineteenth century (1831) that a German classical scholar, Karl Lachmann, ventured to apply to the New Testament the criteria that he had used in editing texts of the classics. Subsequently other critical editions appeared, including those prepared by Constantin von Tischendorf, whose eighth edition (1869–72) remains a monumental thesaurus of variant readings, and the influential edition prepared by two Cambridge scholars, B. F Westcott and F. J. A. Hort (1881). It is the latter edition that was taken as the basis for the present United Bible Societies’ edition. During the twentieth century, with the discovery of several New Testament manuscripts much older than any that had hitherto been available, it has become possible to produce editions of the New Testament that approximate ever more closely to what is regarded as the wording of the original documents.
II. CRITERIA USED IN CHOOSING AMONG CONFLICTING READINGS IN NEW TESTAMENT WITNESSES

In the preceding section the reader will have seen how, during about fourteen centuries when the New Testament was transmitted in handwritten copies, numerous changes and accretions came into the text. Of the approximately five thousand Greek manuscripts of all or part of the New Testament that are known today, no two agree exactly in all particulars. Confronted by a mass of conflicting readings, editors must decide which variants deserve to be included in the text and which should be relegated to the apparatus. Although at first it may seem to be a hopeless task amid so many thousands of variant readings to sort out those that should be regarded as original, textual scholars have developed certain generally acknowledged criteria of evaluation. These considerations depend, it will be seen, upon probabilities, and sometimes the textual critic must weigh one set of probabilities against another. Furthermore, the reader should be advised at the outset that, although the following criteria have been drawn up in a more or less tidy outline form, their application can never be undertaken in a merely mechanical or stereotyped manner. Each and every variant reading needs to be considered in itself, and not judged merely according to a rule of thumb. With these cautionary comments in mind, the reader will appreciate that the following outline of criteria is meant only as a convenient description of the more important considerations that the Committee took into account when choosing among variant readings.

The chief categories or kinds of criteria and considerations that assist one in evaluating the relative worth of variant readings are those which involve (I) External Evidence, having to do with the manuscripts themselves, and (II) Internal Evidence, having to do with two kinds of considerations, (A) those concerned with Transcriptional Probabilities (i.e. relating to the habits of scribes) and (B) those concerned with Intrinsic Probabilities (i.e. relating to the style of the author).²

OUTLINE OF CRITERIA

I. EXTERNAL EVIDENCE, involving considerations bearing upon:

A. The date and character of the witnesses. In general, earlier manuscripts are more likely to be free from those errors that arise from repeated copying. Of even greater importance, however, than the age of the document itself are the date and character of the type of text that it embodies, as well as the degree of care taken by the copyist while producing the manuscript.

B. The geographical distribution of the witnesses that support a variant. The concurrence of witnesses, for example, from Antioch, Alexandria, and Gaul in support of a given variant is, other things being equal, more significant than the testimony of witnesses representing but one locality or one ecclesiastical see. On the other hand, however, one must be certain that geographically remote witnesses are really independent of one another. Agreements, for example, between Old Latin and Old Syriac witnesses may sometimes be due to common influence from Tatian's Diatessaron.

C. The genealogical relationship of texts and families of witnesses. Mere numbers of witnesses supporting a given variant reading do not necessarily prove the superiority of that reading. For example, if in a given sentence reading x is supported by twenty manuscripts and reading y by only one manuscript, the relative numerical support favoring x counts for nothing if all twenty manuscripts should be discovered to be copies made from a single manuscript, no longer extant, whose scribe first introduced that particular variant reading. The comparison, in that case, ought to be made between the one manuscript containing reading y and the single ancestor of the twenty manuscripts containing reading x.

D. Witnesses are to be weighed rather than counted. That is, the principle enunciated in the previous paragraph needs to be elaborated: those witnesses that are found to be generally trustworthy in clear-cut cases deserve to be accorded predominant weight in cases when the textual problems are ambiguous and their resolution is uncertain. At the same time, however, since the relative weight of the several kinds of evidence differs in different kinds of variants, there should be no merely mechanical evaluation of the evidence.

II. INTERNAL EVIDENCE, involving two kinds of probabilities:

A. Transcriptional Probabilities depend upon considerations of the habits of scribes and upon palaeographical features in the manuscripts.

1. In general, the more difficult reading is to be preferred, particularly when the sense appears on the surface to be erroneous but on

more mature consideration proves itself to be correct. (Here “more difficult” means
"more difficult to the scribe,” who would be tempted to make an emendation. The
characteristic of most scribal emendations is their superficiality, often combining “the
appearance of improvement with the absence of its reality.”²⁰ Obviously the category
"more difficult reading" is relative, and sometimes a point is reached when a reading
must be judged to be so difficult that it can have arisen only by accident in transcription.)

2. In general the shorter reading is to be preferred, except where

(a) Paralepsis arising from homoeoarcton or homoeoteleuton may have occurred (i.e., where the eye of the copyist may have inadvertently passed from one word to another having a similar sequence of letters); or where

(b) The scribe may have omitted material that was deemed to be (i) superfluous, (ii) harsh, or (iii) contrary to pious belief, liturgical usage, or ascetical practice.

3. Since scribes would frequently bring divergent passages into harmony with one another, in parallel passages (whether quotations from the Old Testament or different accounts in
the Gospels of the same event or narrative) that reading which involves verbal dissidence is usually to be preferred to one which is verbally concordant.

4. Scribes would sometimes
   (a) Replace an unfamiliar word with a more familiar synonym;
   (b) Alter a less refined grammatical form or less elegant lexical expression, in accord with contemporary Atticizing preferences; or
   (c) Add pronouns, conjunctions, and expletives to make a smoother text.

B. Intrinsic Probabilities depend upon considerations of what the author was more likely to have written. The textual critic takes into account

1. In general:
   (a) The style and vocabulary of the author throughout the book:
   (b) The immediate context; and
   (c) Harmony with the usage of the author elsewhere; and,

2. In the Gospels:
   (a) The Aramaic background of the teaching of Jesus;
   (b) The priority of the Gospel according to Mark; and
   (c) The influence of the Christian community upon the formulation and transmission of the passage in question.

It is obvious that not all of these criteria are applicable in every case. The textual critic must know when it is appropriate to give greater consideration to one kind of evidence and less to another. Since textual criticism is an art as well as a science, it is inevitable that in some cases different scholars will come to different evaluations of the significance of the evidence. This divergence is almost inevitable when, as sometimes happens, the evidence is so divided that, for example, the more difficult reading is found only in the later witnesses, or the longer reading is found only in the earlier witnesses.

In order to indicate the relative degree of certainty in the mind of the Committee for the reading adopted as the text, an identifying letter is included within braces at the beginning of each set of textual variants. The letter {A} signifies that the text is certain, while {B} indicates that the text is almost certain. The letter {C}, however, indicates that the Committee had difficulty in deciding which variant to place in the text. The letter {D}, which occurs only rarely, indicates that the Committee had great difficulty in arriving at a decision. In fact, among the {D} decisions sometimes none of the variant readings commended itself as original, and therefore the only recourse was to print the least unsatisfactory reading.

III. LISTS OF WITNESSES ACCORDING TO TYPE OF TEXT

The following are some of the more important witnesses to the text of the New Testament arranged in lists according to the predominant type of text exhibited by each witness. It will be observed that in some cases different sections of the New Testament within the same witness belong to different text-types.

**Alexandrian Witnesses**

1. Primary Alexandrian:
   \[\text{\p{45} (in Acts)}, \text{\p{66} \text{\p{53}} X B Sahidic (in part), Clement of Alexandria, Origen (in part), and most of the papyrus fragments with Pauline text.}\]

2. Secondary Alexandrian:
   Acts: ∂ 11 (1.16–13.31) 81 104 326.
   Pauline Epistles: A (C) H I 33 81 104 326 1739.
   Catholic Epistles: ∂ 38 A (C) 33 81 104 326 1739.
   Revelation: A (C) 1006 1611 1854 2053 2344; less good, \p{17} X

**Western Witnesses**

Gospels: \p{46} \p{53} X (in John 1.1–8.38) D W (in Mark 1.1–5.30) 0171, the Old Latin, (syr\text{e} and syr\text{c} in part), early Latin Fathers.
   Acts: \p{39} \p{58} \p{65} D E 383 614 1739 syr\text{e} syr\text{e} e Cop\text{e} early Latin Fathers.

It will be observed that for the book of Revelation no specifically Western witnesses have been identified.
Byzantine Witnesses


Acts: H L P 049 and most minuscules.

Epistles: L 049 and most minuscules.

Revelation: 046 051 052 and most minuscules.

In assessing the preceding lists of witnesses two comments are appropriate. (a) The tables include only those witnesses that are more or less generally acknowledged to be the chief representatives of the several textual types. Additional witnesses have at times been assigned to one or another category.

(b) While the reader is encouraged to refer from time to time from the commentary to the above lists of witnesses, it must never be supposed that parity of external support for two separate sets of variant readings requires identical judgments concerning the original text. Although the external evidence for two sets of variant readings may be exactly the same, considerations of transcriptional and/or intrinsic probabilities of readings may lead to quite diverse judgments concerning the original text. This is, of course, only another way of saying that textual criticism is an art as well as a science, and demands that each set of variants be evaluated in the light of the fullest consideration of both external evidence and internal probabilities.

---

Footnotes


Prior to Rinck, J. J. Griesbach began a comprehensive textual commentary on the New Testament, but finished only the portions on Matthew and Mark (*Commentarius criticus in textum Graecum Novi Testamenti*, particula I [Jena, 1798]; particula II [Jena, 1811]). It may also be mentioned that in 1844 J. I. Doedes commented at considerable length on nearly fifty passages that involve major textual problems in the New Testament in his *Verhandeling over de tekstkritiek des Nieuwen Verbonds* (= Teyler's Godgeleerd Genootschap, vol. XXXIV; Haarlem, 1844), pp. 387–481.


In the two volumes entitled *The Revisers' Greek Text* (Boston, 1892), which are in commentary-format, S. W. Whitney discusses about 700 passages in the Revised Version of 1881, which was translated basically from Westcott and Hort's Greek text; in almost all cases Whitney prefers the Textus Receptus, represented in the King James or so-called Authorized Version.


8 The table of criteria has been adapted from the present writer’s volume, *The Text of the New Testament, its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (Oxford, 1964; third edition, 1992), which may be consulted for a fuller account of the science and art of textual criticism.

9 Westcott and Hort, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 27.

It will be noted that this system is similar in principle but different in application from that followed by Johann Albrecht Bengel in his edition of the Greek New Testament (Tübingen, 1734).

10 In this list parentheses indicate that the text of the manuscript thus designated is mixed in character.

As was mentioned earlier, these have been variously designated by other writers as Antiochian, Syrian, Ecclesiastical, or Koine witnesses.

11 In the two volumes entitled *The Revisers' Greek Text* (Boston, 1892), which are in commentary-format, S. W. Whitney discusses about 700 passages in the Revised Version of 1881, which was translated basically from Westcott and Hort’s Greek text; in almost all cases Whitney prefers the Textus Receptus, represented in the King James or so-called Authorized Version.
In order to bring the text of Matthew into harmony with the genealogy in 1 Chr 3.15-16, several of the later uncial manuscripts (M U Θ Σ), as well as a variety of other witnesses (including δ 33 209 258 476 954 1354 1604 syr `by, geo), have added τὸν Ἰωάννην, Ἰωάννην δὲ ἐγένετον. Although it is possible to argue that the clause had accidentally fallen out during transcription, the external evidence in its favor is not as weighty as that which supports the shorter text (B C E K L J V W). The most minuscules it vg syr 57 to syr (arm eth). It should be noted also that when the clause is present there are fifteen generations in the second tesseraedecade (compare ver. 17).

1.7-8 Ἄσαφ, Ἄσαφ [B]

It is clear that the name “Asaph” is the earliest form of text preserved in the manuscripts, for the agreement of Alexandrian (B K) and other witnesses (f 17 700 1071) with Eastern versions (cop arm eth geo) and representatives of the Western text (Old Latin ms. and D in Luke [D is lacking for this part of Matthew]) makes a strong combination. Furthermore, the tendency of scribes, observing that the name of the psalmist Asaph (cf. the titles of Pss 50 and 73 to 83) was confused with that of Asa the king of Judah (1 Kings 15.9 ff.), would have been to correct the error, thus accounting for the prevalence of Ἄσαφ in the later Ecclesiastical text and its inclusion in the Textus Receptus.

Although most scholars are impressed by the overwhelming weight of textual evidence supporting Ἄσαφ, Lagrange demurs and in his commentary prints Ἄσαφ as the text of Matthew. He declares (p. 5) that “literary criticism is not able to admit that the author, who could not have drawn up this list without consulting the Old Testament, would have taken the name of a psalmist in place of a king of Judah. It is necessary, therefore, to suppose that Ἄσαφ is a very ancient [scribal] error.” Since, however, the evangelist may have derived material for the genealogy, not from the Old Testament directly, but from subsequent genealogical lists, in which the erroneous spelling occurred, the Committee saw no reason to adopt what appears to be a scribal emendation in the text of Matthew.

1.10 Ἀμώς, Ἀμώς [B]

The textual evidence for the reading “Amos,” an error for “Amon,” the name of the king of Judah, is nearly the same as that which reads Ἄσαφ in verses 2 and 8.

In 1 Chr 3.14 most manuscripts present the correct Ἀμώς (or its near equivalent Ἀμιών), but Ἀμώς is read by A B (B* and one minuscule read Ἀμιών). In the narrative account concerning King Amon in 2 Kings 21.18-19; 23-24; 2 Chr 33.20-25 several Greek witnesses erroneously read Ἀμώς.

Despite Lagrange’s preference for Ἀμώς (see his argument quoted above on verses 7-8), the Committee was impressed by the weight of the external evidence that attests Ἀμώς.

1.11 ἐγένετον [A]

In the Gospel According To Matthew

Joseph the husband of Mary, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary who was born Jesus who is called Christ. In the more complete form of the Liber generationis incorporated by Hippolytus in his Chronicle (completed about A.D. 234), the genealogy from Adam to Christ closes with the words Joseph, cui dispensata fuit uirgo Maria, quae genuit Iesum Christum ex spiritu sancto (ed. by Rudolf Helm, 1955, p. 126; “Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary, who bore Jesus Christ from the Holy Spirit”).

(3) “Jacob begot Joseph, to whom was betrothed the virgin Mary the wife of Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the virgin, who bore Jesus Christ from the Holy Spirit,” is attested by the Sinaitic Syriac manuscript.

Other witnesses have sometimes been supposed to support reading (3). Thus, in the Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila, an anonymous treatise (dating perhaps from the fifth century) that presents a debate between a Christian and a Jew, Mt 1.16 is referred to three times. The third of these is a loose quotation of the commonly received text, Ἰωάννην δὲ ἐγένετον τὸν Ἰωάννην τοῦ μαθητεύσαντος Μαρίαν, ἐς Ἰωάννην ἤρων Ἡρῴου Ἡρῴου τοῦ θεοῦ (“And Jacob begot Joseph, who was betrothed to Mary, from whom was born the Christ the Son of God”). The second quotation, which stands at the close of a rapid recapitulation of the genealogy, is Ἰωάννην δὲ ἐγένετον τὸν Ἰωάννην τοῦ μαθητεύσαντος Μαρίαν, ἐς Ἰωάννην ἤρων Ἡρῴου Ἡρῴου Ἡρῴου τοῦ θεοῦ (“And Jacob [begot] Joseph, to
The first time that Mt 1.16 occurs in the Dialogue, the Jew quotes it in exactly the form given in (1) above and then follows it with his own inference, namely καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κατάφυτον Χριστόν, περὶ αὐτοῦ νῦν ὁ λόγος, φησίν, ἐγέννησεν ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας (“And [so] Joseph begot Jesus who is called Christ”).

A third witness that has been thought to support the Sinaitic Syriac reading is one time that Mt 1.16 occurs in the Dialogue, the Jew quotes it in exactly the form given in (1) above and then follows it with his own inference, namely καὶ Ἰωάννης ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν κατάφυτον Χριστόν, περὶ αὐτοῦ νῦν ὁ λόγος, φησίν, ἐγέννησεν ἐκ τῆς Μαρίας (“And [so] Joseph begot Jesus who is called Christ”).

Another witness that is sometimes thought to support the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac is a twelfth century Jacobite Syrian writer, Dionysius Barsalibi, bishop of Amida. Hermann von Soden, for example, cites in his apparatus for Mt 1.16 the name of Barsalibi as patristic attestation entirely parallel with that of syr. The evidence, however, is far from being so clear-cut, as the following account of the principal points will make obvious.

In his Commentary on the Gospels Barsalibi discusses the syntactical difference between the ways in which the Greek and Syriac languages express “from whom” in Mt 1.16, but both the Greek and the Syriac, he declares, explicitly attest that Jesus was born of Mary and not from Joseph. The critical point concerns Barsalibi’s comment on Mt 1.18, which reads as follows: “Here the manner of his [Jesus’] corporeal birth [the evangelist] teaches. When therefore you hear [the word] ‘husband’ [i.e., in ver. 19], do not think that he was born according to the law of nature – he who had constituted the law of nature. And when it comes to Joseph, and therefore afterwards it says, ‘Now the birth of Jesus the Messiah was thus,’ that is, not as the rest of men was he born, but a new thing is the manner of his birth, and higher than the nature of those who are born.”

The words cited in Syriac can be translated either (a) “it says, ‘Who begot the Messiah,’” or (b) “it says that he begot the Messiah.” According to rendering (a), Barsalibi appears to be quoting from some manuscript or author, not identified here or elsewhere, whose text of Mt 1.16 paralleled the reading of the Sinaitic Syriac. On the other hand, according to rendering (b), Barsalibi is making his own summary exposition of Matthew’s account of Joseph’s relation to the Messiah. In either case, however, it is obvious that so far as Barsalibi is concerned he intends his quotation (if it be a quotation) or his summary exposition to be perfectly in accord with his earlier discussion of ver. 16 and his immediately following declaration that Jesus’ birth was unique. In other words, it appears that Barsalibi fully accepted the Peshitta text of ver. 16 (i.e. the reading designated (1) above).

The external evidence in support of (1) is extremely good: it is read by all known Greek uncial manuscripts except ℵ, and by all other manuscripts and versions except the limited number that support (2) and (3). Transcitational probabilities suggest that reading (2) arose (perhaps at Caesarea) because the expression “the husband of Mary” was thought to be misleading in a genealogical context. Lest the hasty reader assume that Jesus was the physical son of Mary and her husband Joseph, the text was altered to bring it into conformity with ver. 18 where the verb μνηστεύεσθαι is used to describe the relationship of Mary to Joseph. On the other hand, if reading (2) be supposed to be original, it is exceedingly difficult to imagine why any scribe would have substituted reading (1) for such a clear and unambiguous declaration of the virginity of Mary.

There is no evidence that reading (3) ever existed in a Greek manuscript of the first Gospel. The Committee judged that it arose either as a paraphrase of reading (2) – this was Burkitt’s view – or as a purely mechanical imitation of the preceding pattern in the genealogy. Since every name in the genealogy up to Joseph is written twice in succession, it may be that the scribe of the Sinaitic Syriac (or an ancestor of this manuscript) carelessly followed the stereotyped pattern and in ver. 16, having made the initial mistake of repeating the word “Joseph,” went on to produce reading (3).
It is difficult to decide which is the original reading. On the one hand, the prevailing tendency of scribes was to expand either

The reading of the Sinaitic Syriac (“she bore to him [to Joseph] a son”) is in conformity with the singular reading of this manuscript in ver. 16 (see the discussion above) and its reading (shared with syr) in ver. 21 (“shall bear to thee a son”).

In the face of such conflicting considerations, the Committee judged that the least unsatisfactory course was to adopt the reading that was current in many parts of the early church.

Both γένος and γέννησις mean “birth,” but the former also means “creation,” “generation,” and “genealogy” (compare Luke 3.33), whereas the latter means more strictly “engendering” and therefore became the customary word used in patristic literature to refer to the Nativity. At the same time it is understandable that scribes very often confused these two words, which orthographically and phonetically are so similar.

In the present passage not only do the earlier representatives of several text-types support γένος, but the tendency of copyists would have been to substitute a word of more specialized meaning for one that had been used in a different sense in Luke 3.33. In particular since γέννησις corresponds more nearly with the verb γεννάω used so frequently in the previous genealogy.

Before τοῦ τροφήτου a variety of witnesses (including D 267 954 1582 a\* b\* c\* d\* vg\* syr\* h \* p\* arn lreneaeus 12\*) insert Ἑωνίου. The name is clearly a scribal explanation, for if it had been present

originally there is no adequate reason that would account for its absence from the mass of Greek witnesses.

The reading of the Sinaitic Syriac (“she bore to him [to Joseph] a son”) is in conformity with the singular reading of this manuscript in ver. 16 (see the discussion above) and its reading (shared with syr) in ver. 21 (“shall bear to thee a son”).

Not content with merely the mention of τοῦ τροφήτου several witnesses (4 syr\* ms cop\* h*) add Μιχαελου, and it reads per Esiom propheteum dicentem (“through Isaiah the prophet saying”).

The longer reading, θηρος καὶ κλαυθῆς, appears to be a scribal assimilation to the Septuagint text of Sir 31.15 (LXX 38:15). It entered the Textus Receptus and lies behind the rendering of the AV, “lamentation, and weeping, and great mourning.”

Between verses 15 and 16 two Latin manuscripts (it* vg\* 21) describe the baptism of Jesus as follows: Et cum baptizaretur Iesus (om. Iesus et) lumen magnum fulgebat (lumen ingens circumfulsit it*) de aqua, ita ut timuerant omnes qui congregati erant (adverserant it*) (“And when Jesus was being baptized a great light flashed (a tremendous light flashed around) from the water, so that all who had gathered there were afraid”). According to Isidore of Merv (ninth century) and Dionysius Barsalibi (twelfth century), Tatian’s Diatessaron also contained a reference to the light. The passage from Isidore’s Commentary on the Gospels is as follows:

“And straightway, as the Diatessaron testifies, a great light shown, and the Jordan was surrounded by white clouds, and many troops of spiritual beings were seen singing praises in the air; and the Jordan stood still quietly from its course, its waters not being troubled, and a scent of perfumes was wafted from thence; for the Heavens were opened” (M. D. Gibson’s translation, p. 27).

How much of this extract should be regarded as Tatianic, and how much may have been taken from other sources (perhaps an early hymn), is not known, but it is thought that, in
view of Ephraem’s remark about “the shining of the light upon the waters” (Com. iv:5),
at least the reference to the light on the Jordan was present in the Diatessaron.

Several other writers refer to the tradition of the light, including Justin Martyr, who says
that after Jesus had gone down into the water “a fire was kindled in the Jordan” (Πέρι
ἀνθρώπου τῆς ζωῆς θρόνου Dial. c. Tryph. 88), and Epiphanius, after the voice came from
heaven, “Immediately a great light shone around the place” (εὐθὺς υφόλαυνα τῆς τόπου
φῶς μέγαν, Panarion haer. XXX, xiii, 7).

3.16 [αὐτῷ] [C]
The joining of ἐκαστάτως B, the Old Syriac, and Irenaeus’s in support of the shorter reading
makes a very strong combination, which might well be regarded as the original text. On
the other hand, however, it is possible that copyists, not understanding the force of αὐτῷ,
omitted the word as unnecessary. In order to show this balance of possibilities the
Committee enclosed αὐτῷ within square brackets.

3.16 [καὶ] ἐρήμωσαν (C)
No transcriptional or dogmatic considerations seem to have been at work here, and the
parallels offer no assistance in deciding between the readings with or without καὶ. On
the strength of the diversity of textual groups that support καὶ ἐρήμωσαν, the Committee
retained the words in the text, but, in order to reflect the possibility that καὶ,

being absent from early representatives of both Alexandrian and Western text-types (N* B
a b c h k Irenaeus’s al), may not have been part of the text originally, enclosed it within
square brackets.

4.10 ὑπενέ (A)
If the words ὑπένε μου were originally in the text, no satisfactorily reason can be found to
account for their omission. On the other hand, if they were originally absent, copyists
who recalled the words of Jesus to Peter, ὑπενε ὑπένε μου, Διονύσιος (Mt 16.23, where
there is no variation of reading), would have been likely to supply them here.

4.17 μετανοεῖτε, ἠγγίγεν γάρ [A]
Despite the absence of μετανοεῖτε and γάρ in the Old Syriac and one manuscript of the
Old Latin, and although it could be argued that the words are a later assimilation of the
text to 3.2, the unanimity of the Greek evidence, as well as the overwhelming testimony of
the rest of the versional and patristic witnesses, seemed to the Committee to require that
the words be retained in the text.

5.4-5 μακάριοι … ταρακοληθήσονται. (5) μακάριοι … τίν προφ. [B]
If verses 3 and 5 had originally stood together, with their rhetorical antithesis of heaven
and earth, it is unlikely that any scribe would have thrust verses 4 between them. On
the other hand, as early as the second century copyists reversed the order of the two
beatiudes so as to produce such an antithesis and to bring προφ. and τρεῖς into closer
connection.

5.11 [ψευδάρμονα] (C)
It is uncertain whether ψευδάρμονα should be included or omitted from the text. On the
one hand, the absence of the word in the Western tradition (D Ισραήλ syr geo
Tertullian al) can be accounted
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for as the result of scribal accommodation of the passage to the Lukan form of the
beatitude (Lk 6.22). On the other hand, more than one scribe would have been tempted to
insert the word in order to limit the wide generalization in Jesus’ teaching, and to express
specifically what was felt to be implied by the very nature of the case (compare 1 Pe 4.15.
f.). In order to represent the balance of transcriptional probabilities, the Committee
decided to include the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

5.22 αὕτη [B]
Although the reading with αὕτη is widespread from the second century onwards, it is
much more likely that the word was added by copyists in order to soften the rigor of the
precept, than omitted as unnecessary.

5.32 καὶ ἦν ἀπολελυμένη γυνὴ, μοιχήται [B]
The reading of B (ὁ … γυνής) seems to have been substituted for the reading of the
other uncial (ὁ ἦν … γυνῆς). The omission of the words καὶ … μοιχήται (D
a b c h d k Greek and Latin mss acc. to Augustine) may be due to pedantic scribes who regarded
them as superfluous, reasoning that if “everyone who divorces his wife, except on the
ground of unchastity, makes her an adulteress [when she remarries],” then it would go
without saying that “whoever marries a divorced woman [also] commits adultery.”

5.44 (his) ἡμῶν καὶ προσφέροντες ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόμων ἡμῶν [A]
Later witnesses enrich the text by incorporating clauses from the parallel account in Lk
6.27-28. If the clauses were originally present in Matthew’s account of the Sermon on the

would be entirely unaccountable. The divergence of readings among the added clauses likewise speaks against their originality.

5.47 ἔργοι {B}

In later witnesses, followed by the Textus Receptus, the reading τελῶναί appears to have been substituted for ἔργοι in order to bring the statement into closer parallelism with the preceding sentence. The Armenian version conflates the reading with the Lukan form of the saying (Lk 6.32-34).

6.4 ἀποδόσαι

The Textus Receptus, following D E M S W X ∆ Π Σ φ 28 565 1241 al, introduces αὐτός (“himself”) before ἀποδόσαι, and other witnesses (700 1223) add the word after αὐτός. These readings are obvious expansions designed to heighten the impressiveness of the saying; the shorter text, supported by all other known witnesses, is clearly to be preferred.

6.6 αὐτὸ {B}

See the comment on ver. 4.

6.8 ὁ πατήρ ὁ γεών {A}

The expanded reading ὁ θεὸς ὁ πατήρ ὁ γεών (K* B cop* Origen) occurs nowhere else in Matthew, and is a scribal intrusion reflecting a characteristically Pauline collocation of θεὸς and πατήρ (Ro 1.2).

1 Cor 1.3; 2 Cor 1.2; Ga 1.3; Eph 1.2; 6.23; Php 1.2; 2.11; Col 3.17; 1 Th 1.1; 2 Th 1.1, 2; 2.16; 1 Tim 1.2; 2 Tim 1.2; Tit 1.4; Phm 3). The reading ὁ πατήρ ὁ γεών ὁ σοφόνως, found in several later witnesses, is obviously conformed to the text of ver. 9. The occurrence of ὁ γεών instead of ὁ γεων in several witnesses is due to scribal inadver tence, since in later Greek η and ι were pronounced alike.

6.8 πρὸ τοῦ γεών αἰτήσαι αἰέαν

Instead of the customary reading, “Your Father knows what you need before you ask him,” two Western witnesses (D D-it [it it hiat]) have the vigorous and almost colloquial substitute, “… before you open your mouth” (πρὸ τοῦ ἀνοίξαι τὸ στόμα).

6.12 ἀφίκειται

Is the second verb in the fifth petition “as we forgive” (AV) or “as we have forgiven” (RSV)? The latter translates the aorist form of the verb (ἀφίκειται), read by K* B Z 1 22 124* 1365 1582, five manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate, syr* bo* * cop* lo*. On the other hand the present tense (ἀφίκειται or ἀφίκειται) is supported by all other Greek witnesses as well as by most ancient versions, namely the Old Latin, the majority of the Vulgate manuscripts, both the Sahidic and Bohairic forms of the Coptic, the Curetonian Syriac (syr* hiat), the Gothic, the Armenian, the oldest manuscript of the Georgian, and the Ethiopic. Except for the Syriac Peshitta the parallel in Luke (11.4) reads the present tense (ἀφίκειται or ἀφίκειται).

If the original form of the Lord’s Prayer in Aramaic had a verb in the perfect tense used as a present, the aorist tense in Greek would represent a mechanical translation less idiomatic than the present tense. On the basis of the weight of the external evidence, as well as considering the non-parallel reading, a majority of the Committee preferred ἀφίκειται.

6.13 τοῦ θεοῦ. {A}

The ascription at the close of the Lord’s Prayer occurs in several forms. In K L W ∆ Θ Π f* al it is the familiar triple strophic form, whereas the Sahidic and Fayyumic (like the form quoted in the Didache) lack ἴ θεος ὁ γεών καί, the Curetonian Syriac lacks ἴ θεος καί, and the Old Latin k reads simply “for thine is the power for ever and ever.” Some Greek manuscripts expand “for ever” into “for ever and ever,” and most of them add “amen.” Several late manuscripts (157 225 418) append a trinitarian ascription, “for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit for ever. Amen.” The
same expansion occurs also at the close of the Lord’s Prayer in the liturgy that is traditionally ascribed to St. John Chrysostom.

The absence of any ascription in early and important representatives of the Alexandrian (K B), the Western (D and most of the Old Latin), and other (f1) types of text, as well as early patristic commentaries on the Lord’s Prayer (those of Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian), suggests that an ascription, usually in a threefold form, was composed (perhaps on the basis of 1 Chr 29.11-13) in order to adapt the Prayer for liturgical use in the early church. Still later scribes added “of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.”

6.15 ἀνθρώποις [C]

It is problematic whether an original reading τὰ παρατίθεμαι αὐτῶν was omitted by copyists as unnecessary, in view of the presence of the same words in ver. 14 and τὰ παρατίθεμαι ἰδιών later in ver. 15, or whether the words were introduced in the interests of producing a balanced, liturgical style. The Committee judged that, in view of the absence of the words from the parallel statement added in some witnesses after Mk 11.25, they should be regarded as an intrusion into the text of Matthew, especially since they disturb the chiastic structure of verses 14 and 15.

6.18 σοι [A]

See the comment on ver. 4.

6.25 ή τί πίστει [C]

In favor of the shorter reading, lacking ή τί πίστει, is the possibility that the text was assimilated to ver. 31. The variation between καὶ and ή can also be taken as an indication of the secondary nature of the addition. On the other hand, the similarity of the ending of φίλε ἡ πύλη may have occasioned a transcriptional oversight on the part of one or more copyists. To represent the balance of probabilities the Committee retained the words but enclosed them within square brackets.

6.28 αἰδέεσθαις· οὐ καταθλίψων οὐκ ἐνθάσησαι [B]

The reading of K L W Δ Π f1 28 565 700 892 al, giving the verbs in the singular number, appears to be a scribal correction introduced because the plural subject is neuter gender (compare also Lk 12.27).

The original reading of codex Sinaiticus, which was detected when the manuscript was examined under an ultra-violet ray lamp, is οὐ καταθλίψων (= ξεινωσον) οὐκ ἐνθάσησαι οὐκ καταλήψων, “they do not card neither do they spin nor toil.” This reading, though regarded as original by some scholars, doubtless arose as a scribal idiosyncrasy that was almost immediately corrected.22 Codex Koridethi, supported by the Curetonian Syriac, reverses the order of verbs, placing the specific word (“spin”) before the general word (“toil”).

6.33 τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ [C]

The textual data are susceptible of quite diverse evaluations. On the one hand, according to the opinion of a minority of the Committee, the reading that best explains the rise of the other readings is that supported by K (B) it’ al, inasmuch as the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ (οτ τῶν ποιησάνων) after βασιλείαν seems to be an altogether natural supplement, which, if present originally, would not have been deleted. (The transposition of δικαιοσύνην and βασιλείαν in B is perhaps the result of the desire to suggest that righteousness is prerequisite to participation in the kingdom; compare 5.20.)

On the other hand, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the prevailing usage of Matthew, who almost never employs βασιλεία without a modifier (the instances in 8.12, 13.38, 24.7, 14 were regarded as special exceptions), and explained the absence of a modifier in several witnesses as due to accidental scribal omission. In view of these conflicting interpretations, it was thought best to include the words in the text but to enclose them within square brackets.

7.13 πλατεία ἡ πύλη [B]

The words ἡ πύλη are absent (in ver. 13) from K* 1646 iп b c h k and many patristic quotations of the saying, and (in ver. 14) from 113 182* 482 544 iп b h k and many patristic quotations. Although some have argued that the word was originally present in ver. 14, and has been introduced into most witnesses in ver. 13, the Committee regarded such an explanation as inadequate to account for the absence of the word from witnesses in ver. 14. On the whole it seemed best to follow the reading of the overwhelming weight of the external evidence, and to account for the absence of the word in one or both verses as a deliberate excision made by copyists who failed to understand that the intended picture is that of a roadway leading to a gate.

7.14 τί [B]

Besides having wide external support the reading τί also has strong internal probabilities in its favor. There is no reason why the familiar ὅποι, if original, should have been altered to τί, used here to represent the Semitic exclamation πῶς (“how?” compare Ps 139.17).24 On the other hand, copyists who did not perceive the underlying
Semites would have been tempted to assimilate τι to the preceding δι of ver. 13.

7.14 ή πάλιν [A]

See the comment on ver. 13.

7.24 ἄμεωθήσεται [B]

In view of the quality and diversity of the external attestation, the Committee preferred ἄμεωθήσεται. Likewise the passive verb, “shall be compared,” is more likely to have been altered to the active form, “I shall compare him,” than vice versa, especially if the copyist recalled the Lukan form of the saying (“I will show you what he is like,” Lk 6.47).

8.10 ταπέινος [A] τοσοῦτον πίστεν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ εἶρεν [B]

The reading οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ τοσοῦτον πίστεν εἶρεν, besides being clearer and easier than the text, is doubtless an assimilation to the parallel in Lk 7.9. The other two readings probably arose through inadvertence on the part of copyists.

8.18 διχλα [C]

After repeated discussions a majority of the Committee finally decided that, despite its slender attestation, the reading of B and cop* is to be preferred, and that the other readings are to be explained as amplifications made in order to emphasize the size of the crowd around Jesus.

8.21 τῶν μαθητῶν [αὐτοῖς] [C]

Although the support of N B 33 it* cop* for the omission of αὐτοῖς would usually be regarded as exceptionally strong evidence, in this case a majority of the Committee was impressed by the possibility that αὐτοῖς may have been deleted in order to prevent the reader from inferring that the γραμμάτευς of ver. 19 was one of Jesus’ disciples.

8.25 προσελθόντες [B]

Although it could be argued that the shorter reading of N B 892 is the result of Alexandrian pruning of the text of superfluous details (Jesus’ disciples are mentioned in ver. 23), the agreement of Western witnesses (it* vxk vg Jerome) makes it probable that the shorter reading is original and that the several variant readings represent stages of a growing text.

8.25 άσσου [B]

Since άσσου in the New Testament seldom stands without an object, the addition of a supplementary ἐνάσσω would probably arise through inadvertence on the part of copyists.

8.28 οἶδας [C]

The healing of the demoniacs is recounted by all three Synoptic Gospels, and in each account there are three principal variant readings referring to the place at which the miracle occurred: οἶδας, Γερασῆν, and Γέρησην. The evidence of the chief witnesses for the three accounts is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt 8.28</th>
<th>οἶδας</th>
<th>Γερασῆν</th>
<th>Γέρησην</th>
<th>Γερασὴν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N* B C* (Δ) syr h</td>
<td>it vg cop*</td>
<td>syr*</td>
<td>N* C* K L</td>
<td>W j f* h cop*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 5.1</td>
<td>A C K f*</td>
<td>syr h</td>
<td>N* B D it vg</td>
<td>cop*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 8.26</td>
<td>A K W Δ* f*</td>
<td>syr* h</td>
<td>B D it vg</td>
<td>cop*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gerasa was a city of the Decapolis (modern Jerash in Transjordan) located more than thirty miles to the southeast of the Sea of Galilee and, as Origen perceived (Commentary on John, v, 41 (24)), is the least likely of the three places. Another Decapolitan city was Gadara, about five miles southeast of the Sea of Galilee (modern Um Qeis). Although Origen also objected to Gadara (which, he says, was read by a few manuscripts) because it was not lake nor overhanging banks were there, Josephus (Life, IX, 42) refers to Gadara as possessing territory “which lay on the frontiers of Tiberias” (= the Sea of Galilee). That this territory reached to the Sea may be inferred from the fact that ancient coins bearing the name Gadara often portray a ship. Origen prefers Gergesa, not because it occurs in manuscripts – he is silent about this – but on the dubious basis of local tradition (it is the place “from which, it is pointed out, the swine were cast down by the demons”) and of the still more dubious basis of etymology (“the meaning of Gergesa is ‘dwelling of those that have driven away,’” and thus the name “contains a prophetic reference to the conduct
shown the Savior by the citizens of those places, who “besought him to depart out of their territory”).

Of the several variant readings the Committee preferred Γαζαρηνων on the basis of (a) what was taken to be superior external attestation (R* B C2⁴ ( δ) θυσυπγνωσις geo' mss known to Origen a), and (b) the probability that γεγραψεων is a correction, perhaps proposed originally by Origen, and that Γαζαρηνων (which is supported only by versional evidence) is a scribal assimilation to the prevailing text of Mark (5.1) and/or Luke (8.26, 37).

9.4 καλ. ιδων [B]

A majority of the Committee preferred the reading ιδων to ειδως because (a) the latter appears to be a correction of the former (“seeing” another’s thoughts seems to be a less appropriate expression than “knowing” them), and (b) ειδων, which corresponds to the statement in ver. 2, was more likely to be altered to ειδως through recollection of επιγνωσις in the parallel accounts (Mk 2.8 and Lk 5.22) than vice versa. The weight of the combined testimony supporting καλ. greatly predominates over that supporting ειδων.

9.8 ιδοφθησαν [A]

Superficial readers and copyists, failing to see the deep meaning of “were afraid” (i.e., people felt a profound sense of awe and alarm in the presence of One who had the right to forgive sins), substituted for ιδοφθησαν what seemed to be a more appropriate word, ιθαχασαν (“marvelled,” or “were astonished”). The external evidence supporting the more difficult reading is not only early but it includes representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western text-types.

9.14 νηστεουμεν [πολλα] [C]

The reading of R* is obviously a scribal assimilation to the parallel in Lk 5.33, where πνευμα is read without variation. It is more difficult to decide whether πολλα, which is absent from the Markan account (Mk 2.18), was added originally by Matthew or by subsequent copyists. The Committee decided that, on balance, the non-parallel reading should be preferred; yet, in view of the absence of the word from several important witnesses (R* B a), a majority thought it best to enclose πολλα within square brackets.

9.34 include verse [B]

It is difficult to decide whether this verse should be included in the text or placed in the apparatus. According to several commentators (e.g., Allen, Klostermann, Zahn) the words are an intrusion here from 12.24 or from Lk 11.15. On the other hand, the evidence for the shorter text is exclusively Western and relatively meager. Moreover, the passage seems to be needed to prepare the reader for 10.23. A majority of the Committee was impressed by the preponderant weight of the witnesses that include the verse.

10.3 θαδαιος [B]

Although it is easy to explain the origin of the conflate readings “Thaddaeus who was called Lebbæus” and “Lebbæus who was called Thaddæus,” it is more difficult to decide whether θαδαιος or Λεββαιος is the original reading. On the basis, however, of the agreement of early representatives of Alexandrian, Western, and Egyptian witnesses, the Committee judged that θαδαιος is to be preferred. The reading Judas son of James in Lk 6.16 (= Ac 1.13). The name Judas ZeLotes in several Old Latin manuscripts (compare also the same name in the fifth century mosaic in the great Baptistery at Ravenna [Battistero degli Ortodossi]) may be a further assimilation to the previous name in Luke’s list, “Simon who was called the Zealot.”

10.4 Ισκαρίωτης

The textual problems of the name Iscariot are connected with its meaning. According to most scholars, Ισκαρίωτης (Ισκαρίωθ) is derived from the Hebrew נָחַרְו (נעור), “a man from Kerioth.” In support of this derivation is the variant reading ἀπὸ Καριώτου (Jn 6.71 N* θο f13 syr hyp p; 12.4 D; 13.2 δ; 14.22 D). Other scholars, starting with the form Εξαρίωτης (which is the reading of D here; 26.14; Mk 14.10), have proposed a wide variety of possible (and impossible) derivations, including words meaning a leathern girdle or apron, a bandit or assassin, a liar or traitor, and a man of ruddy complexion. The problem is further complicated by variant readings in Jn 6.71 and 13.26, where several good witnesses attach the epithet to the father of Judas.

In the present passage the Committee was impressed by the age and diversity of text-type of the Greek witnesses supporting a form of the name with initial iota, and preferred Ισκαρίωτης, which is supported by the preponderant weight of evidence.
The textual problem is complicated by the possibility of taking τι as meaning either “what?” or “why?” The printed text of verses 7 and 8 may be translated either (a) “What did you go out into the wilderness to behold? A reed shaken by the wind? (8) What then did you go out to see? A man dressed in soft clothing?” or (b) “Why did you go out into the wilderness? To behold a reed shaken by the wind? (8) But why did you go out? To see a man dressed in soft clothing?” (The second interpretation is represented in the Gospel of Thomas, Logion 78.)

In ver. 9 the Committee decided that the reading ἵνα προφητῆται, which involves the previously mentioned ambiguity, is more likely to be original than the reading προφητήσας ἵνα, which, in the context,

has to be taken in only one way, namely, “Why then did you go out? To see a prophet?”

In view of the frequent occurrence elsewhere of the fuller expression ὅτα ἔσεσθαι (Mk 4.9; 23; 7.16; Lk 8.8; 14.35), it was to be expected that copyists would add the infinitive here (and in 13.9 and 23). If the word had been present in the original text, there is no reason why it should have been deleted in such important witnesses as B D 700 al.

After repeated discussion the Committee decided that copyists were more likely to insert ἵνα for the sake of parallelism with the preceding strophe than to delete it as unnecessary. Furthermore, the shorter text is supported by representatives of widely diversified text-types.

The Committee regarded the reading τέκνων (widely supported by B2 C D K L X Δ Θ Π and most minuscules) as having originated in scribal harmonization with the Lukan parallel (7.35). The readings with πάντων represent further assimilation to the passage in Luke.

Palaeographically it is easy to see how the reading preserved in the earliest witnesses, which represent all the pre-Byzantine types of text,
was accidentally modified. After ἑκατοντάοις, the first letter of μη was accidentally dropped, with the consequent alteration of the verb to either ψωθεῖον or ψωθῆς depending on whether ἡ was taken as the article ἡ or the relative ἣ. The strong external attestation for the presence of μη is supported also by intrinsic and transcriptional probability. The unexpected turn of expression, “And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven?” is a sharp and startling interrogation, entirely in the manner of Jesus’ use of vivid language. On the other hand, most copyists were likely to prefer the more commonplace statement, “And you, Capernaum, that are exalted to heaven …”

11.23 καταβήσῃ [C]

Whether the verb should read “you shall go down” or “you shall be brought down” is a difficult question to answer. Considerations of transcriptional probabilities – such as the heightening of the sense and the replacement of the rare verb with the more usual verb – are inconclusive (see also the comments on Lk 10.15). Despite the possibility of assimilation to the text of Is 14.15 (which reads καταβηση), a majority of the Committee preferred this verb, supported as it is by the earliest representative of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text.

11.27 τὴν ὑλὸν … ὅ υλός {A}

It is perhaps not surprising to find witnesses that modify the wording of this verse, chiefly by way of rearrangement. Following οὕδεις ἐπιγινώσκει, several witnesses (including N Diatessaron[19], αὐτίκα) and a variety of church fathers, some with slight modifications read “[no one knows] the Father except the Son, and no one knows the Son except the Father.” The transposition, which may have been occasioned by the presence of περίδος immediately preceding,

results in an awkward sequence with the following, “and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.”

12.4 ἐφαγαν [C]

Although ἐφαγαν is supported by only X B and 481, as the non-parallel reading it is more likely to have been altered to ἐφαγαν than vice versa. The text implies that David, having gone into the sanctuary, brought out the bread of the Presence which he and those who were with him ate.

12.15 [δόχλοι] πολλοί {C}

While it is possible that through homoeoteleuton δόχλοι may have accidentally fallen out, it is slightly more probable that scribes, influenced by the familiar phrase “great crowds” or “great crowds” (e.g. 4.25; 8.1; 13.2; 15.30; 19.2), strengthened the simple πολλοί (a reading that is supported by early Alexandrian and Western witnesses) by adding δόχλοι, either before or after πολλοί.

12.25 εἶδος δὲ {C}

The subject ὁ Ἰησοῦς was a natural addition, introduced by copyists who thought the words necessary for the sake of clarity. Had they been present originally, no one would have deliberately omitted them. The reading εἶδος, whether with or without ὁ Ἰησοῦς, is supported by the overwhelming weight of external evidence. (See also the comment on 9.4.)

12.47 [include verse] {C}

The sentence, which seems to be necessary for the sense of the following verses, apparently was accidentally omitted because of homoeoteleuton (λαλήσει … λαλήσατε). In view, however, of the age and weight of the diverse text-types that omit the words, the Committee enclosed the words within square brackets in order to indicate a certain amount of doubt concerning their right to stand in the text.

13.9 ὡς [B]

See the comment on the same variant reading at 11.15.

13.13 ἢ ὀποῖος ὁ τιμίος καὶ ἀποτίος ὁ πάντων καὶ ὁ πάντων ὁ ἄνθιστος {B}

Several representatives of the Western and of other types of text, influenced by the parallel passages in Mk 4.12 and Lk 8.10, altered the construction to ὡς with the subjunctive mood of the verb. The references to seeing and hearing come from Is 6.9-10, but in reverse order. Several witnesses add from Mark (or Isaiah) καὶ μὴ θυμήσων (“and not perceive”).

13.35 διὰ {C}

On the one hand, the reading “through Isaiah the prophet” is supported by codex Sinaiticus (first hand), several important minuscule manuscripts, one Ethiopic manuscript, and copies of the Gospel known to Eusebius and Jerome. The latter also states that Porphyry cited it as showing the ignorance of Matthew (tam imperitus fuit). Transcriptional probabilities at once favor this as the more difficult reading, for it is easy to suppose that so obvious an error would have been corrected by copyists (compare 27.8; Mk 1.2).
On the other hand, if no prophet were originally named, more than one scribe might have been prompted to insert the name of the best known prophet – something which has, in fact, happened elsewhere more than once (see comments on 1.22; 2.5; 21.4; Ac 7.48). It is also possible that some reader, observing the actual source of the quotation (Ps 78.2), might have inserted “Asaph,” and subsequently – as Jerome suggests – other readers, not having heard of such a prophet (cf. 2 Chr 29.30), changed it to the much more familiar “Isaiah.” No extant document is known to read ∆υσαφ.

In the face of such conflicting transcriptional probabilities, the Committee preferred to follow the preponderance of external evidence.

13.35 ἀπὸ καταβολῆς [κόσμου] [C]

It can be argued that the shorter reading, attested by representative witnesses of the Alexandrian, Western, and Eastern types of text, was original, and that κόσμου was added by scribes from 25.34, where the text is firm.

On the other hand, since the preponderance of the external evidence was taken to support the inclusion of κόσμου, a majority of the Committee was reluctant to drop the word from the text entirely and therefore decided to retain it enclosed within square brackets.

13.43 ὥσπερ [B]

See the comment on the same variant reading at 11.15.

13.55 Ἰωσήφ [B]

The name Ἰωσήφ (or Ἰωσή), which represents the Galilean pronunciation (יוֹסֵף) of the correct Hebrew (יהוֹשֵׁע), appears to be an intrusion from Mk 6.3 into the text of Matthew. The substitution of Ἰωσής is the result of scribal inadvertence, arising from the frequency elsewhere of references to James and John, the sons of Zebedee. The reading Ἰωσής καὶ Ἰωσή is a manifest conflation, farthest removed from the original.

14.1 tetraárhoj;

See the comment on Ac 13.1.

14.3 Φιλίππου [A]

According to Josephus (see his Antiquities, XVII.5:4) the first husband of Herodias was named Herod (being the son of Herod the Great and Mariamne, Simon’s daughter), whereas it was [Herod] Philip the tetrarch (Lk 3.1) who married Salome, the daughter of Herodias. In Mk 6.17 all manuscripts except two name Philip as Herodias’s first husband (κήρυς and ms. 47 omit the name Philip). It appears, therefore, that either Josephus failed to give the full name of Herodias’s first husband (Herod Philip), or Mark confused Herodias’s husband and son-in-law. In Lk 3.19 several witnesses (including A C K W 33 565 syr cpq sapt, bo) insert Φιλίππον before τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ, though it is absent from the better witnesses (including N B D L G D L X Old Latin Vulgate Gothic).

It appears, therefore, that in 14.3 Matthew followed the original text of Mark and read Φιλίππου, whereas several Western witnesses were assimilated to the shorter text of Lk 3.19 and thus brought Matthew’s account into harmony with that of Josephus.

14.9 λυτρήσεις ὁ βασιλεὺς διὰ [B]

The reading supported by the chief representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text involves a certain ambiguity (i.e. does the phrase with διὰ qualify λυτρήσεις or εὐκακεὐσεων?). In order to resolve the ambiguity copyists inserted ή, thus altering the hypotactic construction (“And being grieved, the king, because of his oaths and because of those who sat with him, commanded [it] to be given”) to the more colloquial paratactic construction (“And the king was grieved; but because of his oaths and because of those who sat with him, he commanded …”).

14.12 αὐτῷ[ν]

On the one hand, the predominant external evidence attests αὐτῷ (or its phonetic near-equivalent, αὐτῷ), with only NT B 0106 it* syr* c eth attesting αὐτῶν. On the other hand, however, it is much more likely that copyists would conform the personal pronoun to the impersonal for the sake of grammatical concord with τιτόμα (or σαίμα), than vice versa. In order to represent the opposition between external evidence and transcriptional probability, it was decided to print αὐτῷ[ν].

14.24 σταδίων πολλῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἀπείχεν (C)

The question is whether Matthew was here assimilated by copyists to John (σταδίως εἰσελθον πέντε ἡμέρας) or to Mark (ὅτι το πλατύν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς θείρασις Mk 6.47). Since the process of harmonization more often took place among the Synoptic Gospels than between the Fourth Gospel and one of the Synoptics, and since the
Johannine parallel is very slight (involving among Greek witnesses only the word τον λογον,22 it appears that the reading of B f11 al best accounts for the rise of the others.

14.29 καὶ ἔδρασεν [B]

The reading καὶ ἔδρασεν (“Peter walked upon the water and came to Jesus”) seemed to say too much, and therefore was altered to εὐερείαν (“Peter walked upon the water to come to Jesus”). Although the reading of Ν* has the appearance of being a conflation, it may be merely an exegetical expansion introduced by the scribe. The reading of eth29 is a translational error.

14.30 ἄνεμον [ιχνύρων] [C]

From the standpoint of external evidence, although the combination of Ν B* 073 33 cop αὐτος is impressive attestation, a majority of the Committee considered it too exclusively Egyptian to be followed here, where the shorter text may have arisen by accidental omission in the ancestor of one text-type. From the standpoint of internal considerations, although it can be argued that ιχνύρων was added by scribes in order to heighten the dramatic effect (as φόρος was added in W), a majority was inclined to regard its presence as intrinsically required in order to explain Peter’s increasing fear. In order to represent these conflicting considerations the Committee decided to retain ιχνύρων in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

15.4 εἶπεν [B]

The presence of τον ἵτον τοῦ θεοῦ in ver. 3 probably prompted copyists to change the statement, “For God said …” to “For God commanded, saying …”, whereas, if the reading εἰς τοὺς λόγους had been original, it is difficult to account for the substitution of the more colorless εἶπεν (in Mk 7.10, where the text is firm, the subject of εἶπεν is Μωσῆς).

15.6 τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ [C]

On the one hand, it can be argued that the addition of the phrase “or his mother” doubtless seemed necessary to scribes who observed the references to both father and mother in the preceding verses. On the other hand, the absence of δι’ [or καὶ] τὸν μητέρα αὐτοῦ may be accounted for either as accidental omission (owing to similarity with the preceding τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ) or as deliberate stylistic suppression of one element in a frequently repeated phrase. In view of the balance of such transcriptional considerations, the Committee made its decision on the basis of what was judged to be superior external attestation.

It is clear that τὸν ἐντολήν was introduced to suit ver. 3, but whether it supplanted τὸν λόγον or τὸν νόμον is more difficult to decide. Although it is tempting to regard εὐερείαν as original and λόγον as the result of harmonization to Mk 7.13, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the weight of the external evidence supporting λόγον. Furthermore, since a specific commandment is cited, there would have been a tendency to replace λόγον with either ἐντολήν or νόμον.

15.14 τυφλοὶ εἶσων ὀδηγοί [τυφλοὶ] [C]

Although from the standpoint of external evidence the reading τυφλοὶ εἶσων ὀδηγοί, supported by B and D, may seem to be preferable,
The best external evidence supports Μαγδαλήν, yet not only the site, but even the existence of such a place-name is uncertain. The parallel passage in Mk 8.10 has “the districts of Dalmanatha” (τὰ μέρη Δαλμανοθῆκην), an equally unknown site and name. The well-known Semitic word for tower, מגדלה, in Greek Μαγδαλήν, is read in many manuscripts in place of Μαγδαλήν or Dalmanouqa. (See also the comment on Mk 8.10.)

In view of the balance of these considerations it was thought best to retain the passage enclosed within square brackets.

In view of the use of the expression “the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees” in verses 6 and 11, it was perhaps natural that a few witnesses should repeat one or both of the words “Pharisees” “Sadducees” after this in ver. 12. Although the reading of D θ f13 175 al syr* cp cot* bemo arm Origen and, according to Jerome, most manuscripts known to him (though he included the passage in the Vulgate). The question is how one ought to interpret this evidence. Most scholars regard the passage as a later insertion from a source similar to Lk 12.54-56, or from the Lukan passage itself, with an adjustment concerning the particular signs of the weather. On the other hand, it can be argued (as Scrivener and Lagrange do) that the words were omitted by copyists in climates (e.g. Egypt) where red sky in the morning does not announce rain.

Both the variety of positions of μὲ in the witnesses that include it and the fact that in the parallel passages the word is firm indicate that it was originally absent from Matthew’s account.

To the shorter reading, which is supported by widely diversified ancient witnesses (R* B L Δ θ f1 28 565 700 1010 1424 it syr* cp cot* Origen al), inattentive scribes added ἤτοι either before ὁ Χριστός (R* C W lat syr* al) or after ὁ Χριστός (D* θ* it*). But since others knew and acknowledged Jesus’ personal name, it would have been useless to deny or affirm that he was Jesus; the point under discussion was whether he was the Messiah (ὁ Χριστός).

Instead of τὸ φῶς, which is strongly supported by witnesses representing all types of text, several Western witnesses, recollecting what is said in 28.3, make the comparison in terms of the clothing being “white as snow” (καλότων).

Instead of τοῖς ποιηματίσταις (the singular number poïēma accords with the self-assured forwardness of the apostle), the scribes of most witnesses assimilated the verb to the plural number (ποιήματα), a reading found in the parallel accounts at Mk 9.5 and Lk 9.33.

It is more likely that the evangelist used ἀληθισταί, a rare word that occurs nowhere else in the New Testament (though ἀληθισταί is used four times in Matthew), and that, in view of ἐπισταί in ver. 17, copyists substituted the more frequently used word ἐπισταί.
(which occurs eleven times in the New Testament), than that the reverse process took place.

17.21 omit verse [A]

Since there is no satisfactory reason why the passage, if originally present in Matthew, should have been omitted in a wide variety of witnesses, and since copyists frequently inserted material derived from another Gospel, it appears that most manuscripts have been assimilated to the parallel in Mk 9.29.

17.22 συστρέφειν [B]

It is probable that the reading συστρέφειν (taken to mean "were gathering together") would strike copyists as strange, and therefore would be changed into what seemed more appropriate (ἀναστρέφειν, "were staying"). The verb συστρέψεω, which occurs only twice in the New Testament, apparently means here "while they were crowding (around Jesus)."

17.26 εἰπόντος ἐκ {B}

The reading εἰπόντος ἐκ, lacking a substantive, was deemed to be the reading that best explains the origin of the other readings.

After "Ἀρεταὶ… οίκος, which may be taken as a question, a noteworthy expansion appears in minuscule manuscript 713, dating from the twelfth century: ἔφη Σίμων. Νας, λέγει οἱ ἱερεῖς, Δῶς οἶνον καὶ οἶ, ὡς ἀλλήλων αὐτῶν ("Simon said 'Yes.' Jesus says, 'Then you also give, as being an alien to them')."
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also give, as being an alien to them”). The same expansion occurs also in the Arabic form of the Diatessaron (25:6). The nucleus of this occurs in Ephraem’s Commentary on Tatian’s Diatessaron, where the Syriac text (14:17) reads, “Give to them therefore as an alien,” and the Armenian reads, “Go; you also give as one of the aliens.”

18.14 ἔμων [C]

Between the readings "your Father" and "my Father" it is difficult to decide.26 The latter, though strongly attested, probably reflects the influence of τοῦ πατρὸς μου in ver. 10 (compare also ver. 35). The reading ἔμων (D* and a few other witnesses) is probably itacism for ἔμων.

18.15 ἀμαρτήσῃ [εἰς οὗ] [C]

It is possible that the words εἰς οὗ are an early interpolation into the original text, perhaps derived by copyists from the use of εἰς ἱμέ in ver. 21. On the other hand, it is also possible to regard their omission as either deliberate (in order to render the passage applicable to sin in general) or accidental (for in later Greek the pronunciation of η, θ, and ει was similar). In order to reflect this balance of possibilities, the Committee decided to retain the words enclosed within square brackets.
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18.19 πάλιν [ἄμων] λέγω [C]

It is difficult to decide whether the presence of ἄμων λέγω in the preceding sentence may have prompted scribes to add ἄμων before λέγω at the beginning of this sentence, or whether they may have deleted the word as redundant. Faced with this quandary, the Committee decided to include the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

18.26 λέγων [A]

Although κῑρευ may have been omitted in order to conform the passage to ver. 29, it is more likely that the word was inserted in order to adapt the expression to a spiritual interpretation. The combination of B D Θ 700 vg syr c, s, pal cop sa, bo geo al is a significant constellation of witnesses supporting the shorter reading.

18.29 αὐτῶν

Although it is possible that the phrase εἰς τοὺς πόλεις αὐτῶν (C F H K M S U V G D P Q 1 71 124 700 892 1396 1424 1573 1579 1582, most of the Old Latin, vg syrא arm geo al) is a significant expansion introduced by scribes in order to explain τοιαύτην, the Committee preferred the shorter reading supported by the chief representatives of witnesses following the Textus Receptus. The eye of the scribe passing from αὐτῶν to αὐτῶν, the Committee preferred the shorter text (N B C* D G L Θ 1 71 124 700 892 1396 1424 1573 1579 1582, most of the Old Latin, vg syrא arm geo al) and regarded the longer reading as a natural expansion introduced by scribes in order to explain τοιαύτην.

18.35 ἔμων

The words τὰ παραπόμομενα αὐτῶν, which the Textus Receptus, following the later witnesses, adds at the close of the sentence, are a natural expansion, derived perhaps from 6.14. The Committee preferred the shorter reading supported by the chief representatives of witnesses following the Textus Receptus.
of the Alexandrian, Western, and other types of text (N B D L Θ 1 22* 700 892 1582 it* b. c. d. e. f. l. q. r. vg syr*∗ cop* ho geo eth Speculum).

19.4 κτίσεως {B}

It is easier to suppose that copyists changed the word κτίσεως (which is supported by several excellent witnesses) to ποιήσεως, thus harmonizing it with the Septuagint text of Gn 1.27 (which is quoted in the immediate context), than to suppose that ποιήσεως was altered to suit the Hebrew word used in Gn 1.27 (N B D L Θ 1 22* 700 892 1582 it* b. c. d. e. f. l. q. r. vg syr*∗ cop* ho geo eth Speculum). Although the combination of N B D L Θ 1 22* 700 892 1582 (which is quoted in the immediate context), than to suppose that ποιήσεως was altered to suit the Hebrew word used in Gn 1.27 (N B D L Θ 1 22* 700 892 1582 it* b. c. d. e. f. l. q. r. vg syr*∗ cop* ho geo eth Speculum).

19.7 ἀπολίσσει {κατήφι} {C}

It is difficult to decide whether κατήφι is an addition (as the ornament undoubtedly is) to a concisely stated expression, or whether the word was deleted in order to assimilate the passage to the near-parallel in Mk 10.4. Since the external evidence is likewise so nearly balanced, the Committee decided to retain the word enclosed within square brackets.

19.9 μη ἐπὶ παρονίῳ καὶ γραμμή ἄλλην μουχάται {B}

The “excepting clause” in the Matthean account of Jesus’ teaching on divorce occurs in two forms: παρονίῳ λόγῳ παρονίας (“except on the ground of unchastity”) and μη ἐπὶ παρονίῳ (“except for unchastity”). It is probable that the witnesses (including B D f1 f11 33) that have the former reading have been assimilated to 5.32, where the text is firm. Likewise the phrase παρονίῳ μουχάται (“makes her commit adultery” [i.e. when she remarries]) has come into several witnesses (including B C* f*) from 5.32, where it is firm. The short reading of 1574, καὶ γραμμή ἄλλην, has been conformed to the prevailing text of Mk 10.11.

19.10 μαθηταὶ {αὐτοῦ} {C}

Although the combination of N B D L Θ 1 22* 700 892 1582 it* b. c. d. e. f. l. q. r. vg syr*∗ cop* ho geo eth Speculum in support of the shorter reading is noteworthy, the Committee was impressed by the possibility that the presence of αὐτοῦ before μαθηταὶ prompted some copyists to delete αὐτοῦ. It was thought best, therefore, to retain the word enclosed within square brackets.

19.11 τῶν λόγων [τοῦτον] {C}

On the one hand, since the general tendency of scribes is to make the text more explicit, e.g. by adding the demonstrative pronoun, the shorter reading, supported by B f1 and several early versions, has a certain presumption in its favor. On the other hand, however, the ambiguity of the reference of τοῦτον in the context – does it refer to the deduction made by the disciples (ver. 11), or to the preceding exposition of Jesus (verses 4-9)? – may have prompted some scribes to delete the word. In order to reflect the balance of possibilities, the Committee decided to retain the word enclosed within square brackets. The reading of Θ is obviously secondary.

19.16 διδασκαλεῖ {A}

The word ἀγαμήθη, which is absent from early and good representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western texts, was manifestly brought in by copyists from the parallel accounts in Mark (10.17) and Luke (18.18). (See also the comment on the following variant reading.)

19.17 τί με ἡμνύει περὶ τοῦ ἀγαμήθου; εἰς ἓστιν ὁ ἀγαμήθος {A}

Many of the witnesses (but not Θ 700 al) that interpolate ἀγαμήθη in ver. 16 also modify ver. 17 by substituting for Matthew’s distinctive account the words from the parallel accounts, τί με λέγεις ἀγαμήθος; αὐτίκα ἀγαμήθος εἰ μὴ εἶς ὁ θεός (“Why do you call me good? No one is good but God alone.” Mk 10.18; Lk 18.19). If the latter reading were original in Matthew, it is hard to imagine why copyists would have altered it to a more obscure one, whereas scribal assimilation to Synoptic parallels occurs frequently.

19.20 ἐφώλιζε {A}

Despite Matthew’s identification of the speaker as ἰησοῦς (verses 20 and 22), the scribes of many witnesses assimilated the account to the Synoptic parallels by adding ἠκ ἰησοῦς μου (Mk 10.20) or ἠ ἰησοῦς (Lk 18.21).
Instead of καμήλων, a few of the later Greek manuscripts read καμίλων, meaning “a rope, ship’s cable.” The two Greek words had come to be pronounced alike.

The presence of γυναῖκα in many witnesses seems to be the result of scribal assimilation to the Lukan parallel (Lk 18.29), and the replacement of πατέρα ἡ μητέρα by γυναῖκα in other witnesses may either reflect influence from the same parallel or be a substitution arising independently. The absence of πατέρα ἡ in D and several Old Latin witnesses appears to be the result of homoeoteleuton.

The several readings are reflected in the parallel passages: the text of Mark (10.30) reads ἑκατονταπλασίων (“a hundredfold”); most of the manuscripts of Luke (18.30) read πολλαπλασίων (“manifold”); and the Western text of Luke (D Old Latin syr hmg) reads ἑπταπλασίων (“sevenfold”). What was judged to be predominant external support, as well as considerations involving the dependence of Matthew upon Mark, led the Committee to prefer ἑκατονταπλασίων.

In the interest of heightening the emphasis, scribes moved καὶ αὐτοῖς to follow ἔλαθον. Although to, might have been omitted by scribes as superfluous, yet because of the weight of the combination of B and D, the Committee decided to retain the word enclosed within square brackets.

Because the word τοῦ τοιὸν ἐμὸν, which is absent from early and good witnesses, occurs at various places in various witnesses, it would be tempting to regard it as a scribal enhancement of the text. Nevertheless, since the word does not appear in the parallel account in Mark, the Committee decided to retain it in Matthew, but to enclose it within square brackets in order to indicate doubt as to its proper position in the text.

The clause ἦ τὸ βάπτισμα … ἐπιτεθήκει, which is absent from important early witnesses representing several types of text (N D L Z Θ f13 al), was added by scribes in order to assimilate the passage to the parallel in Mk 10.38 f.

Because the word τοῦτο, which is absent from early and good witnesses, occurs at various places in various witnesses, it would be tempting to regard it as a scribal enhancement of the text. Nevertheless, since the word does not appear in the parallel account in Mark, the Committee decided to retain it in Matthew, but to enclose it within square brackets in order to indicate doubt as to its proper position in the text.

The majority of the manuscripts have filled out the sentence by adding from the parallel in Mk 10.39 the clause καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐγὼ βαπτίζωμαι ἐπιτεθήκει. The shorter text is decisively supported by the same witnesses that read the shorter text in ver. 22.

Although the combination of B and D in support of ἐστὶν is not insignificant, the Committee judged that the preponderant weight of the external evidence supports the future tense. The same variation occurs also in the parallel at Mk 10.43.
After all, several Western witnesses (D and, with minor variations, βιβλίακα) add ἰδιώτες καὶ ἀρχιπρεσbyterοι τῶν ἅγιων ἐκκλησίων, ὃς καὶ παρακλήθησθαι μὴ ἀνακλίνεται εἰς τοὺς ἐξόρους τῶν ἁγίων ἑνώσεως καὶ προκαλήθησεν ὃ δεικνύεται εἰς τὴν ἀνάγκην τῶν ἂν ἄρει σοι, ἦς κατό τι χρήση, καὶ καταπαθήσῃ, ἐκὼν μὴ ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἱστόν τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐπέξει τὸν ψυχάς τούτων ἐκεῖνος ὑποσκέψεως. Ζύγων ἐν τῷ ἵππῳ, καὶ ἐστὶ τούτῳ ἡ ἁμαρτίαν (But seek to increase from that which is small, and from the greater to become less. When you enter into a house and are invited to dine, do not recline in the prominent places, lest perchance one more honorable than you come in, and the host come and say to you, 'Go farther down'; and you will be put to shame. But if you recline in the lower place and one inferior to you comes in, the host will say to you, 'Go farther up'; and this will be advantageous to you").

This interpolation is a piece of floating tradition, an expanded but inferior version of 14.8-10.

Influenced by the recollection of similar passages elsewhere, copyists have introduced many variations. Since the parallels in Mk 10.47 and Lk 18.38 both contain ἵππος, it is probable that the Matthean readings involving this word are secondary. Although it can be argued that the shortest reading (ἐλέγχων Ἡμᾶς, καὶ Δαβίδ) is original and all the other readings are scribal expansions, it is more likely that copyists, influenced by Matthew’s earlier account of the healing of the blind men, produced by assimilation an exact parallel to 9.27. Furthermore, it appears that readings with ὁ ἱστόν reflect a more elegant Greek style than the more Semitic usage of the nominative (cf. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 147 (3)). As the least unsatisfactory resolution of all the diverse problems a majority of the Committee decided to adopt the reading of τὸν ἱστόν C W Δ 1 28 al. but, in view of the variation in position of κύριε, to enclose this word within square brackets.

The sequence κύριε, ἐλέγχων Ἡμᾶς is well attested by B D L Z Θ f13 543 892 1010 1293 ιτ ιτ βhg, k, n1, v1 vg syr sqp alm arm geo, whereas the sequence ἐλέγχων Ἡμᾶς, κύριε is attested by B D L Z Θ f13 C W X Π Δ Π Σ Φ τὸν ἱστόν most minuscules ιτβhg alm syr alm geo. (κύριε is omitted by 118 209 700 1675 vg sqp). Despite the somewhat poorer quality of the external evidence supporting the second sequence, this reading was preferred by a majority of the Committee because it is the non-liturgical order of words and so would have been likely to be altered in transcription to the more familiar sequence.
Because (b) is the most difficult of the three forms of text, several scholars (Lachmann, Merx, Wellhausen, Hirsch) have thought that it must be preferred as readily accounting for the rise of the other two as improvements of it. But (b) is not only difficult, it is nonsensical – the son who said “Yes” but does nothing obeys his father’s will! Jerome, who knew of manuscripts in his day that read the nonsensical answer, suggested that through perversity the Jews intentionally gave an absurd reply in order to spoil the point of the parable. But this explanation requires the further supposition that the Jews not only recognized that the parable was directed against themselves but chose to make a nonsensical reply rather than merely remain silent. Because such explanations attribute to the Jews, or to Matthew, farfetched psychological or overly-subtle literary motives, the Committee judged that the origin of reading (b) is due to copyists who either committed a transcriptional blunder or who were motivated by anti-Pharisaic bias (i.e., since Jesus had characterized the Pharisees as those that say but do not practice (cf. Mt 23.3), they must be represented as approving the son who said “I go,” but did not go).

As between forms (a) and (c) the former is more probably the original. Not only are the witnesses that support (a) slightly better than those that read (c), but there would be a natural tendency to transpose the order of (a) to that of (c) because:

(1) it could be argued that if the first son obeyed, there was no reason to summon the second; and

(2) it was natural to identify the disobedient son with either the Jews in general or with the chief priests and elders (ver. 23) and the obedient son with either the Gentiles or the tax collectors and the prostitutes (ver. 31) – and in accord with either line of interpretation, the obedient son should come last in chronological sequence. It may also be remarked that the inferiority of form (c) is shown by the wide diversity of readings at the close of the parable.22

21.32 οὐδὲ

The confusion that marks the transmission of 21.29-31 seems to have affected also the text of the final clause of this verse. Instead of οὐδὲ (which is read by B O Σ Φ 0138 i f f1 22 33 157 543 565 700 892 1579 1582 most of the Old Latin vg cop h etc) other witnesses (including N C L W X Π 28 118 209 the Byzantine text and cop*) read οά. D and syr* omit the negative; it c. reads its position (quod non credidistis). D omits the entire clause (from μείζων ὅτι to the end of the verse), perhaps by homoeoteleuton.

The omission of the negative is probably accidental, for the resulting sense (“but you, when you saw it, at last repented”) seems to be an extremely inappropriate conclusion of Jesus’ saying; likewise the transfer of the negative to the final verb is no less infelicitous (“… repented later because you did not believe on him”). The reading οὐδὲ, supported by early and widely diversified witnesses, seems to have been altered to οά by copyists who did not see the force of the argument (“and you, seeing this, did not even feel remorse afterwards so as to believe him”).

21.39 αἰτίων ἐξήλθαν ξέω τοῦ ἐμπελάχος καὶ ἐπέκτειναν {A}

The Western text (D Θ it b c d e 02, h r1 geo Irenaeus Lucifer Juvencus) has been assimilated to the sequence in Mark, where the son is killed and then cast out of the vineyard (Mt 12.8). Matthew and Luke (20.15), reflecting that Jesus had been crucified outside the city (Jn 19.17, 20; He 13.12 f.), reverse the order and put the casting out before the killing.

21.44 [Καὶ … αὐτῶν.] {C}

Many modern scholars regard the verse as an early interpolation (from Lk 20.18) into most manuscripts of Matthew. On the other hand, however, the words are not the same, and a more appropriate place for its insertion would have been after ver. 42. Its omission can perhaps be accounted for when the eye of the copyist passed from αὐτός (ver. 43) to αἰτίων. While considering the verse to be an accretion to the text, yet because of the antiquity of the reading and its importance in the textual tradition, the Committee decided to retain it in the text, enclosed within square brackets.

22.10 ὁ γάμος {B}

The Committee considered the reading ὁ γάμος (here meaning “the wedding hall”) to be an Alexandrian correction introduced in the place of ὁ γάμος, which may have seemed to be somewhat inappropriate with the verb “filled.”

22.23 ἡ λεγόντες {B}

Although the definite article after ἡ λεγόντες could have dropped out because of confusion with the termination of the noun, the Committee considered it to be much more likely that copyists added the article by assimilation to the parallel passages (Mk 12.18; Lk 20.27). Without the article the participle means that the Sadducees advanced their negative opinion at the beginning of their conversation with Jesus; with the article the passage states the Sadducean creed (“Sadducees, who say that…”). Since this would be
the only place where Matthew has provided an explanation of this sort concerning Jewish affairs, the reading without the article is to be preferred.

While the evidence for ἀγγελοί is limited in extent, it nevertheless includes the leading representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text. The addition of (τοῦ) θεοῦ is a natural expansion, which, if present in the text originally, would not have been likely to be omitted.

In the interest of greater precision, the later form of the text inserted a second θεός (“For God is not a God of dead people, but of living”). In order to reflect the difficulty of deciding whether ὃ was omitted by assimilation to the parallel in Mk 12.27, or whether it was added under the influence of the four instances of ὃ θεός immediately preceding, the Committee retained ὃ within square brackets.

Despite what seems to be an overwhelming preponderance of evidence supporting the word ἀναμμός, its absence from family 1 as well as from widely scattered versional and patristic witnesses takes on additional significance when it is observed that, apart from this

passage, Matthew nowhere else uses the word. It is not unlikely, therefore, that copyists have introduced the word here from the parallel passage in Lk 10.25. At the same time, in view of the wide-spread testimony supporting its presence in the text, the Committee was reluctant to omit the word altogether, preferring to retain it enclosed within square brackets.

Impressed by the weight of the external evidence supporting the longer text, a majority of the Committee explained the absence of καὶ διεθάλασσα in L Ἰ 892 as perhaps due to stylistic refinement or to accidental oversight (the eye of the copyist passing from one καὶ to the other). Nevertheless, because it is possible that the words may be an interpolation from Lk 11.46, it was decided to enclose them within square brackets.

[The words καὶ διεθάλασσα should not stand in the text, for (a) if they were present originally, no good reason can account for their absence from such a wide variety of witnesses, and (b) the tendency of copyists to enhance the solemnity of Jesus’ words accounts for the prefixing of μεγάλα before βαρέια in K, and for the interpolation after βαρέια of the synonymous expression καὶ διεθάλασσα from Lk 11.46. B.M.M.]

The gaminated form ἔδειβε, ἔδειβε (D E F G H K M S U V W Y Ι Ω αl) is more solemn and formal, and is probably the result of heightening by copyists. The Committee preferred to follow the shorter reading, which is strongly supported by B L Δ Θ Σ 0107 0138 f1 v g sy p co π hsn or arm eth geo\-\textsuperscript{a}, arab pers.

Instead of the first ιμύν in this verse, several Western witnesses (D Δ Θ vg al) replace it with ιμύν, and a few late Greek manuscripts omit it as superfluous.
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That ver. 14 is an interpolation derived from the parallel in Mk 12.40 or Lk 20.47 is clear (a) from its absence in the earliest and best authorities of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text, and (b) from the fact that the witnesses that include the passage have it in different places, either after ver. 13 (so the Textus Receptus) or before ver. 13.

Apparently the words ὑμοί καὶ were inserted by copyists from ver. 17, inasmuch as no satisfactory reason can be found to account for their deletion if they had been original.

The Committee regarded the second aorist φέραται (N B L 892) as an Alexandrian refinement of the present tense φέρει. The Committee regarded the second aorist φέραται (N B L 892) as an Alexandrian refinement of the present tense φέρει. Since ἀθανατίας, which is strongly supported by early and good witnesses, seemed to be inappropriate with ἀθανάτας (yet, as Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker point out, “intemperance” corresponds to the “cup”), various scribes replaced it with one or another gloss, ἀθανάτας, ἀκαθαρσίας, or πονηρίας.

The words καὶ διεθάλασσα should not stand in the text, for (a) if they were present originally, no good reason can account for their absence from such a wide variety of witnesses, and (b) the tendency of copyists to enhance the solemnity of Jesus’ words

accounts for the prefixing of μεγάλα before βαρέια in K, and for the interpolation after βαρέια of the synonymous expression καὶ διεθάλασσα from Lk 11.46. B.M.M.]

The gaminated form ἔδειβε, ἔδειβε (D E F G H K M S U V W Y Ι Ω αl) is more solemn and formal, and is probably the result of heightening by copyists. The Committee preferred to follow the shorter reading, which is strongly supported by B L Δ Θ Σ 0107 0138 f1 v g sy p co π hsn or arm eth geo\-\textsuperscript{a}, arab pers.

Instead of the first ιμύν in this verse, several Western witnesses (D Δ Θ vg al) replace it with ιμύν, and a few late Greek manuscripts omit it as superfluous.
The weight of the external evidence appears to support the longer text. At the same time the presence of αὐτοῦ (instead of αὐτῶν) in B* f¹ 28 al seems to be a hint that the archetype lacked καὶ τῆς παροιμίας. On balance, there is a slight probability that the words were inserted by copyists from ver. 25.

23.38 ἵματος ἔρημος {B}

On the one hand, it can be argued that copyists added ἔρημος in order to conform the quotation to the text of Ἰρ 22.5. On the other hand, however, in view of what was taken to be the preponderant weight of external evidence a majority of the Committee preferred to include ἔρημος, explaining its absence in some witnesses as the result of deletion by copyists who thought the word superfluous after ἀφίλετοι.

24.6 γενέσθαι {B}

The shortest reading is supported by a wide variety of early witnesses. It is probable that copyists expanded the saying by adding such natural expressions as "all things must take place," or "these things must take place," or "all these things must take place." If any of these had been the original reading, there is no satisfactory reason that would account for its deletion.

24.7 λιμοὶ καὶ σεισμοὶ {B}

Although the words καὶ λιμοὶ may have been accidentally omitted because of the similarity of ending, it is more likely that they were added at various places by scribes who recollected Ἰκ 21.11.

24.31 σάλπιγγος {B}

Although it is possible that copyists may have omitted φωνῆς as unnecessary, it is much more probable that they would have made the expression more explicit by adding φωνῆς or καὶ φωνῆς (being influenced perhaps by the account of the theophany in Ἐκ 19.16). It should be observed that, though the expression φωνῆς μετέλαβε occurs many times in the New Testament, ἀσάλπιγγος μετέλαβε occurs only here.

24.36 αὐθὲν ὁ νῦς {B}

The words "neither the Son" are lacking in the majority of the witnesses of Matthew, including the later Byzantine text. On the other hand, the best representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text contain the phrase. The omission of the words because of the doctrinal difficulty they present is more probable than their addition by assimilation to Mk 13.32. Furthermore, the presence of μόνος and the cast of the sentence as a whole (οἶδα...οἶδα... belong together as a parenthesis, for εἴ μὴ ὁ πατὴρ μόνος goes with οἴδας οἶδα) suggest the originality of the phrase.

24.38 ἱερεῖς {C}

While it is possible that ἱερεῖς was accidentally omitted in some witnesses because of the similarity in the terminations of words, yet because of the weight of the witnesses that support its inclusion, the Committee concluded that the word should be retained, but enclosed within square brackets.

24.42 ἡμέρα {B}

Instead of ἡμέρα, which is strongly supported by Ν B D W Δ ΢ f¹ 13 al, the Textus Receptus, following E F G H L al, reads ζῷον, taken from verse 24 as a more exact term.

25.1 τοῦ νυμφήμου {B}

It can be argued that the words καὶ τῆς νυμφής ("and the bride"), which are supported by a rather strong combination of witnesses, were omitted because they were felt to be incompatible with the widely held view that Christ, the bridegroom, would come to fetch his bride, the church. But it is doubtful whether copyists would have been so sensitive to the logic of the allegory. Furthermore, those who omitted the words envisaged the wedding as taking place in the home of the fiancée; those who added the words envisaged the bringing of the bride by the bridegroom to his home (or the home of his parents) where the wedding takes place. Since the latter custom was more common in the ancient world, it is probable that the words are an interpolation by copyists who did not notice that the mention of the bride would disturb the allegorical interpretation of the parable. Only the bridegroom is mentioned in what follows.

25.13 ἀρανός {A}

The clause εἴνα ἵππος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἤχος (C Γ Π Φ f¹ 13 28 157 543 700 1241 syr*) is a pendent addition made by well-meaning copyists who recollected the similar clause in 24.44. In reality, the warning is more energetic without it, and is amply
perspicuous to one who has read what precedes, from 24.36 onward. The Committee preferred the shorter text, which is decisively supported by א B C* D L W X Y* Δ Θ Π* Σ Φ 047 f¹ 33 356 892 1219 1424* 1604 2145* it vg syr* p h. paidi cop* bo arm eth.

25.15-16 ἀπεδήμησαν, εἶπόν μοι πορευθήκεις {B}

Although the external evidence supporting the reading adopted for the text is limited in extent, it is good in quality. More important, this reading best explains the origin of the other readings, which arose when copyists sought to eliminate the asyndeton as well as the ambiguity of where εἶπόν μοι belongs, by inserting δὲ before or after πορευθήκεις.

The punctuation adopted for the text is in accord with the usage elsewhere in Matthew (where εἶπόν μοι or εἶπεν belongs to what follows) and with the sense of the parable (there is no point in the master’s departing immediately; there is much point in the servant’s immediately setting to work).

26.14 Ῥωμαῖοι

See the comment on 10.4.

26.20 μετὰ τῶν δάκκων {C}

As is the case in 20.17, the reading μεθησαί after οἱ δάκκων is doubtful. In the present verse the weight of the external evidence seems to favor the shorter reading.

26.27 παιδίων {B}

The tendency of copyists would probably have been to add rather than to delete the definite article.

26.28 διαθήκης {B}

The word καινής has apparently come from the parallel passage in Luke (22.20); if it had been present originally, there is no good reason why anyone would have deleted it.

26.39 At the close of ver. 39 several secondary witnesses (C²mg f¹ 124 230 348 543 713 788 826 828 983) add from Lk 22.43-44 the words ὡςθη ἐκ αὐτοῦ ἄγγελος ἀπ’ (ἀπὸ τοῦ 543 826 983) ἀρκανοῦ εὐαγγέλιον αὐτῶν καὶ γειμόμενος ἐν ἐγκυμονίᾳ ἐκείνητος προσημείωσεν ἐν τῷ θύμῳ (om. 124) ὃ ὅρος αὐτῶν ὡσεὶ θάνατοι αἵματος καταθέσαντες ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν.

26.71 οὗτος {B}

The reading καὶ οὗτος appears to have come into the text from the Lukan parallel (Lk 22.59). The concurrence of the best representatives of the Alexandrian, the Western, and the early Syriac texts in support of the shorter reading constitutes strong external support.

27.2 Πιλάτω {B}

If ἔστω had been present originally, there is no good reason why it should have been deleted. On the other hand, its insertion by copyists is natural at the first passage where Pilate’s name occurs in the Gospels. The two names also appear in Lk 3.1; Ac 4.27; 1 Tm 6.13. In the post-apostolic church the double name was common (cf. Ignatius, Trall. 9, Magn. 11, Smyr. 1, and many passages in Justin Martyr). In Josephus’s Antiq. XVIII.ii, Πιλάτω occurs frequently, with Πιλάτος Πιλάτος at the first occurrence.

27.4 ἀθάνατον {A}

The Greek Old Testament has ἁμαρτάνον (“innocent blood”) fifteen times; ἁμαρτάνον (“righteous blood”) four times; and ἁμαρτάνον (“blameless blood”) four times. Thus it could be argued that ἁμαρτάνον, being a rare expression, was more likely to have been altered to the more common ἁμαρτάνον than contrariwise. On the other hand, however, it may be that ἀθάνατον was introduced by copyists from 23.35. In any case, the weight of the external evidence here is strongly in support of ἀθάνατον.

27.9 Ἰερεμίου {A}

The reading Ἰερεμίου is firmly established, being supported by א B C L X W Γ Δ Θ II and most minuscules, most of the Old Latin, vg syr* p h. paidi cop* bo arm eth geo. Since, however, the passage quoted by the evangelist is not to be found in Jeremiah, but seems to come from Zechariah (11.12-13), it is not surprising that several witnesses (22 syr* arm* ms) substitute Ζαχαρίου, while others (Φ 33.157 1579 it* p h. paidi cop* pms pers* Diatessaron*1 ms acc. to Augustine) omit the name entirely. Curiously, two witnesses (21 it* 22.20) read “Isaiah” — perhaps because, as the most prominent of the prophets, his name is met with most frequently in the New Testament (see the comment on διὰ in 13.35).

27.10 ζωαί {B}

It is difficult to decide whether the final μα came into the text in order to avoid hiatus with the following vowel, or whether it was deleted under the influence of μας. On the
strength of the diversity of external evidence a majority of the Committee preferred the plural form.

27.16 [Ἰησοῦν] Βαραββᾶν {C}

27.17 [Ἰησοῦν τὸν] Βαραββᾶν {C}

The reading preserved today in several Greek manuscripts and early versions was known to Origen, who declares in his commentary on the passage, "In many copies it is not stated that Barabbas was also called Jesus, and perhaps [the omission is] right." (Origen discloses in what follows his reason for disapproving of the reading Jesus Barabbas; it cannot be right, he implies, because "in the whole range of the scriptures we know that no one who is a sinner [is called] Jesus.") In a tenth century uncial manuscript (S) and in about twenty minuscule manuscripts a marginal comment states: "In many ancient copies which I have met with I found Barabbas himself likewise called 'Jesus'; that is, the question of Pilate stood there as follows, Τίνα θέλετε ἀπὸ τῶν δύο ἁπάλοικον ἰμὼν, Ἰησοῦν τόν Βαραββᾶν ἢ Ἰησοῦν τὸν λεγάμενον Χριστόν; for apparently the paternal name of the robber was 'Barabbas,' which is interpreted 'Son of the teacher.'" This scholium, which is usually assigned in the manuscripts either to Anastasius bishop of Antioch (perhaps latter part of the sixth century) or to Chrysostom, is in one manuscript attributed to Origen, who may indeed be its ultimate source.

In ver. 17 the word Ἰησοῦν could have been accidentally added or deleted by transcribers owing to the presence of ἰμὼν before it (ἀναπθίρ). Furthermore, the reading of B 1010 (τὸν Βαραββᾶν) appears to presuppose in an ancestor the presence of Ἰησοῦν.

A majority of the Committee was of the opinion that the original text of Matthew had the double name in both verses and that Ἰησοῦν was deliberately suppressed in most witnesses for reverential considerations. In view of the relatively slender external support for Ἰησοῦν, however, it was deemed fitting to enclose the word within square brackets.

27.24 τοῦτον {B}

The words τὸ δεκάτῳ (compare the variant reading in ver. 4), which occur at different places in a variety of manuscripts (but not in the best representatives of the Alexandrian and Western texts), appear to be an accretion intended to accentuate Pilate's protestation of Jesus' innocence.

27.28 ἱδώσαντες αὐτὸν {B}

The reading ἱδώσαντες seems to be a correction suggested by the nudity at the time of the flagellation. The sequence of stripping (ἱδώσαντες) and clothing again is paralleled by ver. 31.

27.29 ἐνεπαίξαν {B}

The imperfect tense may be the result of conformation to ἐστιν (ver. 30). In any case, however, the combination of B D L 33 892 al supporting the aorist seemed to the Committee to be the superior attestation.

27.35 κλήρον {A}

After κλήρον the Textus Receptus, following ΔΘ 0250 f¹ f¹¹ 1424 al, adds ἑνα πληρωθή τὸ ῥηθὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ προφήτου: Δειμνήσατο τα ἰμάτια μου ἐμαυτός, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν ἰματισμόν μου θάλασσα κλήρον (Ps 22.18). Although it could be argued that the passage fell out by reason of homooteleuton, the eye of the抄ist passing from κλήρον to κλήρον, the Committee was impressed by the absence of the passage from early witnesses of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (B A B D L W 33 71 157 565 700 892 D² f² vg ms syri p. lat. p. vulg. and the likelihood that copyists were influenced by the parallel passage in Jn 19.24, with the phrase τὸ ῥηθὲν ἐπὶ (or διὰ) τοῦ προφήτου assimilated to Matthew's usual formula of citation.

27.38

After the words "one on the right" and "one on the left" the Old Latin codex Colbertinus (it) supplies names for the two robbers who were crucified with Jesus: nomine Zoatham and nomine Camma respectively. (See also the comment on Lk 23.32.)

27.40 καὶ (3) {C}

On the one hand, καὶ may have been omitted due to confusion with the first syllable of the following word; on the other hand, it may have been inserted by those who took the conditional clause εἰ … ἐστιν with what precedes. To indicate the balance of considerations, a majority of the Committee thought it best to retain the word, but to enclose it within square brackets.
Not understanding the irony implied by the statement, “He is the King of Israel,” copyists, influenced by ver. 40, inserted ἐι. If originally present, there would have been no good reason to omit the word.

Instead of ἐι (or ἐλά), representing the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים (“my God”), the text of several witnesses, including א B C L, was assimilated to the reading ἐλα of Mk 15.34, representing the Aramaic יתא (“my God”), the o for the a sound being due to the influence of the Hebrew אֱלֹהִים.

The spelling λαμ (א B 33 700 998 al) represents the Aramaic יתא (“why?”), which is also probably to be understood as lying behind λιμ (א K U Δ Π 090 al) and λαμ (E F G H M S V al), whereas λαμ (D Θ 1 22 565 1582 al) represents the Hebrew יתא (“why?”).

As in Mk 15.34, most witnesses read ἀσβακηθεῖν or something similar (ἀσβακηθείσαν, א A Δ 1 69; ἀσβακηθεῖσα, B 22 713 1402), which represents the Aramaic יתא (“thou hast forsaken me”). Codex Bezae, however (as also in the Markan parallel), reads ἀφθάρσαι, representing the Hebrew יישב (“thou hast forsaken me”), for the spelling, see the comment on Mk 15.34), and thus this manuscript in both Matthew and Mark is consistent in giving a transliteration representing a Hebrew original throughout, instead of part Hebrew (the first words) and part Aramaic (the last word). (See also the comment on Mk 15.34.)

Although attested by א B C L al the words ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν has been a quite natural addition for copyists to make; if present originally, there is no reason why it should have been deleted. In Matthew the word κύριος is never applied to Jesus except in his reported sayings.

While recognizing the difficulty of accounting for the absence of the words ἀπὸ τῶν νεκρῶν from D 565 and several early versions, a majority of the Committee judged that the preponderance of external evidence favors their inclusion. Their omission may have been due to an oversight in transcription, perhaps prompted by the circumstance that in the preceding sentence (ver. 6) ἡγήσῃ stands without such an addition.

The reading ἀψέβωσοι, which is strongly supported by a wide range of witnesses, was assimilated by copyists to the parallel in Mk 16.8, where ἐξεμπέμποι is firm.

Although it is possible that the words ὥς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἐπηγγέλλακτο τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἤλθοι fell out of the text due to homoeoteleuton, their absence from the earliest and best representatives of both early types of text (the Alexandrian and the Western) led the Committee to regard them as a natural expansion derived from the sense of the preceding verse.

In view of the weight of evidence, the Committee preferred ἀπῆγγελλαν to ἀπήγγελλαν, a verb that occurs nowhere else in Matthew.

In the one hand, there is strong and diversified external evidence in support of the presence of ἔρμας. On the other hand, in similar expressions elsewhere (11.23; 27.8) Matthew does not add ἔρμας to σῆμαρον. The Committee therefore decided to represent this balance of considerations by including the word enclosed within square brackets.
28.20 άνων. {Α}

After άνων most manuscripts, followed by the Textus Receptus, terminate the Gospel with ἀδύνατον, reflecting the liturgical usage of the text. If the word had been present originally, no good reason can be found to account for its absence from the better representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western text-types.

Footnotes

1 In the genealogy in 1 Chr 3.10 most Greek manuscripts read Ἄνις, though ms. 60 reads Ἄνιλη. In Antiq. VIII.3–xii.6 Josephus uses ἄνων, though in the Latin translation ἀσάπερ appears.


9 Ibid., p. 70, lines 9 ff. (of the Syriac text), and p. 53 (of the Latin translation).


19 Some scholars (e.g., Lagerde, Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philol.-hist. Kl., XXXV (1888), p. 128 Anm., Zahn, Klostermann) have thought that the Matthean ϙδεβδεθ and the Lukan τεκνων arose from the ambiguity of the unpointed Aramaic יֶתַּם, which may be pronounced ḏĕḇḏĕṯ, “her works,” or ḏĕḇḏĕṯ, “her servants.” Others (e.g., Eb. Nestle and Lagrange), however, point out that it is still to be shown that יִתַּם (rather than מִיִּנְא) is ever used as the equivalent of יִתַּם.


21 The Bohairic version has been partially conformed to the Johannine account; it reads “the ship was at a distance from the land about twenty-five stadia.”

22 Hebrew וַיִּמָּשׂ, Aramaic מַמָּשׂ, Arabic مَمْشَى.


24 For other discussions of this perplexing passage see Josef Schmid (who concludes that form (c) is original), “Das textgeschichtliche Problem der Parabel von den zwei Söhnen,” in Vom Wort des Lebens, Festschrift für Max Meinertz, ed. Nikolaus Adler (= Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen; 1. Ergänzungsbänd; München/Weinheim, 1951), pp. 68–84, and J. Ramsey Michaels (who argues that forms (a) and (c) were derived from (b)), “The Parable of the Regretful Son,” Harvard Theological Review, LXI (1968), pp. 15–26.

Lachmann’s suggestion (Novum Testamentum Graece, II, p. v) that the words between τερπόντικαν and Αὐλῷ are an early interpolation has met with no general approval, though in Westcott’s opinion “it seems not unlikely that Lachmann is substantially right” (“Notes on Select Readings,” p. 17). Westcott and Hort mark the passage with an obelus, indicating that in their judgment the text contains a primitive error lying behind all extant witnesses.
The Gospel According To Mark

1.1 Χριστοῦ [υἱοῦ θεοῦ] {C}

The absence of υἱοῦ θεοῦ in B* D* 28C αὐτός may be due to an oversight in copying, occasioned by the similarity of the endings of the nomina sacra. On the other hand, however, there was always a temptation (to which copyists often succumbed) to expand titles and quasi-titles of books. Since the combination of B D W αὐτός in support of υἱοῦ θεοῦ is extremely strong, it was not thought advisable to omit the words altogether, yet because of the antiquity of the shorter reading and the possibility of scribal expansion, it was decided to enclose the words within square brackets.

1.2 ἐν τῷ Ἐσσαι τῷ προφήτῃ {A}

The quotation in verses 2 and 3 is composite, the first part being from Mal 3.1 and the second part from Is 40.3. It is easy to see, therefore, why copyists would have altered the words “in Isaiah the prophet” (a reading found in the earliest representative witnesses of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text) to the more comprehensive introductory formula “in the prophets.”

1.4 οบาดχζων ἐν τῇ ἱρήμῳ καὶ {C}

In view of the predominant usage in the Synoptic Gospels of referring to John as “the Baptist” (ὁ βαπτιστής occurs in Mt 6.25 and 8.28, as well as seven times in Matthew and three times in Luke), it is easier to account for the addition than for the deletion of the definite article before οβαπτιζων. The omission of καὶ in a few Alexandrian witnesses is the result of taking ὁ βαπτιζων as a title.

1.6 τρίχας {A}

Instead of reading, as do all other witnesses, that John the Baptist was clothed with “camel’s hair” (τρίχας καμηλίας), D and it read “camel’s skin” (δέρμα καμηλίας). Although Turner considered the latter to be the original text of Mark, Lagrange pointed out that camel’s skin is much too thick and hard for Bedouins to think of using it as clothing. Consequently, it appears that scribes who exchanged δέρμα for τρίχας did so without any firsthand knowledge of Near Eastern customs. It may be, as Moulton and Milligan suggested, that the word is a corruption derived from Zch 13.4. The argument that the absence of the following words (“and had a leather belt around his waist” καὶ ἐπιβασιλεύσειῥουντ) lacking in D and several Old Latin witnesses) means that the original text of Mark (assumed to have been δέρμα) was accommodated to and expanded from Mt
3.4 is less probable than that through scribal inadvertence a line of text fell out between καὶ ... καὶ or between καμὴ λέγω ... αὕτην.

1.14 ἤσετε {B}

The tendency of scribes would have been to add ἐν before ἤσετε (compare the parallels in Mt 3.11 and Jn 1.26, which read ἐν ἤσετε).

1.11 εἰς γένος ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν {B}

The omission of the verb appears to be either accidental or in partial imitation of Matthew’s καὶ ἵνα φωνῇ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν λέγωσιν (Mt 3.17). The reading with ηὐσίθη (Θ 28 565 a) is clearly a scribal improvement of either of the other two readings.

Page 64

1.14 τὰγεγέλλαιαν {A}

The insertion of τὰς ἱστοριὰς was obviously made by copyists in order to bring the unusual Markan phrase into conformity with the much more frequently used expression “the kingdom of God” (cf. ver. 19).

1.27 εἰ ἢστιν τούτος διάκειται καὶ τένει ἐξουσίαν καὶ {B}

Among the welter of variant readings, that preserved in N B L 33 seems to account best for the rise of the others. Its abruptness invited modification, and more than one copyist accommodated the phraseology in one way or another to the parallel in Lk 4.36. The text can also be punctuated διὰ κείμενη κατ’ ἐξουσίαν καὶ ..., but in view of ver. 22 it seems preferable to take κατ’ ἐξουσίαν with διάκειται καίη.

1.29 εἰ τὰς συμπιγγομένας ἐξελάντες ἱλάθων {B}

Although the singular number of the participle and verb is supported by strong external evidence (including B D Θ f² f¹¹ a), and although the reading “they came...with James and John” appeared strange to some members of the Committee, a majority was impressed by the widespread and diversified attestation supporting εἰν αὐτῶν of ver. 30.

1.34 αὐτῶν {A}

It is clear that Mark terminated the sentence with αὐτῶν and that copyists made various additions, derived probably from the parallel in Lk 4.41 (ὅτι ἥδεων τῶν Χριστοῦ αὐτῶν εἶναι). If any one of the longer readings had been original in Mark, there is no reason why it should have been altered or eliminated entirely.
The absence of a direct object (αὐτόν) may have led to the substitution of προσεγγίσας ("to come near") or προσέβην ("to come to") for προσενέγκας ("to bring to").

2.14 οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων ἰδόντες [C]

The reading which best explains the origin of the others is that preserved in B 892 cop. Since the pendant καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ seems to require a verb, most witnesses moved ἀπόλυται (making it plural) after οἱ ἀσκοὶ. Furthermore, under the influence of the parallels in Mt 9.17 and Lk 5.37, copyists introduced the verb ἐκχύται as more appropriate than ἀπόλυται to describe what happens to wine.

2.4 εἰς ἑαυτὸν ῥηχών [C]

Not observing that εἰ ... ἀσκοὶ is parenthetical and therefore that the force of βέλλει carries over to the words after ἄλλα, copyists inserted βλέπουσιν (from Lk 5.38) or βλέπουσιν (from Mt 9.17). The omission of the words ἄλλα ... καίνους in D and ita, b, e, f, v, i, t, 1 may have been either deliberate (when the copyist, not observing their

regimen with βέλλει, could make no sense of them), or, more probably, accidental (occasioned by the repetition of the words οὐνος and ἀσκοὶ in close succession).

2.26 ἔπει Ἀβίαθαρ ἄρχιερός [A]

According to 1 Sm 21 it was Ahimelech, not Abiathar, who was high priest when David ate the bread of the Presence. In order to avoid the historical difficulty, D W al omit εἴπει Ἀβίαθαρ ἄρχιερός, thereby conforming the text to Mt 12.4 and Lk 6.4. Other witnesses, reluctance to go so far as to delete the phrase, inserted τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀρχιερέως (or ἵππως) in order to permit the interpretation that the event happened in the time of (but not necessarily during the high-priesthood of) Abiathar (who, was afterward) the high priest.

3.7-8 ἐκκολοθήκην, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ ἀπὸ Ἰεροσόλυμων [C]

This nest of variant readings probably arose from the prolix style of Mark’s summary statement. The Committee regarded the reading of B L 565 as the least unsatisfactory text, and the one that accounts best for the origin of most of the other readings. Thus, the change from the singular number to the plural ἐκκολοθήκην, the addition of αὐτῷ after such a verb, and the modification of word order are not surprising. The absence of the verb from Western and other witnesses (D W fr.13 28 Old Latin al) may be due either to an accident of transcription, or, more probably, to deliberate editorial revision. In view, however, of a residuum of uncertainty involving ἐκκολοθήκην, it was thought best to enclose the word within square brackets.

3.8 πλῆθος πολὺ [A]

The absence of πλῆθος πολὺ in a few witnesses (W ita, b, e, sy) is probably to be accounted for as a stylistic improvement of Markan redundancy (cf. πολὺ πλῆθος in ver. 7).
Although the words οἶς καὶ ἀδώνικα may be regarded as an interpolation from Luke 6.13, the Committee was of the opinion that the external evidence is too strong in their favor to warrant their ejection from the text. In order to reflect the balance of probabilities, the words were retained but enclosed within square brackets.

On the one hand, it can be argued that the words καὶ ἀδώνικα have come into the text as the result of scribal oversight (dittography with opening words of ver. 14); on the other hand, the clause seems to be needed in order to pick up the thread of ver. 14 after the parenthesis ὅτι … διὰμόνα. In order to reflect the balance of both external evidence and internal considerations, the Committee decided to retain the words within square brackets.

The reading of W, καὶ περιέβαλεν κηρίσεων τὸ εἰσερχόμενον καὶ, is suspect, for this manuscript also inserts τὸ εἰσερχόμενον καὶ in ver. 16. The reading of f¹² cor", προῦτον Ἴησους καὶ ("First is Simon, and he gave a surname to Simon, Peter"), though appealing, appears to be an assimilation to Mt 10.2, introduced in order to smooth an awkward construction.

The substitution of Ἄνναδείον for Θαδαίειον occurs in Western witnesses also at Mt 10.3, where many witnesses conflate both readings (see the comment on Mt 10.3). The omission of Θαδαίειον from W must be accidental, for only eleven persons are mentioned; i.e., which also omits Thaddeus, adds ἤλως after Bartholomew.

The singular number, read by early witnesses of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text, was altered in most witnesses to the plural, which is the easier reading following upon verses 17-19.

The original reading οἱ παρ' αὐτὸ ("his friends" or "his relatives") apparently proved to be so embarrassing that D W altered it to read, "When the scribes and the others had heard about him, they went out to seize him, for they said, 'He is beside himself.'"

Either κρίσεων ("judgment") or κολάσιον ("torment") was introduced by copyists in order to relieve the difficulty of the unusual expression in the text, and ἀμαρτίας was substituted by others as being more familiar than ἀμαρτίας (which occurs in the four Gospels only here and in ver. 28; elsewhere in the New Testament it occurs three times).

A majority of the Committee considered it probable that the words καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ οὐκ were omitted from most witnesses either (a) accidentally through an oversight in transcription (the eye of the scribe passing from οὐκ οὐκ to οὐκ), or (b) deliberately because either in ver. 31 nor ver. 34 (nor in the parallel passages) are the sisters mentioned. Had the words been interpolated, the addition would probably have been made already in ver. 31. Nevertheless, in view of the weight of attestation for the shorter text, it was thought best to enclose the disputed words within square brackets.

The shorter text should be adopted: the longer reading, perhaps of Western origin, crept into the text through mechanical expansion. From a historical point of view, it is extremely unlikely that Jesus’ sisters would have joined in publicly seeking to check him in his ministry. B.M.M.

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is αἰτεῖν (K B 1071 add), which is nominative neuter plural agreeing with the subject ἥλιον ("Other [seeds] fell into the good ground, and while growing up and increasing they yielded fruit; and brought forth …"). Under the influence of ἀπαλλάσσοντος, which can be (wrongly) construed with κατ' ἀνθρώπον, there was a strong tendency to alter αἰτεῖν (or αἰτεῖσθαι) to αἰτεῖν or αἰτεῖσθαι. Another factor that contributed to altering the participle was the assimilation of ἥλιον to ἅλλο in verses 5 and 7 (the singular number is read by K A D Δ Π Σ Φ f¹ j¹ 22 157 543 565 700 1071 add).

The reading that predominates in the manuscripts is ἐν, whether accented ἐν or ἐν. In favor of the latter is the probability that underlying the variants was the Aramaic sign of multiplication ("-times" or "-fold"); כ, which also is the numeral 'one.'
Instead of εἰς αὐτοίς (B W f¹ f¹ 1 28 902 ai) smooth the expression by reading εἰς αὐτοῖς, while other witnesses (D Θ 33 and the Majority Text) assimilate the text to Matthew’s wording εἰς τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ (M 13.19), and a few other witnesses (A it‘ eth) assimilate to Luke’s wording ἐπὶ τῆς καρδιᾶς αὐτῶν (Lk 6.12).

4.20 εἰς … Τῷ … εἰς {C}

See the comment on ver. 8.

4.24 καὶ προστεθήκει τίμιν {A}

The omission of καὶ προστεθήκει τίμιν seems to have been accidental, owing to homoeoteleuton. The words ταῖς ἀκούσισιν appear to be a gloss inserted to explain the connection of the saying with μὴ πεπερασθε τί ἀκούστε. One Latin manuscript and the Gothic version read “shall be added to you who believe.”

4.28 πλήρης[ε] στῶν {C}

Among the several variant readings, the reading πλήρης στῶν (N A C D f¹ f¹ 1 28 ai) is the most classical, with στῶν in apposition to the preceding accusatives, while in colloquial Hellenistic Greek πλήρης is frequently used as an indeclinable adjective (so Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon, s.v. πλήρης). In view of the strange confusion of readings among the manuscripts, the Committee considered πλήρης (C l’ l’ Σ 28 ai) as probably the true reading, but decided to enclose the final sigma within square brackets in deference to the weight of the witnesses that support πλήρης.

4.40 δειλοὶ ἄστις; ὠπώ [A]

The reading adopted as the text has by far the best external support. The reading… τῶς ὁκ (A C K Π Σ 33 ai) seems to have arisen from a desire to soften somewhat Jesus’ reproach spoken to the disciples.

5.1 Γερασηνῶν {C}

Of the several variant readings, a majority of the Committee preferred Γερασηνῶν on the basis of (a) superior external evidence (early representatives of both the Alexandrian and Western types of text), and (b) the probability that Γερασήνων is a scribal assimilation to the prevailing text of Matthew (8.28), and that Γερασηνῶν is a correction, perhaps originally proposed by Origen (see the comment on Mt 6.28). The reading of W (Γερασηνῶν) reflects a scribal idiosyncrasy.

5.21 τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τίν τῷ πλοίῳ {C}

Although a minority of the Committee regarded the phrase τίν τῷ πλοίῳ as an early scribal insertion, added before τοῦ Ἰησοῦ in W

and after τοῦ Ἰησοῦ in a great number of witnesses (including N A (B) C Θ L Δ f¹ 133 33 1079 1241 ai), the majority preferred the reading witnessed by the Alexandrian and other text-types, and explained the absence of the phrase as either accidental or by assimilation to the parallel in Luke (8.40). The change of position of the phrase in W is due to the desire to achieve a better sequence. In view, however, of the conflict of transcriptional probabilities, it was thought best to enclose the words within square brackets.

5.22 ὁνόματι Ἰάριος

It has sometimes been argued (e.g. by Vincent Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p. 287) that the words ὁνόματι Ἰάριος are an early interpolation, because (1) they are absent from several Western witnesses (D μετ’ άδικ.) (2) the parallel account in Matthew does not identify Jairus by name; (3) the only other person mentioned by Mark outside the Passion Narrative, apart from the disciples, is Bartimaeus (19.46), and the name Jairus is not mentioned in 5.35 ff.; and (4) the use of ὁνόματι is Lukan rather than Markan; elsewhere Mark uses ὄνομα with the dative (3.16 f.: 5.9).

When these arguments are analyzed, their weight is greatly diminished. Considered in reverse order:

(a) The three instances of ὄνομα with the dative are scarcely sufficient to establish Mark’s preferred usage, especially since two of the instances report the conferring of a name upon a person, when the dative is to be expected (ἐπηρεάσθην, 3.16 f.). That Luke generally prefers ὁνόματι is true but irrelevant, for the Lukan parallel (8.41) to the passage under consideration reads ἐπηρεάσθην τὸ ὄνομα Ἰάριος (which accounts for the Markan variant τὸ ὄνομα Ἰάριος in W Θ 565 700).

(b) Whether it is fair to exclude from one’s consideration the many names in Mark’s Passion Narrative is open to question. In any case, however, Taylor has unaccountably overlooked the presence, in addition to Bartimaeus, of Mark’s references by name to John the Baptist (1.4 ff.: 6.9 ff., 14: 6.14, 16-18, 24 ff.): The absence of the name Jairus in 5.35 ff. surely cannot prove that it is an interpolation in 8.41. (Jairus occurs only once in the Lukan narrative (8.41); is it also an interpolation there?)
(c) The absence of the name in Matthew’s account would be explained if, as has been sometimes argued on the basis of other instances, Matthew utilized a copy of a Western text of Mark. In any case, however, it must be observed that Matthew has very much condensed Mark’s whole account, and omits much more than merely the name of Jairus.

(3) The external evidence supporting the presence of ἰδίος is far more impressive (including ὡς ὥστε Ν Α Β Κ Λ Ν Δ Π Σ Φ almost all minuscules it, c, l, a vg syr e, r, p h, p, cop, bo, ter arm geo) than the testimony supporting the absence of these words (D it, e, h2). Put another way, from a text-critical point of view it is more probable that the name Jairus was accidentally dropped during the transmission of part of the Greek text (represented by one Greek manuscript and several Old Latin witnesses) than that it was added, at the same point in the narrative, in all the other textual groups. See also the Note in Western non-interpolations, following Lk 24.53.

5.36 τιμρεκοίνων (B)

The ambiguity of τιμρεκοίνων (“ignoring” or “overhearing”) led to its replacement in Ν’ A C D K Θ Π al by the Lukan parallel ᾧ ὢ εἰς τοῦτο (Lk 8.50).

5.41 Ταλάνθε κοιμέ

The reading Ταλάνθε (without κοιμέ) in W 28 245 349 and several Old Latin and Vulgate manuscripts is due to scribal confusion with the proper name in Ac 9.40. The curious reading of codex Bezae ὢ μῆκε δεβή τηθῆ κοιμέ seems to be a corruption of μήκε, the transliteration of Καινόν, an Aramaic dialectal form meaning “girl.” The variation between κοιμέ (Κ B C L Ν Σ f 3 3892) and κοιμέ (Α D Δ Θ Π Φ f 3 22 28 124 543 565 579 700 1071) most minuscules

it, c, l, a vg syr e, r, p h, p, cop, bo, ter arm geo) reflects the difference in gender of the forms of the Aramaic imperative singular (Σ ε) is masculine, sometimes used without reference to sex; Σ ε is feminine). According to Dahman both forms were to be pronounced alike, the final i of the feminine imperative falling away after the stressed penult. The expansion in it, επαβαίνουσα cumbi has not been satisfactorily explained.

6.2 καὶ αἱ διωκόμες ... γεννᾶσαι (C)

A majority of the Committee preferred the grammatically difficult reading of the Alexandrian text (Ῥ β 38 392 al) as best accounting for the origin of the other readings; thus, some witnesses added αΙ after τουτοίς (Ῥ L Δ), while many others eliminated the article before διωκόμες and changed the participle into a finite verb, either γίνωσκαι or γίνωσκαι (introduced by ἵσταται). The latest reading, which was incorporated into the Textus Receptus, prefixes ὅτι to the indicative clause.

6.3 τικτεῖν, ὅ ἢδς [A]

All uncials, many minuscules, and important early versions read, “Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary …?” Objection was very early felt to this description of Jesus as carpenter, and several witnesses (including P46) assimilate the text to Mt 13.55 and read,

“Is not this the son of the carpenter, the son of Mary …?” The Palestinian Syriac achieves the same result by omitting ὅ τικτεῖν.

6.3 καὶ ἤτοι [B]

The combination of Alexandrian and Western witnesses, along with Θ ρός 33 565 700 al, provides considerable support for the reading ἤτοι. Codex Sinaiticus and several other witnesses have assimilated the name to ἤτοι (Mt 13.55). According to Lagrange (commentary in loc.), the name ἤτοι (A C W f 3 al) is a transcription of ἤτοι, the Galilean form of ἤτοι.

6.14 καὶ ἔλεγεν (B)

The plural ἔλεγεν, read in B W ιτα b d ff2 and supported by the intention of D ρός (ὁ λέγοντας), seems to be the original reading. Copyists altered it to ἔλεγαν in agreement with ἔλεγον, not observing that after the words καὶ ἔλεγον ὁ βασιλεὺς ἤτοι the sentence is suspended, in order to introduce parenthetically three specimens of the opinions held about Jesus (καὶ ἔλεγαν ... ἄλλοιν ἔλεγαν ... ἄλλοιν ἔλεγαν), and is taken up again at ver. 16, ἵστατες ὅτι ἤτοι ήμεν ...
of meaning in contrast to the banality of the clause when ἐπολείπτη is read.

6.22 θυγατέρας αὐτοῦ ᾿Ηρόδιάδος [C]

It is very difficult to decide which reading is the least unsatisfactory. According to the reading with αὐτοῦ the girl is named Herodias and is described as Herod’s daughter. But in verses 24 she is Herod’s daughter, who, according to other sources, was named Salome, a grand-niece of Herod. The reading with αὐτῆς τῆς must mean something like “the daughter of Herodias herself,” unless αὐτῆς be taken as the redundant pronoun anticipating a noun (an Aramaism). The reading with τῆς, read by f1 and (presumably) Greek witnesses lying behind several early versions, is the easiest and seems to have arisen from an accidental omission of αὐτῆς.

A majority of the Committee decided, somewhat reluctantly, that the reading with αὐτοῦ, despite the historical and contextual difficulties, must be adopted on the strength of its external attestation.

6.23 αὐτῆς [πολλῆς] [C]

Since the use of πολλῆς in an adverbial sense (“much, vehemently”) is a characteristic of Markan style (1.45; 3.12; 5.10; 23; 38; 43; 6.20; 9.20; 15.3), it may be suspected that the word, occurring here originally, was dropped accidentally in the course of transcription. On the other hand, however, the general excellence of the witnesses that lack the word (א B L Δ Π f1 f13 a8) makes it advisable to enclose the word within square brackets.

6.24 δ ἃ [C]

It is likely that δ was inserted by copyists who, coming upon the letters στι, took them as ὧν (rather than δ ἃ) and thus felt need of a relative pronoun to introduce the subsequent clause. The other readings represent scribal idiosyncrasies.

6.33 ἵκει καὶ προφήτηδος αὐτοῖς [B]

Amid the wide variety of readings, it is obvious that the Textus Receptus, which follows E F G H and many minuscules, is conflate, being made up of ἵκει καὶ προφήτηδος αὐτός καὶ συνήθουσαν πρὸς αὐτόν, each of which is witnessed separately. Of the two component readings, the former is supported by Β Β 892 as well as, indirectly, by L Δ Θ 1241 αὐτόν (προφήτηδον καὶ προφήτηδον are easily confused palaeographically). It is probable that προφήτηδον was altered to either προφήτηδον or συνήθουσαν by copyists who thought it unlikely that the crowd on the land could have outstripped the boat (it is beside the point to observe, as Lagrange does, that the wind may have been contrary). Thus, both external evidence and internal considerations converge in making it probable that the reading with προφήτηδον is the original.

6.41 μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ] [C]

The weight of the external evidence is rather evenly divided between the readings with and without αὐτοῦ. Normally Mark speaks of “his disciples.” More rarely “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.”

6.22 It is very difficult to decide which reading is the least unsatisfactory. According to the reading with αὐτοῦ the girl is named Herodias and is described as Herod’s daughter. But in verse 24 she is Herod’s daughter, who, according to other sources, was named Salome, a grand-niece of Herod. The reading with αὐτῆς τῆς must mean something like “the daughter of Herodias herself,” unless αὐτῆς be taken as the redundant pronoun anticipating a noun (an Aramaism). The reading with τῆς, read by f1 and (presumably) Greek witnesses lying behind several early versions, is the easiest and seems to have arisen from an accidental omission of αὐτῆς.

A majority of the Committee decided, somewhat reluctantly, that the reading with αὐτοῦ, despite the historical and contextual difficulties, must be adopted on the strength of its external attestation.

6.23 αὐτῆς [πολλῆς] [C]

Since the use of πολλῆς in an adverbial sense (“much, vehemently”) is a characteristic of Markan style (1.45; 3.12; 5.10; 23; 38; 43; 6.20; 9.20; 15.3), it may be suspected that the word, occurring here originally, was dropped accidentally in the course of transcription. On the other hand, however, the general excellence of the witnesses that lack the word (א B L Δ Π f1 f13 a8) makes it advisable to enclose the word within square brackets.

6.24 δ ἃ [C]

It is likely that δ was inserted by copyists who, coming upon the letters στι, took them as ὧν (rather than δ ἃ) and thus felt need of a relative pronoun to introduce the subsequent clause. The other readings represent scribal idiosyncrasies.

6.33 ἵκει καὶ προφήτηδος αὐτοῖς [B]

Amid the wide variety of readings, it is obvious that the Textus Receptus, which follows E F G H and many minuscules, is conflate, being made up of ἵκει καὶ προφήτηδος αὐτός καὶ συνήθουσαν πρὸς αὐτόν, each of which is witnessed separately. Of the two component readings, the former is supported by Β Β 892 as well as, indirectly, by L Δ Θ 1241 αὐτόν (προφήτηδον καὶ προφήτηδον are easily confused palaeographically). It is probable that προφήτηδον was altered to either προφήτηδον or συνήθουσαν by copyists who thought it unlikely that the crowd on the land could have outstripped the boat (it is beside the point to observe, as Lagrange does, that the wind may have been contrary). Thus, both external evidence and internal considerations converge in making it probable that the reading with προφήτηδον is the original.

6.41 μαθηταῖς [αὐτοῦ] [C]

The weight of the external evidence is rather evenly divided between the readings with and without αὐτοῦ. Normally Mark speaks of “his disciples.” More rarely “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.” The former expression is an archaic trait reflecting a stage in the transmission of the Gospel tradition when the disciples of Jesus were not yet “the disciples.”
The Committee recognized that the double superlative, ἕν ἐκ περίφορα, is altogether in the style of Mark and is supported by a variety of witnesses that represent a broad geographical spread. At the same time, however, because ἐκ περίφορα is lacking in important witnesses (N B L Δ 892 al), it was judged appropriate to enclose the phrase within square brackets.

6.51 ἐξίσταντο (B)

The shorter reading is to be preferred, for the expanded reading ἐξίσταντο καὶ ἐθάμιζον appears to be a heightening of the narrative by copyists who recalled the account in Ac 2.7, where the same pair of verbs appears.

7.2 πηγή (A)

The difficulty of understanding the significance of πηγή (literally “with a [the] fist”) in a context explaining Jewish ceremonial washings prompted some copyists to omit it (Δ syr' cop) and others to replace it with a word that gives better sense, such as πρινκι (“often” or “thoroughly,” N W it4 vg al), or momento (“in a moment,” it), or primo (“first,” it).

7.4 ἀφορές (A)

The abruptness of καὶ ἀπ’ ἀγοραῖς ἱνα βαπτίζωσιν was relieved by the addition in several witnesses (D W al) of ἵνα ἐθάμιζον (“when they come from the market place, they do not eat unless they wash themselves”).

7.4 βαπτίζωσιν (B)

Although it can be argued that the less familiar word (βαπτίζωσιν) was replaced by the more familiar one (βαπτίζωσι), it is far more likely that Alexandrian copyists, either wishing to keep βαπτίζωσιν for the Christian rite, or, more probably, taking ἀπ’ ἀγοραῖς as involving a partitive construction, introduced βαπτίζωσιν as more appropriate to express the meaning, “except they sprinkle [what is] from the market place, they do not eat [it],”

7.4 καὶ χαλκῶν [καὶ κλινῶν] (C)

It is difficult to decide whether the words καὶ κλινῶν were added by copyists who were influenced by the legislation of Lv 15, or whether the words were omitted (a) accidentally because of homoeoteleuton or (b) deliberately because the idea of washing or sprinkling beds seemed to be quite incongruous. In view of the balance of probabilities, as well as the strong witnesses that support each reading, a majority of the Committee preferred to retain the words, but to enclose them within square brackets.

7.7-8 ἀνθρώπων, ἀφίνετε ... ἀνθρώπων. [A]

The Greek text that lies behind the AV, “as the washing of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do,” which is absent from the oldest and best witnesses, is doubtless a scribal addition, derived from ver. 4. The fact that the longer reading is found at two different places – at the beginning of ver. 8 (D Θ al) and at the end of ver. 8 (Κ X Π f13 33 700 892 al) – likewise indicates its secondary nature.

7.8 στήριξη (D)

It is most difficult to decide whether scribes deliberately substituted στήριξη (“establish”) for τηρήση (“keep”), as being the more appropriate verb in the context, or whether, through inadvertence in copying and perhaps influenced subconsciously by the preceding phrase τὴν ἁπάντη καὶ θεό, they replaced στήριξη with τηρήση. The Committee judged that, on the whole, the latter possibility was slightly more probable.

7.16 omit verse (A)

This verse, though present in the majority of witnesses, is absent from important Alexandrian witnesses (N B L Δ° al). It appears to be a scribal gloss (derived perhaps from 4.9 or 4.23), introduced as an appropriate sequel to ver. 14.

7.19 καθαρίζων (A)

The overwhelming weight of manuscript evidence supports the reading καθαρίζων. The difficulty of construing this word in the sentence promoted copyists to attempt various corrections and ameliorations.

7.24 Γύροι (B)

The words καὶ Σιδὼνας seem to be an assimilation to Mt 15.21 and Mk 7.31. If they had been present originally, there is no reason why they should have been deleted. The witnesses in support of the shorter text include representatives of the Western and other types of text.

7.28 κύριε (B)
Similar considerations apply in evaluating the evidence for this variant reading as those that were mentioned in discussing the variant in ver. 24. Apparently the word καὶ (which occurs eight times in Matthew, four times in Luke, and nowhere else in Mark) was introduced here from the parallel passage in Mt 15.27.

7.31 ἧδεν δὲ Σιδόνων [A]

According to the reading supported by the best representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western texts, as well as by other noteworthy witnesses, Jesus took a circuitous route, passing north from Tyre through Sidon and thence southeast across the Leontes, continuing south past Caesarea Philippi to the east of the Jordan and thus approached the lake of Galilee on its east side, within the territory of the Decapolis.

The reading καὶ Σιδόνων ἦδεν is a modification that copyists introduced either accidentally (being influenced by the familiar expression “Tyre and Sidon”) or deliberately (because Jesus’ itinerary appeared to be extraordinarily roundabout).

7.35 καὶ [ἐθάναι] [C]

Mark’s fondness for ἐθάνατος (which sometimes appears as ἐθάνας in various manuscripts) makes it probable that the adverb was employed either here or before ἐλθή. The external support, how ever, for ἐθάνατος before ἐλθή is extremely weak, whereas it is relatively strong for including ἐθάνας here. At the same time, the combination of witnesses that lack ἐθάνας (M B D L Δ al) is so impressive that a majority of the Committee considered it advisable to enclose ἐθάνας within square brackets.

8.7 ἔλογος... αὐτά; [B]

The reading ἔλογοτρίτας (D 1009 i6° η) appears to be a scribal assimilation to ver. 6. Of the other readings the one chosen for the text has the best external support. Several witnesses omit the pronoun either as superfluous (in view of the following ταῦτα) or perhaps as inappropriate (Jesus blessed God’s name, not the fishes).

8.10 τὰ μερή Δαλματικά [B]

Two sets of variant readings are involved. The reading τὰ μερή, supported by almost all the uncials and by many important minuscules (M A B C K L X Δ Θ Π f1 f13 33 565 700 al), is clearly to be preferred; its synonym τὰ ἄριστα (which occurs in the parallel passage in Mt 15.39) and the readings derivative from τὰ ἄριστα (τὰ ὀριον and τὸ ἄριστος) lack adequate support.

Dalmanutha (read by all uncials except D) is a place of uncertain location. Puzzled by the word, which occurs nowhere else, 24 copyists replaced it by Μαγδαλά (or Μαγδάλα, readings that occur in the parallel passage in Matthew (15.39).

8.15 Ἡρώδου [A]

The reading τῶν Ἡρώδεων, which was current as early as the third and fourth centuries (54° W cop⁴), is clearly a scribal alteration influenced by 3.6 and 12.13.

8.26 μὴ δὲ εἰς τὴν κάμην εἰσέλθη [B]

The development of the principal variant readings seems to have proceeded as follows:

(1) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κάμην εἰσέλθη (N° B L f1 syr° cop⁴ bo fay)
(2) μηδὲν εἰς τὴν κάμην (i6°)
(3) μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κάμην εἰσέλθη μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κάμην (A C... al)
(4) ἐπειδὴ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα οὐ καὶ μηδὲν εἰς τὴν κάμην (parent of the following)
(4a) καὶ + ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν κάμην εἰσέλθη (θ i611 vg)
(4b) εἰς τὴν κάμην (D)
(4c) εἰς τὴν κάμην (Θ 565)
(4d) καὶ + μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κάμην εἰσέλθη (μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κάμην 124)

Reading (1), which is supported by early representatives of the Alexandrian, Eastern, and Egyptian text-types, appears to be the earliest form of text. Reading (2) arose in the interest of clarifying the import of (1), and reading (3) is obviously a conflation of (1) and (2). Reading (4), which is an elaboration of (2) with the help of an introductory phrase, appears to be the parent of several further modifications that are attested by Western and other witnesses.

8.38 λόγος [B]

Although the reading without the word λόγος gives good sense (“whomsoever is ashamed of me and of my [followers]”), it is easier to account for the origin of the shorter reading as due to accidental omission, facilitated by the similarity of the ending of the words ἰμοὶ λόγος, than to account for the insertion of the word in a wide variety of different types of text.

8.38 μετὰ [A]

The reading with εἰς instead of μετὰ appears to have arisen from scribal inattentiveness, or from assimilation to the parallel in Lk 9.28.

9.14 Ἐλλάντες ... εἴδον [B]
The reading that involves the singular number focuses attention upon Jesus, whereas the plural requires the reader to distinguish between “they” (i.e., Jesus, Peter, James, and John, returning from the Mount of Transfiguration) and “the disciples” (i.e., the other nine who had been left on the plain). Both these internal considerations led the Committee to prefer the reading strongly supported by K B L W Δ Ψ 892 al.

9.23 τὸ εἶ ἐδομὴ [B]

The extreme compression of the sentence has given trouble to copyists. Not seeing that in τὸ εἶ ἐδομὴ Jesus is repeating the words of the father in order to challenge them,23 a variety of witnesses have inserted παντεύμα, which has the effect of changing the subject of the verb “can” from Jesus to the father. As a result the τὸ now seemed more awkward than ever, and many of these witnesses omit it.

9.24 παντεύμα [A]

The presence of the words μετὰ ἄκριβῶς in the later manuscripts reflects a natural heightening of the narrative introduced by copyists and correctors (cf. corrections in A and C). Certainly if the phrase were present originally in the text, no adequate reason can be found to account for its deletion.

9.29 προσκυνή [A]

In light of the increasing emphasis in the early church on the necessity of fasting, it is understandable that καὶ νασταφίλ is a gloss that found its way into most witnesses. Among the witnesses that resisted such an accretion are important representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text.

9.38 καὶ ἐκκλασμένοι αὐτῶν, ὁτι ὡς ἐκκολοθῆτε ἡμῖν [B]

Among many minor variations, there are three principal readings: (1) “and we forbade him, because he was not following us”; (2) “who does not follow us, and we forbade him”; and (3) “who does not follow us, and we forbade him, because he does not follow us.” The last is a conflating reading that presupposes the existence of the other two. Reading (1) is preferred because of superior witnesses (N B Δ Θ Ψ syr f1 f13 syri cop et al) and because in reading (2) there has been a transposition of the last clause to bring it into proximity to its subject (with the change also of ὁτι to ὡς).

9.41 ἐν ὀνόματι [A]

The expression ἐν ὀνόματι ὡς (“under the category that” or “on the ground that”; hence, “because”), though perfectly acceptable Greek, appears to have struck some copyists as strange; they therefore modified it in various ways.

9.42 παντεύματαν [καὶ ἐμέ] [C]

The presence of καὶ ἐμέ is very strongly attested (A B L W Θ Ψ f1 f13 syr f13 cop et al). At the same time, however, the absence of the words from N D and Δ, as well as the possibility that they may have come into the Markan text from the Matthean parallel (18.6), casts substantial doubt upon their right to a firm place in the second Gospel. The Committee therefore decided to enclose the phrase within square brackets.

9.44 omit verse [A]

The words ὅπως ὁ σκότος… ὥστε ἐπέκκεινται, which are lacking in important early witnesses (including N B C W it syri cop et), were added by copyists from ver. 48.

9.45 εἰς τὴν γένναν [A]

Influenced by the parallel passage in ver. 43, copyists tended to add one or another modifier to the reading that is decisively supported by representatives of the Alexandrian, the Western, the Eastern, and the Egyptian types of text.

9.46 omit verse [A]

See the comment on ver. 44.

9.49 τὰς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀληθήσεται [B]

The opening words of this verse have been transmitted in three principal forms: (1) τὰς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀληθήσεται (B L Δ Θ Ψ syr f1 f13 syri cop et al, “For every one will be salted with fire”); (2) πᾶς γὰρ τὸ θυσία ἀλλ’ ἀληθήσεται (D it c d, “For every sacrifice will be salted with salt”); and (3) τὰς γὰρ πυρὶ ἀληθήσεται καὶ πᾶς τὸ θυσία ἀλλ’ ἀληθήσεται (A K Π it, “For every one will be salted with fire, and every sacrifice will be salted with salt”). The history of the text seems to have been as follows. At a very early period a scribe, having found in ἔναν τελείου to the meaning of Jesus’ enigmatic statement, wrote the Old Testament passage in the margin of his copy of Mark. In subsequent copies the marginal gloss was either substituted for the words of the text, thus creating reading (2), or was added to the text, thus creating reading (3). Other modifications include πυρὶ ἀληθήσεται (Θ, “… will be consumed with fire…”), τὸ θυσία ἀληθήσεται (Ψ, “… sacrifice will be consumed …”), ἐν πυρὶ ἀληθήσεται (1195, “… will be tested by fire …”), and πᾶς δὲ οὕτω ἀληθήσεται (implied by it, “… and all [their] substance will be destroyed,” ο being read for ο, and ἀληθῆς for ἀληθῆς).
The reading ἀπὸ τῆς περαν (A K X II most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus; cf. the AV rendering “into the coast of Judaea by the farther side of Jordan”) is manifestly an explanatory correction introduced by copyists who were perplexed by the geographical difficulties involved in the earlier readings. In choosing between καὶ πέραν (Alexandrian text) and πέραν (Western and Antiochian texts), the Committee was impressed by the diversity of external support for the second reading, but considered that the absence of the καὶ may be due to assimilation to the parallel in Matthew (19.1). In order to reflect the balance of external witnesses and internal probabilities, it was decided to retain καὶ but to enclose it within square brackets.

10.2 καὶ προσκλήθησες Φαρισαίοι [B]

The chief problem presented by the variant readings involves the presence or absence of the words προσκλήθησες Φαρισαίοι. Did the original text read merely ἐπηρεάσων, an impersonal plural (“people asked him” or “he was asked”), and has the reference to the Pharisees come into many witnesses by assimilation to the parallel passage in Matthew (19.3)? Despite the plausibility of such a possibility, the fact that the Matthean passage is not absolutely parallel (προσήλθησαν εὐθὺς Φαρισαίοι) and the widespread and impressive support for the longer reading led a majority of the Committee to retain the words in the text.

[Inasmuch as the impersonal plural is a feature of Markan style, the words προσκλήθησες Φαρισαίοι are probably an intrusion from Matthew; if retained at all, they should be enclosed within square brackets. B.M.M. and A.W.]

10.6 αὐτοῖς [B]

The insertion of ὁ θεὸς as the subject of ἐπηρεάσων must have seemed to copyists to be necessary lest the uninstructed reader imagine that the previously mentioned subject (Moses) should be carried on. Several witnesses (D W itb, d, B, k, r1) omit αὐτοῖς as superfluous.

10.7 μὴ περαν [καὶ προσκλήθησαν πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ] [C]

Have the words καὶ προσκλήθησαν πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα (or τῇ γυναικί) αὐτοῖς been added in most copies in order to assimilate the quotation to the fuller form of text found in Mt 19.5 (and Gn 2.24), or were they inadvertently omitted in transcription (the eye of the scribe passing from καὶ to καὶ)? In order to represent the very close balance of probabilities, a majority of the Committee decided to include the clause in the text (where it seems to be necessary for the sense, otherwise οἱ δὲ in ver. 8 could be taken to refer to the father and the mother!), but to enclose it within square brackets. As between πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα and τῇ γυναικί, the former was preferred because the dative construction is obviously a stylistic correction.

10.13 ἐπηρεάσων αὐτοῖς [A]

In order to avoid possible ambiguity as to who it was that the disciples were rebuking, the scribes of A D W 0 f1 f17 al replaced αὐτοῖς with τοῖς προσφέροντοι οὐ τοῖς φέροντοι. The shorter reading is strongly supported by Β C L Δ Ψ 579 892 1342 al.

10.19 μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς [A]

Since the command, “Do not defraud” (a reminiscence of Ex 20.17 or Dt 24.14 [Septuagint mss. A F] or Sir 4.5), may have seemed to be inappropriate in a list of several of the Ten Commandments, many copyists – as well as Matthew (19.18) and Luke (18.20) – omitted it.

10.21 δεῦρο ἀπολάθητι μοι [A]

The Textus Receptus, following A and many minuscules, adds a gloss from 6.34, ἥρας τῶν σακρίων. The shorter text is strongly supported by Β C L Δ Ψ al.

10.23 εἰσκλήσοιτε

The Western text (D itb, d, B, k, r1) has moved ver. 25 so as to follow εἰσκλήσοιτε (reading verses 23, 25, 24, 26). The transposition appears to be the work of the Western redactor who sought to improve the sense by making a more gradual sequence (first, it is difficult for rich people to enter the kingdom; then, it is difficult for those

10.24 οἵτινες [B]

The rigor of Jesus’ saying was softened by the insertion of one or another qualification that limited its generality and brought it into closer connection with the context. Thus, Α C D Θ f1 f17 al read ἐτέρων τοῖς παραδόταις τῷ χρηματίῳ (“for those who trust in riches”); W and it insert πλούσιον (“a rich man”); and 1241 reads οἱ τῷ χρήματα ἔχοντες (“those who have possessions”).
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See the comment on Mt 19.24.

The reading πρὸς ἑαυτοῦ appears to be an Alexandrian correction, taking the place of πρὸς αὐτὸν, which is preserved in A D W Θ f¹ f¹3 it vg arm eth al. and refined in M* it* syr* geo (πρὸς ἀλλὰ ἑαυτοῦ).

On the one hand, the weight of evidence supporting the presence of οἱ is not impressive, but, on the other hand, scribes, recollecting the parallel in Mt 19.30 (which lacks the article), may have omitted it here. In order to reflect the balance of considerations, the Committee chose to include the word but to enclose it within square brackets to indicate a considerable degree of doubt whether it belongs in the text.

The typically Markan reading, μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμῶν (which occurs also in 8.31 and 9.31; elsewhere of Jesus' resurrection, only Mt 27.63), has been conformed by copyists to the much more frequently used expression, τῇ τριτῇ ἡμέρᾳ (compare the parallels in Mt 20.19 and Lk 18.33).

The reading that seems best to account for the emergence of the other readings is that of Ν1 B Ψ, where the accusative με is followed, not, as one would expect, by the infinitive (τοιήσας, as in many of the later manuscripts), but by the deliberative subjunctive, ποιήσω. There may also have been interference from the recollection of the text of ver. 51.

Several early versions (it* b d p2.3 syr* cp o* eth) read the Greek ἀλλὰς as ἀλλὰς, despite the lack of syntactical concord with the preceding part of the sentence.

The presence of the phrase ὑπὸ (οὐ παρὰ) τοῦ πατρὸς μου in several witnesses, some of them early (as Ν1 it* pbp*), is clearly an intrusion from the parallel in Mt 20.23.

The future tense, which is supported by A C1 K X II and most minuscules (followed by the Textus Receptus), appears to be a scribal amelioration designed to soften the peremptory tone of the present ἔστιν. It is also possible that the future may have arisen from assimilation to ἔστι in the next line.

The interpretation of this passage is obscure. Are the words καὶ εἶδος ἢ ἔστιν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὁ δὲ part of the message, or a statement of what will happen? Matthew (21.3) evidently took the words in the latter sense. The presence, however, of πάλιν in most witnesses suggests that the words, as part of the message, give assurance that the animal is to be returned after Jesus has used it. Although it may be argued that copyists, moved by considerations of what would become of the animal, inserted πάλιν before or after the verb, the fact that similar considerations did not operate in the case of the Matthean parallel, as well as the strength of the testimony of Ν1 D Q ¦ 13 28 al suggests that the original text was ἀποστέλλει πάλιν, which was subsequently modified either under the influence of the parallel or because it was no longer interpreted as part of the message. The future tense, which is smoother than the present, appears to be a scribal correction.

Although it is possible that the singular verb (ἐξαποτελέσθη) was altered to the plural in order to suit the next verse, the weight of the evidence tends to support the plural. The omission of the verb in L is the result of an accident in transcription.

Inasmuch as elsewhere the solemn expression ἄμων λέγω ἢ ἔστιν is always introductory and is never preceded by a protasis, it appears that the original reading is the exhortation Ἐστε πίστες θεοῦ, and that the reading introduced by εἰ (Ν1 D Θ f¹13 28 al) arose by assimilation to the saying in Lk 17.6 (cf. also Mt 21.21).
present tense (λαμβάνω) or, under the influence of the parallel in Mt 21.22, to the future tense (λήμψομαι).

12.26 omit verse [A]

Although it might be thought that the sentence was accidentally omitted because of homeoteleuton, its absence from early witnesses that represent all text-types makes it highly probable that the words were inserted by copyists in imitation of Mt 6.15.

12.23 εν τῇ ἀνωτάτῳ δότης [δόταν ἀνωτάτωσι] [C]

The absence of ἄνωτατωσιν from Κ B C* D L W Δ Ψ al is probably deliberate, having been omitted by copyists as superfluous (Matthew and Luke also omitted the words, probably for the same reason). It is hard to imagine that a copyist would have been tempted to gloss εν τῇ ἀνωτάτωσιν, and the pleonasm is in accord with Mark’s style (cf. 13.19 f.). At the same time, however, in deference to the generally high reputation of the witnesses that attest the omission, the Committee thought it right to enclose the words within square brackets.

In order to suggest more clearly that ver. 23 constitutes the nub of the query, copyists inserted ὄντω at various places in various witnesses.

12.26 ὅ] θέου … [ὁ] θέου [C]

It is difficult to decide whether the weight of B D W, supporting the absence of the second and third instances of ὅ, is sufficient to counterbalance the weight of almost all other witnesses that include the article in all three instances. In order to represent the considerable doubt as to the original reading, the Committee decided to include ὅ all three times but, in the second and third instances, to enclose the word within square brackets.

12.34 [εὐερέα] [C]

Since the pronoun εὐερέα forestalls the subject of the dependent clause (literally, “Jesus seeing him, that he answered wisely”), it is not surprising to find that it has been omitted by many copyists. On the other hand, in view of the weight of witnesses that lack the word, the Committee decided to indicate the balance of evidence by retaining the word but enclosing it within square brackets.

12.36 ὑποκάτω [C]

The parallel in the preferred text of Matthew (22.44) supports Mark’s substitution of ὑποκάτω (B DΨ Ψ 28 syr† copει al) for the Septuagint’s ὑποτάσσομαι. Since the latter reading is quoted in Lk 20.43 and Ac 2.35, copyists would have tended to replace Mark’s modification with the “correct” reading.

12.41 κινήσας καταναίνα τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου [B]

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is preserved in Κ L Δ 892 ith- al. Copyists were more likely to insert the words ὁ ἰησοῦς in order to identify the subject than to delete them. Elsewhere Mark uses καταναίνα (11.2, 13.3), but never ἰησοῦς. Those responsible for W Θ f1 f13 28 565 al obviously thought that it was more appropriate for Jesus to stand (στῶ) than to sit in the temple.

13.2 ὕδε λίθος ἐτὶ λίθου [B]

On the basis of preponderant manuscript evidence (Κ B L W Δ Ψ f1 f13 28 33 700 al) the Committee preferred the reading ὕδε λίθος ἐτὶ λίθου. The reading of A and a number of minuscules (λίθος ἐτὶ λίθου) reflects the influence of Lk 21.6.

13.8 ἐσοναι λιμαζ [B]

Although it is possible that the words καὶ ταραξάθη may have fallen out in transcription because of some similarity to the following word ἀπρώτη, it is more probable that here we have an example of a growing text, expanded by various copyists in various ways.

13.33 ἐγραμμεύτητι [B]

The Committee regarded the reading καὶ προκαθόρισθε as a natural addition (derived perhaps from 14.38) that many copyists were likely to make independently of one another. If the words had been present originally, it is difficult to account for their omission in B D 2427 ith-* al. copει.

14.6 ἐπάνω [A]

It has been argued that ἐπάνω is a second-century addition that reflects the depreciation of currency after the time of Nero. If that were the case, however, one would expect early rather than late Greek evidence in support of the shorter reading. It is more probable that several copyists and/or translators omitted ἐπάνω either because they objected to its colloquial usage (see Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 185) or because they were influenced by the parallel account in Jn 12.25, where the word is not used.

14.24 τῆς διαφθορᾶς [A]
It is much more likely that καινής is a scribal addition, derived from the parallel accounts in Lk 22.20 and 1 Cor 11.25, than that, being present originally, it was omitted from B C L Θ 565 it δε τούτου υπάρχουσα. See also the following set of variant readings.

The absence of οὐκέτι from B C L W is probably to be accounted for as the result of scribal assimilation to the parallel passage in Matthew (26.29). Although the use of the verb προσσύμεναι in D

14.29 οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ πιο [C]

The absence of οὐκέτι from B C L W is probably to be accounted for as the result of scribal assimilation to the parallel passage in Matthew (26.29). Although the use of the verb προσσύμεναι in D

14.30 ἢ δές ἀλλετώρα φωνήσει [C]

It appears that scribes either preferred to move ἢ δές closer to the verb or to omit it by assimilation to a parallel account (Mt 26.34; Lk 22.34; Jn 13.38).

14.39 τῶν αὐτῶν λάγον εἰτῶν [A]

Although some have thought that these words are a gloss which entered all types of text except the Western, it is far more likely that a copyist accidentally omitted them in transcription (perhaps they constituted a sense line in an ancestor of codex Bezae).

14.41 ἀνάγεται· ἠδειχθε [B]

The difficulty of interpreting the impersonal use of ἀνάγεται· ηδειχθε led copyists to introduce ameliorations. Several Western and other witnesses (including D W Θ f15) add τὸ γέλοιο (meaning perhaps, “the end has fully come”), a gloss that may have been suggested by Lk 22.37: a few witnesses (including Ἦ 892 ad) omit ἀνάγεται· and it ἰδι τιλσε the passage as follows: et venit tertio et ubi adoravit dicit illis: dormite jam nunc, ecce appropinquavit qui me tradit. Et post postulam excavit illus et dixit: jam hora est, ecce traditur filius hominum…. (“and he came the third time and when he had prayed he says to them, ‘Sleep on now, behold, he who betrays me has come near.’ And after a little he aroused them and said, ‘Now is the hour; behold, the Son of Man is betrayed…”).

14.65 αὐξή [A]

Several witnesses (Θ 565 700 it δε τύχων), no doubt influenced by the parallel account in Mt 26.67, have replaced αὐξή with αὔξην τοῦ

14.66 τριῶν [B]

The longer reading involving the addition of the question τίς ἔστιν ὁ πῶς ὁ προσφήσας; (“Who is it that has struck you?”), with or without the introductory Χριστῇ, appears to be an assimilation to the text of Matthew (26.68) or Luke (22.64). The shortest reading, προφήτων, supported as it is by the Alexandrian text and several early versions, best accounts for the rise of the other readings.

14.66 καὶ ἀλλετώρα φωνήσει [C]

It is difficult to decide whether these words were added or omitted from the original text. It is easy to explain their addition: copyists would have been tempted to insert the words in order to emphasize the literal fulfillment of Jesus’ prophecy in ver. 30 (perhaps copyists would also have reasoned that Peter could not have known that a crowing of the cock was the second if he had not heard the first). It is also easy to explain the omission of the words: copyists wished to bring the Markan account of two cock-crowings into harmony with the narratives of the other three Gospels, which mention only one cock-crowing (perhaps copyists also asked themselves why, if Peter had heard the cock, he did not at once repent).

In the face of such conflicting possibilities, and with each reading supported by impressive external evidence, the Committee decided that the least unsatisfactory solution was to include the words in the text, but to enclose them within square brackets.

14.72 εἰ δευτέρου [B]

Several witnesses omit εἰ δευτέρου (Ν C* al L it δε τύχων; a few witnesses (including D 892 al) omit ἀνάγεται· and it ἰδι τιλσε the passage as follows: et venit tertio et ubi adoravit dicit illis: dormite jam nunc, ecce appropinquavit qui me tradit. Et post postulam excavit illus et dixit: jam hora est, ecce traditur filius hominum…. (“and he came the third time and when he had prayed he says to them, ‘Sleep on now, behold, he who betrays me has come near.’ And after a little he aroused them and said, ‘Now is the hour; behold, the Son of Man is betrayed…”).

14.66 τριῶν [B]

The reading that seems to account best for the origin of the others is the one supported by C L Θ 892 al, in which δες and τρις stand side by side. Copyists moved one or the other of the adverbs in order to improve the style and euphony, or omitted δες· in accord with the same considerations that appear to have operated at verses 30 and 68 concerning the second cock-crowing (see the comments on these passages).

14.72 καὶ ἐμπαλίων ἐκλείπειν [B]

The difficulty of interpreting the meaning of ἐμπαλίων led copyists to replace it with ἤξωσθε in several Western and other witnesses, including D 0 565 Old Latin al. In a few
witnesses (K* A* = 16 C) the imperfect tense (ἐκλαίειν) was assimilated to the aorist (ἐκλαίων) of the parallel passages (Mt 26.75 and Lk 22.62).

15.8 ἀνωθενάς ὁ δεσπότης [B]

The verbs ἀνωθενάω and ἀνωθεθήμενος were liable to be confused in manuscripts (cf. the Septuagint of 2 Sm 23.8; 2 Kings 3.21; Ho 8.9). There is no other occurrence of ἀνωθενάω in Mark, but ἀνωθεθήμενος occurs nine times. The external evidence in support of ἀνωθενάς (a verb that is particularly appropriate if Pilate’s quarters were in the Tower of Antonia) is strong (K* B D 892 most of the Old Latin vg copia, bo goth).

The insertion of ὅποιος in a few witnesses was made in the interest of dramatic heightening of the narrative.

15.12 [βῆλες] ποιήσα [C]

It is difficult to decide whether the shorter reading (supported by Ν B C W Δ Ψ f1 f13 α) is secondary, having been conformed to Mt 27.22, or whether βῆλες has been inserted by assimilation to ver. 9 or Mt 27.21 or Lk 23.20 (compare also Mt 10.38). On the whole the Committee thought it best to include βῆλες in the text but to enclose it within square brackets.

15.12 [ὡν λέγετε] [C]

Although there is strong external attestation for the omission of ὡν λέγετε, Matthew’s reading ὡν λέγομεν Χριστόν (Mt 27.22) seems to presuppose the originality of ὡν λέγετε in Mark. On the other hand, however, the insertion of the clause may be regarded as a scribal amelioration, introduced in order to throw the onus for the use of the title “The King of the Jews” upon the high priests. The unique reading of B is probably to be explained as the result of accidental omission of ὡν. On balance the Committee judged that the least unsatisfactory solution was to include the words in the text, but to enclose them within square brackets to indicate doubt that they have a right to stand there.

15.29 τριτή

In the interest of harmonization with Jn 19.14, instead of τριτή a few witnesses read ἓκτη (0 478* 567* syr* v bo eth). According to the suggestion of several patristic writers, τριτή has arisen out of a confusion between *V (= 6) and *G (= 3). (See also the comment on Jn 19.14.)

15.28 omit verse [A]

The earliest and best witnesses of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text lack ver. 28. It is understandable that copyists could have added the sentence in the margin from Lk 22.37, whence it came into the text itself; there is no reason why, if the sentence were present originally, it should have been deleted. It is also significant that Mark very seldom expressly quotes the Old Testament.

15.34 ελέας ελάς λεμα αυλεθηκανι

The reading τηλι τηλεὶ of D Θ (059 Ελλειποῦ) 0192 (131 Ελλείποι) 565 αλ represents the Hebrew יֵלַי (“my God”), and has been assimilated to the parallel in Matthew (27.46). The great majority of uncials and minuscule manuscripts read ελάς ελάς, which represents the Aramaic יֵלַי (“my God”), the ω for the a sound being due to the influence of the Hebrew יֵלַי.

The spelling λαμ (Ν C L Δ Ψ 72 495 517 579 1342 1675 αλ) represents the Aramaic יַלְמ (“why?”), which is also probably to be understood as lying behind λαμ (A K M R U X G Π αλ) represents the Hebrew יִלְמ (“why?”).

All Greek manuscripts except codex Bezae read αυλεθηκανι or something similar (αυλεθηκανι, A; αυλεθηκανι, B; αυλεθηκανι, C αλ), which represents the Aramaic יֵלַא (“thou hast forsaken me”). The reading (αυλαθι) of D (it reads zaphanui; it zaphanui; א) zaphanui; א zaphani) is a scholarly correction representing the Hebrew of Ps 22.1 יֵלַא ("thou hast forsaken me")2.

Thus, in the text preferred by the Committee the entire saying represents an Aramaic original, whereas the Matthew parallel is partly Hebrew and partly Aramaic (see the comment on Mt 27.46).

15.34 ἐγκατέλειπης με [B]

It is perhaps more likely that copyists should have altered ἐγκατέλειπης με to agree with the Matthew reading με ἐγκατέλειπης (Mt 27.46), than that they should have changed με ἐγκατέλειπης to ἐγκατέλειπης με to agree with the Septuagint of Ps 22.2.

The reading of D* (supported by a few other Western witnesses;25 γνωσθαι με (“[Why] hast thou reproached [or, taunted] me?”) may have been substituted for the usual reading by someone who could not understand how God would have forsaken Jesus on the cross.
there was darkness over the whole circle of the earth, and angels descended from the heavens, and as he [the Lord] was rising [reading surgentes eo] in the glory of the living God, at the same time they ascended with him; and immediately it was light. Then the women went to the tomb...). The emendation viri duo, which in the context appears to be unnecessary, has been proposed in view of the account in the Gospel of Peter of two men who, having descended from heaven in a great brightness, brought Jesus out of the tomb, and “the heads of the two reached to heaven, but the head of him who was being led by them overpassed the heavens” (§§ 35–40).

16.9-20 The Ending(s) of Mark

Four endings of the Gospel according to Mark are current in the manuscripts. (1) The last twelve verses of the commonly received text of Mark are absent from the two oldest Greek manuscripts (K and B), from the Old Latin codex Bobiensis (it'), the Sinaic Syriac manuscript, about one hundred Armenian manuscripts, and the two oldest Georgian manuscripts (written A.D. 897 and A.D. 913).

Clement of Alexandria and Origen show no knowledge of the existence of these verses; furthermore Eusebius and Jerome attest that the passage was absent from almost all Greek copies of Mark known to them. The original form of the Eusebian sections (drawn up by Ammonius) makes no provision for numbering sections of the text after 16.8. Not a few manuscripts that contain the passage have scribal notes stating that older Greek copies lack it, and in other witnesses the passage is marked with asterisks or obeli, the conventional signs used by copyists to indicate a spurious addition to a document.

(2) Several witnesses, including four uncial Greek manuscripts of the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries (Lk 23.56), as well as Old Latin it, the margin of the Harclean Syriac, several Sahidic and Bohairic manuscripts, and not a few Ethiopic manuscripts, continue after verse 8 as follows (with trifling variations): “But they reported briefly to Peter and those with him all that they had been told. And after these things Jesus himself sent out through them, from east to west, the sacred and imperishable proclamation of eternal salvation.” All of these witnesses except it' also continue with verses 9-20.

(3) The traditional ending of Mark, so familiar through the AV and other translations of the Textus Receptus, is present in the vast number of witnesses, including A C D K W X Δ 0 Ψ 099 1012 33 1383 31. The earliest patristic witnesses to part or all of the long ending are Irenaeus and the Diatessaron. It is not certain whether

Justin Martyr was acquainted with the passage; in his Apology (I:45) he includes five words that occur in a different sequence, in ver. 20 τον λεγοντα τοιοι πως η ἑρμηνεία αυτοῦ ἐξελθοντες παράγων τὴν ἴδιαν.
In the fourth century the traditional ending also circulated, according to testimony preserved by Jerome, in an expanded form, preserved today in one Greek manuscript. Codex Washingtonianus includes the following after ver. 14: “And they excused themselves, saying, ‘This age of lawlessness and unbelief is under Satan, who does not allow the truth and power of God to prevail over the unclean things of the spirits [or, does not allow what lies under the unclean spirits to understand the truth and power of God]. Therefore reveal your righteousness now’ — thus they spoke to Christ. And Christ replied to them, ‘The term of years of Satan’s power has been fulfilled, but other terrible things draw near. And for those who have sinned I was handed over to death, that they may return to the truth and sin no more, in order that they may inherit the spiritual and incorruptible glory of righteousness that is in heaven.’”

Finally it should be observed that the external evidence for the shorter ending (2) preserved by Jerome, in an expanded form, preserved today in one Greek manuscript. The whole expansion has about it an unmistakable apocryphal flavor. It probably is the work of a second or third century scribe who wished to soften the severe condemnation of the Eleven in 16:14.

The longer ending (3), though current in a variety of witnesses, some of them ancient, must also be judged by internal evidence to be secondary. 

(a) The vocabulary and style of verses 9-20 are non-Markan (e.g. ἀτιστάω, βιάστω, ρηθώ, ἐποκολασθώ, ἡθοπ., μετὰ τὰα, προσβαίνω, συνηγιλάω, ἄτετον) as well as several that occur nowhere else in the New Testament (δευς, ἄρις, προολίγω). The reading preserved in W, see section [4] in the comments on verses 9-20 above. The reading Ἰησοῦς is to be preferred to the others, which are natural expansions. It is probable that from the beginning the shorter ending was provided with a concluding ἄφην, and that its absence from several witnesses (L cop. eth. eth. me) is due either transcribers oversight or, more probably, to the feeling that ἄφην is inappropriate when verses 9-20 follow.

(b) The connection between ver. 8 and verses 9-20 is so awkward that it is difficult to believe that the evangelist intended the section to be a continuation of the Gospel. Thus, the subject of ver. 8 is the women, whereas Jesus is the presumed subject in ver. 9; in ver. 9 Mary Magdalene is identified even though she has been mentioned only a few lines before (15:47 and 16:1); the other women of verses 1-8 are now forgotten; the use of ἀνισαστάς δὲ and the position of τῶν are appropriate at the beginning of a comprehensive narrative, but they are ill-suited in a continuation of verses 1-8. In short, all these features indicate that the section was added by someone who knew a form of Mark that ended abruptly with ver. 8 and who wished to supply a more appropriate conclusion. In view of the inconcinnities between verses 1-8 and 9-20, it is unlikely that the long ending was composed ad hoc to fill up an obvious gap; it is more likely that the section was excerpted from another document, dating perhaps from the first half of the second century.

The internal evidence for the shorter ending (2) is decidedly against its being genuine. Besides containing a high percentage of non-Markan words, its rhetorical tone differs totally from the simple style of Mark’s Gospel.

Finally it should be observed that the external evidence for the shorter ending (2) resolves itself into additional testimony supporting the omission of verses 9-20. No one who had available as the conclusion of the Second Gospel the twelve verses 9-20, so rich in interesting material, would have deliberately replaced them with a few lines of a colorless and generalized summary. Therefore, the documentary evidence supporting (2) should be added to that supporting (1). Thus, on the basis of good external evidence and strong internal considerations it appears that the earliest ascertainable form of the Gospel of Mark ended with 16:8. At the same time, however, out of deference to the evident antiquity of the longer ending and its importance in the textual tradition of the Gospel, the Committee decided to include verses 9-20 as part of the text, but to enclose them within double square brackets in order to indicate that they are the work of an author other than the evangelist.

SHOWER ENDING

For a discussion of the shorter ending, see the section [2] in the comments on verses 9-20 above. The reading Ἰησοῦς is to be preferred to the others, which are natural expansions. It is probable that from the beginning the shorter ending was provided with a concluding ἄφην, and that its absence from several witnesses (L cop. eth. eth. me) is due either transcriptional oversight or, more probably, to the feeling that ἄφην is inappropriate when verses 9-20 follow.

VARIANT READINGS WITHIN [MARK] 16:9-20

Since the passage 16:9-20 is lacking in the earlier and better manuscripts that normally serve to identify types of text, it is not always easy to make decisions among alternative readings. In any case it will be understood that the several levels of certainty ([A], [B], [C]) are within the framework of the initial decision relating to verses 9 to 20 as a whole.

16:14-15 ἐπιστέφων, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς (A)

For the addition preserved in W, see section [4] in the comments on verses 9-20 above.

16:17 λαλήσωσιν κειμεν (B)

Although it is possible that κειμεν may have been added in imitation of καλλή διαθήκη and κειμεν ἀνθρώπων, it is more probable that it dropped out of several witnesses through homoeoteleuton with the following καὶ ἐν ταῖς [i.e. καὶ ταῖς].

16:18 [καὶ ἐν ταῖς χεραίν] ὄφεις (C)
Although it is possible that the expression καὶ ἐν ταῖς γραπτῖν was added in imitation of the account in Ac 28.3-6, a majority of the Committee preferred to follow the Alexandrian group of witnesses. At the same time, in view of the absence of any good reason to account for the omission of the words from such witnesses as A D* Θ Π f 13 2870 μηδεν καὶ νεαν μή συρετέων al, it was thought appropriate to enclose them within square brackets.

16.19 κύριος Ἰησοῦς [C]

Among the several titles applied to Jesus by the Church, the use of κύριος standing alone appears to be a later development, more solemn than κύριος Ἰησοῦς.

16.20 σημεῖον. [B]

On the addition of ἐντῷ in most witnesses, see the comment on Mt 28.20.

Footnotes

1 See, for example, the expansions introduced into the title of the book of Revelation (Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, 3rd ed., p. 205).


7 M.-J. Lagrange, however, disagrees with this commonly accepted view (Évangile selon saint Marc, ad lac.


10 For example, Celsus, the second-century antagonist of Christianity, sneeringly remarked that the founder of the new religion was nothing but “a carpenter by trade” – a jibe that Origen sought to rebut by declaring, “In none of the Gospels current in the churches is Jesus himself ever described as a carpenter” (contra Celsum, VI 34 and 36). Either Origen did not recall Mk 6.3, or the text of this verse in copies known to him had already been assimilated to the Matthean parallel.


12 For a lengthy discussion of this conflated reading, see Westcott and Hort, Introduction, pp. 95-99.

13 Many modern scholars, following the interpretation suggested by Origen and Chrysostom, regard καὶ νεαν μή συρετέων as connected grammatically with λέγει in ver. 18, and take it as the evangelist’s comment on the implications of Jesus’ words concerning Jewish dietary laws.

14 Many attempts have been made to account linguistically or palaeographically for the origin of the word Dalmanutha (see Eb. Nestle in Hastings’ Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, I, pp. 406 f., and the literature mentioned in Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, s.v.)

15 Many attempts have been made to account linguistically or palaeographically for the origin of the word Dalmanutha (see Eb. Nestle in Hastings’ Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, I, pp. 406 f., and the literature mentioned in Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, s.v.)

16 It should be observed that here εἴ is not only be taken as the ordinary conditional particle (“If you have faith in God, …”), but can also be construed as an interrogative particle introducing (like Hebrew ~a) a direct question (“Do you have faith in God?”; see Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 440 (3)).

17 It is perhaps not surprising that most witnesses have dropped the initial α-sound (with the ‘ain), indicating the close of an ecclesiastical lection (Ellis [and] Max Wilcox [Edinburgh, 1969], pp. 157-180, especially pp. 159 f., and ad lac.)

18 It is perhaps not surprising that most witnesses have dropped the initial a-sound (with the ‘ain), coming as it does immediately after the terminal vowel of ἵσαν.

19 Three Old Latin manuscripts support, each in its own way, the reading of D*: exprobaasti me it, me in opprobrium dedisti it, and me maledixisti it.

20 Two other Greek manuscripts, both of the twelfth century, also lack verses 9-20, namely 304 and 2386. The latter, however, is only an apparent witness for the omission, for although the last page of Mark closes with τριάδες ἐν τοίς ἑτρακάρτοις γῇ, the next leaf of the manuscript is missing, and following 16.8 is the sign indicating the close of an ecclesiastical lection (τὶς π. τέλος), a clear implication that the manuscript originally continued with additional material from Mark (see Kurt Aland, “Bemerkungen zum Schluss des Markusevangeliums,” in Streitumstüentia et Semitica, Studies in Honour of Matthew Black, ed. by E. Earle Ellis [and] Max Wilcos [Edinburgh, 1969], pp. 157-180, especially pp. 159 f., and ad lac.)

21 For their identity see Ernest C. Colwell in Journal of Biblical Literature, LV (1937), pp. 369-386.

22 It has often been stated that three Ethiopic manuscripts, now in the British Museum, lack the last twelve verses of Mark. This statement, made originally by D. S. Margoliouth and reported by William Sanday in his Appendices ad Novum Testamentum Stephanicum (Oxford, 1889), p. 195, is erroneous; for details see the present writer’s article, “The Ending of the Gospel according to Mark in Ethiopic Manuscripts,” contributed to the Festschrift for Morton Scott Enslin (Understanding the Sacred Text, ed. by John Reumann et al. [Valle Forge, Pa., c. 1972]), and reprinted, with additions, in Metzger, New Testament Studies (Leiden, 1980), pp. 127-147.

The Arabic manuscript, Rom. Vat. Arab. 13, has sometimes been cited (e.g. by Tischendorf and Tregelles) as a witness for the form of the Gospel that ends at ver. 6. Since, however, through an accidental loss of leaves the original hand of the manuscript breaks off just before the end of Mk 16.8, its testimony is


See the article mentioned in footnote 22(3) above.

For a full discussion of the Greek and Latin evidence for the endings of Mark, with a more favorable estimate of the originality of the shorter ending, see the article by Aland in the Festschrift for Matthew Black, referred to in footnote 20(1) of p. 102 above.

Three possibilities are open: (a) the evangelist intended to close his Gospel at this place; or (b) the Gospel was never finished; or, as seems most probable, (c) the Gospel accidentally lost its last leaf before it was multiplied by transcription.


1.3 κίμων

Several copyists, dissatisfied that Luke makes no explicit mention of inspiration in connection with his writing the Gospel, added the words “it seemed good to me and to the Holy Spirit...to write an orderly account” (itq νευρογαννκαν νατρον τον αξιωματικόν καὶ τον Καθαρόν). The supplement comes from Ac 15.28 ("it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us").

1.28 οὖν [A]

Although many witnesses (including A C D Θ and most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus) read after οὖν the words ἑλπιδοφαίρεται οὐ ἐν γυναικίν, it is probable that copyists inserted them here from ver. 42, where they are firmly attested. If the clause had been original in the present verse, there is no adequate reason why it should have been omitted from a wide diversity of early witnesses (including B L W Y 700 1241 syr* op* xx* arm geo a). The reading gained wide currency in the early church through Tatian’s Diatessaron. The reading (literally “in thee”), for which Dionysius Barsalibi (died a.d. 1171) argues vigorously in his commentary on Luke, is read by the earliest manuscripts of the Peshitta (the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac manuscripts are not extant here) and is adopted as the text in Pusey and Gwilliam’s critical edition.

1.35 γεννάων [A]

The words ἧκι οὖν are apparently an early addition prompted by a desire for greater symmetry after the two preceding instances of the second person pronoun. The expanded reading gained wide currency in the early church through Tatian’s Diatessaron. The reading (literally “in thee”), for which Dionysius Barsalibi (died a.d. 1171) argues vigorously in his commentary on Luke, is read by the earliest manuscripts of the Peshitta (the Curetonian and Sinaitic Syriac manuscripts are not extant here) and is adopted as the text in Pusey and Gwilliam’s critical edition.

1.46 Μαριάμ [A]

Who is represented as the speaker of the Magnificat? According to the overwhelming preponderance of evidence, comprising all Greek witnesses and almost all versional and patristic witnesses, it was spoken by Mary. On the other hand, according to half a dozen witnesses, chiefly Latin, it was spoken by Elizabeth. These latter witnesses are three Old Latin manuscripts (namely ms. a of the fourth century [Elisabet], ms. b of the fifth century [Elisabet], and ms. c of the seventh or eighth century [Elisabet]), and three patristic writers (Irenaeus in his Against Heresies vii,1 according to the Armenian translation and certain manuscripts of the Latin translation [but in n,1 all manuscripts read Mary]; Niceta, bishop of Remesiana in Dacia [Yugoslavia]; and Jerome’s translation of Origen’s remark that some [Greek?] manuscripts of Luke read Elizabeth instead of Mary).
How shall this evidence be interpreted? There are three possibilities: (1) The original text read simply Καὶ εἶπεν, Μεγαλόποι, ... and some抄ists supplied Mary, and others Elizabeth. (2) The name Elizabeth was present originally, but, because of doctrinal considerations related to the veneration of the Virgin, most抄ists changed it to Mary. (3) The name Mary was present originally, but several抄ists, assuming that the Magnificat was included in the subject of ἡ εὐαγγέλια ἡ ἡγία (ver. 41), and noticing the use of ἔννοια in ver. 56, changed Mary to Elizabeth.

Although sympathetic to the supposition that perhaps neither name was present in the original text, the Committee was impressed by the overwhelming weight of external evidence, as well as by the balance of internal probabilities, and therefore preferred to read Μαρία as the subject of εἶπεν.

1.66 χαίρε κυρίον ἕν [A]

Not noticing that the last clause of the verse is an observation made by the evangelist (such occasional remarks are characteristic of Luke; cf. 2.50; 3.15; 7.39; 16.14; 20.20; 23.12), several Western witnesses (D ms 81, 1 η 26 syr) omit ἕν, thus bringing the clause within the question of those who had heard about Zechariah (“What then will this child be, for the hand of the Lord is with him?”).

1.74 ἐκ χειρός ἐγερθὼν [B]

The addition of ἐγερθὼν is a natural expansion, particularly in view of ἐξ ἐγερθῶν ἥματιν in ver. 71. The readings with καὶ or πάντων are obviously secondary.

1.78 ἐπισκέπτεται [B]

The future tense ἐπισκέπτεται, supported by a variety of early witnesses, was probably altered to the aorist in conformity with ver. 68, thus beginning and closing the canticle with ἐπισκέπτετο.

2.9 καὶ (1) [B]

On the one hand, the reading καὶ ἰδοὺ is in harmony with the solemn style of Luke in chaps. 1 and 2 (where ἰδοὺ occurs ten times). On the other hand, however, it is difficult to imagine why, if ἰδοὺ were present originally,抄ists would have omitted it. The Committee preferred the shorter reading, attested as it is by a variety of good authorities.

2.11 Χριστὸς κύριος [A]

The combination Χριστὸς κύριος, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, seems to have been quite deliberately used by Luke instead of the much more frequent Χριστός κυρίου. It was to be expected that抄ists, struck by the unusual collocation, should have introduced various modifications, none of which has significant external attestation.

2.14 εἰν αὐθάλητοι εἴδοκαί [A]

The difference between the AV, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men,” and the RSV, “Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among men with whom he is pleased!” is not merely a matter of exegesis of the meaning of the Greek, but is first of all one of text criticism. Does the Angelic Hymn close with εἰδοκαί or εἴδοκαί?

The genitive case, which is the more difficult reading, is supported by the oldest representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western groups of witnesses. The rise of the nominative case, which is the more generally attested, is in harmony with the solemn style of Luke in chaps. 1 and 2 (where εἴδοκαί occurs ten times). On the other hand, however, it is difficult to imagine why, if εἴδοκαί were present originally, copyists would have omitted it. The Committee preferred the shorter reading, attested as it is by a variety of good authorities.

2.33 δὲ παρήγοροι αὐτοῖς καὶ ἥ μήτηρ [B]

In order to safeguard the doctrine of the virgin birth of Jesus, δὲ παρήγορα was replaced by ἧ μήτηρ in a variety of witnesses, some of them ancient (Old Latin, Gothic, and the Diatessaron). Other witnesses added αὗτοῖς after ἥ μήτηρ, either for stylistic balance with δὲ παρήγορα αὗτοῖς (as N4, L 157 µ), or by transfer
when ὁ πατήρ was replaced by Ἰωσήφ. Besides a number of singular readings, Ἰωσήφ ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μητέρ αὐτοῦ (157 eth) is an obvious conflation.

2.38 Ἰερουσαλήμ {Α}

The reading Ἰερουσαλήμ best explains the rise of the other readings: the insertion of ἐν relieves the grammatical ambiguity, and the substitution of Ἰερουσαλήμ enhances the theological implications of the passage.

2.41 οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ

In the interest of safeguarding the doctrine of the virgin birth a few copyists and translators replaced οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ with the proper names ὁ τε Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ Μαρία (1012 itb11 [itb2 add mater eius] Diatessaron11). (See also the comments on verses 33 and 43.)

2.43 οἱ γονεῖς

As in verses 33 and 41, in order to safeguard the doctrine of the virgin birth copyists replaced οἱ γονεῖς (N B D L Θ 1 13 33 157 1241 11 1424 1 13 33 157 1241) with Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ μητέρ (A C X Γ Δ Λ Ψ 28 543 565 892 1071 1424). See the comment on Ac 13:1.

3.1 τετρααρχικός (ter)

See the comment on Ac 13:1.

3.19 τετραίρης

See the comment on Ac 13:1.

3.22 οὐ εἰ ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν οἷς εἶδόντες [B]

The Western reading, “This day I have begotten thee,” which was widely current during the first three centuries, appears to be secondary, derived from Ps 2.7. The use of the third person (“This is…in whom…” in a few witnesses is an obvious assimilation to the Matthean form of the saying (Mt 3.17).

3.32 Σαλά {B}

The original reading appears to be Σαλά (Q P N B syr sqd cop b unwr eth), which copyists later assimilated to Σαλίμων, the reading of both the Matthean parallel (Mt 1.4-5) and the Septuagint of 1 Chr 2.11, or to Σαλίμων, the reading of ms. B at Ru 4.20 f. (Σαλίμων, ms. A). In view of the early tradition that Luke was a Syrian of Antioch it is perhaps significant that the form Σαλά appears to embody a Syriac tradition (the Peshitta version of Ru 4.20 f. reads ).

3.33 τοῦ Ἀρμενικῆς τοῦ Ἀρμένι τοῦ Ἀρνι {C}

Faced with a bewildering variety of readings, the Committee adopted what seems to be the least unsatisfactory form of text, a reading that was current in the Alexandrian church at an early period.5

4.4 άνθρωπος {B}

The shortest reading, which has good and early support, must be original; the longer forms of text have been assimilated by copyists to the Matthean parallel (Mt 4.4) or to the Septuagint of Dti 8.3, either verbatim or according to the general sense. If any of the longer forms of text had been original, its omission from N B L W 1241 syr cp would be unaccountable.

4.5-12

In order to bring Luke’s account of the Temptation into harmony with the sequence of temptations in Matthew (4.5-11), several Old Latin witnesses (it b c l q r1), at least one Vulgate manuscript (G), and Ambrose in his Commentary on the Gospel According to Luke,7 transpose verses 5-8 to follow verses 9-12.

4.17 ἀναπτύξας [B]

Since the synagogal copies of Old Testament books were in scroll form, the use of the verb “to unroll” is highly appropriate. Although copyists may have introduced ἀναπτύξας as a pedantic correlative to πτύσσαμαι in ver. 20, it is more probable that, being accustomed to books in codex (or leaf) form, they introduced the frequently used verb ἀνοίγων, “to open,” as an explanatory substitution for ἀναπτύσσομαι (which occurs only here in the New Testament).

4.18 με (2) {A}

Following ἀπέσταλεν με, a number of witnesses continue with the words Ἰδοὺ δὲ ἐπηρέασεν τὸν Ἰδοὺ δὲ ἐπηρέασεν τὸν Ἰδοὺ δὲ ἐπηρέασεν τὸν Ἰδοὺ δὲ ἐπηρέασεν. This is an obvious scribal supplement introduced in order to bring the quotation more completely in accord with the Septuagint text of Is 61.1.

4.44 εἰς τὰς συναγωγῶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας {B}
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In view of Luke’s earlier reference (in ver. 14) to the beginning of Jesus’ Galilean ministry, the reading τῆς Ἰουδαίας (θ' B C L f1 892 Lec syr A· B· *· al) is obviously the more difficult, and copyists have corrected it to τῆς Ἰαλωσίας in accord with the parallels in Mt 4.23 and Mk 1.39. Another attempt to avoid the difficulty was the substitution of τῶν Ἰουδαίων (W 108). As for the variation in prepositions,

the use here of εἰς is pregnant (“Jesus went into and preached in”) and is to be preferred to the more commonplace εἰν.

5.17 οἱ ἠμαθείς ἐλαλοῦσιν [B]

The difficulty of the reading supported by the overwhelming mass of witnesses (according to which the enemies of Jesus had come from every village of Galilee, Judea, and Jerusalem) prompted some copyists to omit οἱ altogether (K· C· B· *· 33) and others to replace it with οἱ (D· f 8· 3· syr·), so that it is the sick who have come from all parts to be healed.

5.17 αὐτῶν [A]

The failure to see that αὐτῶν is the subject, not the object, of τὸ ἱστός led copyists to replace it with a plural form, as αὐτοίς (A· C· D· α·), πάντως (K· Cyril), αὖτος πάντας (sy·), or τοὺς αὐθεντοῦσας (t·). 5.33 οἱ (2) [B]

Copyists who remembered the parallel account in Mk 2.18 transformed the statement into a question.

5.38 ἀμφότερος [B]

The gerundive (the only verbal adjective in -τός that occurs in the New Testament) was replaced in a few witnesses by βάλλοντων of the Matthean parallel (9.17), from which also was derived the widespread interpolation καὶ ἀμφότεροι συντρίπτουσαι (or συντρίπτονται).

5.39 include-verse [A]

The external attestation for the inclusion of the verse is almost overwhelming; its omission from several Western witnesses may be due to the influence of Marcion, who rejected the statement because it seemed to give authority to the Old Testament.

5.39 καί [C]

The evidence for and against the inclusion of καί is so evenly balanced as to call for the use of square brackets.

5.39 χρηστός [A]

The comparative degree of the adjective is probably a scribal emendation introduced in order to make the comparison more apparent. Actually, however, the point is that the prejudiced person does not even wish to try what is new (the gospel), being satisfied that the old (the Law) is good.

6.1 σωμάτικον [C]

The word δευτεροτρόπος occurs nowhere else, and appears to be a vox nulla that arose accidentally through a transcriptional blunder. Perhaps some copyist introduced πρῶτος as a correlative to εἰν ἐν τετραγώνῳ σωμάτικῳ in ver. 5, and a second copyist, in view of 4.31, wrote δευτερόφρον, deleting πρῶτος by using dots over the letters – which was the customary way of cancelling a word. A subsequent transcriber, not noticing the dots, mistakenly combined the two words into one, which he introduced into the text. Alternatively, as Skeat has suggested, by dittography the letters βατω were added to αὐτῷ, and a second copyist, in view of 4.31, wrote ταῖς ἤ τοις αὐτῷ, and took ταῖς as an indication that the adjective was to agree with σωμάτικον.

6.4 καὶ ἔδωκεν τοῖς μετ’ αὐτοῦ [A]

The addition of καὶ after ἔδωκεν, which enhances the point of the argument, seems to be secondary, the work of copyists who may or may not have been following the Markan parallel (2.28). No good reason can be found to account for its omission if it had been in the text originally.

6.4 μίσος τοῖς ἱερεῖς [A]

Codex Bezae transfers ver. 5 after ver. 10, and in its place reads the following: τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεοσεβείᾳ τούτῳ ἐργαζόμενων τῷ σωμάτω οἱ σωμάτων εἶπεν αὐτῷ, “Ἄμήρησο, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τὰ ποιεῖς, μοιρᾶσος εἰ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικαταραμάτοι καὶ παραβαθῇ εἰ τοῦ νόμου” (“On the same day he saw a man working on the sabbath and said to him, ‘Man, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed; but if you do not know, you are accused and a transgressor of the law’”). The scribe (or editor) of D thus makes Luke enumerate three incidents concerning Jesus and the sabbath, and climaxes the series with the pronouncement concerning the sovereignty of the Son of Man over the sabbath.
6.5 κύριος ἐστίν τοῦ αμβλύτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [B]

It is rather more probable that copyists inserted καὶ before τοῦ αμβλύτου, thus giving more point to the saying (and assimilating it to the parallel in Mt 2.20), than that καὶ should have been deleted from early representatives of several text-types. The non-Markan word order is likewise to be preferred.

6.10 εἶπεν [A]

Several groups of witnesses assimilate the account to the Markan parallel (Mt 3.5) by adding ἐν ὑμῖν (or μετʼ ὑμῖν), a phrase which, in the opinion of a majority of the Committee, Luke is not likely to have used (from a sense of reverence).

6.16 Ἑσαρμένον

See the comment on Mt 10.4.

6.21 τοιεῖτε [B]

The shorter reading, supported by a diversity of early witnesses, is preferable to the longer readings, which appear to be, in various ways, scribal assimilations to the wording of the Matthean parallel (Mt 7.12).

6.26 μηδέν [B]

The reading μηδένα ἀπελείποντες ("despairing of no one"), which introduces into the context an alien motive, appears to have arisen in transcription, the result of dittography.

6.48 διὰ τὸ καλόν ὁ ὑιοθετήθηκεν αὐτὴν [A]

The distinctively Lukan clause assigning the reason for the permanence of the house ("because it had been well built"), which corresponds to the earlier statement concerning the builder’s industry ("dug deep, and laid the foundation upon rock"), was supplanted by copyists who preferred the reason given by Matthew ("for it was founded upon the rock," Mt 7.25). The omission of the clause in several witnesses (atives) is the result of accidental oversight occasioned by homoeoteleuton (αὐτὴν ... αὐτὴν).

7.11 ἐν τῷ ἔξοδῳ [B]

With ἐν τῷ ἔξοδῳ the reader is to supply τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ("on the next day"); with ἐν τῷ ἔξοδῳ one supplies χρόνῳ ("[soon] afterward"). Elsewhere, however, when Luke writes τῇ ἔξοδῳ he does not prefix ἐν (Lk 9.37; Ac 21.1; 25.17; 27.18); on the other hand, when χρόνῳ is to be understood, Luke uses ἐν τῷ καθεξῆ (Lk 8.1). On the whole, it is more probable that the less definite expression of time would be altered to the more definite than vice versa. Furthermore, the evidence supporting τῇ ἔξοδῳ is more weighty than that supporting τῇ ἔξοδῳ.

7.19 κύριων [C]

Since it is not likely that copyists would have deleted the name Ἱησοῦ, and since κύριων is in accord with Lukan style, the Committee preferred the reading κύριων.

7.28 γυναικὸν Ἰωάννου. [B]

The shortest reading, which is also supported by the earliest manuscripts, best accounts for the rise of the other readings. It appears that προφήτης was inserted by pedantic copyists who wished thereby to exclude Christ from the comparison, while others added τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ, assimilating the text to Mt 11.11.

7.39 ἐγραφήσαντες [B]
In order to make a better balance of clauses, A Δ Ψ f¹ al. followed by the Textus Receptus, insert (ιᾷ confess following εδικησαμεν). The shorter text is supported by a wide variety of types of text (N B D L W Θ Ξ f¹ al).

7.35 πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς [B]

Some witnesses (D L Θ Ψ 28 700 al) omit the word πάντων, thus not only conforming the text in this respect to Mt 11.19, but also permitting an easier interpretation. The presence of the word, supported by most other witnesses, is in accord with Luke’s fondness for πᾶς (6.17; 20; 9.43; 11.4). As regards the position of πάντων, the Committee preferred to follow the reading of B W f¹ 892 and to explain the origin of the reading of A Δ Ξ and most minuscules as having arisen when the word, having been omitted in order to conform the text in this respect to that of Matthew, was restored at the wrong place. The reading of P* and of manuscripts known to Ambrose is totally conformed to the text of Mt 11.19.

7.39 προφήτης [A]

The insertion of the article before προφήτης (in B* Ξ 205) is an exegetical allusion to “the Prophet” predicted in Dt 18.15; compare Jn 1.21; 6.14; 7.40.

7.45 εἰσῆλθον [A]

Instead of εἰσῆλθον, a few witnesses (L* f¹ 157 1071 al) read εἰσήλθον (“[from the time] she came in”), which appears to be an attempt to avoid the suggestion of an exaggeration in “[from the time] I came in.”

8.3 αὐτοὶς [B]

The plural is supported by good representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western text-types; the singular (compare Mt 27.55; Mk 15.41) appears to be a Christocentric correction, due perhaps to Marcion.

8.26 Γερασημων [C]

Of the several variant readings, a majority of the Committee preferred Γερασημων on the basis of (a) superior external attestation (early representatives of both the Alexandrian and Western types of text), and (b) the probability that Γερασημων is a scribal assimilation to the prevailing text of Matthew (8.28), and that Γερασημων is a correction, perhaps proposed originally by Origen (see the comments on Mt 8.28).

8.37 Γερασημων [C]

See the comment on ver. 26.

8.43 ήτοι [ιεραποιηθησαν ελον των βίων] [C]

The clause ιεραποιηθησαν ελον των βίων looks like a digest of Mk 5.26. The question is whether anyone except Luke himself would rewrite Mark in this way—with skillful condensation and the substitution of προσωπίζωσας (a hapax legomenon in the New Testament for ἀντωνίζομαι). On the other hand, the early and diversified evidence for the shorter text (Ψ 855 Β (D) (ιτ*) Syr palmas cop* arm geo) is well-nigh compelling. As a resolution of these conflicting considerations a majority of the Committee decided to retain the words in the text but to enclose them within square brackets, indicating doubt whether they have a right to stand there.

8.44 ὁτιοθεν ἠφασα τοῦ κρασπέδου [B]

The words τοῦ κρασπέδου constitute one of the so-called minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark. The Committee regarded this as accidental and decided to follow the overwhelming weight of the external evidence supporting the inclusion of the words.

8.45 Πέτρος [B]

The addition of “and those with him” may be due to scribal harmonizing with Mark’s καὶ ἔλησαν αὐτῷ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, or to an attempt to have Peter share the blame of rebuking Jesus. In any case, the weight of the testimony of Δ Β syriac palmas cop* supporting the shorter reading is too strong to be set aside.

8.49 μηκέτι [B]

Although it may be held that the omission of the clause “And you say, ‘Who touched me?’” was due to stylistic pruning by Alexandrian copyists, the diversity of wording in the several forms of the addition makes it probable that they represent scribal efforts at assimilation to the parallel account in Mk 5.31.

8.49 μηκέτι [B]

The Committee preferred to follow the preponderant weight of the combination of Ψ 855 Β syriac palmas cop* al, which attests the less frequently used word μηκέτι (it occurs nowhere else in Luke).

9.1 διδάσκει [B]
Luke apparently took over from Mark (6.7) the primitive appellation τοις ἄνω ἄνω, preserved in early representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western text-types. Later copyists either added or substituted μαθητάς (compare the parallel in Mt 10.1), or added ἀπόστολος, with or without αὐτοῦ.

9.2 ὄνομα [τοις ἄνω ἄνω] [C]

Impressed by the concurrence of B and syri in supporting the shorter text, the Committee was somewhat inclined to regard the other forms of text as scribal expansions introduced in order to relieve the abruptness of the simple verb. At the same time, however, the evidence of the Old Syriac is weakened by its reading “the infirm” as the object of “heal” at the close of ver. 1. Likewise, in Luke ἱδων, except when passive, always has a direct object. Faced with these conflicting data, the Committee decided that the least unsatisfactory solution was to include the words τοις ἄνω ἄνω (supported by NA DL L X ψ f1 al) in the text, but to enclose them within square brackets indicating doubt that they have a right to stand there.

9.7[ἀνά] δόο [C]

The reading with ἀνά appears to be an elucidation of the meaning implicit in the context (i.e. not simply that the Twelve but that no individual should have two coats); but was this an addition made originally by Luke or by later copyists? Or did Alexandrian scribes, taking for granted that readers would correctly understand the passage, delete ἀνά in accord with the parallels (Mt 10.10; Mk 6.9)? To reflect these alternative possibilities, the Committee decided to include the word in the text but to enclose it within square brackets. (Among the versions only it syr and gth express the force of ἀνά, but whether the others simply omit to render the word or whether they rest upon a Greek text that lacked it, it is difficult to say. Syr reads “and not even two coats.”)

9.9 τετραάρχης

See the comment on Ac 13.1.

9.10 εἰς πόλιν καλομενήν Βηθανίαν [B]

Amid the diversity of readings, the Committee preferred to adopt the Alexandrian reading (supported by [syri] B L X* 33 cop) and to explain the other readings as attempts to alleviate difficulties arising from the reference in ver. 12 to “a lonely place.” The phrase εἰς τόπον ἱερόν, derived from parallels in Mt 14.13 and Mk 6.32, was either added to the text (A C W Θ Ξ* εἰς τόπον) or substituted for πόλιν (N* Ψ). “Village” replaces “city” in D and θ, and neither word occurs in ψ al.
The omission of κύριε from B* D syr' al is puzzling; what motive would have prompted copyists to delete it? On the other hand, the word might well have been added, either from ver. 61 or from the parallel in Mt 8.21. Since, however, the absence of κύριε may have been due to a transcribal blunder (ἐγέρετε ἐπεξηρητήθην), it was thought safer to retain the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets indicating doubt that it has a right to stand there.

9.62 εἶπεν δὲ [πρὸς αὐτῶν] ὁ Ἰησοῦς [C]

It is difficult to decide which reading best explains the rise of the others. The phrase πρὸς αὐτῶν is lacking in B 0181 700 cop75; it is placed after ὁ Ἰησοῦς in A C W Θ Ψ f15 al; D reads δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶν; and Δ omits ὁ Ἰησοῦς. The Committee judged that the least unsatisfactory interpretation of the data was to adopt the reading supported by Ν Λ Ξ f1-j 33 157 1241, but out of deference to the evidence of B and Ψ 75 to enclose πρὸς αὐτῶν within square brackets.

9.62 ἐπιθύμησαν τὴν χείρα ἐν' ἀνθρώπων καὶ βλέπαν εἰς τὰ ὁπίσω [C]

The curious variation in the order of the participles (εἰς τὰ ὁπίσω βλέπαν καὶ ἐπιθύμησαν τὴν χείρα αὐτοῦ ἐν' ἀνθρώπων) in several witnesses (Ψ75 al) is probably due to scribal inadvertence; in any case, the reading scarcely makes sense. Although it may be argued that αὐτοῦ was deleted by scribes for stylistic reasons (as not needed with parts of the body), a majority of the Committee was impressed by the weight of the witnesses (Ψ75 B 0181 f1 al) that attest to its absence.

10.1 (δόδο) (1) [C]

Was it seventy or seventy-two whom Jesus appointed and sent on ahead of him? The external evidence is almost evenly divided. On the one hand, the chief representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western groups, with most of the Old Latin and the Sinaic Syriac, support the numeral “seventy-two.” On the other hand, other Alexandrian witnesses of relatively greater weight (Ν Λ Δ Ξ), as well as other noteworthy evidence (f1-j and f15), join in support of the numeral “seventy.”

The factors that bear on the evaluation of internal evidence are singularly elusive. Does the account of the sending of 70 or 72 disciples have a symbolic import, and, if so, which number seems to be better suited to express that symbolism? The answers to this question are almost without number, depending upon what one assumes to be the symbolism intended by Jesus and/or the evangelist and/or those who transmitted the account. In order to represent the balance of external evidence and the indecisiveness of internal considerations, a majority of the Committee decided to include the word δόδο in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets to indicate a certain doubt that it has a right to stand there.34

10.15 καταβῇ [C]

It is difficult to decide between the merits of καταβῇ and καταβίβασθη. Did copyists heighten the sense of the saying by replacing the former word with the latter; or did they replace the more rare verb καταβίβασθη with the much more usual verb καταβή, thus also assimilating the quotation to the text of the Septuagint? A majority of the Committee, impressed by the superior external testimony of Ψ75 B D al, adopted καταβή. (See also the comment on Mt 11.23.)

10.17 (δόδο) [C]

See the comment on ver. 1.

10.21 [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἅγιῷ [C]

The strangeness of the expression “exulted in the Holy Spirit” (for which there is no parallel in the Scriptures) may have led to the omission of τῷ ἅγιῷ from Ψ45 A W Δ Ψ f15 it6 both Clement al. The varying positions of ὁ Ἰησοῦς, as well as the absence of the
words from the earliest witnesses, condemn them as secondary. Since the Septuagint frequently construes ἀναλώθησαν with a preposition (ἐν or ἐντι), the Committee decided to retain the ἐν but, in view of its absence from such witnesses as 33 A B C W Δ Θ Ψ f1 f13 28 565 700. al. to enclose it within square brackets.

10.22 πάντα [A]

The reading καὶ στραφῆς πρὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶναι (A C K W X Δ Θ Ψ 28 565 561.1 lbdh k goth a) is doubtless secondary, derived from ver. 23 and introduced by copyists in order to smooth the abrupt transition from Jesus’ prayer (ver. 21) to his statement to the disciples (ver. 22). Not only is such a mechanical repetition foreign to Luke’s style, but one does not turn to the same persons twice (the presence of καὶ ἔδωκαν in ver. 23 makes no significant difference to the meaning of στραφῆς, for the prepositional phrase is probably to be taken with εἶναι).

10.32 ηγομένους κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐλθὼν

The participle ηγομένους, read by 33 A C D E G H K M S U V W Δ Θ Π and most minuscules, is absent from 33 K* [owing to homeoteleuton R* omits the entire verse] B L X Γ 0190 f1 f13 28 33 700 al. The participle ἐλθὼν, read by 33 Β C E G H K M S U V W Δ Θ Π Γ and many minuscules, is absent from 33 D II 63 68 114 243 253 265 270 482 489 726 990 1200 1219 1375 al. It is difficult to decide whether the longer text, being redundant, was shortened by copyists, some of whom deleted ηγομένους and others ἐλθὼν, or whether the longer text is the result of conflation. In view of the collocation ηγομένους κατὰ in Ac 27.7, a minority of the Committee preferred the reading ηγομένους κατὰ as a Lukan expression; at the same time, in view of the divided attestation for and against ἐλθὼν, they preferred to enclose that word within square brackets. The majority of the Committee, however, impressed by what was taken as superior manuscript support, preferred to retain ἐλθὼν in the text without brackets; and, being reluctant to identify γενόμενους κατὰ as a special Lukan collocation, thought it necessary, in view of the weight of the witnesses that omit γενόμενους, to enclose this word within square brackets.

10.38 αὐτῶν [B]

No motive is apparent for the deletion of the phrase “received him into her house” if it were present in the text originally. On the other hand, the bold and bare ὑπεδέχατο αὐτῶν seems to call for some appropriate addition, which copyists supplied in various forms, some introducing οἰκίαν, others οἶκον, and each with or without αὐτῆς, ἑαυτῆς, or αὐτοῦς.

10.41-42 μεριμνάς καὶ ὕπομβεβήκη περὶ πολλά, ἐνεύς δὲ ἐστὶν χρεία (C)

The rare verb ὄμοιος (ὁμιοιάς 145, 71 B C D L W Θ γ 1 al) seems to have given trouble to copyists, who replaced it with the more frequently used verb ταχθεῖν (A K P Δ Π Ψ f13 al). Most of the other variations seem to have arisen from understanding ἐνεύς to refer merely to the provisions that Martha was then preparing for the meal; the absoluteness of ὑπομίσθησαι, preserved today only in 38 and several versions); and finally in some witnesses (including 33 B L Ψ f13) the two were combined, though with disastrous results as to sense. The omission of both clauses (as well as ὑπομίσθησαι after ἡ διή εἰπεν) from it probably represents a deliberate excision of an incomprehensible passage, if it is not a sheer accident, perhaps occasioned by homoeoarcton (Μάρθα Μαρία).

11.2 λέγετε

After λέγετε codex Bezae continues with an obvious interpolation, derived from Mt 6.7: μὴ βαττολογεῖτε ὡς οἱ λαοί, δοκοῦν γὰρ τις ὑπό τὸ πολλὸν ἐλθὼν (Page 129).

11.2 πάτερ [A]

In view of the liturgical usage of the Matthean form of the Lord’s Prayer, it is remarkable that such a variety of early witnesses managed to resist what must have been an exceedingly strong temptation to assimilate the Lukan text to the much more familiar form. It is not surprising, therefore, that the great majority of witnesses read Πάτερ ἡμῶν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, as in Mt 6.9.

11.2 ἐλθέως ἡ βασιλεία σου [A]

The most interesting variant reading in the Lukan form of the Lord’s Prayer is the petition, “Thy holy Spirit come upon us and cleanse us,” preserved in substantially the same wording in two minuscule manuscripts ἐλθέως τὸ πνεῦμα σου τὸ ἕνωμεν ὑπ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαριστέω ἡμᾶς, ms. 700 of the eleventh century; ms. 162, dated A.D. 1153, agrees except for the sequence σου τὸ πνεῦμα and the omission of ὑπ’ ἡμᾶς). That the same reading was current in copies of Luke’s Gospel during the fourth and fifth centuries is proved by quotations of the petition in the writings of Gregory of Nyssa in Cappadocia and Maximus-Confessor. The former, in one of his homilies on the Lord’s Prayer, declares expressly that, instead of the petition concerning the coming of the kingdom, Luke has ἐλθέως τὸ ἐνωμένον σου ὑπ’ ἡμᾶς καὶ καθαριστέω ἡμᾶς. Gregory’s testimony is confirmed by Maximus who, in commenting on Mt 6.10, remarks that what Matthew speaks of as “kingdom,” another of the evangelists has called “Holy Spirit.” In proof of such equivalence Maximus quotes (perhaps from Gregory) ἐλθέως σου τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἑνωμένον καὶ καθαριστέω ἡμᾶς.
The earliest trace of such a petition is preserved by Tertullian who, in commenting rapidly on five of the petitions of the Lord’s Prayer in Luke (whether according to his own text, or Marcion’s, or both is uncertain), places first after the invocation to the Father a petition for the Holy Spirit, followed by a petition for God’s kingdom. An early Western text (Marcion’s and/or Tertullian’s) must therefore have had the reading quoted by Gregory (or at least the first part of it), but it must have stood in place of ἐστιν ἁγιάσθη τὸ ὄνομά σου. Finally, codex Bezae has been thought to preserve a remnant of the petition for the Spirit, for in this manuscript the petition ἐστιν ἁγιάσθη τὸ ὄνομά σου (intellectually) is followed by ἐφίεμαι ἐλθέτω σου ἡ βασιλεία.

How shall this testimony be evaluated? First, it is by no means certain that ἐφίεμαι in codex Bezae should be taken as evidence of an earlier petition for the Holy Spirit; to pray that God’s name may be hallowed “upon us” is entirely congruent with Old Testament references to the divine “name to dwell there” (e.g. Dt 12.11; 14.23; 16.6, 15, where the Septuagint renders “for my name to be invoked there”). Furthermore, the evidence from Tertullian comes from a treatise written during his Montanist period, when he had a special fondness for texts pertaining to the Holy Spirit; in his earlier exposition of the Lord’s Prayer he betrays no knowledge of the existence of such a petition.

Apparently, therefore, the variant reading is a liturgical adaptation of the original form of the Lord’s Prayer, used perhaps when celebrating the rite of baptism or the laying on of hands. The cleansing descent of the Holy Spirit is so definitely a Christian, ecclesiastical concept that one cannot understand why, if it were original in the prayer, it should have been supplanted in the overwhelming majority of the witnesses by a concept originally much more Jewish in its piety.

11.2 (2) [A]

After σου (2) the great majority of witnesses interpolate γενηθῆτα τὸ θελήμα σου, ὡς ἐν ὑπάρχῃ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς from Mt 6.10. If the Lukan text had originally contained these words, no good reason can be suggested that accounts for their absence from such varied witnesses as Π B L f1 vg sygκοποιούμενος αὐτῷ

11.4 μὴ εἰσενέχῃς ἡμᾶς

Marcion apparently read μὴ ἐδίκης ἡμᾶς εἰσενέχθη ("Do not allow us to be led into temptation"), a theological amelioration of the usual form of the petition.

11.4 περιλαμβάνων [A]

A variety of excellent witnesses (Π75 Ν* B L f1 700 vg sygκοποιούμενος αὐτῷ) resisted the temptation to conform the text to the prevailing Matthean form of the Lord’s Prayer (Mt 6.13).

11.10 ἀνοιγμένοι [C]

It is difficult to decide between ἀνοιγμένοι and ἀνοικτοί. On the one hand, the former reading may have arisen as the result of scribal assimilation to the future tense at the end of ver. 39; on the other hand, the latter reading may be the result of assimilation to the present tense of ver. 10. In order to represent the balance of probabilities, a majority of the Committee decided to print ἀνοικτοί.

11.11 ἤρθεν [B]

It is difficult to decide (a) whether, like the Matthean account (7.9), Luke originally had two pairs of terms (but not the same two pairs as Matthew), and a third pair was incorporated from Matthew (bread and stone); or (b) whether Luke originally had three pairs and, through an accident in transcription, one of the pairs was omitted. A majority of the Committee, considering the longer readings to be the result of scribal assimilation to Matthew, preferred the shorter reading, which is attested by Π58 (Π75) B 1241 and several early verbal and patristic witnesses.

11.11 καὶ ἀντικρητῳ ἤρθεν [C]

The reading with καὶ (Π58, 75 B κοποιούμενος αὐτῷ) preserves a Semitism that most copyists replaced with μὴ, the usual Greek interrogative particle.

11.12 ἐπιθύμωσαι [C]

It is easy to see why most copyists would have inserted μὴ, thus alerting the reader that the following words are to be taken as a question.

11.13 [ο] ἐξ οὐρανοῦ [C]

In view of the Matthean parallel (7.11) δὲ παρελθεὶς ἰσομόν ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἔδωκεν, it is easy to account for the rise of the variant readings ἰσομόν ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ and ὁ οὐρανός. It is much more difficult to decide between ἐξ οὐρανοῦ (“the Father will give from heaven the Holy Spirit to those who ask him”) and ὁ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, which seems to be a pregnant construction for ὁ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ. So evenly is the external evidence divided and so unconvincing are the arguments based on internal considerations that a majority of the Committee finally decided to include ὁ in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets, indicating doubt that it has a right to stand there.
11.13 πνεῦμα ἁγίου [B]

Not only is the external evidence that supports πνεῦμα ἁγίου excellent, but assimilation with the first half of the verse as well as with Matthew’s ἁγιάθε (7.11) accounts for the origin of the other readings.

11.14 καὶ αὐτὸ ἔρχεται [C]

On the one hand, the expression καὶ αὐτὸ ἔρχεται appears to be a Semitism in the Lukan style. On the other hand, the external evidence in support of the shorter reading is exceedingly weighty. In order to reflect these conflicting considerations, the Committee decided to include the words in the text, but to enclose them within square brackets.

11.23 σκορπίζει [A]

The addition of με after σκορπίζει, which is so difficult as to be almost meaningless, must be a scribal blunder.

11.24 τοῦτο λέγει [C]

On the basis of external evidence, a majority of the Committee preferred to include τοῦτο, but, in view of the possibility that it may be a scribal assimilation to the parallel in Mt 12.44, decided to enclose the word within square brackets.

11.25 οἰκοδομεῖτε [C]

After some hesitation a majority of the Committee rejected the reading of D it d must be accidental, for the weight of external evidence attesting its inclusion is overwhelming. Furthermore, a careful author such as Luke would not be likely to pass directly from ei=pen of ver. 20 to ei=pen of ver. 22 (different speaker).

11.26 σωσάμενον [B]

The original Lukan form of the account is clearly that preserved in Í75a D Θ 700 most of the Old Latin, the Old Syriac, al. Copyists could not resist introducing from the Matthean parallel (12.44) the word συνόλετα before or after οἰκοδομήτω, with or without καί.

11.33 αὐτὸ ἔνα τῷ μόδιον [C]

Since Luke preferred not to use μόδιον in 8.16, a word that is present in the parallel in Mark (and Matthew), it may well be that the word, with its clause, was absent from the original form of the present passage also. On the other hand, since the clause is attested by weighty and diversified external evidence, a majority of the Committee was unwilling to drop it altogether and compromised by enclosing the words within square brackets.

11.33 ταῦτα δὲ τούτα ποιήσας κάποιον μὴ παρεῖται [B]

Marcion, finding these words entirely unacceptable, omitted them from his edition of Luke’s Gospel; their absence from codex Bezae may be due to scribal oversight, or, more probably, to influence from the Marcionite form of text.

11.48 οἰκοδομεῖτε [C]

Since οἰκοδομεῖν is usually transitive, most scribes added a suitable object, drawn from ver. 47.

11.49 κρίτην ἢ μεριστήν [B]

The multiplicity of variant readings has arisen from the rarity of μεριστής (which occurs nowhere else in the Greek Bible), from the recollection of Ex 2.14 τίς ἐκ κοινωνίας ἄρχε τοῖς καθοδότας, and from the possibility that the second of the terms was omitted accidentally (through homeoteleuton) or deliberately (as inappropriate to describe Christ). The reading that best accounts for the rise of the others is preserved in Í75a B L ḫ1 al.

11.21 include verse [A]

The omission of ver. 21 from D it ἄθ. d must be accidental, for the weight of external evidence attesting its inclusion is overwhelming. Furthermore, a careful author such as Luke would not be likely to pass directly from ei=pen of ver. 20 to ei=pen of ver. 22 (different speaker).

At the close of the verse several of the later manuscripts include (perhaps from 6.8 or Mt 11.15) the stereotyped expression ταῦτα λέγων ἐφαίνει ὁ Χριστὸς ἡκοίταν ἂνοικῇ.

12.22 μαθητάς [άπο] [C]

In accordance with Lukan usage, a majority of the Committee preferred to adopt ἀπό, supported as it is by the overwhelming preponderance of external evidence, but to enclose it within square brackets in view of its absence from several important early witnesses (Í3to. ὧν B).

12.27 αἰδίον· οὐ κοτηλοὐκὸν νήθκε [B]

After some hesitation a majority of the Committee rejected the reading of D it syr † al, οὕτω νήθκε οὕτω ἐφαινει ("they neither spin nor weave"), as a stylistic refinement
introduced by copyists in view of the following reference to Solomon’s clothing. (See also the comment on Mt 6.26.)

12.31 αὐτοῦ [B]

It is more likely that αὐτοῦ was replaced by τοῦ θεοῦ (as has in fact happened in codex Bezae) than vice versa. The reading τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς θεουσίας αὐτοῦ is an intrusion from the parallel in Mt 6.33. One of the idiosyncrasies of the scribe of Ῥ 75 is his tendency to omit personal pronouns.12

12.39 οὗ [B]

The original Lukan text seems to have lacked ἐργασθηκὼν δὲ καί. Scribes would have been almost certain to assimilate the shorter reading (preserved in Ῥ 75 Χ † α) to the longer reading found in the parallel passage (Mt 24.43), whereas there is no good reason that would account for the deletion of the words had they been present originally.

12.56 τοῦς οὗ καὶ ἔδαπνε τὸ κυρίας εἰς [B]

Although it is possible that copyists inserted ἔδαπνε in conformity with the preceding clause, it is more probable that they omitted the word in order to heighten Jesus’ condemnation (“Why do you not know how to interpret…” implies a lack of knowledge; “Why do you not interpret…” implies an unwillingness to use one’s knowledge).

13.7 ἐκοιμάσθη [οὐν] [C]

In order to reflect the balance of external evidence for and against the inclusion of οὖν, as well as the absence of any compelling consideration relating to transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities, the Committee felt obliged to retain the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets, indicating a measure of doubt that it has a right to stand there.

13.9 εἰς τὸ μέλλον, ἐὰν ὑπ’ ὑμᾶς [B]

The more difficult reading (attested by Ῥ 75 Χ Λ † α), which involves apopiosis (a sudden breaking off in the middle of a sentence), was ameliorated in most witnesses by transposing so as to read εἰς ὑπ’ ὑμᾶς, εἰς τὸ μέλλον.

13.19 εἰς δεινόροιον [B]

Although copyists may have deleted υπ’ ὑμᾶς to harmonize Luke with the prevailing text of Matthew (13.20), it is much more probable that, in the interests of heightening the contrast between a mustard seed and a tree, μέλλειν was added – as it was added also in a few witnesses in the Matthean parallel (syr 75:140, cop θ ε ἐθ). 13.27 ἔρει λέγων ἵμαν [C]

The reading adopted by the Committee, though narrowly attested, seems to account best for the origin of the other readings. The awkwardness of the participle λέγων (which probably represents the construction of the Hebrew infinitive absolute: “he will indeed say to you”) would have prompted copyists either to alter it to the indicative (λέγω) or to omit it as superfluous.

13.27 οὗ ἐδέσα [ιμάν] πάθεν ἔστε [C]

The multiplicity of variant readings of these words in ver. 27 contrasts with the fidelity with which they have been transmitted in ver. 25 (where only Marcion seems to have omitted ἵμαν). The reading οὗ ἐδέσα instead of ἵμαν of D arose because of influence from the Matthean parallel (οὗ ἐδέσαν ἐργασθηκών ἵμαν, 7.23). The absence of τοῦν λέγων in several minuscules (56 61 71 291 692) appears to be the result of scribal oversight arising from homoeoteleuton with the following Αἴσθητα. Since both external evidence and internal probabilities concerning the presence or absence of ιμάν are so evenly balanced, the Committee decided to retain the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

13.35 ιμάν [B]

The Committee judged that the presence of ἐργασθηκών in D Ν Θ Ψ 513 α is the result of assimilation to the text of 22.5 or to the prevailing text of Mt 23.38; its absence is strongly supported by Ῥ 75 Χ A B L W f’1 α. 13.36 ἦ σὲ [ἐσχά τε] εἶμπτε [C]

The rarity of construing ἦ σὲ with the subjunctive (Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 382 (2)), as well as the temptation to assimilate to the Matthean parallel (23.38), seems to have prompted many copyists to omit ἦ σὲ, ἐσχά, and, in some cases (Θ 1241 α), to prefix ἦ σὲ ἐσχά (Δ conflates the Matthean and Lukan readings). Apart from the subsidiary problem involving variation in the presence or absence of ἦ σὲ after ἦ σὲ (with the corresponding change of ἦ σὲ to ἦ σὲ in Ψ f’1 565 700 α), the manuscript basis for the reading “until the time [or, the day] comes when you will say …” includes A D W Ψ f’1 28 in. B C e d μ2 l q α ἐν εἰς τετελεσμένον ἐγώ (Marcion α). 14.5 ἠδὲ ἦ βούς [B]
The oldest reading preserved in the manuscripts seems to be υἱὸς ἡ βοὸς. Because the collocation of the two words appeared to be somewhat incongruous, copyists altered υἱὸς either to οἶνος (cf. 13.15) or to πρόβατον (cf. Mt 12.11). Several witnesses (15 2174 syc') confute all three words.

14.17 ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐστίν

In view of the expression πάντα ἐστὶν in the Matthean parallel (Mt 22.4), it is natural that many copyists should have added πάντα, either after ἐστίν or before ἐστὶν. As between ἐστίν and πάντα, the preponderant weight of witnesses supports the former.

14.27

Through homoeoteleuton the entire verse has been accidentally omitted in M* R G 29 47 57 60 69 71 213 245 482 544 659 692 1279 1574 syr cop/home'.

15.1 πάντες

The absence of πάντες (a word that Luke is fond of using; see the comment on 7.35) from several witnesses (W it* b. c. i. 8 syx e t rop) cop/amu), if not an accident, may be the decision of scribes who were unhappy with the hyperbole.

15.16 χρυσοθηκὴν ἐκ

On the basis of age and diversity of text-type of witnesses, the Committee preferred the reading χρυσοθηκὴν.

15.21 υἱὸς σου

While recognizing that several good manuscripts (N B D 700 al) combine to support the reading τοῦ πατρὸς με ὅσον τῶν μισθῶν σου, the Committee thought it far more probable that the words were added (from ver. 19) by punctilious scribes than omitted, either accidentally or deliberately.

16.12 ὑμέτερον

The reading ὑμέτερον (B L al) has the appearance of being a later theological refinement (“belonging to the Father and the Son”), expressing the divine origin of the true riches (ver. 11) – as is also expressed by the Marcionite reading ἡμὲν. It is more likely, however, that, owing to the constant scribal confusion between υ and η (in later Greek the two vowels came to be pronounced alike), copyists who wrote ὑμέτερον intended ὑμὲτερον – for in the context the correct antithesis to “another’s” is “yours.”

16.19 πλαοῦσας

It was probably horror vacui that prompted more than one copyist to provide a name for the anonymous Rich Man. In Egypt the tradition that his name was Nineveh is incorporated in the Sahidic version, and seems to be reflected also in p75, which reads πλοῦσιος ὄνοματι Νευηῆς (probably a scribal error for Νινεῆς). During the third and fourth centuries a tradition was current in the West that the Rich Man’s name was Phineas. The pseudo-Cyprianic treatise De pascha computus, which was written in the year 242/3 in Africa or in Rome, declares (ch. 17): Omnibus peccatoribus a deo ignis est praeparatus, in quos flamma urit ille Finneus dives ab ipso dei filio est demonstratus (“Fire has been prepared by God for all sinners, in the flame of which, as was indicated by the Son of God himself, that rich man Phineas is burned”). The same tradition is repeated toward the close of the fourth century in the last of the eleven anonymous treatises that are customarily assigned to Priscillian, a wealthy, highly educated layman who became the founder of a gnosticizing sect in southern Spain. Here the name is spelled Fines (in the only manuscript extant of Tract ix the name is spelled Fineet with the i stroked out and surmounted by δ, the preponderant weight of witnesses supports the former.

16.21 τῶν πετάσσων

The more picturesque expression τῶν πετάσσων (“the crumbs”) was introduced by copyists from Mt 15.27.

16.21 πλαοῦσας

The presence of καὶ ὁ ὅμοιος ἔλευσον αὐτῷ in a few witnesses (T11 1071 al vg' al) is a scribal expansion derived from 15.16.

16.23 καὶ ἐν τῷ γὰρ

Several witnesses, chiefly Western (N* lat Marcion), lack καὶ and join the prepositional phrase with ἐν in ver. 22. Considering the weight of the evidence supporting καὶ, as well as the style of Luke who generally avoids asyndeton, the presence of καὶ before ἐν seems to be assured.
Although it is possible that ver. 36, διό ἐν ἄγρῳ ἐς παραλληλοθέτησαι καὶ ὁ ἐτερος ἀμφιθετεῖαι, may have been accidentally omitted through homoeoteleuton (an accident that happened to ver. 35 in Κ* and a few other witnesses), in view of the weighty manuscript authority supporting the shorter text (𝔓73 Κ Α Β Λ Ψ f¹ 28 33 3356) it is more probable that copyists assimilated the passage to Mt 24.45.

18.11 τρεῖς ἑαυτῶν τινες [C]

External evidence (𝔓73 Β Ψ f¹ 892 Origen) favors the reading τρεῖς ἑαυτῶν but internally the more difficult sequence seems to be τρεῖς ἑαυτῶν τινες. The latter was ameliorated to read καθ’ ἑαυτῶν τινα (D δι’ geo’), “[standing] by himself …” Because of the difficulty of construing τρεῖς ἑαυτῶν (especially when the words stood next to σταθείς), several witnesses (𝔓73 Β δι’ ἐλεύθερον) omit the phrase entirely.

18.24 αὐτὸν ὁ θηρός [περίλαμψαν γενόμενον] τίνην [C]

On the one hand, the excellent attestation for the shorter text (Κ Β Ψ f¹ 1241 αὐτὸν) and the variety of positions of περίλαμψαν γενόμενον suggest that the words were introduced by copyists, perhaps from ver. 23 (περίλαμψαν γενόμενον). On the other hand, since Luke’s penchant of repeating a word or phrase in adjacent passages may have operated here, a majority of the Committee did not feel at liberty to omit the phrase entirely, but enclosed it within square brackets.

18.25 κάψας [A]

See the comment on Mt 19.24.
Although it could be argued that ver. 25 was a marginal comment subsequently inserted by copyists into the text (but in that case the subject of εἰς παί μεν would probably not have been left ambiguous – are they the bystanders of ver. 24, or those to whom Jesus was telling the parable?), a majority of the Committee considered it to be more probable that the words were omitted in several Western witnesses (D W 565 it a c f g 592 & 1 f 13 arm) either (a) by assimilation to the Matthean parallel (25 26 29 30) or (b) for stylistic reasons, thereby providing a closer connection between verses 24 and 26. A majority of the Committee considered that, on balance, both external attestation and transcriptional probabilities favor the retention of the words in the text.

19.38 ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ βασιλέας [C]

The transmission of the Lukan form of salutation is complex. The majority of witnesses (N A K L Δ Ψ f3 f13 al) read ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλέας (“Blessed be he who comes as king in the name of the Lord”). Others (W 1216 al) omit ὁ βασιλέας, thus bringing the quotation into harmony with its Old Testament original (Ps 118.26) as well as with the Synoptic parallels (Mt 21.9; Mk 11.10). The omission of ὁ ἐρχόμενος (N* Origen a1) is probably to be accounted for as a transcriptional oversight, occasioned by homoeoteleuton (μενος ... μενος). The Western text (D it a c f g 592 arm) seems to be a colloquial adaptation of ὁ βασιλέας so as to read quite smoothly εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ἀνάμικτι κυρίου, εὐλογημένος ὁ βασιλέας. The reading ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ βασιλέας (B arm sno), being the most difficult, accounts best for the origin of the others.

19.42 εἰν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐ [B]

The insertion of καὶ οὐ before εἰν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ gives the phrase a special force, which the Committee regarded as probably a secondary development (elsewhere in the New Testament καὶ οὐ occurs only at Ac 2.18 in a quotation). The reading καὶ οὐ εἰν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ (D θ al) seems to be a colloquial adaptation of εἰν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ οὐ (N B L 892 Origen).

19.42 εἰρήνην [B]

It seemed to the Committee more likely that copyists would have inserted οὐ (or οὐ) than deleted it.

20.9 ἄνθρωπος [τις] ἐφίσνουν ἄματλώνα [C]

Of the four variant readings, those of C (ἄματλώνα ἄνθρωπος ὑφεύρετον) and D (ἄματλώνα ὑφεύρετον ἄνθρωπος) agree in placing first the noun that describes the setting of the parable (agreeing in this respect with the chief readings of the Markan parallel, 12.1). The only difference between the other two Lukan readings, which are supported by the overwhelming weight of the external testimony, is the presence or absence of τις. On the one hand, Luke commonly writes ἄνθρωπος (τις 19.38; 19.39; 23.16; 19.11; 16.1; 19.19; 19.12); on the other hand, many of the same witnesses that insert τις here also insert τις in the clearly secondary reading in Mark (W 1216 f 13 syr1 arm geo). In order to reflect the conflict between these two considerations, the Committee decided to print τις enclosed within square brackets.

20.27 οἱ ἱστορίας τοὺς [C]

On the one hand, the external attestation for the reading οἱ λέγουσιν is very strong, including, as it does, good representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text. On the other hand,

however, this reading may have arisen from scribal assimilation to the Matthean parallel (22.23); it is, furthermore, the easier reading, for it avoids the double negative involved in ἁπλῆς ἐγκατάλειψαν ... μη. On the basis, therefore, of transcriptional probabilities the Committee preferred ἁπλῆς ἐγκατάλειψαν, but out of deference to the very much superior external attestation supporting λέγουσιν, it was thought best to enclose οἱ within square brackets. The reading ἁπλῆς λέγουσιν is an obvious scribal correction for the pendant nominative participle.

20.34 τοῦτο [A]

Following τοῦτο, several Western witnesses (D with some support from Old Latin and Old Syriac) insert a characteristic expansion, γενομένων καὶ γεγονός (“[those of this age] are begotten and beget”).

20.36 διά λόγου [B]

Instead of saying flatly, “they cannot die anymore,” several witnesses (chiefly Western) soften the statement by using μέλλοντας (“they will not die anymore”).

20.45 τοὺς μαθητὰς [εὗρον] [C]

The general tendency seems to have been to drop εὗρον after readers had come to regard οἱ μαθηταί as needing no identifying possessive pronoun; in the present instance, however, what on this basis appears to be the later reading is supported by the weighty combination of B and D. In order to reflect these conflicting considerations the Committee decided to include εὗρον in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.
The Lukan account of the Last Supper has been transmitted in two principal forms: (1) the longer, or traditional, text of cup-bread-cup is read by all Greek manuscripts except D and by most of the ancient versions and Fathers; (2) the shorter, or Western, text (read by D in D. Acts) omits verses 19b and 20 (to ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἑκατοντάρχης), thereby presenting the sequence of cup-bread-cup. Four intermediate forms of text, which appear to be compromises between the two principal forms, are the following: (a) two Old Latin manuscripts (ṛa) modify the shorter text by placing ver. 19a before ver. 17, thus securing the customary order of bread-cup; (b) the Curetonian Syriac reads the same, but is enlarged with the wording of 1 Cor 11.24 added to ver. 19a; (c) the Sinaitic Syriac is still further expanded, chiefly by the insertion of “after they had supped” at the beginning of ver. 17 and “this is my blood, the new covenant” (ver. 20b) between verses 17 and 18; and (d) the Peshitta Syriac lacks (perhaps due to homoeoteleuton) verses 17 and 18, as do also ṣ, two Sahidic manuscripts, and one Bohairic manuscript. For convenience of comparison the six forms of the text are set forth in parallel columns on p. 149.

It is obvious that the chief problem is concerned with the merits of the two principal forms of text, since each of the others can be accounted for by more or less satisfactorily as modifications of either the shorter or the longer form.

Considerations in favor of the originality of the longer text include the following: (a) The external evidence supporting the shorter reading represents only part of the Western type of text, whereas the other representatives of the Western text join with witnesses belonging to all the other ancient text-types in support of the longer reading. (b) It is easier to suppose that the Bezan editor, puzzled by the sequence of cup-bread-cup, eliminated the second mention of the cup without being concerned about the inverted order thus produced, than that the editor of the longer version, to rectify the inverted order, brought in from Paul the second mention of the cup, while letting the first mention stand. (c) The rise of the shorter version can be accounted for in terms of the theory of disciplina arcana, i.e. in order to protect the Eucharist from profanation, one or more copies of the Gospel according to Luke, prepared for circulation among non-Christian readers, omitted the sacramental formula after the beginning words.
Considerations in favor of the originality of the shorter text include the following: (a) Generally in New Testament textual criticism the shorter reading is to be preferred, (b) Since the words in verses 19b and 20 are suspiciously similar to Paul’s words in 1 Cor 11.24b-25, it appears that the latter passage was the source of their interpolation into the longer text. (c) Verses 19b-20 contain several linguistic features that are non-Lukan.

The weight of these considerations was estimated differently by different members of the Committee. A minority preferred the shorter text as a Western non-interpolation (see the Note following 24.53). The majority, on the other hand, impressed by the overwhelming preponderance of external evidence supporting the longer form, explained the origin of the shorter form as due to some scribal accident or misunderstanding.25 The similarity between verses 19b-20 and 1 Cor 11.24b-25 arises from the familiarity of the evangelist with the liturgical practice among Pauline churches, a circumstance that accounts also for the presence of non-Lukan expressions in verses 19b-20.

Table of six forms of the text of Lk 22.17-20, reproduced (with a few minor modifications) from the chapter, “The Textual Data,” by Sir Frederick G. Kenyon and S. C. E. Legg, in The Ministry and the Sacraments, ed. by Roderic Dunkerley (London, 1937), pp. 284 f. By “Majority Text” at the head of the first column is meant the consensus of ₪57 ¹ B T W AT ¹ X Δ 0 ¹ P 063 f1 f2 ¹ f31 apparently all minuscules it s+1 vg syrMS copMS bo armeo. It will be understood that the Greek form given to the versions is in some details uncertain.

Considerations in favor of the originality of the shorter text include the following: (a) Generally in New Testament textual criticism the shorter reading is to be preferred, (b) Since the words in verses 19b and 20 are suspiciously similar to Paul’s words in 1 Cor 11.24b-25, it appears that the latter passage was the source of their interpolation into the longer text. (c) Verses 19b-20 contain several linguistic features that are non-Lukan.

The weight of these considerations was estimated differently by different members of the Committee. A minority preferred the shorter text as a Western non-interpolation (see the Note following 24.53). The majority, on the other hand, impressed by the overwhelming preponderance of external evidence supporting the longer form, explained the origin of the shorter form as due to some scribal accident or misunderstanding.25 The similarity between verses 19b-20 and 1 Cor 11.24b-25 arises from the familiarity of the evangelist with the liturgical practice among Pauline churches, a circumstance that accounts also for the presence of non-Lukan expressions in verses 19b-20.

The Textus Receptus, following a considerable number of witnesses, inserts εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος as if to mark the beginning of a new subject. On the strength of ₪35 B L T 1241 syr al, the Committee preferred the shorter text, considering that it would have been natural for an identifying phrase to be added whenever the reading of the Scripture lesson was begun at this point.

The absence of these verses in such ancient and widely diversified witnesses as ₪75 A B C T W syrMS copMS bo armeo geo Marcion Clement Origen al, as well as being marked with asterisks or obeli (signifying spuriousness) in other witnesses (Δ2 Π2 892° 1079 1195 1216 copMS) and their transferral to Matthew’s Gospel (after 26.39) by family 13 and several lectionaries (the latter also transfer ver. 45a), strongly suggests that they are not part of the original text of Luke. Their presence in many manuscripts, some ancient, as well as their citation by Justin, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, and many other Fathers, is proof of the antiquity of the account. On grounds of transcriptional probability it is less likely that the verses were deleted in several different areas of the church by those who felt that the account of Jesus being overwhelmed with human weakness was incompatible with his sharing the divine omnipotence of the Father, than that they were added from an early source, oral or written, of extra-canonical traditions concerning the life and passion of Jesus. Nevertheless, while acknowledging that the passage is a later addition to the text, in view of its evident antiquity and its importance in the textual tradition, a majority of the Committee decided to retain the words in the text but to enclose them within double square brackets.

Although it is possible that the verse has come into the Lukan text from the parallel passage in Mt 26.75, a majority of the Committee regarded it as more probable that the words were accidentally omitted from several witnesses (0171 01 892° 82 1195 1216) than added without substantial variation (only ὁ Ἰησοῦς is added in several witnesses after ἐξῆλθον) in all other witnesses.

While it might be argued that the words μοι ἀπόλυσεν have fallen out accidentally owing to homoeoteleuton (.ibatis... αἰτεν) in the ancestor(s) of ₪35 B L T 1241 al, such an explanation cannot account for the absence of the words ἀπόλυσεν from Θ f2 1365 al.
The Committee therefore was inclined to regard both μοι and ἥτται as early glosses.

According to Epiphanius (c. Marc. 316) after ἀποστρέφοντα τὸ θνήσιμον ἡμῶν Marcion added καὶ καταλύουσα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας (“and abolishing the law and the prophets,” compare Mt 5.17), an interpolation that has survived in seven Old Latin manuscripts (it in eillingiai) as well as in several manuscripts of the Vulgate. (See also the comment on ver. 5.)

According to Epiphanius (c. Marc. 316) after ὁδε̣ Marcion added καὶ ἀποστρέφοντα τὰς γυναικές καὶ τὰ τέκνα, a reading that is preserved in expanded form in two Old Latin manuscripts: codex Colbertinus (ii') reads et filios nostros et uxores averrit a nobis, non enim baptizatuar sicur nos (“and he alienates our sons and wives from us, for he is not baptized as we are”); codex Palatinus (ii') has the same down to nobis, and continues non enim baptizatuar sicur et nos, nec se mundant (“for they are not baptized as also we are, nor do they purify themselves”). (See also the comment on ver. 2.)

On the basis of the age of Ψ75 and the difficulty of understanding the force of καὶ in the context, the reading καὶ Ἡρώδης appears to be preferred. At the same time, because of the combination of B Δ* Θ and most of the Old Latin in support of the reading Ἡρώδης, a majority of the Committee thought it right to place καὶ within square brackets.

In the transmission of this clause copyists became hopelessly confused, producing statements either utterly banal, as ἀνέπηφα γὰρ Ἰς μᾶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς (A D W X Δ Ψ f1, 19), followed by the Textus Receptus, or totally nonsensical, as ἀνέπηφα γὰρ Ἰς καὶ ἡμᾶς [= Herod!] πρὸς Ις μᾶς (71 248 788 al). The best attested reading (Ψ75 Β Κ Λ Τ Θ al) is also the most appropriate in the context.

The Committee judged that the omission of the words καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων by homooeoteleuton was less likely than their addition by copyists who wished to specify more particularly the identity of those who called for the crucifixion of Jesus.

According to Epiphanius (c. Marc. 316) after ἐστε καταλύουσα τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας, a reading that is preserved in expanded form in two Old Latin manuscripts: codex Colbertinus (ii') reads et filios nostros et uxores averrit a nobis, non enim baptizatuar sicur nos (“and he alienates our sons and wives from us, for he is not baptized as we are”); codex Palatinus (ii') has the same down to nobis, and continues non enim baptizatuar sicur et nos, nec se mundant (“for they are not baptized as also we are, nor do they purify themselves”). (See also the comment on ver. 2.)

The absence of these words from such early and diverse witnesses as Ψ75 B Δ* W Θ it* εὐσεβὴς cop sa, bomos al is most impressive and can scarcely be explained as a deliberate excision by copyists who, considering the fall of Jerusalem to be proof that God had not forgiven the Jews, could not allow it to appear that the prayer of Jesus had remained unanswered. At the same time, the logion, though probably not a part of the original Gospel of Luke, bears self-evident tokens of its dominical origin, and was retained, within double square brackets, in its traditional place where it had been incorporated by unknown copyists relatively early in the transmission of the Third Gospel.

The mention here of the three languages in which the inscription on the cross was written is almost certainly a gloss, probably taken from the text of Jn 19.20. Every consideration weighs against it: (a) it is absent from several of the earliest and best witnesses (Ψ75 Β Δ* it* εὐσεβὴς cop sa, bomos al); (b) the authorities that insert the words differ among themselves (as to the order of the languages, as to the introductory word, γεγραμμένην or ἐν γεγραμμένην, and as to the order of participle and ἐν* αὐξῆσα); and (c) there is no satisfactory explanation for the omission of the statement, if it were originally present in the text. See also the comment on Jn 19.20.
Although the reading of 35 B L al has, from one point of view, the appearance of being a scribal correction (κις being considered more appropriate than ην with στόχος), a majority of the Committee preferred it as more consonant with Lukan theology (compare 24.26) than either of the other readings. The reading of most witnesses, ἔτοιμη ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου (“when you come in your kingly power”), and still more the reading of codex Bezae, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλήσιας σου (“in the day of your [second] coming”), reflect a developed interest in the eschatological kingdom.

23.43 αὐτῷ

Pious fancy was especially active concerning the story of the penitent robber. In order to make certain that the reader may know to which of the two robbers the words of Jesus were addressed, codex Bezae inserts after αὐτῷ the words τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ θανάτου [which is to be corrected to ἐπὶ τοῦ θανάτου] (“said to him who reproved”). The same manuscript continues by substituting θέρατος (“Have courage!”) for Λήμνη σου λέγω. Codex Colbertinus (it”) has the homiletic insertion of credis before amens (probably to be understood as a question, “Do you believe? Truly I say to you …”). Instead of ἐν τῷ παραθύρῳ the Curetonian Syriac and the Arabic Diatessaron have “in the Garden of Eden.” The Curetonian Syriac rearranges the order of words, joining σήμερον, not with με, ἐμοὶ τῷ Θεῷ, but with Λήμνη σου λέγω (“Truly I say to you today that with me you will be …”).

23.45 τοῖς ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος [B]

The words καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἡλίος (“the sun was darkened”) appear to be the easier reading, substituted by copyists for τοῖς ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος [or ἐκλείποντοσ], which may mean either “the sun’s light failed” or “the sun was eclipsed.”

23.48 ἵππον ἐπιστρέφον

In order to heighten the account, several witnesses include various interpolations. After τοιαύτης codex Bezae adds καὶ τὰ μέτωπα (“beating their breasts and their foreheads”). The Old Syriac (syr”) reads, “All they who happened to be there and saw that which came to pass were beating on their breasts and saying, ‘Woe to us! What has befallen us? Woe to us for our sins!’” One manuscript of the Old Latin (it”) adds at the close of the verse, dicentes vae nobis (to be corrected to nobis) quae facta sunt hodie proper peccata nostra; adhuc nonque noster desolatio Hierusalem (“saying, ‘Woe to us on account of our sins that we have committed this day! For the desolation of Jerusalem has drawn near!’”

Similar references to grief expressed at the death of Jesus are quoted in Ephraem’s Commentary on the Diatessaron (xx.28 of the Armenian version, ed. Leloir), “Woe was it, woe was it to us; this was the Son of God”…’Behold, they have come, the judgments of Jerusalem have arrived!” Cf. also the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, § 7 (25), ἠδύνατο κόπος θανατίου καὶ λέγων, Οὐαὶ τοῖς ἀμαρτώσασι θέλων ἡγεῖσαι καὶ τὸ ἱλάτος Ιερουσαλήμ (“They began to lament and to say, ‘Woe unto our sins; the judgment and the end of Jerusalem has drawn near’”).

23.53 κείμενος

Several witnesses (including U 13 69 124 348 1043 1194 1355 1689) add from the parallels in Mt 27.60 and Mk 15.46 the statement καὶ προσεκλίσαντον λόγον μὲν ἔτει τῆς θρόνου τοῦ μοντείου. Furthermore, codex Bezae expands the text with a characteristic interpolation καὶ θυγατέρας αὐτοῦ ἐστίν. The words οὕτως εἰκοσι εἴκοσι ("and after he had been laid there he [Joseph of Arimathea] placed over the tomb a stone which twenty men could scarcely roll"). The same or a similar expansion is found in it” (et cum positus esset in monumento, posuerunt lapidem quem vix viginti volvebant) and in the Sahidic version (“and when they had put him, they set a stone against the mouth of the sepulchre; this which hardly will twenty men be able to roll”).

24.1-2 ἀφώματα. εἴρησον δὲ

Between verses 1 and 2 codex Bezae, joined by 0124 it” and cop”, expands the narrative with an interpolation partly derived from the parallel account in Mark (16:3): ἔλαβεν δὲ καὶ ἐσκότες, τὰς ἀνδρὰς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν λόφον. ἦλθον δὲ εἶναι… (“And they [the women] were pondering in themselves, ‘Who will roll away the stone.’ And when they had come they found …”).

24.3 τοῦ κυρίου θανάτου [B]

A minority of the Committee preferred the shortest reading, supported by D it” h. d. e. a2. i. i. (see the Note on Western non-interpolations). Following 24.53. The majority, on the other hand, impressed by the weight of ἐν Ν A C W B f 1 33 565 700 al. regarded the reading of D as influenced by ver. 23, and the omission of κυρίου in a few witnesses as due to assimilation to Mt 27.58 or Mk 15.43. The expression “the Lord Jesus” is used of the risen Lord in Ac 1.21; 4.33; 8.16.

24.6 οὐκ ἔστιν άνέκ, ἀλλὰ ἡγεῖσθη [B]

A minority of the Committee preferred to follow the evidence of D it” h. d. e. a2. i. i. geo” and to omit the words οὐκ ἔστιν άνέκ, ἀλλὰ ἡγεῖσθη as an interpolation (see the Note following 24.53), derived from Mt 28.6 and/or Mk 16.8, and cast into antithetic form (…ἄλλα…). The majority of the Committee, on the other hand, interpreted the antithesis
as evidence of independence of the Lukan formulation from that of Matthew and Mark (which lack ἀλλάδε). In any case, the reading of C* at is obviously a scribal assimilation to the Synoptic parallels.

24.9 ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου

A majority of the Committee, considering the absence of the words ἀπὸ τοῦ μνημείου from D ἴ, c, e, f, l, r arm geo to be due to an accident in transcription, was impressed by the overwhelming external attestation, beginning with ℞**, that supports the inclusion of the words in the text.

24.10 Ἰδον δὲ {B}

The omission of Ἰδον δὲ (A D W itſ - s syr h with + αὐτῷ) seems to be an attempt to improve the syntax. The reading Ἰδον δὲ, preserved in K II, Ψ f1 αὐτῷ singles out Mary Magdalene for special mention.

24.12 include verse {B}

Although ver. 12 is sometimes thought to be an interpolation (see the Note following 24.53) derived from ἦν ἐκατον ἐκ Λογίας, a majority of the Committee regarded the passage as a natural antecedent to ver. 24, and was inclined to explain the similarity with the verses in John as due to the likelihood that both evangelists had drawn upon a common tradition.

24.13 ἐξέσκοτον {B}

The variant reading ἐξέσκοτον (K KσΘ Π syrmed arm) seems to have arisen in connection with patristic identification of Emmanuia with 'Amwās (mod. Nicopolis), about twenty-two Roman miles (176 stadia) from Jerusalem (thus Eusebius, Jerome, Sozomen, though they do not mention the distance). This, however, is too far for the travelers to have re-traversed that same evening (ver. 25). The “seven” of it is undoubtedly due to a scribal blunder.

24.17 καὶ ἐστάθησαν {B}

On the strength of a variety of evidence, some of it early (𝔓32, A A* B 0124 579 itř, copς, syr) the Committee preferred ἐστάθησαν rather than ἐστάτε, which is supported by most other witnesses. According to this reading, the question ends with περιπατοῦντές, and the two travelers stand still for a moment in silence, displeased on being interrupted in their conversation by a stranger; then the silence is broken by the reply of Cleopas.

24.18 Κλεοπάς

A gloss in the margin of codex S (which dates from A.D. 949) states ὃ μετὰ τοῦ Κλεοπάτ Βουκλίδου ἤτοι, ὡς ὃ Πέτρος, ἀλλ’ ὃ Τιμόθεος (“The one journeying with Cleopas was Simon, not Peter but the other [Simon]”). Codex V (which dates from the ninth century) has the marginal note: ὃ μετὰ Κλεοπάνα Ναζαρηνάς ἤτοι, ὡς ὃ Παναρίον ἤτοι τοῦ συστήματος, ἐκείνου εἰσπέρασαν τῇ ἐκστάσει (“The one with Cleopas was Nathanael, as the great Epiphanius says in his Panarion [xxiii:6]. Cleopas was a cousin of the Saviour, the second bishop of Jerusalem”).

24.19 Ναζαρηνά {B}

It is probable that scribes replaced the less frequently used word Ναζαρηνάς (six times in the New Testament, including one other time in Luke [nowhere in Acts]) by the more frequently used Ναζαρέας (thirteen times in the New Testament, including eight times in Luke and Acts).

24.32 ἠμῶν κακαλαμένη ήν

The word κακαλαμένη seems to have given trouble to copyists. The reading of D* ἦν ἠμῶν κακαλάματη (“Was not our heart veiled…?”) may have been derived from 2 Cor 3:14-16. The early versions offer a wide variety of readings: among the Old Latin manuscripts excaecatum (itś) and optusum (itś) seem to imply πεπρώματι or πεπυρμένη (“blinded” or “hardened”); less obvious as to its origin is the reading of itś exterminatum (“destroyed”), though this may be a scribal blunder for exterminatum (“terrified”).

The Old Syriac (Sinaitic and Curetonian) manuscripts and the Peshitta version read “Was not our heart heavy…?” as do also the Armenian version, the Arabic and Persian Harmonies, and one manuscript of the Sahidic version; this reading seems to imply ἄφθασεν in Greek, probably from ver. 5, ἦν ἄπληκτος καὶ ἄφθασεν ἐν καρδίᾳ τοῦ πνεῦμα (“The other Sahidic manuscripts read, “Is not then our heart being covered for us…?”

“Burning,” which is attested by the overwhelming preponderance of witnesses, best suits the context.

24.32 [ἐν ἡμῖν] ὡς ἠλάλει ἡμῖν [C]

Although ℞** B D geo Origen unite in support of the shorter reading, the Committee was reluctant to omit the words ἐν ἡμῖν entirely, in view of the possibility that copyists may have deleted them as superfluous in the context. It was thought best, therefore, to retain
them in the text, but enclosed within square brackets indicating doubt that they have a right to stand there.

24.36 καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Εἰρήνη ἦμων [B]

The words ἐγὼ ἦμων, μὴ ἦμεθα, are either before εἰρήνη ἦμων (as in W 579) or after (as in G P it* vg syr* k al cop* bom arm eth geo Diatessaron* t r), are undoubtedly a gloss, derived perhaps from Ἰν 6.20. The Committee was less sure concerning the origin of the words καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς, Εἰρήνη ἦμων, which, as the regular form of Semitic greeting, might well be expected on this occasion. When the passage is compared with Ἰν 20.19 ff. the question arises: have the two evangelists depended upon a common tradition, or have copyists expanded Luke’s account by adding the salutation from John’s account? A majority of the Committee, impressed by the presence of numerous points of contact between Luke and John in their Passion and Easter accounts, preferred to follow the preponderance of external attestation and to retain the words in the text. (See also the Note on Western non-interpolations, following 24.53.)

24.37 τοῦτο μαρτύρησεν

Instead of τοῦτο μαρτύρησεν, which is read by the overwhelming majority of witnesses, Codex Bezae reads φανέρωσα (“they thought they saw a ghost”), a reading which, according to Tertullian, was in Marcion’s New Testament.

24.40 include verse [B]

Was ver. 40 omitted by certain Western witnesses (D it* b d c e f2 l r1 syr*) because it seemed superfluous after ver. 39? Or is it a gloss introduced by copyists in all other witnesses from Ἰν 20.20, with a necessary adaptation (the passage in John refers to Jesus’ hands and side; this passage refers to his hands and feet)? A minority of the Committee preferred to omit the verse as an interpolation (see the Note following 24.55); the majority, however, was of the opinion that, had the passage been interpolated from the Johannine account, copyists would probably have left some trace of its origin by retaining τὸν πνεῦμαν in place of τοῦς πάντας (either here only, or in ver. 28 also).

24.42 μέρος [B]

The words καὶ ἀπὸ μελισσῶν κηρύξας (or κηρύσσων) (“and from a honeycomb”) in many of the later manuscripts (followed by the Textus Receptus) are an obvious interpolation, for it is not likely that they would have fallen out of so many of the best representatives of the earlier text-types. Since in parts of the ancient church honey was used in the celebration of the Eucharist and in the baptismal liturgy, copyists may have added the reference here in order to provide scriptural sanction for liturgical practice.

24.47 εἰς (1) [B]

On internal grounds it is difficult to decide between the two readings, for both are in accord with Lukian usage (e.g. ἱσ. 3.3 βαπτίσιμα μετανοιας εἰς ἄφθονος, and Ac 5.31 οὕτως μετάνοιας τῷ Τοράθι καὶ ἄφθονος ἀμαρτίων). On the basis of (a) what was taken to be slightly superior external attestation, and (b) the probability that, in view of the following εἰς, copyists would have been more likely to alter the first εἰς to καὶ, rather than vice versa, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading εἰς.

24.47 ἀγαθόν [B]

The reading that best accounts for the origin of the others seems to be the nominativus pendens, ἀγαθόν, supported by N Β C* L X 33 al. In attempting to improve the syntax, some copyists preferred the accusative absolute, ἀγαθῶν (Φ 78 A C K W Δ f3 f11 al), and others the genitive absolute, ἀγαθῶν (with ἦμων understood; Δ Δ' al). The nominative singular, ἄγαθον (N 365 1071 al), probably arose through assimilation to εἶπον (ver. 46).

24.49 καὶ [ἰδοὺ] ἐγώ οὐρανόν [C]

On the one hand, the agreement of β75 and D, along with N L 33 it* b d c e f2 l r1 vg syr* cop* bom* provides strong support for the shorter text. Likewise there is no reason why the solemn emphatic wording καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, which seems especially suitable for the last words of Jesus, should have been altered by copyists. On the other hand, however, the Committee, being impressed by the weight of the attestation supporting the reading καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγώ, preferred to retain the word ἰδού, but to enclose it within square brackets, indicating doubt that it belongs in the text.

24.51 καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν [B]

Here N* and geo join D and it* b d c e f2 l r1 in supporting the shorter text. (The Sinitic Syriac condenses ver. 51 by omitting δέσποτα and εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, reading “And while he blessed them, he was lifted up from them”: thus, though shortened, syr still alludes to the ascension.) A majority of the Committee preferred the shorter reading, regarding the longer as a Western non-interpolation (see the Note following 24.53).

The majority of the Committee, however, favored the longer reading for the following reasons. (1) The rhythm of the sentence seems to require the presence of such a clause (compare the two coordinate clauses joined with καὶ in ver. 50 and in verses 52-53). (2) Luke’s opening statement in Acts ("In the first book, O Theophilus, I have dealt with all that Jesus began to do and teach, until the day when he was taken up [ὁ ἐκείνης ἐφήμη]”) implies that he considered that he had made some reference, however brief, to the
The ascension at the close of his first book. (3) If the shorter text were original, it is difficult to account for the presence of καὶ ἀναφέρειν εἰς τὸν οἴκουν in so many and such diversified witnesses, beginning with P [1] about A.D. 200. (4) If the clause were a copyist’s addition, prompted by his noticing the implications of Ac 1.1-2 (see point (2) above), one would have expected him to adopt some form of the verb ἀναλαμβάνειν, used in Ac 1.2 and other passages referring to the ascension, rather than the less appropriate ἀναφέρειν, which in the New Testament ordinarily has the specialized meaning “to offer up.” Finally, (5) the omission of the clause in a few witnesses can be accounted for either (a) through accidental scribal oversight occasioned by homoeoarcton (καὶ … καὶ …) or (b) by deliberate excision, either (i) in order to relieve the apparent contradiction between this account (which seemingly places the ascension late Easter night) and the account in Ac 1.3-11 (which dates the ascension forty days after Easter), or (ii) in order to introduce a subtle theological differentiation between the Gospel and the Acts (i.e., the Western redactor, not approving of Luke’s mentioning the ascension twice, first to conclude the earthly ministry of Jesus, and again, in Acts, to inaugurate the church age, preferred to push all doxological representations of Jesus to a time after the ascension in Acts, and therefore deleted the clause in question as well as the words προσκυνήσατε αὐτὸν from ver. 53 – for when the account of the ascension has been eliminated, the mention of Jesus being worshipped seems less appropriate).²

24.52 προσκυνήσατε αὐτὸν [B]

Although a minority of the Committee preferred the shorter reading, regarding the others as interpolations (see the Note following 24.53), the majority considered it more probable that the words προσκυνήσατε αὐτὸν had been omitted either accidentally (the eye of the copyist passing from λέγειν … to λέγειν) or, perhaps, deliberately (so as to accord better with the shorter reading in ver. 51; see the concluding comments on the previous variant reading).

24.53 εὐλαμβάνετε [B]

The readings εἰλαμβάνετε καὶ εὐλαμβάνετε (A C D Q Y ¦ 33) and εὐλαμβάνετε καὶ ἑλαμβάνετε (eth) are undoubtedly part of Greek εὐλαγεῖν comes to be a distinctively Christian term used in praising God (in contrast with the pagan usage of αἰνῶν), copyists would have tended to replace instances of the latter verb with the former. Considerations relating to the context are similarly indecisive. It can be argued that the presence of εὐλαγεῖν in verses 50 and 51 prompted copyists to introduce the same verb in ver. 53; or, thinking it more appropriate that the activity of the disciples should be differentiated from that of their risen Lord, out of reverence copyists may have altered εὐλαγεῖν to εὐλαγοῦσες. Faced with these conflicting considerations, a majority of the Committee preferred to make a decision on the basis of external attestation, and therefore chose εὐλαγοῦσες, supported as it is by early and diversified witnesses.

24.53 θείων. [A]

The word θείων, which is absent from the earliest and best representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text, is a liturgical addition introduced by copyists. (See also the comment on Mt 28.20.)

NOTE ON WESTERN NON-INTERPOLATIONS

One of the features of the Western text is the occasional omission of words and passages that are present in other types of text, including the Alexandrian. How should one evaluate such omissions from a form of text which is generally much fuller than other text-types? According to one theory, popularized at the close of the last century by Westcott and Hort,² such readings, despite their being supported by the generally inferior Western witnesses, ought to be preferred rather than the longer readings, though the latter are attested by the generally superior manuscripts, B and K. Nine such readings were designated by Westcott and Hort as “Western non-interpolations,”² on the assumption that all extant witnesses except the Western (or, in some cases, some of the Western witnesses) have in these passages suffered interpolation.

In recent decades this theory has been coming under more and more criticism. With the acquisition of the Bodmer Papyri, testimony for the Alexandrian type of text has been carried back from the fourth to the second century, and one can now observe how faithfully that text was copied and recopied between the stage represented by codex Vaticanus. Furthermore, scholars have been critical of the apparently arbitrary way in which Westcott and Hort isolated nine passages for special treatment (enclosing them within double square brackets), whereas they did not give similar treatment to other readings that also are absent from Western witnesses.²

With the rise of what is called Redaktionsgeschichte (the analysis of the theological and literary presuppositions and tendencies that controlled the formation and transmission of Gospel materials), scholars have begun to give renewed attention to the possibility that special theological interests on the part of scribes may account for the deletion of certain passages in Western witnesses. In any case, the Bible Societies’ Committee did not consider it wise to make,
as it were, a mechanical or doctrinaire judgment concerning the group of nine Western non-interpolations, but sought to evaluate each one separately on its own merits and in the light of fuller attestation and newer methodologies.

During the discussions a sharp difference of opinion emerged. According to the view of a minority of the Committee, apart from other arguments there is discernible in these passages a Christological-theological motivation that accounts for their having been added, while there is no clear reason that accounts for their having been omitted. Accordingly, if the passages are retained in the text at all, it was held that they should be enclosed within square brackets. On the other hand, the majority of the Committee, having evaluated the weight of the evidence differently, regarded the longer readings as part of the original text. For an account of the reasons that the majority felt to be cogent in explaining the origin of the shorter text, see the comments on the several passages.

Footnotes


2 For a bibliographical survey of the chief arguments, see R. Laurentin in Biblica, XXXVIII (1957), pp. 15–23.

3 The combination occurs by error (instead of Χριστὸς κυπανοῦ and the Septuagint translation of \textit{Lam 4.20} and in \textit{Ps Sol 17.20}.

4 It should be noted that the Sahidic version employs the possessive pronoun, “And peace upon earth among men of his [pleasure].”

5 According to J. A. Fitzmyer, S.J. (\textit{Theological Studies}, XIX [1958], pp. 225–227) the expression “among men of [his] good pleasure” has been found also in an Aramaic fragment from Qumran.

6 Although the reading ἀνδρὸς ἐθέλησεν ἄπαντα is supported by an impressive range of witnesses (A D 33 565 1079 many versions), with a reading that involves three names (such as that adopted by the Committee) Luke’s entire genealogy of Jesus falls into an artistically planned pattern, even more elaborate than Matthew’s (cf. \textit{Mt 1.17}); thus, from Adam to Abraham, 3 x 7 generations; from Isaac to David, 2 x 7 generations; from Nathan to Salathiel (pre-exilic), 3 x 7 generations; from Zerubbabel (post-exilic) to Jesus, 3 x 7 generations, making a total of 11 x 7, or 77 generations from Adam to Jesus.

7 \textit{Expositio Evangelii secundum Lucan}, ed. by C. Schenkl in \textit{Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum}, XXXII, pars iv (= iii) [Vienna, 1902], pp. 149–156.


9 It is often assumed, for example, that the symbolism is intended to allude to the future proclamation of the gospel to all of the countries of the world. But even in this case there is uncertainty, for in the Hebrew text of \textit{Genesis 11} the several nations of earth total seventy, whereas in the Greek Septuagint the enumeration comes to seventy-two.

10 For a fuller discussion of the external evidence and internal probabilities, as well as a list of about twenty instances from ancient Jewish literature involving either 70 or 72, see the chapter entitled, “Seventy or Seventy-two Disciples?” in \textit{Metzger’s Historical and Literary Studies, Pagan, Jewish, and Christian} (Leiden and Grand Rapids, 1968), pp. 67–76.


12 So Ernest C. Colwell, “Scribal Habits in Early Papryri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text,” in \textit{The Bible in Modern Scholarship}, ed. by J. Philip Hyatt (Nashville, 1965), p. 385, who states that the scribe of D¹ “drops more than a dozen [personal pronouns], and adds one.”

13 It has been conjectured that ποιεῖ is a corruption of the old Greek word βιοί (”a sheep”): see John Mill, \textit{Novum Testamentum Graecum}, 2nd ed. (Leipzig, 1723), p. 44, § 423.


15 According to C. C. Torrey, \textit{Our Translated Gospels, p. 79}, and M. Black, \textit{Aramaic Approach, 3rd ed.}, p. 103, the words πᾶνς λαός immediately after σταυροῖς are to be understood as the Aramaic ethative, meaning, “The Pharisee, taking his stand, prayed. …”


17 The same sequence also occurs in the Didache, in. 2–3; cf. also \textit{1 Cor 10.16}.

18 Kenyon and Legg, who prefer the longer form of text, explain the origin of the other readings as follows: “The whole difficulty arose, in our opinion, from a misunderstanding of the longer version. The first cup given to the disciples to divide among themselves should be taken in connection with the previous verse (ver. 16) as referring to the eating of the Passover with them at the reunion in Heaven. This is followed by the institution of the Sacrament, to be repeated continually on earth in memory of Him. This gives an intelligible meaning to the whole, while at the same time it is easy to see that it would occasion difficulties of interpretation, which would give rise to the attempts at revision that appear in various forms of the shorter version” (Sir Frederick G. Kenyon and S. C. E. Legg in \textit{The Ministry and the Sacraments}, ed. by Roderic Dunkerley [London, 1937], pp. 285 f.).

19 In Syria the difference between the words for “beauty” and “burning” is only the position of a dot, the former is spelled and the latter .

20 For other instances of what appear to be doctrinal alterations introduced by the Western reviser, see the comments on \textit{Ac 1.2} and \textit{9} as well as the references mentioned in \textit{Group D} in footnote 12, p. 226 below. Cf. also Eldon J. Epp, \textit{The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts} (Cambridge, 1966).


22 The nine passages are \textit{Mt 27.49: Lk 22.19b-20: 24.3: 6: 12: 36: 40: 51}, and \textit{52}. 
The Gospel According To John

1.3-4 οὐδὲ ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ γεγονὸς ἐν [B]

Should the words ὁ γεγονὸς be joined with what goes before or with what follows? The oldest manuscripts (𝔓46, 53 | A B) have no punctuation here, and in any case the presence of punctuation in Greek manuscripts, as well as in versional and patristic sources, cannot be regarded as more than the reflection of current exegetical understanding of the meaning of the passage.

A majority of the Committee was impressed by the consensus of ante-Nicene writers (orthodox and heretical alike) who took ὁ γεγονὸς with what follows. When, however, in the fourth century Arians and the Macedonian heretics began to appeal to the passage to prove that the Holy Spirit is to be regarded as one of the created things, orthodox writers preferred to take ὁ γεγονὸς with the preceding sentence, thus removing the possibility of heretical use of the passage.

The punctuation adopted for the text is in accord with what a majority regarded as the rhythmical balance of the opening verses of the Prologue, where the climactic or “staircase” parallelism seems to demand that the end of one line should match the beginning of the next:  

[On the other hand, however, none of these arguments is conclusive and other considerations favor taking ὁ γεγονὸς with the preceding sentence. Thus, against the consideration of the so-called]

1.4 ἐν [A]

In order to relieve the difficulty of meaning when ὁ γεγονὸς (ver. 3) is taken as the subject of ἐν (“that-which-has-come-into-being in him was life”), the tense of the verb was changed from imperfect to present (ὁστάτῳ in Ν D Old Latin syr etc. the fragment, as well as in the standard text of the Fourth Gospel for their doctrine of the origin of the Ogdoad, to take ὁ γεγονὸς with the following sentence (“That which has been made in him was life” – whatever that may be supposed to mean).] It is more consistent with the Johannine repetitive style, as well as with Johannine doctrine (cf. 5.26, 36; 6.53), to say nothing concerning the sense of the passage, to punctuate with a full stop after ὁ γεγονὸς. B.M.M.]
early ecclesiastical writers. The presence, however, of the second ἦν (in the clause ἦ ζωὴ ἦν τὸ φῶς) seems to require the first.  

1.13 οὐκ ἦν ἐγεννηθήσαν [A]  

Several ancient witnesses, chiefly Latin (Tertullian Origen Ambrose Augustine Ps. Athanasius), read the singular number, “He who was born, not of blood nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God” (the Curetonian Syriac and six manuscripts of the Peshitta Syriac read the plural “those who” and the singular verb “was born”).  

All Greek manuscripts, as well as the other versional and patristic witnesses, attest the plural number. (Several minor variant readings occur within the verse: D* and it* omit ἦν, thus leaving the verse without grammatical connection with the preceding sentence; other variants in the verse are mentioned in the following entry.)  

Although a number of modern scholars (including Zahn, Resch, Blass, Loisy, R. Seeburg, Burney, Büchsel, Boismard, Dupont, and F. M. Braun) have argued for the originality of the singular number, it appeared to the Committee that, on the basis of the overwhelming consensus of all Greek manuscripts, the plural must be adopted, a reading, moreover, that is in accord with the characteristic teaching of John. The singular number may have arisen either from a desire to make the Fourth Gospel allude explicitly to the virgin birth or from the influence of the singular number of the immediately preceding αὐτός.  

1.13 οὐκ ἦν θελήματος ἀνήρ [A]  

The presence of similar beginnings (οὐκ … οὐκ) and similar endings (σαρκὸς … ἀνήρ) of the second and third clauses has occasioned the accidental omission of one or the other clause. The clause οὐκ … σαρκὸς was omitted in E* and several minuscule manuscripts, and the clause οὐκ … ἀνήρ was omitted in B* ad.  

1.18 μονογενὴς θεὸς [B]  

With the acquisition of P56 and P71, both of which read θεὸς, the external support of this reading has been notably strengthened. A majority of the Committee regarded the reading μονογενὴς υἱὸς, which undoubtedly is easier than μονογενὴς θεὸς, to be the result of scribal assimilation to Jn 3.16, 18; 1 Jn 4.2. The anarthrous use of θεὸς (cf. 1.1) appears to be more primitive. There is no reason why the article should have been deleted, and when υἱὸς supplanted θεὸς it would certainly have been added. The shortest reading, ὁ μονογενὴς,
he regarded as an edifying etymology: “The etymology of the name [Bethabara] corresponds with the baptism of him who made ready for the Lord a people prepared for him; for it yields the meaning ‘House of preparation,’ while Bethany means ‘House of obedienee.’ Where else was it fitting that he should baptize, who was sent as a messenger before the face of Christ, to prepare his way before him, but at the ‘House of preparation’?”
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2.10 μεθηθοθεσιν

The Textus Receptus (following N* A X Γ Θ Λ Π and many other witnesses) makes a smoother reading by adding τόκε. The shorter reading adopted for the text is decisively supported by Π66, 75 Ν* B L 083 0141 57 248 573 579 1010 1279 ( Isa. 66, 75 L 0141 s y t η s y l s y l m o s b o c h t h a t)

2.12 καὶ ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ [C]

The manuscripts present many differentas as to the sequence of words as well as the omission of one or more words. The αὐτοῦ following ἀδελφοὶ is lacking in Π66, 75 Ν* B L j1 f13 (read by A B 0162); the αὐτοῦ following μαθηταί is absent from L 0141; the phrase καὶ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ precedes καὶ ἡ μήτηρ in W W*; and the phrase καὶ οἱ μαθηταί αὐτοῦ is lacking in N. αὐτοῦ. The reading that, in the judgment of the Committee, best accounts for the rise of the other readings is supported by Π66, 75 Α Θ 0233 f1 j1 al, but in view of the weight of the witnesses that lack the first αὐτοῦ, it seemed appropriate to enclose it within square brackets.

2.15 ὑφετέλλαν [B]

Several witnesses, including the two oldest (Π66, 75 L W* W* X 0162 f1 j1 33 565 al), prefix ὡς. If this word had been present in the original text, there is no good reason that would account for its having been omitted from the other witnesses. On the other hand, it is probable that copyists introduced the word in order to soften somewhat the bald statement that Jesus made a whip of cords; “he made a kind of whip of cords.”
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2.24 ἡμετέρως (1) [C]

In place of the first ἡμετέρως, many witnesses clarify the sense by writing ἐκείνος (Π66 N* A* W* Ψ Φ al). Although the word was omitted (probably accidentally) by a few
copyists, the Committee judged that there was sufficiently weighty support (N* A* B L. 700 al) to warrant including it.

3.25 τοῦ θεοῦ

A few Greek manuscripts (N* 245 291 472 1009) and a wide range of early patristic writers replace τοῦ θεοῦ with τῶν οὐρανῶν. Although it may be argued that the latter reading is original and that τοῦ θεοῦ was introduced in order to make the passage harmonize with ver. 3, the Committee was impressed by (a) the age and diversity of the witnesses that support τοῦ θεοῦ, and (b) the probability that copyists introduced τῶν οὐρανῶν in imitation of the frequently recurring expression in Matthew (εἰς ἐκκλησίαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν occurs in Mt 5.20; 7.21; 18.3; 19.22), whereas εἰς ἐκκλησίαν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ occurs only once elsewhere (Mt 19.24), while the combination of ἐν τῷ θεῷ with τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν occurs nowhere (and therefore it is not surprising that copyists refrained from introducing τῶν οὐρανῶν into ver. 3).

3.13 ἀνθρώπου {B}

On the one hand, a minority of the Committee preferred the reading ἀνθρώπου ὃς λέει ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, arguing that (1) if the short reading, supported almost exclusively by Egyptian witnesses, were original, there is no discernible motive that would have prompted copyists to add the words ὃς λέει ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, resulting in a more difficult saying (the statement in 1.18, not being parallel, would scarcely have prompted the addition); and (2) the diversity of readings implies that the expression ὃς λέει τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὃς λέει ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, having been found objectionable or superfluous in the context, was modified either by omitting the participial clause, or by alteration so as to avoid suggesting that the Son of Man was at that moment in heaven.

On the other hand, the majority of the Committee, impressed by the quality of the external attestation supporting the shorter reading, regarded the words ὃς λέει ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ as an interpretative gloss, reflecting later Christological development.

3.15 ἐν αἰώνι ἐπί {B}

Exegetical as well as textual problems are involved in deciding among the variant readings. Except for this passage, the fourth evangelist always uses εἰς after παντελείαν (34 times), never ἐν. On the other hand, if ἐν αἰώνι is original here, the meaning may well be, “that every one who believes shall in him [i.e. resting upon him as the cause] have eternal life.” In support of such an interpretation is John’s manner of placing an adverbial phrase with ἐν before its verb when the phrase is emphatic or metaphorical (cf. 5.29; 16.28, and 1 Jn passim). On balance, therefore, the reading of P35 B al, being ambiguous, seems to account best for the rise of the other readings.

3.25 μετὰ Ἰουδαίου {B}

Both Ἰουδαίου and Ἰουδαίων are ancient readings, and external support is rather evenly divided. On the whole, however, it is more likely that the singular (which is unique in John) would have been changed to the more customary plural than vice versa.

3.31-32 ἐγράφη ἢ ἔτην πάντων ἐστίν; ὡς ἠλώσει καὶ ἐκκόψει τόσο μαρτυρεῖ {C}

Several variations are involved here. The word καὶ is omitted by overwhelming authority, and may be set aside at once. On the other hand, the omission of τόσο in several witnesses is sufficiently explained as arising from a certain unnecessary pleonasm. The chief problem – the presence or absence of ἢ ἔτην πάντων ἐστίν – is less easy to solve. Good reasons may be adduced to account for it.

scribal deletion of the words (as redundant after the opening part of ver. 31) or for their mechanical addition after the second instance of ἐγράφης by an inattentive scribe. In view of the balance of both external evidence and transcriptional probabilities, the Committee decided to retain the words but to enclose them within square brackets.

3.34 τὸ πνεῦμα {B}

By some oversight, the scribe of B had originally omitted the words τὸ πνεῦμα, but they were subsequently added in the margin by the same hand. In order to make certain that the reader would understand that ὑπὲρ τῆς πνευματικῆς αὐτῶν τῆς ἐναντίων τινι is original here, the meaning may well be, “that every one who believes shall in him [i.e. resting upon him as the cause] have eternal life.” In support of such an interpretation is John’s manner of placing an adverbial phrase with ἐν before its verb when the phrase is emphatic or metaphorical (cf. 5.29; 16.28, and 1 Jn passim). On balance, therefore, the reading of P35 B al, being ambiguous, seems to account best for the rise of the other readings.

4.1 Ἰησοῦς {C}

As between Ἰησοῦς and κύριος the Committee preferred the former. Had κύριος been present in the original text, it is unlikely that a scribe would have displaced it with Ἰησοῦς, which occurs twice in the following clauses. On the other hand, in accord with the increasing use of κύριος in reference to Jesus, and in order to relieve the clumsy style, more than one copyist may have smoothed the passage by changing the first instance of Ἰησοῦς to κύριος.

It has been conjectured that originally the verb ὡς ἐγράφη was without an expressed subject, and that subsequently some copyists inserted Ἰησοῦς and others κύριος.

4.3 πάλιν {A}
The omission of πάλιν from A B* Γ* Λ* Ψ 28 249 579 700 1194 1424 syrH al. if not accidental, may have been occasioned by a desire to clarify the evangelist’s meaning – for (a) Jesus does not actually arrive in Galilee until two days later (ver. 43), after an interlude in Samaria; and (b) an overly punctilious reader could take πάλιν to mean that Jesus returned a second time to Galilee after having left Judea. πάλιν is strongly attested by ÆBCLM W Θ 053 083 0141 f13 33 565 itb c e f2 l vg syrH Arm al.

4.51 παῖς αὐτοῦ {B}

There are two sets of variation: παῖς // ὕλως and αὐτοῦ // σοῦ. In the former case it must be observed that, though Matthew and Luke use παῖς freely, this word appears nowhere else in John, who prefers ὕλως. Apparently the reading ὕλως is due to scribal assimilation (which began at least as early as E66c) to the usage of the context (verses 46, 47, 50, and 53). The reading σοῦ arose when ὅπερ was taken by some copyists to be ὅπερ remittitum, introducing the actual words of the servants (compare also Jesus’ words to the father, ὅπερ σοῦ ζη, ver. 50).

5.1 ἐστῆτι {A}

Strong external evidence favors the anarthrous ἐστῆτι (ÆBCLD Θ f13 28 syrH); likewise, the natural tendency of scribes would have been to identify an otherwise indeterminate feast by inserting ἐστῆτι (with a reference probably to Passover), a tendency that accounts also for such supplements in isolated manuscripts as ἐστὶν λῦμα before Ἰουδαῖος (in Λ) and ἐστὶν ποιήσημεν after Ἰούδας (in 131).

5.2 Βηθσεδᾶ {C}

Of the several variant readings, Βηθσεδᾶ has strong attestation but is suspect as an assimilation to the town of Bethsaida on the Sea of Galilee, mentioned in 1.44. Βῆθσεδᾶ, though widely supported, is also suspect as a scribal alteration originally introduced because of its edifying etymology (Ἀθήνας, “House of [Divine] Mercy”). In the opinion of a majority of the Committee the least unsatisfactory reading appears to be Βηθσεδᾶ (ÆB CLQ 33 Eusebius), of which Βηθσεδᾶ (L itb) and perhaps Βῆθσεδᾶ (D itb f13) may be variant spellings. The Copper Scroll discovered at Qumran contains a reference to a pool at

Bethshaddaiyim, which the minority of the Committee interpreted as corroborating the reading Βηθσεδᾶ.

5.3 ζηρῶν {A}

Because the man whom Jesus heals appears to have been a paralytic (a word that occurs nowhere in John), after ζηρῶν the Western text (D itb b c l) inserts παραλυτικῶς, which, however, was not taken up in any known later text. A variety of witnesses add, perhaps in order to explain the reference in ver. 7 to the troubling of the water, ἐκδοχοῦσαν τὴν τοῦ ὀκτάς κύησιν. The reading, however, is lacking in the oldest and best witnesses (ÆBCLN A* B C* L al) and contains two non-Johannine words ἐκδοχοῦσαν and κύησιν. (66.75)}
Although early and important witnesses (𝔓66, 75 B W al) omit θεοὶ, it seems to be required in the context. The absence of the word can be accounted for through transcriptional oversight; the letters Ὄψις (the customary contraction for θεοὶ) were accidentally omitted from τοῦ θεοῦ ἐγγύς.

It is difficult to decide whether ἵππος was added by scribes in order to provide a subject for ἀπεκρίνετο, or whether the absence of

the name from Ψ75 B W al is an Alexandrian deletion prompted by stylistic considerations. As a compromise a majority of the Committee decided to retain the word enclosed within square brackets. The readings with κύριος are clearly secondary.

The Western reading ὄδης (𝔓* D 1547 μαθήτης sēr arm geo) reflects the desire of copyists to heighten the argument by forcing the Jews to admit that they know the evidence of Jesus’ ματαιωμα to be true (the textual alteration, however, is contradicted by the implication of ver. 376). Other copyists, prompted perhaps by the recollection of instances of ὄδημα in John (3:2; 4:43; 7:27; 9:20; 24; 29; 31; 16:30; 21:24), changed ὄδηκα to ὄδημα (56 58 61).

Instead of μετίζω (accusative case), read by the majority of witnesses (𝔓 H K L S U V Γ ∆ Θ Π and most minuscules; D reads the alternative accusative form μετὶζων), the variant reading μετίζων (properly the nominative case) is found in Ψ66 A B E G M N W Ψ f 33 397 472 579 713 1071 2430 al. The latter reading, however, gives an antithesis (“I who am greater than John have the testimony”) that is out of accord with the context. (It is possible, however, that μετίζων is a socratic form of the accusative [see Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 49]; the meaning would be the same as that given by μετίζω.)

Although the combination of Ψ B it in support of ἄπαντα σημεῖα is impressive, the plural seemed to the Committee to have arisen from scribal assimilation to σημεῖον and ἔνωσις.

While it is possible that ἀνεκβάφρυμα (a word frequently used by Matthew but which occurs nowhere else in John) may have been substituted by copyists for ἐφημερεύει (because flight would seem to be unbecoming for Jesus), a majority of the Committee was impressed by the ancient and widespread testimony supporting ἀνεκβάφρυμα. It regarded ἐφημερεύει as a typical Western reading introduced in several witnesses to enliven the narrative. (Syr confutes both readings, “he left them and fled again …”)

In order to clarify the evangelist’s statement about the boat, copyists added, in one form or another, the explanation that it was the one “into which his [Jesus’] disciples had entered.” The variety of wording of the addition condemns it as secondary, just as the age and variety of witnesses which support the shorter reading confirm that as original.
and πλοίαρχα, in order to represent the balance of evidence and transcriptional probabilities it was decided to print πλοίαρχα.

6.23 εὐχαριστήσαντος τοῦ κυρίου [B]

On the one hand, the rarity of κύριος in referring to Jesus in Johannine narrative and the absence of the clause from certain Western witnesses (D 091 it\textsuperscript{a} ἀκέραστον ἀρμονικόν Diatessaron\textsuperscript{1}) may suggest that the words are a gloss that crept into the other texts. On the other hand, however, in view of the widespread currency of the words in most text-types, a majority of the Committee was reluctant to omit them.

6.27 ἀλώνι ὀδόιει Α

Several witnesses (R D it\textsuperscript{a}, c, 62, v syr-pal Chrysostom) read the present tense, which appears to be the result of assimilation to ὀδόν ἀλώνι in ver. 32. The reading ἀλώνι ὀδόιει, which is strongly supported by Ῥ\textsuperscript{75} A B W Θ f\textsuperscript{1} 28 33 565 700 al, is clearly to be preferred.

6.36 [με] C

A few witnesses (R A it\textsuperscript{a} h, c q syr\textsuperscript{a}) lack με. It is possible that this is the original reading and that με has crept into the other witnesses from the context. In this case Jesus’ statement, “I said to you that you saw and yet do not believe,” clearly refers to the signs that the people had witnessed (ver. 29). On the other hand, a majority of the Committee, impressed by the age and diversity of the external attestation supporting με, preferred to retain the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

6.47 πιστεύων A

The addition of εἰς με as the object of the verb “believe” was both natural and inevitable; the surprising thing is that relatively many copyists resisted the temptation. If the words had been present in the original text, no good reason can be suggested to account for their omission. The reading of the Old Syriac has been assimilated to the text at 14.1.

6.52 [άντων] C

Since external evidence for and against the presence of άντων is so evenly balanced, and since considerations of internal probabilities are not decisive, the Committee decided to retain the word enclosed within square brackets.

6.56 αὐτῷ

After αὐτῷ codex Bezae adds what appears to be a homiletic expansion, καθὼς εἰ ἐμοί ὁ πατήρ κἀγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρί, ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω ἡμῖν, τάν μὴ λάβητε τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ὦλος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡμῶν ἡμῖν ἡμῖν, εἰς ἑκτένειαν ἡμῖν εἰς αὐτῷ (“As the Father is in me, I also am in the Father. Truly, truly, I say to you, if you do not receive the body of the Son of Man as the bread of life, you have no life in him”; the sentence “if you … in him” is also read by it\textsuperscript{60}). For the thought, compare 10.38 and 8.53.

6.58 οἱ πετρεῖς [A]

Since the evidence for οἱ πετρεῖς is predominantly Egyptian, one might argue that the absence of ἡμῖν is the result of Alexandrian pruning. On the whole, however, it is more probable that, owing to the statement οἱ πετρεῖς ἡμῖν ἔφαγον in τῷ ἑρμήν τῷ μάννα καὶ ἀπέθαναν in ver. 48, a variety of copyists introduced ἡμῖν (or, by itacism, ἡμών) into the present passage. In any case, the reading τὸ μάννα in later witnesses is clearly secondary.

6.64 τίνες εἰδοὺς οἱ μὴ πιστεύοντες καὶ B

The omission of these words from several witnesses (Ῥ\textsuperscript{66*} 1344\textsuperscript{*} it\textsuperscript{a} it\textsuperscript{c}) is no doubt the result of oversight in transcription, occasioned perhaps by homoeoarcton (τίνες … τίς). The omission of μὴ by Ῥ X\textsuperscript{omm al} is less easy to account for, but it may be the result of a desire to indicate that Jesus knew his own, rather than those who were not his own. The parallelism, however, with the first part of the verse seems to require the presence of the negative.

6.69 οἱ ἄγους τοῦ θεοῦ [A]

The reading adopted for the text, decisively supported by Ῥ\textsuperscript{75} B C\textsuperscript{*} D L W al, was expanded in various ways by copyists, perhaps in imitation of expressions in 1.49; 11.27; and Mt 16.16.

6.71 Ἰσκαρίωτος

Several witnesses (Ῥ Θ f\textsuperscript{13} syr-bagv σ) interpret “Iscariot” as ἴπτο Ἰσκαρίωτος, that is, Ἰσκάριον (ἰς ὁ Ἰσκαρίωτος) “man of Kerioth” [a town in southern Judea]. On the basis of preponderant external evidence (Ῥ\textsuperscript{66*} 75 B C L W Ψ 33 565 al) the genitive case Ἰσκαρίωτος, agreeing with Σιμώνος, is to be preferred to the accusative case Ἰσκαρίωτης, agreeing with Σιμώνου. (The omission of “Simon” from syr and one ms. of the Vulgate is undoubtedly accidental.) For the spelling Ἱσκαρίωτ (D it\textsuperscript{a} h, d it\textsuperscript{122}, r\textsuperscript{1}) and its variants, see the comment on Mt 10.4.

7.1 ἔθηκεν A
Although it can be argued that, in view of John’s usage elsewhere of εἰρηναίον, meaning “to be able” (10.18; twice; compare 19.10), the reading of W μυ, b, l, τ, α', συφ Chrysostom (εἰρηναίον) should be regarded as original, particularly because it also appears to be the more difficult reading. Since, however, the idiom is not peculiar to John but occurs elsewhere as well, the Committee judged that the overwhelming weight of external evidence supporting εἰκεν εὐρουσίαν more than counterbalances any considerations bearing on the more difficult versus the less difficult reading.

7.18 αὐξ (C)

The reading αὐξων was introduced at an early date (it is attested by P66, 75) in order to alleviate the inconsistency between ver. 8 and ver. 10.

7.20 αὐτός (B)

The reading αὐτός, supported by P56, R D* W f 1 565 al, is to be preferred as congruent with Johannine style. Copyists, however, apparently regarded it as superfluous and altered it to αὐξησια (P33 B D Θ α), or replaced it with ὁ ἰησοῦς as being more specific (αὐξ), or omitted it altogether (1365 f13 if σὺρ' ἀλ ζ). 7.36 At the close of ver. 36 manuscript 225 (copied A.D. 1192) inserts the pericope of the adulteress, usually found at Jn 7.53–8.11.

7.46 ἔκλησεν αὐξων ἀνθρώπος (B)

A majority of the Committee judged that the absence of πρὸς με from several witnesses (P56, N* D it b c e) was probably due to scribal oversight.
The crisp brevity of the reading supported by \( \text{P}^66c,75 \) B L T W cop\(^{76,77} \) \( \text{al} \) was expanded for the sake of greater explicitness in various ways, none of which, if original, would account for the rise of the others.

**7.52** δὲ τῆς Γαλιλαίας προφήτης \( \{\text{B}\} \)

The external evidence for the two readings is rather evenly divided. On the whole, however, the Committee was inclined to prefer the reading supported by \( \text{P}^756c,75 \) B, thinking that a desire on the part of copyists to avoid hiatus may have given rise to the other reading.

**7.53–8.11** Pericope of the Adulteress

The evidence for the non-Johannine origin of the pericope of the adulteress is overwhelming. It is absent from such early and diverse manuscripts as \( \text{P}^66c,75 \) \( \text{B} \) L N T W X Y Ω \( \text{P} \) 0141 0211 22 33 124 157 209 788 828 1230 1241 1242 1253 2193 \( \text{al} \).

Codices A and C are defective in this part of John, but it is highly probable that neither contained the pericope, for careful measurement discloses that there would not have been space enough on the missing leaves to include the section along with the rest of the text. In the East the passage is absent from the oldest form of the Syriac version (sy\(^7\) and the best manuscripts of syr\(^8\)), as well as from the Sahidic and the sub-Achmimic versions and the older Bohairic manuscripts. Some Armenian manuscripts\(^5\) and the Old Georgian version\(^6\) omit it. In the West the passage is absent from the Gothic version and from several Old Latin manuscripts (gt\(^7\)–\(^8\)).

No Greek Church Father prior to Euthymius Zygabenus (twelfth century) comments on the passage, and Euthymius declares that the accurate copies of the Gospel do not contain it.

When one adds to this impressive and diversified list of external evidence the consideration that the style and vocabulary of the pericope differ noticeably from the rest of the Fourth Gospel (see any critical commentary), and that it interrupts the sequence of \( 7.52 \) and \( 8.12 \) ff., the case against its being of Johannine authorship appears to be conclusive.\(^{32} \)

At the same time the account has all the earmarks of historical veracity. It is obviously a piece of oral tradition which circulated in certain parts of the Western church and which was subsequently incorporated into various manuscripts at various places. Most copyists apparently thought that it would interrupt John’s narrative least if it were inserted after \( 7.52 \) (D E (F) G H K M U \( \text{Γ} \) II 28 700 892 \( \text{al} \)). Others placed it after \( 7.36 \) (ms. 225) or after \( 7.44 \) (several Georgian mss.)\(^{32} \) or after \( 8.25 \) (I 565 1076 1570 1582 arm\(^{33} \)) or after \( \text{Lk} \) 21.38

\( ^{32} \) Sometimes it is stated that the pericope was deliberately expunged from the Fourth Gospel because Jesus’ words at the close were liable to be understood in a sense too indulgent to adultery. But, apart from the absence of any instance elsewhere of scribal excision of an extensive passage because of moral prudence, this theory fails “to explain why the three preliminary verses (\( \text{vii} \) 53–\( \text{viii} \) 1-2), so important as apparently descriptive of the time and place at which all the discourses of c. \( \text{viii} \) were spoken, should have been omitted with the rest” (Hort, “Notes on Select Readings,” pp. 86 f.).

Although the Committee was unanimous that the pericope was originally no part of the Fourth Gospel, in deference to the evident antiquity of the passage a majority decided to print it, enclosed within double square brackets, at its traditional place following \( 7.52 \).

Inasmuch as the passage is absent from the earlier and better manuscripts that normally serve to identify types of text, it is not always easy to make a decision among alternative readings. In any case it will be understood that the level of certainty \( \{\text{A}\} \) is within the framework of the initial decision relating to the passage as a whole.

**8.6** τοῦτο δὲ ἀφότι \( \{\text{A}\} \)

A few manuscripts omit the first nine words of this verse, preferring to introduce the statement either after ver. \( 4 \) (D 1071) or after ver. \( 11 \) (M).

**8.7** ἀφότιν ... ἀφότις \( \{\text{A}\} \)

A few witnesses omit τοῦτον as superfluous, while others replace ἀφότιν with the prepositional phrase πρὸς ἀφότις. Neither reading commended itself to the Committee.

**8.8** γῆν

In order to satisfy pious curiosity concerning what it was that Jesus wrote upon the ground, after γῆν several witnesses (U II 73 331 364 700 782 1592 arm\(^{33} \)) add the words ἐν τοίς ἐκάτον ἀφότιν τῆς ἀμαρτίας ("the sins of every one of them")

**8.9** οἱ ἐκ ἀνίκοσωστῶν ἐξήγησαν τις ἄλλος \( \{\text{A}\} \)

The basic text of the pericope continued to be amplified by the addition of explanatory glosses. The Textus Receptus adds the statement that the woman’s accusers were themselves “reproved by their conscience” (ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι).
The reading πρεσβυτέρων was enhanced by adding a clause (in one form or another) indicating that all of the woman’s accusers went away.

The text was elaborated by adding (in one form or another) a clause referring to Jesus’ looking at the woman.

Although a minority of the Committee argued that πατήρ, which is absent from K* D it* syr*, has crept into all other witnesses by assimilation to ver. 18, the majority of the Committee was impressed by the age, range, and diversity of evidence that attests the word, and judged that its omission from four or five manuscripts was due to transcriptional oversight.

Since the older Greek manuscripts lack punctuation and are written without division between words, it is possible to interpret Τὴν ἄρχην … ἦμιν in several ways:

1. As a question, with ὅτι = why? (“Why do I speak to you at all?”).
2. As an exclamation, with ὅτι in the sense of the Hebrew יהוּדָא (“That I speak to you at all!”).
3. As an affirmation, with ὅτι and supplying ἐγὼ ἦμι (“I am from the beginning what I am telling you” or “Primarily I am what I am telling you” or “I am what I have told you from the beginning”).

Several Latin witnesses (and the Gothic), misunderstanding the Greek, translate Principium, qui et loquor vobis (“I am the Beginning, even I who speak to you”). The Ethiopic omits ὅτι (“I am the Beginning, and I told you so”). The Bodmer Papyrus II (𝔓66) reads, according to a marginal correction that may be by the original scribe, ἐγὼ ἦμιν τῷ ἰησοῦ, ἐγὼ ἦμιν τῷ ἰησοῦ ὅτι καὶ λαλῶ ἦμιν (“Jesus said to them, I told you at the beginning what I am also telling you [now]”).

A majority of the Committee explained the absence of τῆς ἀμαρτίας from several witnesses of the Western text (D it* syr* cop* bo* Clement al) as a stylistic improvement introduced by copyists either (a) because τὴν ἀμαρτίαν occurs just a few words earlier or (b) in order to make a closer connection with the following general expression ὅ ἐστιν δολὸς.

The addition of μου after περί and/or the addition of τάσσει as correlative to it appear to be natural explications that copyists would have been inclined to make in the interest of greater clarity; whereas, if either or both had been present originally, it is difficult to explain their omission in the oldest witnesses. (See also the comment on the following variant reading.)

Although ἦμιοντε is early and widespread (𝔓66 K* D Δ Π the Old Latin vg syr* p. b. cop* bo* αθ. 1321), a majority of the Committee judged that it was introduced by copyists in order to balance τὸν πατέρα in the preceding clause; on the other hand, if ἦμιοντε were original, there is no reason why scribes should have substituted ἦμιοντε. A majority of the Committee regarded ἦμιον after τοῦ πατέρα (or τῷ πατρὶ, the dative having been introduced for the sake of uniformity with the preceding clause) and τάσσει as scribal refinements, the former having been inserted in an attempt to clarify what was taken to be a contrast between God and the devil. (This contrast, however, seems to be introduced at ver. 18.) Without the possessive pronouns, both instances of the word “father” in ver. 18 seem to refer to God, and πατέρα is probably imperative mood.

It appears that the original text of this verse involved a mixed conditional sentence, with εἰ … εἰστε in the protasis, and ἦμιοντε in the apodosis (“If you are really Abraham’s children, you would be doing the works of Abraham”). The variant readings arose in an effort to make a more grammatically “correct” condition; thus, instead of ἦμιοντε (𝔓66 73 K* B D L T Ψ 070 1321 60 78, vg syr*), the later text reads ὅτε (C N W X Γ Θ Δ Π f 1 f 13 it* h b c c 1 4 2 cop* bo* al), which, with
makes a condition contrary to fact. Other witnesses add ἀν, even though in koine Greek “the addition of ἀν to the apodosis is no longer obligatory” (Blass-Debrunner-Funk, Grammar. § 360, 1).

8.44 οἷς ἐστινεν {C}

The form ἐστινέν (imperfect of ἀπόστικα), supported by ὑπόνοιαν Κ B* C D L W X Δ Θ Ψ f 133 3892 al follows more naturally after ἵνα than does the perfect tense ἐστινγεν (ὑπόνοιας Κ B* K Π f 133 389 650 700 al).

8.54 θέδα ἡμῶν {B}

The reading ἡμῶν (K B* D X Ψ 700 al) makes the words following ἀντί διέσχισθη, whereas ἡμῶν (ὑπόνοιας, B* C K L W Δ Θ Π f 133 389 650 700 al) involves direct discourse. The Committee, noting that both readings have good manuscript support, judged that the change was more likely to go from direct to indirect discourse than vice versa.

8.57 νοεῖται ἡ 

In an attempt to harmonize the statement more closely with 1K 3.23, a few witnesses (A 239 262 1355 1555 Chrysostom Ps-Athanasius) read τεσσαράκοντα ("You are not yet forty years old").

8.57 τεσσάρακον {B}

A few witnesses (ὑπόνοιας 0124 syr* cop*a,hom, ascp) read τεσσάρακον σε ("... has Abraham seen you?"). This is doubtless a scribal assimilation of the Jews’ question to Jesus’ previous statement ("Abraham … [saw] my day," ver. 56). The reading chosen for the text, besides having much stronger manuscript attestation (ὑπόνοιας Κ A B* B* W Θ 28 τεσσάρακον C D K L X Δ Θ Ψ f 133 389 650 700 892 many others), is more fitting on the part of the Jews, who, assuming the superiority of Abraham (ver. 56), would naturally represent Jesus as seeing Abraham rather than Abraham as seeing Jesus.

8.59 εἰροῦ {A}

The true text almost certainly closes with εἰροῦ, which is attested by ὑπόνοιας, Κ B D W Θ* μεν, ν, Θ, Δ, ο, 2, 1, 1 sg syr* cop*a,hom, ascp arm geo* al. In order to give the impression that Jesus escaped by miraculous power, copyists expanded the text by borrowing διάμεσον αὐτῶν from Ἰδ. 4.30, and then continuing with καὶ παρθηκών αὐτῶς in preparation for the statement in 9.1. If any of these longer texts were original, there is no reason why the best representatives of the earliest text-types should have omitted it.

9.4 ἡμᾶς δεῖ … τόμφατος με {C}

Although it is difficult to choose among the readings, a majority of the Committee preferred ἡμᾶς δεῖ, (a) because of its somewhat superior external support, and (b) because it is slightly more probable that copyists would have altered ἡμᾶς to με than vice versa. The reading περιμένειτο ἡμᾶς, which is a non-Johannine expression, appears to have been introduced into several witnesses (ὑπόνοιας, Κ B* L W cop*a,hom, ascp) as correlative with ἡμᾶς δεῖ at the beginning of the sentence.

9.21 εἰρμόντας εἰρμόντος 

In the interest of making a smoother sequence of clauses (cf. the sequence in ver. 21), the Textus Receptus, following A Γ Δ Λ most minuscules it* 9 goth syr* al, transposes the words εἰρμόντας εἰρμόντος to follow ἡμᾶς δεῖ, εἰρμόντας. The omission of the clause in a few witnesses (ὑπόνοιας it* cop*a,hom, ascp Chrysostom) is probably accidental (ὑπόνοιας) replaces the clause with ἡμᾶς δεῖ.

9.35 ἄνθρωπον {A}

The external support for ἄνθρωπον (ὑπόνοιας, Κ B D W syr* cop*a,hom, ascp, ascp) is so weighty, and the improbability of ἄνθρωπον being altered to ἄνθρωπον is so great, that the Committee regarded the reading adopted for the text as virtually certain.
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9.38-39 ὁ δὲ ἔρχεται καὶ ἐτίπνεεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς {B}

Several witnesses lack the words ὁ δὲ ἔρχεται καὶ ἐτίπνεεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς (ὑπόνοιας, W 28 syr* cop*a,hom, ascp) Diatessaron* lacks verses 38 and 39 entirely. Since ἔρχεται is rare in John (only at 1.23 and in some witnesses at 9.38) and since περισσεύσεως occurs nowhere else in John concerning Jesus, Brown suggests that the words may be “an addition stemming from the association of John ix with the baptismal liturgy and catechesis.” Apart from the question whether such liturgical influence would have been likely as early as ὑπόνοιας, in view of the overwhelming preponderance of external attestation in favor of the longer text it appears that the omission, if not accidental, is to be regarded as editorial, made in the interest of unifying Jesus’ teaching in verses 37 and 39.

10.7 ἦθελε 

The reading ὃ τουρμήν (ὑπόνοιας cop*a,hom, ascp) is an early alleviation of the text, introduced by copyists who found the expression “the door of the sheep” too difficult.

10.8 ἠλάθων {πρὸς εἰμιοῦ} {C}
It is difficult to decide whether copyists added ἵλων, before or after ἡλίκην, in order to make more sense from a highly compressed statement, or whether they omitted the words in order to lessen the possibility of taking the passage as a blanket condemnation of all Old Testament worthies. Although the external evidence for the shorter text is impressive (𝔓46¹ (* B) E F G M S U ᾿Δ 28 892 and most minuscules, ἰτικός ὶ τικός ὶ τικός αὐτός) and although it may seem to be preferred as the more difficult reading, a majority of the Committee considered it "too appropriate not to have been included originally." 

Although both readings are well attested, the Committee judged that the plural γενήσονται has slightly stronger support (𝔓46¹ (* B) D L W Ψ ᾿Δ 33 565 ἰτικός ἰτικός ἰτικός αὐτός) than the singular γενήσονται (𝔓46¹ (* A K Δ Π ᾿Δ 28 700 ἰτικός ἰτικός ἰτικός αὐτός). Furthermore, the singular number appears to be a stylistic correction.

All known witnesses except the Latin Vulgate read “one flock.” Jerome’s erroneous rendering unam ovile ("one fold") was followed by Wycliff and the translators of Cromwell’s Great Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Bishops’ Bible, the Rheims-Douay Bible, and the Authorized or King James Bible.

Although the aorist ἱπνοῦν ("No one has taken [my life] from me") has early and good support (𝔓46¹ (* B)), and although it may seem to be preferred as the more difficult reading, a majority of the Committee judged that its external attestation was too limited in extent, representing, as it does, only a single textual type (the Egyptian).

Instead of the expression “to lay down one’s life,” which is characteristically Johannine (10.15–17; 13.37; 15.13; 1 Jn 3.16 bis), several witnesses (𝔓46¹ (* a)) substitute the expression “to give one’s life,” which occurs in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 20.28; Mt 10.45).
impossible Greek, and cannot be construed. This leaves the reading of B*, which is supported by the Old Latin, Vulgate, Bohairic, Gothic, Ambrose, and Augustine (the difference of sequence of μείζων πάντων in the versions may be accounted for as translational variation). It thus appears that the reading ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ δώδεκαν μοι πάντων μείζων δέχεται, because of the unexpected sequence of neuter relative pronoun after ὁ πατήρ μου (“my Father,” by hyperbaton, functions as subject of δέχεται within the relative clause), best explains the origin of the other readings.

10.38 καὶ γινώσκετε [B]

Copyists seem to have regarded the reading καὶ γινώσκετε, which has early and diversified support (𝔓66 73 B L (W X γινώσκετε) Θ f¹ 33 565 α), to be pleonastic after γίνωσκετε, and therefore either replaced the verb with πιστεύει (as in (N πιστεύεις) Α K Δ Π f¹ 13 28 700 α) or omitted it entirely (as in D ins. b c d e ff2 l).

10.39 ἔζησαν [αὐτοὐ] [C]

The absence of αὐτοῦ, a favorite connective in the Fourth Gospel, may be accounted for through haplography (ἐζήσαν), but its replacement with ἐξ or καὶ in other witnesses was deemed by the Committee as sufficient reason to enclose the word within square brackets.

11.17 τέσσαρας ἥνεκ ἡμῶν

There are four variant readings:

(1) τέσσαρας ἥνεκ ἡμῶν Ψ 73 B C* Θ f¹ 15 α
(2) τέσσαρας ἡμῶν ἥνεκ Ρ A* C L W X Γ Δ Π f¹ 82 ε

(3) ἥνεκ τέσσαρας ἡμῶν Ψ 65 it cop n bo arm eth geo
(4) τέσσαρας ἡμῶν A* D 237 it 501 syr aps arm eth geo

Among the several readings, that chosen for the text is the best supported and also accounts best for the rise of the others. Copyists were either dissatisfied with ἥνεκ separating τέσσαρας ἡμῶν and so moved it before or after the phrase, or, in a few cases, they omitted the word by an accident in transcription, either when “four” was written as a word (ΤΕΤΣΑΡΑΣΧΗΜΙΝΗΡΑΣ) or, more likely, when it was represented as a numeral (ΔΛΙΝΗΡΑΣ).

11.21 κύριε [A]

The absence of κύριε (see ver. 32), though supported by two early witnesses of different text types (B and syr), is probably the result of transcriptional oversight.

11.25 καὶ ἐπήκοα [A]

The omission of καὶ ἐπήκοα from several witnesses (𝔓65 it 501 syr aps palm Diatessaron Cyprian Paulinus-Nola) is puzzling. Was it added in the great mass of witnesses in anticipation of the thought expressed by the following ζήσατε καὶ ὃς ζών, or was it omitted, perhaps by accident in transcription or because ver. 24 makes mention of the resurrection alone? On the basis of considerations of the age, weight, and diversification of witnesses that include the words, a majority of the Committee preferred to retain them in the text.

11.31 δόξαντες [B]

The manuscript support for δόξαντες is early (the nonsensical reading δοξάζοντες of Ψ 73 33 is tantamount to testimony supporting δόξαντες) and widely diversified (N B C* D L W X f¹ 13 700 syr aps arm eth geo). The reading λέγοντες may have arisen when it was asked how the evangelist could have known the thoughts of the Jews (as also in 11.12, where ms. X substitutes ἠλέγαν for ἠλώσαν).
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11.32 τρός

The reading τρός τοῖς πόδας (in the description of Mary’s falling at Jesus’ feet) is supported by early and diverse attestation (𝔓66 Ρ B C* D L W X Ψ f¹ 15 33 α); other witnesses (including Ψ 65 A C G Δ Π f¹ 15 α) read εἰς τοῖς πόδας. Although the latter expression is admittedly strange, and therefore likely to be altered, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the superior external evidence supporting τρός τοῖς πόδας.

11.33 ἐνεργείμαστο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν

Instead of the reading adopted as the text, several witnesses (𝔓65 Ψ 65 it f¹ 22 131 660 1582 2193 n° cop n arm) read ἐπηράθη τῷ πνεύματι ὡς ἐμφραίμωμεν. Since the latter is the easier reading (for it softens the statement by inserting οἷς), a majority of the Committee regarded it as a secondary improvement, introduced from a sense of reverence for the person of Jesus.

11.50 ὥμοι [B]

The second person pronoun, which is strongly supported (𝔓65 66 B D L X α), is in accord with the tone of contempt represented by the closing words of ver. 49. The
omission of the pronoun from N and a few other witnesses may be accidental or under the influence of 18.14.

11.51 τόν ἐναντίον ἕκείνου

Through carelessness the scribes of Ψ66 and D omit ἕκείνου, doubtless because of confusion arising from the ending of the previous word. The whole expression “of that year” is omitted by Ψ75 it syr\r\n, perhaps as redundant after ver. 49.

12.1 Λάζαρος {A}

Although the absence of ὁ τεθηρικός from N B L W X it\r\n is preferable to ὁ τεθηρικός serving as the subject of a verb is such unusual Greek (with τεθηρικός in the predicate position) that serious doubts arise whether the evangelist could have written it thus. A majority of the Committee therefore thought it appropriate to enclose ὁ within square brackets.

12.17 ἤνε {B}

The reading ἤνε is preferable to ὢνε because it is supported by generally superior external testimony, and because ὢνε appears to be an attempt to clarify the account, which otherwise could be taken to refer to two crowds (cf. ver. 16).

12.28 σου τὸ δεόμαι {A}

Instead of the reading “glorify thy name,” found in all the early and in most of the later witnesses, several of the later witnesses (L X f1' 113 1071 1241 al), influenced by the recollection of the opening of Jesus’ high-priestly prayer (17.1), read “glorify thy Son.” In codex Bezae the assimilation takes a different form; while retaining τὸ δεόμαι, the scribe of D continues with words that recall 17.5, which in that manuscript reads … τῇ ἄδειῃ ἢ ἠλευν ἐπάρα ὁ ἄνω κόσμον γενόσανε. (For the reading of D, see the comments on 16.72 and Mt 19.4.)

12.8 include verse {A}

The omission of μεθ’ ἐκείνων ἦν δὲ οὗ πάντων ἔχετε by Ψ75 and Λ\n\r\n is clearly the result of parabolepsis, the eye of the scribe passing from ἔχετε to ἔχετε. The omission of verses 2 and 8 from 0250 seems also to be due to a transcriptional accident, the scribe’s eye passing from ἐπηλυκόμην to εὐφάναι. It is much more difficult to account for the absence of ver. 8 from D it\r\n. On the one hand, it can be argued that the words were added at an early date by a copyist who recalled the similar statement in Mt 26.11 and Mk 14.7. On the other hand, the overwhelming manuscript support for the verse seemed to a majority of the Committee to justify retaining it in the text.

12.9 Ἐγρα ὦν {B} ἥχλος πολὺς ἕκ τῶν Τοῦδελεων {C}

It is natural to regard ἥχλος πολύς (Ψ66\n\r\n A B1 K X Δ Π Ψ f1' 33 822) and ὄ ἥχλος ὄ πολὺς (Ψ66 W 0250 1010) as scribal ameliorations of the difficult reading ἤγρα ὦν ὄ ἥχλος πολύς (N B4 L 28 892 al). But the expression ὄ ἥχλος πολύς serving as the subject of a verb is such unusual Greek (with πολὺς in the predicate position) that serious doubts arise whether the evangelist could have written it thus. A majority of the Committee therefore thought it appropriate to enclose ὄ within square brackets.

12.10 ἐπιφάρονεν {C}

The reading ἐπιφάρονεν (Ψ66\n\r\n K W P al) appeared to a majority of the Committee to have arisen in an attempt to supply a somewhat more suitable verb with τῷ καρδιῶν than ἐπιφάρονεν or πετάρονεν. The form πετάρονεν (B\n\r\n A1 f1' 565 700 822 al) has doubtless been assimilated to the tense of the preceding verb (τετάρανεν).
Receptus (following C Ε Δ Ἰ 28 700 αι) substitutes ἦς which is to be construed as though the evangelist had written something like οὐκ ἄλλου τιμὸς χρείαν ἔχειν. The insertion of μόνον in two of the readings shows the influence of the preceding verse. More difficult to assess is the reading οὐκ ἔχει χρείαν νήσασθαι (N ἤ τον Βερτσίλιον Origen), for whose originality more or less plausible arguments can be advanced. Because, however, the words εἰ μὴ τοῖς πόδας may have been omitted accidentally (or even deliberately because of the difficulty of reconciling them with the following declaration, ἀλλὰ ἐπεξετὰ ἑαυτὸς δίος), a majority of the Committee considered it safer to retain them on the basis of the preponderant weight of external attestation.

Although μετ’ ἐμοὶ (C Ε Δ Ἰ 28 700 αι), which is also the reading of the Septuagint, a majority of the Committee preferred the latter reading because μετ’ ἐμοὶ may be an assimilation to Mk 14.18.

It is more likely that scribal alteration went from the simple (δῶσο) to the compound verb (ἐπιδόσῃον) which John uses nowhere else. Furthermore, the Semitic, paratactic style of two finite verbs connected by καὶ is typically Johannine, whereas the omission of the conjunction and the hypotactic construction involving a participle (βῆκεν) has the appearance of being a stylistic modification introduced by copyists in the interest of elegance. Likewise, the redundant ἀπὸ after δῶσο, so characteristic of a primitive, Semitic style, would almost certainly be deleted by copyists. See also the comment on the following variant reading.

Both the weight of manuscript evidence and transcriptional probability, along with what seems to be Johannine usage elsewhere (6.71; 13.2), appeared to the Committee to favor the genitive Ἰσκαρίωτος. On the reading of codex Bezae, see the comment on 6.71.
The syntactical harshness of the shorter reading ὑπήνων αἰώνες τὴν ὀδόν (𝔓⁶⁶ Ἕ Β C* D L W X Π) seems to invite amelioration. Since Thomas in ver. 5 distinguishes between “where” and “the way,” copyists improved ver. 4 by expanding so as to read ὑπήνων ὑπήνων αἰώνες καὶ τὴν ὀδὸν ἀοίδετε.

The reading adopted by a majority of the Committee here and in the following set of variants involves a promise: “If you have come to know me [as in fact you do], you shall know my Father also.” Despite the harmony between this statement and the rest of ver. 7, another interpretation of Jesus’ words gained wide currency, this one a reproach: “If you had come to know me [which, alas, you do not], you would have knowledge of my Father also.” The latter construction (a condition contrary to fact) seems to have arisen either because copyists recalled Jesus’ reproach against unbelieving Jews in 8.19 or because Philip’s question (ver. 8) and Jesus’ reply (ver. 9) suggested to them that the disciples knew neither Jesus nor the Father.

[The purpose of the Evangelist as well as the laws of textual development have been misunderstood. If a negative and a positive statement about the Apostles stand side by side in the textual tradition, the positive one is usually the later. K.A.]

In view of the parallelism in the successive clauses of verses 31 and 32, a majority of the Committee preferred to adopt the reading of ἐν αἰῶνι (𝔓⁶⁶ Ἕ Β 2148 syr, b, pal, cop, hr, ax, A, sa, bo, ach², sams, bom, ms), and to use the smooth breathing on αἰῶνι. Despite what appears to be Hellenistic usage, a minority of the Committee strongly preferred to use the rough breathing on αἰῶνι.

In this passage, where ὅτι may mean either “that” or “because,” its absence from some witnesses (𝔓⁶⁶ Cival Δ Θ 28 700 byz, lect, followed by the Textus Receptus) is probably to be explained as a simplification introduced by copyists who took it as ὅτι rectitum, which is often omitted as superfluous.

Ver. 14 is omitted by a scattering of witnesses, including several important ancient versions (X f 565 1009 1365 f² 25 f⁴ syr, r, ν, cop, ἐν, bom, ax, arm geo Nonnus). Furthermore, Ἀ* omits ver. 14 and the last seven words of ver. 13, the eye of the scribe having passed from ποίησα to ποίησα. The omission of ver. 14 can be variously explained: (a) it was due to an accident in transcription, the eye of the scribe having passed from ποίησα to ποίησα; (b) similarity in sentiment and even in expression with the first part of ver. 13 prompted parsimonious scribes to delete; (c) it was deliberately omitted in order to avoid contradiction with 16.23.
Either the unusual collocation, "ask me in my name," or a desire to avoid contradiction with 16.23 seems to have prompted (a) the omission of με in a variety of witnesses (A D K L Π Ψ 2254 ai) or (b) its replacement with τὸν πατέρα (249 397). The word με is adequately supported (𝔓⁵⁰⁶ Π B W ΔΘ f¹ 28 33 700 ai) and seems to be appropriate in view of its correlation with ἐγὼ later in the verse.

A majority of the Committee preferred the future tense τιθήσεται, read by B L Ψ 1010 1071 1195* 2148 ai (and perhaps supported indirectly by witnesses that read the aorist subjunctive τιθήσηται, ἔδειχνε Π 060 33 ai), instead of the imperative τιθήσεται, which, though rather well supported (A D K W X Δ Π f¹ 28 565 700 892 ai), accords less well with ἐφανερώθη in the following verse.

A majority of the Committee interpreted the sense of the passage as requiring the future ἐσται, which is adequately supported by ὁδηγήσαι ἕναν τὸν πάτερα (A B D K W X Δ Π f¹ 28 33 700 syr* αi).

The singular and sub-singular readings in several versional witnesses are interesting from the standpoint of later hagiographical tradition. On the reading of codex Bezae, see the comments on 6.71 and Mt 10.4.

The emphatic pronoun ἐγώ, read by B L 060 0141 (33 ἐγώ εἶπον ἡμῖν, cf. ver. 28) 127 1819, is omitted (perhaps as unnecessary) by ὁδηγήσας Π A Ψ f¹ 28 33 700 syr* αi. In the absence of any compelling internal considerations, and in order to reflect the somewhat unusual division of external attestation, the Committee thought it necessary to retain the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

It is possible to punctuate by taking ἐγώ with the following sentence, but this obscures the prominence otherwise given to εἰρήνην.

The plural αἱτεῖται, attested by A B Γ ΔΘ ai, appears to have been altered by copyists to the singular αἰτεῖται (𝔓 23 L X Δ Π 0141 f¹ 15 33 565 1071 ai) in order to agree grammatically with τὸ κλητίμα.
that the phrase was deleted either as being not absolutely necessary for the sense or was added in order to clarify the sense, the Committee decided to retain the words but to enclose them within square brackets.

**16.22 ἔχετε** [B]  

In the opinion of a majority of the Committee the future ἔχετε (𝔓56 ^N^ A D W* Θ Ψ 33 al) appears to have been introduced by copyists to bring the statement in accord with λατρήσαντες in ver. 20. The present ἔχετε is strongly supported by ^R*^ B C K W* Δ Π f¹ f¹¹ 28 565 700 892 al.

**16.22 αἱρεῖ [B]**

Although the future αἱρεῖ is rather well supported (𝔓5 ^B^ D* al), a majority of the Committee was inclined to think that copyists would have been more likely to change the present tense to the future than vice versa. The external attestation for αἱρεῖ is both ancient and widely diversified.

**16.23 ἂν τι** [B]  

The thought of the clause is expressed with virtually identical meaning in four slightly different readings. On the basis of the weight of the combination of Ψ νυ^B^ B C and D* Ψ, the Committee regarded ἂν τι as most nearly representing the original text.

**16.23 ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ μου δώσῃ ἵμαν [C]**

A majority of the Committee preferred the reading that places ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ μου between the verbs αἰρεῖται and δώσῃ, because (a) the external support for this reading is more diversified, whereas the witnesses that support the order δώσῃ ἵμαν ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ μου are chiefly Egyptian, and (b) the context has to do with prayer, which the evangelist elsewhere links with the name of Jesus (14:13, 14; 16:15, 24, 26).

**16.25 ἐρχεῖται**

The abruptness of the shorter reading, supported by early and good witnesses (𝔓56^B^ B C* D* L W X Y 1 13 33 69 213 1582 it* h. d. e v g Syr^m^ cop^m^ bc arm), was alleviated by copyists who inserted ἀλλ' or ἀλλά before ἐρχεῖται.

**16.27 τοῖς θεοῖ [C]**

The reading τοῖς θεοῖ, though strongly supported by B C* D L X al, is probably secondary, having arisen by assimilation to ἐξήλθον παρ' τοῦ πατρὸς of the following verse. The balance of evidence for and against the definite article is so close that a majority of the Committee thought it necessary to enclose the word within square brackets.

**16.28 ἐξήλθον παρ' τοῦ πατρὸς [C]**

Most members of the Committee regarded the omission in D W it* h. d. e v g Syr* cop* m^2 as accidental, and, on the basis of slightly stronger external evidence (𝔓52 ^X^ A C* K Δ Θ Ψ f¹ f¹¹ 28 565 700 892 Bئ). Lect), preferred the reading with πατρὸς. The reading with ἐκ (B C* L X Ψ 33 al) seems to have arisen through assimilation to the compound verbs in the context.

**17.1 β' ὑδάτι [B]**

It is difficult to decide whether ὑδάτι was omitted because copyists thought it superfluous, or whether it was added in order to enhance the solemnity of the style. On the basis of the weight of Ψ νυ^B^ B C* W 0109 it* h. e v g al, the shorter reading was preferred.

**17.7 ἀνέγνωσαν**

Although there is impressive support for the first person singular (ἄνέγνωσαν, Κ it* h. e. v g, = syr*, p. v g p* m* cop*m* bg p*. kopt., late p. g.; ἀνέγνωσαν, W 7)

118 1385 579 1188 2145* t. 22, 36, 44, 60), a majority of the Committee regarded it either as a mistaken correction of a copyist influenced by the first person in ver. 6, or (in the case of ἀνέγνωσαν) as an accidental error in transcription (loss of horizontal line over σ, representing final ι). The reading ἀνέγνωσαν (A B C D L U Θ al) accords with the Johannine use of the perfect tense; the aorist ἀνέγνωσαν (C U X Ψ j¹¹ 33 al) appears to be a scribal assimilation to ver. 6.

**17.8 καλ. ἀνέγνωσαν**

It is curious that several witnesses (N* A D W a few minuscules it* e. g. Σ) lack the words καλ. ἀνέγνωσαν. Lagrange suggests (al loc.) that the phrase may have been deleted because it seemed to contradict 6:69.

**17.11 ψ' δέδωκας μοι [B]**

The reading that best accounts for the origin of the others has also the strongest attestation: the difficulty of ψ' (which is read by Ψ νυ^B^ b. d. e v g Syr^m^ cop^m^ bc arm), prompted some copyists to replace the dative (which is attracted to the case of the antecedent) with the accusative δ' (D* X 2148 al) or with the
plural αὐξ (D* 892“ad 1009 vg goth geo² α). The latter correction could also have been prompted by the recollection of ver. 6 or the statement in 18.8. The omission of one or more clauses from several ancient witnesses (LXX16 itb. e. c. b211 syr copa(κ) may be due to the difficulty of the original reading, or it may be accidental.

17.12 ὑ ἄδοκάς μοι, καὶ [B]

See the comment on ver. 11.

17.14 καθὼς ἐγὼ … κύσμοι {A}

Homeoteleuton accounts for the accidental omission of the clause in several textual traditions.

17.21 ὄνων (2) {B}

The better attested reading is ὄνων ( Engineers B C* D W it6 b. c. d. e syr copa, boms, ach2 arm geo α). The pedantic addition of ἐν before ὄνων (N A C* K L X Δ Θ Π Ψ f1 f13 28 33 565 700 892 BY Lec), which comes from ἐν ὄνων earlier in the verse, clouds the thought more than illumines it.

17.23 ἡγεῖταις (1) {A}

The Western reading, ἡγεῖταις (D 0141 it syr), arose either through scribal inattentiveness or as a deliberate accommodation to 15.8.

17.24 δ ἄδοκάς μοι. {B}

The difficult δ, read by good representatives of several text-types ( Engineers N B D W it6 syr p95 goth goch1), was replaced in most witnesses by the easier δικαίω, which prepares for the following κακίσιοι.

18.1 τοῦ Κέδραν

There are three principal readings:

(a) τῶν κέδρων (“of the cedars”) N* B C L N X Y Γ Δ Θ Ψ f1 f13 αl
(b) τοῦ κέδρος (“of the cedar”) N* D W it6 b. r1 cop sa boms, ach
(c) τοῦ Κέδραμ (“of Kidron”) A S Δ 123 it6 c. q vg syr p roc goth.

Despite weakness of external evidence a majority of the Committee considered that reading (c) accounts best for the origin of the other two readings (that is, what appears to be a lack of concord between article and noun was “corrected” by copyists who took the indeclinable proper noun Κέδρας (= ἱνάμα) to be the common word κέδρος). Indeed, the converse change, from (a) or (b) to (c), is scarcely conceivable, the tendency being to assimilate terminations.

18.5 ἔγρα ἐμι. {C}

In considering the variant readings of this verse it must be recalled that normally scribes contracted the name Ἰησοῦς τοῦ, etc. On the one hand, it is possible that, if Ἰησοῦς stood originally after κύσμοι, the words may have been accidentally omitted through an oversight in transcription (homoeoteleuton), or, if Ἰησοῦς stood originally before εἰσῆλθεν (which in many manuscripts is written ἵστηκεν), it may also have been accidentally omitted in transcription (ECTHEIS). On the other hand, if ἔγρα ἐμι were the original reading, it is probable that copyists would have identified the speaker by inserting the proper name. The variation of position of (ο) Ἰησοῦς before or after ἔγρα ἐμι is further indication of the secondary character of the longer readings.

18.13-27 order of verses {A}

Because the usual sequence of these verses involves difficulties (in ver. 13 Jesus is brought before Annas first and what follows is apparently before him, whereas the Synoptists say nothing of the part played by Annas; ver. 24, in its present position, leaves the reader wondering what happened at the trial before Caiaphas), several witnesses seek to ease the sense by rearranging the order. Thus 225 (copied A D 1192) interpolates ver. 24 into the middle of ver. 13 (after πρῶτον), and 1195 (copied A D 1123) – joined by the marginal reading of the Hurcan Syriac, by codex a of the Palestinian Syriac Lectionary, and by Cyril of Alexandria – interpolates ver. 24 after ver. 13. In spite of the interpolation, however, these witnesses have ver. 24 also in its proper position. A more elaborate rearrangement of the text is given by the Sinaic Syriac (probably following Tatian’s Diatessaron), namely verses 13, 24, 14-15, 19-23, 16-18, 25-27. (Luther, quite independently, proposed a similar order.)

18.27

See the comment on ver. 13.

18.30 κακῶν ποιῶν {B}

In the opinion of a majority of the Committee, the periphrastic construction ἔν … κακῶν ποιῶν (N* B L W it6 syr b. p95 αl; κακῶτατας C* Ψ 33 αl) was modified by copyists
who introduced, perhaps from 1 Pe 2.12:4.15, the substantive κακοποϊός (A C Dкрип K X Δ Θ Π 054 f 1 f 13 28 565 700 892 Byz Lect).

19.14 ἔκτη

Instead of "about the sixth hour" several witnesses (N* Dкрип L Χ 0 053 72 88 123 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (όπως εἰς τὴν ἑκτάραν), or an obvious attempt to harmonize the chronology with that of Mk 15.25 (see the comment there on the converse corruption). Although one may conjecture that the disagreement originally arose (as Ammonius, followed by Eusebius and Jerome, suggested) when copyists confused the Greek numerals γ (= 3) and ι (= 6), the manuscript evidence is overwhelmingly in support of ἔκτη (B D Ε H I K MS U W Y Θ Λ Π f 1 f 13 all minuscules (except those cited above) Old Latin vg syr armt h geop ers al).

19.16 Παρέκλησις ἵνα ἤρθην [B]

Both the ambiguity of "they" (those previously mentioned are the chief priests, whereas in ver. 18 "they" must refer to Roman soldiers) and the brevity of expression called for supplementation. Some scribes added καὶ ἤρθην after ἤρθην (Dκριπ Δ Θ al), others added αὐτῶν (A N W f 1 al), which is the reading at Mt 27.31 and Lk 23.36, while others enlarged the account still further, continuing with καὶ τῷ πραυτήριῳ (700 al), or with καὶ ἐπήθησαν αὐτῷ τὸ σταυρόν (f 13). The reading that apparently gave rise to the other readings is supported by B L Π 0141 33 it cop bo.

19.20 Ἐφραίσις, Ἰραμίσι, Ἐλληρισί

The sequence "Hebrew, Latin, Greek" (i.e. the national language, the official language, the common language) is strongly supported by N* B L Ν X 33 74 89 90 234 248 317 483 484 713 945 1321 1346 it, syr cop bo arm eth. The sequence "Hebrew, Greek, Latin," which is read by A Dκριπ Δι Θ Π most minuscules most of the Old Latin vg syr h, appears to be a secondary development, with the languages arranged in accord with a geographical order going from East to West. The scribes of W and 1194 became confused and produced Ἐφραίσις, Ἰραμίσι, Ἐλληρισί. See also the comment on Lk 23.36, where the several forms of the Johannine reading have intruded into the Lukan text.

19.24 [ἵνα] λέγοντος [C]

It is difficult to decide whether ἵνα λέγοντος is an explanatory clause added to the text in most witnesses in order to let the reader know that what follows is a citation from Scripture (no similar addition, however, is found in similar cases at 13.18 and 19.36), or whether the clause was inadvertently omitted by two early Greek witnesses (N B) and a variety of versions. Taking into account both of these possibilities, the Committee decided to include the clause but to enclose it within square brackets.

19.29 οὐσώμαι [A]

One eleventh-century manuscript (476*) reads ὠσώμαι ("a javelin"; compare perticae (it h 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius Nonnus) read "about the third hour" (w[ra u`sswpwperi;entec mg 151 Eusebius N
of what was taken as the preponderant weight of the external evidence, a majority of the Committee considered the longer reading to be original.

20.23 ἀφέσωσεν [Β]

Although the perfect tense ἀφέσωσεν could be regarded as a secondary assimilation to κοιμήσωσεν at the end of the sentence, a majority of the Committee interpreted the present tense ἀφέσωσεν and the future ἀφεθήσεται as scribal simplifications which weaken the sense. To the external evidence supporting ἀφέσωσεν (N* A D L X 050 f 13 33 Vulg 565 a al) should perhaps be added B*, which reads ἀφεσεν (to being written for ὁ). 20.30 μαθητῶν [εἰς τούτο] [C]

In order to represent the close balance of external attestation for (Τ36 N C D L W X Θ Ψ f 1 f 13 33 565 700 892 a al) and against (A B K Δ Π 0250 a al) the inclusion of εἰς τούτο, the Committee retained the word enclosed within square brackets.

20.31 πασί [C]

Both πασί and πασίν have notable early support. The aorist tense, strictly interpreted, suggests that the Fourth Gospel was addressed to non-Christians so that they might come to believe that Jesus is the Messiah; the present tense suggests that the aim of the writer was to strengthen the faith of those who already believe ("that you may continue to believe"). 21.25 βιβλία.

Many later manuscripts, followed by the Textus Receptus, conclude the Gospel with ἀμήν. See also the comment on Mt 28.20.

After ver. 25 several Greek minuscules (1 565 1076 1570 1582) and many Armenian manuscripts26 add the pericope of the adulteress (7.53–8.11).

Footnotes


2 Despite valiant attempts of commentators to bring sense out of taking o] ge,gonen with what follows, the passage remains intolerably clumsy and opaque. One of the difficulties that stands in the way of ranging the clause with evn auvtw|/ zwh. h=n is that the perfect tense of ge,gonen would require evstin instead of τι (see also the comment on Jn 1.42).

The Latin Vulgate manuscripts of these verses present an interesting variant reading that played a considerable part in later mediaeval discussions of the preeminence of the Greek text over the Latin Vulgate when they differ, and in the question of possible dominical sanction of celibacy. The official Clementine edition of the Latin Vulgate reads Sic eum volo manere donec veniam ("I wish him [Peter] to remain thus until I come"). In the fifteenth century Cardinal Bessarion wrote a pamphlet22 pointing out, among other errors in the Vulgate, that by a copyist’s oversight the text reads sic instead of si (et evti). According to modern critical editions of the Vulgate (those of Wordsworth and White21 and of Robert Weber), Jerome’s text originally contained both words, si sic, just as codex Bezae in ver. 22 (not however ver. 23) adds ὥσπερ after μεν ἐν. 21.23 θρομαι, [τι πρὸς οὗ] [C]

Several witnesses, including N* C f 1 565 it* sy* ar, lack the words τι πρὸς οὗ. 21 Although Tischendorf (8th ed.) and von Soden regarded the shorter text as original (the evangelist often varies the wording in a repeated phrase), it is also possible that copyists omitted the clause in order to draw attention to what was taken as the primary element in Jesus’ reply (codex Bezae accomplishes the same effect by omitting τι). In view of the close balance of probabilities, a majority of the Committee preferred to retain the clause, but to enclose it within square brackets to indicate doubt that it belongs in the text.


*Commentary on John*, bk. vi, § 24 (40). In the manuscripts of Origen’s *Commentary* the spelling of Bethabara varies, reading Bẖqērālā, Bqẖqērālā, or Bẖqērālā. The last mentioned form, found also in a’ syr456, is an orthographical variant (by metathesis) of Bẖqērālā.

For a full discussion see Sebastián Bartina, S.J., *“Ignōtmn episēmon gabex,”* *Verbum Domini*, XXXVI (1958), pp. 16–37, who reproduces a portion of Papyrus Berolinensis 8279 of A.D. 42 (edited by Wilhelm Schubart in *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* [Bonn, 1911], p. XV, nr. 16a) showing first century specimens of the Greek numerals for 3 and 6. Gabēx (gabex) is the name given by Ammonius to the sign denoting six (see above, footnote 16[1]).


According to a note in Zohrab’s edition of the Armenian version, “Only five of the thirty manuscripts we used preserve here the addition [i.e. the pericope of the adulteress] found in Latin manuscripts. The remainder usually agree with our exemplar in placing it as a separate section at the end of the Gospel, as we have done. But in six of the older manuscripts the passage is completely omitted in both places” (translated by Erroll F. Rhodes, who comments as follows in a note to the present writer: “When the pericope is found in manuscripts after 752 it is frequently accompanied with an asterisk or other symbol”).

The pericope is lacking in the Adysh ms. (A.D. 897), the Opiza ms. (A.D. 913), and the Thbṯ’ ms. (A.D. 995).


So Eberhard Nestle, who, however, identifies no specific manuscripts (*Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament*, 3te Aufl. [Göttingen, 1909], p. 157). According to information kindly provided by Dr. J. N. Birdsall, the pericope follows 744 in Sinai ms. georg. 16.

In the *editio princeps* of the Georgian Bible (Moscow, 1743), as well as the editions of the New Testament of 1816, 1818, 1878 (Gospells), and 1879, the pericope stands in its traditional place after 752.


The editor, Alberto Vaccari, suggests that the two verses have dropped out accidentally because verses 17 and 19 begin in the same way (*Dixit ei Iesus*).


Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, LXXXV, col. 1512B.

Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, XXII, col. 1009B.

Migne, *Patrologia Latina*, XXVII, col. 1108C.

For a full discussion see Sebastián Bartina, S.J., “‘Ignōtmn episēmon gabex,’ ” *Verbum Domini*, XXXVI (1958), pp. 16–37, who reproduces a portion of Papyrus Berolinensis 8279 of A.D. 42 (edited by Wilhelm Schubart in *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* [Bonn, 1911], p. XV, nr. 16a) showing first century specimens of the Greek numerals for 3 and 6. Gabēx (gabex) is the name given by Ammonius to the sign denoting six (see above, footnote 16[1]).
The Acts Of The Apostles
Introduction

The text of the book of the Acts of the Apostles circulated in the early church in two quite distinct forms, commonly called the Alexandrian and the Western. The former, which has been traditionally regarded as the authentic text of Acts, is represented by 45 74 K A B C D F 33 81 104 326 and 1175. The other form is represented chiefly by D and the fragmentary papyri 299, 389, and 489, by the readings marked with an asterisk or standing in the margin of the Harclean Syriac version (syrh with * syrhm), by the African Old Latin ms. h (a fifth or sixth century fragmentary palmipress that preserves about 203 of the 1007 verses of Acts), and by the citations of Acts made by Cyprian and Augustine. These, which are the primary witnesses to the Western text in Acts, are sometimes joined by others that present mixed texts with a relatively high proportion of Western elements. Among such are the Armenian version of the commentary on Acts by Epheram Syrus, the Old Georgian version of Acts, several mixed Old Latin and Vulgate manuscripts, and a few Greek minuscule manuscripts that were included by von Soden in his i-group. More recent discoveries of witnesses with decided Western affiliations include a Palestinian Syriac fragment (syrmsK) from the Kastellion Monastery at Khirbet Mird, dating from the sixth century, and a Coptic manuscript (copG67) written in the Middle Egyptian dialect and dated by its editor in the late fourth or early fifth century.

The two forms of text differ in character as well as length. The Western text is nearly one-tenth longer than the Alexandrian text, and is generally more picturesque and circumstantial, whereas the shorter text is generally more colorless and in places more obscure (see also pp. 5*-6* above).

The relationship between the two forms of Acts has been the subject of much discussion; the chief theories that have been proposed are the following.

1. Both forms of text proceed from the author, who produced two editions of his work. The first to make this suggestion appears to have been Jean Leclerc, who, however, later rejected his own hypothesis. In more modern times Bishop J. B. Lightfoot took a rather favorable view of this theory, and it was subsequently adopted and developed with much learning by the German professor of classics, Friedrich Blass. According to Blass, Luke, having made a rough draft of his history of the primitive church, perhaps on the back of some previous manuscript, desired to present a handsome copy of his work to his distinguished friend Theophilus. Not being rich enough to employ a professional scribe to make the copy, Luke had to make it himself; naturally, instead of slavishly following his first draft, he exercised the freedom that an author can lawfully take with a work of his own, in altering phraseology and deleting superfluities. From both forms of Acts, according to Blass, copies were made; the text current in most manuscripts represents the polished, second edition prepared for Theophilus, while copies were also made from the original (longer) draft, which Blass supposed was treasured and preserved in the Roman church.

Nothing in this theory is inherently unreasonable, and it attracted the support of a number of other scholars, including Theodor Zahn, Eberhard Nestle, J. M. Wilson, and M.-E. Boismard. Other scholars, however, found it difficult to understand the motives of the author in choosing to omit certain details found in the presumed earlier account; the gain in space is small and the loss in information and descriptiveness is sometimes great. Is it plausible that the author would have omitted a clause from the decrees of the Jerusalem council (15.20, 29), or have altered the language of the letter of Claudius Lysias (23.26-30) or Festus’s speech to Agrippa concerning Paul’s culpability (25.24-25)? Furthermore, sometimes the shorter form contradicts the longer form. For example, having described (in the first person plural) a break in the journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem at the house of Mnason (so the Western text of 21.16), the author would not be likely to alter it so as to suggest that Mnason lived in Jerusalem (as is implied in the shorter text).

It has also been pointed out that in many cases the text that Blass regarded as the earlier, unrevised form of Acts exhibits the clear characteristics of later additions. Thus, for example, in a devastating review of Blass’s edition, another classical scholar, T. E. Page, assembled numerous examples where the Western text heightens or exaggerates the emphasis of the passage, where it introduces religious formulae and substitutes for the simpler and natural names of Jesus fuller and more elaborate theological titles, and where it emphasizes words and actions as inspired by the Spirit.

For these and other reasons many scholars today are reluctant to adopt Blass’s theory of two editions of Acts.

2. Contrary to the theory proposed by Blass, who thought that the shorter form of Acts was produced when Luke pruned the earlier, longer text of his book, other scholars have considered it much more probable that the Western text of Acts was produced by the expansion of an earlier form of the text. Several theories have been proposed that attribute the process of expansion essentially to Luke himself. One of these was put forward by the Irish polymath, George Salmon, who suggested that “Luke may have continued to reside at Rome after the expiration of Paul’s two years [of Roman imprisonment], and may there have given readings of his work; and explanatory statements which he then made were preserved in the West.” Although it is possible to point to examples of authors in antiquity who gave public readings of their literary works, it is difficult to imagine the historical circumstances that would account for the preservation in written form of the oral comments made by Luke.

3. A much more elaborately argued case was made by Edouard Delebecque on the basis of his extensive analyses of stylistic features of the longer text of Acts. Delebecque agrees with Blass that this form of text displays the same characteristics as those found in Luke’s undisputed writings; he differs, however, in holding that the longer text is
Antioch, was incidental to the work of forming a collection of Christian writings for general Church
use which ultimately, somewhat enlarged, became the New Testament; in a word, the ‘Western
text was the text of the

primitive ‘canon’ (if the term may be pardoned in referring to so early a date), and was
expressly created for that purpose.  

(7) The opposite point of view, namely that the Western text of Acts is primary and
the Alexandrian is a deliberate modification of it, was championed by Albert C. Clark,
Corpus Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford. In his earlier publications Clark
explained the shortened form as being the result of a scribe’s accidentally missing here
and there one or more lines of his exemplar. Since, however, accidental omissions
would not account for the regular correspondence of the omissions with breaks in the
sense, nor does the theory explain the numerous differences in wording where no
omission is involved, in a subsequent publication Clark practically abandoned the theory
of a deliberate editorial shortening of the Western text. The Alexandrian abbreviator, he thinks, excised passages throughout the
book for a variety of reasons; in some cases we can deduce that he eliminated what he
considered to be otiose, but in other cases the excisions, Clark admits, show a singular
want of taste.

Still other theories of a linguistic sort have been proposed over the years to account for the
unusual phenomena of codex Bezae.

(8) J. Rendel Harris revived the theory of Mill, Wettstein, Middleton, and other eighteenth
century scholars that the whole of the Greek text of Codex Bezae from the beginning of Matthew
to the end

of Acts is a re-adjustment of an earlier text to the Latin version. The theory finds
little or no support among present-day scholars.

(9) The view that codex Bezae embodies an appreciable amount of Semitic coloring
has been examined and adopted in various forms by several scholars. Frederic Henry
Chase sought to prove that the Bezan text of Acts is the result of assimilation of a Greek
text to a Syriac text that ante-dated the Peshitta version. In the case of the Gospels,
Julius Wellhausen frequently argued for the primitive nature of the readings in codex
D. This point of view was discussed further by A. J. Wensinck in a study entitled, “The
Semitisms of Codex Bezae and their Relation to the Non-Western Text of the Gospel of
Saint Luke,” and particularly by Matthew Black in his volume An Aramaic Approach to
the Gospels and Acts, in which he gathers, classifies, and carefully evaluates a large
amount of relevant material. According to Black, “The Bezan text in all the Synoptic
Gospels, if less so in some respects in Mark, is more frequently stained with Aramaic
constructions and idiom than the B K text.” A somewhat similar conclusion concerning
the Western text of Acts was also reached by Max Wilcks in his monograph (originally a
doctoral dissertation written under the guidance of Black) entitled The Semitisms of
Acts.
Another hypothesis that seeks to account for Semitisms in codex Bezae was proposed by a specialist in the Semitic languages, C. C. Torrey. After having published several monographs on details of Aramaic coloring in the Gospels and the first half of the book of Acts, Torrey advanced the theory that the Gospels and Acts were translated from Greek into an Aramaic "Targum" towards the end of the first century, and that this "Targum," being mistaken for the original Semitic text of these books, was very soon afterwards retranslated into Greek with constant reference to the existing Greek text. This retranslation, Torrey held, was the basis of the Western text in the Gospels and Acts.

Although F. F. Bruce described Torrey’s hypothesis as “very plausible…[for] it seems to satisfy many of the linguistic phenomena better than any other,” most other scholars have rejected it as too complicated to be probable. Moreover, though such an hypothesis may account for certain linguistic phenomena, it offers no help in explaining how the Bezan text of Acts became nearly one-tenth longer than the Alexandrian text.

Dissatisfied with the methodology of those who adduce sporadic examples of Semitisms without controlling their results by a systematic examination of opposing linguistic phenomena, the present writer suggested to a student of his that he make a comprehensive study of all the distinctive features of the Greek of codex Bezae. James D. Yoder, having assembled a Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae, collected and analyzed not only instances of Semitisms in Bezae, but also instances where that manuscript lacks Semitisms that are preserved in other Greek witnesses. Yoder’s conclusions are: “(1) When one takes into account not only the instances of Semitic phenomena in codex Bezae, but also the Bezan variants which abandon Semitisms found in other MSS, the net increase of Semitisms [in Bezae compared with other Greek witnesses] is sometimes inconsequential, while in other respects this MS actually reveals fewer Semitisms than [the number] found in the B K text; and (2) oftentimes the data are concentrated in limited areas of the text, thus detracting from the supposed homogeneity of the Bezan text.”

After surveying the chief theories that have been offered to explain the origin of the Western text, one is impressed by the wide diversity of hypotheses and the lack of any generally accepted explanation. A failing common to many of the theories is the attempt to account for the Western text by concentrating upon only one aspect of the problem. The complex phenomena, however, that characterize the Western text in relation to the Alexandrian text include, as Haenchen points out in a brief but incisive discussion, at least three kinds or levels of variant readings. There are, first, not only for Acts but for the Gospels and the Pauline corpus as well, a great number of minor variants that seek to clarify and explain the text and make it smooth. Occasionally pious phrases are introduced. This form of text, widely current in the early church and used by Marcion, Tatian, Irenaeus, and others, cannot be regarded as a "recension," for it is not and never was a unity.

Secondly, there are variants of another kind, peculiar to the Western text of Acts. These include many additions, long and short, of a substantive nature that reveal the hand of a reviser.

Working upon a copy of the “Western” text in the first sense, the reviser, who was obviously a meticulous and well-informed scholar, eliminated seams and gaps and added historical, biographical, and geographical details. Apparently the reviser did his work at an early date, before the text of Acts had come to be generally regarded as a sacred text that must be preserved inviolate.

Thirdly, there are still other variants which are not to be associated with the Western text as such, nor with its reviser, but which belong to a particular manuscript, namely codex Bezae. This witness, copied, according to Haenchen, about a.d. 500, exhibits a variety of scribal idiosyncrasies, some of which, though suggesting Aramaisms, are nothing more than errors of a scribe, or possibly two successive scribes. It follows, in the words of Haenchen’s conclusion, that “in none of the three cases does the ‘Western’ text of Acts preserve for us the ‘original’ text of that book; this is the lesson that we are gradually beginning to learn.”

In a more recent discussion of the origin of the Western text of Acts, Barbara Aland traces the several stages in the development of this form (or of such forms) of text. In the second century copyists introduced interpolations, omissions, and alterations in the text of Acts that tended in the direction of the Western type of text. In the first half of the third (?) century a redactor revised a manuscript that contained a form of text that belonged to the first stage, and this resulted in a text embodying the well-known “Western” characteristics. At the third stage the redactor’s exemplar was copied by various persons who dealt with the text in a rather free manner.

By way of summing up at least some of the analyses of the Western text, one may conclude that it would be more appropriate to speak of Western acts, rather than of a Western text. At the same time, one can recognize a, so-to-speak, Western tendency that is shared by many such witnesses. In this sense, as Strange declares, “it is legitimate to refer to the Western text, as long as it is understood that what is meant is a broad stream of textual tradition, and a way of handling the text, rather than a coherent recension of the text, created at a specific time.” Understood in this way, Codex Bezae frequently offers the most original form of the Western text. At the same time, of course, D has a manuscript history of its own, and does not invariably preserve the earliest form of the Western text. To ascertain that stage one must also take into account the evidence of other witnesses, both versional and patristic. For such study we now have available the extensive collection of textual information presented in vol. i, Apparat critique, of Boismard and Lamouille’s Le Texte Occidental de Actes des Apôtres.

Inasmuch as no hypothesis thus far proposed to explain the relation of the Western and the Alexandrian texts of Acts has gained anything like general assent, in its work of editing that book the United Bible Societies’ Committee proceeded in an eclectic fashion, judging that neither the Alexandrian nor the Western group of witnesses always preserves the original text, but that in order to attain the earliest text one must compare the two divergent traditions point by point and...
In each case select the reading that commends itself in the light of transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities.

In reviewing the work of the Committee on the book of Acts as a whole, one observes that more often than not the shorter, Alexandrian text was preferred. At the same time the Committee recognized that some of the information incorporated in certain Western expansions may well be factually accurate, though not deriving from the original author of Acts.\footnote{In the following comments the present writer has attempted to set before the reader a more or less full report (with an English translation) of the several additions and other modifications that are attested by Western witnesses, whether Greek, Latin, Syriac, or Coptic. Since many of these have no corresponding apparatus in the text-volume, care was taken to supply an adequate conspectus of the evidence that supports the divergent readings.}

\[1.1\] ὁ Ἱσραῖλ

Against all other witnesses B and D omit ὁ before Ἱσραῖλ, a reading adopted by Tregelles, Westcott-Hort, and A. C. Clark. These scholars were probably impressed by the nature of the external evidence as well as by the circumstance that this is the first instance of Ἱσραῖλ in the book of Acts, and therefore, according to Attic Greek standards, would not call for the use of the article.

On the other hand, Luke may well have wished, by the presence of the article, to bring to the reader’s mind the content of the Gospel narrative in his first volume.\footnote{This form of text differs in two particulars from the text of all other witnesses: (1) no mention of the ascension, and (2) the “day” that is specified is the occasion during Jesus’ public ministry when he chose the apostles. According to the opinion of Ropes and Clark, whose text-critical views usually differ from each other, this form of the Western text must be regarded as original and the Alexandrian as corrupt, while the text preserved in D syr is a conflation of the two.} The absence of the article in two manuscripts may be accounted for by assuming either that by inadvertence in transcription ὁ was, so to speak, swallowed up by the preceding o-sound of Ἰς ῥαι, or that the scribes of B and D, observing that this is the first occurrence of Ἱσραῖλ in Acts, decided to omit ὁ.

\[1.2\] ἡμέρας … ἀνεκλήμφηθη \[A\]

The text of the opening sentence of Acts circulated in several different forms in the early church. The ordinary text, witnessed by all extant ancient Greek manuscripts with the exception of codex Bezae, can be rendered as follows:

In the first book, O Theophilus, I have dealt with all that Jesus began to do and teach, until the day when he was taken up, after he had given commandment through the Holy Spirit to the apostles whom he had chosen (…δύο ἡμέρας ἐνεκλήμφησε τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ τινῶν μαχαίρων αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐξελίχθη ἀνεκλήμφηθη).

The text of codex Bezae, on the other hand, differs in two respects: (1) ἀνεκλήμφηθη is moved forward so that it follows ἡμέρας, and (2) after ἐξελίχθη it adds a further clause so as to read as follows:…δύο ἡμέρας ἐνεκλήμφησεν ἐνεκλήμφησεν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ τινῶν μαχαίρων αὐτοῦ ὡς ἐξελίχθη καὶ ἐκέλευσε σημείωσιν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. A text like that of codex Bezae is attested by Thomas of Harkel for the Greek manuscript that he collated at the Monastery of the Antonians, except that in this manuscript διὰ τινῶν μαχαίρων αὐτοῦ probably followed ἐξελίχθη. The Sahidic version also agrees with D in moving ἀνεκλήμφηθη earlier in the sentence, but after ἡμέρας it seems to have rendered a Greek text that read ἤκρυσεν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὡς ἐξελίχθη.

Before proceeding further an attempt must be made to understand how this form of the Western text should be construed. Is καὶ ἐκέλευσε to be coordinated with ἀνεκλήμφηθη? In this case the sequence is very awkward, particularly in view of the statement that the ascension terminates the Third Gospel. On the other hand, to coordinate the finite verb ἐκέλευσε with the participle ἐνεκλήμφησεν, while satisfactory from the standpoint of sense, is grammatically intolerable. The only remaining possibility is to take the added clause as parallel with ἐξελίχθη and to render “whom he had chosen and commanded to proclaim the gospel.” It must be acknowledged, however, that this destroys the balance of the sentence, which has already expressed the idea of Jesus’ giving commandment to the apostles ἐνεκλήμφησεν.

Another form of the Western text, which does not involve the difficulties exhibited by the Bezan text, is preserved in several Old Latin witnesses, particularly in codex Gigas and in the quotations of Augustine and Vigilius. On the basis of what is assumed to be the common text lying behind these Latin witnesses, which differ slightly from one another, Blass, followed by Clark and, in most respects, by Ropes, reconstructed the following Greek text: ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ ἐκπαίδευσεν ἐξελίλθη διὰ πνεύματος ἀγίου καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

Page 238

...
noticed is that which was reached at the end of the first, so that ἐξήγησις is essential to the sense.⁵⁴

Although Lake regarded the greater part of the Alexandrian text of ver. 2 as original, he agreed with Ropes in rejecting ἀναλήμφη, and accepted Ropes’ view that the omission of ἀναλήμφη in the Old Latin is to be connected with the omission (in N* D Old Latin) of καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οίκον in Lk 24.51.

It can be agreed that the two omissions belong together, and that (as Lake pointed out) “it is surely illogical to do as Westcott and Hort did, namely, select a text of the gospel which does not mention the ascension, and a text of Acts which says that the gospel did mention it.”⁵⁵ Lake’s attempt, however, to reconstruct the Greek text of verses 1-4 without ἀναλήμφη can hardly be pronounced successful. The main verb in the clause that begins with ἐξήγησις must be παρῆχθη of ver. 4, and this, as Lake candidly admits, “makes a very bad sentence.”⁵⁶ There are, as Creed pointed out, at least three objections to Luke’s having written such a prefatory sentence: (1) the exceptionally long parenthesis, extending from αἵς at the beginning of ver. 3 to ὑποτομής αὐτοῦ in ver. 4, though grammatically possible, is stylistically intolerable; (2) ἐνεπλήσσεσαν ... παρῆχθην is badly redundant; (3) whereas on the usual punctuation συναλίζομεν runs happily with παρῆχθην, it makes a weak third to ὑποτομής αὐτοῦ and λέγων τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ.⁵⁷

If it be assumed that the original text was that which is testified by all known Greek manuscripts except D, simple explanations lie near at hand to account for the several forms of the Western text. Codex Bezae moved ἀναλήμφη earlier in the sentence in order to make its construction with ἐξήγησις clearly apparent, and added καὶ ἐκέλευσεν κηρύσσειν τὸ εὐαγγέλιον in order to make explicit what is implied in ἐνεπλήσσεσαν. The Old Latin translator(s), who were often exceedingly free in their rendering, were perfectly capable of modifying the text in order to make the reference on which they were working so as to omit the reference to the ascension.

If, however, for the sake of the argument it be assumed that a Greek text once existed which lacked reference to the ascension, its origin can be explained on the basis of either doctrinal or stylistic reasons. Plooij argued that the alteration in ver. 2 is only part of a deliberate attempt made by the Western reviser (whose work is seen also in 1.9 and 11 as well as in Lk 24.51) to excise as much as possible of what might imply the bodily ascension of Jesus into heaven.⁵⁸ Without referring to doctrinal considerations Creed made a strong case that the real difficulty is stylistic and is inherent in the narrative itself. He writes: “Here as so often in the Lucan writings, a smooth surface covers real incongruity. The author of Acts begins with part of a Preface, composed in the accepted manner, which resumes the contents of the preceding volume. This leads us to expect that he will take up the thread where he has dropped it. But instead of this, what he does is to give us a new version of the last scene between Jesus and the disciples... This overlapping of Gospel and Acts inevitably dislocates a preface which presupposes continuity of narrative. Luke covers up the seam by introducing a relative clause after ἀναλήμφη which enables him to return to the last appearance. Ropes’ defense of the Old Latin text on the grounds that it avoids a premature reference to the ἀνάλημφη before the narrative of the last appearance is based upon a true perception of the difficulty, but he does not recognize that the difficulty is inherent in Gospel and Acts, apart from the particular word ἀναλήμφη... Since the slenderly supported omission of ἀναλήμφη creates a number of other difficulties to which no satisfactory answer is forthcoming, the word should be retained with all the Greek MSS.”⁵⁹

1.4 συναλίζομεν

The textual problems involving συναλίζομεν and its variants are less perplexing than the lexical considerations concerning the meaning of the word. All known uncial manuscripts, with the possible exception of D, and the overwhelming majority of the minuscule manuscripts read συναλίζομεν. The first hand of codex Bezae reads συναλίζομεν μετ’ αὐτῶν, which has been corrected by a subsequent hand to συναλίζομεν μετ’ αὐτῶν. Since, however, the meaning of συναλίζομεν is intolerable in the context (the verb means to be taken captive together), and since συναλίζομεν is not far phonetically from συναλίζεται, Ropes is justified in correcting the spelling to συναλίζομεν in his transcription of the manuscript. About thirty-five minuscule manuscripts, including 614 (which is a relatively important witness to the Western text) and several manuscripts of family 1 (e.g. 1, 69), as well as many patristic witnesses, read συναλίζομεν, a verb that means literally to spend the night with, to stay with.

The Committee agreed that the manuscript evidence requires the adoption of the reading συναλίζομεν. This verb, spelled with a long α, is common in classical and Hellenistic Greek and means collect or assemble. The same verb, spelled with a short α, means eat with (literally, eat salt with another). This meaning is extremely rare in Greek literature; it does not appear before the end of the second century after Christ, and no example has turned up in the papyri.⁶⁰ Many of the early versions took the word in this sense; it is found in the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Coptic (both Sahidic and Bohairic), the Peshitta and the Harleian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic.

Since the use of συναλίζομεν in its regular sense to assemble, gather is awkward when only one person is mentioned, and particularly awkward in its use in ver. 4 where the present tense is joined with the aorist παρῆχθην αὐτῶν, and since, as was mentioned above, συναλίζομεν in the sense to eat with is unknown in the first Christian century, it has been proposed to regard συναλίζομεν as an orthographic variant for συναλίζεται. This theory, which Cadbury supported with many examples of similar exchange of α- and ο- was adopted by the RSV and the NRSV (“while staying with them”).

The conjectural emendation proposed by I. A. Heikels to read συναλίζομεν, suggested previously by T. Henstruther (whom Heikel does not mention), is only superficially attractive, for if Luke had originally written the dative plural he would not have been likely to follow it two words later with αὐτῶν. (The passage in Lk 8.4 that Heikel adduces as a parallel is not pertinent, for it has nothing corresponding to αὐτῶν.)
The phrase ἵπτει διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου of D ἱπ τοι ευθ Hilary Augustine, which replaces the simple μου of all the other witnesses, is, as Ropes points out, probably “an expansion, ameliorating the transition to direct discourse and avoiding the awkward μου.” (For a similar example of the vivid and homely style of the Western paraphrast, see the final comment on Mt 6.8.)

1.8 ἵπ τοι ἐκτιμήσθηκεν ἄγει

The great majority of witnesses read ἵσσης μόνον ἐκπέπτωσεν οὐκετεί, ἐμείς δὲ βαπτισθῆσθαι ἐν πνεύματι ἄγει. Several important witnesses have a different order of words, involving chiasticus: thus N* B B 81 915 Didymus read...ἵπ τοι ἐκτιμήσθηκεν ἄγει, and D Hilary Augustine read ἵπ τοι ἐκτιμήσθηκεν ἄγει βαπτισθῆσθαι. The chiastic order of words does not seem to be merely an Alexandrian refinement, for it is not confined to the Alexandrian text.

The less elegant order in the great bulk of witnesses can be explained as a harmonization with the sequence of words in the parallel reported in the Synoptic Gospels, all of which place ἵπ τοι ἐκτιμήσθαι ἄγει after the word βάπτισθαι (Mt 3.11; Mk 1.8; Lk 3.16).

The envelope construction of the Alexandrian text (placing the verb between the noun and the adjective) may be an editorial refinement, or it may reproduce an emphasis intended by the author. A majority of the Committee preferred the Alexandrian text, considering the weight of N* B B 81 915 Didymus to be superior to that of D (the evidence of Latin Fathers does not count for much on a point concerned with the presence or absence of the envelope construction in Greek).

1.8 ἵπ τοι ἐκτιμήσθηκεν

At the end of the verse several Western witnesses (D cop. v. 667 Ephraem Augustine Cassiodorus) add ἵπ τοι τις πεντηκοστής, thus explaining more precisely the date of the coming of the Holy Spirit.

1.7 Οὐχ οὐκ ἐστὶν γενέσθαι

Lake and Cadbury render the verse, “And he [Jesus] said to them, ‘No one can know times or seasons which the Father fixed by his own authority,’” and comment on No one can know: “This is the Western reading; the Neutral and later text is ‘it is not yours to know.’ The Western reading is preferable because the paraphrast is unlikely to have ascribed ignorance to Jesus.” The expression “the Western reading” is used here in a rather deceptive manner. No New Testament manuscript in any language contains this reading; only Cyprian (Test. iii, 89) and Augustine (Ep. 197) quote the form, “Nemo potest cognoscere tempus.” Moreover, in a reply to Augustine, Hesychius, Bishop of Salona in Dalmatia (Ep. 198, 2), corrects Augustine’s quotation, pointing out that ‘in the most ancient books of the churches it is not written, ‘No one can,’ but it is written, ‘It is not yours to know times and seasons, which the Father put in his own power.’”

In support of the reading involving the second person plural, Hesychius appropriately draws Augustine’s attention to the continuation of the passage in Acts, which reads, “But you will be witnesses …” In his subsequent reply to Hesychius (Ep. 199, 1 ff.), the Bishop of Hippo tacitly accepts the correction and henceforth quotes the passage, “It is not for you to know …”

In view of such slender evidence it is better, with Haenchen, to regard the text quoted by Cyprrian and Augustine as simply a reproduction of Mk 13.32, and not as testimony for the existence of a similar reading in Acts.

1.8 ἵπ τοι ἐκτιμήσθηκεν

The preposition ἵπ is read before πῶς by Δ74vid N B C C2 E V V* most minuscules. Lection vg syrp. h arm, whereas it is absent from A C* D 81 181 206 322 323 328 429* 945 1611 1704 1704 al. Because the repetition of the same preposition before successive coordinate phrases is more typical of Semitic style than Greek, it can be argued that the word is probably original and was deleted subsequently by Greek scribes who felt the repetition to be unidiomatic. On the other hand, it is also possible that copyists, noticing that Jerusalem is a city whereas Judea and Samaria are countries, inserted the second ἵπ in order to balance the two entities. Unable to determine which consideration is more probable, and in view of more or less equally weighty external evidence, a majority of the Committee voted to include ἵπ in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

1.11 Ἐνβλέπουσις

The external evidence is rather evenly divided between Ἐνβλέπουσις (N* B Egr 33 81 180 218 440 522 614 630 642 945 1245 1642 1704 1739 1831 1875 1884 1891 2298 2495) and Ἐνβλέπουσις (556 Nc A C D Ἐνβλέπουσις* V and most minuscules). It is difficult to decide whether copyists heightened the accent by introducing the compound form (which seems to imply a degree of intensity not suggested by the simple form), or whether the initial syllable was accidentally dropped in copying. In order to represent the even balance of textual evidence and of transcriptional probabilities, a majority of the Committee preferred to print the compound form, but to enclose the initial syllable within square brackets to indicate that it may be a scribal accretion.

1.11 εἰς τὸν οἴκον τῶν (2) [A]

The third of the four occurrences of the phrase εἰς τὸν οἴκον in verses 10 and 11 is omitted by D 33C 242 326* and several Old Latin witnesses, including tiq Augustine Vigilius. Ropes judges that it is correctly omitted, but Haenchen thinks that Lake wished to lay emphasis upon the idea by a fourfold repetition. A majority of the Committee preferred to retain the phrase, considering it more likely that the words were accidentally omitted than deliberately inserted in a context that was already liberally supplied with instances of the same phrase.

1.13 The omission in Codex Bezae of καὶ both before the first occurrence of ἡ ἑδράς and before Σίμων ἐστι to be accounted for (as Ropes points out) by the arrangement of the apostles’ names in two columns in that manuscript; as it happens both names appear in the first column, where none of the names is preceded by κα.

The later manuscripts (E and most minuscules), followed by the Textus Receptus, alter the sequence to the more accustomed order of
“James and John.” Furthermore, in E the name of Andrew is moved forward to follow that of Peter (his brother).

The addition of καὶ τῇ δεκτῇ after τῇ προσευχῇ in the later witnesses (C3 and most minuscules), followed by the Textus Receptus (“in prayer and supplication,” AV), is due to the influence of Peh. 4.6.

Instead of the colorless σῶν γυναικῶν codex Bezae reads σῶν τέκνων γυναικῶν καὶ τόκων (“with their wives and children”); compare 21.5, where the Tyrian Christians accompany Paul to his ship σῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τόκων and the Dura fragment of Tatian’s Diatessaron, which apparently refers to the wives of those who accompanied Jesus from Galilee.

The Textus Receptus, following B C D 33 132 and most minuscules, reads σῶν before τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, whereas the preposition is absent from Ν Α Β D 88 104 134 241 464c 468 547 876 915 1175 1311 1576 1838 al. Since σῶν seems to separate Jesus from his ἀδελφοὶ, and is therefore suspect as a scribal addition made in the interest of supporting the perpetual virginity of Mary, a majority of the Committee preferred the shorter text.

The Western text (D itₚ thₜ Cyprian Augustine) has substituted μαθητῶν for ἀδελφῶν of Ν Α Β C al. The reason is obvious: to prevent the reader from confusing these “brethren” with the brothers of Jesus (ver. 14). (The word μαθητής is used nowhere else in the first five chapters of Acts.) For the same reason the scribe of the Bodmer Papyrus of Acts seems to have substituted ἔστησάν (§74vid).

The enigmatic τήρησις γενόμενος (literally “having become prone”; AV, ASV, and RSV “falling headlong.”) NEB “fell forward on the ground”) is interpreted variously in the early versions.

(1) The Latin versions attempt to harmonize the account in Acts with the statement in Matthew that Judas “went out and hanged himself” (Mt 27.5). The Old Latin version current in North Africa, according to a quotation by Augustine in his contra Felicum, i.4, seems to have read collum sibi alligavit et deiectus in faciem diruptus est medius, et diffusa sunt omnia viscera eius (“he bound himself around the neck and, having fallen on his face, burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out”). On the basis of this sole patristic witness Blass introduced καὶ κατάληψαν αὐτὸν τῶν ἄρχων into his stichometric edition of Acts. Jerome, who may have known this rendering, reads in the Vulgate suspensus crepuit medius et diffusa sunt omnia viscera eius (“being hanged, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out”).

(2) A different tradition is represented in the Armenian version and the Old Gregorian version; these describe Judas’s end thus: “Being swollen up he burst asunder and all his bowels gushed out.” What the Greek may have been from which this rendering was made is problematical. Papias, who according to tradition was a disciple of

...
1.26 αὐτοῖς [B]

Instead of αὐτοῖς, which is well attested by Ρ A B C 33 81 1739 vg copsa, bo al, the Textus Receptus, following D E Ψ most minuscules, reads αὐτῶν. In the opinion of a majority of the Committee, the ambiguity of αὐτοῖς (is it intended as indirect object, “they gave lots to them,” or as ethical dative, “they cast lots for them”?) prompted copyists to replace it with the easier αὐτῶν.

The scribe of codex Bezae replaced the rare verb συγκαταθηκόσθησαν with the more common συμπήρνεσαν. Then, taking μετά in the sense of “among,” he substituted “the twelve (ἔξι) apostles” for “the eleven apostles.” Not satisfied with this, other pedantically-minded scribes produced the conflate reading, “he was counted among the eleven apostles as the twelfth” (so the Armenian catena, the Georgian version, and Augustine).

2.1-2 Καὶ ἐν τῷ συμπληρώματι τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἦσαν πάντες ἕως ἕως τὸ αὐτό. (2) καὶ ἐγένετο

The Bezan text, preferred by Ropes, reads καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέρας ἐγένεσθαι τῷ συμπληρώματι τῆς πεντηκοστῆς ἄτομον αὐτῶν πάντων ἕως τὸ αὐτό, καὶ εἶδον ἐγένετο, which means, he says, “And it came to pass in those days of the arrival of the day of pentecost that while they were all together behold there came,” etc. He explains the unusual Greek as the result of translation from Aramaic (compare Torrey’s suggestion that the original read נָבָא עֲבוֹדָה and “when and the Weeks were fulfilled”).

2.5 κατακοικεῖσθαι Ιουδαίοις, ἄνδρες ἐλαμβάνει [B]

Behind the familiar words, “Now there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven,” lie several interesting and provocative textual problems. Why should Luke think it necessary to mention that Jews were dwelling in Jerusalem? Likewise, why should it be said that they were devout men; would not this be taken for granted from the fact that they were Jews? Most amazing of all is the statement that these Jews were persons from every nation under heaven. Out of all lands under heaven could be understood – but since Jews were already an ἔθνος, to say that these were from another ἔθνος is tantamount to a contradiction of terms.

Now it is certainly significant that the word Ιουδαίοις, which creates so many exegetical problems in the verse, is absent from Ρ, and is variously placed in two other uncial manuscripts: C reads ἄνδρες Ἰουδαίοις and E reads Ἰουδαίοις κατασκοικεῖσθαι, whereas in the rest of the Greek witnesses Ιουδαίοις follows κατακοικεῖσθαι and precedes ἄνδρες. Does not this mean, as Blass, followed by Ropes, suggested, that the word is an early, perhaps pre-Western, variant that found lodgment at various places in the sentence?

On the other hand, one must ask what would have motivated several different scribes to insert a word that raises so many questions in the reader’s mind? It is easier to understand that, being present in the original text and witnessed by the overwhelming mass of manuscripts, Ἰουδαίοις was either dropped as seemingly contradictory to ἔθνος, or moved to a position considered less objectionable from a stylistic point of view.

2.6 ἡ θέσις

The variations are between the imperfect and the aorist tense and the singular and the plural number. A majority of the Committee regarded θέσαν (C 81 467 547 1311 1739 vg syrh copsa geo) as a correction of θέσαν (A D E Ιvid most minuscules Chrysostom) under the influence of the following εἶς ἔθνος. The readings θέσαν (Ρ B 181 241 307 327 614 917 1874) and θέσαν (181 460) seem to have arisen from harmonization with adjacent verbs in the aorist tense.

2.7 οὐκ εἶδον διαλέγειν λαλοῦσαν αὐτῶν

Ropes suggests that the sequence of the Western reading, λαλοῦσας τὰς γλῶσσας αὐτῶν (D syrp, hmg Augustine), “is perhaps intended to make it clear that the speaking, not the hearing only, took place in these languages.”

2.7 λέγουσας

The addition of τῶν ἀλλήλων before τὰς (or ἄπαντας) after ἐξῆμεν ἀδίκα (Ῥ Ρ C E most minuscules), including 33 81 181, followed by the Textus Receptus was probably made under the influence of ver. 12. It is lacking not only in B but in the Western text as well (D ἵππι Augustine), and is the kind of heightening of the narrative that would occur independently to more than one scribe.

2.9 ἡ ἡμέρα

And when the Weeks were fulfilled (ἢ ἡμέρας) was either dropped as seemingly contradictory to ἔθνος, or moved to a position considered less objectionable from a stylistic point of view.

2.7 ὡς

Although the iota of ὡς (attested only by B) may have fallen out before ἔδωκα, resulting in the reading ἔδωκα (Ῥ D E 81 98 794 915 1175 1827), it may have been added in order to produce a more emphatic expression. The reading ὡς (Α C most minuscules), which entered the Textus Receptus, is the orthographically correct form. A majority of the Committee was of the opinion that ὡς best explains the rise of both other readings.

2.9 Ἰουδαϊκῶν

Although solidly supported by external evidence (by all Greek witnesses, and almost all versional and patristic witnesses, except those mentioned below), the word Ἰουδαϊκῶν has frequently been suspected because (1) it stands in an unusual sequence in the list (between Mesopotamia and Cappadocia); (2) it is properly an adjective and therefore when used as a substantive (as here) it ought to be preceded by the definite article; (3) it is absent from the astrological geography of Paulus Alexandrinus, with which Luke’s
list is otherwise in partial agreement; and (4) it involves the curious anomaly that the inhabitants of Judea should be amazed to hear the apostles speak in their own language (ver. 6). 22

For these reasons some ancient and many modern writers have proposed the names of other countries. Thus, Tertullian and Augustine (once) substitute Armeniam, Jerome substitutes (habitantes in) Syria, and Chrysostom Ἱουλιαν. Modern scholars have proposed a wide variety of conjectures, including Idumea (Caspar, Spitta, Lagercranz), Ionia (Cheyne), Bithynia (Hemsterhuis, Valckenaer), Cilicia (Mangey), Lydia (Bentley, Bryant), Armenia (following Chrysostom) Erasmus, Schmidt, Gordyaya (Greve, Burkitt), Yaudi (Gunkel), Adiabene (Eberhard Nestle), and Aramaeae (Hatch). 23 Others, including Eusebius, Harnack, and C. S. C. Williams, omit the word altogether, considering it a scribal gloss.

Despite internal difficulties, the Committee was impressed by the overwhelming preponderance of external evidence supporting Ἰουδαίαν, and therefore retained it in the text.

2.12 διηρύθωσιν

The middle voice of διαπερατεῖν (R A B 076) is so appropriate here that, if it were original, it is difficult to account for its being altered to the active voice in the great mass of witnesses (C D E I and apparently all minuscules). On the other hand, if Luke wrote διηρύθωσιν it is easy to see why Egyptian witnesses adopted an Alexandrian refinement.

2.13 ἄλλον

The addition in D syrē interpreting ἐπὶ τῷ γεγονότι (“concerning what had taken place”) after ἄλλων is a typical expansion so characteristic of the Western text.

2.14 σταυρεῖς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν ταῖς ζῦκακα

Instead of σταυρεῖς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν ταῖς ζῦκακα Codec Bezae reads τόσο σταυρεῖς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν ταῖς δέκα ἀποστόλωις.

suggesting that the source from which this account came either disregarded or was ignorant of the election of Matthias.

Codex Bezae enhances the prominence of Peter by inserting πρῶτος after ἐπήριον (see also the comment on 1.23).

2.16 πρῶτοι λόγι [B]

A majority of the Committee judged that the name λόγι had fallen out accidentally from the Western text (D itd, h, 57 Irenaeus Rebaptism Ephraem Hilary Gregory of Elvira Augustine).

2.17-21

The quotation from JI 2.28-32 (= LXX 3:1-5) is preserved in two forms, represented by codex Vaticanus and by codex Bezae. The former agrees almost exactly with the text of the Septuagint, whereas the latter embodies a series of changes from the Septuagint, most of which make the quotation more suitable for the occasion. This adaptation may be the work of the original author, and the agreement of the B-text with the Septuagint may have been produced by an editor. On the other hand, however, it is equally possible that the author copied exactly, or nearly so, from his Septuagint, and that the modifications were introduced by the Western reviser. In favor of the latter view is the fact that in other formal quotations the author of Acts displays a remarkable degree of faithfulness to the text of the Septuagint. Moreover, several of the Western modifications appear to reflect an emphasis on Gentile interests, sometimes approaching what has been called the anti-Jewish bias of the Western reviser. The problem is a complex one, however, and the possibility must be left open that occasionally the text of B represents a secondary development.

2.17 ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις

It was probably the author himself who substituted ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (R A D E I P S 462 ν ς yς Irenaeus Hilary Macarius Chrysostom Augustine al) for μετὰ ταῦτα of the Septuagint (JL 2.28 [= LXX 3:1]), which is inappropriate for the context of the narrative in Acts. The presence of the words μετὰ ταῦτα in B 076 copies Cyril of Jerusalem, therefore, should be regarded as the work of an Alexandrian corrector who brought the quotation in Acts into strict conformity with the prevailing text of the Septuagint. 24

2.17 λέγει οὐ κρίσις

Instead of λέγει οὐ κρίσις, which is read by most of the manuscripts, the Western text reads λέγει κρίσις (D E 242 467 1845 Old Latin Vulgate Irenaeus). The Septuagint lacks the clause. Kilpatrick thinks that “in general the tendency may have been to change κρίσις to θεός as κρίσις is ambiguous and may mean God or Christ, but θεός like Ἰησοῦς or Χριστός is not.” 25

There is, however, no evidence that such a tendency as Kilpatrick suggests operated in the case of codex Bezae. A glance at Yoder’s Concordance to the Distinctive Greek Text of Codex Bezae reveals that ten times D reads κρίσις for θεός in other manuscripts, and eleven times D reads θεός for κρίσις in other manuscripts.

In the present passage the textual decision must be made on the basis of external evidence, and when the geographical distribution of witnesses is taken into account, it seems to be obvious that λέγει οὐ κρίσις should be preferred to λέγει κρίσις.

2.17

The substitution of οὐκόλων (in D itig Rebaptism Hilary) for the first two instances of Ἰωάν, as well as the omission of the next two instances of Ἰωάν (in the former case by D Rebaptism; in the latter by D E it Rebaptism), may have been motivated by the Western reviser’s wish to make the prophetic oracle apply to Gentiles and not exclusively to the Jews to whom Peter was speaking:

“I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, 26 and their sons and their daughters shall prophesy, and the young men shall see visions, and the old men shall dream dreams.”
That such was in fact his intention seems to be evident by what follows in ver. 39, where the Western text alters the second person pronouns to the first person, thus implying that the promises belong to the spiritual Israel, the new people of God, and not to the Israel κατά σάρκα, to which Peter is speaking.

2.18 εἰς τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνες {A}

On the basis of the testimony of the overwhelming mass of witnesses, a majority of the Committee preferred to retain εἰς τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνες, explaining the absence of the words in D itd, g, r Rebaptism Priscillian as due either to an accident in transmission or to a feeling that they were otiose after εἰς τὰς ἡμέρας ἐκείνες in ver. 17.

2.19 αἵμα καὶ πόρο καὶ ἀσίμωδες κατηνον {A}

The omission of the words αἵμα καὶ πόρο καὶ ἀσίμωδες κατηνον from the Western text (D itd, p r Tertullian Rebaptism Priscillian) brings the passage into harmony with the Septuagint (and Hebrew) text. Ropes prefers the shorter text and explains the addition as a Western non-interpolation, made before the formation of the text of B.

Ropes’s pronouncement that, “if [the words] were originally present, the only reason for omitting them in D would have been the desire to conform to the LXX, but, as has been shown, this motive is the opposite of that which, under any hypothesis, governed the formation of the D-text,” fails to take into account the possibility of accidental omission.

A majority of the Committee preferred the non-parallel reading, which is supported by the preponderant attestation.

2.19 αἵμα καὶ πόρο καὶ ἀσίμωδες κατηνον {A}

The omission of the words αἵμα καὶ πόρο καὶ ἀσίμωδες κατηνον from the Western text (D itd, p r Tertullian Priscillian) may have resulted from paraplepsis when the eye of the scribe passed from the preceding word κατηνον to the final word κατηνον. A majority of the Committee preferred the longer text, supported as it is by 74 A B C al.

2.20 καὶ έτομανεν

A majority of the Committee regarded the absence of καὶ έτομανεν in Ν D itd, r Priscillian as the result of scribal oversight, occasioned either by the presence of two groups of similar letters, μαγάρις and τομάρις, or by the homoeoarcton involved in what follows, κατηνοντες κατηνοντες. The text adopted is supported by the preponderant weight of external evidence (74 A B C E P, apparently all other Greek witnesses, vg al).

2.22 κατηνοντες

The addition of κατηνοντες after κατηνον in Ν C3 D E P 614 al, followed by the Textus Receptus, is a typical scribal expansion, introduced in order to fill out the construction.

2.24 θανάσεως {A}

The Western substitution of θανάσεως (D itd, e, gig vg syrp copbo Polycarp Irenaeuslat Ephraem Augustine) for θανάσεως appears to be an assimilation to the use of θανάσα in verses 27 and 31.

2.26 ἢ καρδία μου

The sequence of μου ἢ καρδία, attested by Ν* B Clement, is a more artificial order that may have been introduced by Alexandrian scribes in order to provide a chiastic contrast with the following ἢ γλῶσσά μου. Therefore, despite the agreement of ἢ καρδία μου with the Septuagint (Ps 16:9 (= LXX 15:9)), a majority of the Committee prefers the latter order, supported as it is by all other witnesses (74 Ν C D E P al).

2.30 οὐφιος

The substitution of καρδίας in D* for οὐφιος has been explained in terms of an Aramaic source, or as a false retranslation from the Latin text (praecordis, which means both “belly” and “heart”). The reading καρδίας (1311 itd, p vg2 mss syrp Irenaeuslat) is a scribal assimilation to the text of the Septuagint (Ps 132:11 (= LXX 131:11)).

2.31 καθίσαι {B}

The Hebraic use of the phrase εἰς καρπον as a noun, the object of καθίσαι, is extremely harsh in Greek and has given rise to various explanatory expansions (derived perhaps from 2 S 7:12). Thus, before καθίσαι D* inserts καθάπερ ἄνωστος τῶν Χριστῶν καὶ, and the Textus Receptus, following P 049 056 0142 most minuscules Lect itd syr copG67 al, reads τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ἀνωτέρων τῶν Χριστῶν.

2.31 Through an accidental oversight on the part of the scribe, codex Bezae (D* itd) lacks προϊδων ἀλλήλων περὶ τῆς.

2.31 έδησ

The construction εἰς έδοσ (standing for εἰς έδοσ οὐκὸν [or έδομον]) is usual in classical Greek (where Hades is the god of the nether world). In the Septuagint text of Ps 132:11 (= LXX 15:10) έδοσ is read by A and έδησ by Ν B and the papyrus designated U by Swete. The Committee saw no reason to depart from έδησ (Ν B 81 1739 al), which occurs also in ver. 27 (Ν A B C D 81 al).

2.33 The insertion of έδωσ after έδοσ in codex Bezae and the insertion of τοῦ δώσων before έδωσ in E itp syr corps Irenaeuslat are obviously scribal embellishments.

2.37 The replacement of ἀκούσαις with ἀκούσας of τῶν πάντων ἀκούσας καὶ ἀκούσας in D syrh the insertion in D of τῶν εἰς αἱτίας before εἰς (because the entire crowd could not speak to Peter and the apostles) and of ὑποδέχεται ήμιν (“Show us”) after ἀκούσας in D E Old Latin syrh copG67 are typical Western expansions.

2.37 Λοτούσαι {A}

The omission of λοτούσαι from D 241 itd, 57 co3bo2mss Hippolytusarm Augustine seems to have been accidental, occasioned perhaps because of homoeoteleuton (καὶ τούθεν ἀποκαλεσθείον τοιοῦτον).

2.38 Μετανοήσατε, [φρενίν]
The witnesses offer a wide variety of readings: (a) Πέτρος δέ πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μετανοήσατε, B 218 606 630 1835 al; (b) Πέτρος δὲ αὐτοὺς Μετανοήσατε, φησίν, 274vid Ῥ Α C 81 630 1642* 1704 1739 1891 vg al; (c) Πέτρος δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς φησίν Μετανοήσατε, D itd, p Irenaeus; (d) Πέτρος δὲ ἐφὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μετανοήσατε, E P Ῥ Ψ Byz ittig vgmss; (e) Πέτρος δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἐφη. Metanoh,sate, 2147; (f) ἐπὶ δὲ Πέτρος πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μετανοήσατε, 42 51 57 223 582 1405 al; (g) as (f) followed by ἐφη, 206; (h) Πέτρος δὲ ἐφῇ πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μετανοήσατε, φησίν, 36 180 453 1642c; and (i) Πέτρος δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς Μετανοήσατε ἐφη, 945 al. A majority of the Committee was impressed by the diversity of early testimony supporting reading (b), but preferred to enclose φησίν within square brackets because of the weight of codex B, which lacks the word.

[Only reading (a) adequately accounts for the rise of the other readings, for the absence of an explicit verb of saying prompted copyists to add, at various places, φησίν or ἐφη or εἰς; there is no good reason why any of these verbs, if original, should have been omitted or altered to a different verb. It ought to be noted also that elsewhere Luke occasionally dispenses with a verb of saying (25.22a, 26.28, O.M.M.)]

A majority of the Committee preferred ἓν (𝔓 A E almost all minuscules), which is the more unusual preposition in such a context, and explained ἓν (B C D 429 522 1739 2298 al) as a scribal accommodation to the more accustomed expression (cf. 10.48 where ἓν occurs with no variant reading).

The omission of ἓν after εἰς ἄφοσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν by D ittig syrp, h Irenaeus Augustine al is, as Ropes points out, “conformation to the solemn formula of the Gospels, not an original shorter reading.”

for there is a “complete absence of tendency to expand in Matt. xxvi 28, Mk. i.4, Lk. iii.3.”

For the second person pronouns in the Western text, see the final comment on ver. 17 above.

The substitution in D of πιστεύσιςα for ἀπόδειξιςα was doubtless motivated by theological concern that faith in, and not merely reception of, the word preached by Peter is prerequisite to receiving baptism. The addition of ἀγίων ἡμῶν before ἀπόδειξιςα (“they that gladly received his word”) in E P 614 copG67 Augustine al, followed by the Textus Receptus, is an obvious accretion, deriving either from 21.17 or from a feeling that such a description would be eminently appropriate for Peter’s hearers.

After τῶν ἀποστόλων codex Bezae adds ἐν Ἰερουσαλίμ. The Latin text of codex Bezae reads, with vg syrp copsa, bo, “in the fellowship of the breaking of bread.”

It is exceedingly difficult to ascertain the original text of this passage. It can be argued, as Ropes does, that the words ἐν Ἰερουσαλίμ, φίλοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐπὶ πάντας καὶ were omitted because they seem to repeat ver. 43a. On the other hand, Haenchen supposes that the words are an expansion smoothing the way for ver. 44. A majority of the Committee preferred to follow B (D) 614 1739 itd, gig, p5, r synh copsa al.

2.44 πιστεύσιςα
In the book of Acts the absolute use of the participle of πιστεύσιςα occurs as a designation of Christians. The present participle πιστεύσίςα (A C D E P most minuscules) indicates the continuance of the state of believing, whereas the aorist πιστεύσατε (fhσιν, î) designates the second in a series of three instances of the same phrase within three verses; (b) why he moved κατ᾽ ὄχθον from the phrase “breaking bread in their homes” to the previous clause, producing the curious description, “All were regular in attendance at the temple and in their homes [were] together” (πάντες σε προσκαρέμουν ἐν τῇ λειψίᾳ καὶ κατ᾽ ὄχθος ἐν ἐπὶ το αὐτῶ, where the word ὄχθος is an obvious corruption); or (c) why
the phrase εν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ was introduced in ver. 47. (Since the last reading passed into the Textus Receptus, it happens that in the AV the earliest mention of the word “church” in the book of Acts is at this verse; in the other witnesses the word first appears at 5:11.)

2.47-3.1 ἔτι τὸ αὐτὸ. Πέτρος ἐδὲ [B]

The difficulty arises chiefly from the obscurity of the phrase ἔτι τὸ αὐτὸ. Torrey explains it as a mistranslation of a Judean Aramaic word meaning “greatly,” and translates the reconstructed Greek text, “And the Lord added greatly day by day to the saved.” Although de Zwaan characterized this a “splendid observation,” it was rejected on linguistic and exegetical grounds by F. C. Burkitt, M. Black, and H. F. D. Sparks.

The phrase ἔτι τὸ αὐτὸ, which is common enough in classical Greek and in the Septuagint, acquired a quasi-technical meaning in the early church. This meaning, which is required in 1:15, 2:1, 47, 1 Cor 11:20, 14:23, signifies the union of the Christian body, and perhaps could be rendered “in church fellowship.” Not perceiving this special usage of the word in ver. 47, scribes attempted to rearrange the text, either by moving the phrase to the following sentence (3:1) or by glossing it with an equivalent phrase, εν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.

The Committee preferred to adopt the reading of ℶ74 N A B C G 81 1175 itigig vg copsa, bo arm eth al. Haenchen observes (in loc.) that the scribe of codex Bezae regarded the absence of a connection as a deficiency and therefore introduced εν δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις at the beginning of chap. 3 (the same phrase also appears in itp and copG67). But there is also another (or a further) explanation of the origin of the words. Bengel, in the apparatus of his 1734 edition of the Greek Testament, suggests that the phrase may have been borrowed from Greek lectionaries, which normally introduce a lection with εν ταις ἡμέραις ἐκκλησίας. Eberhard Nestle, who characterizes Bengel’s observation as “not unsound,” qualifies it, however, by pointing out that the phrase could not have been borrowed from a separate Greek lectionary (for lectionary manuscripts are more recent than the age of codex Bezae), but may have been written in the margin of the codex from which D was copied.

3.1 οἶρον

Not satisfied with the account that “Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour,” codex Bezae adds (after οἶρον) yet another circumstantial detail: it was “toward evening” (τὸ δελεατύρον, ad vesperum). The word δελεατύρον appears nine times in the Septuagint but nowhere else in the New Testament.

3.2 τίς

Ropes argues (in loc.) that the addition of οἶδο (before τίς) in D itp vgms syrp “may be original, since it is more Semitic.” On the other hand, however, in this instance as well as in the two others in Acts where codex Bezae introduces οἶδο (2:2, 13:47) the explanation may well be that it was a Jewish Christian who prepared the Western text of Acts.

3.3 λαβων

The presence of λαβων (Φ74 N A B C E G 33 81 1739 al) seems to overload the expression ἵππωσα ἑλπισμονὴν λαβων (and so was omitted by Western and Byzantine witnesses (D P most minuscules). For other examples of the infinitive after ἵππωσα, see Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 392, 1 (c).

3.3-5 The usual text reads, “Seeing (δὲ Ιωάννης) Peter and John about to go into the temple, he [the lame man] asked…And Peter directed his gaze (παρατηθεὶς) at him, with John, and said, ‘Look at us’ (βλέψας). And he fixed his attention (οὐ κατατύτησαν) upon them…” Codex Bezae rewrites the passage, using the verb ἀνενήσας of the lame man: οὖς ανενήσομεν τοῖς ὁπλίταις αὐτοῦ καὶ Ιωάννην καὶ ἀπόκρισαν δὲ τὸ Πέτρον εἰς αὐτόν συν Ιωάννην καὶ εἶπεν τοῖς ἀνενήσασιν αὐτοῖς…

These changes are especially curious in view of the fact that in stories of miracles it is usual to employ ἀνενήσας of the person who effects the cure. Lake and Cadbury comment on this passage: “If it were not for general considerations it would be tempting here to accept the Western text as original and regard the B-text as an accommodation to the typical vocabulary of a miraculous story.”

3.6 [Εγείρω καὶ περιεπατεί [C]]

It is difficult to decide whether the words ἐγείρω καὶ are a gloss, introduced by copyists who were influenced by such well-known passages as Mt 9:5; Mk 2:9; Lk 5:23; Jn 5:8; 6:16, 40, 47; 13:47, scribes attempted to rearrange the text, either by moving the phrase to the following sentence (3:1) or by glossing it with an equivalent phrase, δὲ ἀνενήσας αὐτοῖς…

In periphrastic fashion the Bezan text adds after περιεπατεί the participle χειροκίρως (which Ropes, on the basis of the testimony of ith, thinks may be for χειροκίρου καὶ ὄχι τοιούτως). The word χειροκίρως appears nine times in the Septuagint but nowhere else in the New Testament.

3.11 The two forms of text of this verse involve a particularly difficult set of problems, some textual, some archaeological. Instead of the usual text, codex Bezae reads ἐκτόρομένου δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου καὶ

Ἰωάννου συνεξέπερσαν κρατῶν αὐτοῦ, οί δὲ θαμβηθέντες ἔστησαν εἰς τῇ στολῇ, ἡ καλομένη Σολομόνος, ἐκθάμβωσε, which may be rendered as follows (the material in square brackets is not in D but is added here from the Alexandrian text in order to make sense of the phraseology of D): “And as Peter and John went out, he went out with them, holding on to them; and [all the people ran together to them and] stood wondering in the portico that is called Solomon’s, astounded.”
The differences between the Alexandrian and Western texts involve the location of Solomon’s portico. According to the Alexandrian text (a) Peter and John healed the lame man at the Beautiful gate; (b) they went into the temple (ver. 8); and (c) they became the center of a crowd that ran together to them in Solomon’s portico. From this account the reader would conclude that Solomon’s portico was inside the ισρα. On the other hand, according to the Western text the apostles (a) heal the lame man at the Beautiful gate, (b) they go into the temple, and then (c) the apostles and the healed man go out to Solomon’s portico. This envisages the location of Solomon’s portico outside the ισρα (see however the Western text and the comment at 5.12).

Commentators try in various ways to resolve the difficulty. Dibelius regards the Western text as an editorial attempt to cover up the seam left by Luke between his own work and the preceding narrative that he incorporated from an older source. According to F. F. Bruce, this is another instance where the Western text makes explicit what is implicit in the Alexandrian text, as if the readers could not be trusted to draw the correct inference for themselves. On the other hand, after a painstaking analysis of the topographical evidence of the temple area, Kirsopp Lake concludes that the Western text must be accepted as the original.

It may be conceded that Luke was less well acquainted with the topography of the temple than was the person who was responsible for the tradition embodied in codex Bezae. At the same time, however, even the most ardent proponent of the Western text would scarcely be prepared to accept the wording of the text of D, as it stands, as the work of so careful an author as Luke. For, in addition to the need for identifying the “they” in ver. 11 in some such way as is done in the Alexandrian text (enclosed in square brackets in the translation given above), the atrocious grammar of ἐν τῇ σταύρῳ, ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου Ἰωάννου, reminds one of the solecisms perpetrated by the author of the Apocalypse.

The least unsatisfactory text, therefore, seems to be that preserved in N A B C 81 al. The reading κρατῶντος δὲ τοῦ ἱεροῦ χαλαρόν (P S most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus), which identifies the colorless αὐτόν of the earlier witnesses, is obviously a secondary development, probably connected with the beginning of an ecclesiastical lection at this point.

The word εὐσέβῃ, which is, as Lake and Cadbury declare, “certainly the right reading,” was taken as ἐξουσίᾳ in some early versions (ith. p, some manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshitta, and the Armenian). Irenaeus omits ἐξουσίᾳ. The word ἐξουσίᾳ seemed to scribes to be a more natural complement after δύνατον in describing a miracle (cf. Lk 4.36; 9.1).

In order to avoid the repetition of Ἰησοῦς in two successive clauses (cf. ver. 13), codex Bezae substitutes Ἰησοῦς. This word, which appears in N at 28.27, and in D H al at Lk 21.34, but nowhere else in Luke-Acts, is so manifestly inappropriate in the context (it means “weighed down, burdened, oppressed”) that many scholars have suspected something other than an ordinary corruption. Among proposals that postulate a Syriac or Hebrew original, Chase followed by Nestle and Blasi suggested that the error arose in Syriac where ἐξουσίας was perhaps into (or mistranslated as), the former meaning ἴησοῦς, and the latter Ἰησοῦς. Harris, on the other hand, was inclined to describe the variant reading as a Latinizing error, related to Irenaeus’s quotation of 8.14 aggrauavas et petistis virum homicidam. Ropes, without mentioning Harris, also took Ἰησοῦς as “a retranslation of the Latin εξουσίας” (in itd). But why the Latin translation took this turn is not explained. Yet another conjecture was offered by Torrey; rejecting Nestle’s suggestion that the confusion arose in Hebrew when ה��ול, “you denied,” was copied as קָרַע, “you weighed down, oppressed,” he proposed that “the Aramaic editor rendered Ἰησοῦς by קְרָע, ‘you denied, declared false.’ It was wrongly copied as קָרַע, which could only be translated (regarded as a Hebraism) by the Greek Ἰησοῦς.”

The text of the first part of ver. 16 is exceedingly awkward; literally it runs, “And by faith in his name he made whole this man whom you see.” Following a suggestion made by Burkitt, to place a colon before εὐσέβῃ, this is another instance where the Western text makes explicit what is implicit in the Alexandrian text, as if the readers could not be trusted to draw the correct inference for themselves. The proposal of Burkitt to place a colon before εὐσέβῃ, thus taking the preceding words when ὑπὲρ τοῦ πέντε as “a retranslation of the Latin εξουσίας” (in itd). But why the Latin translation took this turn is not explained. Yet another conjecture was offered by Torrey; rejecting Nestle’s suggestion that the confusion arose in Hebrew when הeous, “you denied,” was copied as קָרַע, “you weighed down, oppressed,” he proposed that “the Aramaic editor rendered Ἰησοῦς by קְרָע, ‘you denied, declared false.’ It was wrongly copied as קָרַע, which could only be translated (regarded as a Hebraism) by the Greek Ἰησοῦς.”

The text of the first part of ver. 16 is exceedingly awkward; literally it runs, “And by faith in his name he made whole this man whom you see.” Following a suggestion made by Burkitt, to place a colon before εὐσέβῃ, this is another instance where the Western text makes explicit what is implicit in the Alexandrian text, as if the readers could not be trusted to draw the correct inference for themselves. The proposal of Burkitt to place a colon before εὐσέβῃ, thus taking the preceding words when ὑπὲρ τοῦ πέντε as “a retranslation of the Latin εξουσίας” (in itd). But why the Latin translation took this turn is not explained. Yet another conjecture was offered by Torrey; rejecting Nestle’s suggestion that the confusion arose in Hebrew when הeous, “you denied,” was copied as קָרַע, “you weighed down, oppressed,” he proposed that “the Aramaic editor rendered Ἰησοῦς by קְרָע, ‘you denied, declared false.’ It was wrongly copied as קָרַע, which could only be translated (regarded as a Hebraism) by the Greek Ἰησοῦς.”

Torrey argued that the original Aramaic, in an unpointed text, was ambiguous, and that what was “originally intended was not הeous הeous, ἐστηρικεῖν τὸ δόμον αὐτοῦ, but הeous הeous, ἐστηρικεῖν (οὐ καταστρέψει).” The meaning, therefore, is “and by faith in his name he [either Ἰησοῦς or θεός] has made whole this man whom you see and know.” The difficulty with this suggestion, however, as with so many explanations that postulate a misunderstanding of an Aramaic original, is how one can explain psychologically that such a misunderstanding could ever have arisen. These proposals do not relieve the redundancy that remains when one continues with the second part of ver. 16: “and the faith which is through him [Jesus] has given him [the cripple] this perfect health in the presence of you all.” Following a suggestion made by his father, C. F. D. Moule refers to several passages in Acts that seem to preserve alternative drafts of the same sentence. He writes: “If it is conceivable that the writer of the Acts really did leave his work unrevised, and that each of these passages represents several different attempts to say the same thing, which were eventually copied collectively, instead of the alternatives being struck out, it would offer a more plausible explanation of these passages (I suggest) than either the hypothesis of intolerably bad mistranslation, or that of an unaccountable conflation of simpler texts; and it might throw an extremely interesting light on the writer’s style and sensitiveness to alternative possibilities in idiom.”

In the present passage Moule, using Westcott and Hort’s text, suggests that the three drafts of the sentence that were combined were:
(a) τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ [αὐτὸς ηλιόθε - or equivalent, this alternative being defective].

(b) τοῖς… ἐγέρσεσαν τὸ ἄνωμα αὐτοῦ.

(c) ἡ πίστει ἢ δι' αὐτοῦ [οὐ τὸ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ] ἔσωκεν αὐτῷ τὴν ἀλατολήναν τεσσάρην...

Interesting though this suggestion is, it leaves the modern editor in a quandry: shall one assume that the last of the three rival drafts best represents the intention of the author, or – since apparently the author could not make up his mind – must one not reproduce the several clauses, redundant though they are? In the latter case, much can be said in favor of punctuating (with Lachmann, followed by Blass) by placing a colon after ἐστερέωσαν (omitting, of course, the comma after τὸ ἄνωμα αὐτοῦ).

3.16 ὁ θεωρεῖται καὶ αἰδέτε

The Greek (but not the Latin) text of codex Bezae omits ὅ ὄνομαθε before θεωρεῖται and adds ἐτι after αἰδέτε, so as to read, “And by faith in his name you behold this (man) and know that his name has made him strong …”

3.17

The Western text (D E ith copG67) introduces several changes: it (a) expands ἀδιάφοροι into the more usual expression ἄνδρες ἄδικοι, (b) accommodates the verb to the plural (ἐπιστήμηθεν for αἴδετε) in harmony with the preceding ἡμῖν (ver. 15), and (c) adds ταχόν after ἐπιστάθητε in order to express the idea that, though the Jews’ part in bringing about Jesus’ death was done in ignorance, it was nevertheless a crime. By inserting μὲν in ver. 17 a sharper contrast is afforded between the act of the Jews over against the purpose of God, expressed in ver. 18. The heightened emphasis in the D-text is apparent: “We know that you, on the one hand, did a wicked thing in ignorance …, but, on the other hand, God…fulfilled [his purpose].”

3.19 εἶς

Despite Ropes’s declaration that “the only ground of decision [between πρὸς (N B) and εἶς (all other witnesses)] is the relative value ascribed to the opposing groups [of witnesses],” a majority of the Committee was impressed by the fact that, except for Lk 18.1, the construction of πρὸς τὸ with infinitive is not found elsewhere in Luke-Acts.

3.20 τῶν … Ἰησοῦν Ἰησοῦν

On the basis of the combination of Alexandrian and Western witnesses (N B D E syrh copsa), the Committee preferred the sequence Ἰησοῦν Ἰησοῦν. The alternative sequence, Ἰησοῦν Ἰησοῦν (𝔓74 A C Ψ ms μinuscules vg syr cop bo eth), followed by the Textus Receptus), seems to have arisen as an adaptation to the somewhat more usual appellation (in the New Testament Ἰησοῦς Χριστός occurs 152 times, and Χριστός Ἰησοῦς 107 times). In any case, the copyists who introduced the sequence Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν failed to perceive that here τῶν … Ἰησοῦς means “the Messiah.”

3.21 ὁ θεὸς ἴμαχον [B]

Variation in wording seems to have been occasioned by the possibility of taking τῶν ἰμάχων as a noun followed by an appositive. The omission of ὁ θεὸς ἴμαχον in the Western text may be either accidental or the result of asking whether prophets actually existed from the beginning. A majority of the Committee preferred, as the least unsatisfactory reading, that attested by Ψ74 Vid N* A B* C 81 1739 ite.

3.22 ᾧθε [C]

The Committee regarded the several additions before or after εἶμι as natural expansions to the text, made by scribes who may have recollected the phrase ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων in ver. 13.

3.23 ὁ θεὸς ἴμαχον [C]

The quotation is from Dt 18.15 f. (where the Septuagint reads ὁ θεὸς οὐαί) and Lv 23.29. It appears that the Alexandrian text, with its usual tendency toward parsimoniousness, has eliminated the pronoun after θεὸς. In view of the interchange of ήμῶν and ἴμαχον through Isaiah it is difficult to decide between the two chief readings; a majority of the Committee, however, judged that external evidence seems to support ἴμαχον.

3.25 ἴμαχον [C]

A majority of the Committee considered it probable that the second person pronoun ἴμαχον has been conformed to the general usage of Acts in referring to “our fathers.”

3.26 ἴμαχον

The more difficult reading is the plural pronoun, which B omits, probably for stylistic reasons. The singular αὐτός (5 88 241 257 322 323 915) is a scribal conformation to the preceding ἐκαστὸν. Both external evidence and internal considerations strongly favor ἴμαχον.

4.1-4

In these verses codex Bezae makes a number of modifications for reasons that are not always clear. The addition of τὸ ὄνοματος τούτος in ver. 1 was probably made in the interest of fullness of expression in accord with the Semitic love for cognate accusatives. The absence of καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ must be due to scribal idiosyncrasy, for other Western witnesses have the words. In ver. 2 the modification of καταγγέλλειν ἐν τῷ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀναστάσιν τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν into ἀναγγέλλειν τῶν Ἰησοῦν ἐν τῇ ἀναστάσιν ἐκ νεκρῶν is curious, to say the least. In ver. 3, after altering ἐπιθήλου into ἐπιθέλοντες the scribe of D, as Haenchen remarks, overlooked the need of omitting καὶ before ἔθνος (a subsequent corrector has deleted the superfluous word). In ver. 4 the addition of “also” in the sentence...
"and the number also of the men came to be about five thousand" (καὶ ἀριθμὸς ἡμῶν ὥς χιλιάδες ἦ), was probably intended to heighten the point of the statement, though it does so at the expense of good literary style.

4.1 Ἴρενέας [B]

The word Ἴρενέας occurs 31 times in the New Testament; the word ἀγγέλων occurs 122 times. It is more likely that scribes would have substituted the more frequently used word for the other than vice versa, especially since in this instance the modification was also in the interest of heightening the seriousness of the persecution. [112]

4.4 [A]

It is difficult to decide whether the passage originally stated that the number of the believers was five thousand (𝔓74 Β A 81 vg copsa, bo eth) and copyists added ὡς (B D 0165 1611) or ὡς (E P most minuscules), on the pattern of 2.41; or whether the qualifying word (which seems to be a favorite of Luke when referring to numbers) was dropped by scribes for whom the number 5000 had become a firmly fixed tradition.

To reflect the dubiety in the interpretation of the evidence the Committee preferred to retain ὡς, which is supported by B and D, but to enclose the word within square brackets. [4.5]

According to Chase the addition in codex Bezae of ἢμέρων after τὴν αἵρεσιν seems to reflect Semitic usage: "the Syriac Vulgate has לילה, where the word 'day' is necessary." [113]
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According to Harris the Greek side of Bezae was assimilated to the Bezan Latin, continent diem (but compare σμήνην ἡμέρα in Ac 20.26; Ro 11.8; 2 Cor 3.14).

4.6 Ιωάννης [A]

Both John and Alexander are unknown. Codex Bezae, in substituting Jonathan for John, agrees with information given by Josephus, who says that Jonathan, son of Annas, was appointed high priest in a.d. 36 in succession to Caiaphas (Antiquities vaciv:3).

Either the reading of Bezae is a correction of Luke, in accord with what may be historical fact, or scribes substituted the familiar name Ἰωάννης for the less familiar Ἰωάννης. A majority of the Committee was impressed by the former possibility, when considered in the light of the preponderance of external evidence.

4.8 προηγούμενος [B]

The addition of the words τοῦ Ἰσραήλ was probably made in the interest of symmetry and balance with the preceding τοῦ λαοῦ. The shorter text is supported by a diversified group of witnesses (𝔓74 Β A B 0165 629 1175 itar, c, ph vg copsa, bo eth Cyril Fulgentius).

4.10 Ερίκης [A]

After ἐρίκης several Western witnesses, including E eth syrhmg Cyprian Bede, add καὶ ἐν ἄλλω ὀφείλει. The words are obviously an intrusion from ver. 12. (See also the comment on ver. 12.)

4.12 καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐν ἄλλῳ ὀφείλει ἡ σωτηρία [A]
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Kilpatrick (following A. C. Clark) argues that the words καὶ ἐν ἄλλῳ ὀφείλει were original in ver. 10, but that after they had been accidentally omitted from that verse they were later inserted erroneously into ver. 12, with the addition of οὐκ ἐστὶν in order to make the insertion construe; but it construed with so little sense that ἡ σωτηρία was subsequently added, producing the current printed text. [123] Although each of these steps is possible, the combination of all of them appeared to the Committee to be highly improbable.

4.13-16

The Western text, preserved most fully in it6 and cop67, rewrites the account, emphasizing the perplexity of the Sanhedrin:

"Now when they all heard the firmness of Peter and John, convinced that they were uneducated and common men, they were amazed; (14) but seeing the lame man standing with them, cured, they could make no opposition in deed or word. But some of them recognized that they had been with Jesus. (Then they talked with each other [cop279].)"

Codex Bezae stands between the full-blown Western form of text and the text of most of the old uncials. The scribe of D omits καὶ ἀλλωταί (ver. 13), perhaps because the double expression ἀλλωταί εἶσαι καὶ ἀλλωταί seemed to depreciate the apostles too much. In order to heighten the Sanhedrin’s inability to cope with the situation, D inserts παρήγαγον ἃ after εἶχαν, “they had nothing to do or say in opposition” (ver. 14). For the more neutral, “When they [the Sanhedrin] commanded them to go aside (ἀπείρησιν) out of the council,” Bezae substitutes a more picturesque word, “... commanded that they should be led (ἀπείρησιν) out of the council” (ver. 15). Instead of saying simply that “it is clear” (φανερῶν) that a notable sign had been performed through the apostles, D enhances the account by using the comparative φανερότερον (instead of φανερῶτερον) in the elative sense, “it is all too clear” (ver. 16).

4.18 καὶ καλάσωστες αὐτοὺς [A]

Several Western witnesses (D ἀλτ. b syrhmg cop67 Lucifer) expand the text by replacing καὶ καλάσωστες αὐτοὺς with the circumstantial clause συγκεκαταβίαι δι memoir πάσων (ομ. πάσων D ith syrhmg) τῇ γνώμῃ (ομ. τῇ γνώμῃ ἱδίᾳ Lucifer) φανερώσατε αὐτοὺς ("And when they all had agreed to the decision, having called them ...")

4.18 το καθάλοι
The Alexandrian omission (only R* B) of τὸ in the expression παρθένου τὸ κυθῆλον μὴ ἐφάνεται was perhaps a precautionary measure, lest the reader suppose that the article was to be taken with the infinitive (compare Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 399, 3).

The reading of D ἅτος Lucifer, ἀποκριθεὶς ὑπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Ἰωάννου ἀποκριθέντος εἶτον

The Alexandrian omission (only B) of ἐκεῖνος εἶτον, which Kilkpatrick prefers to the ordinary text, is rather to be regarded as an alteration made in the interest of enhancing the position of Peter as chief speaker.

Manuscripts B and D unite in attesting ἐγενέσθαι, whereas all other witnesses read ἐγεγενέτο. According to Moulton-Howard, in the New Testament the augment of the pluperfect is usually dropped (Grammar, p. 190). They go on to comment that “in Attic writers the temporal augment is omitted, but not the syllabic, MSS and edd. notwithstanding (see e.g. Tit schendorf on Ae 4.22...)” In the light of the evidence that they produce to substantiate their dictum, it appears that ἐγεγενέτο is the result of the Atticistic revival in the early Christian centuries.

After ἐκεῖνος εἶτον D and copG67 add καὶ ἐπηγαγότες τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκήρυξαν (“And when they heard it, and recognized the working of God ...”), a clause which Harris was at first inclined to explain as a Montanist gloss, but which he subsequently described as “either a part of the primitive Greek text of the Acts or an extremely early Greek expansion, with a strong balance of probability in favour of the former.” The use of ἐκήρυξα here, as Blass had earlier observed, is in accord with the account of the interposition of divine providence in 3 Macc 4.21, with which Harris compares a similar usage in 3 Macc 5.12, 28 and 2 Macc 3.29. Against Harris’s strong preference for regarding the clause as original is the fact Luke nowhere else uses ἐκήρυξα (in the New Testament the word appears only in Paul).

The shortest form of text appears to be the oldest; the additions were doubtless made in the interest of heightening the apostles’ reverence in prayer. If one of the longer expressions were original, no scribe would have abbreviated it.

ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδὸς σου εἶπόν [C]

The text of this verse is in a very confused state. The reading of the old uncials is anomalous both grammatically (how is the phrase τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν to be construed?) and theologically (where else does God speak through the Holy Spirit?). Many attempts have been made to account for the confusion in the manuscripts. On his theory of a written Aramaic source Torrey reconstructed the text as follows: אָנָּא דָּהָיְפָי לָמוֹשׁ רָאוּי יִרְשָׁא דָּוִיר דָּבָּר אֱלֹהִים אִיר means, “That which our father, thy servant David, said by (or, by the command of) the Holy Spirit.” According to Torrey, this clear statement became chaotic when “the ἀγίου was lengthened into ἅτοσ (perhaps the most common of all accidents in Hebrew-Aramaic manuscripts, and here made especially easy by the preceding context) [and] the whole passage was ruined. ἀγίου ἅτοσ was of necessity ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, and every other part of our Greek text followed inevitably; there is no other way in which a faithful translator would have been likely to render it.”

Objections to this superficially attractive proposal can be made on psychological and grammatical grounds. According to Luke and Cadbury, “It is hard to believe that a writer of Luke’s general ability would have produced what Torrey rightly calls ‘an incoherent jumble of words,’ and... ἀγίου ἅτοσ (for ‘said it’) is regarded as harsh by some authorities on Aramaic idiom.”

According to an interesting theory first proposed by H. W. Moule,

“the words as we have them contain traces of three or more alternative ways of writing the sentence, any one of which could introduce the quotation ἀνεπιγνωσθείς διὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς ἡμῶν εἰπόν...

[Luke] knew his own marks for deletion or addition, but one of the earliest copyists misunderstood them, combined words which were really alternative, and thereby sowed the seed of confusion for all time. Some such theory as this is perhaps both simpler and less unlikely than those generally put forward.”

However the variant readings arose, it is widely agreed that (a) the more complicated readings could scarcely have arisen through additions to the simpler text of 049 056 0142 and most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus (for no adequate reason can be assigned why it should have been glossed so ineptly), and (b) the earliest attainable text appears to be that attested by P74 R A B E 33 cf. What the author wrote originally and what kind of textual corruption was responsible for the multiplication of variant readings are questions that have been answered variously. Lachmann traced all the trouble to the addition of the word πνεύματος (though surely ἅγιον is involved too, for to leave it in the text, as Lachmann does, results in the utterly unlikely expression διὰ ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ(δ)). Westcott and Hort, who marked the passage with an obelus indicating the presence of a primitive error, made two different suggestions concerning the origin of the error. According to Westcott, “a confusion of lines ending successively with Δαυὶδ ΧΧΧΑ ΔΑ may have brought πνεύματος ἁγίου too high up, and caused the loss of one διὰ.” According to Hort, “if τοῦ πατρὸς is taken as a corruption of τοῖς πατράρχαις, the order of words in [the W-H] text presents no difficulty, David (or the mouth of David) being represented as the mouth of the Holy Spirit.”
Recognizing that the reading of 1 Cor. 16:22 was unsatisfactory, the Committee nevertheless considered it to be closer to what the author wrote originally than any of the other extant forms of text.

Because it is not represented in the passage from Ps 2:1, which the author just quoted, the phrase in 1 Cor. 16:22 is omitted by Ps 1 168 462 al and the Textus Receptus. Not noticing that λαός Ἰσραήλ is plural because of parallelism with Ps 2:1, some witnesses (including E 3 326 Hilary Augustine Theophylact) read λαὸς Ἰσραήλ. The Peshitta has “synagogue (or, assembly [ ]) of Israel.”

The word βολῆ [ου] without σου is read by A* B Evid 945 1704 1739 ittig vgmss al, whereas βολῆ σου is read by Ḍ A2 D Ec vid P Y Byg al. In order to represent the balance of external evidence it was decided to include σου in the text but to enclose it within square brackets.

Instead of τὴν χειρὶ σου, read by Ḍ45 (ἰεκείνειν before τὴν χειρὶ σου) Ṍ DGR E P Y and most minuscules, a few witnesses have merely χειρὰ (§74 A (but σε ἰεκείνειν) B 1175 itd, gig Lucifer). It is difficult to determine whether the pronoun, which suits the character of the diction of prayer, was deleted by Atticizing copyists as superfluous with parts of the body, or was added from verses 27 and 29. In order to represent the balance of evidence and of probabilities, the Committee retained the word but enclosed it within square brackets.

At the end of the verse codex Bezae and some other witnesses (including E, certain Greek manuscripts known to Bede, vg* cop* Irenaeus Ephraem Augustin) add, a little naively but conformably to the spirit of the recital, παντὶ τῷ θελοντι πιστεύειν (“to every one who wished to believe”). According to Rendel Harris, “Its origin is evidently an attempt to assimilate the fulfilment of the prayer to the prayer itself which is in v. 29.

Hence we expect naturally the addition of πᾶντις, and a number of MSS. show it. (For example, the Gigas reads τοιουτων θερμα χωματισμιων αιανων σου cum fiducia omni logui verbum iustum.)
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by the line division has been read as a dative, and turned back into Greek as παντὶ with the result that it has itself become the subject of the expansion, in order to limit the extravagance of the statement and to round off the sentence.”

Although one may have reservations about the validity of the several steps in Harris’s ingenious theory, the words nevertheless are obviously an accretion to the text.

Page 284

After ἕνεκα several Western witnesses (D E Cyprian Zeno Ambrose) add καὶ σῶκ ἣν διάκρισιν (χωρισμάτων Ἐ) ἐν αὐτοῖς οὐδεμίᾳ (τις Ἐ) (“and there was no quarrel among them all” “[and there was not any division among them, E”). According to A. C. Clark, the shorter text was formed by the accidental omission of a stichos, facilitated by the presence of μιᾷ at the end of successive stichoi 128. On the other hand, since such an explanation fails to account for the reading of E, it is more likely that the Western reading is an expansion of the original text, made in the interest of emphasizing the unity of the primitive church.

Of the four major variant readings, that supported by 2 Cor. 4:5 049 056 1162 1262 133 69 326 440 522 623 920 1611 1827 is the more urbane expression, and since there is no fluctuation of witnesses in 4:35 and 5:2, it is altogether probable that in 4:37 the original reading was πρὸς τοῖς πόδας, which scribes altered so as to bring it into harmony with the adjacent passages 4:35 and 5:2. It should also be observed that the same tendency to alter the less elegant expression appears in 5:10, where πρὸς (A B D) is replaced in various witnesses by παρὰ or ἐπὶ or ὑπὸ.

Instead of ὁ Πέτρος, Αἰσχυλος reads Πέτρος πρὸς Ἀνανίαν. Did πρὸς come from partial dittography of Πέτρος, or is it the commonly received reading the result of accidental omission of the preposition and of the final ν (perhaps written as a horizontal line over the final ε) of Ἀνανία;? In view of the tendency of the Western text to expand readings, it is probable that the scribe of D filled out the expression either accidentally or deliberately (compare the insertion by E 321 syg* h w h*) cop* h* eth al of πρὸς αὐτῶν before or after Πέτρος).
Since the expression ἐπέλθωσαν ὁ Σατανᾶς τὴν καρδίαν σου seems somehow to involve an inappropriate use of the verb “to fill,” it has been argued that the original text read either ἐπέλθσαν or ἐπήλθσαν. It is more probable, however, that the reading ἐπέλθωσαν (“disabled, maimed”) arose through accidental omission of λ from ἐπέλθωσαν. In codex Sinaiticus (fol. 102, col. a, of the New Testament) the lines are arranged as follows (spaces are left between the words here):

λανᾶμα διατε εἰπή
ρύσσον ο σατανας
τὴν καρδίαν σοῦ
᾿εγκαλοσε σε τὸ
παίδι το αγίον και

From ἐπέλθωσαν it was an easy step, by itacism and connection ad sensum, to the production of the verb that above all others seems to be admisible avi καταφρονῶν (“tempted”)

But what seems to have been generally overlooked, as Girard has pointed out, is that the expression “to fill the heart” is a Hebraism that means “to dare (to do something).” Thus, in Ec 8.11: "Questa e καταφρονήσας κατατέθηκα..." the Septuagint translates literally: ἐπέλθωσαν αὐτοδίκαις αὐτῶν ἐπεζητάνει, and the Hebrew reads... "אָבִים תְּחִלָּת אֲדֹנִי לִשׁוֹא וגו..." which the Septuagint renders "Τις αὐτοὺς, διότι ἐκώμησι παρέχει τὸ πράγμα." For the Vulgate, Quis est iste... ut haec audae faceret? The combination, therefore, of superior external attestation and the possibility of explaining the idiom in terms of Semitizing Greek led the Committee to prefer the reading ἐπέλθωσαν.

In order to make the account in ver. 4 more vivid, codex Bezae reads παρέτεινε παρετείνω τοῦ, and to heighten the dramatic effect in ver. 5 it inserts before πωσῶν the adverb παραθέμα (from ver. 10).

Codex Bezae alters ver. 8 by replacing ἐπικρίθη with ἐλέεν and by rephrasing Peter’s inquiry, ἐπικρίθη ο ειλ ἔστη τὸ καρδιῶν τουσ κατά ἐπεζητάνει (“I will ask you if indeed you sold the land for so much”). In view of the use of the interrogative prefix ἐπικρίθη ἐπεζητάτιν ιμα in Lk 20.3, C. A. Phillips argued that the reading of codex Bezae in ver. 8 preserves a genuine Lukan trait. Cop reads, “Peter said to her, I asked you about the sale. Did you sell the garden for this money?”

In ver. 9 the expression τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου, which, apart from Old Testament quotations, is very rare in the New Testament, is replaced in ἐπέπλησαν 1838 geo by the more usual expression τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀγίου.

In ver. 10 the Greek text of codex Bezae adds συνετελείώτητι ("having wrapped her up"), derived from ver. 5.

After ἐπέπλησα several witnesses add ἐν τῷ ἑρμήνιον (D 42 copies, 67th ed). This is clearly an interpolation (which even Blass refused to admit into his Roman text of Acts), for according to the Western text of 3.11 Solomon’s portico was outside το ἑρμήνιον.

The ordinarily received text is difficult to interpret because καλλάθσα (meaning “to join”) seems to be inappropriate in the context (contrast ver. 14), and because the identity of τῶν λατρών is not disclosed. Among the attempts to clarify the verse, several conjectures may be mentioned. Pallis emended καλλάθσα αὐτῶς to καλλάθσα αὐτῶς, and adopted A. Hilgenfeld’s emendation of τῶν λατρών to λευκίτως, producing thereby the sentence, "And of the Levites none dared to prevent them [from holding meetings in the Temple precincts]."

Torrey conjectured that the original Aramaic was קרווש, "the elders," which was misread as קרווש, "the rest," the meaning being, "of the elders no one dared join himself to them; nevertheless the common people magnified them...multitudes both of men and women." Without resorting to an Aramaic original, Dibelius conjectured that τῶν δὲ λατρῶν came from τῶν ἀρχιτών. He writes, "The number of letters is the same, and the changes, at least from A to Α and from X to Χ, are easily understood. 'Of the leaders no one dared join them, but the people made much of them, and more believers than ever were won for the Lord.' Thus the sentence becomes intelligible." Against this proposal, however, is the disappearance of the connecting particle.
Instead of ἀνωτάτης it has “Annas,” which Bodelius, following Blass, was inclined to accept as original. But ἀνωτάτης, which is a favorite Lukan word (out of 107 occurrences in the New Testament, 26 appear in the third Gospel and 45 in Acts), in this passage reflects the usage of Septuagint Greek, where it is often little more than a copula. Furthermore, as Luke and Cadbury point out, “no reviser or scribe is likely to have objected to the inscription of the high priesthood to Annas, but ἀνωτάτης may easily have been read accidentally as “Ἀννας, especially after the phrase in 4.6-7.”

5.18 ἐδοξέως

Codex Bezae adds, with typical circumstantial detail, καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς ἕκαστος εἰς τὰ ίδια (“and each one went to his own home”). A similar sentence appears in the pericope de adulterina. [Jn] 7.53, ἐπορεύθην (D ἐπορεύθη) ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν άλοχον αὐτόν. The phrase εἰς τὰ ίδια is characteristic of John, but it is also found in Ac 21.6.

5.21-22

The Western text of these verses is variously preserved in D E and other witnesses. Instead of the opening words ἀνάκοινως, D, E reads ἐξελάθοντες ἐκ τῆς φυλακῆς, which is received by Blass into his Roman form of the text. Codex Bezae paints more vividly the circumstances of the trial by adding a phrase that is analogous to the reading of D in ver. 18: “the high priest came and those who were with him, having risen early, and ἐγείρθην ὅ τι πρῶτο καὶ καλλιεργήσαντο” called together the council.” In ver. 22 the Western text (D itp vg syrhmg) adds the detail, “But when the officers came and opened the prison (καὶ ἀνοίξαντες τὴν φυλακήν, they did not find them inside (ἐν οἷς D).”

5.28 [ο]ί [παρα]γγειλέα [C]

A majority of the Committee interpreted the absence of ὦ from several witnesses as due to their copyists’ desire to transform thereby the high priest’s question into a rebuke. In view, however, of the weight of the external evidence supporting the shorter reading, it was decided to print ὦ within square brackets.

[From the standpoint of transcriptional probability, it appears that ὦ is a scribal addition, occasioned by the influence of the verb ἐτρήθην in ver. 27 (compare 4.17). For this reason, as well as the strong combination of ἐτρήθην in ver. 24, D* E* P (A* B* Dgr* 915 vg syrh copsa Irenaeus Augustine, seems to be an ancient transcriptional error (ἐτρήθην) which a careless reader might have objected to the ascription of the high priesthood to Annas, but ἀνωτάτης may easily have been read accidentally as “Ἀννας, especially after the phrase in 4.6-7.”

5.32 ἐσμένει μάρτυρες [B]

A majority of the Committee regarded the reading ἐσμένει μάρτυρες (F74 Κ (A) Dgr* 915 vg syrh copsa, bo α] to be original. The insertion of αὐτός (D E P (K) Byza) doubtless reflects recollection of the words of Jesus reported in 1.6, καὶ ἔστη μου μάρτυρες. The words ἐν αὐτῷ (which in B replace ἐσμένει) appear to be the result of scribal inadvertence; perhaps they are somehow connected with the Western variant at the close of ver. 41 (see the preceding variant).

5.32ν

The omission of ὦ by B and a few other witnesses was probably accidental. The masculine gender ὦ (D* E) appears to be a theological correction ad sensum. There may be, as Ropes suggests, some deeper but hidden factor which led to the omission of both ὦ and ὦ in the B-text of this verse.

5.33 ἔβαλον [B]

A majority of the Committee interpreted the context as favoring ἔβαλον (which occurs 13 times elsewhere in Acts), for the members of the Sanhedrin, being enraged, were scarcely in a mood quietly to take counsel. The reading ἔβαλεν (a word that occurs elsewhere in Acts only in 27.39) seems to have arisen accidentally through a scribal blunder.

5.34 τοὺς ἀντίθέτους

Copyists no doubt deemed the expression τοὺς ἀντίθέτους (K A B vg copbs ara) too undignified for Luke’s narrative (it reappears in Gamaliel’s speech in verses 26 and 29) and substituted τοὺς ἀποστόλους (so the Textus Receptus, following D E H P most minuscules syrp, h copsa eth). The declarative form of the B-text is witnessed as early as the second and third century in Polycrates’s letter to Pope Victor (quoted in Eusebius, Eccl. hist., v.xxiv.7), Origen (contra Celsum, en.vi.26), and Hippolytus (c. Noet, 6 fin.).

5.31

The Western reading, “God exalted him for his glory” (τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ), supported by D itig, p copbs Ireneaeus Augustine, seems to be an ancient transcriptional error (ἐξαλλῇ for ἐξέλλῃ). Nestle draws attention to the same confusion in the manuscripts of the Septuagint at 2 Chr 30.8 and Is 62.8.

The presence of ἐν αὐτῷ (D* itd, h, p copbs etho Augustine) after ἄβαλον ἀνατιμήσεως appears to be a typical Western expansion. (See also the next variant.)

5.32νν

The omission of ὦ by B and a few other witnesses was probably accidental. The masculine gender ὦ (D* E) appears to be a theological correction ad sensum. There may be, as Ropes suggests, some deeper but hidden factor which led to the omission of both ὦ and ὦ in the B-text of this verse.

5.33νν ἔβαλεν [B]

A majority of the Committee interpreted the context as favoring ἔβαλεν (which occurs 13 times elsewhere in Acts), for the members of the Sanhedrin, being enraged, were scarcely in a mood quietly to take counsel. The reading ἔβαλεν (a word that occurs elsewhere in Acts only in 27.39) seems to have arisen accidentally through a scribal blunder.

5.34νν τοὺς ἀντίθετους

Copyists no doubt deemed the expression τοὺς ἀντίθετους (K A B vg copbs ara) too undignified for Luke’s narrative (it reappears in Gamaliel’s speech in verses 26 and 29) and substituted τοὺς ἀποστόλους (so the Textus Receptus, following D E H P most minuscules syrp, h copsa eth). The declarative form of the B-text is witnessed as early as the second and third century in Polycrates’s letter to Pope Victor (quoted in Eusebius, Eccl. hist., v.xxiv.7), Origen (contra Celsum, en.vi.26), and Hippolytus (c. Noet, 6 fin.).

5.31νν

The declarative form of the B-text is witnessed as early as the second and third century in Polycrates’s letter to Pope Victor (quoted in Eusebius, Eccl. hist., v.xxiv.7), Origen (contra Celsum, en.vi.26), and Hippolytus (c. Noet, 6 fin.).

5.31νν

The declaration of the B-text is witnessed as early as the second and third century in Polycrates’s letter to Pope Victor (quoted in Eusebius, Eccl. hist., v.xxiv.7), Origen (contra Celsum, en.vi.26), and Hippolytus (c. Noet, 6 fin.).
itacism). In 33 Old Latin vg (and the Textus Receptus) the reading προσκλήθη is an interpretation of or substitution for προσκλήθη.

5.36 ἄνεργηθη
Instead of using ἄνεργηθη to describe the death of Theudas, the Greek text of codex Bezae (but not itd or ith) employs the curious expression δυσεκθην ἀπό τοῦ αὐτοῦ (“he was destroyed by himself”). (The same verb is used more idiomatically in verses 38 and 39.) Bezae’s account of Theudas’s suicide is contrary to that of Josephus, who expressly says that Theudas, having been captured alive, was beheaded (Antiquitates, xx.v:1) – or is the disagreement between the two accounts an added argument supporting the theory that Josephus and Acts refer to two different persons with the same name?

5.37 λαον [A] This verse provides a clear example of a growing text. Dissatisfied with the unadorned account that Judas the Galilean “drew away some of the people after him” (ἀπεστησεν λαὸν ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ), various scribes undertook to heighten the account by the addition of παλιὸν or ἵκων before or after λαον. It is significant that the Latin text of codex Bezae agrees with the earlier and shorter reading.

5.38-39 The Western text has, as Lake and Cadbury admit, “a vigorous and attractive paraphrase,” which Rendel Harris was tempted to regard as possibly original. In the following translation the chief expansions are italicized: “So in the present case, brethren, I tell you, keep away from these men and let them go, without defiling your hands; for if this plan or this undertaking is of human origin, it will fail; (39) but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them – neither you nor kings nor tyrants. Therefore keep away from these men. lest you be found opposing God!” (For each expansion, see the following comments.)

5.38 νῦν After νῦν D itd copG67 add ἀδελφοί (compare a similar addition in the Western text of 20.18). Harris suspected the Western addition μὴ μάνοντες (μαλβονευτες Ε) τὰς χείρας (+ ἵκων E ith) of D E itd copG67 to be of Montanian origin. (For each expansion, see the following comments.)

5.39 αἵτωσ [A] The expansion in D, ὅσον ἵκως ὅσε βασιλεῖς ὅσε τίραννοι· ἀπέχεατο ὦν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων (similarly 614 1108 1611 2138 syrh with * copG67), doubtless shows the influence of a passage in the Wisdom of Solomon where the writer is dealing with the same problem as in Acts, namely the question whether it is safe to oppose God. The passage (Wis 12.13 f.) is as follows: ὅσον γὰρ θὰς ἐστίν πλὴν σου ἀοῦ... ὅσε βασιλεῖς ἢ τίραννοι, ἀντοφθαλμήσαι δυνάσθησαν τοῖς ἐν τοῖς ἐκλάσασθεν (“For neither is there any God besides thee....nor can any king or tyrant confront thee about those whom thou hast punished”). In E the word τίραννοι (which is not a New Testament word) is replaced by ἀρχιερεῖς, but at the expense of the sense, for now Gamaliel seems to refer to the Sanhedrin twice (“neither you...nor rulers”).

The addition of ἀπέχεατο ὦν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τούτων is, as Weiss characterizes it, “an empty repetition of ver. 38; but it serves at the same time as an appropriate connection for the following μὴ...κατ...”.

5.41 ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος After ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος copE itd and codex Vaticanus add the phrase ἐν τῷ διακονεῖ τῶν Ἑβραίων (“in the ministration of the Hebrews”), which is quite superfluous in view of the preceding context. Old Latin h reads a ministris Hebraecorum, representing ὑπὸ τῶν ἑδακτῶν τῶν Ἑβραίων (“by the ministers of the Hebrews”).

6.1 Codex Bezae and codex Vaticanus have each altered the opening words of the verse in accord with the predilections of its scribe. The former (supported by itd and copG67) prefaces the suggestion made by the apostles with an introductory interrogative phrase, ὃν εἶπον εὐσταίχον οὖσαν (“If you heard that at Theudas”) which lends a colloquial touch to the narrative (compare also the Western readings mentioned at 2.37 and 5.8). The phrase seems to have come to the present passage from 21.22.

The unique reading ἐπισφυσάθηκα in codex Vaticanus, as Ropes remarks, is probably “due to the desire not to exclude the apostles from a share in the selection of the Seven. It is clearly inconsistent with vs. 6 in the usual text. Perhaps the ‘Western’ ἐπισφυσάθηκα in the latter verse has arisen from the same motive.”

6.2 ἀδέλφοι [B] The reading ὦν is so appropriate in the context that, if it were original, there would have been no reason why the other readings should have arisen. The Committee agreed with Tischendorf (ad loc.) that the presence of ἀδέλφοι in both the preceding and following sentences prompted scribes to alter ὦν in this verse (Κ B copsa) to either ἀδί (Α) or ὄν (C E P ώς 33 614 1739 Byc, followed by the Textus Receptus), or to omit it entirely (Ρ74 copsa arm eth geo α�). The conflation ὄν ovo is read by 1175.

6.3 πνεύματος It was natural for scribes to add ἐγίων after πνεύματος (A C H P S vg copsa eth), and the word passed into the Textus Receptus. The shorter text is supported by P98, 74 K B D 431 614 2412 syrh Chrysostomos.

6.4 ἐλλήνων The Western text (D itd copG67) adds τῶν μαθητῶν λεγοντος τοῦ πλῆθους be taken to refer to the non-Christian multitude.

6.5 μάθηται
The undeclinable form πλήρης, read by A C D E H P and many minuscules, was corrected in B and several minuscules to πλήρη, a reading that passed into the Textus Receptus.

6.5 Τίμωμαι

Instead of Τίμωμαι Old Latin h reads Simonem. Since the name Τίμωμαι is unique in the Bible, it is altogether probable that a scribe (or translator) misread the Greek name as Simon, a name more familiar to readers of the New Testament.144

In the present verse the Committee preferred ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, which, in view of ver. 2, seems to be the more appropriate reading, and which is supported by superior external evidence (including Ψ74 A B C 33 1739 itg syrp copsa, bo). Instead of τῶν ἑρήμων (Ψ74 A B C D al) is to be preferred to the more commonplace τῶν Ἰουδαίων (Ῥ* 142 424 453 2401 al syrp) and to the obviously corrupt τῶν ἑρήμων that underlies ἵν (in tempio). The earlier text describes Stephen as a man “full of grace” (χάριτος, with Ψ74 A B D vg syrp copsa, bo arm). The later text was assimilated to ver. 5. “Full of faith” (πίστις) with H P S most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus. Both readings are conflated in E (χάριτος καὶ πίστις).145

6.8 λαῷ

The Western text adds διὰ τοῦ ἀνάμοιον τοῦ κήρυκα Θεοῦ ὁ Χριστός (D 5 33 431 453 876 2412 copsa Augustine), an interpolation probably derived from 4.30.

6.9 Λιβυρτίνων

Since the other synagogues mentioned in this verse are named from countries, and since there were freedmen in every country, many scholars from Beza onwards have suggested that instead of Λιβυρτίνων we should read Λιβυστίνων or Λιβυστίνων (“Libyans”).146 Schulthess proposed Λιβυδάκων τῶν κατὰ Κυρήνην (compare 2.10). One of the Arabic versions reads “Corinthians.”

In Ropes’s opinion, the explanation “Libyans,” which is quoted from Chrysostom in the Armenian catena and is found in the Armenian vulgate text, may be an interpretation, not a variant reading.147

On the other hand, it is possible, as Lake and Cadbury suggest (in loc.), that the Greek text refers to only one synagogue; thus, the NEB renders the verse: “But some members of the synagogue called the Synagogue of Freedmen, comprising Cyrenians and Alexandrians and people from Cilicia and Asia, came forward and argued with Stephen.”

With this interpretation emendation is not necessary, and even on the usual view that several synagogues are intended, there is no compelling reason to depart from the text of the Greek witnesses.

6.9 καὶ Ἀσίας

The omission of καὶ Ἀσίας from A D* l60 seems to have been accidental, occasioned by parablepsis (compare the similar ending of Κυλλῶν, which immediately precedes).

6.10-11

A Western expansion, in slightly different forms, appears in D E νδες καὶ ἡμῖν καὶ τὸν Κῆρυς. Since the name is unique in the Bible, it is altogether probable that a scribe (or translator) misread the Greek name as Κηρύξ, which immediately precedes).

The word ἀναφερθηκειν is used in Wsd 12.14, a passage that may have influenced the Western reviser of Ac 5.39.

6.13 λαλῶν ῥήματα

Instead of λαλῶν ῥήματα the Textus Receptus reads ῥήματα ἀνάρρημα λαλίκων with E H P al arm; ἀνάρρημα is an interpolation from ver. 11.

6.13 [τοῦτον]

The phrase κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἄγγελου (Ψ74 A D E H P Ψ 066 0175 itgig vg arm eth) refers, of course, to the temple. The addition of τοῦτον after ἄγγελου (B C 33 69 1739 syr P e`stw/toj evn me,sw| auvtw/n) allows (if indeed it does not require) the phrase to refer to the place of assembly of the Sanhedrin, which may have been situated on the Temple Mount on the western side of the enclosing wall.

The omission may have occurred accidentally (many words in the context end in -οι), or the word may have been deleted because the scene, according to ver. 12, took place in the assembly room of the Sanhedrin, for which a reference suited to the temple was inappropriate. On the other hand, the word may have crept into the text from the next verse, where the text is firm.

In view of the balance of these possibilities the Committee decided to retain the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

6.15 ἀγγέλου

After ὅσιον ἀγγέλου the Greek text of codex Bezae (supported by itgG67) adds the phrase ἀνήθητοι ἐν μίσος ἄστων (“all who sat in the council saw that his face was like the face of an angel standing in their midst”). Since, however, the Latin text of
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Bezae reads stans in medio eorum. Harris argues that the nominative form of the participle shows that the gloss originally belonged to the first verse of the following chapter, describing the position of the high priest “standing in their midst” (compare Mk 14.60). But this explanation overlooks the fact that what is needed to describe the action of the high priest is not merely that he was standing, but that (as the Markan passage shows) he stood up in their midst and spoke; the gloss therefore belongs (as the Greek text of Bezae indicates) with what precedes.

7.1 After εἶπεν ἐκ τοῦ ἄρχοντος the Western text (D E itgig, h vgms copG67) adds the very natural supplement καὶ Στεφάνῳ.

7.3-4 Several Old Latin witnesses (including it²⁷ α τη) remove the clause μετά τοῦ ἰπτάθην τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν from its place in ver. 4 and insert it just before ver. 2. Probably the motive for this alteration was to bring the text into closer accord with the interpretation that the ordinary reader of the Textus Receptus reads stásia ("wheat, grain") with H P and many minuscules, whereas ἰπτάθην occurs only here in the New Testament, and only once in the Septuagint (Pr 30.22); scribes would therefore be tempted to assimilate it to the more frequently used σίτιον, which occurs 14 times in the New Testament, and 79 times in the Septuagint.

7.13 ἐκατέργασίας
It is probable that scribes changed the verb ἐκατέργασιας (ってしまった C D E H P most minuscules) to the simple form ἐκατέργασια (A B itp vg) because the compound form seems to imply that Joseph had also made himself known to his brothers on their first visit to Egypt. (According to Brooke and McLean, in the Septuagint of 45.1 three manuscripts read ἐκαταργησία for ἐκαταργησία.)

7.13 τοῦ Ιωσήφ
The Textus Receptus, following D H P and many minuscules, reads τοῦ Ιωσήφ, whereas the article is absent from B C 88 90 915 al, and instead of τοῦ Ιωσήφ Ν A E 181 1895 vg arm al read αὐτοῦ.

The Committee was divided in its evaluation of the evidence. Some members regarded αὐτοῦ as original and thought that copyists replaced it with Ιωσήφ or τοῦ Ιωσήφ for the sake of perspicuity. Others held that since Joseph had already been mentioned in the previous clause, scribes were led by stylistic considerations to substitute αὐτοῦ for the proper name. It was finally decided that the least unsatisfactory solution was to print τοῦ enclosed within square brackets.

7.16 ἐν Χεισραήμ [C]
The author has combined the accounts of two transactions: (a) Abraham bought a burial plot from Ephron the Hittite in Machpelah east of Hebron (Gn 33.19; Gn 49.31; 50.13), and (b) Joseph was buried in a plot that Jacob bought from the sons of Hamor, the father of Shechem (Gn 33.19; Jos 24.32). Except for the two passages just mentioned, in the Old Testament Shechem is always the name of a place, not of a person. The variant readings in Ac 7.16 reflect the two traditions concerning the name Shechem, except that the Western and Antiochian texts reverse the relationship, making Shechem the father instead of the son of Hamor. In seeking an explanation to account for the curious reading τοῦ (p774 Dgr al), it should be observed that the Harlean Syriac reads “who was from Shechem”; could it be that πατήρ or αὐτός has fallen out of the archetype of the Western group of witnesses?

All things considered, the Committee judged ἐν to be the least unsatisfactory reading, supported, as it is, by Ν* B C 88 1739 copsa, bo, fay arm geo al.

7.17 ἐκκατάργησαν [B]
The verb ἐκκατάργησαν (ἐκκατάργησαν) is used frequently throughout the Septuagint to render בקר. On the other hand, ἐκκατάργησαν and ἐπαργήσεσαν are used infrequently in the Septuagint (ἐκκατάργησαν occurs a total of 14 times and ἐπαργήσεσαν occurs 11 times; neither verb appears in the Pentateuch or the historical books). It is probable, therefore, that in the present passage scribes substituted ἐκκατάργησα for one of the other two verbs. Furthermore, since the verb ἐκκατάργησα acquired a technical meaning in the early church...
("to make one’s confession"). There was added reason for copyists to alter it here. The verb ἐπιγγέλειν may have arisen as an echo of the previous τῆς ἐπιγγέλειας.

7.18 [ἐπ'] Ἀγίωντος [C]

On the one hand, if the shorter reading be regarded as original, it is easy to see how Ex 1:8 in the Septuagint (ἀνείπετο δὲ βασιλέως ἔτερος ἐπ’ Ἀγίωντος, δὲ οἷς ήτε τοῦ Τοσσήν) would have influenced scribes to insert the phrase, ἐπ’ Ἀγίωντος. It may have arisen as an echo of the previous.

Hilgenfeld, followed by A. C. Clark, accepted the reading of codex Bezae as original, αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφισάκεκυκέν Μωίσης (E reads ἐφισάκεκυκέν καὶ ἴοις, which means that the verb is transitive, with ὁ ἄρτος of ver. 27 understood as the subject). The word φυγάδευσιν appears nowhere else in the New Testament; in the Septuagint it occurs both transitively and intransitively, but generally the latter. Although it is just possible that the more commonly used verb φεύγων may be a corruption of the less usual φυγάδευσιν, on the whole the Western reading has little to recommend it in the face of the overwhelming weight of evidence against it (all other witnesses support ἐφισάκεκυκέλ καὶ ἴοις).

7.20 [ἐφισάκεκυκέλ

The Western and the Antiochian texts (D H P S 614 syr. h arm eth Augustine) insert κυρίον, a natural addition, especially in the light of Ex 3:2. The AV follows the expanded text with "an angel of the Lord."

7.31-34

The manuscript copG67 is unique in making extensive additions to Stephen’s account from the Old Testament and from tradition: "... as he [Moses] drew near to look (there came the voice of the Lord saying),
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the Lord spoke to him in a voice saying, Moses, Moses! But he said, Who art thou, Lord? But he said to him, Do not draw near to this place. Take thy shoes off thy feet, for the place on which thou standest is a holy ground. Then (the Lord) God said to him (Moses), Loose the sandals from thy feet, for the place where thou art standing is holy ground. Seeing I have seen the oppression of my people in Egypt, and thou wilt bring my people, the children of Israel, out of the land of Egypt and wilt bring them out of that land and take them into another land, which is good and plentiful, a land abundant with milk and honey, the place of the Canaanites and Hittites and Amorites and Phereites and Jebusites. And the cry of the children of Israel has come up to me, some of the sufferings with which the Egyptians have afflicted them. Now come, and I send thee to Pharaoh, the king of Egypt, and thou wilt bring my people, the children of Israel, out of the land of Egypt."
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7.33 εἶπαν & αὐτῷ ὅ κύριος

Instead of the commonplace introductory clause, "And the Lord said to him," codex Bezae substitutes the more colorful expression, καὶ ἔγνωντο φωνή ὧν αὐτῶν...("And there came a voice to him, ‘Loose the shoes...’")

7.34 αὐτῶν

Since the singular number αὐτῶν (B D 321 1838 syr) is the more correct form grammatically (it refers to τοῦ λαοῦ), it is probable that αὐτῶν (ἢ) C E H P nearly all minuscules and versions) is the original reading that was altered by punctilious scribes.
Instead of “our fathers” several witnesses (including 36 81 242 24 01 copG67 geo Ireneaus) read “your fathers.” (See also the comment on ver. 38.)

Instead of “book of the prophets” copG67 reads “Amos the prophet.” (See also the comment on ver. 48.)

The absence of καὶ after θεός in ᾽Ιησοῦς, 74 N* A C and many other witnesses, as well as the more deliberate emphasis that its presence gives to the text (“both ruler and deliverer”), led some members of the Committee to regard the word as a scribal addition. On the other hand, the strong external support in its favor (including B D) made other members of the Committee reluctant to omit the word entirely. As a compromise it was decided to retain the word enclosed within square brackets.

The reading γῆ Αλιγέπτου (𝔓74 Dgr 1611 1739 vg syrp, h al) is obviously a correction of γῆ Αλιγέπτου (𝔓 A E N P 81 many minuscules). The witnesses of both readings, however, unite in their support of γῆ against τῆ, which is read by B C 38 69 94 255 307 itd copsa. The Septuagint text at Ex 2.14, to which the present passage seems to allude, reads γῆ. Although normally the Committee preferred readings that depart from the Septuagint, in this case the palaeographical possibility that scribes misconstrued θαλαγγυτός for the more usual (and therefore more to be expected) θαλαγγυτός was regarded as the probable explanation for the emergence of scattered witnesses attesting τῆ. A few secondary witnesses (4 122* 181 241 460 1898 2180) omit both γῆ and τῆ, reading simply Αλιγέπτου.

The original text, ᾧ θεός (𝔓74 N A B D 81 vg copsa, bo eth), has undergone various expansions. Since the Septuagint reads κύριος before ᾧ θεός (1 L18.15), it was natural for scribes to insert the word here (C E H P al). Later the expression was expanded still more (through assimilation to κύριος by the addition of ήμῶν [E H and most minuscules] or ήμων [P some minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus]). At the end of the verse the addition of the words εἰς τὸν Ἰουδαίον θεόν (“You shall hear him” [referring to the Messiah]), is a scribal assimilation to 1 L18.15 and/or Ac 3.22, which is read by C D E most minuscules vg syrp, h copbo arm eth, followed by the Textus Receptus.

As usual the manuscripts differ in their testimony to the first and second person plural pronouns, which, being pronounced alike, were constantly confused by scribes. It appears from the context that what is needed is ήμιν (A C D al), for Stephen does not wish to disassociate himself from those who received God’s revelation in the past, but only from those who misinterpreted and disobeyed that revelation. The erroneous ήμας is read by ᾽Ιησους B 36 76 257 307 467 489 913 1838 2138 copsa, bo geo. (See also the comment on ver. 39.)
was first rendered by τῷ κυρίῳ ὀνειδ., and then this unusual expression corrupted to the familiar-sounding but inappropriate phrase τῷ θεῷ ὀνειδ. 166

Not all scholars, however, are agreed that the reading οὐδὲ is so lacking in sense as to require conjectural emendation. Lake and Cadbury, for example, remark that “after all, the Temple, like the Tabernacle, was a house or tent ‘of meeting,’ and it was to be used by the house of Jacob as well as by the Almighty.” 167 Furthermore, as Klijn points out, “the Temple, like the Tabernacle, was a house or tent ‘of meeting,’ and it was to be used by the house of Jacob as well as by the Almighty.” 168

Furthermore, as Klijn points out, “the Temple, like the Tabernacle, was a house or tent ‘of meeting,’ and it was to be used by the house of Jacob as well as by the Almighty.” 168 Not all scholars, however, are agreed that the reading οὐδὲ is so lacking in sense as to require conjectural emendation. Lake and Cadbury, for example, remark that “after all, the Temple, like the Tabernacle, was a house or tent ‘of meeting,’ and it was to be used by the house of Jacob as well as by the Almighty.” 167

It is difficult to decide the textual problem involving the presence or absence of the article. Since in the New Testament Samaria denotes the district, not the city of that name, the phrase εἰς τὴν πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρίας means “to the [main] city of Samaria.” But which city did Luke intend by this circumlocution; was it Sebaste, the name given by Herod the Great to the city previously called Samaria, or was it Neapolis (Nablus), the ancient Shechem, the religious headquarters of the Samaritans? 169 And why did he choose to refer to it without mentioning its name? It is not probable that he thought that Samaria had only one city.

On the other hand, the reading without the article (“to a city of Samaria”) makes excellent sense in the context, and is the natural antecedent for the reference in ver. 8, where the author states that “there was much joy in that city.” 169

The Committee was of the opinion that the external evidence supporting the article (φῗ 74 Ρ A B 69 181 460* 1175 1898) was so strong that the word ought not be omitted. After “prophet” cop. 74 adds “Isaiah” (see also the comment on ver. 42).
“one of those tricks of mental ‘telescoping’ to which all writers are liable,” and that, as such, “it is one of several indications in the text that it was never finally revised.”

8.9 καλομήν

Struck by the syntax of the expression λέγων εἶναι τὸν ἱνάτου μὲν ἔργον, several scholars have proposed emendations. Valckenier, van de Sande Bakhuyzen, and Blass regard μὲν as an interpolation. Bowyer, Mangey, van Manen, and (tentatively) Lake and Cadbury prefer to read μένον. In view, however, of ver. 10, which may illustrate what Lake and Cadbury thought was Luke’s tendency to repeat a word soon after he has used it, it seems best to retain μὲνον. 128

8.10 καλομήν [A]

The awkward καλομήν is omitted by the later Byzantine text; it is replaced by λέγομην in several minuscules. Klostermann thought that Μεγάλη was a transliteration of the Samaritan מֶגָּלָה or מִגָּלָה.

meaning “he who reveals, the revealer,” in which case καλομήν apologizes for the foreign term (compare 1:12; 3:11; 8:9).

8.18 πίνακας [B]

A majority of the Committee was of the opinion that the shorter reading, although supported by only Β copa Apostolic Constitutions, was to be preferred to the reading of the overwhelming mass of witnesses, for after τὸ πίνακα the addition of τὸ δέγαν was as natural for Christian scribes to make as its deletion would be inexplicable.

8.19 δέγαν

In order to strengthen Simon’s request the Western text (D ἐπὶ οὖν inserts παρακαλέων καὶ) before λέγων (compare ver. 24 where παρακαλέω occurs in D ιτίγ συργ); the combination of verbs is not infrequent, e.g. Mt 8:5, 3:1; 18:29; Mc 5:12, 23; Ac 2:40; 16:9, 15.

8.24 ἐπ’ ἑμὶ ὧν εἰρῆκατε [A]

The Bezan text differs from that of other witnesses in several striking particulars: “And Simon answered and said to them, ‘I beseech you, pray for me to God, that none of these evils of which you have spoken to me may come upon me’ – who did not stop weeping copiously.” The last clause is attached so awkwardly to the close of the sentence that Blass conjectured καὶ for the οὐ of D, which reads…δέποι μὴν ἐπέλθῃ μοι ταύτων τῶν κακῶν ὧν εἰρήκατε μοι, ὡς πολλά κληρίων ὧν ἤκληταν. The addition gives the suggestion that Simon’s tears are of remorse and perhaps of repentance; in the Clementine tradition Simon’s tears are tears of rage and disappointment (Clem. Hom. xx:21; Revog. x:63).

Curiously the verb διαλυόμασται appears again in codex Bezae at 17.13 and nowhere else in the New Testament.

8.33 πατερεῖος [αὐτοῦ]

The pronoun αὐτοῦ, present in most witnesses, is absent from τῇ 74 Β 103 629 1642* 1739c vg al. Although such testimony in support of the shorter text generally carries conviction of originality, in this case, since the Septuagint text of 53.8 lacks αὐτοῦ, copyists would have been tempted to conform the New Testament quotation to the Old Testament text. In order to represent the conflict between external evidence and transcriptional probability, it was thought best to include αὐτοῦ in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

8.35 Cop67 reads, “Then Philip took his beginning from the scripture, and now he was in the spirit; he began to explain to him from the scripture, (and) preached the Lord Jesus Christ to him.”

8.37 omit verse [A]

Ver. 37 is a Western addition, not found in 345, 74 Β 103 81 614 vg syrh, h copa, bo eth, but is read, with many minor variations, by E, many minuscules, itig, h vgsx syrh with * copG67 arm. There is no reason why scribes should have omitted the material, if it had originally stood in the text. It should be noted too that τῶν Ἱερού Χριστοῦ is not a Lukan expression.

The formula πατέρας…Χριστοῦ was doubtless used by the early church in baptismal ceremonies, and may have been written in the margin of a copy of Acts. Its insertion into the text seems to have been due to the feeling that Philip would not have baptized the Ethiopian without securing a confession of faith, which needed to be expressed in the narrative. Although the earliest known New Testament manuscript that contains the words dates from the sixth century (ms. E), the tradition of the Ethiopian’s confession of faith in Christ was current as early as the latter part of the second century, for Irenaeus quotes part of it (Against Heresies, 1.xii:8).

Although the passage does not appear in the late medieval manuscript on which Erasmus chiefly depended for his edition

8.39 πίνακας [A]

Instead of πίνακας κυρίου several witnesses, including A (correction by the first hand) 36a 94 103 307 323 385 467 1739 2298 itp vgsx syrh with * arm Ephraem Jerome Augustine (D is defective here), read πίνακας δέγαν ἐπέλθῃν εἰς τὸν εἶναι ἐνακολ., ἠγγίζας δὲ (“the Holy Spirit fell on the eunuch, and an angel of the Lord caught up Philip”). Some scholars, holding the longer reading to be original, have explained its absence in the other witnesses as due either to accidental omission or to deliberate excision because of its variance with the account in verses 15–18, where it is implied that the Holy Spirit was bestowed only through the laying on of the hands of the apostles.

On the other hand, most scholars have been impressed by the weight of attestation supporting the shorter text as well as by the probability that the words were added in order (a) to make explicit that the baptism of the Ethiopian was followed by the gift of
the Holy Spirit, and (h) to conform the account of Philip’s departure to that of his commission (by an angel of the Lord, ver. 26).

9.2 τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντος

There are six variant readings: τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντος (B C E H L P many minuscules), ὄντας τῆς ὁδοῦ (§74 δ Α 81 88 242 323 467 915 1739 2298), τῆς ὁδοῦ ὅταν ὄντας (181 1838 α), ὄντας τῆς ὁδοῦ τετάρτης (104), τῆς ὁδοῦ (33 429* 522 1175 1871 1891 copsa, bo), τῆς ὁδοῦ τετάρτης (the vg). It is clear that τετάρτης was introduced at various positions by scribes who wished thereby to relieve the peculiarity of the term ὁδός, used here for the first time in reference to Christianity. The choice between the reading of B C αl and of τῆς ὁδοῦ (§74 δ Α 81 1739 seems to depend upon which order would have appeared more difficult and therefore more likely

to be altered to an easier sequence. It is probable that scribes, in order to prevent the reader from taking ὄντας chiefly with what follows (“being both men and women”), moved the participle nearer τυχός.

9.4-5 διαδίκαιος

The clause σκεληρός σαυροτόνησεν is included after διαδίκαιος (ver. 4) in E 431 vgms syrp, h with * Petilianus Jerome Augustine; and after διαδίκαιος (ver. 5) in ittg, h, p vgms Lucifer Ambrose. Although Clark argued that it would have been “inartistic” of Luke not to include the clause in one or the other verses (Clark prefers ver. 4), it is more probable that the words were introduced by copyists who assimilated the passage to the account of Paul’s conversion given in 26.14, where the clause follows διαδίκαιος (the text is firm). In support of this judgment is the lack of any reason that would satisfactorily account for the omission of the clause from verses 4 or 5, had it stood there originally. Likewise, it is always suspicious when a variant reading, which agrees with a parallel passage, has no fixed location but vacillates between two points of attachment in Western witnesses.

9.5-6 διαδίκαιος ἀλλὰ

After διαδίκαιος (and omitting ἀλλὰ of ver. 6) the Textus Receptus adds σκεληρὸς σαυροτόνησεν πρὸς κύριον λακτιζέων. (6) τρέψω τε καὶ ἄθρωμα ἔπει, κύριε, τί με θέλεις ποιήσῃ; καὶ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν, which is rendered in the AV as follows: “it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.” And he trembling and astonished said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him.” So far as is known, no Greek witness reads these words at this place; they have been taken from 26.14 and 22.10, and are found here in codices of the Vulgate, with which ıth, p syrh with * cor(G67) substantially agree (all except the Vulgate add after ἄθρωμα the words ἄπλος τὸ γραφήται αὐτῷ, taken from 3.10). The spurious passage came into the Textus Receptus when Erasmus translated it from the Latin Vulgate into Greek and included it in his first edition of the Greek New Testament (Basel, 1516). See p. 8* above.

9.6 ἠγέρθη... γῆς

Instead of the statement ἠγέρθη δὲ Σαυρός ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, several Western witnesses heighten the pathos of the account by reading ἠγέρθη δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς. Ἑγερθέτω μὲ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς (ifth, p vgms), followed by καὶ ἠγερθέτων αὐτῶν (ifth Ephraem).

9.8 οἴδην

Instead of οἴδην (§74 δ Α* B ite vg syrp, h copsa, G67) oi'dh/n is read by A2 C Egr H L P 614 and many others (in codex Sinaiticus the letter a seems to have been begun above the line, but was left unfinished). The latter reading entered the Textus Receptus and lies behind the AV, “he saw no man.”

9.12

Because the verse is absent from the Old Latin h, Blass omitted it from his Roman edition of Acts and Hilgenfeld bracketed it. There is,

however, as Knowling remarks, no apparent reason why it should have been inserted if not genuine, as it is not influenced by any parallel passage. After a lengthy discussion of problems, some real, some imaginary, which have been found in the verse, Corson contends himself with the deletion of εἰν ὄραματι and ἀναπτύξεις. Clark, without manuscript support, prefers to place ver. 12 immediately after ver. 9. Although he professes to find “admirable sense” in this sequence, the rearrangement leaves the introduction of ver. 10 (Clark’s ver. 11) extremely inexpert, for now Ananias is introduced as though he were unknown (ὅπερ δὲ τις μετήρξην ἐν Δαμασκῷ ὄραματι Ἀνανίας) despite his having been mentioned by name in the immediately preceding sentence.

It seems best to regard the absence of the verse from it as due to an accident in transcription, occasioned perhaps by the presence of the name Ananias early in both ver. 12 and ver. 13.

9.12 ἔνδοξος [ἐν ὄραματι] [C]

The fact that the words ἐν ὄραματι stand in several positions in the manuscripts may suggest that the phrase is an explanatory gloss introduced to complete the sense of εἰν. On the other hand, since ἐν ὄραματι had just been used (in ver. 10), the second instance (though referring to a different vision) may have been omitted as apparently redundant. Moreover, inattentive scribes would be likely to confuse ὄραματι with the following ὄραματι, which also varies in position (the Textus Receptus, following H L P and many other manuscripts, reads ὄραματι Ἀναπτύξεις, and ὄραματι is omitted by copsa ethro Chrysostom). It should be noted, as Haenchen observes, that the sequence of words in B C is unusual (but not unknown to Luke; cf. the preferred reading in 14.8), and therefore may have been amended in the later manuscripts.

In view of the balance of possibilities a majority of the Committee
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decided to retain the words in the text enclosed within square brackets.

9.17 Τηροῦς
Although the word Ἰησοῦς, which is absent from H L P Ψ 218 255 257 326 383 431 467 623 927 1311 1838 2143 copsa ethro, may have come into the text from ver. 5 (as John Mill thought), a majority of the Committee was impressed by the weight of early and diverse external support for its inclusion (𝔓45, 74 Β C E most minuscules vg).

In order to heighten the account concerning the restoration of Paul’s eyesight, παρεξήγησις is added by C2 E L many minuscules syrp copsa armms eth Chrysostom. The gloss came into the Textus Receptus, whence the AV renders “and he received sight forthwith” (the translators avoided using “immediately” because they had employed this word earlier in the sentence for ἔθεος).

The reading of Ἰησοῦ (𝔓45, 74 Β C E 61 vg syrp, h copsa, bo al) was displaced (probably for doctrinal reasons) by the reading Χριστοῦ (H L P armms al), which was taken into the Textus Receptus and so into the AV. But, as Alford pointed out long ago, “the following τὸ δύσμα τοῦτο (ver. 21) is decisive for the reading Ἰησοῦ, and οὖν ὁ χριστός (ver. 22) still more so” (The Greek Testament, ad loc.).

Copyists added the words εἰς τὸ λόγον (C om. εἰς E 467 ith, p copG67) to make it clear that the statement, “Saul increased all the more in strength,” refers to his power in preaching and not merely to his recovery of physical strength (compare ver. 19).

After Χριστοῦ the Western text, preserved in itig, h, p, adds εἰς ὑμᾶς (or εἰς δό) εὐδοκίαν οὐκ θεός. According to Lake and Cadbury, “[this] may be the original reading, for it is not at all the type of addition which was customary at any late date, and it may have been omitted for theological reasons.” On the other hand, however, in view of the absence of the reading from all Greek manuscripts of Acts, it is safer to regard the clause as a scribal gloss derived from either Mk 3.17 or Lk 3.22 (compare 2 Pe 1.17).

Several witnesses (A 181 242 323 1898), having been conformed to Paul’s account of the incident (2 Cor 11.32), read ὅτι πάντως οὐκ ἦν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς. This was altered (perhaps because in verses 19 and 26 μαθηταὶ is used absolutely) to οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (𝔓74 Β C 81* vg al). This was altered (probably because in verses 19 and 26 μαθηταὶ is used absolutely) to οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (69 81c), or to αὐτῶν (H L P syrp, h copsa, bo arm al, followed by the Textus Receptus), or to οἱ μαθηταὶ (S 36 429 al).

Since it is scarcely conceivable that Jewish converts to Christianity at Damascus would be called “Paul’s disciples,” various attempts have been made to alleviate the difficulty that the best attested reading involves. Occasionally the genitive αὐτοῦ is construed as the object of λαβοῦντες (“taking hold of him”), but the sequence of words as well as the unnatural sense stand against this expedient. To assume, as Rengstorff does, that these disciples had been Paul’s “companions on the way to Damascus, who through his own leadership and by his witness had themselves come to the faith,” is totally gratuitous. The most satisfactory solution appears to be the conjecture that the oldest extant text arose through scribal inadvertence, when an original αὐτῶν was taken as αὐτοῦ.

The reading ἐπιγράφεται, which is from the usual verb in classical Greek meaning “to try [to do something],” was introduced into the later text (E H L P many minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus) in place of ἐπιγραφέναι (𝔓74 Β C 61 81 al). The substitution was made because the latter verb, which is much more common in the New Testament, ordinarily has a different sense (“to make trial of, tempt”) from its meaning here.

The weight of the manuscript evidence is decisively in support of Ἑλληνισταὶ, usually rendered “Hellenists” (i.e., Greek-speaking Jews). See also the comment on 11.20.

The range and age of the witnesses that read the singular number are superior to those that read the plural. The singular can hardly be a scribal modification in the interest of expressing the idea of the unity of the church, for in that case we should have expected similar modifications in 15.41 and 16.5, where there is no doubt that the plural number ἵσκεσις is the original text. More probably the singular number here has been altered to the plural in order to conform to the two later passages.

Ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας Χριστοῦ the Western text, preserved in itig, h, p, reads ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμέρας Ἰησοῦ καὶ τῆς νυκτὸς. This was altered (perhaps because in verses 19 and 26 μαθηταὶ is used absolutely) to Ἰησοῦ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (𝔓74 Β C 81* vg al). This was altered (probably because in verses 19 and 26 μαθηταὶ is used absolutely) to Ἰησοῦ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (69 81c), or to αὐτῶν (H L P syrp, h copsa, bo arm al, followed by the Textus Receptus), or to Ἰησοῦ μαθηταὶ (S 36 429 al).

Since it is scarcely conceivable that Jewish converts to Christianity at Damascus would be called “Paul’s disciples,” various attempts have been made to alleviate the difficulty that the best attested
9.35 Σαρώνα
The testimony of most early witnesses converges upon the spelling Σαρώνα (𝔓53, 74 (-r- A) B C E). The scribes of Ψ45 and of numerous minuscules (followed by the Textus Receptus), not observing that the word was already accusative from Σαρώνα, added -ν, making it accusative from Σαρώνας. The spelling with prefixed alpha (Ἄπαρσων) in H L (📅 ai P 33 ad) may be, as Zahn suggested, in imitation of the Hebrew article, although the Aramaic article was already indicated by the final -ν.

9.38 δός ἀνδρείας
The sending of two messengers (δός ἀνδρείας, read by Ψ45, 74 Ν A B C E and most minuscules) is in accord with Near Eastern custom. The omission of the words in some witnesses (H L P 🕒 104 326 383 440 536 920 ad) may be due to influence from 10.18 (see the comment there).

9.38 At the close of the verse copG67 adds “for the city was not far away. And when the men had gone there, they begged him to come with them without delay.”

9.40 After ἄνωποτε several Western witnesses (itig, p yqmmss syrh with * copsa, G67 am Cypr Ambrrose) add in slightly varying forms the words ἐν τῷ ἀνήματι τούτου τοῦ φωτοῦ, Ἰησοῦν Χριστοῦ (“in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ”); compare 4.10, “in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth.” Another Western modification is the addition of παράρχημα (“immediately”) before ἤρειξαν (E itig, p copsa, G67 Speculum).

9.42 τῆς
The word τῆς is absent from Ψ53 B C* but present in apparently all other Greek witnesses. Should the acknowledged excellence of codex Vaticanus and the early age of Ψ53 (third century) be regarded as decisive in adopting the shorter text, or should the reading of the overwhelming mass of manuscripts be preferred? Since Luke always uses the definite article after καθ’ ἄλογα (Lk 4.14; 23.5; Ac 9.31; 10.37), and in view of a certain tendency on the part of the scribe of Vaticanus occasionally to omit the article, the Committee regarded its absence from the three witnesses as accidental.

9.43 ἡμέρας ἴκανίας μείναι
There are three variant readings: ἡμέρας ἴκανίας μείναι (𝔓53 Ν* B 3 209* 216 1175 1739 geo), αὐτοῦ ἡμέρας ἴκανίας μείναι (𝔓74 Νc A E 18 81 181 242 323 328 429 441 920 2298 ad), and ἡμέρας ἴκανίας μείναι αὐτοῦ (C L P most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus). A majority of the Committee preferred ἡμέρας ἴκανίας μείναι as the most difficult reading (it is also the earliest attested reading – Ψ53 is third century, Ν and B are fourth). In order to clarify the construction, scribes supplied αὐτῶν either before or after ἡμέρας ἴκανίας μείναι.

10.3 Τιμή
The Textus Receptus, following L P ⬃ and most minuscules, omits τιμή. The word, which apparently was dropped by copyists who deemed it superfluous, is decisively supported by Ψ74 A B C E 36a 642 808 al.

10.5 τιμή [B]
The presence of τιμή after Σίμων is altogether appropriate in the mouth of Cornelius, to whom Peter was unknown. On the other hand, however, the expression “a certain Simon who is called Peter” may have seemed to copyists to lack proper respect for the chief of the apostles, and so the belittling τιμή was dropped.

10.6 At the close of the verse several minuscules (321 3 22 436 453 466 467) add from 10.19 the words δὲ λαλήσας ἰδέας ὑμῖν ἥματι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας κατηγορήσω, which are found in 69mg 1611 and in several Latin manuscripts (it is included in the Clementine Vulgate, but not in Wordsworth and White’s edition), somehow got into the Textus Receptus (perhaps Erasmus translated it into Greek, on the model of 9.6), and so the AV renders, “he shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do.”

10.9 ἐκτήτω
Instead of “sixth” hour Νc 225 ad read “ninth” (ἐκτήτω), making Peter’s prayer coincide with Cornelius’s prayer (ver. 30).

10.10 ἐγένετο (2)
Instead of the second instance of ἐγένετο, the later text (E L P many minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus) substitutes ἐπέσεν, which not only avoids the repetition of ἐγένετο but provides a more appropriate word with ἐσκοπεῖν.

10.11 καταθήκην σκέψεως τῶν ἀληθῶν μυθών ἀρχῆς καθήμενον (C)
Apparently the Western text lacked καταθήκην (it is omitted by itd syrp, h copsa Didascalia [in Apostolic Constitutions]) and described the vessel as “tied (θητεύμαν) at (the) four corners.” In the text of the old uncial, which read καθήμενον, the vessel is said to be “lowered (καθήμενον) by (the) four corners.” A majority of the Committee judged that witnesses that have all three participles are conflate, and preferred the reading supported by Ψ74 Ν A B (C2) ite vg geo.

10.12 θητεύμας καὶ ἐτρέπτης τῆς γῆς [B]
Copyists recollecting the similar but fuller account in 11.6 produced a variety of expanded readings; thus, the usual expression (εὐαγγελία) τῆς θητεύματος was introduced before or after τῆς ἐτρέπτης, or after
If, as is usual in similar cases, the shortest reading is regarded as original (compare ἄνδρες, ver. 5), recollection of ver. 7 or 11.11 would have induced scribes to include a numeral with ἄνδρες.

On balance, it seemed to the Committee that the least unsatisfactory solution was to adopt the reading supported by the broadest spectrum of external evidence.

Instead of ἰησοῦς, supported by the overwhelming number of witnesses, a majority of the Committee preferred ἰησοῦς, read by 𝔓74 B and 81 (the latter has the orthographic variant -νης, which in Byzantine Greek was pronounced like -νες). If the finite verb were original, it is difficult to understand what would have induced scribes to substitute the participle. On the other hand, when the sentence-building power of ἵδον was forgotten, the emergence of the reading ἰησοῦς would have been almost inevitable.

The Textus Receptus, following C D E L P and most minuscules, reads καί. A majority of the Committee, impressed by the weight of 𝔓45, 74 B 81 181 242 255 429 al, preferred the reading ἵδον without καί

(1) The reading of B, being the most difficult (because of the discrepancy with ver. 7 and 11.11), is preferred by Ropes, who suggests that the two servants alone (ver. 7) may be thought of as responsible messengers, the soldier merely serving as a guard. Scribes, not observing the reason lying behind the use of ἵδον, corrected what they supposed was an error either by deleting the word or by substituting τρέχει (in accord with 11.11).

(2) The reading τρέχει is strongly supported by diversified external evidence. Assuming this reading to be original, one can explain the origin of ἵδον as the work of a discriminating scribe and the absence of the word as an accidental omission after the absence of the word as an accidental omission after ἀδέρφης (-ἀδερφής).
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The expansion in the Western text of this verse appears to have arisen from reflecting upon the difficulty involved in the ordinary text, that Cornelius could not have known exactly when to go out to meet Peter and to summon his kinsmen and close friends to his home. The text of D, supported by itp witnesses, reads: προσέχοντες δὲ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰς τὴν Κασαβίαν προβάλοντες εἰς τῶν δούλων διεσκέψαντο παραγγέλοντας αὐτῶν, ὅ δὲ Κορνήλιος ἐκπροσώπησε καί…("And as Peter was drawing near to Caesarea, one of the servants ran ahead and announced that he had arrived. And Cornelius jumped up and…").

Instead of ἀνάστησθαι in ver. 26, D reads τί πους (compare 7.26 τί πους; D, and 14.15); both expressions are conlated in itp syrh, and itp2 adds δευτέρων (compare τῷ θεῷ προσκοπέσθησαν, Re 19.10; 22.9). In the same vein D E Itig, p vgnss add ὡς καὶ σύ after εἰμι. In ver. 27, D omits συνυπόλογοι αὐτῶν, perhaps because it was regarded as superfluous. With the addition in ver. 28 of ἐκλέγοντας ὑπέφασθαι in D ("you yourselves know very well"), compare the similar heightening in D at 4.16. The insertion of ἐνδόθη before ἀλλοφαίρετο in Dgr syrp copsa may be due to the presence of the same word
earlier in the sentence. In ver. 29 after μεταπιθανότης D E itp fill out the expression with the obvious υπ’ ζων.

10.30 τὴν ἐνέπτυν [B]

The Textus Receptus, supported by a diversified and respectable array of witnesses, appears to be clear and straightforward: ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι τάσεως τῆς ὥρας ἠμνη μητροκέφαι, καὶ τὴν ἐνέπτυν ἡμνη προσευχήματος ἐν τῷ ὀλίγῳ μου, which ought to mean he cometh, shall day until this hour I was fasting, and while keeping the ninth hour of prayer in my house” (the reading in D ἀπὸ τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας may have arisen when the scribe counted the three instances of ἐνταύρων in verses 9, 23, and 24). The superficial impression, however, that Cornelius had been fasting for the immediately preceding four days is clearly erroneous, for the terminus of the fasting was the sudden appearance of a man in bright clothing who told him to send to Joppa, etc. Instead, therefore, of counting forward four days (or three, according to D), we must take ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας to mean “four days ago.”

Great difficulty arises with μέχρι τάσεως τῆς ὥρας, which ought to be “until this (very) hour” (the variant reading in D μέχρι τῆς ἀριστής ὥρας has substantially the same sense), but which, since the preceding ἀπὸ cannot signify “from,” must mean either “at this (very) hour” or “about this (very) hour.”

Since, however, it is highly questionable whether μέχρι can bear either of these meanings, several scholars have proposed conjectural emendations in order to remove the word from the text. Lake and Cadbury, for example, think it possible that either “the author or a scribe was misled by the suggestion of ἀπὸ to write its usual correlative μετὰ, Blass and Schmiedel rewrite the passage, getting rid of both ἀπὸ and μέχρι. The former conjectures τετάρτην ἡμέραν ταύτην ἡμέραν, and the latter proposes ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας ἀπὸ τάσεως τῆς ὥρας ἡμερ.

Since, however, it is just possible that the Greek may be explained as colloquial koine or as Semitized Greek, the Committee decided to retain both the ἀπὸ and the μέχρι phrases. Although the words μητροκέφαι καί may have been deleted in some copies because nothing is said in the previous account of Cornelius’s fasting, it is more probable that they were added to the text by those who thought that fasting should precede baptism (compare 9.9 and Didache 7.4 κελεύσεις καὶ μητροκέφαι τοῦ μετατεταμένου πρὸ τοῦ μας ἢ δόκο). 10.32 θελεύσων [B]

The concluding clause, ἐλπισάμενοι λαλῆσαι (translated in the AV “Who, when he cometh, shall speak unto thee”), appears to be an innocuous expansion in the Western text (D E itd, e.g., 63, 67 syrK) that was later incorporated into the Byzantine text (H L P many minuscules). Although it can be argued that the clause was pruned from the Alexandrian text as an unnecessary and, indeed, an awkward appendage (strictly ὁς refers to Σίμων)

βήσοντις), a majority of the Committee regarded it as a circumstantial expansion, to be compared with the partial parallel in 11.14.

10.33 The Western text modifies the verse in several respects: “So I sent you to me at once, asking you to come to us (παρακάλων ἐλθεῖν σε [D* omits σε] πρὸς ἡμᾶς, D itp omits σε, msK corpG67), and you have been kind enough to come quickly (ἐν τῷ δέ). Now behold (Ἰδοῦ D syrth instead of ὁδοῦ, and πάρεμφει omitted), we all are before you (σὺν instead of τοῦ θεοῦ, see following comment), wishing to hear from you ἡθοδοσίαν παρὰ σοι D*) the things that you have been commanded from God (ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ instead of ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου) [see following comment].”

Of these alterations, Ropes (in loc.) thinks that the Semitism involved in ἴδος, with the omission of the following πάρεμφει, may be preferable to the usual reading with ὁδοῦ. On the other hand, the presence of ὁδοῦ twice in the previous verse may have led to its being dropped here.

10.34 ἐντάξεων τοῦ θεοῦ

Although Ropes and Haenchen hold ἐντάξεων σου (D* itp vg syr hyp msKvq arma) to be preferable to the more religious phrase ἐντάξεων τοῦ θεοῦ, a majority of the Committee preferred the latter reading, which is supported by Ἡ74 A B C D2 E H L P and almost all minuscules, and which is a Septuagintal phrase very much in the style of Luke.

10.35 ὑπὸ There are four variant readings: ἀπὸ (Ἡ74 A B C D), παρὰ (E), ὑπὲρ (1175), and ὑπὸ (R* B H L P and apparently all other witnesses). The reasons for variety in the preposition are not clear, though possibly the variant readings κυρίου and θεοῦ may have had some influence. On the basis of the weight of the external evidence the Committee preferred ὑπό.

10.33 τοῦ κυρίου [C]

Although θεοῦ may have been altered to κυρίου in order to avoid repetition with the preceding θεοῦ, the Committee was not impressed by the weight of the evidence supporting θεοῦ. Considerations of intrinsic fitness are inconclusive, for, although it may be argued that θεοῦ would be more appropriate than κυρίου in the mouth of a Gentile proselyte, it is possible that a copyist as well as the author may have been moved by such a consideration.

10.36-38 In several respects the Greek of the Alexandrian text is harsh: (1) both sentences lack connecting particles; (2) ἐρώμενος cannot be syntactically construed; and (3) the abrupt apposition of Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου to ἄρμα is far from idiomatic. Besides several scribal efforts at amelioration, modern attempts to account for the unusual Greek include (1) the theory that an Aramaic original was translated literalistically into poor Greek (see the following comments); and (2) the suggestion that the text, being unrevised, is a conflation of two different drafts of essentially the same sentence, namely (a) ὥσις ἢμερα ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἂν ἐπιστελέει ἃ ἡμερίζεται…(ὡς ἢμερας τῶν ἑδύνατων) (b) ἢμερα ἢμερα τοῦ γενόμενον ἄρμα…Ἰησοῦ. 10.38

Desparsing of construing the text as it stands, Preuschen conjectured that originally the text may have run as follows, ὥσις ἢμερα ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ ἂν ἐπιστελέει…(ὡς ἢμερας τῶν ἑδύνατων, ἢμερα ἢμερα τοῦ γενόμενον ἄρμα…Ἰησοῦ):
Either the addition or the omission of ὄνων can be defended on palaeographical grounds (dittography or haplography with the preceding -ον). Of the two readings the one with the relative pronoun is the more difficult. According to Torrey, the un-Greek suspended construction of τῶν λόγων ὄνων reflects exactly a perfectly idiomatic sentence in Aramaic.

Considering the alternative possibilities, none of which is free from difficulties, a majority of the Committee judged that the least unsatisfactory solution was to retain ὄνων in the text, enclosed within square brackets.

The use of the pendent nominative, ἀρρέμισθαι (𝔓74 A B C D E H 1739 al), which is to be taken in a quasi-adverbial sense, can be paralleled not only in Greek inscriptions and papyri but also in Xenophon and Plutarch; one is therefore not compelled to resort, as Torrey does, to an Aramaic idiom in which τοῦ ἀρρέμισθαι amounts to not much more than “from.” In any case, however, the nominatius pendens is sufficiently unusual so that scribes would have attempted to improve the grammar either by altering it to the accusative (𝔓45 L P 69 81 most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus), or by retaining the nominative and adding γὰρ (𝔓74 A D ite, p syrmsK Ireneaslat) – which is described by Blass-Debrunner as a futile attempt to ameliorate the construction.

The reading μετά τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας (𝔓43 itd, l, t) may be either an attempt to harmonize the expression with that of Μη 27.63, etc., or, as Harris argues, may be an idiosyncrasy of codex Bezae (as also in Μη 16.21; 17.23) that reflects the Latin post tertium diem, meaning “the third day after.”

In support of the reading ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ (𝔓74 C al) Tischendorf observes that ἐν after ἠγέρεν can easily fallen out, and that scribes would have a tendency to substitute the much more customary expression τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ. On the other hand, however, a majority of the Committee, judging that it was also possible that ἐν had been accidentally introduced through dittography, considered it preferable to enclose the word within square brackets, indicating thereby a certain doubt that it belongs in the text.

Toward the end of the verse several Western witnesses (with minor variations) make two additions to the usual text: “who ate and drank with him and accompanied (him), after he rose from the dead, for forty days” (after αὕτω D2 itgig p syrth add καῖ συνεισερήθηναι, Tischendorf and Codex Bezae); and ἡμέρας ὁ μεν ἡμέραν E (𝔓324). It may be observed that in Acts codex Bezae is fond of συνεισέρθηναι, which it introduces also in αὕτως.

Instead of αὕτως (𝔓324 B C Dgr Egr 33 94 103 104 307 323 489 614 623 913 1739 1765 1827 1838 1891 syr, h copsa, bo al) the Textus Receptus, following (𝔓74 A H P 69 81 ite vg eth al, reads αὕτως. A majority of the Committee was impressed not only by the weight of the witnesses that support αὕτως, but also by the consideration that since αὕτως might be taken to have a depreciatory implication, it was more likely to be altered to αὕτως than vice versa.

Several Western witnesses qualify “tongues” with one or another adjective; thus it reads praeveraticas linguas, which may presuppose an original Greek reading ποικίλας (Hilgenfeld), or καυσίμως (Blass), or εὐαγγελίζων (Ropes and A. C. Clark); a manuscript of the Vulgate reads linguas variis; copsa, bopt read “other tongues”; and the anonymous treatise on Rebaptism reads linguas suis.

Since προστασίας is usually construed with the dative of the person commanded and the accusative of the thing commanded, it is probable that αὐτῶς (𝔓74 A 33 al) is a learned correction introduced by those who did not perceive that αὐτῶς serves as a subject of the following infinitive.

Although it may be argued that the primitive reading was τοῦ κυρίου, which was expanded or supplanted by Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in order to denote more precisely the specific character of the baptism, the Committee was impressed by the weight and diversity of the witnesses that read Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. In any case, the reading of τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is clearly a conflation. The position of βαπτίσθητι was moved forward in order to make it plain that ἐν τῇ ἁπάτῃ goes with it and not with προστασίας αὐτῶς.

“Peter, therefore, for a considerable time wished to depart, and accompanied (him), that is, Peter, therefore, wished to depart, and accompanied (him),” etc.

Instead of the customary text codex Bezae, substantially supported by syr², reads ἀκουστόν δὲ ἐγένετο τοῖς ἄποστολοι καὶ τοῖς ἄδελφοις τοῖς (ἢ D* ἐν τῇ ἱδίκεια).

Although Ropes preferred the Western reading because it is more Semitic than the B-text, a majority of the Committee was unwilling to abandon the weight of the testimony of the rest of the witnesses, particularly since in this case D contains the word ἀκουστόν, which appears nowhere else in the New Testament. It may also be pointed out that at the end of the verse several Western witnesses add the comment, “and they glorified God” (ὃς εἰτὶ ὑγιὴν syr² vg).
them (he departed), speaking much throughout the country [and] teaching them; he [lit. who] also went to meet them and reported to them the grace of God. But the brethren of the circumcision disputed with him, saying ...”).

According to Clark the omission of the passage from the other Greek witnesses is to be accounted for by homooteleuton, when “the eye of a copyist passed from τοῦ θεοῦ at the end of ver. 1 to τοῦ θεοῦ later on.” This explanation, however, accounts for only part of the difference between the Western text and that of the old uncials, for after the χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ codex Bezae goes on with αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκ περιστούς ἀδελφοὶ διεκινήστη, whereas the other witnesses read δὲν δὲν ἀνήθη Πέτρος εἰς Ιερουσαλήμ, διεκινήσεν πρὸς αὐτῶν αὐτῷ ἐκ περιστοῦς. Since the information given in the Alexandrian text (that Peter went up to Jerusalem) is (as Clark admits) “indispensable to the sense,” it is obvious that paraphesis on the part of a scribe is not sufficient to explain the differences between the two forms of text.

The motives for the expansion in the Western text appear to be connected with the tendency in that text to avoid putting Peter in a bad light. In order to prevent the reader of the Alexandrian text from gaining the impression that the conversion of Cornelius compelled Peter to break off his missionary work and go to Jerusalem in order to justify himself, the Western reviser introduces a passage (in the style of 8.29 and 15.3) that describes how Peter continued his missionary work for a considerable length of time, and how, finally, on his own initiative, he went up to Jerusalem, where, so far from being called to give an account of himself, he voluntarily sought out the brethren at Jerusalem “and reported to them the grace of God.”

11.3 ἔλθη...κυρίες
Instead of ἔλθη...κυρίες, ὡσπέρ...κυρίες, ὡσπέρ...κυρίας. Since in later Greek usage ἡτία may stand for τί (“Why?...?”) a majority of the Committee held that failure to recognize this idiom led copyists to produce the reading involving the third person, in which ἡτία is taken as recitative introducing direct discourse (either as a statement, “saying, You went in...” or as a question, “saying, Did you go in...?”). The text is supported by ὡσπέρ (lacuna at εἰς θηλυκαὶ τοις A D E H P most minuscules vg syrhmgcopsa, boeth.

11.5 ἐγράφη
Codex Bezae and 241 read ἔγραψα, ὡσπερ...κυρίας. While the reading ἔγραψα may be ignored, the two others deserve comment.

In Attic Greek ἐγράφη was used predominantly, and it is found extensively in the Septuagint and the New Testament. In later Greek the form with the final sigma came into ever wider usage, though it was condemned by Prynichus and other grammarians.

Whether Luke followed Attic preference and later scribes corrupted it, or whether he followed the growing tolerance for ἐγράφη and later purist scribes, reacting against the prevailing usage, corrected the spelling according to archaic standards, is a difficult question to answer. A majority of the Committee decided that it was wisest to err (if indeed it is to err) in company with ὡσπέρ A B* al.

11.11 ἔμαθεν [C]
The more difficult reading is ἔμαθεν, which because of its apparent irrelevancy was assimilated to ἔμαθεν of ver. 5.

11.12 μὴν ἀπεκρίνατο [C]
Although it may be, as Lake and Cadbury admit, that the Western text preserves the original reading and that the words were interpolated from the parallel account in 10.20 (μὴν ἀπεκρίνατο), a majority of the Committee was not persuaded, chiefly because the earliest form(s) of the reading utilize the active (not the middle) voice of the verb. The reading of H L P al was interpreted as due to the influence of 10.20, not for the insertion but for the assimilation of the voice of the participle.

11.17 ὁ θεός [A]
The omission of ὁ θεός by D vgms Rehaptism Augustine (but not syrh, as is sometimes stated) is probably due, as Ropes observes, “to...”
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The ‘Western’ reviser’s view that the Holy Spirit was the gift of Christ.”

11.17 ὁ θεός [A]
In order to explain the meaning of the expression καλύπτει τὸν θεόν codex Bezae, with support, in whole or in part, from other Western witnesses (467 ὁ δόχων syrh with * corG67) adds τὸν μὴ δοκῇν αὐτοῖς πέφαγεν ἄγιον πνεῦμα συνεφαγέναι εἰς αὐτῷ (“that he should not give them the Holy Spirit after they had believed on him”).

11.20 Ἐλληνισταῖς [C]
The textual problems of this verse are compounded by the diversity of views concerning the meaning of Ἐλληνισταῖς. This noun, which appears to be a new formation from ἐλληνιζέων, “to speak Greek” or “to practice Greek ways,” is found nowhere in previous classical Greek literature or in hellenistic-Jewish literature; in the New Testament it occurs only here and in 6.1 and 9.28. According to the prevailing opinion, current since the time of Chrysostom, the Ἐλληνισταῖς of 6.1 were Greek-speaking Jews (or Jewish-Christians) in contrast to those speaking a Semitic language (so Thayer, Souter, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker). Since, however, in the present passage the author seems to draw a contrast between Ἐλληνισταῖς (or the variant reading Ἐλληνας) and θαυμάζων of ver. 19, it has been urged that the word must possess some more distinctive meaning than merely “Greek-speaking Jews.” Thus, Warfield and Cadbury argue that it means Gentiles (and so is synonymous with...
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“Ἐλληνας); the former translates it “Graecizers” and the latter “Hellenists.” Other alternatives include the proposal to take Ἐλληνισταῖς as connoting proselytes, or to interpret it as referring to a radical, reforming, “gentilistic” sect within Judaism, to which Stephen may have belonged before he became a Christian. None of these views, however, is entirely free from more or less serious difficulties, and perhaps the least unsatisfactory assumption to make is that the meaning of the word, though quite definite in the early church, was lost to Christian usage. When the word reappears in patrisic...
literature (other than that influenced by Chrysostom’s exegesis of 6.1), it means “a defender of paganism” (E. A. Sophocles’s Lexicon), or simply, “a pagan” (Lampe’s Patristic Greek Lexicon).

In assessing the evidence for the variant readings in the present passage, no weight can be attached to the fact that the early versions all read “Greeks” (so the Latin, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Old Georgian, and Ethiopic). for, as Hort justly observes, they “would naturally be at a loss to provide a distinctive rendering for so rare and so peculiar a word as Ἑλληνιστὴς.” The first hand of codex Sinaiacus, which already in ver. 19 gives the meaningless Ἰουδαῖος without subsequent correction, writes in ver. 20 the equally meaningless τῶς τοῖς ἐνεργείασεις, which, however, has been corrected by a later hand to Ἑλληνιστὴς. Likewise the testimony of codex Alexandrinus is weakened, if not discredited, when one observes that in 9.29 the scribe substituted Ἑλλήνης for Ἑλληνιστὴς, which is acknowledged to be the true reading.

Transcriptional probability is all in favor of Ἑλληνιστὴς, for the temptation to editor or scribe was to substitute an easy and familiar word (Ἑλλήνης) for one which was by no means familiar. There is no counter temptation to set against this, so that the argument drawn from it is a strong one. Perhaps the chief objection of modern scholars to adopting Ἑλληνιστὴς here is the belief that it always means “Greek-speaking Jews,” and therefore is inappropriate to stand in contrast with the preceding Ἰουδαῖος. But since Ἑλληνιστὴς is derived from Ἑλλήνης, it means strictly “one who uses Greek [language or customs]”: whether the person be a Jew or a Roman or any other non-Greek must be gathered from the context. In 6.1 the contrast is no doubt between Greek-speaking Jewish Christians and Semitic-speaking Jewish Christians. What the word connotes in 9.29 is not altogether clear; in any case they are not believers as in 6.1. In the present passage, where the preponderant weight of the external evidence combines with the strong transcriptional probability in support of Ἑλληνιστὴς, the word is to be understood in the broad sense of “Greek-speaking persons,” meaning thereby the mixed population of Antioch in contrast to the Ἰουδαῖος of ver. 19.

The word οὗτος is read by 342 PK B E 33 81 614 1611 1852 2138 al, and is absent from A D H L P most minuscules and the Textus Receptus. Since the present participle οὗτος is used elsewhere in Acts with the special meaning “the local …” (13.1; 28.17), the Committee considered it more probable that copyists would have deleted than added the word here.

The definite article τάχυν, which is read by 342 D E H L P and almost all minuscules, is absent from K A B 927. On the one hand, since the usual construction is ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, the article after χάριν appears to have a special force, suggesting that Barnabas rejoiced because he recognized that the grace was obviously that of God (τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ). Scribes, not observing this nuance, may have dropped the article as unnecessary. On the other hand, it can be argued that τήν is a pedantic insertion made by Alexandrian scribes. In view of the balance of probabilities a majority of the Committee thought it best to retain the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

The use of τὸν before τὸν χηρὸν reminds one of Pauline usage; since this characteristic expression is found nowhere else in Acts, its presence in B Ψ 181 al was judged to be due to scribes rather than the author.

Codex Bezae, supported in part by other Western witnesses, reads ἀκούσας ὀδηγεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀναπαύειν αὐτῶν, καὶ ὡς παρακάλεσαν ἠλλάθων εἰς Ἀντιοχείαν. αὐτῶν ἔνεντον ἔναντι τῶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν ἄρεσσήν ἐν Αντιοχείᾳ καὶ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι (D E H L P S trg syrh) is in accord with the style of Luke (cf. 9.38; 11.19; Lk 2.15), and the absence of διελήθην in the other witnesses may be the result of deliberate excision to simplify the construction. For these reasons the word is retained in the text, but enclosed within square brackets to indicate doubt that it belongs there.

The presence of καὶ before ἔναντιν αὐτῶν, “even for a whole year” (Ψ42 Β A B 33 614 syrh), is unusual, and it is not strange that the later text has omitted it (E H L P 383 al, as well as the Textus Receptus). Since the expression καὶ followed by ἔναντιν or by a year is not New Testament usage, Blass thinks that the καὶ may have come from some other reading, and compares καὶ in ver. 124.

It is difficult to see why the Western text should have been shortened if it were original; on the other hand, the Alexandrian text may have been rewritten to show more clearly why Barnabas went to Tarsus, and to indicate that Saul was not “brought” to Antioch, but was “entreated” to come.
An important Western reading, preserved in D (\textsuperscript{it}G) Augustine, supplies the first "we"-passage\textsuperscript{25} in any text of Acts: ἐγὼ δὲ ἦν

There are four variant readings: \textit{proagagein} (\textsuperscript{B}74 A 36a 51 81 307 337 460 467 915 1874 \textit{al}), \textit{proagagein} (B 33 254), \textit{prosaigein} (\textit{N} \textit{P} 5 323 436 440 450 2180), and \textit{proagagein} (D E H L P most minuscules). In each pair of variant readings, the aorist tense is to be preferred to the present. As between the two verbs, a majority of the Committee regarded the compound with \textit{pro} to be more appropriate in the context.

\textbf{12.7} The Western text differs in several respects from the generally received text: an angel of the Lord appeared "to Peter" (ἐπόνη [lit. "stood by"] + τῷ Ἡλίκροι, D ἰτπ syrh with * copG67), light "shone forth from him [the angel]" (σκόλαμψα, D, + ἐξ αὐτῶν, itig, P syrhng); instead of ἐν τῷ οἰκήματι, itd, gig, (p) Lucifer read "in that place" (in illo loco); and instead of the angel's "striking" (πετάζας) Peter on the side in order to waken him, D itig Lucifer speak of his "nudging" (νύξας) the sleeping apostle.\textsuperscript{224

\textbf{12.8-9} Between verses 8 and 9 copG67 adds the sentence, "But he [the angel] seized him [Peter] and drew him along and took him out, and Peter followed.

\textbf{12.10} ἑβδομάς τοῖς \textit{A})

The circumstantial detail in codex Bezae, namely that Peter and the angel when coming out of prison "walked down the seven steps" (κατέβησαν τοὺς κατηβαίνοι καὶ), has seemed to many scholars to possess a verisimilitude that reflects local knowledge of Jerusalem. It should not be overlooked, however, as Lake and Cadbury remind us, that "we have no knowledge as to (i) where the prison was …, and (ii) whether there really were seven steps."\textsuperscript{230}

A trace of the same reading is preserved in \textit{it}G and copG67, "they descended (the) steps" (without "seven"). The reading of the Latin side of codex Bezae is slightly expanded, "when they went out they descended (the) seven steps and went on one step, and immediately

\textbf{12.5} Several Western witnesses (but not codex Bezae) expand the statement, "So Peter was kept in prison," by adding the words "by a cohort of the king" (\textit{a cohorte regis, itp1 vgms syrh with * copG67}). What relation this cohort had to the sixteen soldiers of ver. 4 is not clear.

\textbf{12.6} ἐκτενεύειν

Instead of \textit{ἐκτενεύειν} (\textsuperscript{B}74 K L* vid B 33 181 216 440 453 1898 ite vg Lucifer), the Textus Receptus, following A2 E H L P and most minuscules, reads \textit{ἐκτεινεῖν}. It is more likely that the adverb (which was condemned by Phrynichus as poor Greek)\textsuperscript{233} would be altered to the adjective than vice versa. Codex Bezae rewrites the sentence avoiding both adjective and adverb (notice also the heightening of the account by the addition of \textit{πολλῷ} as well as the redundant \textit{περὶ αὐτῶν}): \textit{πολλῷ ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ αὐτῶν ("but much prayer in earnestness was [made] for him by the church to God for him").} For the expression \textit{ἐκτεινεῖ} compare \textit{26.7}, and Judith 4.9.

\textbf{12.6} \textit{proagagein}

\textbf{12.15} ὁ ἐγγύλας

Jews ..." Although Luke uses the verb \textit{ἐπεξεργαεῖν} (Lk 1.1; Ac 9.28; 19.13), the noun \textit{ἐπεξεργάσις} appears nowhere else in the New Testament.
By prefixing τυφόν ("Perhaps it is his angel") the Western text (D syrp) enhances the naïveté of the account, softening the definiteness of the explanation offered to solve the enigma. Except as a Bezan variant reading in Lk 20.13, τυφόν occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in 1 Cor 16.6.

12.17 συνάν

In order to prevent the reader of the generally received text from supposing that Peter made his explanation while still standing at the door of the gateway, the Western text adds the graphic touch that, "having motioned to them with his hand that they should be silent, he came in and described to them how the Lord had brought him out of the prison" (instead of συναν δι ατυχους εισηλθεν και).

12.20-22

The account in the last part of the day and death of Herod Agrippa I differs in several respects from that in the commonly received text. By using ἄψιν instead of ἀντί (ver. 20) the scribe of D indicates more clearly the reason why it was that, according to ver. 19, Herod had gone down "from Judea to Caesarea"—it was to hold an audience with representatives from two neighboring cities, Tyre and Sidon.

The non-Western text declares that the people of Tyre and Sidon "came to him in a body" (ἀκολούθων δὲ παρῆσαν τρίς αὐτῷ). Taken literally this is clearly an exaggeration; the Western reviser, however, skillfully rewrote it, while still retaining ἀκολούθων, to suggest that some from both of the cities came in a body to the king (ὁ δὲ ἀκολούθων ἐξ ἀκολούθων τῶν τάκων παρῆσαν τρίς τὸν βασιλέα). D (614 syrɔ, avpο, evx), but it is also discredited by the fact that it is not the common usage of Acts to specify the place whence return is made (1.12 is the only such instance of the twelve occurrences of the verb ἀποτρέψεις in Acts).

On the other hand, as Westcott and Hort declare, "εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, which is the best attested and was not likely to be introduced, cannot possibly be right if it is taken with ὑπαίτεροι." Their conclusion is that the passage contains a primitive error that has infected all extant witnesses, and they propose that the sequence of words be emended to read ὑπαίτεροι τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ πληρώσασις ἑαυτοῖν ("having fulfilled their mission at Jerusalem they returned").

Much more extreme is the remedy proposed by Simcox, who decided that the whole verse is an interpolation that should be omitted. Others have suggested that the variations arise from a confusion of marginal glosses. Thus, Alford, who adopted Ἰερουσαλήμ as the text, conjectured that εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ may have been an explanatory gloss that was later substituted for Ἰερουσαλήμ, then Ἱερουσαλήμ may have again been corrected to Ἱερουσαλήμ, leaving the εἰς standing. Less complicated is the suggestion of Bartler which is adopted by Bruce that originally the passage had no prepositional phrase and that all the variant readings represent additions to the simple verb "returned."

Other scholars, preferring what appears to be the best attested reading (εἰς), attempt to alleviate the contextual difficulties by making various lexical or grammatical suggestions. Thus, instead of taking the aorist participle παρῆσαν in its normal sense "when they had fulfilled," several writers regard it as an instance of the rare usage of the "futuristic" aorist, expressing purpose. Attractive though this proposal may be, it involves taking also the following aorist participle (παρῆσαν) as an aorist of subsequent action—a category whose existence is denied by most grammarians. Less violent to Greek syntax and lexical usage is the proposal that a comma be placed after εἰς, having been influenced by the expression ἄγγελος κυρίου of ver. 23.

12.25 Σαῦλος

After Σαῦλος several Western witnesses (614 itp syrh with * copG67) add ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Ἡρῴδης Παύλος ("who was called Paul"). This appears to be a scribal anticipation of 13.9 (Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παύλος), introduced here because of the presence later in the verse of a similar identification of John Mark (Ἰουδαίων τοῦ ἐπίσκοπου Μάρκου).

Furthermore, instead of Σαῦλος manuscripts 2 57 326 436 441 al read Παύλος (102 reads Σαῦλος Παύλος).

12.25 εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ [C]

Many attempts have been made to account for the origin of the reading εἰς in this verse. The natural impression one gets when reading the section 11.27 to 13.1 is that 11.30 refers to the arrival of Paul and Barnabas at Jerusalem and that 12.26 ought to tell of their departure from Jerusalem. On the one hand, all the canons of textual criticism favor the more difficult reading εἰς, supported as it is by the earliest and best witnesses. Furthermore, the lectio facilior is not only divided against itself (ἀντί and εἰς), but it is also discredited by the fact that it is not the common usage of Acts to specify the place whence return is made (1.12 is the only such instance of the twelve occurrences of the verb ἀποτρέψεις in Acts).

The later text (Ε Ἡ Λ Ρ 33 al syrh arm and Textus Receptus) interpolates τοὺς after ἥραν δὲ in order to imply that the six persons about to be mentioned were not the only
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prophets and teachers in the church at Antioch. Codex Bezae and the Vulgate achieve
the same end by replacing δε with εν τοις (“among whom [were]”).

13.1 τετράφρου

Since the tendency in hellenistic Greek was to permit hiatus for the sake of etymological clarity,²² the Committee adopted the spelling τετράφρος (instead of τετράφρης) at each occurrence of the word, in accord with the following witnesses: Mt 14.1 K C Z Δ copsamss, bo; Lk 3.1 (three times) K* C copsa, bo; 5.19 K* C copsa, bo; 9.7 K (K omits δ τετρ.) C Δ copsamss, bo; Ac 13.1 K* copsa, bo.

13.3 προσωπάμωνος

The addition of πάντες after προσωπάμωνος in codex Bezae is a typical Western expansion. The omission of ἐπίλεγων by the same manuscript must be accounted a scribal blunder, for its absence ruins the syntax. (Blass and Clark retain the word in their editions.) After ἐπίλεγων E vg copsa, bo syrp, h with obelus add αὐτοῖς.

13.5

Instead of τῶν λόγων τοῦ βασιλέως codex Bezae ittiyg syrp read τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου.

The latter reading reflects the Christianization of the traditional expression.²⁴⁶

Page 354

Instead of ἕπτατιν, D 614 itp syrhmg copsa read ὑπερήφανα αὐτοῖς and E vg read εἰς δικαιώσεων. According to Weiss,²² these alterations were made in order to avoid describing Mark as a (menial) ἕπτατιν. On the other hand, however, in Lk 1.2 the word seems to have an honorable connotation, for ἕπτατιν τῶν λόγων are mentioned along with eyewitnesses of Jesus’ ministry.²²

13.6 δικαίωσεν

According to Haenchen, the Western reading, “And when they had gone around the whole island as far as Paphos …” (αὐτὸς περιελθόντος (+ δὲ D, omit itd) αὐτοῖς, D ittiyg vg Lucifer), replaced the commonly received text (δικαίωσεν) in order to explain why no other places on Cyprus are mentioned: the missionaries sailed southwards from Salamis around the island as far as Paphos.²²

13.6 βαρικριτοί

Various witnesses give the name “Bar-Jesus” in various forms: Βαρικριτός (𝔓74 Β 181 242 257 460 ittiyg, pvid vg syrhxct copbo), Βαρικριτοί (Β C E 33 many minuscules copsa), Βαρικριτον (A D2 H L P 101 104 326 614 1108 1611 2127 syrhxct αλ), Βαρικριτονα (D*), -uam itd), Βαρικριτος (𝔓9), Βαρικριτος (syrp Ephraem), bariesuban (Lucifer), varisusus (Opus imperfectum in Matt. xxiv:3). With some hesitation the Committee agreed with Tischendorf and Ropes that the form Βαρικριτοί best accounts for the other variant readings; the nominative is an attempt to improve the grammar, and the accusative appears to be in apposition with χαίροντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον. The reading of D presupposes a more exact transliteration of the Semitic Bar Jeshua²²
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(ἦσαν ἐπί τῷ “which passed into bariesuban of Lucifer and varisusus [i.e. barisusus] of the anonymous Opus imperfectum in Matt.

13.8 Ἔλληνς

Instead of Ἔλληνς codex Bezae reads (with a lacuna of one letter) Ἐτ[.].μας. That it should be spelled Ἐτοιμας is shown by the Latin side of the manuscript, which reads Etoemus, as does also Lucifer; the manuscripts of Ambrosiaster vary between elthmas, etymas, tymas, thimas, and atmas. Manuscripts of Pacianus read betyaman or betym magh. Likewise in support of the reading of Bezae is the addition in some Old Latin witnesses at the end of ver. 6, where E reads ὃ μεθερμηνεύεται Ἐλλήνες, but where ittig vgmsss Lucifer read paratus [i.e. “Ἑτοιμας.”

It is possible, as Harris suggested,²² that the Western tradition of Ἐτοιμας (or Ἐτοιμος) goes back to a source similar to the one used by Josephus when he mentions the part played by a Jewish magician who lived in Cyprus about this time and who helped the procurator Felix to win Drusilla (Ac 24.24), the wife of king Aziz of Emesa (Antiquities, xxvii:2). Although most of the manuscripts of Josephus call the magician Simon, one eleven-century manuscript, supported by the Epitome of the Antiquities, give him the name Atomos (“Ἀτόμος.”²²

While some scholars (including Zahn, Clemen, Wellhausen, Ropes, A. C. Clark, and C. S. C. Williams) have been impressed by the parallel in Josephus, Burkitt hesitated to accept the identification and proposed the conjectural emendation of οἱ λόγοι, a word that occurs in 24.5 and that was used by Demosthenes for a φήμη ("sorcerer"). The passage, as Burkitt would read it, runs: ἄνευστο
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οὐς αὐτοῖς ὃ λόγος, ὃ μάγος, οὗτος γὰρ μεθερμηνεύεται τὸ δύομα αὐτοῦ. “Now they were withstood by the pestilent fellow, the sorcerer I mean, for ‘pestilent fellow’ is the interpretation of the name.”²²

Despite Harris’s ingenious argument, which broadens the testimony supporting the Western reading(s), the Committee did not feel itself justified in disregarding the weight of the manuscript evidence attesting Ἐλλήνες.²²

13.8 τάσσεται

At the close of the verse codex Bezae, with the support of E syrhmg copsa, adds the reason why Elymas sought to turn away the proconsul from the faith: ᾧ ἐπεκρήνη ήμισθος ἥμισθοι αὐτῶν (“because he [the proconsul] was listening with the greatest pleasure to them”).²²

13.11 παραχρημάτα τι

External evidence is divided between παραχρημάτα τι, read by Ψ45 Β C 81 623 1175 vg syrh copbo eth, and παραχρημάτι δὲ, read by Ψ74 Β E H L P most minuscules syrh copsa arm, while codex Bezae goes its own way with καὶ ἐπεκρήνη. The frequent use of τι in Acts and Luke’s fondness for παραχρημάτα (all but two of its 18 occurrences in the New Testament are in Luke-Acts) led the Committee to prefer the reading of Ψ45 Β C 81 al.

13.12

Curiously, though codex Bezae is especially fond of τότε,²² here it substitutes δὲ for τότε.
In order to heighten and clarify the narrative D E itig syrp. Lucifer Ephraem and Vigilius add τθδμων και before ἐπίστευον, and D adds το γωνίαν after it. (“The proconsul, when he saw what had occurred, marvelled and believed in God, being astonished ...”)

13.18 ἐφροσύφορον {C}

The evidence is singularly evenly balanced between ἐφροσύφορον (“he bore with [them]”) and ἐφροσύφορον (“he cared for [them]”). The author is doubtless alluding to Dt 1.31, where the Septuagint text, in rendering ΝΨΞ, presents the same two variant readings: ἐφροσύφορον (so B and 28 other mss.; ἐφροσύφορο, ten mss.) σε κύριος ὢ θεὸς σου, ὡς εὐ τις τροφοφόρησα (Be al; τροφοφόρο, B* N 75 Origen3/6) ἄνθρωπος τῶν ὕλων αὐτοῦ. In Acts a majority of the Committee regarded ἐφροσύφορον to be slightly better attested (by Alexandrian and several Western witnesses). On the other hand, one has the feeling that in the context it is more likely that reference should be made to God’s interposition and efforts in behalf of the Israelites rather than his forbearance in the face of their ingratitude; the problem is whether the greater appropriateness was sensed by the author or by copyists. On balance it seemed best to adopt the reading that differs from the prevailing Septuagint text, on the ground that scribes would have been more likely to accommodate the two than to make them diverge.

13.19 καὶ καθελὼν

The initial καί is absent from B 81 corsa; it is present in Ἡ 74 Ν A C D E H L P and almost all minuscules. Despite Ropes’s argument for taking (as Westcott and Hort did) the preceding ὡς as “when,” the Committee regarded it as less cumbersome syntax and more in the style of Luke when numerals are involved to understand ὡς as “about,” and therefore was disposed to explain the absence of καί as haplography due to the following καθελὼν.

13.19 τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν {B}

Although αὐτῶν may have been omitted because it seemed to be too clumsy with the following αὐτῶν, a majority of the Committee preferred the shorter reading (supported, as it is, by early witnesses representing the Alexandrian and the Western types of text), and explained the insertion of αὐτῶν either as an assimilation to Dt 3.28 or as an expansion made in the interest of clarification (“he gave them their land as an inheritance”). D* al read “he gave the land of the foreigners.”

13.20 ὡς ἔστων ... μετὰ ταύτα (C)

The problems of verses 19 and 20 are both textual and exegetical. The Textus Receptus (following Db E P Ἡ and most minuscules) speaks of the period of the judges following the division of Canaan: “and after that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years, until Samuel the prophet” (AV). On the other hand the Alexandrian text transfers the temporal clause to the end of ver. 19, and thus makes the four hundred fifty years cover a period prior to the institution of the judges: “… when he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he gave them their land as an inheritance, for about four hundred and fifty years. (20) And after that he gave them judges until Samuel the prophet” (RSV).

The chronological reckoning involved in the reading of the Textus Receptus agrees almost exactly with that of Josephus (443 years, according to Antiquities, viii.ii.1), and both differ widely from 1 Kgs 6.1, where it is said that Solomon (who lived long after the judges) began his temple in the four hundred and eightieth (so the Hebrew text; but the Septuagint text reads four hundred and fortieth) year after the Exodus. The reckoning that lies behind the Alexandrian text evidently covers the four hundred years of the stay in Egypt (ver. 17).
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plus the forty years in the wilderness (ver. 18), plus about ten years for the distribution of the land (Jos 14). 122

On the surface, however, the Alexandrian text appears to limit the four hundred fifty years to the time that passed between the division of the land by Joshua and the institution of the judges. It was probably in order to prevent the reader from drawing such an erroneous conclusion that scribes transposed the temporal clause to the following sentence, producing the reading of the Textus Receptus.

It may be added that when modern translators of the Alexandrian text break up the one Greek sentence of verses 17, 18, and 19 into several different sentences, it is almost inevitable that the reader will take the temporal clause of ver. 19 as referring only to the final sentence.

13.23 ἠρέσατον {B}

Not only ἠρέσατον have strong and varied support, but in view of the presence of ἠρέσατον in ver. 22, it is easy to understand how copyists would have altered the less usual verb to the more characteristic expression.

13.23 σωτῆρα Ἰσραήλ

Instead of reading “God has brought to Israel a Saviour, Jesus,” Ἡ 74 H L and about 45vid C D E H L P and most minuscules read “God has brought to Israel salvation.” The error arose, as Tischendorf observes, through a palaeographical oversight, when εὖ οὖν (= σωτῆρα Ἰσραήλ) was read as ἐφαρμίζει (ἐν σωτηρίαν), or σωτηρίαν as σωτηρίαν.

13.25 τι ἢμι {B}

The reading τι ἢμι is supported by Ἡ 74 Α Β (81 τι μι αὐτοῦ (= μι αὐτοῦ) 915 corsa eth, whereas the reading τι ἢμι με is supported by Ἡ 45vid C D E H L P Ἡ 75 μι as minuscules vg syrp, h copbo arm. Here the Alexandrian text corresponds to Aramaic usage, and the Western and the Byzantine Greek texts reflect linguistic improvement.

It is possible to take τι as equivalent to a relative pronoun, so and so to replace the question mark after ἢμι with a comma (resulting in the meaning, “I am not what you think I am”; so Haenchen and REB).

13.26 ἢμιν {B}

The interchange of ὦ for ἢ (both were pronounced θθ), and vice versa, was a common blunder among Greek scribes (for example, earlier in the verse A D 81 read ἐν ἢμιν
instead of the obviously correct \(\text{in} \ \text{\`m}n\). In the present case the context as well as a combination of Alexandrian and Western witnesses strongly support the first person pronoun.

13.27 τοτεων ἀγαπημένης καὶ τὰς φωνὰς ... κρίναντες \(\text{[A]}\)

The text of verses 27–29 circulated in a variety of forms, the shortest being that of the Alexandrian witnesses. Several forms of the Western text (or, several Western types of text) supply various additions in order to provide a more complete, though summary, account of Jesus’ trial and death. Here and there the text of codex Bezae is ungrammatical and obviously corrupt. By using evidence from the Harclean Syriac and the Old Latin witnesses Blass, Hilgenfeld, Zahn, Ropes, and Clark reconstructed what each regarded as the original Western text. Ropes’s reconstruction,\(^{265}\) which may be selected as representative of a median text, is as follows: (27) οἱ μὲν κατευθυνότες εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ οἱ ἐρωτάτες αὐτής, \(\text{[B]}\)

The Committee, though agreeing with Hort’s judgment that “it can hardly be doubted that \(\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{n}\) is a primitive corruption of \(\text{h}^\text{tm}^\text{h}^\text{m}\),”\(^{266}\) felt compelled by the predominance of external evidence to print \(\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{h}^\text{h}\) but, in view of the transcriptional considerations mentioned above, to enclose \(\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{h}^\text{m}\) within square brackets. Besides the customary rendering of \(\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{h}^\text{h}\), it has been proposed to take \(\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{h}^\text{m}^\text{h}^\text{m}\) with what follows and to translate, “This promise God has fulfilled for the children, having for us raised up Jesus” (so W. F. Burnside, \textit{The Acts of the Apostles} [Cambridge, 1916], p. 163).

13.33 Ἰερουσαλήμ

Several Western witnesses expand Ἰερουσαλήμ by reading τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν (D copsa Ambrose) or τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν Ἰηρούσαλημ (614 syrh Hilary). It is obvious that if either of these had been the original reading, copyists would not have deliberately shortened the text so as to produce Ἰηρούσαλημ, which is read by the overwhelming mass of witnesses.\(^{13.33}\) εὐφορία γερμάντης \(\text{euvfV h`m`n}^\text{268}\) (\(\text{[B]}\))

It is not known when numerals were first assigned to the Psalms. There is some patristic and rabbinical evidence that in the early Christian period what is now reckoned as the second Psalm was regarded as the continuation of the first Psalm. In his comments on the second Psalm Origen states that he had two Hebrew manuscripts, in one of which the second Psalm was joined to the first. In illustration of such an ordering of the Psalms he refers to the present passage in Acts, where the statement, “Thou art my Son, today I have begotten thee,” is identified as a quotation from the first Psalm, whereas in the Greek manuscripts (here Origen means the Septuagint) this Psalm is indicated (\(\text{mu/nu/nu}^\text{269}\) as the second. At the same time, one should not overlook the fact, he adds, that no Hebrew manuscript of the Psalms actually contains a number, such as “first” or “second” or “third.”

Both the Jerusalem and the Babylonian Talmuds contain examples of rabbinical exegesis that count the first and second Psalms as one Psalm.\(^{270}\) In quoting the two Psalms Justin Martyr passes from the first to the second without indicating any break (\textit{Apol.} v.40), and Eusebius, Apollinaris, and Euthymius Zigabenus (all of whom, however, are probably dependent upon Origen) refer to this Hebrew practice.

\(\text{On the Latin side Hilary discusses at length in his treatise on the Psalms whether the apostle Paul made an error when, in Acts, he designated the quotation as coming from the first Psalm. Likewise in some manuscripts Tertullian (adv. Marcionem, n.22) and Cypritan (Testimonia, c.15; n. 112) adduce passages from the second Psalm under the rubric of \textit{in primo psalmo}.}^{271}\)
In evaluating the Greek manuscript evidence of Ac 13.33, it is apparent that the reading “second Psalm” was very widely disseminated—all uncials except D read δευτέρῳ.

On the other hand, the patristic evidence for πρῶτῳ is, if not overwhelming (as Clark characterizes it), at least very impressive.

The textual critic must weigh probabilities: was it more likely that Luke was acquainted with the tradition that counted the first two Psalms as one, and later editors or transcribers altered his πρῶτῳ to δευτέρῳ to conform to what became the usual enumeration, or was πρῶτῳ substituted by someone who was acquainted with the rabbinical practice of combining them?

Or is the reading of Π45, τοῖς ψαλμοῖς, to be preferred, not only because it is the oldest, but for transcriptional reasons as well?

The variety of positions at which the numeral (whether πρῶτος or δευτέρῳ) is introduced makes both numerals suspect. The rabbinical evidence for counting the two Psalms as one is linked, as was mentioned above, with the currency of the Eighteen Benedictions; but it is generally agreed that in the first century this liturgical set of prayers contained fewer than eighteen (perhaps twelve) benedictions, and so such an incentive to join the two Psalms could not have operated at that early date.

Yet, if the shorter reading is regarded as original, one has the difficulty of explaining why, in this passage alone in the New Testament, almost all scribes thought it necessary to identify the quotation by using a numeral with ψαλμοί. Does not this tradition suggest that the author had used one or the other numeral?

In view of the balance in transcriptional probabilities a majority of the Committee, impressed by the weight of four of the great uncials, supported as they are by Π74 33 81 al, preferred the reading τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ.

The Western text (D vg⁴⁴ syrh ms copG⁶⁷) continues the quotation by adding Ps 2.8, αὐτῶν παρ’ ἑμῶν καὶ δόξῳ σου ἐθνίς τὴν κληρονομίαν σου, καὶ τὴν κατασκευήν σου τὰ πέρα τῆς γῆς (“Ask of me and I will give you Gentiles for your inheritance, and for your possession the ends of the earth”).

Instead of ἄτι (1), which resumes the quotation begun at the beginning of ver. 33 (ἄτι), D 614 2412 itиг vgms Hilary continue with a somewhat easier and more loosely articulated construction introduced by ἐν.

CopG⁶⁷ expands ver. 34 with the following material: “He has raised him up from the dead in such a way as never again to return to decay, that all the people may know (ו) and repent. For thus it stands written in the prophet Isaiah, ‘I will make with you an everlasting covenant, the sure mercies of David.’”

The reading διὰ τούτου (“through this man,” K A B3 C D L P many minuscules) is more appropriate in the context (compare in τούτου, ver. 39) than διὰ τοῦτο (“for this reason.”) Π74 B* 61 326 436 1175 1838 al.

The latter reading may have arisen accidentally when Y fell out by haplography. The reading διὰ αὐτοῦ (E 218 425 611 642 808 al) softens what could be taken as a slightly disrespectful tone in τούτου (“this fellow”). The reading διὰ τούτοις (919) is an orthographic variant.

In order to smooth the construction by amplifying the sense the Western text makes several insertions: “Through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you, and repentance (μετάνοια, D vgms syrh with * and copG⁶⁷ before ως) from all those things from which you could not be freed by the law of Moses; by him therefore (οὖν, D 614 syrhmg) every one that believes is freed before God” (πρὸ τοῦ θεοῦ D syrhmg ὑπὸ θεοῦ).

The addition of ἐφ’ ἑμᾶς seems to be a natural supplement that scribes felt to be necessary in the context. Had it been present originally, there is no good reason that would account for its being dropped.

CopG⁶⁷ makes the reference more explicit, “what is said in Habakkuk the prophet.”

The second instance of ἔργον (Π74 K A B C 33 81 1765 1827 vg copsa, bo) was omitted (D E L P 104 216 326 429 915 1881 itig, p syrp, h al) either because it was felt to be redundant, or in order to assimilate the text to the Septuagint text of Hab 1.5.

At the close of Paul’s speech D adds καὶ ἔστησαν, and 614 syrh with * copG⁶⁷ add καὶ ἐστησαν: The former reading describes the deep impression that the apostle’s words made on his hearers; the latter reading indicates merely that he had finished his address.

The ambiguity of the earliest text (“as they [i.e. the apostles] went out, they [i.e. the people] besought them …”) was relieved by expansions serving to identify the several groups. Thus, in the Textus Receptus (following P 049 056 and most minuscules) the subject of καὶ ἐστησαν is τῶν Ἰουδαίων, and this is balanced by τὰ τῆν as the subject of παρεκάλεσαν (see the comment on the following set of variants). instead of μεταξύ, which more properly means “between” and only in common parlance “next,” codex Bezae preferred the unambiguous ἔξω.
Codex Laudianus (E), which has very short lines (sometimes but a single word), accidentally omits παρεκκλῆσιν; codex Vaticanus likewise omits it, but inserts another verb (which can also mean “they were asking”) after αὐθέντων.

The fact that there is a certain amount of repetition between verses 42 and 43, as well as the ambiguity referred to in the comments on the previous set of variants, accounts for the multiplication of variant readings. Hort was inclined to think that the exegetical difficulties pointed to the existence of a primitive error that had infected all witnesses, and suggested that “perhaps Ἀξιοῦντων should replace Τιμίων, and παρεκκλῆσιν and the stop at the end of the verse be omitted.” The resulting text, however, which involves two genitives absolute before the main verb, can hardly be regarded as superior to the reading attested by the majority of the old uncials. Even less plausible is the proposal to take παρεκκλῆσιν as “a corruption of παρ’ Ἁμαρκίων (or perhaps παρ’ Ἁμαρκίων – a possible form) – i.e. ‘from Habakkuk’: originally a sidenote to the effect that the quotation in v. 41, with which Paul’s speech ends, was made from that prophet.” Apart from the fact that παρ’ was not the preposition normally used to denote the origin of a quotation, the resulting syntax of the sentence without παρεκκλῆσιν is impossibly chaotic.

13.44 [A]
After Ἐρμῆς 614 al syrh with * insert ἔξοδος ἔπειτα ἐπισκόπησεν (“asking that they be baptized”), an addition which, as Haenchen says, was made in order to give content to the exhortation that they “continue in the grace of God.”

13.43 θεοῦ. [A]
At the close of ver. 43 codex Laudianus (E) corG667 and the Greek text known to Bede add ἔγραψεν ὑμῖν καὶ κατὰ πᾶνον πᾶλιν φιλοτείχησεν τὸν λόγον (“And it came to pass that the word was spread throughout all the city”). The verb φιλοτείχησεν occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only at Mt 28.15 as a variant reading of διαφημίζεται. The addition was probably made in order to explain how it was that on the following sabbath almost the whole city gathered together.

Codex Bezae, supported in part by syrhG67, makes even more extensive additions: “And it came to pass that the word of God went throughout the whole city (ἦν δὲ καθ’ ἅπαν τῆς πάνως διελθὼν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ). And the next sabbath almost the whole (ἦν δὲ καθ’ ἅπαν) city gathered together to hear Paul. And when he made a long discourse about the Lord (αὐδάον Παῦλον, παλιν τὸ λόγον πολυσυμνοῦσας πελ’ τοῦ κυρίου) and the Jews saw the multitudes, they were filled with jealousy, and contradicted the words (τοῖς λόγοις) spoken by Paul, contradicting and (ἀντιπέλαγοι καὶ) blaspheming.”

13.44 [C]
13.45 [B]
A majority of the Committee preferred the shorter text, regarding the longer reading as a Western expansion. The reading ἐπιστάλομεν καὶ appears to be an attempt to avoid the tautology that ἀνέλεγον makes with ἀνέλεγον.

13.46 [C]
The accusative is the object of ἐδάδησαν, Now, the expression διαίρεσεν τὸν λόγον occurs frequently, but διαίρεσεν τὸν λόγον τοῦ (θεοῦ (or κυρίου) is not found elsewhere. Probably for this reason codex Bezae substitutes ἔδόθη (“received”). Other scribes and translators omitted τὸν λόγον and made τὸν θεόν the object of the verb, and several (including those responsible for 614 876 1799 2412 and syrh) reworded the text to produce ἐκδιδότας τὸν θεόν καὶ ἐπιστάλοντο τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου (“glorified God and believed the word of the Lord”). As was the case in ver. 44, so here also the Committee judged that it was more likely that τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου would be supplanted by the more frequent τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ, than vice versa, especially since ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου occurs in ver. 49.

13.50 [A]
Codex Bezae, partly supported by E, adds θλίψιν μεγάλην καὶ βιασμόν (“... stirred up great affliction and persecution against Paul and Barnabas”); for a similar Western expansion, see 8.1.

14.2-7
The Western text of these verses adds a number of details that serve, among other things, to smooth away what, in the ordinary text, is a seeming lack of coherence between verses 2 and 3 (where mention is made of the opposition of the Jews: therefore the apostles remained for a long time). According to codex Bezae (with support in part from syrhG67 and corG667) the passage runs as follows (italics mark the chief additions and changes): “But the chiefs of the synagogue of the Jews and the rulers of the synagogue [syrhG67 omits “of the synagogue,” thus identifying ‘the rulers’ as those of the previously mentioned Iconians] stirred up for themselves and their followers persecution against the righteous τοῖς ἀγρυπνούσι τῶν ἱσχαριῶν καὶ τοῖς ἀρχηγοῖς.
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13.45 ἐπιστάλομεν καὶ [B]
13.46 τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου [C]
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14.2-7
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The greater smoothness of the Western text is probably a mark of its secondary character. for all the additions seem to be comments calculated to remedy difficulties in the ordinary text. Wong and Moffatt secure a smoother text by transposing ver. to what they think was the original position between verses and 2. Haenchen takes the aorist verbs in ver. as progressive (Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 318) and regards the Western text as an unnecessary expansion of what is already expressed in the usual text.

On the one hand, the overwhelming weight of external evidence reads τῷ λόγῳ (B C D E L P Ψ and apparently all minuscules), whereas only a few witnesses read εἰς τῷ λόγῳ (A* A syr bo) On the other hand, εἰς is such an unusual construction after μαρτυρεῖν that, according to the opinion of Ropes (ad loc.), it is probably genuine, perhaps being derived from an Aramaic original. Desiring to take into account both these considerations, a majority of the Committee decided to include εἰς in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.
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whereas only a few witnesses read εἰς τῷ λόγῳ (A* A syr bo). On the other hand, εἰς is such an unusual construction after μαρτυρεῖν that, according to the opinion of Ropes (ad loc.), it is probably genuine, perhaps being derived from an Aramaic original. Desiring to take into account both these considerations, a majority of the Committee decided to include εἰς in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.
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The reading of codex Bezae, oi ἐκ νευφων τοῦ δότος Δίου πρὸ πάλαιοι ... ἥθελον ἐπιθύμησιν (“But the priests of the local Zeus-before-the-city,” i.e. the Zeus whose temple was in front of the city) is, according to Lake and Cadbury, “either original or represents a correction based on exact knowledge of the probable situation.” Despite Blass’s protestations to the contrary, a college of priests was usually connected with great temples. Ropes, on the other hand, thinks that “the unhellenic phrase of the B-text τοῦ Δίου τοῦ δότος πρὸ τῆς πάλαιος may well reflect a Semitic original.”
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The reading of codex Bezae, oi ἐκ νευφων τοῦ δότος Δίου πρὸ πάλαιοι ... ἥθελον ἐπιθύμησιν (“But the priests of the local Zeus-before-the-city,” i.e. the Zeus whose temple was in front of the city) is, according to Lake and Cadbury, “either original or represents a correction based on exact knowledge of the probable situation.” Despite Blass’s protestations to the contrary, a college of priests was usually connected with great temples. Ropes, on the other hand, thinks that “the unhellenic phrase of the B-text τοῦ Δίου τοῦ δότος πρὸ τῆς πάλαιος may well reflect a Semitic original.”
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The reading of codex Bezae, oi ἐκ νευφων τοῦ δότος Δίου πρὸ πάλαιοι ... ἥθελον ἐπιθύμησιν (“But the priests of the local Zeus-before-the-city,” i.e. the Zeus whose temple was in front of the city) is, according to Lake and Cadbury, “either original or represents a correction based on exact knowledge of the probable situation.” Despite Blass’s protestations to the contrary, a college of priests was usually connected with great temples. Ropes, on the other hand, thinks that “the unhellenic phrase of the B-text τοῦ Δίου τοῦ δότος πρὸ τῆς πάλαιος may well reflect a Semitic original.”
come from Jerusalem ordered them, Paul and Barnabas and certain others, to go up to Jerusalem (εὐαγγ. … εἰς αὐτῶν ἠγγέλων γὰρ ὁ Παύλος μένιν οὕτως καθὼς ἐπίστευσαν διάσχισμαν, οὐ δὲ ἐλεημόριον ἤ Ἰερουσαλημ παρῆχθησαν αὐτοῖς τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ Βαρνάβῳ καὶ συμβ. Ἕλλην ἄνθρωποις). D (ἐφησάνεται) 1799 2412 syrh with * (αὐτῶν, 614 2412) against this question. (3) So, being sent on the way…[verse 3 as in ordinary text]. (4) When they came to Jerusalem, they were welcomed heartily (παρεκάθισαν) + μηγάλῳς, C D (μέγας) 614 1799 2412 syrh with * (copsa) by the church and the apostles and the elders, having declared all that God had done with them. (5) But those who had ordered them to go up to the elders (ἐξαντότητας καὶ τιμιῶσας αὐτοῖς ἐκεῖνος) + μηγάλοις τοῖς προφήταις ἐξαντότητας (+ κατὰ τῶν ἑπισκόπων, Syrh) λέγοντες τοὺς, D (syrh) and omit subsequent λέγοντες, namely certain believers who belonged to the party of the Pharisees, rose up (against the apostles), and said, ‘It is necessary to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses.’

The Western form of text is obviously written from a different point of view from the B-text. In the latter certain unidentified persons “arranged” (εὐαγγ. εὐαγγέλιον) for Paul and Barnabas, with others, to go from Antioch to Jerusalem; in the D-text, on the other hand, the envoy from Jerusalem “ordered” (παρῆχθησαν) Paul and others to go up to Jerusalem in order to give an account of themselves to the apostles and elders (ὅπως κρίθησθεν ἐν αὐτοῖς). One cannot say, however, that the Western paraphrast was anti-Pauline, for not only does he describe the Jerusalem church’s welcome to the apostles as hearty (ver. 4), but he displays no trace whatever of the animus against Paul that is so apparent in the circles represented by the later Clementine Homilies, where Paul appears as ἐγνώκετο ἄνθρωπος. The most that can be said is that the B-text reflects the point of view of Paul, whereas the D-text is more sympathetic to the local tradition of the church at Jerusalem. It should be noted that in ver. 1 the Western text makes the demands still more sweeping by adding “and walk according to the custom of Moses.” Likewise, the designation in ver. 1 of the brethern arriving from Judea as former Pharisees is drawn from ver. 5, where perhaps it was intended that the clause should be omitted.

In ver. 2 (αὐτῶν (after παρῆχθησαν), Ropes says “is not easily explained,” appears to be a clear example of the Semitic proleptic pronoun.
In order to enhance the solemnity of the occasion and the authority of the apostle Peter’s speech, several Western witnesses add, before or after Πέτρου, “in the (Holy) Spirit” (אVEN νπικλ, D; + Aleppo 614 1799 2412 syrhmg); see also the comment on 15.12. The scribe of Ψ45 has amplified the text by repeating information from 15.2.

15.9 οἴδην

During the Christian era the less usual form was οἴδεν. Copyists would therefore be inclined to change it to οἴδεν.

15.12 Ἐξάγησον δὲ [A]

Perhaps in order to enhance the prestige of Peter (see the comment on 15.7), several Western witnesses (D syrh with * Ephraem) add at the beginning of the verse the words συμπατηθήσεται δὲ τῶν προφετῶν τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρήμενοι (“And when the elders assented to what had been spoken by Peter”).

15.16 κατασκημμένω

Instead of κατασκημμένω (A C D E L P συρ- H) (ἵνεκ- E) most minuscules), several witnesses (R (ῥεμ- B) 33 61 104 326 915) read κατασκημμένα. The Septuagint text of Am 9.11, which is quoted here, also presents a variant reading involving the same word; Ac Q* read κατασκημμένα and B Qa read κατασκημμένων. The verb κατασκημμένων occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only at Ro 11.3. A majority of the Committee preferred the rarer verb, supported as it is by representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western texts.

15.17-18 πᾶντα γνωστὰ ἄτρ αἰῶνας [B]

Since the quotation from Am 9.12 ends with πᾶντα, the concluding words are James’s addition. The reading γνωστὰ ἄτρ αἰῶνας, however, is so elliptical an expression that copyists made various attempts to recast the phrase, rounding it out as an independent sentence.

15.20, 29; 21.25

The text of the Apostolic Decree, as it is called, is given at 15.29; it is referred to proleptically in 15.20 and retrospectively in 21.25. The three verses contain many problems concerning text and exegesis: (1) Are Gentiles commanded to abstain from four things (food offered to idols, blood, strangled meat, and unchastity) or from three (omitting either strangled meat or unchastity); and (2) are the three or four prohibitions entirely ceremonial, or entirely ethical, or a combination of both kinds?

(a) The Alexandrian text, as well as most other witnesses, has four items of prohibition.

(b) The Western text omits “what is strangled” and adds a negative form of the Golden Rule in 15.20 and 29.

(c) Several witnesses omit “unchastity” from 15.20 (so Ψ45 which unfortunately is not extant for 15.29 or 21.25) and eth) and from 15.29 (so Origen, contra Celsum, νε29, as well as vgms Vigiliius and Gaudentius).

The occasion for issuing the Apostolic Decree, it should be observed, was to settle the question whether Gentile converts to Christianity should be required to submit to the rite of circumcision and fulfill other Mosaic statutes. The Council decided that such observance was not required for salvation; at the same time, however, in order to avoid giving unnecessary offense to Jewish Christians (and to Jews contemplating becoming Christians), the Council asked Gentile converts to make certain concessions for prudential reasons, abstaining from those acts that would offend Jewish scruples and hinder social intercourse, including joint participation in the Lord’s Supper.

As concerns transcriptional probabilities, τῆς παροιμίας may have been omitted because this item seemed, superficially, to be out of place in what otherwise appeared to be a food law. Although such a consideration may well account for its absence, it is possible that what was intended by the Jerusalem Council was to warn the Gentile believers to avoid either marriage within the prohibited Levitical degrees (Lv 18.6-18), which the rabbis described as “forbidden for παροιμία,” or mixed marriages with pagans (Nu 25.1; also compare 2 Cor 6.14), or participation in pagan worship, which had long been described by Old Testament prophets as spiritual adultery and which, in fact, offered opportunity in many temples for religious prostitution.

Another way to make sure that the list deals entirely with ritual prohibitions is to remove παροιμία by emending the text. Bentley, for example, conjectured that the Apostolic Decree was an injunction to abstain “from pollutions of idols and swine’s flesh (παροιμία) and things strangled and from blood.” A similar conjecture, intended to produce the same dietetic interpretation, is to read παροιμίαν instead of παροιμία. But there is no known example of such a word in Greek, and if an example were found it would be an abstract noun (from παροιμώ) meaning “piggishness.”

Concerning (b), it is obvious that the threefold prohibition (lacking τοῦ πνεκτοῦ) refers to moral injunctions to refrain from idolatry, unchastity, and blood-shedding (or murder), to which is added the negative Golden Rule. But this reading can scarcely be original, for it implies that a special warning had to be given to Gentile converts against such sins as murder, and that this was expressed in the form of asking them to “abstain” from it – which is slightly absurd!

It therefore appears to be more likely that an original ritual prohibition against eating foods offered to idols, things strangled and blood, and against παροιμία (however this latter is to be interpreted) was altered into a moral law by dropping the reference to πνεκτοῦ and by adding the negative Golden Rule, than to suppose that an original moral law was transformed into a food law.

The alternative to accepting the fourfold decree is to argue, as P. H. Menoud has done, that the original text involved a twofold prohibition, namely to abstain from pollutions of idols and from blood, and that to this basic decree respecting kosher foods, Ψ45 al added “and from what is strangled,” thus extending the food-law concerning blood to all flesh improperly slaughtered. In the Western tradition the twofold decree was understood to be a moral injunction relating to idolatry and murder, and these witnesses added the prohibition against another major sin, unchastity. Subsequently the injunction concerning the negative Golden Rule was appended to the Western text, which thus extends the moral application far beyond the three basic prohibitions. Finally, the text of the great mass of witnesses represents a conflation of several Western expansions of the basic twofold decree.
Attractive though this theory is on the surface, the textual evidence is not really susceptible of such an interpretation. First, there is no manuscript evidence for the hypothetical twofold decree. Menoud does indeed shrink from pressing his conjecture concerning the twofold decree, and is prepared, with Lagrange, to adopt the reading of 'P45 as the original text. But such an alternative proposal leaves the text critic with exactly the same problems that confronted him before, namely, how to explain the deletion as well as the addition of certain items in the decree.

Secondly, the fact that in 15.20 πνευτοί precedes καὶ τοῦ αἵματος is hardly compatible with the theory that it was added in order to clarify and extend the meaning of αἵματος.

In conclusion, therefore, it appears that the least unsatisfactory solution of the complicated textual and exegetical problems of the Apostolic Decree is to regard the fourfold decree as original (foods offered to idols, strangled meat, eating blood, and unchastity – whether ritual or moral), and to explain the two forms of the threefold decree in some such way as those suggested above.


See the preceeding comments.

15.20 καὶ τοῦ πνευτοῦ [C]

See the preceeding comments. 202

15.20 αἵματος [A]

See the preceeding comments. 203

It is of historical interest that according to Aelius Lampridius, the biographer of Severus Alexander (A.D. 222–235), the Emperor "would often exclaim what he had heard from someone, either a Jew or a Christian, and always remembered, and he also had it announced by a herald whenever he was disciplining anyone, 'What you do not wish to be done to you, do not do to another.' And so highly did he value this sentiment that he had it inscribed on the Palace and on public buildings." 204

15.22 ἔρωμαι

In estimating the standard of accuracy displayed by the scribe of codex Bezae one must take into account the transforming of ἔρωμαι into ἔρωμαι and into ἐρωμαι in 1.23.

15.23 ἄδειλοι [B]

The addition of καὶ οἱ before ἄδειλοι appears to be an emendation made in order to avoid what in Greek is a somewhat harsh

apposition of ἄδειλοι with both οἱ ἀπόστολοι and οἱ πρεσβύτεροι. 205 The omission of the word by a few witnesses may be accidental due to similar endings.

15.24 ἐξελθόντας [C]

Despite the possibility that ἐξελθόντας was added, either under the influence of Ga 2.12 or "to guard against the appearances that τινὸς ἢ ἰδιωμόν belonged to the senders of the letter" (Knowling, ad loc.), a majority of the Committee was impressed by the weight of external evidence in support of its inclusion in the text. To represent the equivocal evidence, however, it was thought best to enclose the word within square brackets.

15.24 ἰδιωμόν [A]

The expansion, which though absent from D, is probably part of the original Western text, appears to be an addition derived from verses 1 and 5 and inserted here in order to specify in what particulars the Judaizers had sought to trouble the Antiochian Christians. The interpolation passed into the Textus Receptus.

Other witnesses add still further details; Chrysostom, for example, read ἐγένετον περιστομένων στόχων πάντων τῶν νήμων, and after νήμων the Old Georgian adds "of Moses."

15.25 ἐκλεξαμένοις [C]

It is difficult to decide whether ἐκλεξαμένοις was corrected to the dative for grammatical reasons, or whether ἐκλεξαμένοις was altered to the accusative to accord with
the prevailing text of ver. 22. On the basis of what was considered superior manuscript evidence a majority of the Committee preferred the reading ἐκλεξαμένοις, a reading that one member of the Committee preferred for ver. 22 also (where the dative is read by §74 33 206 242 614 630 642* 945 1704 1739 1891).

15.26 At the close of the verse the Western text (D E 614 1799 2412 syr[mss]) adds εἰς πάντα περισσῶν (“they risked their lives for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ in every trial”). The addition was probably prompted, as Lake and Cadbury remark (ad loc.), by the fact that παρεκκλησίαν τῇ φυσιᾷ is not usually applied to a man who is still alive. The gloss may be a reminiscence of 20.19 (so B. Weiss) or of Sirach 2.1 εἶπον αὐτῷ τὴν ψυχήν σου εἰς περισσόν (so J. Rendel Harris).

15.28 τῶν ἐπίσκοπων

The difficulty of the Greek τῶν ἐπίσκοπων (Nc B C H 69 81 429 436 611 614 1799 2412 al) prompted the alteration to the easier sequence of τῶν ἐπίσκοπων τοιχῶν (E L P most mss, followed by the Textus Receptus). The reading of τῶν ἐπίσκοπων (A 76 94 307 431) probably arose through the accidental omission of τοιχῶν. Whether τῶν ἐπίσκοπων (N* D 33) arose from haplography or whether τοιχῶν came into the other readings by dittography is uncertain, but the former is perhaps slightly more probable.

15.29 καὶ ποικίλας (B)

The plural number was assimilated to the singular in ver. 20. Concerning the omission, see the comments on ver. 20.

15.29 καὶ ποικίλας (A)

See the comments on ver. 20.

15.29 πράξας (A)

The future tense is to be preferred on grounds of both external evidence and transcriptional probability. The addition in the Western text, “being borne along by the Holy Spirit” (for the sense compare Php 3.15), reminds one of similar interpolated references to the Holy Spirit. Whether it arose among Montanists, who would naturally desire some reference to the Paraclete, or whether it is a misplaced gloss that was intended to explain ἀπολύσεις (ver. 30) or whether it is merely a pious expansion to give a specifically Christian turn to an otherwise secular close of the apologetic letter, which was inspired by the Holy Spirit (ver. 28), it is difficult to decide.

15.30 ἀπολύσεις

After ἀπολύσεις Dgr* and the manuscripts (which Blass, followed by Belser, takes to reflect the joyous speed with which they carry the letter to Antioch, in contrast to the more leisurely journey from Antioch to Jerusalem (ver. 21). On the other hand, however, Weiss interprets it not of the time consumed in the journey, but of the time of their departure, i.e. shortly after the close of the council they returned to put an end to the troubles at Antioch (compare ver. 24).

15.32 ἀνέτεις

After ἀνέτεις codex Bezae, with its characteristic interest in the Holy Spirit, adds πλήρεις πνεύματος ἀγίου (“who were themselves prophets filled with the Holy Spirit”).
The effect of the addition is to show that Lystra and Derbe were not included in Syria and Cilicia mentioned in the previous verse.

16.3 ἔλθην δὲ πατήρ αὐτῶν

The Textus Receptus, following Πατριαρχεῖα Παραλόγον ΑΒΓΔ in his two editions (the text of the American Bible Society’s edition of the Armenian New Testament reads “the Spirit of Jesus”).

16.8 παρευλόντος

The Western reading, “passing through Mysia” (διελθόντος, D itgig vg syrh, instead of παρευλόντος), is distinctly the easier reading, for the ordinary sense of παρευλόντος, “to pass alongside,” does not fit the context, which requires something like “passing by” in the sense of neglecting. It seems unlikely, as Knowling observes, “that διελθόθα, a common word, should have been changed to παρευλόθα. – the converse is far more probable.”

16.9 ὄραμα

In view of the external attestation (all witnesses except D in Acts Luke says “saw a vision”), a majority of the Committee had no hesitancy in preferring ὄραμα. Codex Bezae (supported in part by other Western witnesses) alters the structure of the verse: καὶ τὸν ὄραμα διὰ νυκτὸς ἀδέσποτον ἀνήρ Μακεδόνας τις ἐστώς κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν παρακαλῶν καὶ λέγων… (“And in a vision in the night there appeared to Paul, as it were a man of Macedonia, standing before his face, beseeching and saying …”). See also the following comments.

16.9 ἄνηρ
Against all other witnesses D syr12 and Ephraem read ὃς ἄνηρ. Although ὃς appears to be something of a favorite with Luke (15 of its 21 occurrences in the New Testament are in Luke-Acts), a majority of the Committee considered it more likely that the qualifying word would have been added than deleted in the present passage.

16.9 ἄνηρ Μακεδόνας τίς ἢ ἢν
A majority of the Committee judged that the combination of Πατριαρχεῖα Παραλόγον ΑΒΓΔ in Acts Luke-Acts was unknown in Luke’s time. The purpose of the banal addition is clear enough: the reviser wanted to make sure that the reader will understand how it was that Paul’s companions knew what he had seen in the vision – Paul told them!
Since internal considerations offer no decisive help in choosing between the variant readings, the Committee preferred to rely upon the strong combination of $\text{P}74 \ A \ B \ C \ 33 \ 81 \ al$.

16.11 ἀναχωφάνες δὲ [Β]

It is easy to understand how, at the beginning of a new section, δὲ (ς$\text{P}74 \ A \ (\text{D} \ E \ 33\ 51\ 69\ 81\ 181\ 326\ 441\ 1678\ 1989\ \text{vg}\ \text{syrhmg}\ \text{copbo}\ \text{Chrysostom})$ was replaced by $\text{o}ν(\text{B C H L most minuscules syrhtx copsa arm Irenaeuslat})$. The Western text (D 257 383 614 2147 syrhmg), in the light of its revision of ver. 10 (see above), leaves nothing to the reader’s imagination and reads δὴ ἐβαφοῦν ἀναχωφάνες (D$^2$ ἐβαφ.), thus showing the acracy with which Paul and his companions responded to the Macedonian call.

16.11 Νέας Πόλεως

The Textus Receptus, following C D$^2$ E H L P al, reads Νέας Πόλεως, whereas $\text{P}74 \ A \ B \ D2\ 467\ 1175\ 1739\ 1838\ \text{al}$ read Νέαν Πόλεων. A majority of the Committee preferred to adopt the classical usage, witnessed also in inscriptions, and to spell the name in two words.

16.12 πρῶτης[ς] μερίδος τῆς [D]

The oldest form of text in the extant Greek witnesses appears to be πρῶτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλεως, “a first city of the district of Macedonia.” Hort denied that μερίδος could ever denote a geographical division, and for this, and other reasons, regarded the passage as primitively corrupt. Subsequent to Hort, however, examples of such a geographical usage have turned up in papyri, in an inscription, and in late writers. But what is the meaning of πρῶτη; (1) Against the translation “chief” city (AV) is the fact that not Philippi but Thessalonica was acknowledged to be the chief city of Macedonia and Amphipolis the chief city of the district in which Philippi was situated. (2) Some have suggested that the author means that Philippi was the first Macedonian city to which Paul and his companions came in that district. But as a matter of fact the apostle first set foot in Neapolis, which apparently belonged to the same district as Philippi. Furthermore, apart from questions of geography one may well wonder why, on this interpretation of the meaning of πρῶτη, Luke should have wished to call attention to something so inconsequential to his narrative. (3) In view of the use of πρῶτη as a title of honor (found on coins of Pergamum and Smyrna as well as in inscriptions referring to Thessalonica), Lake and Cadbury translate the passage, “Philippi, which is a first city of the district of Macedonia, a colony.” In their comments, however, they point out that as a definite title the word has been found so far only in the cases of cities that were members of a κοινον (league or union) in their particular province, and were not Roman colonies at the time. Since Philippi does not qualify in either respect, they conclude that it is more probable that “the meaning of πρῶτη in this passage is simply ‘a leading city’” (the rendering subsequently adopted by the RSV).

The difficulties involved in the reading πρῶτη led to attempts at correction in other branches of the tradition. Among these, however, πρῶτη μερίς is impossible because a city cannot be called a μερίς. The omission of τῆς μερίδος results in calling Philippi πρῶτη τῆς Μακεδονίας πόλεως, which merely increases the problem, as does also the curious replacement of πρῶτη by κεφαλή, which is generally explained as a Latinism (rendering caput) or which may suggest influence from Syriac, where means both “head” and “foremost.”

Disappointed for various reasons with all these readings in Greek witnesses, a majority of the Committee preferred to adopt the conjecture proposed by a number of scholars from Le Clerc to Blass and Turner namely to read πρῶτης for πρῶτη τῆς, with the resultant meaning, “a city of the first district of Macedonia.” Those who adopt this conjecture usually explain the origin of the commonly received text (πρῶτη τῆς μερίδος) as due either (a) to the accidental reduplication of the letters τής or (b) to a misunderstanding of the correction if by mistake a copyist had written πρῶτης and then -τής were written over it to correct it. (The reading πρῶτης μερίδος is paralleled by primae partis found in three late Vulgate manuscripts, but it is doubtful whether this versional reading represents an original Greek witness or whether it originated within the Latin tradition.) At the same time, in order to take into account the overwhelming manuscript evidence supporting πρῶτης, the majority decided to enclose the final sigma of πρῶτης within square brackets.

[Despite what have been regarded as insuperable difficulties involved in the commonly received text (πρῶτη τῆς μερίδος), it appears ill-advised to abandon the testimony of $\text{P}74 \ A \ B \ C \ 33\ 81\ al$, especially since the phrase can be taken to mean merely that Philippi was “a leading city of the district of Macedonia”; cf. Bauer’s Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch, 6te Aufl. (1988), s.v. μερίς, K.A. and B.M.M.]

16.13 ἐνακείζομεν προσευχὴν [C]

In view of the wide range of variables in lexicography, syntax, palaeography, and textual attestation, the difficulties presented by this verse are well-nigh baffling.

Was ἐνακείζομεν supported by the later Byzantine text, original and subsequently altered, as Ropes argued, in order to avoid the less usual sense of the verb ἐνακείζομεν = “according to custom”; ἐνακείζομεν = “we thought”; ἐνακείζος = “it seemed”? How shall the following προσευχή[ν] be spelled and construed? The nominative as subject of an impersonal verb, though not impossible, is certainly not as common as the accusative, especially with εἶναι following. Furthermore,
Changing μ to ν Blass (ad loc.) conjectured that the original read οὐ ἐνώμεζον ἐν προσευχῇ ἐνίατι, “where they were accustomed to be at prayer” (cf. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 397, 2).

Faced with these difficulties the Committee decided that the least unsatisfactory solution was to print ἐνώμεζον προσευχῇ ἐνίατι, even though A2 and Ψ appear to be the only uncials that give precisely this reading. It was felt, however, that the manifestly erroneous reading οὐνωμεζον of ℓ74 K probably testifies to an earlier οὐνωμεζον, and that προσευχή in ℓ74 A B may have resulted from accidental omission of the horizontal stroke over the ν, signifying a final ν.

The Western text characteristically expands the narrative by adding παίζων, before δ ὀἶκος (D; compare cum omnibus suis, itigig).

The more difficult reading appears to be πέθων (ℓ74 K A B C* D* 81 326 1837 vg arm), which has been replaced in some manuscripts (ℓ45 C3 D2 E H L P most minuscules itigig syrh(gr) by πέθων.

The second person plural pronoun, which is more appropriate to the context, is supported by weighty evidence.

παρερχόμενα

In the opinion of a majority of the Committee the omission of παρερχόμενα from B itigig Lucifer must be accidental. The word appears to be a favorite with Luke, occurring in fifteen other passages in Luke-Acts, and in the rest of the New Testament only twice.

δ ἄσκομφολάς

After δ ἄσκομφολάς several manuscripts, including 614 1799 and 2147, identify the jailer as ο Πιστός Στεφάνος (“Faithful Stephanas”).

megálē phōs [6] Πισλώς

The manuscripts present a wide variety of readings: (a) μεγάλη φως Πισλώς, ℓ74 Ψ itd; (b) same as (a) but δ Πισλώς, A 1875 1898; (c) φως μεγάλη Πισλώς, K C* 33; (d) same as (c) but Πισλώς, C3 Dgr E P most minuscules; (e) Πισλώς μεγάλη φως, B; (f) same as (e) but Πισλώς, 181 431 927; (g) Πισλώς φως μεγάλη, 36 180 629 itigig. The overwhelming weight of external evidence reads φως near ἐξάσσομεν υἱῷ. It appears that several copyists, disliking this Semitic type of construction, moved φως farther away from the verb. In view of the division of testimony for and against the presence of δ, it seemed best to include the word on the basis of the combined testimony of ℓ74 A Ψ 1875 1898 ad, but to enclose it within square brackets.

προσευχήν

After προσευχήν the Western text (D* itd, gig vgcl syrh with obelus copsa, bo Lucifer Cassiodorus) introduces the natural supplement πρὸς τούς πόδας.

The Western text adds the detail that the jailer “secured the rest” of the prisoners before he addressed Paul and Silas (after ἤλατο δ σύρων with * read τοὺς λοιπούς ἀσφαλείαςμον). Despite Sir William Ramsay’s inclination to accept the addition as genuine, “suggestive of the orderly, well-disciplined character of the jailor,”232 the great probability is that after an earthquake the average Near Eastern jailer was hardly likely to exhibit such a degree of discipline as either Ramsay or the Western glossator attributes to him!

καὶ τοῦ κυρίου (B)

Although Weiss argues that the reference in ver. 31 to the Lord Jesus influenced scribes to alter “the word of God” to “the word of the Lord,”232 in view of the preponderant weight of external testimony the Committee preferred κυρίου. What Ropes describes as a special force residing in θεός, which calls attention to the divine truth of the answer of ver. 31, so far from supporting the genuineness of θεός, suggests rather the work of scribal refinement.

καὶ τὸν

The Textus Receptus, following E H L P most minuscules, replaces τὸν (ℓ74 A B C D 33 36a 61 81 181 242 431 441 927 1837 1873 ad) with καὶ, thus attaining greater simplicity, and paralleling οὐ καὶ δ ὀἶκος of the previous verse.

ἀπεστείλαν οἱ στρατηγοὶ (A)

In order to explain the sudden change of attitude on the part of the magistrates, who now entreat the apostles to leave, D syg est Cassiodorus and Ephraem read, (35) ημέρας ἂν γενόμενης οἱ στρατηγοὶ ἔθνος τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ ἀδικηματοθείνας τῶν σκοπῶν τῶν γεγονότων ἐμφανίσασθαι, καὶ ἀπεστείλαν τοὺς αὐθαυτούς λέγοντας (“But when it was day the magistrates assembled together in the market place, and recollecting the earthquake that had taken place, they were afraid; and sent the police, saying …”).

καὶ τῶν

Here D 614 1799 2412 syr add the rather superfluous clause οὐς ἐχθρὸς τιμῆται (“whom you took into custody yesterday”).

ἐν εἰρήνῃ (A)

Although Ropes thought that ἐν εἰρήνῃ “is inappropriate in the mouth of a Greek jailer,” a majority of the Committee did not regard such a consideration to be germane to the question whether Luke may not have thus described the words of farewell uttered by the newly converted jailer. The omission of the phrase from two manuscripts (D itigig) appears to be accidental.

προσευχή

Leaving nothing to the imagination of the reader, in ver. 36 codex Bezae reads καὶ εἰσέλθων ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ ἐπήγγειλε, while syr, still more circumstantial, reads καὶ ἀκούοντας ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ εἰσέλθων ἐπήγγειλεν. Similarly in ver. 38 codex Bezae is
The wide variety of readings seems to have arisen from the unusual reading preserved only in codex Vaticanus. Since, however, the Committee was reluctant to accord a decisive role to one manuscript, it preferred to indicate the slender basis of the reading by enclosing within square brackets the definitive article before Ἰησοῦς.

For the change to direct discourse from indirect compare 1.4 23.22 Lk 5.14

17.4 ἐπικρατήσαντες

On the strength of the confused text of codex Bezae, ἐπικρατήσαντες τῷ Ἄρκτῳ καὶ τῷ Σιλαίᾳ τῇ διάκονῃ πολλοὶ τῶν σεβόμενων ..., A. C. Clark, following the suggestion of Blass, reconstructs the text as follows: ἐπικρατήσαντες τῇ διάκονῃ καὶ προσκεκληθησάντες τῷ Ἄρκτῳ καὶ τῷ Σιλαίῳ πολλοὶ τῶν σεβόμενων...(... were persuaded by the teaching, and many of the devout joined Paul and Silas ...).

17.4 Ἐλλήνων

The unusual collocation of σεβόμενον Ἐλλήνων, not found elsewhere, prompted several copyists (𝔓74 A D 33 661 614 1739 al) to insert καί, so as to indicate two classes instead of one. 17.4 γυναικῶν τε (A)

It is possible to translate γυναικῶν τοῖς τῶν πρῶτων "and wives of the leading men," an interpretation that the Western text enforced by reading καί γυναικῖς τῶν πρῶτων. A majority of the Committee preferred the reading supported by Ἐλλήνων τε (B). It was thought much more likely that copyists would replace the less usual connective by the more common καί (or de, as in ii1.321).

17.5 σχημάτισαντες καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι προσκλήσαμεν Part of the distinctive reading of codex Bezae, οἱ καὶ ἀπεστάλθησαν Ἰουδαίοι συνεργάζονται τινας ἁριστάς τῶν ἀρχαίων τουσιον προσκλήσασθαι τὴν πόλιν ("But the Jews who disbelieved assembled some wicked fellows of the rabble and set the city in an uproar"), is preserved in the later Byzantine text, προσκλήσαμεν δὲ οἱ Ἰουδαίοι οἱ ἀπεστάλθησαν (ὁ λ. ἀπεστ. Ἰουδ.)(H L P most minuscules), and in the Textus Receptus, σχημάτισαντες δὲ οἱ ἀπεστάλθησαν Ἰουδαίοι καὶ προσκλήσαμεν (a reading that lacks any significant support in the manuscripts). On the verb συντρίβεται, see the final comment on 10.41.

17.9 καὶ λαβόντες On the strength of συντρίβει, with indirect support from Ephraem, A. C. Clark prints οἱ μὲν οὖν πολεμάρχαι λαβόντες. The reading, however, appears to be an obvious amelioration introduced in order to smooth the sequence between verses 8 and 9.

17.11 οὗτος At the close of the verse the Western text, represented by 383 614 1799 2412 ἐπέθετο ὑγιές Ἐφραήμ Priscillian, expands by adding καθὼς Παύλος ἀπέγραψε ("examining the scriptures daily to see if these things were so as Paul was proclaiming").

17.12 After beginning the verse with a rather banal observation, τινες κέν οὖν τούτων ἐπίστευον, τίνες δὲ ἠπίστευον ("Some of them, therefore, believed, but some did not..."
believe,” cf. 28.24), codex Bezae smooths the grammar of the generally received text and reads καὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ τῶν εἰσηγηθέντων ἄνδρες καὶ γυναίκες.

17.13 καὶ παρέσυρσε τοὺς δῆλους [B]

Many witnesses, including 345 E P 049 056 0120 0142 al, followed by the Textus Receptus, lack the words καὶ παρέσυρσε. The shorter text appears to be the result of transcriptional oversight, accompanied by homoeoteleuton with the preceding παλαιώτερος. The vernacular διαλεκτικόν occurs in D only here and at 8.24.

17.14-15

Codex Bezae, with occasional support from other Western witnesses, recasts these two verses as follows: τῶν μὲν οὖν Παύλου οἱ ἀδελφοὶ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπελεύσθη ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν ὑπείρασαν ὧν ἦν ὁ Σιλας καὶ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἵνα οἱ ὁ καταστάσεως τοῦ Παύλου ὑγιῶν Εὐρώπης, παρθένοιν ἡ γυναῖκας, ἐκκυμωσιν γὰρ εἰς αὐτοὺς περιέρχεται τὸν λόγον, λάβοντες δὲ εἰς τὴν ἐλάσσον πάροικον παλαιόν τῶν Σιλαν καὶ Τιμόθου ὡς ἐν τῇ ἑβδομαδίᾳ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἐξήκουσαν (“The brethren therefore sent Paul off to go to the sea, but Silas and Timothy remained there.”) (15) And those who conducted Paul brought him as far as Athens, and he passed by Thessaly, for he was prevented from proclaiming the word to them; and having received a command from Paul for Silas and Timothy to come to him quickly, they departed). The purpose of the addition in ver. 15 is to explain why nothing happened on Paul’s journey through Thessaly.

17.14 ἐκ τῆς

The Western text (D ἐκ m6 al) reads ἐκ τῆς θάλασσας. The introduction of ἐκ in the Byzantine text suggests an attempt to foil the Jews by a ruse (“then immediately the brethren sent away Paul to go as it were to the sea.” AV). Inasmuch as ἐκ as with a following preposition occurs elsewhere in Luke-Acts (cf. Lk 24.50; Ac 21.5; 26.11), the Committee preferred to follow the combination of 374 Β A B 33 81 1739 vg al.

17.18 ὅτι ἐσφυγκέλετο

It is curious that D ἐκθεῖ omit the explanatory clause. Although some scholars have regarded the reading as a Western non-interpolation, it is more likely that the words were omitted because “the writer scrupled to appear to class ἔφυγεν among the ἠδρικά” (so Knowling; i.e. the clause implies that Paul’s hearers understood ἔφυγεν as a female deity parallel with Jesus).

17.19 ἐπιλαμβάνει τε αὐτοῦ

The Western text embroiders the sentence by prefixing μετὰ δὲ ἡμῶν τινὰς ἐπιλαμβάνειν αὐτοῦ (D syrh) and by adding ποινοθυμοῦμεν καὶ κατὰ Πάριου (D; “And after some days they took hold of him and brought him to the Areopagus, inquiring and saying ...”).

17.26 εἰς ἔνδοξος [B]

The Western text, with the support of a wide range of early versions and patristic witnesses, adds αἰματος after ἔνδοξος. This reading passed into the Textus Receptus and lies behind the AV. In support of
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the longer text is the palaeographical consideration that αἰματος may have been accidentally omitted because it ends in the same letters as the preceding ἔνδοξος. It is also possible, though perhaps not probable, that someone deliberately deleted the word, since it appears to contradict the statement in Genesis that God made man from dust – not blood (Gen 2.7). Likewise, there is some force in the consideration that αἰματος is not a very natural gloss on ἔνδοξος – for that one would have expected αὐνάρησις or something similar.

On the other hand, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the external evidence supporting the shorter text, and judged that αἰματος was a typical expansion so characteristic of the Western reviser.

17.27 ἦρεν τὴν θέσιν [A]

The reading κήρυκος undoubtedly arose from the careless substitution by a scribe of κηρυς for κηρυκος, an exchange that occurs frequently. In any case, the argument of Kilpatrick, who assumes that κήρυκος was original and that scribes felt it to be ambiguous, is difficult to reconcile with the circumstance that the following verb “to feel after” agrees better with κήρυκος than with either κηρυς or κήρυκον.

Although it is doubtless true, as Nestle pointed out, that scribes would be more likely to alter θέσιν to θέσων, the fact that θέσιν occurs in ver. 29 may account for its intrusion here. Furthermore, since θέσις is the subject of the sentence (cf. ver. 24), there was an added incentive for scribes to alter θέσιν to θέσων or κήρυκος.

It should be noted that the present text of codex Bezae, μέλιστα ἦρεν τὸ θείον ἑστιν, cannot be construed with the rest of the sentence and must be emended either by altering τὸ to ὁ (as Clark does in accord with the testimony of m76 and Irenaeus) or by deleting ἐστιν (as Ropes and Streeter prefer). In either case the presence of
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μέλιστα gives the impression that the reading is a secondary qualification.

17.28 ὅς καὶ τινὲς τῶν καθ᾽ ἑμᾶς ποιητῶν [A]

Codex Bezae adds to the quotation the phrase τὸ καθ᾽ ἑμᾶς ἡμῶν (“in him we live and move and have our being day by day”).

According to Rendel Harris this reading arose from a misread and misplaced marginal annotation. He suggests that a corrector who wished to alter τῶν καθ᾽ ἑμᾶς in the next line to “some of our own poets” “indicated this in the margin in a sort of short-hand, which was
misunderstood as τὸ καθορισμένον and inserted as an expansion into the previous line.

Williams, however, agrees with W. L. Knox that “a more likely explanation is that it was a favourite phrase of D.”

Although Clark thinks that “it would be difficult to find a more typical example of a gloss than the addition of ποιήσαντος,”124 it is also possible, as Lake and Cadbury remark, that the Western editor may have had some moral objection to quoting poets. At any rate, the Peshitta Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic versions read “sages” or “wise men” instead of “poets.”

Scribal confusion between ἵμας and ἵματι, which were pronounced alike, was common. It is scarcely likely that Paul would have represented himself as one of the Greeks.

17.30 τῆς ἁγίασις

The addition in codex Bezae and the Vulgate of ταύτης after τῆς ἁγίασις, thought by Evw125 to involve a deliberate contrast to the ignorance referred to in 3.17, is more probably an innocent heightening

with no subtle allusion to a different attitude of God toward Jewish (as distinguished from Gentile) ignorance.

17.31 εἰς ἀνδρὶ (A)

After ἀνενέχθη several Western witnesses (D vg126 and Irenaeus) add the identifying Ἰρνοῦ.

17.34

The omission in codex Bezae of the words καὶ γυνὴ ἄνδρῳ Δάμαρις has been taken by some (e.g. Wm. M. Ramsay) to be another indication of the anti-feminist attitude of the scribe (see the comment on ver. 12 above)127. It is, however, more likely, as A. C. Clark suggests,128 that a line in an ancestor of codex Bezae had been accidentally omitted, so that what remains in D διὰ τῆς καὶ Διονυσίου τῆς Ἀρεοπαγίτης ἐνεργειάς καὶ Ἴρνου, ὡς αὐτός (among whom also was a certain Dionysius, an Areopagite of high standing, and others with them). In either case, however, the concluding phrase αὐτὸς αὐτοῖς suggests that Luke originally specified more than one person (Dionysius) as among Paul’s converts.

It is curious that codex Bezae reads ἐνεργειάς to indicate the high standing of Dionysius, though being an Areopagite would naturally imply his honorable estate without adding the adjective.129 Its presence, according to an ingenious explanation proposed by J. Armitage Robinson,130 is to be accounted for as follows. According to Robinson it is significant that in Acts the word ἐνεργειάς is used only of women (13:50, 17:12). Under the influence of its usage earlier in Acts some gallant scribe added the word after Δάμαρις.131 Later, after the same trade, and he stayed with them and worked; for they were tentmakers by trade. (4) And entering into the synagogue each sabbath day, he held a discussion, introducing the name of the Lord Jesus, and persuaded not only Jews but also Greeks).

Lake and Cadbury remark on verses 2 and 3 that “the awkwardness of the Greek in the B-text may be at least partly responsible for the interesting and smoother version of the Western text.”132 (On ἐγκαίνια in ver. 3, see the comment on that verse.) In ver. 4 the Western addition implies that in his expounding of the Old Testament scriptures Paul would “insert the name of the Lord Jesus” where, according to Christian theology, it was appropriate. Compare also the addition in D syr133 ἐν at the beginning of ver. 6. At the end of ver. 3 codex Bezae and ἐν lack the statement, “for they were tentmakers by trade”; the absence is due no doubt to accidental omission of a line of text.

16.3 ἐγκαίνια / ἐγκαίνια (B)

The plural ἐγκαίνια in several Alexandrian witnesses is probably an accommodation to the plural forms immediately preceding and following.

18.6 λόγῳ (B)

The expression that Paul ἐγκαίνια τοῦ λόγου (“was wholly absorbed with preaching,” so Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker) seems to have been misunderstood, so that παντὸς was either deliberately substituted for λόγῳ or, being added as an explanation in the margin, eventually usurped the place of λόγῳ, with the resultant meaning “was urged on by the Spirit” or “was pressed in the spirit” (so the AV).
18.6

At the beginning of the verse the Western text (D syriac it) inserts πολλοὶ δὲ λόγου γνωρίζοντα καὶ γράφοντα ὄμμηπολομένων

("And after there had been much discussion, and interpretations of the scriptures had been given …"). Compare also the comments on verses 2 and 3.

18.7 ἐκείνου

The Western reviser emended ἐκείνου to ἔκειν τοῦ Ἀκίλλα (D it), and other witnesses conflated the two readings; thus ἐκείνου to τοῦ Ἀκίλλα, 614 (1799) 2412. But it is unlikely that opposition of the Jews in the synagogue would have caused Paul to change his residence from the home of Aquila, with whom Paul continued to have good relations. The Western revision reflects, as Bruce points out, "a misunderstanding of Luke’s meaning; Paul did not remove his private lodgings from Aquila’s house to that of Justus, but made Justus’s house his preaching headquarters instead of the synagogue," which was next door.

18.7 Τίτιος Ἰωάσου (C)

There is a considerable amount of divergency among the witnesses. Ropes argued that the reading with a single name Ἰωάσου is probably original, and by dittography ὄνοματι ΠΙΟΥΣΟΥ gave rise to Τίτιος. But, as Goodspeed pointed out, the hypothesis is seriously weakened by the absence of the word ὄνοματι from codex Alexandrinus, the chief ancient support for the omission of Titus. Furthermore, the opposite error, that of haplography, is perhaps even more likely to have occurred, and from ΤΙΤΙΟΣ and ὄνοματι Τίτιος Ἰωάσου came the shortened form in most of the uncial manuscripts. In any case Τίτιος seems to be a secondary correction, as the more familiar name.

18.8 καὶ ἔβαπτιζοντο (A)

The verb ἔβαπτιζοντο was supplemented by scribes with the addition of "through the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (614 syriac it) or "believing God through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ" (D); the latter ignored the redundancy that was created with the previous ἐπίσκεψιον.

18.12 Ἰουδαίοι

After Ἰουδαίοι the Western text (D it and partly syriac it) continues with the more colorful account συνελάβασαν μὲν ἑαυτοὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον, καὶ ἐπέθετες τὰς χείρας ἧγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν ἀνθίσθενον (D has ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα), κεφαλοῦσας καὶ λέγοντες...("having talked together among themselves against Paul, and having laid hands upon him they brought him to the governor, crying out and saying ...").

18.17 πάντες (B)

In order to identify the “all” who seized and beat Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, the Western and later ecclesiastical texts (and hence the AV) add the identifying words, “the Greeks,” i.e. the Gentile community. Several minuscule manuscripts read “all the Jews,” which is much more unlikely to represent the real situation.

At the close of the verse the Latin text of codex Bezae reads lunc Gallio fingebat eum non videre ("Then Gallio pretended not to see him"). The line in the Greek text of codex Bezae after βῆματος is erased and nothing is now legible, but it is fair to assume that it corresponded to the Latin; Clark reconstructs τότε ὁ Γαλλίων προσκυνεῖτο μὴ ἰδεῖν.

18.19 κατήγοραν (B)

The Textus Receptus, following Ψ33 P Ψ most minuscules αι, alters κατήγοραν to the singular in conformity with the other verbs in the context.

18.21 εἶπαν [A]

The addition made by the Western reviser, which has passed into the later ecclesiastical text (and therefore is represented in the AV: “I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem”), is loosely paralleled by the similar statement in 20.16, and by the Western text of 19.1 (see the comment on the latter passage). The interpolation (for thus it must be accounted, there being no reason why, if original, it should have been deleted in a wide variety of manuscripts and versions) may well give, as Bruce observes, “the true reason for Paul’s hasty departure, the feast probably being passover.”

18.24 Ἀπαλλάθη ὄνοματι

The name Ἀπαλλάθη is an abbreviated form of Ἀπαλλάθωνος (read here by D). It may be that the variant reading Ἀπαλλή (N* 307 431 453 536 610 cop arm geo (eth) Didymus Ammonius) is an Egyptian preference. On the other hand, despite its meager attestation here and in 19.1, Kilpatrick suggests that Ἀπαλλή is the original reading in Acts and that scribes assimilated it in most witnesses to the name of the Ἀπαλλάθων of 1 Corinthians. (See also the comment on 19.1.)

18.26 οὗτος δὲ κατηχημένος τὴν Ἰδού τοῦ κυρίου
The Western addition (D 383 614 syr arm al) of εν τῇ πατρίδι (“who had been instructed in his own country in the word of the Lord”) implies that Christianity had reached Alexandria by about A.D. 50. Whether the statement of the Western reviser depends upon personal knowledge or is based on inference, the implication of the statement no doubt accords with historical fact.

The reading τῶν λόγων (D 35 36* 94 142 242 307 309 323 429 431) instead of τῶν δόων is, as Ropes declares, “clearly an attempt to make a hard word easier” (ad loc.); the same type of change appears also in ver. 25.

18.25 τοῦ Πησείου (A)

The Committee preferred the reading Πησείου, not only because of the stronger and more diversified external witnesses in its support, but also because it appears that the readings with κυρίου arose from assimilation with the previous instance of κυρίου in the same sentence.

18.26 Πρίσκilla καὶ Ἀκύλας

Apparently the Western reviser (D 383 614 syr arm al) desired to reduce the prominence of Priscilla, for he either mentions Aquila first (as here) or inserts the name of Aquila without including Priscilla (as in verses 3, 19, and 21). The unusual order, the wife before the husband, must be accepted as original, for there was always a tendency among scribes to change the unusual to the usual. In the case of Priscilla and Aquila, however, it was customary in the early church to refer to her before her husband (cf. Ro 16.3; 2 Tm 4.15). On an antifeminist tendency, see the comment on 17.12 above.

18.26 τῶν δόων [τοῦ θεοῦ] (C)

While appreciating the force of the consideration urged by Alford, Ropes, and others, namely that τῶν δόων in the Western text is original and the other readings are attempts to render it more intelligible, a majority of the Committee was reluctant to accord primary weight to the testimony of D here inasmuch as in ver. 25 it is clearly secondary, having substituted λόγων for δόων. On the other hand, in view of the usage in 9.2; 19.9, 23; 24.14, 22, it was agreed to represent the possibility that the Western text may be original and to enclose τοῦ θεοῦ (N* A B) within square brackets.

18.27

The Western reviser (D, supported in large part by syr arm al) expanded and paraphrased this verse as follows: εν ὁ τῇ Ἑβραϊσ ἐπιημονίεστες τινες κυρίσθησιν καὶ σκοποῦντες αὐτοὺς παρακάλεσθε διεκθῶ τὰν αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν πατρίδα αὐτῶν, συμμετεχοῦσαν ταῦτα αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἑβραῖος ἑγγειον τὰς εἰς τὸν κυρίσθησιν μακρῖς ὅπως ἀποδέξηται τὸνἄνεμον αὐτὸς ἑπιημονίας εἰς τὴν Ἀχαιαν παυλίσαν καὶ συνεβάλλοντο ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (“And some Corinthians who were on a visit to Ephesus and had heard him invited him to cross over with them to their native place. When he agreed, the Ephesians wrote to the disciples to receive the man; and when he took up residence in Achaia he was of great help in the churches”).

The unusual orientation and outlook, as well as certain internal difficulties of the passage, have been pointed out more than once. For example, nowhere else in Acts do we read of members of one church acting in another church, nor do we ever hear of an invitation to an apostle or evangelist to come to a church (16.9 is not a parallel). But there is a more serious difficulty. If Apollos’s visit is made at his own initiative, an introductory letter recommending him to the Corinthians is appropriate; if, on the other hand, he goes at the invitation of members of the Corinthian church, why is it necessary that the Ephesians supply such a letter?

18.28 δημοσίως ἐπιδεικνύοντο

The Western text (D 383 614 syr arm al) expands the account so as to read δημοσίως διαλεγόμενοι καὶ ἐπιδεικνύοντο (“discoursing publicly and showing”).

19.1 Ἐγκύκλιο ... εἰς Ἐφεσον (A)

Omitting the clause Ἐγκύκλιον τῷ ἄνωτέρῳ ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ, the Western text (D 383 syr arm al) with partial support from it and Ephraem) substitutes the following: Φιλικόντες δὲ τῷ Παύλῳ κατὰ τὴν ἱδρυμας βουλής παρεκθεθανε εἰς ἑρωδίαμα εἶπαν αὐτῷ τὸ σήμα ὑποστρέψῃ εἰς τὴν Ἀλίαν, διεθέσας δὲ τὰ ἀνωτέρους μέρη ἔρχεται εἰς Ἐφέσος (“And although Paul wished, according to his own plan, to go to Jerusalem, the Spirit told him to return to Asia. And having passed through the upper country he comes to Ephesus …”).

It is difficult to understand why so much is said about a purpose that was not accomplished. Weiss is correct in observing that “the whole antithesis between ἱδρυμας βουλής and an order of the Spirit is neither in the character of Paul nor of Luke, who brings expressly into prominence how Paul allows all his decisions to be made by the will of God made known to him through the Spirit.” (See also the comment on 18.21.)

19.1 Ἀπολλὼ

Instead of Ἀπολλὼ, 334 A 181 read Ἀτταλὼν, and 334 370 431 453 536 610 cp00 read Ἀταλίλον. (See also the comment on 18.24.)

19.5 Πησείου

The Western text (D 383 614 ἀνθ.) expands the brief statement, “they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus,” by continuing Χριστοῦ (ν) ἐν ἐπάθην ἐμπρόσθεν. The addition, though intended to be edifying, is inept, because these persons had previously received John’s baptism for the remission of sins.

19.6

Instead of ἣν δὲ καὶ codex Bezae and Jerome read the more colorful εἰκὼν εἰς πνεύματοι (“the Holy Spirit immediately fell upon them”). After γλῶσσας the Western text (represented by syr arm al) and, in part, by ὄν ἐν ἐπάθην and Ephraem) adds “other tongues, and they themselves knew them, which they also interpreted for
themselves; and certain also prophesied.” Although Clark professes to believe that “it is more natural to suppose that the words...were struck out as inconsistent with ch. 2, than that they were introduced as an interpolation from 1 Cor. xiv,” it is much more probable that the Western form of text arose by scribal embroidering of the Alexandrian text than that the text in all known Greek manuscripts has been curtailed because of what might possibly be regarded as an inconsistency with the account of Pentecost in Acts 2.

19.8 ἐπαρθησιαζότο

The Western text (D syr') reads ἐν δυνάμει μεγάλῃ ἐπαρθησιαζότο (“spoke boldly with great power”).

19.9 Γυνάκινον (B)

The interesting addition in the Western text (”[Paul] argued daily in the hall of Tyrannus from the fifth hour to the tenth” [i.e. from 11:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.]) may represent an accurate piece of information, preserved in oral tradition before being incorporated into the text of certain manuscripts. Were it present in the original text, there is no good reason why it should have been deleted. (Instead of “to the tenth” two Latin manuscripts of the Vulgate read “to the ninth” (G), “to the ninth and tenth” (D).)

19.14, 16

The Western text (codex Bezae and, in part, J rs syr' Ephraem) rewrites ver. 14 as follows: ὑπὸ τὸ ὅτι [ἐκ τῆς συμβουλῆς] Σκηνεῖ τινὸς ἱερῶς ἔδηλον τοῦ αὐτοῦ τοίχου (πέσε ἐσάρξ τοῖς τοιούτοις ἔξοριζεν), καὶ ἐσκελεστέα πρὸς τὸν ἀκούσαντέα ἔριζε τὸ ὅσιον ἡμῶν. Παραγγελίαν οὐ ἐν ὅποιον ἡμῶν ἐξείλεντον κηρύσσων (”in this connection also [seven] sons of a certain priest named Sceva wished to do the same thing (they were accustomed to exorcize such persons). And they entered into the one who was demon-possessed and began to invoke the Name, saying, ‘We command you, by Jesus whom Paul preaches, to come out’

Some have felt a difficulty that ἐπιτέλει in ver. 14 changes in ver. 16 to ὅς ὁμοῖος ὅτι ἐπιτέλει, though occasionally in substandard Greek ἐπιτέλει has the meaning “all”. Codex Gigas emends ἐπιτέλει to ὅς ὀδήγητε (D rs), omitting the numeral entirely. In ver. 16 ms. E omits ὁμοίῳ ὃς ὂν, and others (including H L P S al. followed by the Textus Receptus) replace it with ὁμοίῳ.

Among modern proposals, Moulton reports a conjecture of J. B. Shipley, that ἐπιτέλει has arisen from a gloss, in which the name Σκηνεῖ was taken to be the Hebrew מִדְבֶּר, which can be read as the numeral seven (ἑπτά).

A. C. Clark argued that by mistake a marginal note of interrogation ζ (ἐν ζήτει), meaning “query,” being taken as the numeral seven, was erroneously incorporated into the text. Torrey, following Overbeck, conjectured that the error of “seven” for “two” arose because in the first century the Greek β (2) and ζ (7) were made very much alike. Finally, it may be reported that at the end of the last century the Dutch classical scholar Naber proposed that ἐπιτέλει be emended to ἐπιτέλει as “suddenly,” a reading that J. M. S. Baljon adopted in his edition (1898).

The difficulty of reconciling ἔπειτα with ἐπιτέλει, however, is not so great as to render the text that includes both an impossible text. On the other hand, however, the difficulty is so troublesome that it is hard to explain how ἔπειτα came into the text, and was perpetuated, if it were not original, whereas, in view of ἐπιτέλει, it is easy to see how it might have been omitted by certain witnesses.

19.20 τοῦ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἥξισεν καὶ ἔλειχεν (B)

A majority of the Committee preferred the Alexandrian reading (N* A B), on the consideration that it is more likely that the less usual order was altered into the characteristic order, than vice versa. The substitution of τοῦ κυρίου for κυρίου appears to be a secondary correction. Codex Bezae presents a conflate reading, ὥσπερ κατὰ κράτος ἀνυψεθήκατο καὶ ἔνθισεν τὸν θεοῦ ἱερόν καὶ ἐπλήρθη (“So mightily it prevailed; and the faith of God grew and multiplied”). Although it could be argued that ἀνυψεθήκατο is a Lukan word (it appears twice in the New Testament, Lk 22.43 and

19.22-26

In these verses various witnesses of the Western text incorporate a variety of picturesque details. After χρόνον in ver. 22 the Greek text of codex Bezae adds ὠλγόν (“stayed in Asia for a little while”) in ver. 23 after Ἀνδρέας D and syr' adds συνεκριθήται (“fellow-craftsmen”), a word that does not appear elsewhere in the New Testament. In ver. 24 after ὁ Παύλος ὁ λύκος codex Bezae adds τίς τον [which, in the light of ἐν δε ὁ Παύλος nescio quem, is to be read τίς τον], that is, colloquially “this Paul, a somebody.”

19.28 θημων (A)

Following θημων codex Bezae syr' (614) (1799) 2401 2412 add καὶ ἄραμφος εἰς τὸ ἄμφος (“and running into the street they cried out”).

19.33 συνεβιβάζοντο (B)

The difficulty of understanding συνεβιβάζοντο in the context doubtless led scribes to change it to κατεβιβάζοντο or to προσβιβάζοντο.

19.37 ἡμών (B)

The Textus Receptus, following the later manuscripts, replaces ἡμών with ἡμῖν, which copyists apparently regarded as suiting better the second person plural ἡμῖν.
It is difficult to understand how, if ἐδειξεν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ were original, the phrase would have been omitted. Furthermore, as Conzelmann points out, it appears that the author of 1 Timothy envisaged a situation in Paul’s activities that is reflected in a text of Acts lacking the addition.

Although Ropes conjectured that παραίτησα had somehow arisen out of the preceding παρατησον the Committee, impressed by the external evidence supporting Πάροιτο, regarded its omission as the result of an accident in transcription.

The generally received text of Acts involves a well-known crux: in 20.4 Gaius is called a man of Derbe, whereas in 19.29 he, along with a certain Aristarchus, is identified as a Macedonian. The discrepancy has been resolved (a) by emending Μάκεδονάς in 19.29 to Μακεδών (which is indeed the reading of 307 and a few other manuscripts), thus identifying only Aristarchus as a Macedonian; or (b) by assuming that two different persons bearing the name Gaius are meant; or (c) by following the Western reading Δοβήριος at 20.4 (ii⁴, compare D* Δοβήριος [pros and ii⁴ doverius [= doberius]) and identifying this place with a Macedonian post-town by that name near Mt. Pangasio, on the road from Philippi. Although this identification has been widely approved (e.g. by A. C. Clark, B. S. Streeter, Lagrange, C. S. C. Williams, G. Zuntz [Gnomon, xxx (1958), p. 26], F. F. Bruce, and a scant majority of the translators of the New English Bible), a majority of the Committee was hesitant to do so, for (a) Δερβείας applied to a man apparently called a Macedonian in the context would have been the harder reading in the second century, when everyone knew that Derbe⁶ was in Asia Minor, and (b) Δοβήριος would be a natural and intelligible emendation at that period. Furthermore, as Haenchen points out, the grouping of the names in pairs (after the mention of Sopater) according to their place of residence suggests that this Gaius, who is mentioned in company with Timothy, was from Asia Minor and not from Macedonia.

It is important to understand that Bezae’s identification of Paul’s companions as Ephesians rather than Asians (the Harclean Syriac margin conflates the two, ex Asia Ephesii) may suggest that the Western reviser was satisfied with the apostle’s journey to Syria, but the Spirit told him to return through Macedonia. (4) Therefore when he was about to leave, Sopater of Berea, the son of Pyrrhus, and of the Thessalonians Aristarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Douberios, and Timothy, went with him as far as Asia; but the Ephesians Eutychus and Trophimus ...

According to the generally received text Paul was intending to go to Syria in order to carry the collection for the poor of Jerusalem; the Western reviser, however, ascribes the reason for the journey to the Jews’ plot. Furthermore, in characteristic fashion (cf. 15.1) the Western text introduces the prompting of the Spirit to account for Paul’s going by a land route rather than by sea, as the apostle had formerly planned to do.

In ver. 4 Bezae’s identification of Paul’s companions as Ephesians rather than Asians (the Harclean Syriac margin conflates the two, ex Asia Ephesii) may suggest that the Western reviser belonged to, or was closely connected with Ephesus. The substitution of Ἐὔτυχος for Τυχεῖος may be an emendation based on ver. 9.

It is difficult to understand how, if ἐδειξεν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ were original, the phrase would have been omitted. Furthermore, as Conzelmann points out, it appears that the author of 1 Timothy envisaged a situation in Paul’s activities that is reflected in a text of Acts lacking the addition.

Although Ropes conjectured that παραίτησα had somehow arisen out of the preceding παρατησον the Committee, impressed by the external evidence supporting Πάροιτο, regarded its omission as the result of an accident in transcription.

The generally received text of Acts involves a well-known crux: in 20.4 Gaius is called a man of Derbe, whereas in 19.29 he, along with a certain Aristarchus, is identified as a Macedonian. The discrepancy has been resolved (a) by emending Μάκεδονάς in 19.29 to Μακεδών (which is indeed the reading of 307 and a few other manuscripts), thus identifying only Aristarchus as a Macedonian; or (b) by assuming that two different persons bearing the name Gaius are meant; or (c) by following the Western reading Δοβήριος at 20.4 (ii⁴, compare D* Δοβήριος [pros and ii⁴ doverius [= doberius]) and identifying this place with a Macedonian post-town by that name near Mt. Pangasio, on the road from Philippi. Although this identification has been widely approved (e.g. by A. C. Clark, B. S. Streeter, Lagrange, C. S. C. Williams, G. Zuntz [Gnomon, xxx (1958), p. 26], F. F. Bruce, and a scant majority of the translators of the New English Bible), a majority of the Committee was hesitant to do so, for (a) Δερβείας applied to a man apparently called a Macedonian in the context would have been the harder reading in the second century, when everyone knew that Derbe⁶ was in Asia Minor, and (b) Δοβήριος would be a natural and intelligible emendation at that period. Furthermore, as Haenchen points out, the grouping of the names in pairs (after the mention of Sopater) according to their place of residence suggests that this Gaius, who is mentioned in company with Timothy, was from Asia Minor and not from Macedonia.

It is important to understand that Bezae’s identification of Paul’s companions as Ephesians rather than Asians (the Harclean Syriac margin conflates the two, ex Asia Ephesii) may suggest that the Western reviser was satisfied with the apostle’s journey to Syria, but the Spirit told him to return through Macedonia. (4) Therefore when he was about to leave, Sopater of Berea, the son of Pyrrhus, and of the Thessalonians Aristarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Douberios, and Timothy, went with him as far as Asia; but the Ephesians Eutychus and Trophimus ...

According to the generally received text Paul was intending to go to Syria in order to carry the collection for the poor of Jerusalem; the Western reviser, however, ascribes the reason for the journey to the Jews’ plot. Furthermore, in characteristic fashion (cf. 15.1) the Western text introduces the prompting of the Spirit to account for Paul’s going by a land route rather than by sea, as the apostle had formerly planned to do.

In ver. 4 Bezae’s identification of Paul’s companions as Ephesians rather than Asians (the Harclean Syriac margin conflates the two, ex Asia Ephesii) may suggest that the Western reviser belonged to, or was closely connected with Ephesus. The substitution of Ἐὔτυχος for Τυχεῖος may be an emendation based on ver. 9.

It is difficult to understand how, if ἐδειξεν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ were original, the phrase would have been omitted. Furthermore, as Conzelmann points out, it appears that the author of 1 Timothy envisaged a situation in Paul’s activities that is reflected in a text of Acts lacking the addition.

Although Ropes conjectured that παραίτησα had somehow arisen out of the preceding παρατησον the Committee, impressed by the external evidence supporting Πάροιτο, regarded its omission as the result of an accident in transcription.

The generally received text of Acts involves a well-known crux: in 20.4 Gaius is called a man of Derbe, whereas in 19.29 he, along with a certain Aristarchus, is identified as a Macedonian. The discrepancy has been resolved (a) by emending Μάκεδονάς in 19.29 to Μακεδών (which is indeed the reading of 307 and a few other manuscripts), thus identifying only Aristarchus as a Macedonian; or (b) by assuming that two different persons bearing the name Gaius are meant; or (c) by following the Western reading Δοβήριος at 20.4 (ii⁴, compare D* Δοβήριος [pros and ii⁴ doverius [= doberius]) and identifying this place with a Macedonian post-town by that name near Mt. Pangasio, on the road from Philippi. Although this identification has been widely approved (e.g. by A. C. Clark, B. S. Streeter, Lagrange, C. S. C. Williams, G. Zuntz [Gnomon, xxx (1958), p. 26], F. F. Bruce, and a scant majority of the translators of the New English Bible), a majority of the Committee was hesitant to do so, for (a) Δερβείας applied to a man apparently called a Macedonian in the context would have been the harder reading in the second century, when everyone knew that Derbe⁶ was in Asia Minor, and (b) Δοβήριος would be a natural and intelligible emendation at that period. Furthermore, as Haenchen points out, the grouping of the names in pairs (after the mention of Sopater) according to their place of residence suggests that this Gaius, who is mentioned in company with Timothy, was from Asia Minor and not from Macedonia.

It is important to understand that Bezae’s identification of Paul’s companions as Ephesians rather than Asians (the Harclean Syriac margin conflates the two, ex Asia Ephesii) may suggest that the Western reviser was satisfied with the apostle’s journey to Syria, but the Spirit told him to return through Macedonia. (4) Therefore when he was about to leave, Sopater of Berea, the son of Pyrrhus, and of the Thessalonians Aristarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Douberios, and Timothy, went with him as far as Asia; but the Ephesians Eutychus and Trophimus ...

According to the generally received text Paul was intending to go to Syria in order to carry the collection for the poor of Jerusalem; the Western reviser, however, ascribes the reason for the journey to the Jews’ plot. Furthermore, in characteristic fashion (cf. 15.1) the Western text introduces the prompting of the Spirit to account for Paul’s going by a land route rather than by sea, as the apostle had formerly planned to do.
The Armenian catena, which rests upon the Old Syriac text, expands the "we" into "I, Luke, and those who with me went on board," a reading that Rendel Harris argued was the original Western reading of this verse.

20.13-14 **Ἤσσουν**

Instead of "Ἄσσουν," in ver. 13 15:** L P 237 614 2401 2412 Al syri," kop** and in ver. 14 P 614 1709 2401 2412 Al syri," kop** read θέσσουν (or θέσσων), Thassos, which is an island east of Amphipolis, is an impossible reading in the context; how it arose in such diverse witnesses is a puzzle.

20.15 τῇ ἕκ (2) (B)

The information contained in the longer text is, as Ramsay points out, "in itself highly probable, for the promontory of Trogylia or Troglia projects far out between Samos and Miletus, and the little coasting vessel would naturally touch there, perhaps becalmed, or for some other reason. Whether the words were present originally and later accidentally fell out of some texts (or were stricken out deliberately in the interests of the rhythm of the sentence, as Weiss supposed), or whether they were inserted by the Western reviser who thought that the run from Samos to Miletus was too long, it is difficult to decide. Chiefly because of superior external attestation, a majority of the Committee preferred the shorter text.

20.18

In this verse codex Bezae makes a number of characteristic additions. After the opening words, "And when they [the Ephesian elders] came to him," the Western reviser added the superfluous όμοιος δέων αὐτῶν ("while they were together"). It is easy to understand why ὃς εἶναι was inserted after ἐπίστατε. After Ἀλεξάνδρον reads ἂς ἐκτέλεσα ἦν καὶ πᾶλιν ποιησάμενος μετὰ ἢμών ἦν (? ἡμήν) πεπλωμένος χρόνου ("for about three years or even more ..."), the addition may be derived from ver. 11.

20.21 εἰς τὸν κύριον τῷ Ἰησοῦ (B)

There is no good reason why Ἱησοῦν should have been omitted if it were present originally, whereas scribal expansion of the names of the Lord is a frequent occurrence.

20.24

Instead of the awkward, yet idiomatic, ἀλλ᾽ οὐδείς λόγον ποιήσας τὴν φυσήν τιμῆν ἐμαυτῷ ( Philo: Χριστός τῆς συνθέσεως τοῦ Κυρίου ἔμαυτος αὐτῷ), the Western text (in D) expands to ἀλλ᾽ οὐδείς λόγον ἔχω μου οὐδέ ποιήσας τὴν φυσήν μου τιμῶν ἐμαυτοῦ (perhaps for ἔμαυτος) ("But I make no reckoning of anything for myself nor do I account my life as precious [to me]"). The Textus Receptus, following E H L P and most minuscules, combines elements of the Alexandrian and

Western texts, reading ἀλλ᾽ οὐδείς λόγον ποιήσας οὐκ ἔχω τῇ φυσήν μου τιμῶν ἐμαυτῷ.

After διαμαρτύροντες the Western text (D ital vg cop Luci) expands by adding Ἰουδαίοι καὶ ἕλθον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐστίν from ver. 21.

20.25 τὴν βασιλείαν

After τὴν βασιλείαν D and cop expand τοὺς Ἰησοῦν Ἰταλοῖν καὶ Lucif add τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; and E H L P most minuscules vg syr (followed by the Textus Receptus) add τοῦ θεοῦ. The text is adequately supported by 304 N B C 33 36 307 431 al.

20.28 τοῦθεν (C)

The external evidence is singularly balanced between "church of God" and "church of the Lord" (the reading "church of the Lord and God" is obviously conflate, and therefore secondary – as are also the other variant readings). Palaeographically the difference concerns only a single letter: ΕΥ and ΚΥ. In deciding between the two readings one must take into account internal probabilities.

The expression ἐκκλησία τοῦ Κυρίου occurs seven times in the Septuagint but nowhere in the New Testament. On the other hand, ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ appears with moderate frequency (eleven times) in the Epistles traditionally ascribed to Paul, but nowhere else in the New Testament. (The phrase αἱ ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ occurs once in Rom 16:16.) It is possible, therefore, that a scribe, finding θεοῦ in his exemplar, was influenced by Pauline usage, changed κυρίου of his exemplar to θεοῦ.

In support of the originality of κυρίου is the argument (urged by a number of scholars) that copyists were likely to substitute the more common phrase ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ for the more rare phrase ἡ ἐκκλησία τοῦ κυρίου. On the other hand, it is undeniable that θεοῦ is the more difficult reading. The following clause speaks of the church "which he obtained of the blood of his Own." (It is found in Greek papyri as a term of endearment referring to near relatives. It is possible, therefore, that "his Own" (ὁ Ἰδοὺς) was a title that early Christians gave to Jesus, comparable to
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"the Beloved" (ὁ ἡγεμόνις); compare Ro 8.32, where Paul refers to God “who did not spare the idios you” in a context that clearly alludes to Gn 22.16, where the Septuagint has ὁ ἡγεμόνις.

Without committing itself concerning what some have thought to be a slight probability that τοῦ ἱδίου is used here as the equivalent of τοῦ ἱδίου ὁ Παύλος, the Committee judged that the reading θεοῦ was more likely to have been altered to κυρίου than vice versa.

20.29 ἀμέτρος τοῦ ἱδίου (A)

The reading ἱδίου ἀμέτρος is supported by many of the Byzantine witnesses that read the conjunction καί, θεοῦ in the preceding variant. It may well be, as Lake and Cadbury point out, that after the special meaning of ὁ ἱδίος (discussed in the previous comment) had dropped out of Christian usage, τοῦ ἱδίου of this passage was misunderstood as a qualification of ἀμέτρος (“this own blood”). This misunderstanding led to two changes in the text: τοῦ ἱδίους τοῦ ἱδίου was changed to τοῦ ἱδίου ἀμέτρος (influenced by Heb. ix.127), which is neater but perverts the sense, and θεοῦ was changed to κυρίου by the Western revisers, who doubtless shrank from the implied phrase “the blood of God.”

20.32 θεοῦ (B)

The predominant weight of the witnesses supports θεοῦ.

21.1 Πατάρα (A)

Although it is possible (as both Ropes and Clark argue) that καὶ Μύρα was accidentally dropped through homoeoteleuton (πατρικαμισμα), a majority of the Committee regarded it as slightly more probable that the text has been assimilated either to 27.5 (so Blass and Weiss) or to the narrative in the Acts of Paul and Thecla concerning Paul’s residence in Myra.

21.8 ἰδίος (A)

Before ἰδίος, the Textus Receptus, following H L P 049 056 0142 and most minuscules, inserts οἱ ἐπί τοῦ Παύλου. The reason for the addition arises from the circumstance that an ecclesiastical lesson begins with ἰδίος. For the same reason the Byzantine and Lectionary texts alter ἰδίος to ἱδίος.

21.12-15

In these verses one or another Western witness makes sundry small additions. In ver. 12 after οἱ ἐκκλησίαι D and ἱδίος add τοῦ Παύλου; in ver. 13 D adds πρὸς ἡμᾶς before τοῦ Παύλου; after διότι D and Tertullian add βούλομαι; and after Ἰησοῦς Ο. D syg adds ἢ καθαρτοῖς; in ver. 14 after εἰς τῶν D adds πρὸς ἢκάθαρσις ἡμῶν ἁπατητήματα; in ver. 15 D reads μετά τινα ἡμῶν ἁπατητήματα. (And after some days we bade them farewell …).

21.13 τούτῳ ἀρχιπρέπει οὐ τοῦ Παύλου (B)

When the word τούτῳ was taken with the preceding sentence, some copula (ὁ or τι) became necessary. In several of the later forms of text τούτῳ is omitted altogether.

21.16-17 ἐκκαθαρίσθησαν Μινασωδάς…17 Γεννάκινον ὑμᾶς ἢμῶν (A)

The Western text of these verses expands what may be implied in the use of ἐκκαθαρίσθησαν (ver. 15), namely that the journey from Caesarea to Jerusalem took two days, and that Paul and the Caesarean disciples rested the first night at the home of Mnason in a village en route to Jerusalem: “And these [the Caesarean disciples] brought us to those with whom we were to lodge; and when we arrived at a certain village, we stayed with Mnason of Cyprus, a disciple of longstanding.” (17) And when we had departed from there we came … (ὁιοντες ἐφέγαιν ἡμᾶς πρὸς Μνᾶσων ἀντικείμενοι, καὶ παρεκκλίσαντες ἐκ τῆς πόλεως Ἕρακλεία παρὰ Μνᾶσων του Ἐρακλῆ, μαθητὴ Ἀρχελοῦ. (17) κακοκείσθεν ἐξόντες ἡμᾶς, Παύλων …). (D
ewtext

21.21 πάντας

Ropes argues that the word πάντας, which is lacking in A D* (E) 33 vg cop, is “so awkwardly placed that it is hard to believe it original.” On the other hand, however, the argument that the word is awkwardly placed, if valid, is valid also against its having been introduced by copyists. The shorter text appears to be the result of emendation.

21.22 ἀκούσαντα (B)

The expanded form of text (which is to be translated either, “There must be a meeting of the whole church” or, less probably, “A mob will congregate”) appears to be a Western addition that gained rather wide circulation, though it is not in the Harclean Syriac.

21.26 ἡμῖν ἐποτελεῖμαι (C)

The Western text brings out the meaning more explicitly by expanding so as to read, “But concerning the Gentiles who have become believers, they [i.e., the Jewish Christians] have nothing to say to you, for we have sent a letter with our judgment that they should observe nothing of the kind, except to keep themselves from what …”

21.28 ἐν τοῖς φιλάδεισθαι αὐτοῖς (B)

Although it can be argued that the words μηδὲν τοιούτοις στρεφέ τοιούτοις ἢ ἡμᾶς (or ἅλλο) were deleted because no such clause is found in the Apostolic Decree (15.28), it is more likely that the reading is a Western paraphrase of the intent of the Decree. It is perhaps significant that
the negative Golden Rule, which is present in the Western text of the Decree as cited in 15.20 and 29, is absent here.

21.26 τὸ τε ἐἰδολολάθητον καὶ αἷμα καὶ σινκτὸν καὶ πορφύριαν (B)

See the comments on 15.20.

21.31

At the end of the verse the margin of the Harclean Syriac adds with asterisk the words, “See therefore that they do not make an uprising,” which Hilgenfeld, Blass, and Clark render into Greek, ὅπως ὅτι μὴ ποιῶται ἐναρεύσεως (the word ἐναρεύσεως, however, does not occur in the New Testament).

22.3 τῇ ἐπίθεσιν ὑπάρχου τοῦ θεοῦ

Instead of τῇ ἐπίθεσιν ὑπάρχου τοῦ θεοῦ, Western witnesses offer a variety of readings. The minuscule 614 and codex Toletanus of the Vulgate omit τοῦ θεοῦ, a reading that Blass regards as original. Instead of τοῦ θεοῦ, the Vulgate reads “zealous of the law” (legis), and the margin of the Harclean Syriac reads with asterisk “zealous of my ancestral traditions” (representing των πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων, from Ga 1.14).

22.5 οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς

After οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς several Western witnesses (including 614 and syr/h) add ἀνενέκτας (compare 23.2).

22.7 Several Western witnesses expand the verse from parallel passages. After ἀνενέκτας codex Gigas and the margin of the Harclean Syriac add “in the Hebrew language” (compare τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς διαλέκτου. 26.14). The words τῆς με διώκεισι are followed in E 255 ἱνα συνάχει αὐτῷ by αὐτῷ ως πρὸς κείμενα λειτουργεῖν (from 26.14).

22.9 ίδθος ὁ (B)

Although it is possible that the phrase καὶ ἡμῖν ἐγίνετο fell out of the text because of homoeoteleuton, a majority of the Committee was disposed to regard it as a natural expansion in Western and other witnesses.

22.11 ὡς ὅ ὁκεύεται

Adopting an expansion in several Western witnesses (ἰδέ is syr/msn cop/sn Eiphraem) A. C. Clark reads ὡς ὅ ὁκεύεται, ὁκεύεται (“And when I rose up, I could not see”). The reading of codex Vaticanus, ὅτι δὲν ἴμπην τὸν (“I saw nothing”), which is preferred by Haenchen, may have been introduced from 9.8.

22.12 κατακολύτων Ἰουδαίων (B)

The difficulty of κατολύτων used absolutely in the shorter text probably led scribes to add an explanatory gloss, either ἐν διαμάθει in the later uncials and many minuscules or ἐκεῖ in ἱνατος syr. The omission of κατολύτων in a few witnesses was probably accidental, when the eye of the scribe passed from τούς before κατολύτων to the last three letters of that word.

22.26 ἑκατοντάρχης

After ἱσόν ὁ ἑκατοντάρχης the Western reviser, who left nothing to the imagination of the reader, added ὁ “that he called himself a Roman”, a reading preserved in D ἱνα τὴν ἱσσωτικήν.

22.26 Τῇ (A)

The reading with ἤρθα seems to have arisen in order to soften the abruptness of the text.

22.29

From ἤρθα αὐτῷ onward the text of codex Bezae is lacking. The Latin side ends in the middle of ver. 20.

Once again the Western reviser leaves nothing to the imagination of the reader; at the close of the verse 614 1611 syr/msn cop/sn add καί

23.9 In order to balance the protasis (εἰ ὅ...) at the close of the verse, the Byzantine text (H L P al, followed by the Textus Receptus) adds, perhaps from 5.39, μὴ θρομαχήσων (“Let us not fight against God”).

23.12 συστροφήν αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίοι (B)

The addition of τῶν was made in order to provide better accord with ver. 13.

23.15 At the beginning of the verse the Western text (ἰδέ is syr/msn cop/sn Luther) expands by reading (according to A. C. Clark’s reconstruction) τὸν αὐτὸν ἰσόν ὁκεύεται τοῖς τοιούτους ἐμβαδόντες συνοδοῖς ἥματα κλείσας τὸν κελάρι (“Now therefore we ask you that you do this for us: Gather the Sanhedrin together and give notice to the tribune”). At the
close of the verse the Western text (614 2147 it sy) adds ἐὰν δέῃ καὶ ἀποθανεῖν ("even though we must die too").

23.23-24

The Western text, reconstructed by A. C. Clark on the basis chiefly of 614 it sy sy text, reads as follows... Ξύνωμενετερατωμένον, ὅπως περιεχούσιον έκς Κεσαρείας, ἵππης έκείνον καὶ δεκαεπτάδευς διακόσιον καὶ ἀνά θίτης ὀρῶς τῆς νυκτὸς κολεός ἐτόμων εἶναι περείσθαι (24) καὶ τοὺς ἑκατοντάρχους παραγέγραφε την παραδόσειν, ἵνα ἐπιβάσασθτε τὸν Παῦλον διὰ νυκτὸς διακόσιον έκς Κεσαρείας τρός

...("And when he had read the letter, he asked evparci,aj ei=* e;fh( Ki,lixā kai. puqo,menoj e;fh... motivate him...")

24.6-8 evkrath,samen(...)

The later manuscripts, followed by the Textus Receptus, incorporate a natural addition, which rounds out the phrase and makes it more explicit.

24.10 Ἀπεκρίθη ... λέγειν

On the basis of a curious Western expansion in the margin of the Harclean Syriac, A. C. Clark reconstructed the following Greek text: Ἀπεκρίθη δὲ ο Παῦλος γνώσκοντος αὐτὸ τὸν ἡγεμόνα ἀπολαγείν ἐξείπν ὑπὲρ ταὐτοῦ ὡς αὐχένα ἔκολομοιν ἐξήλθων ἐπὶ τὸν Ἰούδαιον πρὸς Καίσαρα ἀνεξηγην νηστείαν εἰς τὴν τρίτην ἡμέραν τῆς νυκτὸς ἀνά τρίσης ὀρῶς τῆς νυκτὸς κολεός ἐποίησεν εἰς τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ... ("And when the governor had motioned for him to make a defense for himself, Paul answered; and having assumed a godlike bearing, he said...").

24.24 εἰρενοῦ ἀδίκητον (B)

The later manuscripts, followed by the Textus Receptus, incorporate a natural addition, which rounds out the phrase and makes it more explicit.

24.26 Παῦλον

After Παῦλον the later manuscripts (H L P al, followed by the Textus Receptus), unwilling to leave anything to the reader’s imagination, add ὅπως λίπη ἄετων ("that he should release him").
24.27 θέλων ... δεδεμένον (A)

Corresponding to the paraphrase in ver. 24, after Phθατον the Western text (614 2147 syr∗ syv∗ syv†) substitutes for θέλων ... δεδεμένον the statement τὸν Λεωνίδα Έλαουν ἐν τῇ θηρείᾳ διὰ Δρουσίλλαν (“But Paul he kept in prison on account of Drusilla”).
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25.17 [αὐτῶν] ἐνθάδε

On the basis of diversity of external evidence a majority of the Committee preferred the reading αὐτῶν ἐνθάδε (Q A E H L P W and most minuscules). Nevertheless, in view of the combined weight of the other readings (ἐνθάδε, witnessed by B 0142 5 42 51 97 181 209* 234 453, and ἐνθάδε αὐτῶν, witnessed by C 36 180 1518 2495), it was considered advisable to enclose αὐτῶν within square brackets.

[The reading that best explains the origin of the others is that supported by B, for αὐτῶν is clearly an amelioration of a grammatical difficulty, having been added at different places by different copyists. (For other instances in Luke-Acts where the subject of a genitive absolute is understood from the context, see Lk 12.36; Ac 21.31.) B.M.M.]

25.18 συνηγματίζων (C)

Although συνηγματίζων (or συνηγμάτων or συνηγματίζων) has the appearance of being a gloss added at various places to explain οὐκ ἔμαθεν, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the weight of the witnesses that support συνηγματίζων, and explained its omission in the later witnesses as due to copyists who wished to make a smoother text.

25.21 On the basis of the testimony of ἑνὸς A. C. Clark reconstructed the following Greek text: τότε ὁ Πάουλος ἐπικαλέσατο Καίσαρα καὶ ἤθελον ταραχῆναι αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν τοῦ Σαμωνίου διάφορας, ἐπείδη ταῦτα ἦν ἔνα ἔκλεισμον κρίσις, ἐκέλευεν... (“Then Paul appealed to Caesar and asked that he be kept in custody for the decision of the emperor, and since I was not able to judge him, I commanded ...”).

25.23 Near the close of the verse the margin of the Harclean Syriac reads, "who had come down from the province," a reading that probably represents the Greek τοῖς κατεβαίνοντις ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπαρχίας. It is doubtful whether this Western reading is intended to take the place of τοῖς κατ’ ἐξοχὰν τῆς πόλεως (so Ropes), or is to be subjoined after τῶν κατ᾽ ἐξοχὰν τῆς πόλεως (so Blass and A. C. Clark).
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25.24-26 ἐνθάδε

After ἐνθάδε the Western text, preserved in the margin of the Harclean Syriac, and partially supported by a few other witnesses, adds the following, as reconstructed by A. C. Clark: ὅπως παραλόγον εἶνεν ἐκ παραδοξίας ἀντιπόλιττον (25) εἰς ἐλεφάντην ὧν παραδόθη εἶναι, διὰ τῆς ἑνότητος ἢ ἐχθρῖον παρὰ τῶν Σαμωνίων, εἶναι δὲ ταύτης κατηγορεῖσθαι θῆκος. Ἐξ ὅλων ἀναλοίπους μιᾶς εἰς τοὺς ἑκατέρους ὑπὲρ ὁμολογίας ἐρήμος ἔργον ἐν αὐτῷ ἔργον ἐν μία ἕνωσι ἔργον ἐν τῷ ζώοις ἀκούσας ἐν διάφορον κατελαβήματον ἐν μὴν αὐτῷ ἐγένετο θεωρεῖν εἰπόντος δὲ μοί, θέλεις κρίνεσθαι μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολυμίᾳ; Ἀνακεκάλεσα (26) περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἥτις ἐκείνης περὶ Σεβαστοῦ, ἐν θηρείᾳ τοῖς διαλογίσαις των ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἐνθάδε. Ὅταν δὲ κατελαβήματον ἐν μὴν αὐτῷ ἐγένετο θεωρεῖν εἰπόντος δὲ μοί, θέλεις κρίνεσθαι μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολυμίᾳ; Ἀνακεκάλεσα (26) περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἥτις ἐκείνης περὶ Σεβαστοῦ, ἐν θηρείᾳ τοῖς διαλογίσαις των ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἐνθάδε.
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26.1 The text of the Western reviser, preserved in the margin of the Harclean Syriac, adds the words, “confident, and encouraged by the Holy Spirit, Paul stretched out his hand …,” a reading that A. C. Clark reconstructed in Greek, paraλόγον κατὰ τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀγίας παρακλήσεως καὶ ἐνθάδε (26) ἄνευ αὐτοῦ ὧν παραδόθη εἶναι, διὰ τῆς ἑνότητος ἢ ἐχθρῖον παρὰ τῶν Σαμωνίων, εἶναι δὲ ταύτης κατηγορεῖσθαι θῆκος. Ἐξ ὅλων ἀναλοίπους μιᾶς εἰς τοὺς ἑκατέρους ὑπὲρ ὁμολογίας ἐρήμος ἔργον ἐν αὐτῷ ἔργον ἐν μία ἕνωσι ἔργον ἐν τῷ ζώοις ἀκούσας ἐν διάφορον κατελαβήματον ἐν μὴν αὐτῷ ἐγένετο θεωρεῖν εἰπόντος δὲ μοί, θέλεις κρίνεσθαι μετ’ αὐτῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολυμίᾳ; Ἀνακεκάλεσα (26) περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἥτις ἐκείνης περὶ Σεβαστοῦ, ἐν θηρείᾳ τοῖς διαλογίσαις των ἀνθρώπων ἐν ἐνθάδε.

26.4 οἶον Ἰουδαίοι

Instead of οἶον Ιουδαίοι ὧν Ιουδαίοι is read by the Textus Receptus, following NK A P and most minuscules. A majority of the Committee thought it best to represent the evidence for both readings by including οἶον in the text but enclosing it within square brackets.

[Since πάντας normally takes the definite article, it is more likely that οἶον would have been added than omitted (note the evidence of codex Ephraemi); therefore the shorter reading is to be preferred. B.M.M.]

26.14 γῆν

After ἐν τῆς γῆς the Western text (614 1611 2147 ἑνὸς syr∗ syv∗ syv†) adds ἀπὸ τῶν φύοντα ἐγὼ μάλιστα (“when we had all fallen to the ground on account of fear, only I heard …”).

26.15 Ἰησοῦς

After Ἰησοῦς the Western text (181 614 ἑνὸς vg† syv syv†) adds ὁ Ἰησοῦς Κυρίου (from 22.8).

26.16 με (C)

In order to represent the balance between external evidence and transcriptional probability, a majority of the Committee preferred to include με in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.
Although the text of Θ 14 Λ 33 81 syr mss, which was adopted by the Committee, is hardly tolerable as Greek, at the same time the addition of εἰς before πέων in the Byzantine text (E H P and apparently all minuscules) has every appearance of being a scribal alleviation of the solecism. Blass emended the passage to read εἰς πέων τε χῶραν Βουθεῖος καὶ τοῖς ἐθνικαῖς ("in every land to both Jews and Gentiles").

The difficulty of capturing the nuances intended in this verse is notorious. Without entering into the lexical problems (e.g. does εἰς ἄλλην mean "in a short time" or "with little effort"?), from the standpoint of textual criticism the reading that is supported by Θ 14 Λ 33 81 syr mss cop ἀλ seems to account best for the other readings, which appear to be attempts at smoothing the meaning. Thus, instead of πεῖTheta τις codex Alexandrinus reads πεῖΘη ("you trust [or, think that you can make me a Christian"), which is adopted by Lachmann, Alford, A. C. Clark, though the text seems to have been suggested by πεῖθαι of the Byzantine text (Ε Π 6 049 most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus) appears to have come from the following verse. Hort, who suspected some primitive corruption in the text, suggested that possibly πεῖθαι should be read for με πεῖθης.

A. C. Clark’s reconstruction of the Western text (represented in part by 97 421 syr) and fairly completely by syr mss reads as follows: Ὁδεῖς οὖν ἔριζεν ὁ ἡμῶν αὐτοῦ Καύλαμος, καὶ τῇ ἐπιφάνεια προσκυνόμενος ἐκατοντάρχης τοὺς Ἰνόμας Ἰούλιον, σπείρας Ἀρείας, παράφεδόν ἀνεύρον τὴν παραλίαν σου ἐφθασεν διὰμήτης (2) ἀρβανίας δὴ τοῦ ἀποτελεί ἐς τὴν Ιταλίαν ἐπέβημεν πλοῖον..."(So then the governor decided to send him to Caesar; and the next day he called a centurion named Julius of the Augustan Cohort, and delivered to him Paul with the other prisoners. (2) And beginning to sail for Italy we embarked in a ship..."

According to Ropes the origin of the Western paraphrase is to be accounted for as an attempt to relieve the abruptness of the Alexandrian text. At the close of ver. 2 several witnesses (614 1518 syr) add "and Secundus" (θεσσαλονικητός ὁ Ἀριώταρχος καὶ...)
27.35 ἐσθείων [A]

After ἐσθείων the Western text (614 1611 2147 cop sx) adds ἐπιλογός καὶ ἡμῖν ("having given also to us"). If one inquires who, in the mind of the Western reviser, is comprehended by ἡμῖν, it is not enough to suggest (as Ramsay does) Luke and Aristarchus, for, according to the Western text of ver. 2, Secundus should also be included. According to Bruce, in this narrative ἡμῖν includes the whole ship’s company along with the narrator.

27.37 διακύσται ἤξοδοκοῦσιν ἐκ [B]

The reading in B and cop sx ("about seventy-six") probably arose by taking πλουτός (= πλοῦς) as πλουτάνεσσις. In any case, ὡς with an exact statement of number is inappropriate (despite Luke’s penchant for qualifying numbers by using ὡς or ὡς ὡς, cf. Lk 9.23; Ac 2.41; 4.4; 5.7; 6.1; 10.3; 13.16; 20: 19.7; 34).

Other witnesses present a curious vacillation: codex Alexandrinus reads 275; 69 and Ephraem read 270; occasional Coptic (Bohairic) manuscripts read ποις (= 176) or ως (= 876); 522 and 1048 read 76; and Epiphanius reads ως ἤξοδοκοῦσιν.

27.39 ἔξωσαι [A]

The reading ἔξωσαι, “to bring the ship safe to shore,” apparently arose from an error in hearing; the verb ἔξωσαι is regularly used of “driving [a ship] ashore.”

27.41 ὑπὸ τῆς βάσις [τῶν κυμάτων] [C]

While it may be true, as Ropes points out, that “the curtness of ὑπὸ τῆς βάσις led to various expansions,” it is also true that the penchant of Alexandrian scribes for brevity of expression may account for the deletion of τῶν κυμάτων. Faced with these conflicting possibilities, the Committee decided to retain the words τῶν κυμάτων but to enclose them within square brackets in order to indicate doubt that they belong in the text. The singular readings of 629 and of ἡ are the result of scribal idiosyncrasies.

28.1 Μελίθη [A]

The reading Μελίθη [B* al] probably arose through digraphy of some of the letters in Μελίθη or Ἰσχας in scriptio continua. The reading Μυστιλή, presupposed by several Latin witnesses, is a translational or transcriptional error, occasioned perhaps by the recollection of 20.14 (where the alternative spelling Μυστιλή occurs).

28.13 περιελόντες [C]

Although it is possible that the reading περιελόντες is simply a scribal mistake (having fallen out before o), a majority of the Committee preferred to follow B Y cop sx, taking the word to be a technical nautical term of uncertain meaning (it may be a shorter expression for τῶν ἀγκών περιελόντες, as in 27.40, “weighting (anchor),” casting loose”). The difficulty of the term would have given rise to the variant readings, περιελόντες, προκλῆσεν, and προκλήσθης.

28.16 ἔπρεπε τῷ Παῦλῳ [A]

The Western text expands ἔπρεπε τῷ Παῦλῳ ἀποκράτησιν ἐπέτρεψεν τῷ Παῦλῳ ἐκ τός ἕκαστος ἑαυτὸς τῶν δικαιών τῆς στρατηγοῦ[ήμαρχου]. τῷ δὲ Παῦλῳ ἔπρεπεν ("the centurion delivered the prisoners to the stratopedarch [captain of the guard]; but Paul was allowed ... "). The expansion passed into the Byzantine text and lies behind the AV.

After καθ’ ἑαυτὸν the Western text (614 1611 2147 it sx syr al) adds ἕξω τῆς παρεμβολῆς ("outside the barracks").

28.18 ἀποτίμεσιν

After ἀποτίμεσιν the Western text (614 1547 Syr sx) adds πολλά ("when they had examined me concerning many things [or, after a long examination]").
The artistic literary cadence of the concluding phrase of the book of Acts and the powerful note of triumph expressed by ἀκολούθων is greatly weakened by the pious Western addition following ἀκολούθων, several later witnesses (‘f. 36 453 614 1175 2495 al’ γέγραψε αὕτη ταῦτα’) a) conclude the book with “Amen,” indicating a liturgical use of the text.
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For the Greek text see *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. V, p. 2, and for an English translation see ibid., vol. IV, pp. 2–4.


The statement is based on information kindly supplied by Prof. Herbert C. Youtie of the University of Michigan, who, at the request of the present writer, consulted his comprehensive index verborum of the Greek papyri.


*The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. IV, p. 8.

*Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, vol. LVII, p. 236, lines 6–11.

George Salmon finds here “an illustration of the tendency of scribes to refuse to allow two words to part company which usually go together (such as eating and drinking, fasting and praying, wives and children), and when one occurs to add the other, with or without authority” (*Hermathena*, IX [1896], p. 235; compare Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, p. 198).
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Chehan finds a desire in the Western text to enhance the position of Peter by “pairing off” episodes in the history of Peter with those in the history of Paul; “for at 15:41 and 16:1 there is just such a passage as this about Paul, and The word καταντάω is used again of his turning aside from Cilicia to visit Derbe and Lystra” (op. cit., p. 598).


So Lake and Cadbury in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. IV, p. 124.


The great diversity of testimony among the Western witnesses indicates, as Zahn correctly points out, the secondary character of the addition (D*ie Apostelgeschichte des Lucas*, p. 365, Anm. 90).


See C. F. D. Moule’s critique, “Once More, Who Were the Hellenists?” *Expository Times*, LX (1959), pp. 100–102. Moule adopts the traditional definition of the word, but refines it slightly; thus, “Jews who spoke only Greek” in contrast to Ἰδραίοι, “Jews who, while able to speak Greek, knew a Semitic language also.”

In 9.29 the Syriac Peshitta renders Ἑλληνισταῖς “Jews who understood Greek,” which may show a connection between Chrysostom and the Peshitta.

*Notes on Select Readings,* p. 93.

It is often assumed that the reading of καὶ presupposes Ἐλληνισταῖς, on account of its similar termination. But since it seems certain that Ἐλληνισταῖς was suggested by, and results from, the proximity of ἀποστείλω, which follows immediately, it is with considerable hesitation that one can take the weight of καὶ to be in favor of Ἐλληνισταῖς.


Harnack, however, argued that the original form of the Western addition was... ἐπιγραμματεύεται καὶ ἀποστείλω... and that the ἀποστείλω was later “corrected” to ἐπιστεύω in order to avoid confusion with the following ἀπεσταλμένος (see his “Über den ursprünglichen Text Act. Apost. 11, 27:28,” *Sitzungsberichte der königlich preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1899*, pp. 316–327, reprinted in his *Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche*, vol. I, Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik [Berlin and Leipzig, 1931], pp. 33–47).


According to C. S. Williams (*Alterations in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*, 1951, p. 81) both participles may be derived from the same Syriac word ( ). F. H. Chase, however, argues for the influence of *in 19:34* on the mind of the scribe of the Western text (*The Old Syriac Element in the Text of Codex Bezae*, 1893, p. 88).


Because of its quaint diffidence Hammond’s comment may be quoted in its entirety: “The word ἐνδυνάμωσε is so near in likeness ( tho’ far enough off in the nature and signification of it) to ἐνδυνάμωσα, that it is very possible one of these may here by the transcriber be put for the other. And indeed the signification of the latter is so near in likeness (tho’ far enough off in the nature and signification of it) to their own mood: “Which is the true text? No one knows…For my part, I am in the same frame of mind as was the scribe of Codex B, who began to write ἐνδυνάμωσε and ended by writing ἐνδυνάμωσα. (The Practical Value of Textual Criticism, Illustrated from the Book of Acts,” Biblical World, N.S. XIX [1902], p. 366). For a much more confident discussion, concluding that ἐνδυνάμωσε is indeed the correct reading, see Pierson Parker, Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIII (1964), pp. 168–170.

The Committee confesses that more than once K. Lake’s frank admission of despair reflected its own mood: “Which is the true text? No one knows…For my part, I am in the same frame of mind as was the scribe of Codex B, who began to write ἐνδυνάμωσε and ended by writing ἐνδυνάμωσα. (The Practical Value of Textual Criticism, Illustrated from the Book of Acts,” Biblical World, N.S. XIX [1902], p. 366). For a much more confident discussion, concluding that ἐνδυνάμωσα is indeed the correct reading, see Pierson Parker, Journal of Biblical Literature, LXIII (1964), pp. 168–170.
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The author of the Alexandrian text cannot have intended such a meaning is shown by (1) the verb κατεκλυθομαι, which refers to a definite point of time and not to a period of more than four centuries; and (2) the usage of the dative case (in distinction from the accusatives of time in verses 18 and 21) to embrace the whole period from the date implied in verse 17 to the division of the promised land.

The New American Standard Bible (La Habra, Calif., 1963) attempts to prevent the reader from drawing such an inference by punctuating verse 19 with a dash ("... distributed their land as an inheritance — all of which took about four hundred and fifty years").

C. C. Torrey, The Composition and Date of Acts, pp. 37 f.


“Notes on Select Readings,” p. 95. With Hort agree, e.g., Souter (Expositor, Eighth Series, X [1915], p. 436), Ropes (The Text of Acts, p. 124), Haenchen (Commentary, ad loc.), and Evaid Lövestam (Son and Saviour [Lund, 1961], pp. 7–6).

See Jerusalem Talmud, Taanith, fol. 65, 3, quoted by John Lightfoot, Horae hebraicae et talmudicae, ed. by R. H. Gaddell, vol. IV (Oxford, 1859), pp. 119 f., and Babylonian Talmud, Berakoth, fol. 9b, translated by Maurice Simon, in the Sonecio edition (London, 1948), p. 50 f. In both cases the purpose of making such an enumeration is to enable the opening verse of Psalm 20 to stand immediately after the eighteenth Psalm, in the interest of drawing a parallel with the Eighteen Benedictions.

In his edition of Tertullian in the Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticon Romanorum Kroymann abandons the oldest manuscript evidence and prints in secoundo psalmo. The manuscript testimony of Cyprian in the two passages mentioned is divided, some reading in primo psalmo; in five other instances all manuscripts of Testimonia cite passages from the second Psalm as in psalmo secundo. For other patristic references see Paul de Lagarde, “Novae Psalmorum Graeci editionis specimen,” Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, XXXIII (1886), pp. 16–18; for a discussion, see Zahn, Die Urausgabe der Apostelgeschichte des Lucas (Leipzig, 1916), pp. 83 and 234 f.


Tischendorf and Souter cite (but with a question mark) the tenth or eleventh century semi-unofficial manuscript 0142 in support of the omission of the numeral; upon inspection by Dom G. Morin, however, it has been ascertained that this manuscript reads τύπον καὶ ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τῷ δικαιῳ λέγοντα (see E. R. Smothers in Recherches de science religieuse, XXIV [1934], pp. 467 f.).

According to Zahn, in his first edition of Acts Luke followed the old Jewish synagogue usage in the public reading of Psalms 1 and 2 as one, whereas later either Luke himself altered the numeral (to accommodate the reference to the scriptural usage current in Greek congregations) or various scribes made the alteration (see Die Apostelgeschichte des Lucas [Leipzig and Erlangen, 1921], p. 443). It may be asked, however, what evidence exists to prove that in the first century the Psalms were included in the lectionary of scripture readings for synagogue services?

“Notes on Select Readings,” p. 95. The emended text could be translated, “When they asked that they speak these words to them on the next sabbath, and after the synagogue service was dismissed, many Jews and devout converts to Judaism followed Paul...”


For statistics, see above, pp. 353 f., footnote 248[2].

It is not quite certain how ἄξιον is to be taken. Normally one would regard it as the object of ἵνα in the verb, “stirred up persecution against them,” but the following κατὰ τὸν δικαίον seems to render it superfluous. It may represent, as Torrey suggests, the Aramaic ethical dative (Documents of the Primitive Church, pp. 125, 138, 147), and it is taken thus in the translation above. See also the comment on verse 27.


Die Apostelgeschichte, 1913, p. 218, Anm. 2.


It should be mentioned that some of Buchanan’s palaeographical work has come under severe criticism; see H. A. Sanders, “Buchanans Publikationen altlateinischer Texte, eine Warnung,” Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXI (1922), pp. 291–299, and compare the annotation on item no. 936 in B. M. Metzger’s Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, 1914–1939 (Copenhagen, 1955). As Ropes points out (ad loc.) “no other authority seems to give any hint of this gloss.”


F. Blass, *Acta apostolorum...editio philologica*, p. 158.


*Der Codex D in der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 78. Kilpatrick, however, prefers the reading of Bezae, which has the participle in the singular number (ἐκκολόγησεν δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκ Παύλου); see G. D. Kilpatrick in *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*, edited by J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thomson, pp. 69 f.


C. C. Torrey, *Documents of the Primitive Church*, p. 146. The suggestion, however, involves Torrey’s improbable theory of multiple translations (see above, pp. 231 f.).


Who first proposed the emendation is not known; it found champions in such diverse persons as William E. Gladstone and Joseph Halévy – indeed, the latter unguardedly gave the impression that it is actually found in manuscripts of Acts (*Revue Sémitique*, X [1902], pp. 238 f.).


“If our conjecture about the original text appears to be too hazardous, this text of p. 18 can be regarded as the original,” op. cit., p. 24, with a reference to M.-J. Lagrange, in *Revue Biblique*, XLIII (1934), p. 168, and *La Critique textuelle* (Paris, 1935), p. 414.

An ingenious attempt to solve the problem by proposing that both the Alexandrian and the Western readings are, in a certain sense, original was made by Karl Six, S.J., who asks, “Could not James, who according to tradition was more legalistic than the rest, have included the prohibition of murder in his proposal, while in the composition of the letter it was omitted, either in the interest of conciseness or because it seemed to be comprehended in the prohibition of blood?” (*Das Aposteldekret* [Act 15, 28-29]. Seine Entstehung und Geltung in den ersten vier Jahrhunderten [Innsbruck, 1912], p. 18). The difficulty with this theoretical solution is that it is unsupported by the evidence of the manuscripts in 15.20 and 29.

According to Jacques Dupont, “Present day scholarship is practically unanimous in considering the ‘Eastern’ text of the decree as the only authentic text (in four items) and in interpreting its prescriptions in a sense not ethical but ritual,” *Les problèmes du Livre des Actes d’après les travaux récents* (Louvain, 1950), p. 70.


Scriptores Historiae Augustae, Severus Alexander, L, 7–8: Clamabatque saepius, quod a quibusdam sive ludens sive Christianis audierat et terebat, idque per praecociem, cum aliquem emendaret, dici iubebat: quod itib non vis, alteri ne feceris, quam sententiam usque adeo dilexit, ut eti in Patatio et in publicis operibus pscrbici iubet.

In Aramaic, however, such apposition is entirely idiomatic; see C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts*, p. 39. The translation “and the elder brethren” in the Revised Version of 1881, taking presbu,teroi as an adjective, is inadmissible (see H. Hyman, *Classical Review*, III [1889], pp. 73 f.), and was not followed by the American Standard Version of 1901.

*Der Codex D* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 82.


See, for example, the list in *Group D in the footnote on p. 226* above.

Thus J. Rendel Harris (*Four Lectures on the Western Text*, p. 77), who translates, “So they were led by the Holy Spirit and came down to Antioch.”

*Der Codex D* (Leipzig, 1897), p. 82.


B. Weiss, *Der Codex D*, p. 84.


Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 1896, pp. 436 f.

See Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary, s.v., and p. xvi.


St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, p. 222.
According to a suggestion made by C. A. Phillips, behind the two forms of text one may postulate the Syriac verb, which, according to Brockelmann’s Lexicon Syriacum, means primarily averti (occulos, faciem) but also non curavit, neglexit (Bulletin of the Bezan Club, V [1928], p. 44; cf. D. Plooij, ibid., IX [1931], p. 16).


Cf. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 29, 4.


Reported by W. M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, p. 161.

Ramsay observes that “it was impossible in Athenian society for a woman of respectable position and family to have any opportunity of hearing Paul; and the name Damaris (probably a vulgarism for damalis, heifer) suggests a foreign woman, perhaps one of the class of educated Hetairai, who might very well be in his audience,” St. Paul the Traveller and the Roman Citizen, p. 252.

The word amphodon appears elsewhere in the New Testament only in Mk 11.4.

Notice that Lk 23.50 does not retain diakryw of Mk 15.43.

The verb muvein occurs nowhere else in the New Testament.

According to a suggestion made by C. A. Phillips, behind the two forms of text one may postulate the Syriac verb, which, according to Brockelmann’s Lexicon Syriacum, means primarily averti (occulos, faciem) but also non curavit, neglexit (Bulletin of the Bezan Club, V [1928], p. 44; cf. D. Plooij, ibid., IX [1931], p. 16).


Cf. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 29, 4.


The verb muvein occurs nowhere else in the New Testament.


Der Codex D, p. 94, Anm. 1.


Anglican Theological Review, XXXVI (1944), pp. 253–255.

Mnemosyne, XXIX (1881), p. 289.

The word μυπηκαλεωε occurs elsewhere in the New Testament only in Mk 11.4.


Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XLV (1954), p. 266.

Epigraphic proof is now available to show that Derbe was situated at Kerli Hüyük, about 60 miles from Lystra. Whether it was within or outside the Province of Galatia is an open question; see George Ogg, “Derbe,” New Testament Studies, IX (1963), pp. 367–370.

“The Thessalonian Aristarchus (also mentioned in 19.29 and 27.2) and the otherwise unknown Secundus constitute the first pair; the Lycaonian Gaius from Derbe and Timothy (from the neighboring) Lystra, 16.1; since he is well known to the reader he is not further identified), form the second pair; and the Asians, Typhicus and Trophimus, the third pair” (Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, A Commentary, p. 574).


The British Friend, April, 1913, quoted in Expository Times, XXIV (1912–13), p. 530.


W. M. Ramsay, The Church in the Roman Empire, p. 155.


James Hope Moulton, Prolegomena, p. 90; and Moulton and Milligan, Vocabulary, s.v.


The Letter Of Paul To The Romans

1.1 Christo/ Ιτρο/ (B)

In the opening verses of most of the Pauline letters, the manuscripts vary the sequence between Ιτρο/ Christo/ and Christo/ Ιτρο/. In general, the earlier letters read indubitably Ιτρο/ Christo/ (or Christo/ Ιτρο/), while those written later (with the exception of Titus) just as indubitably read Christo/ Ιτρο/. For Romans (and 1 Corinthians), however, the weight of the witnesses supporting each sequence is more evenly balanced. On the basis of two fourth-century manuscripts (D* and B), supported by 81 and several other witnesses, the Committee preferred the sequence Christo/ Ιτρο/.

1.7 εν 'Πάμη [A]

A majority of the Committee interpreted the absence of the words εν 'Πάμη in several witnesses (G 1739* 1908* 1004* Origen) either as the result of an accident in transcription, or, more probably, as a deliberate excision, made in order to show that the letter is of general, not local, application. Whether the omission of the designation is also connected with the circulation of an alternative (shorter or longer) form of the letter (see the comment on 1.23) is an open question.

1.13 οὐ θλια (A)

The reading of D* G ιδ*: Ambrosiaster Pelagius, oúc οὐδειμα ("I do not suppose"), was regarded as a scribal modification limited to Western witnesses; oúc οὐδειμα is still more limited (D* D*). The reading of θλια, which is supported by the great mass of the manuscripts (G* D* N A B C Ψ 81 1739 vg syr* it* arm Origen* 1004 al), the variant εν 'Πάμη (G* 1004) was judged by a majority of the Committee to be clearly secondary. Its origin may be connected with the omission of εν 'Πάμη (see the comment on the previous variant), and the final syllable of θλια may have been taken to be a superfluous definite article. The omission of θλια in several witnesses (D* 1915) must be regarded as accidental.

1.15 τοῖς εν 'Πάμη [A]

Two witnesses (the bilingual G and the Latin translation of Origen) omit toǐς εν 'Πάμη, either accidentally, or, more probably, deliberately (to make the letter of general application). See the comment on εν 'Πάμη at 1.17.

1.16 πράτων

The omission of πράτων (B G ιδ* cop* Tertullian Epiphraem) is perhaps due to Marcion, to whom the privilege of the Jews was unacceptable. All other witnesses include the word.

1.29 πορνυρία πληκείως κακία (C)

The Textus Receptus, following L Ψ 88 326 330 614 Byz Lct syr* arm α/ inserts πορνυρία ("fornication") before πορνιμα. Although it could be argued that πορνιμα had fallen out accidentally in transcription, it is more likely that the word is an intrusion into the text, either accidentally (when πορνυρία was erroneously read as πορνυρία) or deliberately (when copyists, finding the word in some forms of the text (D* E G P α/), inserted it by conflation either before or after πορνυρία). The fact, however, that Paul argues (verses 24-25) that such vices as listed here issue from the licentious practices of idolatry, makes it unlikely that he would have included πορνυρία within the list itself.

1.31 ἀστάργοις (A)

Recalling a similar catalog of vices in 2 Tm 3.2-5, where ἀστάργοις, is followed by αὐτόνας, copyists inserted the latter word in Romans, some before ἀστάργοις (33 1913), and others after (N C Ψ α/).

2.16 Χριστο/ Ιτρο/ (C)

In view of considerable doubt as to which sequence is original, the Committee preferred to adopt the reading supported by the oldest extant witnesses (N* α/ B; Origen reads εν Χριστο/ Ιτρο/).

2.17 ει δέ

The Textus Receptus, following the later text (D* L most minuscules syr*), reads ικά (whence the AV rendering, "Behold"). This reading arose either as an itacism (ει and ει were pronounced alike) or as a deliberate amelioration of an otherwise extremely long and drawn out sentence (with the apodosis in ver. 21). In any case ει δέ is strongly supported by the best representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (N A B D* K P Ψ 88 614 1739 Byz ιδ*: it* arm α/).

3.7 δέ (B)

A majority of the Committee, feeling that Paul’s argument requires a parallel between verses 5 and 7, preferred the reading ει δέ and regarded ει γάρ as a rather inept scribal substitution, perhaps of Western origin.

3.12 [οὐκ ἀστατέω] (2) (C)
be preferred when it appears that the other reading has been assimilated to the Septuagint, in this case a majority of the Committee preferred the longer reading, supported as it is by the mass of witnesses, considering it probable that ω_κ_κ_κ_κ was deleted as superfluous. At the same time, because of the weight of the combination of witnesses that omit the words (B 1739 syr Origen), it was decided to enclose them within square brackets.

3.22 εἰς πάντας (B)

In place of εἰς πάντας (B D C P 81 1739 al) a few witnesses read εἰς πάντας (vg Pelagius John-Damascus). The Textus Receptus, following K D G K 33 al, combines the two readings, producing an essentially redundant and tautological expression.

3.25 διὰ [τῆς] πίστεως (C)

On the one hand, the article may have been added by copyists who wished to point back to διὰ πίστεως Ισραήλ in ver. 22. On the other hand, later in the chapter when Paul uses πίστις absolutely (i.e. without a modifier), διὰ is followed by the article (cf. verses 30 and 31). In order to represent the balance in both external evidence and internal considerations, a majority of the Committee preferred to include τῆς in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets to indicate doubt that it belongs there. The omission of the clause in A and 2127 must be accidental.

3.26 Ισραήλ

The expansion of Ισραήλ (A B C K P 81 1739 Byz al) by the addition of Χριστοῦ (629 itt: 61 cop al) is a natural scribal accretion. The reading of syr (κυρίον ιμιν Ισραήλ Χριστοῦ) appears to Syriac ecclesiastical idiom. The omission of Ισραήλ by F G 336 itt and the reading Ισραήλ in D* P 33 614 Lect al are the result of copyists' blunders in transcribing scriptio continua γνωστην. (Γνωστην was usually written Νιν, and Ισραήλ, Νιν.)

3.28 γάρ (B)

On the whole, the external evidence supporting γάρ (A D* P 81 1739 Old Latin vg synod cop arm al) is slightly superior to that supporting οἷς (B C D* P 33 614 Byz syn* arm al). The context, moreover, favors γάρ, for ver. 28 gives a reason for the argument in ver. 27, not a conclusion from it. The reading οἷς probably arose when copyists took λογιζόμεθα to mean “we infer, we conclude,” rather than “we hold, we consider.” Since ver. 28 opens a new lesson (for the third Saturday after Pentecost), the Greek lectionaries omit the conjunction altogether.

4.1 εἰρηνεύεις Ἀβραὰμ τὸν προπέταρχον ἤμων (B)

Although it can be argued that the variation of position of εἰρηνεύεις, before Ἀβραὰμ, X A C D G P 81 629 al, after ἤμων, K P 33 88 614 Byz al indicates that the word was added at various places and that therefore the short text (B 1739 Origen) is original, the Committee considered that (a) there was no reason why copyists should have decided to add εἰρηνεύεις at various places if it did not belong in the text originally, and (b) εἰρηνεύεις after ἤμων may have fallen out accidentally because of the similarity of the beginning of both verbs. Of the two readings that include the word, the sequence ἤμων εἰρηνεύεις was judged inferior both in sense and external support.

The word προπέταρχος (which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament) was replaced in the later manuscripts (K P 33 104 614 1739) by πατέρα (which is the customary designation in the New Testament for Abraham; see Lk 16.24, 30; Jn 8.53; Ac 7.2). If 4.19)

4.11 λογισθήθηκεν [καί] (C)

On the one hand, after the final syllable of λογισθήθηκεν the word καί, being not indispensable to the sense, could easily have been overlooked in transcription. On the other hand, it is possible that καί has been added by copyists in the interest (at least superficially) of sharpening the argument (“… reckoned to them also”). In view of the balance of transcriptional probabilities, a majority of the Committee thought it best to include καί but to enclose it within square brackets. The reading of 451 is obviously a scribal blunder.

4.15 οἷς (B)

As far as external evidence is concerned, the reading οἷς οὐκ appears to be rather decisively supported (X A C B 81 al). On the other hand, if οἷς were original, one could understand that some scribes, noticing the presence of γάρ at the beginning of verses 13, 14, and 15, might well have decided to replace the fourth instance of γάρ with οἷς. In the face of such considerations, the Committee preferred to adopt the reading supported by the earliest evidence.

4.19 κατευθύνθη [C]

Curiously enough, each of the two readings, one positive and one negative, gives good sense: (a) κατευθύνθη (X A B C D* K P 33 614 Byz Lect itt) means, “His faith did not weaken when he considered …” and (b) οὐκ κατευθύνθη (D G K P 33 614 Byz Lect itt οὐκ syn* arm al) means, “He was so strong in faith that he did not consider …” Whereas reading (b), like many other readings of Western origin, appears at first to be preferable, after further reflection it reveals itself to be less appropriate in the context: here Paul does not wish to imply that faith means closing one’s eyes to reality, but that Abraham was so strong in faith as to be undaunted by any consideration.

4.19 θνητόν (C)

The predominant weight of manuscript evidence, in the opinion of a majority of the Committee, favors the retention of θνητόν (X A C D* K P 33 614 Byz Lect syn* arm syn* arm al). At the same time, however, the presence of θνητόν gives the impression of a certain heightening of the
account. Moreover, who would have omitted the word had it stood in the text originally? As a compromise that reflects the conflict between external evidence and internal considerations, the Committee retained ὅν in the text but enclosed it within square brackets.

4.22 [καὶ] [C]

In order to represent the balance of external evidence for and against the presence of καὶ, the Committee decided to print it within square brackets.

5.1 ἐκωμεν [A]

Although the subjunctive ἐκωμεν (N* A B* C D K L 33 81 ἰ6 ἱ9 vg syr† cop*) arm eth al has far better external support than the indicative ἐκωμεν (N* B* G* P 9 ν 0220 ἰ6 ἱ9 88 326 330 629 1241 1739 Byz Lect ἰ6† cop† syr†) a, a majority of the Committee judged that internal evidence must here take precedence. Since in this passage it appears that Paul is not exhorting but stating facts ("peace" is the possession of those who have been justified), only the indicative is consonant with the apostle’s argument. Since the difference in pronunciation between ὁ and ὦ in the Hellenistic age was almost non-existent, when Paul dictated ἐκωμεν, Tertius, his amanuensis (16.22), may have written down ἐκωμεν. (For another set of variant readings involving the interchange of ἰ and ὦ, see 1 Cor 15.49.)

5.2 [τῇ πίστει] [C]

It is doubtful whether the words τῇ πίστει belong to the text or not, for the weight of external evidence is almost evenly balanced between their inclusion (N A C K P 33 1739 Byz Lect ἰ46† ἰ6† vg syr† cop*) and their omission (B D G 0220 ἰ6† cop*). Furthermore, the sense is not materially changed by their presence or their absence, for Paul has previously declared that faith is necessary for justification, and therefore it may be that copyists dropped the words as redundant and superfluous after ἐκωμεν of ver. 1. In order to represent the balance of evidence, a majority of the Committee preferred to retain the words in the text but to enclose the phrase within square brackets. (The reading ἐν τῇ πίστει seems to have arisen by dittography after ἐκωμεν.)

5.8 ἔτι γὰρ ... ἔτι [C]

Although it must be acknowledged that the reading ἔτι γὰρ ... ἔτι (B cop*) possesses a certain inherent fitness which, despite its very slender external support, makes it most attractive, a majority of the Committee could find no adequate reason why, if this reading were original, the others would have arisen. On the other hand, not only is the external evidence for ἔτι γὰρ ... ἔτι quite overwhelming in weight and variety, but also all witnesses that omit one or the other instance of ἔτι may be held to have originated as scribal improvements to avoid the awkward repetition of the word. Thus, the reading adopted as text seems to be the earliest attainable reading preserved in the manuscripts; whether it originated as a primitive error in the exemplar of the first collection of the Pauline Letters, or whether it arose when, as one may assume, Paul repeated ἔτι, perhaps for the sake of emphasis, while dictating to Tertius (16.22), it is impossible to say.

6.4 ὥν [A]

Uncertain of the appropriateness of ὥν in relating ver. 4 to ver. 3, the Peshitta Syriac version and other witnesses omit the connective, while the Old Latin versions, joined by Origen, substitute γὰρ.

6.8 ἢ [A]

Instead of ἢ, which is supported by a very wide variety of witnesses, a few scribes preferred to use γὰρ in order to connect the sentence to what goes before.

6.11 ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ [A]

The Textus Receptus, following N C K P 33 81 614 1739 al, adds τῷ κυρίῳ Ἰησού. The words appear to be a liturgical expansion,
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derived perhaps from ver. 23. If they were original, no good reason can be found why they should have been deleted from such weighty witnesses as B D G 0220 ἰ6† cop*. Tertullian Origen Speculum al.

6.12 ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ [B]

The reading ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ, strongly supported by Alexandrian witnesses as well as by a few Western witnesses (N A B C* 81 1739 ἰ6† ἰ46† vg syr† cop*) a, was replaced in several (chiefly Western) witnesses by αὐτῷ (feeds D G ἰ6† Speculum a), probably under the influence of the repeated mention of ἐπιθυμία in the following verses. The Textus Receptus, following C K P 9 ν 614 Byz Lect syr† al, blends the two earlier readings, combined with ἐν, in the corollation αὐτῷ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις αὐτοῦ. The omission of the words from 618 must be accidental.

6.16 εἰς τὴν σκέψιν

The words εἰς τὴν σκέψιν, strongly supported by N A B C G K P 33 81 330 614 ἰ6† syr† cop* arm eth al, are absent from a few witnesses, chiefly versantional and patristic (D 1739 ἰ6† vg syr† cop* arm Origen Ambrosiaster Ephraem). Since the phrase seems to be necessary as a correlative to the following phrase εἰς δικαιοσύνην, a majority of the Committee was disposed to regard their omission as an unintentional oversight.

7.14 ἐκωμεν [A]
Influenced by Paul’s frequent use of “I” in verses 7 to 25, a few copyists and church Fathers divided the word so as to read οἶε. But to do this overlooks the need at this point in the apostle’s argument for a statement that would command the general assent of his readers – such as he has the habit of introducing by using οὐκ εἰρήνη:

7.18 οἱ (B)

The abrupt termination of the sentence with οἱ (K A B C 81 1739 cop* n* goth arm α*) prompted copyists to add some kind of supplement:

(a) εἰρήνη (D G K P 1739 614 Byz Lect), or (b) γινώσκω (678* 2127), or (c) is not in me (εἰρήνη).

7.20 ήγεια (C)

Not only is the external evidence rather evenly balanced, but also from the point of view of transcriptional probability ήγεια might have been either accidentally omitted through parablepsis or deliberately added for emphasis in conformity with the following εἰρήνη. Accordingly, the Committee decided to retain the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

7.22 θεοῦ (A)

The scribe of B, having noticed τῷ γνώσα τοῦ θεοῦ in ver. 23, inadvertently replaced θεοῦ with θεοῦ in ver. 22.

7.25 χάρις δὲ τῷ θεοῦ (B)

The reading that seems best to account for the rise of the others is χάρις δὲ τῷ θεοῦ, supported by Ν* C* 33 81 104 1046 2127 α*. Two Western readings, ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ (D i* s* e* m* υ* vg Ireneus a) and ἡ χάρις κυρίου (G i*), pedantically provide a direct answer to the question τίς με βοήθειαν; in ver. 24. The absence of οἱ (B cop* Origen Methodius Epiphanius Jerome*) seems to represent a natural development in the light of liturgical usage (ὁ) is present in the same ascription at 6.17; 2 Cor 2.14; 8.16, and in some witnesses at 2 Cor 9.15. The reading εὐχαριστοῦ τῷ θεοῦ (Ν* A K P 1739 Byz Lect) seems to have arisen through transcriptional error involving the doubling of several letters, τοῦχρις[ε]ιρήνη[τα]νοεως.

8.1 Ἰνδική (A)

At the close of the verse the later manuscripts introduce an interpolation from ver. 4 in two stages: μὴ κατὰ οὖρα πεπατισθῶν is read by A D* Ψ 81 629 2127 it* vg syr* goth arm Speculum α*, and the same clause followed by ἀλλὰ κατὰ πνεῦμα is read by Ν* D* K P 33 88 104 614 Byz Lect it* syr* arm α*. The shorter text, which makes the more general statement without the qualification that is appropriate enough at ver. 4, is strongly supported by early representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (Ν* B C* D* G 1739 it* 6 cop* arm α*).

8.2 οί (B)

While it is rather certain that the reading ἠγεια is a secondary modification, introduced in order to make the apostle’s statement apply to all Christians (as in ver. 4), it is much more difficult to choose between με and οί. The latter, as the more difficult reading, is more likely to have been replaced by the former (which harmonizes better with the argument in chap. 2) than vice versa. On the other hand οί may have originated in the accidental repetition of the final syllable of ἠγεια when the terminal -ν, represented by a horizontal line over the ν, was overlooked.

Although it is possible that the original text was without any object pronoun, the verb being used absolutely (i.e. as a kind of gnomic aorist), the Committee was reluctant to rely upon the slender evidence for omission (arm α* Origen), since the absence of a pronoun in these witnesses may reflect nothing more than freedom of translation or quotation. Impressed by the weight of the combination of Alexandrian and Western witnesses, a majority of the Committee preferred οί as the earliest attainable text.

8.11 τοῦ εὐαγγελίατος αὐτοῦ πνεῦματος (B)

Remembering that in the Pauline corpus the weight of B when associated with D G (as here) is quite considerably lessened, a majority of the Committee preferred the genitive case, on the basis of the combination of text-types, including the Alexandrian (K A C 81), Palestinian (syr* α* Byz Jerusalem), and Western (it* Hippolytus).

8.21 ὡς (A)

The oldest and best witnesses read ὡς (344* A B C 33 81 614 1739 α*). Apparently ὡς arose accidentally by dittography. ἐξαιρέωι becoming ἐξαιρέωι.

8.23 προσεῖται (A)

Several witnesses, chiefly Western (344* D G 614 it* α*), omit προσεῖται, a word that copyists doubtless found to be both clumsy in the context and dispensable, as well as seeming to contradict ver. 16.

8.24 τίς (B)

A majority of the Committee, impressed by the weight of the combination of 344* B* 1739* 1908* cop* Origen, preferred the reading τίς and regarded the other readings as expansions of a strikingly terse and typically Pauline type of question. The expansions may have been introduced by copyists because of the lack of punctuation (after βλέπων) and the ambiguity of τίς (interrogative or indefinite) in unaccented script.

8.24 ἐκλεῖπει (B)
Although ὑπομνήμα (ὥς A 1739 byz, arm eth Origen Ephraem) may appear to be the more difficult reading and therefore deserving of adoption, a majority of the Committee was unwilling to base the text upon such limited support, especially in view of the early and very diversified testimony for ἐλπιζεῖ (𝔓56 B D C G K 33 81 614 1739 itty 743 vg syr h ἀρμ eth Clement Origen Cyprian al). Furthermore, although the verb ὑπομνήμα with object ("to await something") is rather common in the Septuagint, no example for this use can be cited from the New Testament except in the present variant reading. On balance, therefore, it is probable that the presence of ὑπομνήμα in the following verse prompted an early copyist to substitute ὑπομνήμα for ἐλπιζεῖ.

8.26 ὑπομνημάτιμα (A)

The Textus Receptus, following Ὕῶς C K P Ψ 33 614 Byz Lect al adds ἄνευ ρυμον, thus making explicit what is implicit in the compound verb ὑπομνημάτιμα, which is decisively supported by 535776 ᾽ᾲ Β A B D G 81 1739 itty 9 arm Origen al.

8.27 συνεργεῖ (B)

Although the reading συνεργεῖ ὃ θεός (𝔓46 ᾽ᾲ B D G it 81 it arm eth Clement Origen Cyprian al) is both ancient and noteworthy, a majority of the Committee deemed it too narrowly supported to be admitted into the text, particularly in view of the diversified support for the shorter reading (Ἁῶς C D G K Ψ 33 614 1739 Byz Lect itty 9 syr h ῶ ἀρμ arm eth Clement Origen Eusebius Lucifer Cynti-Jerusalem Chrysostom Augustine al). Since συνεργεῖ may be taken to imply a personal subject, ὃ θεός seems to have been a natural explanatory addition made by an Alexandrian editor.

8.34 Χριστός (Ὑφοσίς) (C)

The weight of the evidence for and against the presence of Χριστός is so evenly balanced that the Committee considered it preferable to retain the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

8.35 Χριστός (A)

Since the reading θεοῦ τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ Υφοσίς (𝔓46 ᾽ᾲ B 81 cop αθ ἀρμ eth Origen Cyprian al) is in all probability a scribal harmonization with ver. 39, the reading θεοῦ (𝔓326 330 cop αθ Origen) is in doubt, also a partial echo of that verse. The reading Χριστός is strongly supported (Α Ὅῶς C D G K Ψ 33 614 1241 1739 Byz Lect Old Latin vg syr h ῶ ἀρμ eth Tertullian Origen Eusebius) and binds together verses 34 and 35.

8.38 οὗτος εἴσερχεται οὗτε μελλόντες οὗτε δυνάμεις (A)

The Textus Receptus, following K L Ψ most minuscule manuscripts syr h ἀρμ eth Chrysostom Theodoret Oecumenius Theophylact, places the words οὗτος δυνάμεις before οὗτε εἴσερχεται, thus associating them more closely with ἐρωτάτης (as also in 1 Cor 15.24; Eph 1.21). The reading adopted for the text is decisively supported by early and good witnesses (𝔓56 ᾽ᾲ A B C D G itty 9 syr h ἀρμ eth Origen Eusebius Ephraem Cyril John-Damascus Augustine al). There is no reason to expect that the apostle would give a systematic classification of angelic-beings; on the other hand, the rearrangement of the items has every appearance of being the work of copyists or editors who wished to improve the sequence.

9.1 ἐλαθήκαι (B)

Although the reading ἥ ἐλαθήκαι is strongly supported (𝔓56 ᾽ᾲ B D G it 81 it arm eth Origen Cyprian al), the plural ἐλαθήκαι (Ἡῶς C K Ψ 33 81 614 1739 Byz Lect itty 9 syr h ῶ ἀρμ arm eth Origen) was preferred on the grounds that (a) copyists would have been likely to assimilate the plural to the pattern of instances of the singular number in the series, and (b) plural covenants may have appeared to involve theological difficulties, and therefore the expression was converted to the singular number. Certainly there is no good reason why the singular, if original, should be altered to the plural.

9.3 πάρκα, ὃ ἐν ἐπὶ τῶν αἰῶνας ἐκλογῆς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας

Since the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament are without systematic punctuation, editors and translators of the text must insert such marks of punctuation as seem to be appropriate to the syntax and meaning. The present passage has been the object of much discussion as to whether or not Paul intended to refer θεός to ὃ Χριστός. The chief interpretations are the following:

(a) Placing a comma after οὐκάρηκα and referring the following words to ὃ Χριστός ("... who is God over all, blessed for ever").

(b) Placing a point (either a colon or a full stop) after οὐκάρηκα and taking the following words as a clause independent of ὃ Χριστός. (Several translations are possible: "God who is over all be blessed for ever!"; or "He who is God over all be blessed for ever!"; or "He who is over all blessed for ever."")

(c) Placing a comma after οὐκάρηκα and a point (a colon or a full stop) after τῶν αἰῶνας. (This, which is a modification of (b), is to be translated, "... who is over all. God be [or, is] blessed for ever!")

In deciding which punctuation should be used, the Committee was agreed that evidence from the Church Fathers, who were almost unanimous in understanding the passage as referring to ὃ Χριστός, is of relatively minor significance, as is also the opposing fact that four uncial manuscripts (A B C L) and at least twenty-six minuscule manuscripts have a point after οὐκάρηκα, either by the first hand or by subsequent correctors. In both cases the tradition, whether patristic or palaeographical, originated at a time subsequent to Paul’s writing (i.e. dictating; cf. 16.22) the passage, and is therefore of questionable authority.
On the one hand, some members of the Committee preferred punctuation (a) for the following reasons:

(1) The interpretation that refers the passage to Christ suits the structure of the sentence, whereas the interpretation that takes the words as an asyndetic doxology to God the Father is awkward and unnatural. As Westcott observes, "The juxtaposition of ὁ Χριστός κατὰ σάρκα and ὁ Θεός κ.τ.λ. seems to make a change of subject improbable."1

(2) If the clause ὁ Θεός κ.τ.λ. is an asyndetic doxology to God the Father, the word ὁ Θεός is superfluous, for "he who is God over all" is most simply represented by ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός. The presence of the participle suggests that the clause functions as a relative clause (not "he who is ..." but "who is ..."), and thus describes ὁ Χριστός as being "God over all."

(3) Pauline doxologies, as Zahn points out,2 are never asyndetic but always attach themselves to that which precedes: with ὁ ζῷος τῆς ἐπιστολῆς (Ro 1.25); with ὁ θεός (2 Cor 11.31); with ὁ θεός (Ga 1.3; 2 Tim 4.18; cf. He 13.21; 1 Pe 4.11); with συνέφωρος (Rom 11.36; Eph 3.21; cf. 1 Pe 5.11; 2 Pe 3.18); with ὁ ἄγιος (Phn 4.20; 1 Tim 1.17).

(4) Asyndetic doxologies, not only in the Bible but also in Semitic inscriptions, are differently constructed; the verb or verbal adjective (ἔλεγχως, Ἰωάννης, Ἡρών, Ἰησοῦς) always precedes the name of God, and never follows it, as here.3

(5) In the light of the context, in which Paul speaks of his sorrow over Israel’s unbelief, there seems to be no psychological explanation to account for the introduction of a doxology at this point.

On the other hand, in the opinion of others of the Committee, none of these considerations seemed to be decisive, particularly since nowhere else in his genuine epistles—does Paul ever designate ὁ Χριστός as Θεός. In fact, on the basis of the general tenor of his theology it was considered tantamount to impossible that Paul would have expressed Christ’s greatness by calling him God blessed for ever. As between the punctuation in (b) and (c), the former was preferred.

The Committee also considered the possibility that by accident in transcription ὁ Θεός had replaced an original Θεός (cf. the preceding ver. 4 ὁ θεός ἐλπίζοντας ... ver. 5 ὁ Θεός οἱ πατέρες), but was unwilling to introduce a conjectural emendation into the text.4

9.23 καί οὖν (A)

The absence of καί from several witnesses (B 326 436 1739 D G K P Ψ 64 94 1241 vg cop ἐν αὐτῷ) was thought by the Committee to have been the result of an attempt to simplify the construction. The evidence from the versions in this case is of limited significance, since translational freedom, and not a different underlying Greek text, may account for the absence of the conjunction.

9.28 συμπέσατον (A)
evn or parV, the Committee decided that it would be safest to adopt r`h/ma Cristou/ which is strongly supported by A D K P Y 33 614 1241 Byz Lect syr* a, but to enclose it within square brackets in order to indicate considerable doubt whether it belongs in the text.

11.31 [vou] (2) (C)

Once again external evidence and internal considerations are rather evenly balanced. A preponderance of early and diverse witnesses favors the shorter reading. On the other hand, the difficulty in meaning that the second occurrence of vou seems to introduce may have prompted either its deletion or its replacement by the superficially more appropriate iou/steron. In view of such conflicting considerations it seemed best to retain vou in the text but to enclose it within square brackets.

11.32 ta/j pa/jntas (1) (A)

Instead of the first occurrence of ta/j pa/jntas several witnesses (D* G Old Latin vg Ambrose) substitute t`j pa/jnta (or pa/jnta), a reading that seems to have arisen from scribal recollection of Ga 3.22 (συνεκλεισθεν ἡ γραφή τῇ ταχύτητι).

12.2 vou

After vou the Textus Receptus, following K D* L most minuscules if* syr* a, goth arm a, the Textus Receptus, following K* A D* K P  33 614 1241 Byz Lect syr* a, reads th/en. The expression th/en Χριστοῦ occurs only here in the New Testament, whereas th/en άνθρωπος is a more familiar expression (Lk 3.2; in 3.34; Eph 6.17; He 6.5; 11.3). The omission of Χριστοῦ (or άνθρωπος) in an ancestor of several Western witnesses (G II* Ambrosiaster Hilary Pelagius) is to be attributed to carelessness.

11.11 το/j la/jn (A)

Instead of το/j la/jn several witnesses (D* G if* goth a) read την κληρονομίαν, which appears to be a Western assimilation to Ps 94.14 (= LXX 93.14) but to enclose it within square brackets.

11.6 χρίζεις (2) (A)

After χρίζεις the Textus Receptus, following K (B) L  1139 and later manuscripts, adds τού χρίζεις ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἐργαν αὐτός ἀδελφὸν ἔργον ("But if it be of works, then is it no more grace: otherwise work is no more work" AV). There appears to be no reason why, if the words were original, they should have been deleted. The existence of several forms of the addition likewise throws doubt upon the originality of any of them.

11.17 της ρίζης της πίστεως (B)

The unexpected asyndeton of the reading της ρίζης, της πίστεως της ἑλείας, in spite of its rather limited attestation (K* B C  1739 Clement Origin Cyprian), appears to explain best the original of the other readings, since the widespread introduction of καὶ and the omission of της ρίζης (D* G if* a) are suspicious as ameliorating emendations.

11.21 [μη ποιεῖ] οἴδε (C)

On the one hand, the strong combination of K B C 81 1739 in support of the shorter text would normally be preferred. On the other hand, however, (a) μη ποιεῖ is a typically Pauline expression (it occurs in nine other passages in Paul; only once elsewhere in the New Testament), and (b) copyists may have taken offense at its presence here because of its apparent unrelatedness (Origen substituted the more appropriate ποιεῖ μάλλον and ποιεῖ πλέον – see Tischendorf in loc.) and its grammatical inappropriateness with the following wording. In order to give due weight to both external evidence and internal considerations, a majority of the Committee considered it necessary to retain μη ποιεῖ in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

11.25 [παρ'] (C)

Although it can be argued that the simple dative, without a preposition, may be the original reading (supported, as it is, by 3.41 F G  1739 a) and that the difficulty of construing the sense prompted scribes to insert ἐν or τῷ, the Committee decided that it would be safest to adopt παρ', which is strongly supported by K C D a, but to enclose it in square brackets in order to indicate considerable doubt whether it belongs in the text.

12.11 κυρίῳ (A)

The reading κυρίῳ, supported chiefly by Western witnesses (D* F G 5 if* O Origen Cyprian Ambrosiaster Jerome a), probably arose from a confusion of kai and κυρίῳ (the nomen sacrum κυρίῳ was customarily contracted to καὶ, and the καὶ compendium was written κ).

12.14 ἀδιάκοπας [ιμάκα] (C)

It is difficult to decide whether ἀμάκας was deleted in order to extend the range of the exhortation, or whether copyists, recollecting the parallel sayings in Mt 5.44 and Lk 6.28, added the pronoun. Since both readings are fairly evenly supported in the witnesses, a majority of the Committee preferred to print [ιμάκα].

12.17 ἐνέπτυσεν πάντας

Under the influence of Pr 3.4 and 2 Cor 8.21 several witnesses expand by prefixing ἐνέπτυσεν τῶν θεσμῶν καὶ (A*) or οὖν μάνων ἐνέπτυσεν τοῖς θεσμοῖς ἀλλὰ καὶ (F G if* vg goth Lucifer Ambrosiaster). On the other hand, perhaps through transcribal oversight
On the one hand, the external evidence for the absence of γῷ αὐτῷ appears to be slightly superior to that attesting its presence. On the other hand, since the word here expresses merely a continuation rather than a causal relationship, copyists who did not appreciate this Pauline usage of the particle (for examples, see Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker, s.v., § 4), may have been tempted to delete it. On balance, the Committee thought it best to include the word in the text but enclosed it within square brackets signifying doubt that it belongs there.

14.6 ἕρωται

The Textus Receptus, following the later witnesses (C5 L P most minuscules syr a B g 56 0142), adds the clause καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔρωται ὑπὲρ ἑκατέρου αὐτῶν ὥσπερ ὁ ἔρωταί τε ἔρωτα. This is a typical Byzantine gloss, promoted by the desire to provide a balanced statement after the model of the clause καὶ ὁ μὴ ἐνσώοιο λατρεύων τείνεται later in the verse.

14.9 ἀπέδωκαν καὶ ἔρχεται (A)

The oldest and best attested reading appears to be ἀπέδωκαν καὶ ἔρχεται (A). Since the use of ἐρχόμενος διδάσκοντες... (1 Th 4.14) is easy to understand why, if the words were originally absent from the text, copyists would have supplied them in order to clarify the reference of the verb. To represent the balance of external and internal considerations, it was decided to include τῶν ἔρωτων in the text, but to enclose the words within square brackets.

14.10 θεοί (B)

At an early date (Marcion Polycarp Tertullian Origen) the reading θεοί, which is supported by the best witnesses (A C D B C D G 33 614 1739), was supplanted by Χριστοῦ, probably because of influence from 2 Cor 5.10 (μυροθήκη τοῦ βραχία τοῦ Χριστοῦ).

14.12 [τῶν θεῶν] (C)

On the one hand, the combination of such witnesses as A C D D 33 81 614 and most versional testimony makes it difficult to reject the reading τῶν θεῶν. On the other hand, however, it is easy to understand why, if the words were originally absent from the text, copyists would have supplied them in order to clarify the reference of the verb. To represent the balance of external and internal considerations, it was decided to include τῶν θεῶν in the text, but to enclose the words within square brackets.

14.19 διώκωμεν (D)

The question whether in this verse Paul describes the Christian ideal (the indicative διώκωμεν continuing the statements made in verses 17 and 18), or whether he now begins his exhortation (the subjunctive διώκωμεν leading to καταλύειν in ver. 20a), is extremely difficult to answer. Despite the slightly superior uncial support for διώκωμεν (A B C D 56 0142 P 048 0209 a), and despite the circumstance that elsewhere in Romans the phrase ὅπως ἀληθῶς always followed by
The textual evidence for six locations of the doxology is as follows:

- 1:16.23 + doxology
  - Παύσις κ Β Δ Γ 11.1739 mss
  - Old Latin

- 1:14.23 + doxology + 15.1–16.23 + doxology
  - P 5 33 104 arm

- 1:14.23 + doxology + 15.1–16.24
  - Π 10209; 181 326 330 614 1175 Byz

- 1:16.24
  - P G (perhaps the archetype of D) mss

- 1:15.33 + doxology + 16.1–23
  - vg

- 1:14.23 + 16.24 + doxology
  - Old Latin

By the way of explanation of the citation of the evidence for the sequence designated (d), it should be said that codex G, a Greek manuscript with a Latin interlinear version, leaves a blank space of six lines between 14.22 and 15.1, i.e. large enough to accommodate the doxology. This suggests that the scribe of G had reason to think that after 14.23 was the place where the doxology should occur, but that it was lacking in the manuscript from which he was copying. Codex F, the Greek text of which seems to have been copied from the same exemplar as G was copied, joins 15.1 immediately to 14.23, and only in its Latin text (written in a column by itself) presents the doxology after 15.1, while the Greek text of F lacks the doxology. Apparently the doxology was lacking also in the exemplar from which codex D was copied, for D is written colometrically (in sense lines) throughout Romans up to 16.24 and the doxology is written stichometrically (in lines straight across the page). This difference in format has been taken to imply that the section was lacking in a recent ancestor of codex D. The caputula that are referred to in the citation of evidence for the sequence designated (d) are headings, or brief summaries of sections, that are prefixed to the epistle in a number of Vulgate manuscripts. The last but one heading (no. 50) begins at the close of chap. 14, and in others it does not occur at all. (See the comment at 16.25–27.)

By the way of explanation of the citation of the evidence for the sequence designated (d), it should be said that codex G, a Greek manuscript with a Latin interlinear version, leaves a blank space of six lines between 14.22 and 15.1, i.e. large enough to accommodate the doxology. This suggests that the scribe of G had reason to think that after 14.23 was the place where the doxology should occur, but that it was lacking in the manuscript from which he was copying. Codex F, the Greek text of which seems to have been copied from the same exemplar as G was copied, joins 15.1 immediately to 14.23, and only in its Latin text (written in a column by itself) presents the doxology after 15.1, while the Greek text of F lacks the doxology. Apparently the doxology was lacking also in the exemplar from which codex D was copied, for D is written colometrically (in sense lines) throughout Romans up to 16.24 and the doxology is written stichometrically (in lines straight across the page). This difference in format has been taken to imply that the section was lacking in a recent ancestor of codex D. The caputula that are referred to in the citation of evidence for the sequence designated (d) are headings, or brief summaries of sections, that are prefixed to the epistle in a number of Vulgate manuscripts. The last but one heading (no. 50) begins at the close of chap. 14, and in others it does not occur at all. (See the comment at 16.25–27.)

The text of Romans is supported by several excellent Alexandrian witnesses (א ב C), and by a few Old Latin manuscripts (אא יא). The shorter reading without אא is current in the great mass of witnesses, including most of the Old Latin manuscripts and all the other versions. Without אא the words אא πνευματικα ευχλεπτον אא can take the place here as a statement or as a question; the latter makes a more lively style, which is appropriate in the context. Was אא introduced in order to relieve a certain abruptness, or did the word fall out accidentally in transcription because of itacism after אא? In order to represent the balance of possibilities, the Committee decided to retain אא with א ב C but to enclose it within square brackets.

A full discussion of the problems of the termination of the Epistle to the Romans involves questions concerning the authenticity and integrity of the last chapter (or of the last two chapters), including the possibility that Paul may have made two copies of the Epistle, one with and one without chap. 16 (chaps. 1–15 being sent to Rome and chaps. 16–16 to Ephesus). The doxology (“Now to him who is able to strengthen you...be glory for evermore through Jesus Christ!”) varies in location; traditionally it has been printed at the close of chap. 16 (as verses 25–27), but in some witnesses it occurs at the close of chap. 15, and in another witness (אא) at the close of chap. 16. Moreover, several witnesses have it at the close of both chap. 15 and chap. 16, and in others it does not occur at all. (See the comment at 16.25–27.)

It is further to be observed that the benediction (“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you...”) is found sometimes after 16.20, sometimes after 16.23, and sometimes in both places. In the last case it is found under three conditions: (1) before the doxology, (2) without it, (3) after it. In its discussion of these problems, the Committee was concerned chiefly with the textual phenomena, and made no attempt to formulate a comprehensive literary theory bearing on questions of the authenticity, integrity, and destination(s) of the epistle. (On the positions of the benediction see the comment on 16.20.)
degree of uncertainty that it belongs there. Some of the other sequences may have arisen from the influence of the Marcionite text upon the dominant form(s) of the text of the epistle in orthodox circles. Whether sequence (e) is merely one of several idiosyncrasies of the scribe of Ƥ46, or somehow reflects a stage during which Romans circulated without chapter 15, is difficult to decide. Sequence (f) appears to be peculiar to the transmission of the epistle in Latin.

15.7 ἴματα (A)

The reading ἴματα, which has superior and more diversified support than the reading ἴμας, is in harmony with the other instances of the second person plural in the context (verses 5, 7).

15.15 ἴματα

The Textus Receptus, following Ƥ46, K D F G L P most minuscules Ƥ46, Ƥ52, h, poly, cop, arm, adds ἀδιάφορον after ἴματα (in mas. 3 and 209 the word is added after ἄπλο προφυλάκα). Whereas there is no reason why the word, if original, should have been dropped, its insertion, at one point or another, would have been prompted by the lectionary use of the epistle. The shorter text is read by K A B C 38 81 218 927 1288 1739 1898 cop Ƥ46, Ƥ52, Ƥ58, Ƥ99, etc. Origen Cyprian Chrysostom Augustine.

15.19 πνεύματος [θεοῦ] (C)

On the one hand, it can be argued that the presence of ἄγιον in some witnesses and ἀγοῦ in others is suspicious because each can be explained as a scribal addition to complete what in B and Vigilius seems to be an unfinished expression. (The reading πνεύματος [θεοῦ] ἄγιον is an obvious conflation.) On the other hand, despite the generally excellent text preserved by B, a majority of the Committee was unwilling to adopt a reading based on such slender Greek evidence. As a compromise, therefore, it was decided to follow the testimony of the earliest witness (Ƥ46), but in deference to transcriptional considerations to enclose θεοῦ within square brackets.

15.24 Σπανίας (A)

In order to fill out the thought, scribes of later manuscripts added ἔλεος ἐμαυτοῦ πρὸς ἴματα. The shorter reading is strongly supported by Ƥ46, Ƥ52, Ƥ58, Ƥ99, A B C D F G L P Ƥ 81 al.

15.29 Χρυστοῦ (A)

The shorter reading εὐλογίας Χρυστοῦ, decisively supported by early and good testimony (Ƥ46, A B C D G P Ƥ 81 1739 Old Latin cop Ƥ46, arm Clement Origen), was expanded in later witnesses (Ƥ46, Ƥ 33 88 614 Byz) by the insertion of τοῦ εὐκαρποῦ τοῦ.

15.31 διακοσία (A)

In order to avoid the harshness of διακοσία εἰς ἱεροσακάτῳ, several witnesses, chief Western (B D* G* Ambrosiaster Epheam), replace διακοσία with δωροφορία ("the bringing of a gift"), a word that occurs nowhere else in the New Testament and is an obvious gloss defining the purpose of Paul’s journey. The same Greek witnesses, along with several others (1108 1611 1911 1952), also replace εἰς with the easier εἰν.

15.32 εἰναὶ ἑλάθων πρὸς ἴματα διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τοῦ συναπεσεῖναι ἴματα (C)

This verse involves a nest of variant readings, the easiest of which to evaluate are those that involve the word or words that qualify ἴματα, Paul nowhere else speaks of ἴματα [Ὑπο]. Χρυστοῦ (Ƥ46) or θεοῦ. Χρυστοῦ. Θεοῦ (Ƥ52) or θεοῦ. κυρίου. Θεοῦ (Ƥ58), but always of ἴματα [Ὑπο]. The omission of συναπεσεῖναι, ἴματα Ƥ46, Ƥ52, Ƥ58, Ƥ99 B is more difficult to account for, but its absence from Ƥ46 may have been the result of an accident in transcription when the eye of the copyist passed from ἑλάθων ἴματα to ὀλοκληροῦν in ver. 33. In a few Western witnesses συναπεσεῖναι is replaced by ἀνεφάσεί (Ƥ58) or ἀνεφάσει (Ƥ52). The paratactic construction (ἐλάθων ... καί) appears to be a scribal simplification of the syntax.

15.33 ὀμήν! (A)

On the reading of Ƥ46, see the comment on 14.23.

It is difficult to account for the absence of ὀμήν! from A G 330 436 451 630 1739 1881 Ƥ46 al (its omission from Ƥ46 is doubtless connected with the presence here of the doxology, concluding with ὀμήν, in that witness). On the other hand, if ὀμήν! were not present originally, copyists would have been tempted to add it to such a quasi-liturgical statement as is ver. 33. To represent the conflict between the strong external evidence for its inclusion (Ƥ B C D F G L P Ƥ 33 81 614 al) and the equally strong transcriptional probability suggesting that it is secondary, the word should be enclosed within square brackets.

16.3 Ἰφισκάκιαν

The Textus Receptus, following Ƥ46, Ƥ52, Ƥ99 209* 255 256 462 489 920 1311 1319 1827 1852 syr Ƥ46, Ƥ99, eth al, reads the diminutive form Ἰφισκάκιαν. The form Ἰφισκάκια is decisively supported by Ƥ46 (πρεσκάκια) A B C D F G L P most minuscules it vg cop Ƥ46, arm al. See also the comments on 1 Cor 16.19 and 2 Tim 4.19.

16.7 Ἰουνία (A)

On the basis of the weight of manuscript evidence the Committee was unanimous in rejecting Ἰουνία (see also the next variant in ver. 15) in favor of Ἰουνίαν, but was divided as to how the latter should be accepted. Some members, considering it unlikely that a woman would be among those styled "apostles," understood the name to be masculine Ἰουνία ("Junias"), thought to be a shortened form of Junianus (see Bauer-Aland, Wörterbuch, pp. 770 f.). Others, however, were impressed by the facts that (1) the female Latin name Junia occurs more than 250 times in Greek and Latin inscriptions found in Rome alone, whereas the male name Junius is unattested anywhere, and (2) when Greek manuscripts began to be accentuated, scribes wrote the feminine Ἰουνία ("Junia"). (For recent discussions, see R. R. Schulz in Expository Times, ic (1986–87), pp. 108–
The earliest subscription is merely a. Other subscriptions include: (b) ἁμαρτιανοῖς ἐγκαθέσθην απὸ τοῦ Κορινθίου (B D); (c) ἁμαρτιανοῖς ἐγκαθέσθην τὸ Κορινθίου 35 (201 om. pr. ἁμαρτιανοῖς); (d) ὁ ἁμαρτιανός ἐγκαθέσθην απὸ τοῦ Κορινθίου διὰ Φαιτίς ἀπὸ Κορίνθου 42 90 216 339 462 466 642; (e) as (d) but prefixing τῷ γένους καὶ πανεπίστημι ἀπόστολον Πολεμίου ἐπισκόπον τῆς (ἡ ἐγκαθέσθην ἡ ἁμαρτιανός ἐπιστήμη τοῦ Τίτων τῆς ἐγκαθέσθην διὰ Φαιτίς ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ ἀπόστολον Πολεμίου ἐπισκόπον τῆς ἐγκαθέσθην διὰ Φαιτίς τῆς ἐγκαθέσθην τῆς).


It should be pointed out that, since $\text{î}61$ is extremely fragmentary in Romans (preserving only 16.23, 24-27), it could be cited in support of sequence (b) as well as (a).

For two other sequences of the material in Romans (though without the citation of specific manuscript evidence), see K. Aland, *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes* (Berlin, 1967), p. 47.

So Corssen, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, x (1909), pp. 5 f.; but Zahn explains the difference in style of writing (which also occurs occasionally elsewhere in cod. D) as arising from the scribe’s attempt to save space (*Introduction to the New Testament*, i, pp. 403 f.).

For a description of these three manuscripts, see R. Schumacher, *Die beiden letzten Kapitel des Römerbriefs* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, 4; Münster i. W., 1929), pp. 15 ff.

---

### The First Letter Of Paul To The Corinthians

1.1 Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ (B)

The Committee judged the weight of evidence that supports the sequence Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ ($\text{î}46$ B D F G 33 a) to be slightly more impressive than that supporting Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (N A L P and the Majority Text). (See also the comment on Ro 1.1.)

1.2 τῇ ὁσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμη, ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ

On the one hand, a minority of the Committee argued that the reading adopted for the text, which is supported by $\text{î}46$ N A D P $\ddot{\pi}$ 049 (056 0142 om. Ιησοῦ) and apparently all minuscules, is secondary, since it is the easier of the two variants. On the other hand, however, the reading ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ τῇ ὁσίᾳ ἐν Ῥώμη, though supported by a notable combination of witnesses ($\text{î}46$ B D $\ddot{\pi}$ F G), appeared to the majority of the Committee to be intrinsically too difficult, as well as quite un-Pauline in comparison with the style of the salutations in other Pauline letters. The reading apparently arose through the accidental omission of one or more phrases and their subsequent reintroduction at a wrong position.

1.4 θεῷ ὑμῖν [A]

Although it is possible that μου may have crept into the text by assimilation to Ro 1.8 or Php 1.4, the Committee thought it more probable that the word was omitted as inappropriate by several copyists (N* B 6th Ephraem). The reading θεῷ μου is strongly supported by a wide variety of Greek and versional witnesses (N* A C D G P $\ddot{\pi}$ 33 614 1739 Byz Lect It vg syr $\ddot{\gamma}^b\gamma^b$ cop $\ddot{\alpha}^b$ arm). The omission of τῷ θεῷ μου (1884) and the reading θεῷ ὑμῖν (491) are accidental scribal errors.

1.8 [Χριστοῦ] (C)

The absence of Χριστοῦ from both $\text{î}46$ and B is noteworthy. The presence of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in the preceding and following verses might be thought reason enough for Paul not to use the word here – and for ordinary scribes to insert it! On the other hand, however, the word may have been omitted either accidentally in copying Χριστοῦ was ordinarily written in contracted form, $\chi\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\upsilon$ or perhaps deliberately for aesthetic reasons (in order to differentiate the sequence of three instances of Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). In view of the strong and varied support for Χριστοῦ (N A C D G P $\ddot{\pi}$ 33 81 166 614 1739 and all versions) the Committee felt obliged to include the word in the text, but decided to enclose it within square brackets to indicate a certain amount of doubt concerning its originality.

1.13 μεμέρισται [A]
Since μαρτύρων δ Ἱησοῦ may be read either as a statement or as a question, several witnesses, including 314 326 1962 D sa cop# arm, prefix the interrogative μή, thus relieving the ambiguity and conforming the clause to the following questions.

1.14 [τὸ ἦν ἐκεῖ] (C)

It is obvious that the addition of μή after ἦν is the result of scribal assimilation to ver. 2. It is more difficult, however, to decide whether τὸ ἦν fell out accidentally in transcription (ἐγκατέχρυστομένων), or whether copyists supplemented Paul’s abbreviated expression with the addition of τὸ ἦν, on the pattern of 1 Cor 1:4, 14:18, etc. It was considered safer to follow the usage of Paul and to include τὸ ἦν in the text, out of deference, however, to the weight of Ν* B 1739 αφ., which omit the words, they were enclosed within square brackets.

1.20 κόμματος

The Textus Receptus, following later witnesses (Ν* C D* F G L Ψ 6 104 326 623 1739# αφ.), with which some early versions agree (ιτ# αγ), adds τοῦκοσμοῦ. Influence from the preceding expression, τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦκοσμοῦ, would make the addition of the demonstrative almost a foregone conclusion; the remarkable thing is that so many copyists resisted the urge to assimilate expressions (κόμματος alone is read by 314 Ν* A B C D* 33 181 206 429 917 1610 1836 1898 αφ.).

1.23 ἔκφρασις

The Textus Receptus, following several later manuscripts (C D* 6 177 206 326 489 919 920 1739 1835 αφ.), replaces ἔκφρασις with ἔκφρασιν. The change was prompted by the desire to make Paul’s terminology consistent in verses 22, 23, and 24.

1.28 τὸ μὴ ὄντα (B)

The presence of καί before τὸ μὴ ὄντα (Ν* B C D* P Ψ 81 614 Byz αφ.) seems to be an interpolation prompted by the preceding series of objects, each joined to the next by καί (see Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 490). In adding the word, however, scribes overlooked the force of the expression τὸ μὴ ὄντα, which (as Zahn points out, in loc) is not another item of the series, but is a comprehensive and climactic characterization of all the preceding items. The shorter reading is strongly supported by 314 Ν* A C D* G 0129 33 1739 αφ.

2.1 μακρύτερον (B)

From an exegetical point of view the reading μακρύτερον τοῦ θεοῦ, though well supported (Ν* B D G P Ψ 33 81 614 1739 Byz i6 6 vg syr# cop# arm eth Origen αφ), is inferior to μακρότερον, which has more limited but early support in 314# Ν* A C 88 436 i6 61 syr# cop# Hippolytus Ambrosiaster Ephraem Ambrose Pelagius Augustine Antiochus. The reading μακρύτερον seems to be a recollection of 1.6, whereas κατότερον here prepares for its usage in ver. 7.

2.4 τὸ δόξης [τοῦ θεοῦ] σοφίας [λόγων] (C)

Of the eleven different variant readings in this passage, those that read δόξης before or after σοφίας (Ν* A C P Ψ 81 614 1962 2495 Byz i6 syr# cop# αφ) are obviously secondary. If the words were original, there is no good reason why it would have been deleted; on the contrary, it has the appearance of an explanatory gloss inserted by copyists (at different places) in order to identify more exactly the nuance attaching to σοφίας. It is much more difficult to decide what to do with τὸ δόξης, an adjective found in no other passage in all of Greek literature. Did the rarity of the word produce confusion in the transmission of the text? Or is it really a vox nulla, having arisen from a scribal mistake in copying πεiqoi@sofai@logoi@? In order to represent the diversity of evidence, a majority of the Committee decided to print τὸ δόξης, and, on the strength of 314 G 35 that lack λόγων, to enclose this latter word within square brackets.

2.10 ὄν (B)

The loose use of the connective ὄν (Ν A C D G P Ψ 33 81 614 Byz αφ) is entirely in Paul’s manner, whereas γὰρ, though strongly supported by 314 B 1739 Clement αφ, has the appearance of being an improvement introduced by copyists.

2.10 περὶ κόσμου

The Textus Receptus, following Ν* D F G L almost all minuscules the Old Latin vg syr# h cop# arm eth αφ, adds the explanatory αὐτοῦ. The Committee preferred the earlier and shorter reading, supported by 314# Ν* A B C D 33# 1611 cop# Clement Cyril Basil αφ.

2.12 κόμματος

Influenced by a similar expression in ver. 6 (τοῦ αἰῶνος τοῦκοσμοῦ) copyists added the demonstrative, producing τοῦ κόμματος τοῦκοσμοῦ (D E F G l6 61 # cop# arm). The shorter text is decisively supported by 314# Ν* A B C L P all minuscules vg syr# h αφ.

2.15 [τὰ] πάντα (C)

Of the two textual problems involved in this passage, the presence (Ν* B D* P Ψ 33 614 1739 αφ) or absence (314# A C D* G αφ) of μὐδιν is the easier to resolve. Although it is possible that copyists may have omitted the word because it seemed to be inappropriate following ὄν at the beginning of the sentence, the Committee thought it more probable that the word was added by pedantic copyists in order to provide a correlative for the following ὄν. It is more difficult to decide
what to do with τό. Was the word added in order to prevent the reader from taking τόνησιν as masculine singular; or was it omitted, either accidentally (τάπισίτα) or deliberately, so that the statement would be in accord with the precedent in ver. 10? On the strength of ὅσα ἀκοών A C D* all the Committee retained the word in the text, but, in view of its absence from many other important witnesses, enclosed it within square brackets.

2.16 Ἐχθροῦ (B)

The original text appears to be Ἐχθροῦ (strongly supported by ὅσα Ν A C Ψ 048 στ), which was assimilated in other witnesses to the preceding κυρίου.

3.2 τίς (A)

The omission of τίς by Δ* B 0185 appears to be an Alexandrian improvement in style.

3.3 τίς (B)

Although the reading ὅσα καὶ ἰδιοκτάσεως has early and diversified attestation (ὅσα D* B D F G) 33 614 Byz if it is a 61 srf*, Marcion στ, the absence of καὶ ἰδιοκτάσεως from such witnesses as ὅσα Ν B C Ψ 81 1739 αρ led the Committee to suspect the intrusion of a Western gloss, derived perhaps from the list of vices in Ga 5:20. There being no sufficient reason to account for the omission, if the words were present originally, the shorter reading is to be preferred.

3.5 τί ... τί

Instead of τί ("What?") the Textus Receptus, following ὅσα C D F G and most minuscules, reads τίς ("Who?") in both instances. The masculine, however, appears to be a secondary accommodation to suit the personal names; moreover, the implication of the neuter τίς in ver. 2 is decisive for τίς in ver. 3 since the answer is "Nothing" the question can scarcely have been "Who?").

3.5 Ἐπαθάλλως ... Παύλος (A)

The Textus Receptus, following several of the later witnesses (Δ* L Ψ 6 88 104 326 915 srf, ὅσα arm στ) reverses the sequence so as to read Παύλος τί δέ ἐστιν Ἐπαθάλλως. This transposition was obviously made out of deference to the greater prominence of Paul and because of the sequence in ver. 4. The reading adopted for the text is decisively supported by ὅσα Ν A B C D* (F G) P 31 33 38 69 181 462 1912 ὅσα arm srf, vg cop.

3.12 θημέλιον

On the basis of the testimony of ὅσα A B C* 6 81 cop, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading ὅσα, regarding the reading ὅσα τούτο, supported by the rest of the manuscripts, to be a secondary modification introduced in order to clarify the meaning.

3.13 [κωτό]

The pronoun, which is absent from ὅσα D* B D L Ψ 104 177 255 621 1912 ὅσα, vg syr* cop, is arm στ, as supported by such witnesses as A B Ψ 33 88 181 326 424 441 915 917 1836 1891 2127 syr* στ. Even though the Committee suspected that copyists had omitted the word as pleonastic, yet because external evidence for its inclusion is relatively limited in range, it was decided to enclose the word within square brackets.

3.17 φθήνει (B)

Influenced by the preceding word, several witnesses, chiefly Western, read the present tense φθάνει (D* G* P 81 ὅσα vg syr* Ephraem) instead of φθήνει. [...]

4.17 Χριστῷ (Ἰησοῦ) (C)

Among the several variations presented by the manuscripts, the Western reading of D* F G ("In Lord [sic] Jesus") is clearly a scribal corruption (καὶ for καὶ) under the influence of the preceding κυρίου. It is more difficult to decide between Χριστῷ Ιησοῦ (Ἅσα Ν 33 81 1739 στ) and simply Χριστῷ (A B Ψ 0150 στ). In order to represent the balance of evidence, the Committee decided to retain Ἰησοῦ but to enclose it within square brackets.

5.2 πρέσεως

The Textus Receptus, following ὅσα B D F G L Ψ 049 056 0142 and most minuscules, reads τούτης, whereas πρέσεως is read by ὅσα Ν A C 33 81 104 326 436 462 1912 στ. The more literary word, πρέσεως, occurs 18 times in Paul’s letters; elsewhere in the New Testament, it occurs 20 times (18 times in Luke-Acts, and twice in John). Since the verb πρέσα μιξ is very familiar to transcribers of the New Testament, they were more likely to replace πρέσεως with τούτης than vice versa.

5.4 Ἰησοῦ (Ἰησοῦ) (1) (C)

In accord with the solemn character of the address, the Textus Receptus, following ὅσα D* G P 33 614 Byz Lect it* it* vg syr* it* cop, etc., expands by adding Χριστῷ after Ιησοῦ, and 81 transposes to read Ιησοῦ Χριστῷ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ. Whether Ἰησοῦ was added by copyists, or was accidentally...
omitted by several witnesses (A D* 1108 1611 2495 syr* eth*), is difficult to decide. On the basis of the testimony of B D* 429 918 1175 1739 1836 1984 it*, the Committee retained the word in the text, but enclosed it within square brackets to indicate a measure of doubt as to its right to stand there.

5.2 κυρίου (B)

The reading that best explains the origin of the other readings is κυρίου, well attested by early and important manuscripts and Fathers. The name ‘Jesus’ is twice in the preceding verse: reason enough for Paul not to write it, and for scribes to add it, here.2

5.3 ζώματι

Several Western witnesses (D* it* vg Marcion Irenaeus Tertullian Origen Augustine Ambrosiaster) read δολοί. The same Western correction occurs in Ga 5.9.

5.10 καὶ

Instead of καὶ the Textus Receptus, following Ψ N* Π L Ψ many minuscules vg syr* h* cop* goth arm af. reads η, thus mechanically conforming to the context. The reading καὶ is strongly supported by both Alexandrian and Western witnesses (KA BCD* FG P 33 88 177 181 326 441 1099 it* eth).

5.12 οὐχὶ τούς Ἰωάννης κρίνετε;

Instead of the usual text several early witnesses present interesting variations: (a) Ψ, syr* and cop* omit οὐχὶ and read the verb as an imperative, τοὺς ζωάκιν ἱματίς κρίνατε (“Judge ye those who are inside [the church]”); (b) the Sahidic apparently took οὐχὶ with the preceding sentence, reading τί γὰρ μοί τοὺς ἐξω κρίνεις καὶ τοὺς ἐσώ οὐχὶ; τοὺς ὑμᾶς κρίνετε (“For what have I to do with judging those who are outside and not those who are inside? Judge ye those who are inside”).

5.13 κρίνει (C)

The earlier manuscripts being without accent marks, κρίνει (Ψ N A B* C D* G*) can be read either as present or future tense. Since the expectation of the parousia was vivid in Paul’s day, a majority of the Committee regarded the future tense to be more appropriate in the context.

6.11 Τῷ Χριστῷ (C)

The readings with Χριστῷ (B C* D* P 33 1739 Π syr* h* arm eth) all appear to have arisen by scribal assimilation to the following Χριστῷ. Even though the Textus Receptus, following A D* 88 614 Byz Lect syr*, has the shortest reading (Τῷ Χριστῷ), a majority of the Committee interpreted the absence of Χριστῷ to be the result of an accident in transcription and preferred to read Τῷ Χριστῷ with Ψ 1108 1611 2495 syr* it* Irenaeus Tertullian, as well as the witnesses (except cop*) that are cited above for ζῷματι.

5.14 εξεγερέω (B)

The witnesses are fairly evenly divided as to the tense of the verb: (a) the aorist Εξεγερέω, Ψ N A D* F G P 69 468; and (c) the future Εξεγερέω, Ψ N C D* K L most minuscules and most versions. The context makes the future necessary as the correlative of καταργήσεως in
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ver. 13 (compare also the parallel in 2 Cor 4.14). The aorist Εξεγερέω (which involves an interpretation that applies it to baptism) appears to have arisen from mechanical adaptation to the preceding ημετέρων.

It is curious that the original reading of Ψ was altered twice. According to Zuntz, “It is unlikely that the corrector found these variants, all three, in the manuscript from which Ψ was copied. We seem to be granted a glimpse into a scriptorium where some authoritative manuscripts were used by the correctors in an endeavour to bring the productions of the scribes up to a definite standard.”

6.20 δι’ (B)

Among several variant readings involving δι’ is (a) the interesting expansion, preserved in Latin witnesses (it* vg Marcion Tertullian Cyprian Lucifer Ambrosiaster Speculum al), Glorificate et portate Deum in corpore vestro (“Glorify and bear God in your body”). Apparently this reading arose (in Greek) when δι’ was misread as ἐν θανάσει (ἀνατείνω: ανατείνω). Other variant readings include (b) οὖν, syr* cop* Pseudo-Athanasius; (c) ἵνα γε ἐπετάξατε: ἐπετάξατε: (d) οὖν, syr* Pseudo-Athanasius, Chrysostom; (e) omission of any particle, Ν* Π syr* cop* Β. Although the Committee acknowledged that the clause may have originally lacked a connective and that subsequently the abrupt anacoluthon was remedied by the addition of one or another particle, the overwhelming evidence in support of δι’ (Ψ N A B C D F G K L P and almost all minuscules) requires that it be regarded as the earliest definitely ascertainable text (even though Paul nowhere else uses this particle).

6.21 εξερεύνω (A)

The Textus Receptus, following several of the later uncials and most of the minuscules (C3 D* K L P 6 31 88 915 syr*), adds
after ίς ήμων the words καὶ εἶναι τῷ πανεξαίτα των ἔκτιμον ἐστί τού θεοῦ. That these words are a gloss with no claim to be original is clear (α) from the decisive testimony of the earliest and best witnesses in support of the shorter text (决不ς Θ H A B C D G P 6 33 181 1424 1912 1944 vg copας 46 arm eth Tertullian Origen Cyprian al), and (β) from the nature of the additon itself (it is not needed for the argument, which relates to the sanctity of the body, with no mention of the spirit). The words were inserted apparently with a desire to soften Paul's abruptness, and to extend the range of his exhortation.

Instead of άμηλην, which is overwhelmingly supported by决不ς 46 Θ H A B C D G P 6 33 181 1424 1912 1944 vg copας 46 arm eth Tertullian Clement Cyprian Origen Methodius al, the Textus Receptus, following K L 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ goth arm ἀμηλην, softens the expression (which refers to sexual relations) by substituting the words άμηλην ἡμεν εἰναίσας ("the kindness that is her due").

The Textus Receptus, following Ν 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ ἀμηλην καὶ, and 330 451 John-Damascus add καὶ ἡμεν εἰναίσας. Both are interpolations, introduced in the interest of asceticism. The shorter text is decisively supported by all the early and best witnesses (决不ς 11 vid, 46 A B C D F G P 6 33 81 104 1739 it vg copας 46 arm eth al).

In a variety of witnesses, most of them late (决不ς 46 K L most minuscules syrγινθ goth arm al), the explanatory gloss άμηλην ἡμεν εἰναίσας (or -κάδοι) has replaced the more colorless ήμεν. The latter is adequately supported by Ν A B C D G P 6 33 88 181 255 263 467 618 1838 1912 1944 2127 1739 it vp 46 arm eth al.

The reading άμηλην, which is strongly supported by决不ς 46 Ν 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ ἀμηλην καὶ, is preferable to τῷ ἡμεν εἰναίσας, which appears to be a correction introduced by scribes who did not appreciate the nuance of opposition to the concession mentioned in ver. 6.

After ἁρμακεία several witnesses, chiefly Western (D F G vg syrγινθ), add the interpretative gloss τῇ παρκοτύχῳ (compare also the addition τῷ πιστῷ in the following comment).

Instead of άμηλην, which is strongly supported by决不ς 46 Ν 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ ἀμηλην καὶ, the Textus Receptus, following interior witnesses (决不ς D* K L 88 614 326 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ goth arm eth al), reads άμηλην, a more appropriate correlative to ἁρμακεία, the special force of άμηλην not having been appreciated. In order to recapture some of the nuance belonging to άμηλην, a subsequent modification τῷ πιστῷ was added to τῷ πιστῷ (629 it vg syrγινθ Ireneaus* Tertullian Ambrosiaster).

Although ήμεν seems to have slightly stronger external support (决不ς B D G 33 104 614 1739 it vg syrγινθ 46 arm eth al), the Committee preferred ήμεν (决不ς A C 81 326 2127 copας 46), since the general tendency of scribes is to make modifications in the interest of generalizing the reference of aphorisms (as, in fact, has occurred here in codex Sinaicus). In later Greek the two words were pronounced alike.

Should the definite article be omitted (with B F G 429) or retained (with决不ς A D K L P and most minuscules) ? Although the article may have come into the text by dittography from the preceding ήμεν, the Committee thought it more likely that, because of an apparent lack of appropriateness of the article in the context, it was deleted by several copyists.

After considering the multiplicity of variant readings and the uncertainties of interpretation, the Committee decided that the least satisfactory reading is that supported by early representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (决不ς 11 46 B 104 vg syrγινθ 46 arm). The absence of the first καὶ in some witnesses (决不ς D F G K L 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ 46 arm eth al), and the presence of the second καὶ in some witnesses, has led to a difficulty in determining the correct reading. The presence of the second καὶ is strongly supported by the addition of决不ς 15 46 Ν 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ 46 arm eth al. The difficulty of distinguishing ήμεν from ήμεν may have led copyists to insert the article from γάρ to παρκοτύχους (决不ς D* K L 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ 46 arm). The reading of决不ς Ν 88 614 Byz Lect syrγινθ 46 arm may have ήμεν after both καὶ and παρκοτύχους, has the appearance of a typical scribal correction.

The reading Χρυσοῦ in two manuscripts (决不ς 15 33) arose through faulty transcription.
The absence of τῶν θεῶν from Ἰουδαίου Clement was regarded by the Committee to be the result of formal assimilation to ver. 2. The phrase ἵνα αὐτῶν is absent from several witnesses, as though ἐγνώσται were active voice. It was to be expected that Ἰουδαίου Clement should omit the words since their antecedent (τῶν θεῶν) is lacking in these witnesses. Their absence also from Ν* and 33 was regarded by the Committee as accidental, having arisen perhaps from the scribe's expectation that Paul was going to say something like, “If anyone loves God, this man truly knows him.” The surprising turn of expression, however, is characteristically Pauline (Ga 4:6; cf. also 1 Cor 13:12).

8.6 αὐτῶν

At the close of the verse several witnesses (including 0142 234 460 618) expand Paul's reference to one God, the Father, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by adding καὶ ἐν πνεύμα ἁγίῳ, ἐν υἱῷ τῷ πάση και ἡμῖν ἐν ἀμώμῳ (“and one Holy Spirit, in whom are all things, and we in him”). The trinitarian form was current as early as the close of the fourth century, for Gregory Nazianzus quotes it (Orat. xxxix:12), though omitting the clause beginning with καὶ ἡμῖν.

8.7 συνήθεις [A]

The reading συνήθεις, strongly supported by Ν* A B P Ψ 33 81 1739 al, was preferred to συνειδῆς (Ν* D G 88 614 Byz Lec), a reading that apparently arose through assimilation to the following συνειδῆς.

8.10 οἷς

Several witnesses, including Ἰουδαίου* B F G vg Origen* Augustine Pelagius, lack οἷς. Copyists are more likely to have omitted the pronoun, thus generalizing the apostle's statement, than to have inserted it.

8.12 δικαιονόμων [A]

The absence of δικαιονόμων from Ἰουδαίου* and Clement was regarded as either an accident in transcription or a deliberate modification, introduced to prevent the reader from assuming that wounding a brother's conscience is allowable except when it is “weak.”

9.10 εἰς ἔλεος τοῦ μετέχειν

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is εἰς ἔλεος τοῦ μετέχειν (Ἰουδαίου* (A) B C P 33 69 vg syri* corp* arm a). Not observing that ἀλοιπόν must be understood after ἀλοιπόν, copyists assumed that μετέχειν (was the infinitive after ὀφείλει) and therefore adjusted the reading to τῆς ἔλεος αὐτῶν μετέχειν (D F G 181 917 1836 1896 syri*). Later the sense was improved somewhat by combining the readings, thus producing τῆς ἔλεος αὐτῶν μετέχειν εἰς ἔλεος (Ν* D* K L Ψ 88 326 623 920 1175 al, followed by the Textus Receptus).

9.15 αὐτός κενωμεί (B)

According to the view of a majority of the Committee the earliest reading is that supported by Ἰουδαίου* B D* 33 1739 it* syri* al. Not observing that after ὁ Paul breaks off the sentence (a figure of speech called apophasis), various copyists attempted in one way or another to ameliorate the construction and to carry on the syntax. The most widespread correction was the replacement of αὐτός by τίς τις (Ν* C D* K P Ψ 81 88 104 330 346 451 614 629 1241 1877 1962 1984 1985 2127 2492 2495 Byz Lec al). Because of itacism the pronunciation of κενωμεί and κενωμαί was indistinguishable.

Instead of using a dash, it is also possible to punctuate the text with a full stop after ἀποθέως, accenting the next word as ἢ (“Truly no one shall deprive me of my ground for boasting!”). But this use of ἢ, though common in the classics, does not occur elsewhere in Paul.

9.20 μὴ ὅπως ἀκούσας ἐπὶ νόμῳ (A)

The Textus Receptus, following D* K Ψ 88 256 326 460 1175 1518 2138 syri* eth, omits the parenthetical clause μὴ ὅπως ἀκούσας ἐπὶ νόμῳ. The words, which are decisively supported by Ἰουδαίου* (A) B C D* F G it vg syri* corp* arm a. The absence of νόμῳ, however, is characteristically Pauline (Dt 25.4). The reading is not likely to have been lost by accident in transcription, the eye of the copyist passing from ἐπὶ νόμῳ to ὅπως νόμῳ.

9.22 πάνως τεκνῶν (A)

Instead of πάνως τεκνῶν, strongly supported by a wide spectrum of witnesses, the Western text (D F G lat) reads πάνως, the result of scribal conformation to the preceding clauses.

9.23 πάντα

The reading πάντα is strongly supported by Ἰουδαίου* Ν* A B C D E F G P 33 69 181 424* 436 1611 1837 it vg corp* arm eth. Later copyists (followed by the Textus Receptus), wishing to define the meaning more precisely, replaced πάντα with πάντας τεκνῶν (Κ L Ψ many minuscules syri* arm a).
On the basis of what was taken to be superior evidence and Pauline usage, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading tou/ta de, u`má/j.
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10.28 συνειδήσεων (A)

The Textus Receptus, following a few later uncialcs (H* K L Ψ) and most minuscules, adds τού γάρ κυρίου ἡ γὰρ καὶ τὸ πλήσμα αὐτῆς. That this is a gloss derived from ver. 28 is clear from (a) the decisive evidence supporting the shorter text (K A B C D F G H* P 33 81 1739) is vg svf* cap* bo arm eth α); and (b) the lack of any good reason to account for deletion of the words, had they been in the text originally.

11.12 ἀρχή

It was to be expected that, at the beginning of a new section and following ἐπισκεπτόμενος ἐκ ἡμάς, many witnesses would interpolate ἀδέξασθαι (D F G K L Ψ 33 88 104 326 623 913 1836) it vg svf* goth eth*). If the word were present originally (as at 10.1 and 12.1, where no witness omits it), its absence from ἐπισκεπτόμενος K A B C P 181 206 255 429 441 1738 1836 1898 1912 cop* bo arm eth* αl would be inexplicable. (Compare also 15.31.)

11.10 ἐξουσίαν (A)

The presumed meaning of the difficult ἐξουσίαν in this passage is given by the explanatory gloss καλόμουμα “a veil,” read by several versional and patristic witnesses (cop* bo arm* αl). Tertullian Jerome Augustine.

11.15 ἁπάντωσιν. [κατά] (C)

The absence of ἁπάντωσιν in ἐπιχείρησα D E F G Ψ and many other witnesses, as well as the variety of its position either before or after ἁπάντωσιν,
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might lead one to reject the word (as G. Zuntz argues on the basis of sense: see The Text of the Epistles, 1953, p. 127). On the other hand, a majority of the Committee, impressed by the weight of the combination of K A B 33 81 365 2464 αl, preferred to retain the word, but to enclose it within square brackets to indicate doubt as to its right to be in the text.

11.24 Τοῦτο (A)

The Textus Receptus, following C* K L P most minuscules svf* goth eth*), adds from Mt 26.26 the words ἄνευτε φύσεις. If these words were present originally in Paul’s account, no good reason can be found to explain their absence from ἄνευτε K A B C* D F G 33 104 181* 218 424* 425 618 1906 1912 it* vg cap* bo arm Cyprian Basil Cyril Theodoret Chrysostom Euthalius John-Damascous.

11.24 ἐπικλοῦσιν (A)

The concise expression τὸ ἐπηκολούθησεν, read by ἐπικλοῦσιν K A B C 6* 33 424* 1739* arm Cyprian αl, is characteristic of Paul’s style. Attempts to explicate the meaning of the words resulted in the addition of various participles: (a) ἔκπληκτον (D*); (b) κλαύσεως (K* C* D* bo G
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10.9 Χριστότων (B)

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is Χριστότων, attested by the oldest Greek manuscript (P46) as well as by a wide diversity of early patristic and versional witnesses (Irenaeus in Gaul, Ephraem in Edessa, Clement in Alexandria, Origen in Palestine, as well as by the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Syriac, Sahidic and Bohairic). The difficulty of explaining how the ancient Israelites in the wilderness could have tempted Christ prompted some copyists to substitute either the ambiguous xhyth υμα/j or the unobjectionable τού τα. e;ξεστίν. Paul’s reference to Christ here is analogous to that in ver. 4.

10.11 τοῦτο αὐτῷ (B)

Although it is possible that πάντα may have been omitted by copyists who recalled ver. 8, a majority of the Committee thought it more probable that the original τοῦτο αὐτῷ (A 33 630 1739 1881) was expanded by the addition of πάντα, whose varying position in the manuscripts suggests that the word is a gloss, inserted to heighten the narrative.

10.20 αὐτός, δειμανίας καὶ αὐτῷ τῆς [θέους] (C)

The words αὐτός, δειμανίας καὶ αὐτῷ τῆς [θέους] were transposed in several witnesses (D F G*) to follow the second θεοῦς. In both instances the Textus Receptus reads μοι between πάντας and ξέροντων, following K C* (first time) H K L Ψ most minuscules.
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10.12 τοῦτο, ἀρχή

The concise expression τὸ ἐπηκολούθησεν, read by ἐπικλοῦσιν K A B C 6* 33 424* 1739* arm Cyprian αl, is characteristic of Paul’s style. Attempts to explicate the meaning of the words resulted in the addition of various participles: (a) ἔκπληκτον (D*); (b) κλαύσεως (K* C* D* bo G...
K P 严峻 614 1739 Byz Lect ii,6 syrh,6 goth a6, derived from the preceding ἐκλασθα- (c) δέδομένον (vg copa,6 69 69 e9 θεον Euthalus, it6 quod tradidi pro vobis), assimilated to Lk 22.19.

11.29 保罗... σῶμα (A)

The meaning of the shorter text, which is preserved in the best witnesses (D46 Ν A B C 33 1739 copa,6 69 69 a9, was clarified by adding ἀπελεξίας (from vers. 27) after πῶς and τοῦ κυρίου after σῶμα (Ν C 6 D G K P most minuscules it syrh,6 cpma,6 arm a9). In each instance there appears to be no good reason to account for the omission if the word(s) had been present originally.

12.9 ἐν τῇ ἐνεχθήμετρᾳ (A)

Although it could be argued that ἐνεχθήμετρᾳ is a variation introduced for stylistic reasons to avoid the monotony of three successive instances of the phrase “the same Spirit,” the Committee, impressed by the diversified support for ἐν τῇ (A B 33 81 104 1739 it6 46 vg Ambrose Speculum Hilary Basil a9), regarded it more probable that copyists mechanically conformed ἐν τῇ to σῶμα (Ν C 6 D G K P 614 Byz Lect ii syrh,6 cpma,6 arm a9). Through an oversight in transcription D46 reads merely ἐν τῇ πανιμάτῳ, and C 6 and Π accidentally omit several words.

13.3 καυχᾶσθαι (C)

Did Paul write ἐνεχθήμετρᾳ (“that I may glory”) or ἐν εἰς καυχῆσθαι (“that I should be burned”)? To answer this question requires the evaluation of several very evenly balanced considerations.

In support of the reading καυχῆσθαι one can appeal to external evidence that is both early and weighty (D46 Ν A B 6 33 69 1739 copa,6 69 69 goth a9, Clement Origen Jerome and Greek msacc to Jerome). Transcriptional considerations likewise favor καυχῆσθαι, for copyists, uncertain of Paul’s meaning in linking the idea of glorying or boasting to the preceding clause about the giving up of one’s body, may well have sought to improve the sense by substituting the similar sounding word καυχῆσθαι. Intrinsic considerations likewise seem to favor καυχῆσθαι, for this verb occurs frequently in the letters traditionally attributed to Paul (a total of 35 times).

On the other hand, in support of καυχῆσθαι (σῶμα) there is an impressive number of witnesses, including C D F G K L Ψ; most minuscules it vg syrh,6 goth a9 arm erth, and numerous patristic writers, including Tertullian Aphraates Cyprian Origen Basil Chrysostom Cyril Theodoret Euthalus Maximus-Confessor John-Damascus. It has been argued that in the context καυχῆσθαι is as appropriate as καυχῆσθαι, for the reference to burning, whether by martyrdom (as the Three Hebrew Youths in Daniel 3.15 ff.) or by voluntary self-burning, is particularly suitable as the strongest example of sacrifice; whereas, if the motive for giving up life is pride and self-glory, there is no need to declare that such sacrifice is worthless, and therefore Paul’s following statement, ἐφαίτιον ἐὰν μὴ ἤγετο, becomes superfluous.

A majority of the Committee preferred καυχῆσθαι for the following reasons. (a) After the Church entered the epoch of martyrdom, in which death by fire was not rare, it is easier to understand how the variant καυχῆσθαι would creep into the text, than the opposite case. Likewise the passage in Daniel was well known in the Church and might easily have induced a copyist to alter καυχῆσθαι into καυχῆσθαι. On the other hand, if the latter reading were original, there is no good reason to account for its being replaced in the oldest copies by the other reading.

(b) The expression παρείδρον τὸ σῶμα μου ἐνεχθήμετρᾳ, though certainly tolerable in itself, is noticeably cumbersome (“I give up my body, that I may be burnt”); one would have expected, as a more natural expression, ἐνεχθήμετρᾳ (“that it may be burnt”). But in the case of καυχῆσθαι this difficulty disappears.

(c) The reading καυχῆσθαι, while appearing occasionally in Byzantine times, is a grammatical monstrosity that cannot be attributed to Paul (Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 28; Moulton-Howard, p. 219); occasionally, however, the future indicative after ἐνεχθήμετρᾳ occurs (Ga 2:4; Php 2:10-11).

(d) The argument that the presence of the statement, “that I may glory,” destroys the sense of the passage loses some of its force when one observes that for Paul “glorying” is not invariably reprehensible; sometimes he regards it as justified (2 Cor 8.24; Php 2:16; 1 Th 2.19; 2 Th 1.4).

13.4 [ό ἄγνωτη] (3) (C)

On the basis of rhythm and sentence structure, the third instance of ὃ ἄγνωτη (omitted by B 33 a9) could be considered to be secondary. On the other hand, a majority of the Committee was impressed by the weight of the witnesses that include the words. In order to represent the balance of these considerations, it was decided to retain the words but to enclose them within square brackets.

13.5 ἀνέχμησι (A)

Instead of ἀνέχμησι, the scribe of D46 unaccountably wrote κεύμησι ("[does not] behave with decorum").

13.13 ... ἔτοιμα

A few early witnesses (D46 Clement Augustine) transpose so as to read in a much more commonplace sequence: τὰ τρία τέσσαρα, πότες, ἐλπίς, ἄγαπη.
The Textus Receptus, following N*, D F G K L, most minuscules it vg syr*–* goth arm, adds ἀναρ克莱. Although it can be argued that the shorter text (Q*–* N*: A B P 33 81 206 429 1175 1758 cop*–* bo) was created by an Alexandrian editor who deleted the pronoun as superfluous, the Committee thought that, on the whole, the tendency of scribes would have been to add the pronoun (as in fact has happened in the case of codex Sinaiticus).

14.34-35 include verses here [B]

Several witnesses, chiefly Western, transpose verses 34-35 to follow ver. 40 (D F G 88* it*). Although it can be argued that the shorter text (46 a* A B P 33 81 206 429 1175 1758) was created by an Alexandrian editor who deleted the pronoun as superfluous, the Committee thought that, on the whole, the tendency of scribes would have been to add the pronoun (as in fact has happened in the case of codex Sinaiticus).

The evidence of the sixth-century Codex Fuldensis is ambiguous. The Latin text of 1 Cor 14 runs onward throughout the chapter to ver. 40. Following ver. 35 is a scribal siglum that directs the reader to a note standing in the lower margin of the page. This note provides the text of verses 36 through 40. Does the scribe, without actually deleting verses 34-35 from the text, intend the liturgist to omit them when reading the lesson?

14.34 γνησίως

The Textus Receptus, following D F G K L many minuscules it*–* syr*, h with obelus al, reads ἐκατοντατριήμερον after γνησίως. The Committee regarded this as probably a scribal addition, and preferred the shorter text, which is strongly supported by Q*–* N*: A B C P 33 43 88 104 256 263 296 436 467 623 915 1319 1739 1837 2127 vg cop*–* bo, arm eth al.

14.38 ἄγνωστα [B]

Although the external evidence may at first sight seem to favor ἄγνωστα (Q*–* B K P 33 81 614 syr*.–* arm eth al), several important representatives of the Alexandrian, the Western, and the Palestinian texts unite to support the indicative (N*–* A*–* D*–* D*–* F G 33 1739 it* syr*–* cop*–* bo,–* bo gr*–* Origen*). The alteration between active and passive forms of the same verb accords with Paul’s usage in 8.2-3, whereas the use of the imperative form may have been suggested by Re 22.11. In any case, the imperative gives a less forceful meaning than ἄγνωστα. The reading of D* (ἁγνώστα) is by itacism for ἄγνωστα (ἐ and αι were pronounced alike).

14.40 γνωσθείη. [B]

See the comment on verses 34-35.

15.5 ἀνάφορα

Instead of recognizing that ἀνάφορα is used here as an official designation, several witnesses, chiefly Western, have introduced the pedantic correction ἀνάφορα (D* F* G 330 464* it* vg syr*–* goth Archelaus Eusebius Ambrosiaster Jerome Pelagius ms*–* it* gr*–* bo, John-Damascus). Compare the similar correction at Ac 1.26.

15.10 (ἵ) οὖν ἐκατοντατριήμερον (C)

The reading ἵ ἐκατοντατριήμερον (Q*–* syr*–* goth Theodoret) is an assimilation to the expression in the first part of the verse. It is more difficult to decide whether ἵ was accidentally omitted from several witnesses (N*–* B D* F G 1739 it* vg) or mechanically inserted in other witnesses. In order to represent the balance of probabilities a majority of the Committee decided to retain ἵ enclosed within square brackets.

15.14 ἀναρκλείου [B]

Although several important witnesses (including B D*–* 33 81 330 1739) read ἀναρκλείου, this may be either itacism for ἀναρκλείου or mechanical assimilation to the previous ἀναρκλείου. In any case, the context seems to require “your faith” as a correlative to “our preaching”; compare also ἂν πάντες ἐκατοντατριήμερον in ver. 17, where the reading is firm.

15.31 [ἀνάφορα.] (C)

On the one hand, the absence of ἀνάφορα from Q*–* D F G L P 1739 Byz Lect it*–* gr* shows the influence of ver. 13, just as the presence of the word in an affectionate asseveration is to be expected. On the other hand, however, because of strong external support for inclusion of the word (N A B 33 81 104 330 1241 it*–* vg syr*–* goth arm), the Committee was reluctant to drop it from the text altogether, and finally decided to enclose it within square brackets. Compare also the comment on 11.2.

15.47 ἀνθρώπος (2) [A]

The reading that best accounts for the origin of the others is ἀνθρώπος, supported by a strong combination of early and good witnesses representing several text-types (N*–* B C D* G 33 1739* it*–* 61 gr*–* bo, arm eth al). The insertion of ὁ κύριος (Marcion preferred κύριος as a substitute for ἀνθρώπος) is an obvious gloss added to explain the nature of “the man from heaven” (N*–* A D*–* K P 33 81 104 614 1739* Byz Lect syr*–* bo, goth arm al); if this were original there is no reason why it should have been omitted. The singular reading of Π*–* ἁνθρώπος (Π*–* syr*–* gnost prov) shows the influence of ver. 36, while the omission of ἁνθρώπος (cop*–* Cyril) is merely a transcriptional accident.

15.49 ἀναφέρομαι (B)

Exegetical considerations (i.e., the context is didactic, not hortatory) led the Committee to prefer the future indicative, despite its rather slender external support (B I 38 98 206 668 242 421 830 915 919 999 1149 1518 1872 1881 syr*–* cop*–* arm al).

15.51 οὐ καμπαθηρόμενα, πάντες δὲ ἀλληλογράμματα (A)
The reading which best explains the origin of the others is that preserved in B D K P Ψ 81 614 Byz Lct syr\(^h\) cop\(^m\) goth eth al. Because Paul and his correspondents had died, the statement πάσες ἡ δοκήθησαν seemed to call for correction. The simplest alteration was to transfer the negative to the following clause (N (A\(^\circ\)) C 33 1739 if\(^c\) arm eth al). That this was an early modification is shown by the artificial conflation of both readings in \(\Psi\)\(^h\) A\(^\circ\) Origen, όπου in \(\Psi\)^\(h\) may have arisen from a transcriptional blunder, όντων being read as όντων. The most radical alteration, preserved in several Western witnesses (D* if\(^c\) \(\psi\) Marcion Tertullian al, replaces ημερία/ντινωσει with διευκρινιζόμεθα, a reading that apparently arose to counteract (gnostic?) denials of the general resurrection.

15.54 οὖν ἡ τοῦ φησιν τούτοι ενδέχεται ἁφαίρεσιν καὶ τὸ θητέρου τούτο ενδέχεται ἀναφαίρεσιν [B]

The shorter reading, οὖν ἡ τοῦ θητέρου τούτο ενδέχεται τὴν ἁφαίρεσιν, supported, with trifling variations, by several important witnesses (\(\Psi\)\(^h\) Ν 088 0121a 0243 1739 if\(^c\) vg cop\(^m\) to goth eth Marcion Irenaeus\(^c\) al), probably arose accidentally through an oversight in copying, occasioned by homoeoarcton or homoeoteleuton. The readings of A 326 cop\(^m\) arm seem to have arisen when the oversight was noticed, but the omitted clause was restored in the wrong sequence. The omission of the entire verse (F G 614 1877 if\(^c\) cop\(^m\) to) is explained from homoeoteleuton with ver. 53.

15.55 νῦν οὗτος ποι οὖν, δεήσε, τὸ κέντρον [B]

Two sets of variant readings are involved, both connected with the fact that in Ho 13.14 the Septuagint differs from the Hebrew. The sequence νῦν οὗτος ... κέντρον, strongly supported by \(\Psi\)\(^h\) Ν Β C 1739\(^v\) vg cop\(^m\) to al, is to be preferred to the reverse sequence, which arose from scribal assimilation to the text of the Septuagint. The reading οὗτος (N\(^c\) A\(^\circ\) Κ Ψ 88 104 614 Byz syr\(^h\) goth arm al) is also an assimilation to the Septuagint; Paul never uses οὗτος. The reading of \(\Psi\)\(^h\) Ν Β ικύος ("strike, dispute") is an iliacic error, having arisen from the similarity of pronunciation of ι and ι.

16.19 Πρίσκα

The Textus Receptus, following A C D F G K L P Ψ most minuscules syr\(^h\) \(\psi\) goth, reads Πρίσκα, a diminutive form familiar from the book of Acts (18.2, 18, 28). In the Pauline letters, however, the form Πρίσκα is to be preferred, which in the present passage is supported by \(\Psi\)\(^h\) (Πρίσκας) Ν Β Μ 33 226 vg cop\(^m\) goth. See also the comments on Ro 16.3 and 2 Tm 4.19. After Ἀκέλας καὶ Πρίσκας several Western witnesses (D F G goth Pelagius) add the gloss παρ᾽ οίς (F\(^c\) οίς) καὶ Συνεῖς ("with whom also I am lodging").

16.23 Ἰπποῦ

The Textus Receptus, following \(\Psi\)\(^c\) A C D F G K L M most minuscules, including 6 424 920 1739, if\(^c\) \(\psi\) syr\(^h\) cop\(^m\) arm eth, reads Ἰπποῦ. The shorter reading Ἱπποῦ, which is supported by \(\Psi\)\(^c\) B 33 35 226 356 423 1611 1904 2004 vg goth al, is to be preferred. In view of the presence of the longer reading in other Pauline benedictions (Ro 16.24; 2 Cor 13.13; Ga 6.18; Phe 4.23; 1 Th 5.28; 2 Th 3.18; Phm 25), as well as the natural proclivity of scribes to expand the sacred name, it is perhaps remarkable that any witnesses should have resisted such pressures.

16.24 Ἰπποῦ. (B)

After Ἰπποῦ (B 0121a 0243 33 630 1739 1881 if\(^c\) \(\psi\) Ambrosiaster Euthalius) the liturgical οὐδὲ is added in most witnesses (N A C D K P Ψ most minuscules and most versions al). Other singular or sub-singular variations occur in several of the later witnesses.

16.24 Subscription

(a) The subscription in N A B C* 33 is πρὸς Κορινθίους. Other subscriptions include: (b) πρὸς Κορινθίους (D* adds ἐγραφὴ αὐτῆς Θεολογίας ἐπιστ. D; (c) ἐξετάσθη πρὸς Κορινθίους, F (πρώτη G), add ἐγραφὴ ἀπὸ Ἐβδομήν B; (d) πρὸς Κορινθίους \(\langle\) L 103 α\(\rangle\) ἐπιστολή ἐγραφὴ αὐτῆς Θεολογίας (add τῆς Κορίνθιος 242 α) διὰ Στεφάνου καὶ Φωτοποιοῦ (K al Φουρτζούς) καὶ Ἀρχιμάτου καὶ Τιμοθείου K many minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus (with πρώτη for α); (e) as (d) but add ἐγραφὴ ἀπὸ Ἐβδομήν P al (462 α) ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡσιάς).

Footnotes

3. For further discussion see G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, pp. 256 f.
4. According to Tischendorf, however, the corrector of the Greek text of D had second thoughts, and, after having fully accented the words, decided to delete them.
The Second Letter Of Paul To The Corinthians

1.10 τιμικοῦσσαι θεοῦ (B)

The text is doubtful. On the one hand, the weight of the external evidence seems to favor the singular τιμικοῦσσαι θεοῦ (A B C D G K P Q Ψ 33 614 1739) Byz Lect capmarm arm Clement ά. On the other hand, the oldest known witness (Σ56) reads the plural τιμικούσσων θειαίων, an expression which, according to Zuntz (The Text of the Epistles, p. 104), “bears the stamp of genuine Pauline diction; cf. 1b, ν.63 and ν.4 ff...The singular clearly arose from the pedantic idea that no one could risk more than one death.” A majority of the Committee was impressed by the preponderance of external evidence in support of the singular number, and considered that the plural may have originated from a desire to heighten the intensity of the account, particularly since Paul himself refers to more than one deliverance (“has delivered...and will deliver”).

[For the reasons indicated by Zuntz the plural seems preferable. It is the harder reading, that of the oldest Greek witnesses and of most Old Latin manuscripts. A.W.]
of ἰμῶν, it was decided to enclose the pronoun within square brackets.

3.15 χαρίν \([B]\)

The reading χαρίν (K B L P 661 915 2005 cop\textsuperscript{lo} a) appears to be a scribal modification of χαρίν (K\textsuperscript{a} A C D G K L 1739 Byz Lect it vg syr\textsuperscript{h} cop\textsuperscript{arm} arm), perhaps under the influence of 2.3.

3.17 χάρι \([C]\)

Although χάρι has rather limited support (\textsuperscript{περί} B 31 33 1739 it\textsuperscript{y} syr\textsuperscript{h}cop\textsuperscript{arm} \textsuperscript{lo} a), a majority of the Committee preferred it to υἱό (K A C D\textsuperscript{y} (D\textsuperscript{y} εὐ) G K P 1739 most Old Latin vg syr\textsuperscript{f} a), because 2.1 is neither a mere addition nor a contrasting statement to the preceding, but supplies the reason for Paul’s delay in visiting the Corinthians (7.23 \(\text{f}\)).

3.9 τοῦ διακονίας \([B]\)

A majority of the Committee, impressed by the weight of the external evidence supporting τοῦ διακονίας, was inclined to regard the nominative as due to scribal assimilation to the preceding (and following) διακονίας.

3.17 εὐθερία

In order to provide a correlative for ὁ the Textus Receptus, following K D\textsuperscript{y} F G K L P it\textsuperscript{y} most minuscules if\textsuperscript{h} vg syr\textsuperscript{h} cop\textsuperscript{arm} eth, inserts εἰκόνει before ἐὐθερία. The shorter reading is decisively supported by \textsuperscript{περί} K A B C D\textsuperscript{y} 33 424\textsuperscript{y} 1912 if syr\textsuperscript{h} cop\textsuperscript{arm}; furthermore, the use of ἐἰκόνει to balance ὁ is apparently not in Paul’s style (cf. Ro 4.15, 5.20).

4.6 Ἰησοῦν (2) \([B]\)

Good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western texts (A\textsuperscript{A-2007} B D G) join in support of the reading Ἰησοῦν. An early variant reading, Ἰησοῦ, also makes good sense, but is slightly less well supported (\textsuperscript{περί} K\textsuperscript{A} A C 33 1739 it\textsuperscript{y} \textsuperscript{lo} \textsuperscript{y} vg cop\textsuperscript{arm} Marcion). The other readings, which involve the word “Christ,” are obviously secondary.

4.6 Ἰησοῦν \(\text{Χριστός}\)

There are three variants: (a) Ἰησοῦν Ὀρθοτός, read by \textsuperscript{περί} N C H K L P 049 056 075 0142 0209 most minuscules syr\textsuperscript{h} \textsuperscript{lo} \textsuperscript{y} cop\textsuperscript{arm} a); (b) Ἰησοῦν, read by A B 33 1739 \textsuperscript{cop} \textsuperscript{arm} Marcion Tertullian Origen Ephepha Chrysostom a; and (c) Ὀρθοτός Ἰησοῦν, read by D F G 6 206 630 1739 1758 1898 \textsuperscript{h} \textsuperscript{f} \textsuperscript{y} vg a. On the basis of what was regarded as superior external support, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading Ἰησοῦν Ὀρθοτός. At the same time, in view of the evidence supporting the shorter reading, it was decided to enclose Ἰησοῦν within square brackets.

[The reading that best explains the origin of the others is Ὀρθοτός (cf. the same expression in 2.10), which has significant, though limited, support. Pious scribes could not resist adding Ὀρθοτός before or after Ὀρθοτός; if Ὀρθοτός had been present in the text originally, no good reason can account for its absence from such manuscripts as A B 33 1739 as well as important and patristic witnesses. B.M.M. and A.W.]

4.14 τῶν κύριῶν Ἰησοῦν \([B]\)

A majority of the Committee was impressed by the diversity of the witnesses supporting the presence of κύριων (K C D G K L P 1739 Byz Lect it\textsuperscript{y} syr\textsuperscript{h} cop\textsuperscript{arm} a), and explained the shorter reading as an assimilation to Ro 8.11a. The other readings are obvious scribal expansions.
Because of preponderant attestation, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading βλέπω γάρ and explained the rise of variations as attempts to clear the construction. Thus, copyists rightly sensed that a new portion of the discourse begins with εἰ, καὶ, μετεμελέματι (whence B inserts δι' αὐτοῦ as an adversative conjunction), and therefore the main clause was taken to begin either at βλέπω, with the consequent omission of γάρ, or at νῦν καίρῳ, with the substitution of the participial form βλέπων as a gloss for βλέπω γάρ.

On the other hand the minority of the Committee explained the rise of the variants in another way. Since the reading βλέπω (which is attested by a notable combination of witnesses) involves a typically Pauline anacoluthon, one can understand that copyists would have been inclined to relieve the syntax either by substituting βλέπων or by adding γάρ.

In view of the uncertainty in the evaluation of the evidence, it was thought best to retain γάρ enclosed within square brackets.

In view of its superior external support the reading ἐνδείκνυμι should be adopted, the reading ἐνδεικνύμιν being an early alteration to avoid apparent tautology: B.M.M.

Since the following sentence begins with τά, ὅταν, one could argue that the original reading was καίνα, τά πάντα (D* K P 5629 Byz Lect syr) goth ethf (“Marcion α) and that the reading καίνα, originated when the eye of a scribe accidentally passed over the first τά πάντα. Such an explanation, however, does not account for the reading τά πάντα καίνα, and it also pays insufficient attention to the age and character of the witnesses that support the shorter reading καίνα (𝔓46 B C D G 1739 ita νῦν syr* goth arm ethf Clement Origen). In view of the following τά, ὅταν, it was perhaps natural that copyists should enhance the meaning of καίνα by prefixing or by adding τά πάντα.

The weight of the witnesses that support the presence of καίνα is somewhat less than the weight of those that omit the word. On the other hand, its omission produces the easier reading, which is therefore suspect as secondary. The picture is clouded still further by the fact that several witnesses read εὐσμεν — yet this may perhaps be taken as indirect support for the earlier presence of καίνα. On balance, the Committee considered that the least unsatisfactory decision was to retain καίνα but to enclose it within square brackets.

Because of preponderant attestation, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading βλέπω γάρ and explained the rise of variations as attempts to clear the construction. Thus, copyists rightly sensed that a new portion of the discourse begins with εἰ, καὶ, μετεμελέματι (whence B inserts δι' αὐτοῦ as an adversative conjunction), and therefore the main clause was taken to begin either at βλέπω, with the consequent omission of γάρ, or at νῦν καίρῳ, with the substitution of the participial form βλέπων as a gloss for βλέπω γάρ.

On the other hand the minority of the Committee explained the rise of the variants in another way. Since the reading βλέπω (which is attested by a notable combination of witnesses) involves a typically Pauline anacoluthon, one can understand that copyists would have been inclined to relieve the syntax either by substituting βλέπων or by adding γάρ.

In view of the uncertainty in the evaluation of the evidence, it was thought best to retain γάρ enclosed within square brackets.

It is difficult to decide between ἐνδείκνυμι and ἐνδεικνύμιν. On the one hand, from the standpoint of external attestation the former reading is to be preferred. On the other hand, internal considerations, in the opinion of a majority of the Committee, decisively favor the latter reading, for with ἐνδεικνύμιν the apostle’s statement is banal and even tautologous, whereas with ἐνδείκνυμι it is characteristically vivid and paradoxical (“insasmuch as we, though unclothed, shall not be found naked”). The reading ἐνδείκνυμι probably arose through paleographical confusion when εεκακω — was taken as εεκακω.

The second person plural pronoun, which comports with the apostle’s argument, is strongly supported by external evidence (𝔓46 B D G K P Ψ 81 614 Byz Lect ita νῦν syr* goth ethf). Since in later Greek the vowels η and υ came to be pronounced alike, scribes sometimes confused the two, writing ἦμας instead of ἦμας. Furthermore, homiletic or devotional application of the statement to Christian believers in general would have fostered the adoption of the reading ἦμας.

The reading ἦμας γάρ ναις θεοῦ ἦμαν (𝔓46 B D* 33 81 ita νῦν syr* goth arm ethf Clement Origen) is to be preferred to ἦμας … ἦστε (𝔓46 B C D G K Ψ 614 Byz Lect ita νῦν syr* goth arm ethf). Since the latter reading was very naturally suggested by the recollection of 1 Cor 3.16 as well as by the context (verses 14 and 17), while there was no reason for putting ἦμας … ἦστε in its stead. The plural νοικί (𝔓4 2043 1739 Clement Augustine) is a pedantic correction.

Because of preponderant attestation, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading βλέπω γάρ and explained the rise of variations as attempts to clear the construction. Thus, copyists rightly sensed that a new portion of the discourse begins with εἰ, καὶ, μετεμελέματι (whence B inserts δι' αὐτοῦ as an adversative conjunction), and therefore the main clause was taken to begin either at βλέπω, with the consequent omission of γάρ, or at νῦν καίρῳ, with the substitution of the participial form βλέπων as a gloss for βλέπω γάρ.

On the other hand the minority of the Committee explained the rise of the variants in another way. Since the reading βλέπω (which is attested by a notable combination of witnesses) involves a typically Pauline anacoluthon, one can understand that copyists would have been inclined to relieve the syntax either by substituting βλέπων or by adding γάρ.

In view of the uncertainty in the evaluation of the evidence, it was thought best to retain γάρ enclosed within square brackets.
and the Western texts (B D* E F G 33 181 1898). If the original reading had been Ινών θαυμάτων (Κ C D* L P almost all minuscules and many versions – although in such a case the evidence of the versions counts for very little), there is no reason why it should have been altered to the participial construction; on the other hand, however, it is easy to understand that copyists, unacquainted with the Semitic idiom, would change the participle to the finite verb.

9.4 λέγω ([B]

A majority of the Committee preferred to adopt the reading λέγω, supported by Π 3* C D G (including *D) and explained λέγω καί as a scribal assimilation to the preceding καί συνήθως. Elsewhere in the context Paul uses the first person singular (verses 1, 2, 3, and 5).

9.4 ταύτι (B)

The presence of τής καυχήσεως in later manuscripts is an explanatory scribal gloss, possibly derived from 11.17.

10.12-13 οί συνιδόν. ημένς δὲ (B)

The absence of οί συνιδόν. ημένς δὲ in several witnesses of the Western text (D* G 33 451 Ambrosiaster Vigilius Sedulius Scotus) is doubtless the result of an accident in transcription, when the eye of a copyist passed from οί to οίκ. and omitted the intervening words. The reading ημένς δὲ (429 vg Ephraem Pelagius) appears to be an imperfect restoration of the shortened text. The reading οί συνιδόν. ημένς δὲ (Κ* 88) is an obvious orthographical error, which produces the sense “they compare themselves with themselves without understanding [that they do so]”. But we …” In deciding between the alternative spellings of the verb, the Committee preferred to follow the testimony of Π 3* B H 33 1739 al.

11.3 άτο τής ἀπλάττησις καί τής ἀγνότητος) (G)

In this set of variant readings the external evidence and the transcriptional probabilities are susceptible of quite diverse interpretations. On the one hand, assuming that the reading άτο τής ἀπλάττησις καί τής ἀγνότητος (Π 3* B G 33 451 33 1739 vg syr cop * goth) is original, scribal oversight occasioned by homoeoteleuton (άτο τοῦ ἢ-τοὺς) can easily account for the readings άτο τής ἀπλάττησις (Κ* D* H K P Ψ 614 1739 Byc Lect vg syr * arm) and άτο τῆς ἀγνότητος (Lucifer Ambrose Augustine Vigilius). It is more difficult to account for the reversed order of words in the reading άτο τῆς ἀγνότητος καί τῆς ἀπλάττησις (D* vg syr * goth) (Lucifer Ambrose Augustine Vigilius). Although it may be the result of mere inattention on the part of copyists.

On the other hand, the several readings may also be interpreted as modifications of an original άτο τής ἀπλάττησις in the following manner. In order to explain ἀπλάττησις in terms of the marriage symbolism of ver. 2 (παρθένου ἡγαμή), in an early copy someone wrote ἀγνότητος in the margin as a gloss, and later copyists introduced the word into the text, either before or after ἀπλάττησις. It is more difficult to account for the reading άτο τής ἀγνότητος, although the witnesses (apparently all of them are patristic) may have had special interests that led them to quote only one part of the conflated text.

In view of the age and character of such witnesses as Δ* B 33, the Committee retained the longer reading in the text, but in deference to the testimony of Ν* D* H K P Ψ 614 1739 al. they enclosed καί τής ἀγνότητος within square brackets.

11.17 κύριον (A)

In place of κύριον (which at this place refers to Jesus), several inattentive scribes substituted θεοῦ αὐτῆς.

11.21 ἀπαθείματος (B)

The Committee considered the witnesses that support the perfect tense to be of greater weight than those that support the aorist tense. After ἀπαθείματος, a few witnesses (D E G it) add the gloss ἐν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει (“in this matter”).

11.32 πιάσαι με (B)

Although support for the reading πιάσαι με is not extensive, its quality is impressive (B D* G vg syr * cop αρ * goth). If θεῶν were

original, its omission would be difficult to account for; on the other hand, its insertion at various positions can be explained as the work of copyists in the interest of stylistic amelioration.

12.1 καυχήσεως δὲ (A)

The difficulty of understanding the meaning of the verse led at an early date to various scribal emendations. The original text appears to be preserved in Π 3* B D* G P 33 81 614 1739 vg syr * arm) and (See also the comment on the following set of variant readings.)

12.1 υμᾶς μέν (A)

The Committee preferred the reading supported by Π 3* B G* 33 1739 vg cop Μ Ν, for the other readings, when considered in the light of the variants earlier in the verse, seem to be the result of attempts to ameliorate the style and syntax.

12.6 οἴκοι (τί)
On the one hand, the shorter reading, ἀκού, is supported by a strong combination of witnesses (K* B D F G 33 424 2198 syr ch arm). On the other hand, however, it is easy to see why τι (20K N D* K L P 104 326 8 syr goth) should have been dropped by copyists as superfluous and disturbing to the syntax. To indicate this balance of considerations, the Committee decided to retain the word enclosed within square brackets.

12.7 διή (C)

Although διή is absent from such important witnesses as 20K L P 88 614 it² 2198 syr ch arm, the Committee preferred to retain the word in the text as the more difficult reading, attested, as it is, by Alexandrian and other witnesses (K A B G 33 81 1739 it² Euthalios). The excision of the conjunction seems to have occurred when copyists mistakenly began a new sentence with καί τις ὑπεράσπισις τῶν αἰτιολόγων, instead of taking these words with the preceding sentence.

12.7 ζνα μὴ ὑπερασπίζει (2) (B)

Several important witnesses (K* A D G 33 629 it² 2198 syr ch arm) omit the second occurrence of these words as unnecessary and superfluous; they are well supported, however (20K B 81 614 1739 syr ch arm), and the repetition has special emphasis in the context.

12.9 δὸν ομοίως (A)

The Textus Receptus, following K* A D G 33 629 it² 2198 syr ch arm, reads ἦ γὰρ δὸν ομοίως μοι. The possessive pronoun, which is absent from 20K D* A B D* F G 424 2198 syr ch arm, was no doubt added by copyists for the sake of perspicuity.

12.15 εἰ (B)

In order to give added emphasis the Textus Receptus, following K* D* K L P most minuscules syr ch arm, reads εἰ συρόθα γον εθα, adds καί after εἰ. The reading εἰ is strongly supported by K* A B G 33 629 it² 2198 syr ch arm. The omission of εἰ from several Western witnesses (D* 2198 syr ch arm) may be due either to an accident in transcription or to deliberate scribal modification.

12.16 ἀγαπᾶτε [π], ἡμοιον ἀγαπᾶτε; (C)

It is difficult to decide between ἀγαπᾶτε (20K N D* B D G K P 81 614 1739 syr ch arm) and ἀγαπᾶτε (K* A 33 104 330 451 syr ch arm), each of which can be explained on palaeographical grounds as rising from either adding or dropping ν before εἰ. The more difficult reading is the participial form, which demands that the reader supply mentally the finite verb εἰς [π] (nowhere else does Paul make this kind of demand on the reader). In order to represent the preponderance of external evidence, a majority of the Committee preferred ἀγαπᾶτε, but in view of internal considerations it was thought advisable to enclose ν within square brackets.
As would be expected, the Textus Receptus, following the minuscules it* vg
sy® ν pp, h, pal
addition to the text (without it*, it is decisively supported by the
minuscules it* A B F G 33 90 424 it® vg arm® eth®.

Subscriptions

(a) The subscription in the form A B 33 is from the Parisinus 1.3

(b) The subscription in 33 is from the Parisinus

(c) The subscription in 33 is from the Vaticanus

(d) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(e) The subscription in 33 is from the Bezae

(f) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(g) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(h) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(i) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(j) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(k) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(l) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(m) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(n) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(o) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(p) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(q) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(r) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(s) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(t) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(u) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(v) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(w) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(x) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(y) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

(z) The subscription in 33 is from the Sinaiticus

Footnotes

The weight of manuscript evidence supporting γαρ or supporting ότι is almost evenly balanced. As concerns transcriptional probability, however, the Committee preferred γαρ, and considered that ότι may have arisen from assimilation to 1 Cor 15.1 or 2 Cor 8.1.

1.15 ενδώτερον [ό θεός] (C)

On the basis of preponderance of external testimony a majority of the Committee preferred the reading with ό θεός, yet, in view of the importance of the witnesses that lack the words, it was thought advisable to enclose them within square brackets.

[The reading with ό θεός has every appearance of being a scribal gloss making explicit the implied subject of ενδώτερον, nor is there any good reason why the words should have been deleted if they had been original (the supposition that they were accidentally omitted is improbable in view of the diversified testimony supporting the shorter text). B.M.M. and A.W.]

1.18 Κηφήνες

The Textus Receptus, following D F G K L P and most minuscules, substitutes the more familiar Greek name ΠΗΡΙΟΙ. The Aramaic name Κηφήνες is supported by 66,51 εν Α B 33 424 467 823 920 1739 1912 syr, hag, cop TR arm eth. (See also the comments on 2.9, 11, and 14.)

2.1 πάλιν ἀφιέρων (A)

Of the several variant readings, πάλιν ἀφιέρων appears to be preferable, being supported by early and diversified witnesses (66,51 Α B K P ὥς 81 614 1739 vg syr TR arm eth), whereas ἀφιέρων πάλιν is supported by predominantly Western witnesses (D G it 8.6 goth Pap. Pelagius Jerome) and πάλιν ἀφιέρων has only meager support (C Paschal Chronicle). The absence of πάλιν in several versalional and patristic witnesses (cop Marcion Irenaeus Tertullian Ambrosiaster Chrysostom Augustine) is either accidental or the result of scribal uncertainty concerning its precise significance in the context.

2.4 οὖς οὖς (A)

The omission of οὖς in several witnesses (syrr Marcion Greek mss acc to Ambrosiaster Ephraem) was probably deliberate, in order to rectify the anacoluthon. Omission of οὖς, whether with or without omission of οὖς, is confined chiefly to Western witnesses (D G it Π goth arm eth), whereas οὖς πάλιν is supported by predominantly Eastern witnesses (D G it 8.6 goth Pap. Pelagius Jerome) and οὖς ἀφιέρων has only meager support (C Paschal Chronicle). The absence of οὖς in several versalional and patristic witnesses (cop Marcion Irenaeus Tertullian Ambrosiaster Chrysostom Augustine) is either accidental or the result of scribal uncertainty concerning its precise significance in the context.

2.20 λοιμον τοῦ Θεοῦ (A)

argument and to his temperament, the Committee had little hesitation in adopting the reading οὖς οὖς, which is decisively supported by all known Greek manuscripts except D* and by the preponderant weight of versalional and patristic witnesses.

2.9 Ιδούμαχος καὶ Κηφήνες καὶ Ιωάννης

Several witnesses, chiefly Western, replace the Aramaic name Κηφήνες with the more familiar Greek name ΠΗΡΙΟΙ (66,51 D F G it Π goth Marcion Origins) Marius Victorinus Ephraem Ambrosiaster Jerome; all but two of the same witnesses (not 66,51 Π) give more prominence to Peter by placing his name first in the series, thus also bringing together the familiar pair of names, James and John (this James, however, is not the son of Zebedee and the brother of John, who had been killed by Herod [Acts 12.2], but the brother of Jesus and leader of the Church at Jerusalem [Gal 1.19; Ac 15.13]). (See also the comment on 1.18.)
Although the reading θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ is supported by several important witnesses (B D F G it F D* G it Marius Victorinus Pelagius), it can scarcely be regarded as original since Paul nowhere else expressly speaks of God as the object of a Christian’s faith. The reading that best explains the origin of the others is the customary Pauline expression τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, which is widely attested by a broad spectrum of Greek, versional, and patristic witnesses. It is probable that in copying, the eye of the scribe passed immediately from the first to the second τοῦ, so that only τοῦ θεοῦ was written (as in ms. 330); since what followed was now incongruous, copyists either added τοῦ θεοῦ or inserted καὶ Χριστοῦ.

The Textus Receptus, following C D K L P Ψ* most minuscules vg ex sys* syr* gr* Goth* arm* al, adds τῷ ἁλληνίκῳ μῆνι. ποικιλήθησαι from ἧνεκεν.

The Textus Receptus, following D E F G K L many minuscules it F* syr* thebe, adds εἰς Χριστῷ, which the AV takes with the following τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The words τοῦ θεοῦ are absent from several early and important witnesses (B D F G it F D* G it Ambrosianus Marius Victorinus). On the one hand, since the shorter reading is terse and entirely in accord with Pauline style, the words τοῦ θεοῦ may be a natural addition made by copyists who recalled such passages as Ro 4.20 or 2 Cor 1.20. On the other hand, however, since the absence of the words in a few witnesses may be due to an accident in transmission, the Committee thought it best to represent the balance of probabilities by retaining the words enclosed within square brackets. The reading of 104 represents the substitution of ποικιλήθησαι for ποικιλήθησαι.

The Textus Receptus, following several of the later uncials (D E K L Ψ*), and most minuscules, reads θεοῦ, thus conforming the person of the pronoun to the earlier καὶ. The first person τοῦ θεοῦ is strongly supported by early and diversified witnesses (including 33* A B C D* G P 104 1241 1739 1881 1962 1984 it vg ex sys* cop* Arm Marcion Tertullian Origen).

Of the several variant readings, the unusual and unexpected expression, κληρονόμος διὰ θεοῦ, which is well supported by early and diversified witnesses (N* A B C* G P 104 1739 1881 1962 1984 it vg ex sys* cop* Arm Marcion Clement), seems to account best for the origin of the other readings. In the context one would expect διὰ to be followed by the genitive of Χριστοῦ as the Mediator, rather than θεοῦ as the source of the inheritance (nevertheless, on occasion Paul does use διὰ with θεοῦ, e.g. 1 Cor 1.9 and 1 Cor 1.9). The less frequent expression was altered by copyists in various ways:

(a) θεοῦ ("an heir of God"), 1962 arm eth
(b) διὰ θεοῦ ("an heir on account of God"), G* 1881
(c) διὰ Χριστοῦ ("an heir through Christ"), 81 630 syr* cop* Jerome
(d) διὰ Χριστοῦ ("an heir through Christ")
(e) διὰ θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ ("an heir of God through Christ")
(f) διὰ θεοῦ ("an heir of God")
(g) διὰ θεοῦ ("an heir through God")
(h) διὰ θεοῦ ("an heir through God")
(i) διὰ θεοῦ ("an heir through God")
(j) διὰ θεοῦ ("an heir through God")
(k) διὰ θεοῦ ("an heir through God")

The less frequent expression was altered by copyists in various ways:
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The influence of Ro 8.17 is apparent in variant reading (θ).

4.14 τον περιφαραγων ειμων (A)

In order to alleviate the difficulty of the expression τον περιφαραγων ειμων, which is strongly supported by good witnesses of both the Alexandrian (N* A B C* D* 33) and the Western (D* G it6, 81 88 1241 vg Ambrosiaster a) types of text, ειμων was replaced by μου (D* it6), or by μου τον (C* D* D* it6 K P 614 Byz Lect syr* cop* it8), or by τον alone (N* 81 88 1241 vg goth arm eth a).

4.25 τη Ανωπη Σινα (C)

As between δι and γαρ, the Committee preferred the former on the strength of superior attestation (A B D* 1739 syr* al). After γαρ had replaced δι in some witnesses, the juxtaposition of γαρ τη Ανωπη led to the accidental omission sometimes of γαρ and sometimes of τη Ανωπη.

4.26 ειτε (A)

The Textus Receptus, following Ν* A C* K P 81 614 arm a, inserts παιςων before ειτε (cf. Ro 4.16), an insertion which “gives the text a broader, pastoral application, but obscures Paul’s distinction between the ‘chosen ones’ and the ‘sons of Hagar’” (Zuntz, p. 223). The uninterpolated text is strongly supported by δ* B C* D* G Y 33 1739 most Old Latin vg syr* it8 kop* goth marcion Irenaeus al.

4.28 ουκ εις … εστε. (B)

Influenced by the first person pronoun in ver. 26 (cf. also ver. 31), the Textus Receptus, following Ν* A C D* K P Ψ 614 a, reads ουκ εις … εστε. The second person ουκ εις … εστε is strongly supported by early and diverse witnesses (D* B D* G 33 1739 it8 syr* kop* a).

5.1 τη ελευθερία της Χριστου ηλευθερωσεν στηκετε ουν (B)

Amid the variety of readings, that adopted for the text seems to account best for the origin of the others. The apostle’s abrupt introduction of exhortations was softened by inserting the relative η before or after ελευθερία, or by transferring ουν to the preceding clause.

5.2 ζυμων

Several Western witnesses (D* it8 vg goth marcion marian victorius ambrosiaster a) replace ζυμων with δοκει. The same Western correction occurs in 1 Cor 5.6.

5.20 ερις

The Textus Receptus, following C D* F G K L N P most minuscules Old Latin vg goth syr* kop* a, reads the plural ερις. The earlier representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (N* A B D* 1739 syr* a) support the singular ερις. In later Greek both forms were pronounced alike.

5.21 φιλον (C)

A wide range of witnesses read φιλον, φιλων (A C D G K P Ψ 88 1739 Byz Lect most of the Old Latin vg syr* kop* goth eth a). Although the shorter reading may have originated in accidental omission due to homoeoteleuton, a majority of the Committee, impressed by the age and quality of the witnesses supporting φιλων (D* Ν* B 33 81 cop* marcion Irenaeus* clement Origen* a), was inclined to think that φιλων was inserted by copyists who recollected Ro 1.29.

5.23 ιγνατεα (A)

Several witnesses supplement Paul’s list of nine Christian graces: υπομονη (”patience”) is appended by N* 442 463, and χαστιτη (”chastity”) by D* F G it8 a goth cyprian Irenaeus c Clement Origen a, is strongly supported by early and diversified external attestation (δ* B C* D* G Y 33 1739 most of the ancient versions), as well as transcriptional probability (scribes would be likely to conform the future to the preceding imperatives, καταρτισθε (ver. 5) and βασταζε (ver. 10)).

6.2 ουσιασθαι (C)

Although the aorist imperative ουσιασθαι is strongly supported (N* A C D* K P Ψ 614 1739 syr* arm a), the future tense appeared to the Committee to be slightly preferable on the basis of early and diversified external attestation (δ* B G and most ancient versions), as well as transcriptional probability (scribes would be likely to conform the future to the preceding imperatives, καταρτισθε (ver. 5) and βασταζε (ver. 10)).

6.10 ιγηρες ουδεθα (A)

Although several otherwise strong witnesses read the indicative ιγηρες ουδεθα (B* Ψ P a), intrinsic probability as well as significant external attestation favors the hortatory subjunctive in the context. In later Greek οι and ο were rarely distinguished in pronunciation.
Influenced by the similar passage in 5.6, the Textus Receptus, following Ν A C D F G K L P most minuscules it\(^{1}\)VG sy\(^{2}\) eth\(^{3}\) reads εν γέρῳ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ αὐτῷ. The shorter reading has limited but adequate support in \(A B^{33} 33 1175 1611 1739 1908 2005 \)it\(^{4}\) sy\(^{5}\) eth\(^{6}\) αὐτῷ.

6.17 Ἰησοῦ

Instead of Ἰησοῦ, which is strongly supported by Ν\(^{1}\) A B C\(^{33}\) 33 1070 1753 most of the Old Latin vg sy\(^{2}\)cop\(^{3}\) al, several witnesses (P \(\) B\(^{61}\) 81 255 256 442 463 1175 1319 1908 2127 cop\(^{3}\) arm eth\(^{3}\) subst. Χριστοῦ, and others provide various edifying expansions: κυρίου Ἰησοῦ (C\(^{33}\)) K L most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus; κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Ν 917 941 it\(^{3}\) subst. κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (D\(^{2}\)) F G 104 1524 sy\(^{3}\) goth; and κυρίου μου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Origen\(^{1}\)).

6.18 Subscription

(a) The subscription in Ν A B C\(^{33}\) 33 466 is πρὸς Γαλάταις. Other subscriptions include: (b) πρὸς Γαλάταις ἔγραψε (P -Φιλ-) ἀπὸ Ἡρώδη Β\(^{3}\) K P 1908, followed by the Textus Receptus; (c) πρὸς Γαλάταις ἔγραψεν θυγατέρα; (d) ἔγραψε συστηματικά τῆς πρὸς Γαλάταις ἔγραφα (42 adv dē) ἀπὸ Ἡρώδη Λ\(^{42}\) (Φιλ- ἐγραφή ἀπὸ Ἡρώδης ὑπὸ Παύλου καὶ τῶν ἅγιων πρὸς Γαλάταις οἱ [τις -ις] ἐπιστολή αὐτῆς Euθαλίου\(^{1}\)).

Footnotes


\(^{2}\) Singularly enough, however, Ν, which reads the future βαστατόκε (corrected to -άτεκ in \(Ν\(^{3}\)), has the imperative ἀναστάταικε.

The Letter Of Paul To The Ephesians

1.1 εὐνοεῖς [C]

The words εὐνοεῖς are absent from several important witnesses (Ω\(^{1}\) Ν\(^{6}\) B\(^{2}\) 424\(^{1}\) 1739) as well as from manuscripts mentioned by Basil and the text used by Origen. Certain internal features of the letter as well as Marcion’s designation of the epistle as “To the Laodiceans” and the absence in Tertullian and Ephraem of an explicit quotation of the words εὐνοεῖς have led many commentators to suggest that the letter was intended as an encyclical, copies being sent to various churches, of which that at Ephesus was chief. Since the letter has been traditionally known as “To the Ephesians,” and since all witnesses except those mentioned above include the words εὐνοεῖς, the Committee decided to retain them, but enclosed within square brackets.

1.6 ἤγγιστήμενον [A]

After ἤγγιστήμενον several witnesses, chiefly of a Western textual tradition (D\(^{2}\) F G α δ), incorporate an explanatory scribal addition, νῦν ἀκούστων.

1.14 ὁ [B]

It is difficult to decide whether copyists altered ὁς to ὁ in order to make it agree with the gender of πνεῦμα, or whether ὁ became ὁς by attraction to the gender of the following ἀγάπην. According to a usual idiom. On the basis of what was taken to be superior external attestation, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading ὁ.

1.15 καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας τοῖς ἀγίοις [B]

The shorter reading καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας τοῖς ἀγίοις (Ω\(^{1}\) Ν\(^{6}\) B P 33 1739 αδ) appears to be the result of an accident in transcription, occasioned by homoeoarcton (τὴν ... τὴν). If, as some scholars have suggested, the shorter reading is original and the addition is derived from Col 1.4, τὴν ἐπιστολὴν would have been inserted instead of the second τὴν. The rearrangement of the sequence of the words so as to dispense with the second τὴν (81 104 256 αδ) is clearly a secondary modification.
Because of the weight of Greek and versional witnesses that support ἱμάντων, the Committee decided that the word should be included in the text, but, in view of its absence from 1.38 B 33 1739 and other significant witnesses, that it should be enclosed within square brackets.

The reading ἐν τῷ Ἡράκλει (1.38 B 33 a) seems to have arisen from either accidental dittography of the previous -ν, or from deliberate assimilation to ἐν Ἡράκλει. ‘Ἡράκλει in ver. 6.

In order to identify precisely the source of the grace that saves, several witnesses, chiefly Western (D* F G a), add οἷς (“whose”).

The Textus Receptus, in company with a scattering of late minuscules, replaces οἰκονομία, the interpretative gloss (hence AV “fellowship”). The true reading is supported by 46, all known uncials, almost all minuscules, all known versions and patristic quotations.

The second instance of οἰμών in ver. 13, supported by early and weighty witnesses, is replaced in later manuscripts with ἱμάντων — which is totally inappropriate in the context. In later Greek the vowels η and i came to be pronounced alike, and inattentive scribes tended to confuse them.

Instead of περιμαθείς εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρημα τοῦ θεοῦ, which is amply attested by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and
Because of its apparent redundancy several witnesses (𝔓⁴⁶ D E F G iτ⁶ ε ᵇ vg Ambrosiaster) omit ἵππη.

4.4 πιστεύω (A)

The Textus Receptus, following a few minuscules and patristic witnesses (489 Chrysostom Theodoret al), adds ἵππην; other witnesses (D F G K L Ὠ 181 326 917 920 iτ⁶ ε ᵇ vg ἵππην arm al) add ἵππην. Both readings are explanatory glosses, introduced in order to establish a personal reference of ἵππην to the Christians. The reading adopted for the text is strongly supported by \[𝔓⁴⁶ \text{N A B C P 082 33 88 104 424} \text{δ} 436 442 460 462 1912^* 1944 \text{cop} \text{ex. bs eth arab af.}\]

4.8 ἐδάκτυλον (B)

On the whole it appears that the reading without καὶ is to be preferred, not only because it is supported by such diversified witnesses as \[𝔓¹¹⁶ \text{A D G 33 88 it vg} \text{cop} \text{ex. bs} \text{eth arab}.\]

4.3 κατέβη (A)

The addition of πρῶτον after κατάβη (N C K P Ὠ 88 614 Byz Lect al) appears to be a natural expansion introduced by copyists to elucidate the meaning. The shorter text is strongly supported by \[𝔓¹¹⁶ \text{A C D G 1739 al}.\]

4.8 [μερη Ν] (C)

Although the presence of μερη in the text is strongly supported by \[A B C P \text{iales} \text{al}.\] its absence from \[𝔓¹¹⁶ D F G al] leaves one uncertain whether the word was added as an explanatory gloss or deleted as virtually superfluous. The Committee judged that the least unsatisfactory solution was to include the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

4.17 [θητη] (C)

The Textus Receptus adds λοιπά before θητη, with the correctors of two uncial manuscripts as well as the later uncials and most minuscules (𝔓¹¹⁶ D F G al) leaves one uncertain whether the word was added as an explanatory gloss or deleted as virtually superfluous. The Committee judged that the least unsatisfactory solution was to include the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

4.19 ἀπελθηκότος (A)

Instead of ἀπελθηκότος (from ἀπελθήκας, “become callous, without feeling”), a word appropriate to the figure suggested by νάρκων of ver. 18, several Western witnesses read ἀπελθηκότος or ἀπελπηκότος (from ἀπέλπηκα, “despair of oneself”). The Committee preferred the reading supported by the earliest manuscripts (𝔓¹¹⁶ A B).

4.28 ταῖς [ἰδῖαις] χρεοῦν τὸ ἄγωνον {C}

The differences of reading are numerous in this brief clause. As concerns the sequence of words,抄ists would have been more likely to move τὸ ἄγωνον next to the participle than to separate them; furthermore, the stronger external evidence also supports such a sequence (𝔓¹⁷⁹, 49vid B D G 81 330 451 IT vg ἐν εἰκόνι βῆθι goth arm eθ). It is more difficult to decide whether ἵππην is an interpolation from 1 Cor 4.12, or whether it was deleted as superfluous, or whether it was accidentally omitted in transcription (ταίς ἵππης χρεοῦν).
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On the basis chiefly of external evidence (𝔓¹¹⁶ A D G 81 104 ᾿ηνικόν σῦν goth arm eθ), the Committee preferred the reading ταῖς ἵππης χρεοῦν, the unclassical usage of ἵππης being common in colloquial Greek of the time. At the same time, however, in view of the absence of ἵππης from such early and notable witnesses as Ὠ²⁶ *B* ᾿ηνικόν βῆθι, it was decided to enclose the word within square brackets. The omission of either τὸ ἄγωνον (cop²⁶ Tertullian) or ταῖς (ἰδῖαις) χρεοῦν (P 33 1739 1811 Clement Origen Speculum) may have arisen from the presumed incompatibility of τὸ ἄγωνον with manual labor.

4.32 ἵππην (B)

In the light of the earlier part of the sentence the reading ἵππην, which is adequately supported by \[𝔓¹¹⁶ A D G 81 614 most of the Old Latin cop²⁶ εὐθυς goth arm eθ], seems to be required by the sense. The origin of the reading ἵππην (𝔓¹⁷⁹ B D G K Y 33 1739 ἐν εἰκόνι arm al) may have been accidental, through confusion arising from similar pronunciation of ἵππην and ἵππην in later Greek. (See also the comments on the next two sets of variant readings.)

5.2 ἢπας (B)

The external evidence supporting the two readings is rather evenly balanced (ἣπας Ὠ¹⁴ D G K Y 33 614 1739 ἐν εἰκόνι δὲ ἵππην goth arm at ἢπας Ὠ¹⁴ A B P 81 ᾿ηνικόν ᾿ηνικόν εὐθυς eθ; eθ) and, with a slight preponderance of weight favoring ἢπας. Since the following set of variant readings seems to require the adoption of the reading ἢπας, a majority of the Committee felt that uniformity of the personal pronoun in two successive clauses joined by καὶ was indispensable, and therefore preferred ἢπας. (See also the comment on 4.32.)

5.2 ἵππην ἢπας προσφεράν (A)
In comparison with the external evidence supporting ημῶν (B 31 69 442 462 547 it*86), the reading ημῶν is much more strongly attested (ο*46, η*49 A D F G K L P Y 33 81 161 1739 vt a*80, vt syrh h goth arn A). The reading ὕπερ ἡμῶν ἐν φλορῳ (1241) is the result of a curious transcriptional blunder. (See also the comments on the previous two sets of variant readings.)

Rather the Committee preferred the sequence ἄρκμως πῶς on the basis of the strength of the external evidence (ο*46, η*49 B 33 81 1739 cop*86, Origae α) as well as transcriptional probability (πως may have been accidentally omitted after ἄρκμος, and subsequently inserted at the wrong place). The presence of ἀρκμως in several witnesses (N A 629 it*1 vg cop*86, Pelagius) is obviously secondary, there being no good reason to account for the deletion of the word if it had been present originally.

5.3 (continued)

Instead of the conventional formula ὅ ἐστιν (“that is to say”), which koiné Greek can employ “without reference to the gender of the word explained or to that of the word which explains” (Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 132 (2), the alteration of ὅ to ἦς (A D K L P most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus) appears to be a correction introduced by overly punctilious scribes. The reading ὅ is strongly supported by Υ B F G L Y 33 81 256 424 915 1175 1319 1739 2005 2127 it vg goth af.

5.5 o[5.19 wv|dai/j pneumatikai/j

Instead of the conventional formula o[ evstin (“that is to say”), which koine Greek can employ “without reference to the gender of the word explained or to that of the word which explains” (Blass-Debrunner-Funk, § 132 (2), the alteration of o[ to o[j (A D K L P most minuscules, followed

A curious variety of readings has arisen in the transmission of these words. The reading θεοῦ (ο*46 1245 2147) originated either through scribal oversight (ἀγγελιαγον) or through the influence of the stereotyped expression (ἀγγελιαγον τοῦ θεοῦ) in the Gospels. Probably the latter influence is also to be seen in the sequence of the Western reading θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ (1739* eth Theodoret), Χριστοῦ (38* 90), and ἦν οὗ τοῦ θεοῦ (1838).

5.9 φωτάς (A)

Instead of φωτάς the Textus Receptus reads πεθάματος, with Υ B D* K L Y 88 104 614 1739* it. Although it can be argued that φωτάς has come in from the influence of the same word in the preceding line, it is much more likely that the introduction of the word here. The reading φωτάς is strongly supported by early and diversified witnesses, representing both the Alexandrian and the Western text-types (ο*46 N A B D* G P 33 81 1739* it vt syrh h cop*86, goth arn eth Origae).

5.14 ἐπιφάνειας οὐ δ ἡμοῦ (A)

Instead of “Christ will shine upon you,” strongly supported by a wide range of witnesses, several Western witnesses substitute either “Christ will touch you” or “You will touch Christ.” Apparently the readings arose from the legend that the cross on which Jesus was crucified was erected over the burial place of Adam, who was raised from the dead by the touch of the Savior’s blood.2

5.15 o[ν άρκμος πῶς (B)

Although it is possible that the shorter text, which is supported by early and good witnesses (including ο*46, η*49 B 33 81 1739 cop*86, it may have arisen by accidental omission occasioned by homoeoteleuton (αιτοῦ … αἰτοῦ), it is more probable that the longer readings reflect various scribal expansions derived from Gn 2.23 (where, however, the sequence is “bone…flesh”), anticipatory to the quotation of Gn 2.24 in ver. 31.

5.16 o[ οὐν άρκμος πῶς (B)

The words οὐν κυρίῳ are absent from several early manuscripts and patristic quotations (B D* G it*19 Marcion Clement Tertullian Cyprian Ambrosiaster). It is difficult to decide whether they were added by copyists who recollected 5.22 and/or Col 3.20 (ο*46 N A D* K P 9, apparently all minuscules, and the other versational witnesses), or were deleted from several witnesses in order to prevent the reader...
from supposing that the writer intended to limit or qualify the duty of obedience (rather than merely to characterize the spirit in which obedience is rendered). The longer text was preferred on the basis of (a) preponderance of external evidence, and (b) the likelihood that if the phrase had been inserted from 3.22 it would have been ως τι κυριως, or if from Col 3.23 it would have stood after δικαιος. Nevertheless, in order to reflect the weight of the witnesses that lack in κυριου, a majority of the Committee voted to enclose the words within square brackets.

6.12 ήμιν (B)

Whereas the preponderance of external evidence (B D* G 81 al) appears to support ήμιν, the natural tendency of copyists would have been to alter ήμιν to εμιν, since the rest of the paragraph involves the second person. A majority of the Committee preferred ήμιν as being perhaps the more difficult reading.

6.19 τοις εικαγελιοι (A)

Although it may appear noteworthy that B joins G in replacing έξας αλιν supporting the shorter reading, in the Pauline corpus codex Vaticanus not infrequently displays a strand of Western contamination, and therefore the weight of its testimony, when united with Western witnesses, should not be overevaluated. Moreover, it is significant that besides τοις εικαγελιοι there is no other variation, such as τοις Χριστοις or τοις θεοις (for which there are parallels in 3.4; Col 2.2; 4.3), as one might have expected if, in fact, the shorter reading were original and τοις εικαγελιοι were a scribal addition.

6.20 εις αυτου (C)

In place of εις αυτου (which refers, of course, to το μυστηριον το εικαγελιοι of ver. 19), a few important witnesses read εις αυτο, thus pointing more directly to the antecedent.

6.24 διψησετην. (A)

The Textus Receptus adds the liturgical ἡμνην with Ν* D K L P most minuscules synth. The text is well supported by Π66 K* A B F G 33 cop* arm mes eth. The subscription in Ν A B (D) 33 466 cop* is προς Εφεσους. Other subscriptions include: (d) καλλιεργης επιτοπων προς Εφεσους F G; (e) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Ψ 31 82 329 436 1908; (e) τριφαθης οργης απο Ρωμης των Τυχαιου; (e) απο Ρωμης δια τυχαιου Π; (e) απο Ρωμης των Τυχαιου; (e) απο Ρωμης δια τυχαιου Τυχαιου Textus Receptus.

6.24 Subscription

(a) The subscription in Ν A B D (33 466 cop) is προς Εφεσους. Other subscriptions include: (b) εκελεθης επιτοπων προς Εφεσους Φ G; (c) προς Εφεσους Θραφης Π; (d) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Π; (e) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (f) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (g) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (h) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (i) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (j) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (k) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (l) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (m) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (n) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (o) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (p) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (q) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (r) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (s) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (t) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (u) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (v) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (w) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (x) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (y) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (z) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (AA) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (BB) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (CC) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (DD) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (EE) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (FF) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (GG) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (HH) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (II) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (JJ) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (KK) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (LL) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (MM) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (NN) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (OO) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (PP) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (QQ) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (RR) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (SS) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (TT) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (UU) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (VV) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (WW) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (XX) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (YY) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου; (ZZ) προς Εφεσους τριφαθης οργης Χριστου.

Footnotes

A majority of the Committee was persuaded that, if γάρ were present originally, no good reason can be found for its deletion, whereas the anacoluthon involved in τοῦτο standing alone seems to cry out for a connective, whether γάρ or οὖν or καί (each of which is found in a variety of witnesses).

2.7 ἀνακολουθίαν

Instead of ἀνακολουθίαν several early witnesses read ἀναθρόπιον (A 45 syr B cop mar Marcion Origen Cyprian Hilary Ambrose). Although it is possible that the Adam-Christ typology implicit in the passage accounts for the substitution, it is more likely that the singular number is merely a non-doctrinal conformation to the singular ἄνθρωπον and the following ἀνθρώπιον.

2.8 τοῦ δικαίου (B)

The Textus Receptus, following D F G ϊπ' and many minuscules, lacks τοῦ, resulting in the meaning that Jesus was given an unspecified name subsequently defined as that name which is above every name. While the article before δικαίου may have been inserted in order to assimilate the expression to a more usual one, it is also possible that the last syllable of ἄκριτα somehow led to the omission of the article. On the whole, the Committee was impressed by the weight of the witnesses that include the word.

2.11 ἐξουσιαστήσαι (C)

Although the subjunctive may be a scribal assimilation to κύριος, the indicative may be an assimilation to the indicative κύριος ("shall swear") in Is 45:23. Faced with such a balance of possibilities, the Committee preferred to adopt the reading supported by ἐκκ. Ν B al.

2.11 κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός (A)

Several witnesses, chiefly Western, omit Χριστός, perhaps in order to conform the expression to that in ver. 10.

2.12 ως (A)

The omission of ως from B 33 42 234 618 1241 al is probably accidental, although抄ists may have deliberately deleted it as superfluous; in any case, the presence of the word is strongly supported by ὑπ. and representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (A C D G K P Ψ 81 614 1739 Byz Lect).

2.26 ὢμιξις (C)

While the external evidence for and against the insertion of ὢμιξις after ὢμιξις is very evenly balanced, a majority of the Committee was
3.13 εὖ (B)

The reading εὖ, which is amply supported by Ἐκκλησίας B D* G K P 88 1739 most Old Latin vg synh° cop° arm, appears to have been changed to οὖν (K A D* P 33 614 synh° arm, goth eth Clement) by copyists who considered Paul to be too modest in his protestations.

3.15 φρονέων (A)

In place of the hortatory subjunctive, which is appropriate in the context, the indicative is read by K L and a few other witnesses, probably through scribal inadvertence.

3.16 τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖον (A)

The earliest form of text appears to be that preserved in Ἐκκλησίας 46 K* A B lth 33 424° 1739 cop°, eth° al. Because of the conciseness of style, copyists added various explanatory words and phrases; e.g. the Textus Receptus reads τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖον κανών, τῷ αὐτῷ φρονέων with K* K P 88 614 synh° eth° al, where κανών serves to identify the otherwise enigmatic τῷ αὐτῷ, and τῷ αὐτῷ φρονέων is a gloss explaining τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖον (compare 2.2 and Ga 6.16); other witnesses insert κανών before στοιχεῖον (69 1908), and still others insert τῷ αὐτῷ φρονέων before τῷ αὐτῷ, with or without κανών (D G 81 330 1241 it vg goth arm Euthalius). The variety and lack of homogeneity of the longer readings make it difficult to suppose that the shorter reading τῷ αὐτῷ στοιχεῖον arose because of homoeoteleuton.

4.11 καὶ

The Textus Receptus, in company with 462, erroneously reads καὶ. All other witnesses, as it seems, read καὶ.

4.12 αὐτῷ

Some have taken this word as a proper name, Συζύγος ("Syzygus").

4.13 τῶν λαοτῶν συνεργῶν μου (A)

Because of scribal inadvertence two early witnesses (Ἐκκλησίας K*) read τῶν συνεργῶν μου καὶ τῶν λαοτῶν ("… with Clement and my fellow workers, and the others whose names are written …").

4.17 νοήματα (A)

In order to diversify still further the domains covered by καρδίας and νοήματα, several Western witnesses (F G R°) replace the latter with συνεργάτα, while Ἐκκλησίας adds καὶ τῇ συνεργάτῃ after νοήματα.

4.18 ἐπειδής (A)

After ἐπειδής, the scribes of several Western witnesses (D* F G it*), not wishing to leave ἐπειδής without specification, added ἐστὶν ὑμῖν εἰς τὴν χρήσην μου (C)

The preposition εἰς is lacking in several witnesses, including Ἐκκλησίας A D° 81 330 451 1241 2492 synh° goth eth; it seems to have been omitted either accidentally after ἐπειδής (Ἀκοφνίως) or deliberately in order to provide a direct object for the verb ἐπειδής. The genitive μου (D P 614 630 a) is a scribal replacement for the less usual and far better supported dative μου. The readings of the Coptic and of it° appear to be overtranslations of the Greek. The reading in unum mitti (vg°) may be a confused reminiscence of Ι.κ. 10.42.

4.19 τελευτάω (B)

Instead of the future indicative ("My God will supply …"), strongly supported by Ἐκκλησίας A B D° K L P and many minuscules, the scribes of several Western and other witnesses preferred the aorist optative ("May my God supply …").

4.23 τοι: πνεύματος

Although some have supposed that the reading τοι: πνεύματος was introduced by copyists from Ga 6.18 or Phm 25, the Committee was impressed by its distinctly superior attestation (Ἐκκλησίας K* A B D° F G P 6 88 104 241 322 330 424° 436 442 463 1319 1898 2005 2127 it° a° vg cop°, eth arm eth), and explained the variant reading πνεύματος (K* K L P most minuscules synh° and Textus Receptus) as a scribal substitution of a more familiar termination for a benediction (cf. 1 Cor 16.24; 2 Cor 13.13; 2 Th 3.18; Tit 3.15).

4.23 οὕτως: (A)
The Letter Of Paul To The Colossians

The σήμερον (Φ 3:1-8 vg syr 6636 cop 46 arm eth) appears to have been added by copyists in accord with liturgical practice; if it had been present originally, it would be difficult to account for its omission in B F G 6 1739 1836 1908 itl syr 66 arm al.

4.2 Gotus

(a) The subscription in N A B 33 466 is τρός Φιλιππινοῦς. Other subscriptions include: (b) τρός Φιλιππινοῦς ἐπισκόπησε Φιλιππινοῦς F G; (c) τρός τοῦ Φιλιππινοῦς έγραψε ἀπὸ Ἐφραίμοντος K 1908 al. followed by the Textus Receptus; (d) as (c) but prefixing τοῦ Ἀγίου Ἑπίσκοπου Παύλου ἑπότου Λ; (e) as (c) and concluding ἐγραψε ἀπὸ Ἐφραίμοντος (cop 2005) eth.

Footnotes

1 As already Theodore of Mopsuestia recognized (see quotation in Tischendorf’s apparatus in his 8th ed.).

2 It has sometimes been suggested that the fact that ver. 8 begins a lection would probably facilitate the dropping of γήρ. How far such influence would make itself felt on non-lectionary manuscripts is debatable; in any case, however, N A B C, all of which lack γήρ, probably antedate the presumed date of the origin of the developed lectionary system.

1.2 ἐγερθήσανθε [A]

After ἐγερθήσανθε the Textus Receptus adds καὶ κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, with N A C G 188 614 Byz Lec at the same addition is found also in other witnesses with a second ἐγερθήσανθε added to κυρίῳ, standing before or after Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ. The words, which are absent from a variety of witnesses, some of them early (B D K Y 33 81 1739 it d, mon vg syr h cop sa arm eth), have no doubt been added by copyists who assimilated the text to Pauline usage; certainly no reason for deliberate omission suggests itself.

1.3 πατρίς [C]

The reading adopted for the text, although it is rather narrowly supported (B C* 1739 Augustine), appears to account best for the origin of the other readings. In order to avoid the very unusual collocation of words, some copyists inserted τῷ (D* G 2005 Chrysostom) and others inserted καὶ (A C* D K P* 33 81 614 Byz Lec). (See also the comments on ver. 12 and 3.17.)

1.6 ἐκτιν [B]

In order to relieve a certain awkwardness of expression, the Textus Receptus reads καὶ ἐκτιν, with D* F G K L* most minuscules itl 50 vg syr 66 al. The reading adopted for the text is decisively supported by early and diversified witnesses (D* N A C* D* I K P 33 88 104 326 330 436 464 489 1837 1944 cop 66 arm eth al).

1.7 ἐμπέλεη [B]

Although on the basis of superior Greek evidence (Γ 165 and early Alexandrian and Western authorities) ἐμπέλεη might seem to be preferable, a majority of the Committee, impressed by the widespread currency of ἐμπέλεη in versioinal and patristic witnesses, considered it probable that copyists introduced the first person pronoun under the influence of the preceding ἐγερθήσανθε and the following ἐκτιν.

1.12 τῷ πατρὶ [B]

This verse presents a curious nest of variant readings (see also the following comments). The reading that best explains the origin of the others is τῷ πατρὶ, supported by a diversified group of witnesses (F 3:1 A C* D K P 33 81* 1739* itl 50 vg syr 66 cop 66 arm eth). The strangeness of designating God simply as τῷ πατρὶ when Christ has not been named in the immediate context doubtless prompted copyists to add either τοῦ Χριστοῦ (330 451 2492) or (τῷ) τοῦ, either in apposition (N itl syr Speculum) or connected with καὶ (C 118 88 104 614...
Among what at first sight seems to be a bewildering variety of variant readings, the one adopted for the text is plainly to be preferred (a) because of strong external testimony (𝔓46 B Hilary Pelagius Ps-Jerome) and (b) because it alone provides an adequate explanation of the other readings as various scribal attempts to ameliorate the syntactical ambiguity of τοῦ θεοῦ, Χριστοῦ.

The reading τίτασε, strongly supported by B D* H 33 81 al, best accounts for the rise of the other readings.

Although the reading εἰς εὐχαριστίαν εἰς εὐχαριστίαν is rather strongly supported (B D* H K 614 Byz Lect εἰς εὐχαριστίαν εἰς εὐχαριστίαν) and explained by the Committee as a copyist’s assimilation to the preceding phrase εἰς αὐτὸν, the Committee regarded it as a copyist’s assimilation to the preceding phrase εἰς αὐτὸν, and explained (a) its omission from B D G P Y (𝔓048?) no doubt arose through transcriptional oversight by which εἰς εὐχαριστίαν was omitted.

The original reading appears to be εἰς εὐχαριστίαν, which is adequately supported by Ν* A C inscrit 33 81 1739 vg cop* eth al.

A majority of the Committee preferred ἰματίζει, which is adequately supported by Ν* A C K 81 1739 614 1739 syrh* cop* br arm al, and explained (a) its omission from Ν* D G P Y (𝔓048) on the ground of its seeming to be superfluous, and (b) its replacement with ἰματίζει in Ψ135 B 33 88 ἐν εὐκλ. arm al as due to a desire to conform the person to the following ἰματίζει.

In later Greek the vowels η and υ came to be pronounced alike. Here the weight of the evidence strongly supports ἰματίζει.
2.18 ε [B]

The reading ε is strongly supported by άν[β] and good representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of the text (N A B D* F G H K P Ψ 33 1375 1739 δ* vg cop* Speculum a). Apparently the negative (either δικαίος in F G or μηδέν in N C D* F G H K P Ψ 33 1375 1739 δ* qv syr* υπάρχειν) was added by copyists who either misunderstood the sense of εὐδείως or wished to enhance the polemical nuance that is carried on by the following εἰκῇ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ εὐρύτατος. The singular reading μηδέν (B1) is an accidental scribal error.

2.23 τοῖς ἀπευθυνόμενοις [καὶ] [C]

A minority of the Committee preferred the reading without καὶ on the basis of strong and early external evidence, and the likelihood that copyists would insert καὶ on the assumption that ἀπευθυνόμενος was the third in a series of datives after εἰκῇ, rather than an instrumental dative qualifying the previous prepositional phrase. On the other hand, the majority of the Committee regarded the omission as accidental and preferred the reading with καὶ, which is widely supported by N A C

D* H K P Ψ 33 81 614 vg syr* cop* arm a[β]. As a compromise it was decided to adopt καὶ but to enclose it within square brackets. The reading τοῖς ἀπευθυνόμενοις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ (G δ* min. syr* a[β]) is an expansion derived probably from ver. 18.

3.4 ἐκείνοι [B]

Although it is possible that ἐκείνοι, which is supported by B D* H K 326 614 1241 syr* cop* arm a[β], was altered by copyists to ἐκεῖνοι in order to agree with the second person pronouns before and after, the Committee was impressed by the considerably stronger manuscript evidence that supports ἐκείνοι, including ἐκεῖνοι and good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western text-types (N C D* F G P Ψ 33 81 88 104 1739 it vg cop* goth arm e[β]).

3.6 [ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς ἐπειδήθειας] [C]

It is exceedingly difficult to decide whether the words ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους were added in most witnesses by copyists who recollected Eph 5.6 (where no manuscript omits the words), or whether they are absent from ἐκεῖνοι B cop* eth* and several Fathers (Clement Cyprian Macrobius Ambrosiaster Epheuem Jerome) because of an accident in transmission. In view of (a) the very widespread testimony supporting the longer reading (N A C D* F G H K P Ψ 33 81 88 104 1739 it vg cop* goth arm e[β]) and (b) the inappositeness produced by the shorter reading with the following εἰκῇ, as well as (c) the impression that καὶ ἐπικρατεῖ in ver. 7 assumes a previous mention of unbelieving Gentiles, a majority of the Committee decided to retain the words in the text but to enclose them within square brackets in order to indicate a measure of doubt as to their genuineness in Colossians.

3.13 κρύος [C]

On the strength of the weight of ἐκεῖνοι joined by the best witnesses of both the Alexandrian and the Western texts (A B D* G P Ψ 33 1739 Speculum a) the Committee preferred κρύος, and explained ἐκεῖνος (N).
The reading ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν ("that you may know how we are"), which is adequately supported by good representatives of the Alexandrian, Western, and Eastern types of text (A B D* G 33 81 it*, h, p, h, palms syr* cop* arm eth Ephraem & al), best explains the origin of the other readings. Though inadvertence copyists produced nonsense either by substituting ἡμῶν for ἡμῶν ("that you may know how you are") or by accidentally dropping τα before τα ("that he may know how we are") 330 451 (ἐκκένωσεν ἡμᾶς), The reading γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν (ἐκκένωσεν ἡμᾶς) was produced when copyists tried to make sense of ἵνα γνῶτε τὰ περὶ ἡμῶν (α) by taking it as ἵνα γνῶτε τα τε περὶ ἡμῶν and then (β) omitting τα as awkward and superfluous. The reading adopted for the text is congruent with the writer’s declared purpose of Tychicus’s visit (verses 7 and 9).

4.12 Χρυστόπουλος [Πηλόπου] (C)

Ordinarily one might regard this to be a growing text, but the Committee was not impressed by the weight of the witnesses that support Χρυστόπουλος standing alone. The least unsatisfactory resolution, therefore, seemed to call for Ηγεμόνιος to be retained, yet enclosed within square brackets.

4.13 πολὺν πόνων

Instead of πόνων, which is a rare word in the New Testament (it occurs only here and in Re 16.10, 11; 21.4), copyists have introduced various substitutions: πολὺν κόπουν D* F G; πολὺν ἐριάν D* 33 1906 1908; ἵνα πολὺν K L ἐς most minuscules syr*, followed by the Textus Receptus; πολὺν πόνου 442 1912; πόνου πολὺν 10 104 263; πολὺν ἐγένετο 6 424 1739. The reading adopted for the text is strongly supported by A B C P 88 296 436 467 1837 1838 Euthalius.

4.15 Νυμφαῖν καὶ τὴν κατ’ οἶκον αὐτῆς (C)

Νυμφαῖα can be accented Νυμφαια, from the feminine nominative Νύμφα ("Nymph"), or Νυμφαῖα, from the masculine nominative Νυμφαίας ("Nymphas"). The uncertainty of the gender of the name led to variation in the following possessive pronoun between αὐτῆς, and αὐτοῦ. On the basis chiefly of the weight of B 6 424 1739 1877 1881 syr*, avgwna * cop* of Origen, the Committee preferred Νυμφαῖα ... αὐτῆς. The reading with αὐτοῦ arose when copyists included ἐκείνος in the reference.

4.16 ἡμῶν. [A]

The Textus Receptus adds the liturgical ἡμῶν, with K* D K P 33 88 614 1739 Byz Lecf *h, K* D K P 33 88 614 1739 Byz Lecf *h, h, palms cop* formed * goth al. If the word were present originally, however, it is impossible to account for its deletion from such early and varied witnesses as K* A B C G 048 33 81 1881 it* sy* avgw* cop* formed * arm eth* al.
The First Letter Of Paul To The Thessalonians

1.1 εἰρήνη [A]

Representatives of the Alexandrian and the Western types of text unite in supporting the shorter reading (B G Ψ 1739 τῆς ἑκ. Μ μ. ν. ο. τ. ρ. τ. Σ κ. Π Πυργίου ά. c. 424 442 1311 1739 1908 2005 τῆς εἰς υἱόν του θεού [3]). Other witnesses expand the salutation by adding phrases familiar from the salutations in other Pauline letters. If any one of these expansions had been original, there is no reason why it would have been deleted.

The expression "our gospel," which is solidly based in a diversity of witnesses of every type of textual family, seems to have offended some scribes; Κ* C preferred "the gospel of God," and Κ* preferred "the gospel of our God."

1.2 τῶν [A]

It is more likely that copyists would have altered the singular number τῶν [B D* 6 33 81 104 181 424 442 1311 1739 1908 2005 τῶν εἰς υἱόν του θεού] to the plural τῶν [Κ A C Φ* G K L Π τῶν εἰς υἱόν του θεού] in order to agree with Ἰωάννης than vice versa. The reading τῶν in D* is a scribal error.

1.7 νησίων [B]

From a transcriptional point of view it is difficult to decide whether νησίων arose by dittography after the preceding νεωτάρης or whether Ἰωάννης arose by haplography. Likewise, considerations of what the author was more likely to have written are equally inconclusive. Thus, though Paul uses νησίων almost a dozen times elsewhere whereas Ἰωάννης is found in the Greek Bible only in 2 Tim 2:24, yet the apostle always applies νησίων to his converts and nowhere else refers to himself as a νησίων. Again, though the shift of metaphor from that of baby to that of mother-nurse is admittedly a violent one, it is characteristically Pauline and no more startling than the sudden shift of metaphor in Ga 4:19.

In the absence of any strong argument based on internal probabilities, a majority of the Committee preferred to follow what is admittedly the stronger external attestation and to adopt νησίων.2

[Despite the weight of external evidence, only Μ* Μ* seems to suit the context, where the apostle’s gentleness makes an appropriate sequence with the arrogance disclaimed in ver. 8. The choice of reading has a bearing on the punctuation; if Μ* is adopted, a full stop should follow ἐπιστάσαι, a comma should follow Ἰωάννης, and a colon should follow καθεύδει. B.M.M. and A.W.]

2.12 καλοῦντος [B]
The reading 

\[ \text{kλέστας} \]

supported by three Alexandrian witnesses (A B cop\(^b\)), appears to have arisen from scribal conformation to the preceding ημών, resulting in near nonsense (cf. the similar image in ver. 2).
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5.25 [καὶ (G)]

On the other hand, it can be argued that καὶ was added by copyists who recalled Col 4.3. On the other hand, however, if the word were present originally it could have fallen out when its reference to ver. 17 was overlooked. In view of the balance of probabilities it was thought best to include καὶ in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

5.27 ἀδικήσας (A)

Instead of τοῖς ἀδικήσας a variety of witnesses, followed by the Textus Receptus, read τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀδικήσας (K A K P \( \Psi \) 33 81 614 1739 Byz Lect \( \text{it}^\text{b} \) \( \text{vg} \) \( \text{syri}^\text{a} \) \( \text{cop}^\text{b} \) \( \text{eth} \) arm \text{eth} \( \text{a} \)). While it is possible to account for the reading τοῖς ἀδικήσας on the supposition that ἁγίοις fell out accidentally because of homoeoteleuton, the Committee regarded the shorter reading as original because (a) the expression

\[ \text{τοῖς ἁγίοις} \]

occurs nowhere else in Paul; (b) the probability of the accidental omission of ἁγίοις is not so great as the probability of its being added from ἁγίῳ in the previous verse; and (c) the weight of the external testimony supporting the shorter reading (K A B D* F G 33 104 181 218 330 1311 1611 1836 1908 1912 2005 2127) is slightly superior to that which supports the longer text. The reading τοῖς ἁγίοις (1884 1985 Theophylact) is secondary, having arisen from an oversight in transcription.

5.28 ὁμολ. (A)

Through the influence of liturgical usage, most witnesses add ὁμολογοῦσα (A B D* K L P 431 436 1311 1836 1907 2005 \( \text{it}^\text{b} \) \( \text{syri}^\text{a} \) \( \text{cop}^\text{b} \) \( \text{eth} \) \( \text{a} \)) Ambrosiaster Ephraem Pelagius Cassiodorus) is slightly superior to that which supports the longer text. The reading τοῖς ἁγίοις (1884 1985 Theophylact) is secondary, having arisen from an oversight in transcription.
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4.4 καθὼς καὶ περιμετρεῖτε (A)

The reading καθὼς καὶ περιμετρεῖτε is lacking in D* K L \( \Psi \) 177 206 257 623 917 1175 1518 1739 syri (and the Textus Receptus), having been dropped either accidentally (through confusion with the earlier καθὼς clause) or deliberately (as seemingly superfluous).

External testimony supporting the clause is strong (N A B D* F G \( \Psi \) 33 104 181 218 330 1311 1611 1836 1906 1912 2005 2127 \( \text{it}^\text{b} \) \( \text{vg} \) \( \text{syri}^\text{a} \) \( \text{cop}^\text{b} \) \( \text{eth} \) arm \text{eth} \( \text{a} \)); internal considerations likewise favor the presence of the clause, for ἀπὸ περιμετρήσεως presupposes the earlier mention of the Thessalonians having begun the Christian life, but such a beginning is not implied in the preceding text without καθὼς καὶ περιμετρεῖτε.

4.5 έχετε

Although the construction is harsh (literally, “You have no need to write to you”) the reading έχετε is not only well supported (N* A D* K L most minuscules syri \( \text{cop}^\text{b} \) \( \text{eth} \) Origen John-Damascus Theodoret Euthalius) but accounts for the rise of the other readings as scribal alleviations of the irregularity: ἔχομεν (N* D* F G \( \Psi \) 88 104 142 216 424 927 1311 1611 1739 2005 \( \text{it}^\text{b} \) \( \text{vg} \) \( \text{syri}^\text{a} \) \( \text{cop}^\text{b} \) \( \text{eth} \)); εἴχομεν (B \( \text{vg}^\text{a} \)); and έχετε γράφεσθαι (H 81 257 424 1319 1518 1837 2127).

4.11 (ἵδαις) (C)

It is difficult to decide whether ἵδαις is a gloss, added for the sake of symmetry with τὰ τῶν earlier in the sentence, or whether it accidentally fell out in transcription (ὙΛΙΣΙΔΙΑΙΣ). In view of the balance of these considerations, the Committee decided to retain the word in the text but to enclose it within square brackets.

4.13 ἐκμιμηθήκατε

The text is somewhat doubtful, external testimony being divided between κοιμωμένων, which is supported by Alexandrian witnesses (N A B 33 326), and κοιμημένων, supported by Western and Byzantine witnesses (D F G K L \( \Psi \) 88 104 257 623 915 1245 1518 2005 Hippolytus Cyril-Jerusalem) and adopted by the Textus Receptus. The Committee preferred the former reading, because it is found in the older manuscripts, and because it is more likely to have been altered into κοιμημένων than conversely, the latter being the usual expression (cf. Mt 27.52; 1 Cor 15.20).

4.17 οἱ περιελήφθησαν (A)

By some accidental oversight, several Western witnesses (F G \( \text{it}^\text{b} \) \( \text{pol} \) \( \text{cop}^\text{b} \) \( \text{a} \)) omit οἱ περιελήφθησαν.

5.4 κλέτας (A)

Footnotes

\footnote{For a fuller discussion of the variants, see Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, pp. 230–33.}
The Second Letter Of Paul To The Thessalonians

1.2 τιτρόν, ημών καὶ κυρίου (C)

The clause with ἀντι occurs in all the Pauline letters except 1 Thessalonians, and except in Ga 1.3, where the evidence is divided, ημών always stands after τιτρόν. In the present verse it is difficult to decide whether the pronoun was present originally but was later omitted by copyists for stylistic reasons (cf. ver. 1.1 τιτρόν, ημών), or whether, the word originally absent, was later added by copyists in imitation of the stereotyped formula. In order to represent the balance of probabilities, a majority of the Committee decided to include the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets. The sub-singular readings of συρβαμομαι and copαμομαι are doubtless intra-verbal variants.

2.3 ἀνομίας (B)

Did the apostle write “man of sin,” as most witnesses read, or “man of lawlessness,” as Ν B 81 88, 1739 copαμομαι arm Marcion Tertullian and others attest? Despite the broader external testimony supporting ἀνομίας (witnesses from each of three text-types: A, D G it vg; K L P most minuscules), on the whole it appears that the early Alexandrian witnesses preserve the original reading, ἀνομίας, a word rarely used by Paul, which was altered by copyists to the much more frequently used word, ἀνομίας. Furthermore, γὰρ ἀνομίας in ver. 7 seems to presuppose ἀνομίας here.

2.4 καθίσας (A)

The interpretative gloss ὃς ἥμων is inserted before καθίσας by a great number of the later witnesses (D* G K L most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus), while a few other witnesses (1964 1965 Theophylact) add it after καθίσας. The shorter text is strongly supported by early and diversified witnessa (Ν A B D* Ψ 33 330 1739 it vg syrσομαι goth arm eth Marcion αι).

2.8 Τοῦτος (C)

The Textus Receptus, with B D* K 88 614 1739 Byz Lect copαμομαι αι, omits Τοῦτος. On the other hand, the word is present in a wide variety of Greek and versional witnesses (Ν A D* G Ψ 33 1241 it vg syrσομαι arm eth αι). It is difficult to decide whether the word is an addition introduced by pious scribes (vgσομαι read Τοῦτος Χριστός), or was omitted either accidently (οἱκετέοι) or intentionally (to bring the quotation more nearly into accord with ls 11.4). In order to represent the balance of probabilities the Committee decided to retain the word, but to enclose it within square brackets.

2.13 ἀπαρχὴν (B)

Although the reading ἀπαρχὴν is strongly supported (Ν D K L Ψ most minuscules Πσ ε. κ. μ. συρσομαι arm eth αι), the Committee preferred ἀπαρχὴν (B F G P 33 81 1739 vg syrσομαι αι) because (α) ἀπαρχὴν occurs nowhere else in the Pauline corpus (πρὸς τῶν αἰώνων is used in 1 Cor 2.7 and ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων in Col 1.26 to express the idea “from eternity”; (β) except for Php 4.15, ἀρχὴν in Paul always means “power”; (γ) ἀπαρχὴν occurs six other places in Paul (though in five of them it is with a qualifying genitive); and (δ) elsewhere copyists took offense at ἀπαρχὴν and altered it to ἀπαρχή (Ro 14.4 K 336 1918, and Ro 16.5 D*) even though the latter expression is inappropriate in these passages. One manuscript (88) emphasizes the middle voice of ἔλθεν by reading ευκοπάτο ἀπαρχής.

2.16 ὃς ἢ διὰ ταῦτα

Struck by the unusual expression ὃς ἢ διὰ ταῦτα ἡμῶν, copyists have altered ὃς παρὰ (om. Ν B D* F G 33 431 442 1311) to the more familiar Pauline expression (Α D K L Ψ 6 81 104 326 917 it vg syrσομαι goth). Since the article before παρὰ, a word rarely used by Paul, which was altered by copyists to the much more frequently used word, παρά, is lacking in B D* K L 33 αι, a majority of the Committee thought it wise to enclose it within square brackets, thus indicating a doubt as to its right to be included in the text.

3.6 περὶ λαβώσας (B)

The reading that seems best to explain the origin of the others is παριλαβώσας (Ν* A (D* ελαβώσας) 33 88 1827 1845 2005 Basil), whose dialectic termination was corrected later to παριλαμβάνει (Ν* D* K L P 81 104 326 917 it vg σομαι goth). Since the article before παρὰ is lacking in B D* K L 33 αι, a majority of the Committee thought it wise to enclose it within square brackets, thus indicating a doubt as to its right to be included in the text.

3.8 νικῶς καὶ ημέρας

A majority of the Committee preferred the reading with the genitives (supported by Ν B F G 33 81 104 255 256 263 442 1611 1845 1908 2005), which is in conformity with Paul’s usage in 1 Th 2.9 and 3.10. The reading with the accusatives (supported by A D K L P most minuscules) appears to be a heightening of the apostle’s statement, by emphasizing the duration of his labors (“throughout night and day”).

3.16 ἐκρήψα (A)
In several witnesses, chiefly Western (A* D* F G 33 76 it d, g, 61, 86 vg Ambrosiaster Chrysostom), the reading τρόπος, which is strongly supported by R A’ B D*’ K P 9 81 614 1739 Byz Lect syh, *cop etc. al, is replaced by τόπος, a more usual expression, in conformity with 1 Cor 1.2; 2 Cor 2.14; 1 Th 1.6; 1 Tm 2.8.

3.18 ομίλια [A]

The liturgical ομίλια has been introduced by copyists into most witnesses; those that have resisted include B 6 33 328 424 462 1739 1836 vg mss cop sa, bomss arm Ambrosiaster Athanasius Pelagius.

3.18 Subscription

(a) The subscription in KA B 33 is πρὸς θεοσκοποῦντας. Other subscriptions include: (b) πρὸς θεοσκοποῦντας ἐπὶ πληρόθη; (c) ἔπειτάσθη (Qet F) πρὸς θεοσκοποῦντας F G; (d) πρὸς θεοσκοποῦντας ἐγέρθη ἀπὸ Άγιον Α’ Β’ Κ’ Π’ 31 101 1908 1927 al, followed by the Textus Receptus (with δευτέρα for α'); (e) πρὸς ἐαν ἀποστόλου Παύλου πρὸς θεοσκοποῦντας δευτέρα: ἐγέρθη ἀπὸ 'Αγίου Λ'; (f) πρὸς θεοσκοποῦντας δευτέρας (sic) ἐπιστολῆς [sofw|/] ἐγέρθη ἀπὸ 'Αγίου Ἡσαΐα Παύλου καὶ Σιλαουσίου καὶ Τιμόθεου cop βυζ] Euthalius

Footnotes

1 According to Henry St John Thackeray, “these forms in οὐκ εἰσόχθησον are exceedingly frequent in LXX, being distributed over all the translations (excepting [1–2 Kg, 1–2 Chr]) from the Hexateuch to 2 Esdras” (A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint, 1 [Cambridge, 1909], p. 213); cf. also Moulton-Howard, p. 209.

The First Letter Of Paul To Timothy

1.1 ἐπιταγή [A]

Instead of καὶ ἐπιταγή, Codex Sinaiticus reads κατ’ ἐπιταγήν, a variant not suitable to the context; it may have arisen inadvertently from the scribe’s recollecting 2 Tm 1.1.

1.4 ἐκςετήριος [B]

Instead of ἐκςετήριος, a hapax legomenon in the New Testament, several witnesses, chiefly Western (D F G and many minuscules), read the more familiar word ζήτητηριος. The meaning of the two words is essentially the same.

1.4 αὐθοικομία [A]

The Western αὐθοικομία (D* syh) is the easier reading, but αὐθοικομία, supported by the overwhelming weight of witnesses, gives a deeper meaning.

1.15 πιστὸς [A]

Instead of πιστὸς several Latin witnesses (μ. n. Ambrosiaster mss to Jerome Augustine Julian-Edianum Vigilius), perhaps recollecting a similar reading at 3.1, introduce humanus (= ἀνθρώπινος). (See also the comment on 3.1.)

1.17 ἀφθάρτου ἁπειροῦ [A]

Instead of ἀφθάρτου, several Western witnesses (D* 2 lat sy) read ἁπαντησόμενος, and others (F G) add ἁπαντησόμενος after ἀφθάρτου ἁπειροῦ.

1.17 μόνον

After μόνον the Textus Receptus inserts ὅσοι, with N* D* K L P most minuscules syh goth. The word is no doubt a scribal gloss derived from Ro 16.27; the shorter reading is strongly supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (N* A D* F G H* 33 1739 it d, g, 61, 86 vg mss cop etc. arm etc arab).

2.1 Παρακαλεῖ [A]

In place of Παρακαλεῖ, several Western witnesses (D* F G) it 61, 86 vg mss have the imperative Παρακαλέσομαι, which is obviously a scribal modification intended to give the sentence the form of a specific command to Timothy.

2.7 λέγω [A]
Recollecting Paul’s declaration in Ro 9.1, ἐλήλυσεν λέγω ἐν Χριστῷ many witnesses (X D’ H K 614 1241 Byz it”® goth a), followed by the Textus Receptus, have added ἐν Χριστῷ. The emergence of the shorter reading, which is well supported by X A D’ G P 81 629 1739 it”® vg syr h® cop® eth, cannot be adequately explained on the supposition that the longer reading was original. Because of scribal inadvertence several other variant readings occur in various minuscule manuscripts.

3.1 πυτός (A)

The origin of the variant reading ἐλθφύψις ὤ λόγος ("is a human saying," i.e. "a common [popular] saying"), supported by several Western witnesses (D’ it”® Ambrosiaster ms”®”® Augustine Speculum Sedulius Scotos), is puzzling. If the evidence were confined to Latin witnesses (as is the case for the similar variant at 1.15), the translation humanus could be taken as a very free rendering of πυτός (hum. = benignus), but this leaves unexplained the origin of the reading in D’ (the theory that the Greek text of this manuscript was influenced by the Latin translation is disputable).

Perhaps the Greek text arose accidentally when a copyist mistook πυτός for λόγος and mistakenly resolved it as διηρθψίς; or (as H. B. Swete proposed) perhaps the translator (or copyist) confused πυτός, standing at the beginning of a line, with λόγος, and considered it to be the final syllables of ἐλθφύψις; or perhaps a copyist, taking the designation πυτός ὤ λόγος to be a formula that introduces a following statement and observing how ill-suited the expression is to introduce ver. 3b, deliberately substituted ἐλθφύψις for πυτός. In any case, the Committee was impressed by the over-whelming weight and variety of witnesses that support πυτός, and thought it improbable that πυτός was introduced as a substitute for ἐλθφύψις by copyists who recalled the expression πυτός ὤ λόγος at 4.5 2 Tim 2.15; and 5.3.8, where the text is firm. In Titus the words cannot be a formula introducing a quotation, but must be taken as a formula of asseveration, relating to what precedes. In the present passage, likewise, πυτός may be taken with 2.15.

3.3 πλήκτρα

After πλήκτρα the Textus Receptus, as well as many minuscules, inserts μὴ αἰεχροκρηδῆ. The words are gloss derived from Ti 1.7 and are not present in X A D F G K L P 5 33 38 104 181 218 263 323 424 436 442 460 462 618 623 635 920 1149 1738 1827 1837 1838 1906® 1944 2004 2125 it”® vg syr® cop® eth® goth arm eth al.

3.16 ὃς (A)

The reading which, on the basis of external evidence and transcriptional probability, best explains the rise of the others is ὃς. It is supported by the earliest and best uncialis (X A ms”® C”® G”) as well as by 33 365 442 2127 syr® cop® eth® Origen® Epiphanius Jerome Theodore Euthérius acc. to Theodoret Cyril Cyril acc. to Ps-Oecumenius Liberatus. Furthermore, since the neuter relative pronoun ὃ must have arisen as a scribal correction of ὃς (to bring the relative into concord with μιμητικόν), the witnesses that read ὃ (D”® it”® vg Ambrosiaster Marius Victorinus Hilary Pelagius Augustine) also indirectly presuppose ὃς as the earlier reading. The Textus Receptus reads θης, with X (this corrector is of the twelfth century) A”® C”® D’ K L P 81 330 614 1739 Byz Lect Gregory-Nyssa Didymus Chrysostom Theodoret Euthalius and later Fathers. Thus, no uncial (in the first hand) earlier than the eighth or ninth century (Ψ) supports θης; all ancient versions presuppose ὃς or ὃ; and no patristic writer prior to the last third of the fourth century testifies to the reading θης. The reading ὃς arose either (a) accidentally, through the misreading of ὃ as θῆς or (b) deliberately, either to supply a substantive for the following six verbs, or, with less probability, to provide greater dogmatic precision.

4.10 ἄγνωστος ζητεθα (C)

It is difficult to decide between ἄγνωστος ζητεθα, which is supported by X D L P most minuscules it vg cop® eth® Origen Ambrosiaster al. and ἄγνωστος ζητεθα, which is read by X A C F G”® K 81 33 104 326 442 915 1175 1245 1518 1611 1874 al. A majority of the Committee preferred the latter, partly because it has slightly better attestation and partly because it seems better suited to the context.

4.12 ἐγάπη

Perhaps under the influence of Col 1.8, after ἐγάπη the Textus Receptus inserts ἐν πνεύματι with K L P most minuscules John-Damascus Theodoret. The shorter reading is strongly supported by the best representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western text-types (X A C D F G 33 104 it”® vg syr® cop® eth® goth arm eth).

5.16 πυτός (B)

Instead of πυτός (X A C F G”® P 33 81 1739 1881 it”® vg cop® eth® al) the Textus Receptus reads πυτὸς ἃς πυτή with D K L Ψ most minuscules it”® vg syr® cop® al. While it is possible that πυτὸς ἃς was omitted accidentally through an oversight in copying, a majority of the Committee, observing that the shorter reading is somewhat better attested than the longer reading, regarded the latter as a natural expansion made by copyists who, in light of ver. 4, felt that a restriction of the principle of this verse to Christian women was unfair. The reading πυτὸς ἃς is confined to versions and may be merely translational in origin.

5.18 τοῦ μιμητοῦ (A)

The original hand of codex Sinaiticus reads τῆς τροφῆς, no doubt from having recollected Mt 10.10.

5.19 ἐκτὸς ἐλ μὴ ἐτι ὄν ἡ ἑαυτῶν μαρτύρων
These words, found in all extant manuscripts of the passage, were absent from some Latin manuscripts known to Jerome, and perhaps also from the copies used by Cyprian and Ambrosiaster, who quote no farther than ἰππάλαγος.

The reading προοιμίαται, which is attested by several witnesses, chiefly Western (N* 1912 it vg arm Cyprian Ambrosiaster Lucifer Pelagius Theodore), appears to be a scribal correction for the more difficult reading προοιμίαται, which is adequately supported by the rest of the witnesses.

After the Textus Receptus adds ἡ νύμφη with D (D* om. τῇ) K L most minuscules if* syrh*- at. The shorter reading, which is supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (A A F G P 33 424 6.13 if* vg cop* arm eth a), was expanded by copyists who recollected the reference to “the living God” in 3.19 or 4.10.

The Textus Receptus, with D* K L P 614 1241 Byz Lect cop* Chrysostom al, reads αἰωνίου, a manifest correction for the less usual αἰωνίας, which is supported by the better witnesses of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (A A F G P 33 81 104 1739 it vg syrh*- cop*- arm eth Ambrosiaster a). A few witnesses (69 1175) present the conflated reading αἰωνίου αἰωνίας (or ἀιωνίας αἰωνίου 296 467).

The reading of the Textus Receptus, ἡ χάρις μεθ' ἰμαντῶν, which is supported by D* K L Ψ nearly all minuscules if* syrh*- cop* arm eth Theodoret al, seems to be a correction introduced as being more appropriate in a letter addressed to an individual than μεθ' ἰμαντῶν. The latter reading, which occurs also in 2 Tim 4.9.22 and Tit 3.15 (where a few witnesses have the singular number of the pronoun), is adequately supported by N* A F G* 33 81 1311 if* cop* (2.19). Apparently through inadvertence, several versionsal and patristic witnesses lack the concluding benediction altogether (cop* Chrysostom Speculum Euthalius cop*). The liturgical ἱμαντή, which has been attached to the benediction in most witnesses, is not an original part of the letter, being absent from the earliest representatives of both the Alexandrian and Western types of text (N* A F G* P 33 81 1311 1881 if* cop* arm eth a).

The subscription in A 33 460 a' is: τῆς Τιμόθεου ἐφ' (or πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐφ' 460 a). Other subscriptions include the following: (b) πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐπιμέλεια D; (c) ἐπιμέλεια ἐπιστολὴ: Τιμόθεου ἐπ' G; (d) πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐγραφή ἀπό Λουκιασία A 241

cop* (e) πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐγραφή ἀπό Νικοπόλεως P 102; (f) πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐπιμέλεια πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐπιστολὴ Λουκιασίας cop*; (g) ἐπιμέλεια ἐπιστολῆς Λουκιασίας cop*.
The Second Letter Of Paul To Timothy

1.11 καὶ διδασκάλως (B)

Although the overwhelming mass of witnesses (all except Ν* A I 33 1175 syr*), read ἐν τῷ Ιωάννῃ, the Committee regarded the word as a gloss introduced by copyists from the parallel passage in 1 Tim 2.7, there being no good reason to account for its omission if it were original here.

2.3 συμμακαντάθησαν

The Textus Receptus, following C* D* K L most minuscules syr* goth Chrysostom Euthalius Theodoret John-Damascus, reads ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ κακοπαθήσει. Probably the beginning of ver. 1 gave occasion for the alteration, which was also recommended by the lack of any word to which the prefixed preposition refers. Even the occurrence in some manuscripts (D* E*) of the reading συμμακαντάθησαν for συμμακαντήσεις is an indication that συμμακαντάθησαν is original.

2.14 θεοῦ (B)

It is difficult to decide between ἐν τῷ θεῷ and ἐν ἀγίῳ τοῦ κυρίου, both of which are supported by weighty evidence. A majority of the Committee preferred the former reading, which is in harmony with 4.1 and 1 Tim 5.4 and 21. The reading Ἐρυθαίος (206 429 1758) obviously presupposes an earlier κυρίου.

2.18 τήν ἀνέστασαν (C)

In view of the variety of ways in which copyists might have interpreted, or misinterpreted, the significance of the author’s reference to ἀνέστασαν, the Committee thought it best, because of nearly overwhelming textual support, to include τήν in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets in order to indicate the possibility that Ν G 048 33 Cyril may correctly represent the original in omitting the word.

3.8 Ἰώνινς καὶ Μαμβρίης

Instead of Ἰώνινς, Βιοτοςu* Euthalius* read Ἰωάννης, and instead of Μαμβρίης certain Western witnesses (F G it* vg goth Cyprian Hippolytus Lucifer Ambrosiaster Augustine Ps-Augustine a) read Μαμβρίης, which in Jewish tradition is a parallel form of the name. 4

3.11 ἐν Ἰσραήλ

Before ἐν Ἰσραήλ the copyist of 181 includes a not very intelligent gloss: ἡ δὲ τὴν Θεόλαν ἔπιθεν ("the things which he [should be] suffered on account of Thecla [in Iconium].")

3.14 εἰς τὸν (B)

In order to magnify the apostle Paul’s role as Timothy’s instructor, the plural was changed to the singular.

3.16 καὶ

Because the word καὶ seems to disturb the construction, it is omitted in several versions and Fathers (vg* syr* cop* Origen* Hilary Ambrosiaster Primasius).

4.1 καὶ τὴν ἐπαφέας (B)

Instead of καὶ, which involves the more difficult construction, the Textus Receptus substitutes the easier κατά, with C* D* K L P* most minuscules syr* cop* goth arm eth al. The reading adopted for the text is amply supported by representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (Ν* A C D* F G 33 424 1739 2495 it* ei* vg cop* a*).

4.8 νόος

Although copyists not infrequently added "all" in order to heighten the account, a majority of the Committee was of the opinion that in the present instance the word is too widely supported in diverse textual traditions to be regarded as a scribal insertion, and interpreted its absence from several witnesses, chiefly Western (D* 424* 1739* 1881 it* ei* vg syr* Ambrosiaster Ambrose Augustine Primasius), as the result of an oversight in transcription.

4.10 Ἐλατίας (A)

The reading Ἐλατίας, which is strongly supported by a diversity of Eastern and Western witnesses (A D F G K L P* it* Byz Lech* it* it* it* it* vg cop* it* it* Eus biography), appears to be the original text, which in some witnesses, chiefly Alexandrian (Ν* C 81 104 326 436 vg cop* it* Eusebius Epiphanius), was altered to Ἐλατίας, either accidentally (the second ά being read as ά, with the consequent suppression of the τ), or deliberately (by copyists who took it to mean Gaul, which in the early centuries of the Christian era was commonly called Ἐλατίας).

4.19 Ἀκρίλας

After Ἀκρίλας two minuscules (181 and 460, of the eleventh and thirteenth centuries respectively) insert Ἀκρίλας τῆς γυναίκες αὐτοῦ καὶ Σάμου (Σαμος 460) καὶ Σάμου τῆς γυναίκος αὐτοῦ. Since, according to the apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla (§ 2), these are
the names of the wife and the children of Onesiphorus, the gloss was evidently written first in the margin and later introduced into the text at the wrong place (giving Aquila two wives!).

4.22 κύριος (B)

Three forms of text are current: (a) the shortest is ὁ κύριος μετὰ τοῦ πνεύματος σου, read by Ν¹ F⁴ G 33 1739 itf; (b) several witnesses expand by including Ἰησοῦς after κύριος (A 102 104 1245); and (c) the full formulation ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός occurs in Ν¹ C D K L P 52 6 81 257 326 917 2138 itf vg syr (= our Lord...). John-Damascus Ambrosiaster Chrysostom Euthalius Theodoretst.

In the expectation that a letter as late as 2 Timothy would have the fullest formulation, one would be tempted to explain the shorter readings as due to accidental omissions. Such omissions of the sacred name(s), however, are rare, and it is far more probable that the original reading is that preserved by the joint testimony of Alexandrian (Ν¹ 33) and Western (F⁴ G itf) witnesses, supported as well by 1739.

4.22 ἢ χάρις μεθ' ἡμῶν. (A)

Of the eight forms of the final sentence of the letter, that attested by Ν¹ A C G 33 81 1881 appears to be superior on the score of external evidence and transcriptional probability. The substitution of the first person plural pronoun ἡμῶν (460 1908 1984 cop⁶⁰⁶⁰ Chrysostom a) is perhaps merely an orthographic variant, arising from the circumstance that in late Greek υ and η were pronounced alike. The substitution of σου for the plural pronoun in several versions (syr⁵ cop⁶⁰⁶⁰ arm John-Damascus Ambrosiaster Chrysostom Euthalius Theodoret) may have been prompted by σου in the preceding sentence, or by the seeming unsuitability of the plural pronoun in a letter addressed to an individual (cf. also the similar variant reading in 1 Tim 6.21). The reading οὐράριον εἰν εἰρήνην of several Western witnesses (D⁴ itf⁵) combines the usual farewell greeting of Hellenistic letters with the Jewish-Christian expression εἰν εἰρήνην. The addition of the liturgical ἁμαρτία (Ν¹ D⁴ K P 52 itf⁵ syr⁵ cop⁶⁰⁶⁰)
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eth⁶⁰⁶⁰ a) is natural; its deliberate omission, supposing that it were present originally, is most unlikely in such diversified witnesses as Ν¹ A C G 33 81 1881 itf cop⁶⁰⁶⁰ eth⁶⁰⁶⁰ Ambrosiaster. In a scattering of witnesses (330 cop⁶⁰⁶⁰ eth⁶⁰⁶⁰ Ambrosiaster Pelagius Ps-Jerome) the entire sentence is lacking, probably because it was felt to be superfluous after the preceding sentence.

4.22 Subscription

(a) The subscription in Ν¹ C 33 is πρὸς Τιμόθεου. Other subscriptions include the following: (b) πρὸς Τιμόθεου δεύτερυ 90 at (c) πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐπιπλησθείς D; (d) ἐκλεσθεῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεου F G; (e) πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐγραφὴ ἀπὸ Λουκανίας A; (f) πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἐγραφὴ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης P (g) as (f) plus ἀπὸ τὸ δευτέρου παρέστη Παύλος τῷ Καίσαρι Ρώμης Νέρωνς K; (h) τοῦ ἐγίνου ἀποστόλου Παύλου ἐπιστολή ἢ πρὸς Τιμόθεου τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα· ἐγραφὴ εἰς. as (h) L; (i) πρὸς Τιμόθεου δεύτερυ, τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονηθέντα, ἐγραφὴ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης, ὡς ἐκ δευτέρου παρέστη Παύλος τῷ Καίσαρι Νέρωνς Textus Receptus.

Footnotes


2 Among the very occasional instances of the accidental omission of nomina sacra are the absence of Ἰησοῦς after κύριος in L at Col 3.17, and the reading ἢ ὁ κύριος in B at 1 Cor 11.23, which has been mechanically conformed to the preceding ἢ πρὸς τοῦ κύριου.
The Letter Of Paul To Titus

1.4 χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη (A)

The typically Pauline epistolary salutation, χάρις καὶ εἰρήνη, is strongly supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (K C D G P Ψ it vg). The insertion of ἔλαχις (A C K 81 614 Byz Lect al) and the Textus Receptus seems to be an emendation prompted by the analogy of the threefold salutation in 1 Tm 1.2 and 2 Tm 1.2. Other minor fluctuations, such as the insertion of ἢμιν (33) or σοι (cop3), are obviously scribal modifications.

1.6 ἐλέγχειν

After ἐλέγχειν a trilingual manuscript of the thirteenth century (no. 460, Greek with Latin and Arabic versions) adds ὥστε χραστοῦντες διάγνημα μηδὲ διακόναις αἰτίας ποιεῖν, μηδὲ γνωστὰς ἔχειν ἐκ διαγνήματος μηδὲ προαρρητίζωμαι ἐν τῷ θυσιαστήριῳ λειτουργίᾳ τῷ θεῷ, τοῖς ἁρχονταῖς τοῖς ἀδικοφέρτας καὶ ἁρπαγμαῖς καὶ φεύσεσαι καὶ ἀκελάσσασαι ἔλεγχε ὡς θεοῦ δίκαιον ("Do not appoint those who have married twice or make them deacons, and do not take wives in a second marriage; let them not come to serve the Deity at the altar. As God’s servant reprove the rulers who are unjust judges and robbers and liars and unmerciful"). (See also the comment on ver. 11.)

1.10 πολλοὶ [καὶ] (C)

It is difficult to decide whether καὶ was added in accordance with the rhetorical usage known as hendiatys, or whether it was omitted by copyists who, not appreciating such usage, deleted it both as unnecessary and as apparently disturbing to the sense. A majority of the Committee preferred to follow the testimony of D G I K Ψ 1739 it ἡ ἐν Syriac al, which read καὶ, but to enclose the word within square brackets in view of its absence from such weighty authorities as A C 33 81 it ς64 syrψ, h cop3 ς64 al

1.11 χάριν

After χάριν a trilingual manuscript 460 (see also the comment on ver. 8) adds τὰ τέκνα αἱ τοὺς ἄδικος γονεῖς ὑψόζοντες ἡ τέσσαρες ἐπιτάχθησαν καὶ ἔλεγχε καὶ καθίσεις ὡς πεθή τέκνα ("The children who abuse or strike their parents you must check and reprove and admonish as a father his children").

2.6 οἰκουμηνοῖς

Instead of the word οἰκουμηνοῖς (N* D* H L P most minuscules most Fathers, followed by the Textus Receptus), which occurs frequently in classical Greek, Ν* A C D* F G I 133 177 330 623 Clement of Rome read οἰκουμηνοῖς, which occurs elsewhere only in Soranus, a medical writer of the second century A.D. A majority of the Committee preferred the latter reading because of superior external support, and because it was regarded more probable that an unusual word should have been altered by copyists to a well-known word, than vice versa.

The text may be punctuated with or without a comma after οἰκουμηνοῖς.

2.7 ἀθανασίαν

The Committee preferred the reading ἀθανασίαν ("incorruption") because it is supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and Western types of text (A C D* 33 it, and because its rarity explains the origin of the other readings: ἀθανασίαν ("freedom from envy") 32 F* G* 88 915 cop3, ἀθανασίαν ("sincerity") N* D* L most minuscules arm (followed by the Textus Receptus), and ἀθανασίαν ("indifference") 35* 205 1905 Theodoret3). The last reading is an obvious transcriptional error; all four words are hapax legomena in the New Testament.

3.1 ἀγαθοίς (B)

After ἀγαθοῖς the Textus Receptus adds καί, following the later uncials (D* K P) as well as most of the minuscules, versions, and Fathers. The more difficult asyndetic construction is supported by the best witnesses of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (K A C D* it it it vg). Influence from 3.1 ἀγαθοίς (or its phonetic equivalent, ἀγαθὸς) is supported by A C K L P 075 0142 most minuscules it (or its phonetic equivalent, ἀγαθὸς) is supported by A C K L P 075 0142 most minuscules it vg Speculum al, which read καί, but not to enclose the word within square brackets in view of its absence from such weighty authorities as A C 33 81 it ς64 syrψ, h cop3 ς64 al

3.3 ἐρείποι (C)

On the one hand, from the point of view of transcriptional probability it is more likely that copyists would have altered ἐρείποι to ἐρέιπος, in agreement with the plurals before and after it, than vice versa. On the other hand, external evidence appears to favor the plural form; ἐρείπος (or its phonetic equivalent, ἐρείπος) is supported by A C K L P 075 0142 most minuscules it ἡ ἐν syrψ, h cop3 ς64, whereas ἐρείπος (or its phonetic equivalent ἐρείπος) is supported by K* D* F G * 999 arm eth al. A majority of the Committee preferred to be guided in its judgment by the weight of the external evidence (which includes all versions except the Ethiopic), especially since the context seems to call for a reference to a plurality of disagreements.

3.15 μετὰ πάντων ἤματιν. (A)

The impulse to identify the origin of ἤματιν, in the benediction prompted copyists to insert τοῦ κυρίου (D) or τοῦ θεοῦ (F G vg). Influence from 3.4.22 accounts for the substitution of μετὰ τοῦ πνευμάτος σου in 33, and for the addition ἀσκεῖ μετὰ τοῦ πνευμάτος σου in 81.
concluding ὁμολογίας is obviously secondary, for the word is absent in a variety of early and diverse witnesses (็นομολογίας A C D* 048 1739 1881 a), and the

... is obviously secondary, for the word is absent in a variety of early and diverse witnesses (A C D* 048 1739 1881 a), and the temptation for copyists to add the liturgical conclusion would be great.

3.15 Subscriptions

(a) The subscription in Ἡ 33 εθ is πρὸς Τίτων. Other subscriptions include the following: (b) πρὸς Τίτων ἐπιπλεονήσεις D; (c) ἐπιταύλη ἀπὸ Τίτων F G; (d) πρὸς Τίτων ἐγγράφη απὸ Νικοπόλεως A P arab; (e) πρὸς Τίτων τῆς Κρήτης ὕκτορις τρόπων ἐπίσκοπου χειροτονηθέντα ἐγγράφη απὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας Κ 101 1908 1927, followed by the Textus Receptus; (f) Παύλου ἐπιπλεονήσεις (κ. τοῦ ἀγίου ἐπίσκοπου Παύλου) ἐπιταύλη ἀπὸ Τίτων τῆς Κρήτης (κ. Κρήτης) ὕκτορις τρόπων ἐπίσκοπου χειροτονηθέντα ἐγγράφη απὸ Νικοπόλεως τῆς Μακεδονίας Η Λ 462; (g) as (d) ποὺ τῆς Μακεδονίας Ευθαλίου ο. (h) To Titus it was finished, it was written in Nicopolis and he sent it by Artemas his disciple, cop
c; (i) Was finished the epistle to Titus, which was written from Nicopolis and was sent through Zina and Apollo, syr. (j) Was finished the epistle to Titus, who was the first bishop of the Church at Crete, which was written from Nicopolis of Macedonia, syr
c.

The Letter Of Paul To Philemon

ver. 2 τῇ ἀδελφῇ (A)

A preponderance of ancient and diversified witnesses (نحن A D* F G P 048 33 81 1739 1881 a) supports ἀδελφῇ. Furthermore, from a transcriptional point of view, it is more likely that ἀγαπητῷ was introduced (in D* and most minuscules) in conformity with the preceding ἀγαπητῷ (ver. 1) than that ἀδελφῇ was substituted in order to avoid repetition. A few copyists present both words (629 it syr)

ver. 5 ἐν ἑμῖν (B)

Instead of ἐν ἑμῖν the Textus Receptus reads ἐν ἑμῖν, strongly supported by Π X P G 33 1739 Byz ιτ in syr a cop
c, since it is more expressive and because, standing amid other pronouns of the second person singular and plural, ἑμῖν was more likely to be changed by copyists to ἑμῖν than vice versa.

ver. 9 προφήτης

Although the manuscripts support προφήτης ("an old man"), many commentators follow the conjecture of Bentley and others that προφήτης ("an ambassador") should be read (cf. Eph 6.20). J. B. Lightfoot supposed (Commentary, ad loc.) that in koine Greek προφήτης may have been written indifferently for προφήτης, for the two forms are interchanged by scribal confusion in the manuscripts of the Septuagint (cf. 2 Chr 32.31; 1 Macc 13.21; 14.21; 22; 2 Macc 11.34; cf. Ignatius, Smyr. 11; etc.). On the other hand, other Scholars deny that the context permits the meaning "an ambassador" (cf. Theodor Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament, vol. i, p. 457, note 6, and the commentaries of M. R. Vincent, Herrmann von Soden, M. Dibelius, and M. Meinertz).

ver. 12 ἐνέπνευσεν ὑμᾶς, αὐτὸν, τοῦτο ἐστι τῇ ἕματε σπλάγχνα (B)

The reading of Ν A 33, adopted for the text, best explains the origin of the other readings. In order to smooth the syntax, the verb ποιεῖται (from the Greek ποιεῖται) is introduced by copyists, either after σπλάγχνα (نة A C D K P Π 81 614 1739 Byz ιτ in syr a) or after αὐτῶν (048 330 451 2492 ιτ in arm a), or before αὐτῶν (69 431 462 in arm a). Likewise, the introduction of τῶν, either in place of ὑμᾶς (نة D* G* K P a) or in addition to it (C D* 048 88 a), is obviously a further scribal amelioration.

ver. 25 κυρίου (B)
The Letter To the Hebrews

In the manuscripts and versions of the New Testament the position of the Letter to the Hebrews varies widely. It follows (a) immediately after Romans in D* 390 103 455 1961 1977 1994 2104 2576 2685; (b) after 2 Corinthians in 1930 1978 1992 2000 2248; (c) after Galatians in an ancestor of codex Vaticanus; (d) after Ephesians in 606; (e) after 2 Thessalonians in A B C H K P 0150 0151; (f) after Titus in 1311 2183. Other editions, however, following the witnesses mentioned under (e), place it after Paul’s Letters to churches and before Hebrews, James, Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Jude, 2 Peter, and 1 John in 1241 (the manuscript breaks off with 1 John). Most printed editions of the Greek New Testament have followed the traditional sequence represented by (g), with Hebrews at the end of the Pauline canon. Other editions, however, following the witnesses mentioned under (e), place it after Paul’s Letters to churches and before Hebrews, James, Romans, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Jude, 2 Peter, and 1 John in 1241 (the manuscript breaks off with 1 John).
words οὐ θανάτου must be taken, not as a vocative (an interpretation that is preferred by most exegetes), but as the subject (or predicate nominative), an interpretation that is generally regarded as highly improbable. Even if one assumes that καί, which is absent from the Hebrew and the Septuagint of the Psalm, was inserted by the author with the set purpose of making two separate quotations, with ver. 8α in the second person and 8β in the third person, the strangeness of the shift in persons is only slightly reduced.

3.2 [ὁμοῦ] (C)

Both external evidence and transcriptional probabilities are singularly difficult to evaluate. On the one hand, ἀναθήματος is read by a wide variety of text types, but is suspect as having been conformed to the text of ver. 5 and/or of νῦν 12.17 LXX. On the other hand, several early and excellent witnesses (Q),[2,3] D* [joined by copia lum. Syr. al] lack ὁμοῦ, but the omission may be a deliberate (Alexandrian?) emendation, introduced in order to render the Old Testament quotation more appropriate to the argument (in ver. 2 “whole” disturbs the parallelism between Moses and Jesus). In the face of such a balance of possibilities, a majority of the Committee thought it best to include ὁμοῦ in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets in order to express doubt whether it belongs there.

3.3 οὗ (A)

The reading οὗ, which appears to be predominantly Western in character ([Q] D* 0121b 88 424[2,3] 1739 εἰς h. d. vg Lucifer Ambrose), is probably a scribal modification of οὐ̲, introduced perhaps for the sake of logical exactitude (Christians are God’s house, not Christ’s house). The reading οὗ is more than sufficiently supported by early and diversified witnesses (Q) D* A B C D* it K P v 33 81 εἰς vg h. d. copia lum. bo arm).

3.4 κατάσχεσαν (B)

After ἐλέεινα; the Textus Receptus adds μη/χρι τέλος βιβεῖων, with K A C D K P 33 81 629 1739 εἰς vg. It is probable, however, that the phrase is an interpolation from ver. 14, especially since not βιβεῖων but βιβεῖων is the gender that one would have expected the author to use, qualifying the nearer substantive αὐτὸς καθήμενα.

4.2 συνεκκεραμενοῦς (B)

Among the bewildering variety of readings preserved among the manuscripts (conveniently represented in the apparatus by the use of parentheses), the one that best explains the origin of the others is συνεκκεραμενοῦς. Supported by early and diverse testimony representing both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (Q) D* A B C D* εἰς (33) 81 1739 αὐτ., as the more difficult reading it would naturally have been altered to the easier nominative singular (K 57 (102) εἰς copia lum. Ephraem al).

4.3 εἰςορθογράφηκα γῆρ (A)

Among the connectives γῆρ is to be preferred both because of early and good external evidence (Q) D* B D K P v 33 614 εἰς vg copia lum. and because it suits the context. The reading οὗ (K A C
0121b 81 1739 cop (a), which is considerably less vigorous, was suggested by oùv in verses 1, 11, 14, and 16, which, however, are not parallel, for here oùv seems to have a resumptive sense (“well then”). The colorless ó (synch arm) probably represents a mere translational variant. The hortatory subjunctive, ēiνπρεψθήτε, which is quite inappropriate with the following óι τιμοῦμενς, arose as a secondary development in connection with the misinterpretation that produced oùv (A C d).

4.3 τήν (C)

The balance between the weight of evidence for and against the presence of τήν led the Committee to decide to retain the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

5.12 τίνος (C)

The Textus Receptus reads the interrogative τίνα (hence AV renders, “ye have need that one teach you again which [τίνα] be the first principles of the oracles of God”), with B D K 88 614 Byz Lect al. Since the earliest manuscripts are without accent marks, editors must decide on the basis of context which is the more appropriate form; here the Committee felt that the indefinite pronoun (τίνα) gives a sharper antithesis to εἰς τίνα ὀδύνησθαι in the preceding clause.

6.2 διδαχής (A)

Although the reading διδαχής, which is in apposition with θηματίων of ver. 1, is early (B 46 B ii), a majority of the Committee regarded it as a stylistic improvement introduced in order to avoid so many genitives. The reading διδαχής is strongly supported by good representatives of all the major types of text (K A C D1 K P 33 81 614 1739 Byz Lect ad).

6.3 ποιήσατεν (A)

The future tense ποιήσατεν is to be preferred on the basis of (a) the weight of external evidence (B 46 K B i 33 88 614 1739) as well as (b) its congruence with the following clause, “if God permits” (which is more appropriate with the future tense than with the exhortation “let us do this”). The reading ποιήσατεν (A C D1 P 38 81 ad), if it is not merely the result of an orthographic confusion between o and α, probably arose from mechanical conformation with θερμάθεις in ver. 1.

7.21 εἰς τὸν αἰώνα (A)

On the one hand, the omission of the phrase κατὰ τὴν τέχνην Μελχισεdarwin could be explained if the eye of the scribe wandered from κατὰ to the κατὰ that follows Μελχισεdarwin. On the other hand, many scribes would have felt the temptation to add the phrase here (from ver. 17). The Committee judged that the second possibility was much the stronger.

8.8 αἰτοῦσι (B)

The variation between αἰτοῦσι (N* A D* I K P 33 81 it vg cop ex bo syr h Origen a) and αἰτοῦσι (P 46 N* B D* 614 1739 Byz Lect ad) makes very little difference in sense, though the latter may be construed with either μεμφᾶνιν or λέγειν. Observing the direction in which scribal corrections moved, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading αἰτοῦσι.

8.11 λαλίτσα (A)

Instead of λαλίτσα, which is strongly supported by (P 16) N A B D K L most minuscules (b) synch arm, the Textus Receptus substitutes the more commonplace λαλίτσα, with P several minuscules (including 81) it h b. (synch arm) eth aL.

9.1 καί (C)

The evidence, evenly balanced for and against the presence of καί (it is read by N A D at), it is lacking in B 1739 ad, is represented by the Committee in retaining the word but enclosing it within square brackets.

9.2 ἐδῶ (A)

After ἐδῶ several witnesses (B cop ex eth aL) add καί τοῦ χρυσοῦ θηματίων, and in ver. 4 instead of χρυσοῦ ἔχουσι θηματίων καί, the same witnesses read only ἔχουσι. The transposition was obviously made in order to remove the difficulty concerning the author’s statement regarding the location of the golden altar of incense in the tabernacle.

9.10 ἡσυστημοῦσις, δικαιώματα (A)

The reading that best explains the origin of the other readings is ἡσυστημοῦσις, δικαιώματα, which is supported by early and good witnesses (including (P 16) N* A I P 33 81 1739 synch arm bo syr h Origen a). It is more probable that, in view of the preceding datives, δικαιώματα was changed into δικαιώματα, and joined to them by means of καί, than that καί δικαιώματα, if it were original, was altered, on account of the concluding word ἐπικεῖται, into δικαιώματα. The singular number δικαιώματα (D2 it) is a mere scribal oversight, and the reading ἡσυστημοῦσις καὶ δικαιώματα (N* B 451 2492), which has the appearance of being a conflation, provides no satisfactory sense.

9.11 γενεὰς ἡμῶν (B)

Although both readings are well supported, on the whole γενεὰς ἡμῶν appears to have superior attestation on the score of age and diversity of text type (P 16) B D* 1739 it h pat Origen a). The presence of the expression τῶν μελλόντων ἐγγονῶν in 10.1, where the text is firm, seems to have influenced抄ists here.

9.14 εἰμί (A)
It was no doubt to be expected that, confronted with the rather unexpected phrase πνευματος αἰωνίων, copyists would replace the adjective with ἀγίου, but there was no reason for their replacing ἁγίαν with αἰωνίον.

9.14 ἡμῶν (C)

The external evidence for the two readings ἡμῶν (A D* K P 1739* α) and ἡμῶν (K D* 33 81 1739* α) is rather evenly balanced. The former was preferred because the author uses the direct address only in the hortatory sections of his Epistle.

9.17 μήπως (A)

Instead of μήπως, three Greek manuscripts (N* D* 075* 666) read μὴ τότε, which then requires the reader to understand the sentence as a question (“… since it is not in force as long as the one who made it is alive, is it?”). In all three manuscripts, a later hand has changed τότε to ποτέ.

9.19 μόνον [καὶ τῶν ἀρξάμεν] (C)

Although the text without καὶ τῶν ἀρξάμεν is supported by an impressive combination of witnesses (P tâm. K L F 181 1241 1379 syr. h. Origen), a majority of the Committee thought it probable that the words had been omitted either accidentally (through homoeoteleuton) or deliberately (to conform the statement to Ex 24.5). Since, however, it is possible that the shorter reading may have been expanded by copyists in imitation of it, the Committee decided to enclose the words within square brackets in order to indicate a certain doubt that they belong there.

10.1 οὐκ ἀυτῆν (A)

The substitution of καὶ for οὐκ ἀυτῆν in the earliest known copy of the Epistle (P 666) has produced an interesting reading, but one that certainly cannot be original, for the construction of the sentence implies a contrast between κύριος and οὐκ. The other readings, supported by individual minuscule manuscripts and the Armenian version, are scribal (or translational) idiosyncrasies.

10.1 δύναται (B)

Although the reading δύναται (N A C D* P 33 81 α) is strongly supported, it appears to have been introduced by copyists who were influenced by τροφοφόρουσιν. After some hesitation, partly because of the presence of other variant readings in the same verse, the Committee preferred δύναται, which is supported by P 666 D* H K Ἡ τῆς 1739 αλ.

10.9 τοιχία

After τοιχία: the Textus Receptus adds ὁ θεὸς, with N L* 81 104 206 462 489 913 919 1739 2127 vg syr. h. arm eth. This addition, which is clearly a secondary assimilation to ver. 7 and/or to the Septuagint text of Ps 39.9, is absent from P 666 73 383 467 623 794 1319 2004 it syr. h. arm eth.

10.11 ἐρετικός (A)

The reading ἀρχιερετικός (A C P 88 614 syr. h. arm eth) appears to be a correction introduced by copyists who recalled 5.1 or 6.3. In any case, the reading ἐρετικός is well supported by early and diverse witnesses (P 666 33 81 1739 it syr. h. arm eth). Through transcriptional oversight the first iota was omitted, resulting in the reading ἐκείνος (P 666 104 Origen). Then, in order to improve the sense, copyists added a personal pronoun, either αὐτός.

10.34 δεδομένος (B)

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is ἐκείνος, which is supported by good representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text, as well as by several Eastern witnesses (A D* 33 81 1739 it syr. h. arm eth). Through transcriptional oversight the first iota was omitted, resulting in the reading ἐκείνος (P 666 104 Origen). Then, in order to improve the sense, copyists added a personal pronoun, either αὐτός.

10.38 δέκα τοὺς μαθητὰς μου ἔπειτα (B)

Influenced by the citation of the same Old Testament quotation in Ro 1.17 and Ga 3.11, where Paul omits the personal pronoun μου, P 666 and the majority of later witnesses (D* H* K P Ἡ τῆς 81 614 Byz Lect) followed by the Textus Receptus, omit the word here. But it undoubtedly belongs in the text, being strongly supported by early and reliable witnesses. The only question, however, is where it belongs, some (P 666 33 81 1241 1175 1739 1831 1875 it syr. h. arm eth) placing it after δέκατος, and others (D* 1518 1611 it syr. h. Eusebius) placing it after πᾶσιν τοῖς. (The same kind of variation occurs in the manuscripts of the Septuagint of Hab 2.4, where πᾶσιν τοῖς μου is read by N B Q W* [W is the Freer papyrus dating from the third century; W* deletes μου], whereas A and the minuscules of the Catena magna read δέκατος μου.) In view of the strong external support, the Committee preferred the reading δέκα τοὺς μαθητὰς μου.
After ver. 23, certain witnesses (chiefly Western) add the equivalent of a whole verse recounting an additional feat of Moses: "By faith Moses, when he was grown up, destroyed the Egyptian when he observed the humiliation of his brothers." The interpolation, which is read by D* 1827 ff. v.gr.* was probably inspired by Ac 7.24 and/or Ex 2.11-12.

11.37 ἐπιρρήματα (C)

The presence in most manuscripts of the rather general statement ἐπιρρήματα ("they were tempted") amid the author's enumeration of different kinds of violent death has long been regarded by commentators as strange and unexpected. Many have suggested that ἐπιρρήματα is the corruption of some other word more suitable to the context, or that it entered the text as the result of inadvertent scribal dittography of ἐπιρρήματα. Among the conjectural emendations of ἐπιρρήματα the following have been proposed (the name of the scholar who, it appears, first proposed it is enclosed within parentheses): ἐπὶρρήματα (Galatian), ἐπὶρρήματα (Lücke), ἐπὶρρήματα (Bezze, edd. 3, 4, 5), ἐπὶρρήματα (Junius and Piscator), ἐπιρρήματα (Sykes), all of which mean "they were burned"; ἐπὶρρήματα (Bezze, edd. 1, 2), "they were pierced" (cf. Luther’s "zers tochen") ἐπὶρρήματα (Faber), "they were mutilated"; ἐπὶρρήματα (le Moyne), "they were pierced through"; ἐπὶρρήματα (Bryant), "they were stabbed"; ἐπὶρρήματα (Wakefield), "they were impaled"; ἐπὶρρήματα (reported by Griesbach), "they were broken on the wheel"; and even ἐπὶρρήματα (Mathäi), "they were picked!"

Several singular readings in individual manuscripts are due to carelessness and/or to itacistic confusion: thus D* reads ἐπιρρήματα, ἐπὶρρήματα (sic), which stands for the aor. pass. ind. ἐπεραίσκομαι, and ms. 1923 reads ἐπιρρήματα, ἐπὶρρήματα, of which ἐπὶρρήματα is an itacistic spelling of ἐπιρρήματα ("they were burned").

With some hesitation, but partly on the strength of the uncertain position of ἐπιρρήματα in the witnesses (sometimes standing before ἐπιρρήματα, sometimes after it), the Committee decided to adopt the shorter reading preserved in ἔκθεσις 1241 1384 1641 1846 συρ" (cop. s.) Ιουλ. 38 Origer 1923 Eusebius Acacius Ephraem Jerome Socrates Ps-Augustine Theophylact, and to print only ἐπιρρήματα.

12.1 εὐπρήστασατο (A)

The reading εὐπρήστασατο ("easily distracting"), which occurs in 316 and 1739 (and perhaps lies behind it*), is either a palaeographical error or a deliberate modification of εὐπρήστασατο, which is supported by all the other known witnesses.

12.3 εἰς ζευγόν (C)
Although external evidence strongly favors either εἰς ἑαυτῶς (N* D* syr* Ethraem) or εἰς ἑαυτόν (Φ13-46 Π048 33 1739*)

Although the difficulty of making sense of the plural led a majority of the Committee to prefer the singular number, choosing εἰς ἑαυτόν as the least inadequately supported reading (A P 104 326 1241 John-Damascus). Several versions handle the passage freely, it reading in vsbvs and cop* arm omitting the phrase entirely.

[The plural is the qualitatively best supported and the more difficult (though meaningful) reading, and the one more likely to be altered. A.W.]

12.18 ψηλαφομένη (B)

External evidence strongly supports the reading ψηλαφομένη without ὃς εἰς (Ψ13-46 Α C 048 33 (81) vg syr* cop* arm ανθ). Moreover, the diversity of position of ὃς εἰς in the witnesses that read the word (it stands before ψηλαφομένη in 69 255 462 syr*, and after it in D* K P Π 88 614 1739 Byz Lect) suggests that it is a scribal gloss derived from ver. 22.

13.18 δι' αὐτόν (οὖν) (C)

Although most witnesses include οὖν (N* Α C D* K 056 0121b 0142 81 88 614 1739 most minuscules vg syr* cop*, arm ανθ), it is absent from several early and important witnesses (Ψ13-46 Ν* D* Π P (ανθ) syr*,). It is difficult to decide whether copyists added the word, which seems to be needed at this point, or whether it was accidentally omitted in transcription (ὑγιεύομενα [--]). In order to reflect the balance of probabilities a majority of the Committee decided to include the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets.

13.21 παντεί αἰγήθη (Α)

After παντεί the Textus Receptus, in company with C D* K M P almost all minuscules and syr* ι* cop* arm ανθ, adds ἤγγικα, an obvious homiletic gloss. If the word had been present originally, no good reason can account for its absence from Ψ13-46 Ν* D* Π P (ι* syr*, ν* ι* cop* arm ανθ). The singular reading παντεί ἤγγικα καὶ λόγῳ ἁγιάνθη, in codex A, is from 2 Th 2.17.

13.21 ποιών (Α)

Although the reading αὐτός ποιών is strongly attested (N* A C 33* 81 1739* cop*), the Committee was disposed to regard the unintelligible pronoun as a diglotth of the preceding αὐτός (as also αὐτός in Ψ13-46). The reading αὐτός ποιών (451 2492 ἤν Ψ) may be a homiletic expansion. The shorter reading ποιών, which was preferred by the Committee, is supported by Ν* D* K P Π 88 614 1739* Byz Lect* vg syr* ι* cop* arm ανθ.

13.21 ἴμην (Α)

In view of the preceding ἴμην it is easy to understand why ἴμην, which is strongly supported by Ψ13-46 Α D* K M 33 81 614 1739* cop* arm ανθ was altered to ἴμην (Π Π 88 ι* ι* ι* vg syr* ανθ ανθ).

13.21 τῶν αἰώνων (Γ)

The phrase εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας τῶν αἰώνων, which occurs only here in the Epistle to the Hebrews, is attested in all manuscripts in 1 Tim 1.17. It is difficult to decide whether copyists, influenced by familiarity with the Hebrews, is attested in all manuscripts in 1 Tim 1.17, and in eleven of its twelve occurrences in Revelation. In the doxologies in Ga 1.5 Phil 4.20, 1Pe 4.11, 5.11; and 2Pe 1.9 the words τῶν αἰώνων are omitted by several (mostly later) manuscripts. In He 5.6; 6.20; 7.17, and 21 (all quoting Ps 110.4 (= LXX 109.4)) we find the short form τῶν αἰώνων, as also in 2 Cor 9.5 (where F G K 1739 expand by adding τῶν αἰώνων) and 1Pe 3.22. None of these instances of the short form occurs in a doxology. A quasi-doxology in He 13.8 reads εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, with no variations (except the addition of ἐμοί in D* ι*).

In view of these data it is difficult to decide whether copyists, influenced by familiarity with the longer form in doxologies elsewhere in the New Testament as well as in current liturgical usage, added τῶν αἰώνων (N A C* K P 33 81 614 1739* cop* arm ανθ) on the whole the Committee was disposed to prefer the shorter text as original, yet because of the weight of such witnesses as N A C* 33 614 1739 ανθ was decided to retain the words τῶν αἰώνων, but to enclose them within square brackets as an indication that they might well be a gloss.

13.26 πάντων ἱμών. (Α)

The later liturgical use of the concluding words ("Grace be with all of you") must have made it difficult for scribes not to add ἱμών when copying the epistle. Several important witnesses, however, including Ψ13-46 Ν* D* εις 33 vg* cop* arm ανθ, have resisted the intrusion. Instead of ἱμών ms. 1241 reads ἱματιών, and D* reads ἱμένων.

13.25 Subscription (Α)

(a) The subscription in N C 33 is πρὸς Ἐβραίους. Other subscriptions include the following: (b) πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἑγερθεὶς ἀπὸ τὸν Ἰωάννην A E I; (c) πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἑγέρθηκε ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου P; 1908; (d) πρὸς Ἐβραίους ἑγερθεὶς ἀπὸ τῆς Παύλου 460 Euthalida* add τῆς Ἐβραίους Β ΘΜ 102 460 1923 Euthalida*; followed by the Textus Receptus: (e) η θ θ; (f) Ἐβραίους ἑγερθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου 425 464 431; (g) η Ἐβραίους ἑγερθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου 404 425 431; (h) μ Παύλου ἑγερθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου 1911; (i) Ἐβραίους ἑγερθεὶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου 104 104.


Hebrews in the Canon of the New Testament,* Harvard Theological Review, XXIX (1936), pp. 133–151, with many valuable additions supplied through the kindness of Kurt Aland from the files of the Institute for New Testament Text Research at Münster. For information concerning evidence from early canonical lists and patristic writers, see the article by Hatch.

Although in codex Vaticanus Hebrews follows 2 Thessalonians, the chapter numbers in that manuscript disclose that in an ancestor it occupied a position after Galatians. The chapter numeration of the Pauline Letters begins with Romans and runs continuously through 2 Thessalonians. The Letter to the Galatians concludes with the 58th chapter, whereas the next Epistle, that to the Ephesians, begins with the 70th chapter, and then the numbers continue regularly through Philippians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, ending with the 93rd chapter. Following 2 Thessalonians (as was mentioned above) stands Hebrews, which begins with the 59th chapter, and proceeds with the 60th, 61st, 62nd, 63rd, and 64th chapters, as far as He 9.14, where the manuscript breaks off, the remaining part being lost. Doubtless there were originally eleven chapters in Hebrews (59 to 69). It is clear, therefore, from the sequence of chapter divisions that in an ancestor of codex Vaticanus Hebrews stood after Galatians and before Ephesians, and that the scribe of Vaticanus copied mechanically the chapter numbers even though they no longer were appropriate after Galatians.

The evidence can be set forth as follows: the phrase τοῦ ἰδίου τις δικαιόμενος is followed by (a) δικαιόμενον Κ A B 33 81 917 1175 1836 Ἰ εὐβ θρ θρ θρ θρ 0121 424' 1739 cop* at (b) δικαιότατον (ὁ κύριος) ΔF 1.12 He 9.14

“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever, and the scepter of righteousness is the scepter of thy kingdom.”

“God is thy throne (or, Thy throne is God) for ever and ever, and the scepter of righteousness is the scepter of his [i.e. God’s] kingdom.”

“Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever,’ and ‘the scepter of righteousness is the scepter of his kingdom.’”

See also G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles*, 1953, p. 163.

According to H. D. F. Spinks, the papyrus reads ἄποστικατενει: see Wordsworth and White, *Novum Testamentum*, Part 2, fasc. vii (Oxford, 1941), p. 743, where a variety of Latin evidence is also cited.


Commentators who prefer to take the words (with or without στοιχεῖον) as divine include E. Riggenbach, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Leipzig, 1913), pp. 356 ff.; O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Göttingen, 1949), p. 262; and F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids, 1964), p. 302.
witnesses (K P² 814 Byz syr [74] al). The reading adopted as the text is strongly supported by both Alexandrian and Western witnesses (N* B C 81) 1739 it² vg al).

1.27 ἀποστολὴν ἵππων τηρεῖ

Instead of the text that is supported by the overwhelming bulk of the witnesses, ἅ[

2.3 ἐκεῖ ἢ κάθω (B)

The reading which, in the opinion of a majority of the Committee, best explains the origin of the others is that supported by A C* 33 81 614 630 2495 vg syr P h 644 it²(74) 945 1241 1739:

where ὥκεν creates a better parallelism and expresses explicitly what is otherwise implied – namely, that the place ὑπὸ τοῦ ἄρπονδαν ὅμι is thought of as nearer the speaker than the place indicated by the command στήθη ἐκεῖ. Not recognizing this, B and several other witnesses (including 1739)
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transposed ἐκεῖ so as to produce a parallelism of two (rather than three) references to places.

2.19 εἰς ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς (B)

Among the several readings the chief difference turns on the presence or absence of the article: B 614 630 1875 2412 2495 α' read εἰς ἐστίν θεὸς (“There is one God”); compare εἰς ἐστιν θεὸς 945 1241 1739 α', and the singular reading of Π, whereas the other readings involve ὁ θεὸς standing either before or after the verb (“God is one”). The reading εἰς ἐστιν θεὸς (C 33 [74] 81 syr P h) and still more the reading εἰς ἐστιν θεὸς can be suspected of having been assimilated to the style of the Christian kerygma 1 Cor 8.6, Eph 4.6, 1 Th 2.5. On the other hand εἰς ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς (佇[74] Ν Α 945 1241 1739 omit ὁ) 2464 vg syr² cop²α [74] is in conformity with the prevailing formula of Jewish orthodoxy. Clearly secondary is the reading of the Textus Receptus, ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἐστιν (K* 049 056 0142 88 436 Byz Lect al), in which ὁ θεὸς is placed first in order to give it a more emphatic position.

2.20 ἄργη (B)

Instead of ἄργη the Textus Receptus reads νεκρῆ, with Ν A C² P Π P² 1641 1241 Byz Lect syr² cop²α α'. Since there is considerable suspicion that scribes may have introduced the latter word from either ver. 17 or 26, the Committee preferred ἄργη, which not only is strongly supported by B C² 322 323 945 1739 it² vg cop²α α', but may also involve a subtle play on words (ἄργην ἄργη [ἀ ν ἄργη]). The singular error of Φ² α [κεφή] was suggested by the preceding κεφή.

2.25 αὐγγέλας (A)

So that readers would not mistakenly understand ἄγγελος as “angels,” various witnesses (C L 945 1241 1739 α') replaced it with κατακόκκους (“spies,” also found in He 11.31) or added τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (81 syr² α*).

Page 611

3.3 εἰ ὁ θεός (C)

The tautological confusion between εἰ and ὁ being extremely common, it is possible that a copyist wrote ὁ θεός but meant εἰ ὁ θεός, or vice versa (see Moulton-Howard, Grammar, pp. 76 ff.). The editor must therefore choose the reading that, in his judgment, is most appropriate in the context. Accordingly, a majority of the Committee preferred εἰ ὁ θεός as the more difficult reading, and explained the reason of ὁ θεός partly as the result of tautism and partly in harmonization with لَهُ in verses 4 and 5. The Textus Receptus assimilates to لَهُ, with 36 483 1874 1877.

3.8 ἀπατήτατος (B)

Instead of characterizing the tongue as a “restless (ἀπατήτατος) evil (Ν A B K P 1739 α')
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other witnesses of somewhat less weight (C Π and most minuscules) describe it as an “uncontrollable (ἀπατήτατος) evil. Since the latter involves a more commonplace description, it probably arose through scribal adjustment.

3.9 κύριου (A)

Instead of κύριου, the Textus Receptus reads θεοῦ, with K L most of the minuscules vg syr² cop²[74] α'. The reading κύριου is to be preferred (a) because the combination “Lord and Father” is unusual (it occurs nowhere else in the Bible) and would more likely be changed to “God and Father” than vice versa, and (b) because the external evidence supporting κύριου is decidedly superior (Ν A B C P 33 623 1739 1852 it² vg syr² cop²[74] arm α').

3.12 οἴστε ἄλληκαν (B)

Many witnesses, including Ν C² K P 049 056 0142 81 104 1739 it² vg syr² with cop²[74] α', add oίστε before the negative. Since, however, it was natural for copyists to add such a word to enhance the comparison, and since it is absent from such early and important witnesses as A B C² 88 2492 syr² cop²[74] arm, the Committee preferred

the shorter reading. Still less likely to be original is the expansion in the Textus Receptus, which after oίστε continues οἴσχειν τὴν ἄλληκαν καί, with K (P) 049 056 0142 104 614 917.

4.4 μοιχαλίδας (A)

In scriptural imagery, μοιχαλίς (“adulteress”) is used figuratively of Israel as the unfaithful spouse of Jehovah (cf. Ps 73.27, Is 54.6; Jr 3.20, Eze 16 and 23; Ho 9.1; and similarly in the New Testament Mt 12.25, 16.4, Mk 8.30). When copyists, however, understood the word here in its literal sense, they were puzzled why only women were mentioned and therefore considered it
right to add a reference to men as well. The shorter reading is strongly testified by both Alexandrian and Western witnesses (N^* A B 33 81 1241 1739 it^* vg syr^* cop^* al arm eth).

4.12 (B) (1) (C)

Because manuscript evidence for and against the inclusion of ο before γνωσθήσεται is rather evenly balanced, with no compelling considerations arising from either palaeography or syntax, the Committee retained the article but enclosed it within square brackets.

4.14 τοῦ τῆς αἰρέων (B)

Of the several readings, τοῦ τῆς αἰρέων, though supported by several good witnesses (A P 33 81 1739 al), is suspect as a scribal assimilation to Pr 27.1; and, in view of a certain tendency of B to omit the article, the reading τοῦ τῆς αἰρέων cannot be confidently regarded as original. The remaining reading, τοῦ τῆς αἰρέων, is supported by a wide diversity of witnesses (N K P Y most minuscules vg syr^* arm al).

4.14 τοῖς (B)

Although the reading with γῆρ is widespread (N^* K^2 A K L P Y 049 056 most minuscules vg syr^* cop^* al), the connective appears to have been inserted (perhaps under the influence of the following clause) in order to prevent ambiguity (τοῖς may introduce an independent question, or may depend upon ἐπίστωσθε). The reading τοῖς is adequately supported by N^* B 614 it^* syr^* cop^* arm eth^*.

4.14 ἄρμα γῆρ ἔσται ή (C)

The connective γῆρ, seeming to interrupt the sense after the preceding question, was omitted in A 33 al. Although several important witnesses (including B and 1739) lack the article, the Committee considered it more probable that scribes would have accidentally omitted ή than added it. Since in later Greek al and ή were pronounced alike, either ἔσται or ἔσται may have originated through itacistic corruption of the other; the evidence for the two together far outweighs that supporting ἐσται. As between the second person ἔσται and the third person ἔσται, not only does external evidence on the whole favor the former reading, but it is probable that copyists would tend to prefer the third person in the reply to a question. The omission of ἄρμα γῆρ ἔσται in N seems to be the result of accidental oversight on the part of the scribe.

5.4 ἀποστερέμεθα (A)

The manuscripts present three readings, ἀποστερέμεθα (N B^*) and two forms of ἀποστερήσε, the perfect tense, ἀποστερέμεθα (A B P Y al), and the present tense, ἀποστερήσε (K L al). A majority of the Committee preferred to read ἀποστερέμεθα.

[The earliest reading appears to be the rare word ἀποστερέμεθα, which copyists emended to a more familiar word. B.M.M.]

5.7 λάβῃ (B)

Since the reading λάβῃ πρόμαχον καὶ δήμῳ, which is strongly supported by representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (N^* B 048 1739 vg cop^*), was ambiguous, copyists added what was regarded as an appropriate noun. Thus, in accord with the consistent usage of the Septuagint, λάβων is read by A K L P Y most minuscules syr^* al. Several other witnesses (N 255 398 1175 it^* syr^* al) Cassiodorus Antiochus), perhaps not being acquainted with the climate of Palestine and the great importance of the early and the late rain, introduce καρπόν from the previous clause, thus implying that the subject of λάβῃ is “he,” i.e., the farmer.

5.14 τοῦ κυρίου (A)

The reading τοῦ κυρίου is supported by the broadest spectrum of witnesses, whereas the omission of τοῦ by A Ψ 81 al, and of τοῦ κυρίου by B, probably arose through inadvertence in transcription. The readings Ποιόν Χριστοῦ (B) and τοῦ κυρίου Ἡρώδου (135) are scribal glosses.

5.16 εὐχέσθαι

Not counting the present passage, εὐχέσθαι occurs in the New Testament six times; προσευχόμεθα occurs 85 times. Although προσευχόμεθα appears four other times in this chapter without noteworthy variation among the witnesses, in the present passage the Committee preferred to follow Ν K Ψ 056 0142 and most minuscules, which read εὐχέσθαι, and regarded προσευχόμεθα, found in A B (προςευχόμεθα) 048 al and a few minuscules, as the result of scribal conformation to the customary Christian usage.

5.20 γυναῖκας ἑτέρ (B)

The reading γυναῖκας, read by B 69 1505 1518 2495 syr^* eth, appears to be an amelioration, having been introduced either in order to conform to the address (ἀδελφοί μου, ver.
5.20 αὐτῶν ἐκ θανάτου (C)

The reading that seems best able to account for the origin of the others is ψυχήν αὐτῶν ἐκ θανάτου, which is well supported by important witnesses (N A 33 vg). Perplexed by the ambiguity of ψυχήν αὐτῶν (is it the soul of the converter or of the converted?), scribes either (a) transferred αὐτῶν to follow ἐκ θανάτου (“from death itself” B 614 1108 1611 1852 2138 εὐκ) or (b) omitted it entirely (K L ℓ 049 056 0142 most minuscules).

[The reading of 74 B al seems preferable. Non-recognition of the intensive use of αὐτός could explain the omission or transposition. In this position, also, omission might easily be accidental in some witnesses. A.W.]

5.20 ἀμαρτιῶν.

After ἀμαρτιῶν several of the later witnesses (181 378 614 1765 1898 syr) add ἀμην, and one (330) adds ὅτι αὐτῷ ἐδόθη ἐκ τῶν ἁμῶν ἀμην.

Footnotes

1 The present tense “dwelleth” of the margin of the ASV, as well as the text of the AV and sixteenth century English versions, is derived by understanding the aorist κατώκησα (literally, “he dwelt”) in the sense “has taken up [his] dwelling.” For another interpretation of the verse see Johann Michl, “Der Spruch Jakobusbrief 4, 5,” in Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid, ed. J. Blinzler et al. (Regensburg, 1963), pp. 167–174.
Between verses 19 and 20 several Latin witnesses (vg* Bede) insert the equivalent of another verse: *ipse ergo qui et praecognitus est ante constitutionem mundi et novissimo tempore natus et passus est ipse accepit gloria semper possidet sine initio manens in patre* (“He himself therefore, who was also known before the foundation of the world and at the last time was born and suffered, received the glory that God the Word always possessed, abiding without beginning in the Father”).

1.21 πιστοῖς

A majority of the Committee preferred the more striking expression *πιστοῖς*, preserved in A B 398 vg, and regarded *πιστοῖς* (read by the overwhelming mass of witnesses) and *πιστοίς*, 33 af as scribal assimilations to much more commonplace ways of expressing the idea.

1.22 ἀληθείας [A]

After ἀληθείας the Textus Receptus, following the later uncials (K P 049 056 0142) and most minuscules, omits *eiv* ὀν ἀνθρώπῳ. These words, whose absence from such early and good witnesses as ὶτο* N A B C ὶ’ 33 1739 α’ cannot easily be explained if they were present originally, appear to be a theological expansion introduced by a copyst. In the West several Old Latin manuscripts and the Vulgate replaced ἀληθείας with *cancatis* (“charity”), and one witness (Speculum) expanded with *fidei per spiritum* (“faith through the Spirit”).

1.22 εἰκ [καθαράς] καρδίας (C)

On the strength of ὶτο* N C 81 614, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading εἰκ καθαράς καρδίας, but, in view of the absence of the adjective from A B vg, thought it best to enclose καθαράς within square brackets. The singular reading καρδίας ἀληθείας (*K*) may have arisen through confusion with the following ἀληθής:

1.23 μένοντας

After μένοντας the Textus Receptus, in company with K L P most minuscules vg syri* eth, adds εἰς ὁν ἀνθρώπῳ. The phrase, which is an intrusion from ver. 25, is absent from a wide variety of representative types of text (quotelev* N A B C 33 322 323 424* 436 618 1739 1852 2138 vg* syri* cop* arm Didymus Cyril Jerome).

1.24 αὐτῆς

Instead of αὐτῆς (quotelev* N* -το* N’ A B C 206 614 1739 1873 2298 vg syri* cox arm Origen Didymus), the Textus Receptus, following the later uncials (K L P ὶ’) and most minuscules, substitutes ἀνθρώπου, thus assimilating the quotation to the Septuagint text of Is 40.6.

2.1 εἰς σωτηρίαν

The Textus Receptus, following L and most minuscules, omits εἰς σωτηρίαν either through an oversight in copying (κικ⋯κικ) or because the idea of “growing into salvation” was theoretically unacceptable.

2.2 εἰς (B)

The reading εἰς, supported by early representatives of the Alexandrian type of text (יישוב* N* A B, improved stylistically in later witnesses by using the more subtle εἰς πρὸ (N* C K P ὶ’ 81 614 1739 syri*), which among New Testament authors occurs only in Paul.

2.3 εἰς

The Textus Receptus, along with the later uncials (K L P) and most minuscules, omits εἰς, probably because its presence seemed to imply that the Christians were not already priests (compare ver. 5). Its right to be in the text is strongly attested by *_PROD N* A B C 5 88 307 322 323 424* 436 441 467 623 915 1739 1852 Origen Eusebius Cyril al.

2.19 χάρις (B)

In order to identify more precisely the idea conveyed by χάρις, scribes have added various supplements, παρά τῷ θεῷ in C ὶ’ 33 omit τῷ) 1793 al, θεῷ in 2464, and θεῷ in 623.

2.19 θοῦ (B)

The difficulty of interpreting the expression διὰ σωτήριος θεοῦ, a collocation that occurs only here in the New Testament, prompted copyists to introduce one or another alleviation. In accord with *Ac 23.1; 1 Tm 1.5*; 1 Tm 1.5, 19 some witnesses (C 94 208 322 323 424* 614 915 1175 1518 1739 2298 vg syri* arm Didymus Cyril Jerome) by *mss* 72 α* C 81 614 1739 2298 syri* (A* ὶ’ 33) and σωτηρίου θεοῦ (澨* 81). The reading θεοῦ is strongly supported by N A* B K L P most minuscules vg cop* arm eth John-Damascus.

2.21 γὰρ (A)

The reading γὰρ, which is strongly supported by * PROD N A B C 81 614 1739 81 2298 vg syri* cop* arm Didymus Cyril Jerome), the Textus Receptus, following the later uncials (K L P ὶ’) and most minuscules, substitutes ἀνθρώπου, thus assimilating the quotation to the Septuagint text of Is 40.6.

2.21 ἐκ (A)

Instead of ἐκ (澨* N” -το” N’ A B C 206 614 1739 1873 2298 vg syri* cox arm Origen Didymus), the Textus Receptus, following the later uncials (K L P ὶ’) and most minuscules, substitutes ἀνθρώπου, thus assimilating the quotation to the Septuagint text of Is 40.6.

2.21 ἐκ (A)
Both external evidence and transcriptional probabilities join in favoring \( \text{εἰς ἡμᾶς} \) as the original reading. Supported by representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (𝔓⁵⁲ Ν A B C 81 \( \text{III} \) ἐςς syr.), the reading was altered by copyists either because of carelessness (having confused \( \epsilon \) and \( \eta \), which were pronounced alike), or because reference to the work of Christ as an example to the readers alone seemed to be too limited.

The external evidence for each reading is fairly evenly balanced ( veteris, Ν A B 1505 2464 at; \( \text{κακοποίω} \) C ἐςς and most minuscules), but in transcription the tendency to change to the neuter form was very natural in view of the word πρόφατα immediately preceding.

The weight of external evidence is rather evenly balanced for and against the presence of the familiar expression (κύριοι τῶν θεοῦ) replacing the less usual expression (κύριοι τῶν Χριστοῦ). The omission of τῶν Χριστοῦ in the patristic treatise de Promissionibus attributed to Quadratus must be due to accidental oversight on the part of either translator or copyist.

Although the shorter reading καταλαλείπει is supported chiefly by Egyptian (Alexandrian) witnesses, including \( \text{𝔓⁵² Π} \) 614 copᵃ⁽ᵃ⁾ Clement, it is to be preferred on transcriptional grounds, for recollection of the writer’s earlier statement ώς καταλαλείποις (ἑςς \( \text{κακοποίω} \)) undoubtedly prompted copyists to modify the shorter reading by adding \( \text{ὡς κακοποίω} \) (syrᵃ⁽ᵃ⁾ copᵇ⁽ᵇ⁾) or by altering the person of the verb and adding θεοῦ (vg arm (Spectulum)) or θεοῦ (ὡς κακοποίω) (Ἀ C Κ Π Ο 049 33 81 \( \text{Lect} \) syrᵇ⁽ᵇ⁾ corᵇ⁽ᵇ⁾ arm Cyprian).

The bewildering diversity of readings can be listed in connection with the variation involving the accompanying verb. Followed by ἐπέθυκα the variants are:

(a) περὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐπέθυκα Β Ρ 049 056 0142 326² 330 451 1877 2127 Byz \( \text{Lect Ps-Oecumenius} \).
(b) ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀμαρτημάτων 326².
(c) ὑπὲρ ἀμαρτημάτων 2 241 242 325 337 460 489 2492.

Followed by ἐπέθυκα the variants are:

(a) περὶ ἀμαρτημάτων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν \( \text{𝔓⁵² Β} \) 206 429 441 1241 arm.
(b) εἰς ἡμῶν ἀμαρτημάτων 326².
(c) ὑπὸ ἄμαρτημον 33 88 322 323 436 614 630 945 1739 1881 2412² corᵇ⁽ᵇ⁾ eth Didymus.
(d) περὶ ἡμῶν ὑπὸ ἀμαρτημάτων Ρ².
(e) περὶ ἄμαρτημαν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Νᵃ⁽ⁿ⁾ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων \( \text{𝔓²} \) 33 88 322 323 436 614 630 945 1739 1881 2412² corᵇ⁽ᵇ⁾ eth Didymus.
(f) περὶ ἄμαρτημαν ὑπὸ ἄμαρτημον Ρ².
(g) περὶ ἄμαρτημαν ἡμῶν \( \text{𝔓²} \) 5 629 2298 ἐςς corᵃ⁽ᵃ⁾ Cyprian.
(h) ὑπὸ ἀμαρτημάτων Didymus.
While acknowledging the difficulty of ascertaining the original text, a majority of the
Committee preferred the reading peri. amartiw/n e;paqen because (a) this verb, which is a
favorite of the author (it occurs elsewhere in 1 Peter eleven times), carries on the thought of ver.
17, whereas amartiw/n (which occurs nowhere else in the epistle) abruptly introduces a new
idea; (b) in view of the presence of the expression peri. amartiw/n scribes would be more likely
to substitute διακόσμημα for e;paqen than vice versa; and (c) the readings with ἐπάνω or ἀπάνω (which
in later Greek had the same pronunciation) are natural and, indeed, expected scribal expansions.

3.18 ἐπάνω (C)

The Committee was inclined to prefer ἐπάνω (P B P Y syr v*) arm to ἐπάνω (K*) (R*
accidentally omits the pronoun) A C K 81 614 1739 vg syr* vg* cop* bo* Clement), because copists
would have been more likely to alter the second person to the first person (as more inclusive)
than vice versa.

3.19 ἐπάνω (A)

Several scholars have advocated the conjunctive emendation that introduces the subject
“Enoch” (ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ). Instead of improving the intelligibility of the passage (as a conjuncted
reading ought to do), the word ἐπάνω breaks the continuity of the argument by introducing an
abrupt and unexpected change of subject from that of ver. 18.

3.20 ἐπάνω (A)

Despite the difficulty of construing ἐπάνω, the Committee felt obliged to accept it as the text, (a)
because it is strongly and widely supported by N* A B C K P τ 33 81 614 1739 Byz ιδρυτις vg arm Cyprian Origen* al, and (b) because the other
readings are obvious ameliorations of the difficulty, some witnesses (P Β Π τ 255 436 eth) having
omitted the word, and others having substituted for it either ϕ (69 206 216 241 630 1518) or ὅς (cop* Augustine*).

3.22 ἀπάνω

After θεός most manuscripts of the Vulgate insert deglutitios mortem ut vitae aeternae
haeredes efficercemur (“swallowing up death that we might be made heirs of eternal life”). As
suggested by the use of the present participle deglutitios in the sense of the past tense, it is
probable that the addition is a translation of a Greek gloss, which, according to Harnack’s
reconstruction, may have read καταπίων των κληρών, ἐνεχοντων καθάρειαν κατακόρυφον
83).

4.1 παράδοτος (A)

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is παράδοτος, which is strongly
supported by P Β Π τ 330 1739 ιδρυτις vg cop* al. In order to express the idea more fully some

copists added ἐπάνω ἑπάνω (so the Textus Receptus, following N* A K P τ 33 81 614 Byz Lect syr*
arm eth al) while others added ἐπάνω ἑπάνω (K 1505 2495 syr* al). Had either of the latter
readings been the original, no adequate reason can account for the absence of the prepositional
phrase from the best representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text.

4.14 ἀπάνω καὶ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (A)

After ἀπάνω a considerable number of witnesses, some of them early, read καὶ ἄνευτος.
The words are suitable to the context, but their absence in such diversified witnesses as P Β τ 049 330 Tertullian Ephraem Cyril Fulgentius al, and the fact

that those that have the addition present it in somewhat different forms, sufficiently condemn all of
them as homiletic supplements to the original text.

5.2 ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ (A)

It is difficult to decide whether one should follow the authority of such important witnesses as
N* B al and regard the inclusion of ἐν οἴκῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ in P* K A and most other witnesses as an
exegetical expansion (made perhaps in accordance with 5.245), or whether the shorter text is the
result of deliberate excision; prompted either by stylistic considerations (namely, that after
ποιμνίῳ the word is redundant) or by ecclesiastical conviction (namely, that Peter could never
have admonished presbyters [ver. 5] to exercise the function of bishops). In order to represent the
balance of external evidence and of transcriptional probabilities, the Committee decided to
include the word (which tallies very well with the author’s fondness for participles), but to enclose
it within square brackets to indicate a certain doubt that it belongs in the text. The phrase καὶ τοῦ
θεοῦ, which is read by a variety of witnesses representing several text types (P Β Π τ 33 81 1739 ιδρυτις vg syr* cop* arm eth (Speculum)), is omitted by B K τ most minuscules syr*, perhaps
because copyists found difficulty in understanding its precise import (i.e. “according to [the will of] God”).

5.3 μὴ ἀλλά ἐκκλησίαις τῶν κληρῶν ἄλλα τύπα γενόμενα τοῦ ποιμνίου (A)
Because of some unaccountable quirk in transmission, this verse is lacking in codex Vaticanus.

5.6 καυρῷ (A)

After καυρῷ the Textus Receptus adds ἐπισκοπῆς, with A P (א) 5 28' 33 104 181 326 436 623 913 1827 1898 vg syr harm cop φ eth Ephraem Bede. The word, which is absent from Ῥ Ῥ Ῥ 1 K 1206 most minuscules syr cursus cop φ φ Origen, appears to be a scribal addition derived from 2.12.

5.8 [τινὰς] καταπέταλος (C)

After τινὰς there are three main variant readings: (a) τινὰς καταπέταλος ["seeking] someone to devour"; (b) τινὰς καταπέταλος ["seeking] whom he may devour"; and (c) καταπέταλος ["seeking] to devour." (The reading τινὰς καταπέταλος is a transcriptional error either for the infinitive, written καταπέταλος, or, by itacism, for the subjunctive.) On the one hand, it can be argued that (c), which is supported by B Φ Origen, is the original reading, and that the others are scribal attempts to alleviate the difficulty of the absolute use of καταπέταλος. On the other hand, it can be argued that the constancy of position of τινὰς (however accented) in the overwhelming bulk of the manuscripts makes it probable that it is original and that its absence from a few witnesses is the result of accidental oversight. In either case reading (b), which is supported by Ῥ Ἰ Φ 614 Byz most early versions (whose evidence, however, may count for little, being merely idiomatic), appears to be a secondary development, arising when the colorless indefinite τινὰς was taken as the interrogative τινὰς. In the light of such considerations a majority of the Committee voted to represent the divergent textual evidence by adopting the reading (a), which is supported by K (K P 049) 81 181 326 1739 cop φ Origen, but to enclose τινὰς within square brackets.

5.10 θύμα (A)

The Textus Receptus, following later Greek manuscripts, reads θύμα instead of θυμάς, the latter of which is supported by the overwhelming preponderance of evidence. In later Greek, the vowels θ and ú were pronounced alike, and it is altogether possible that some抄ists who wrote θυμάς intended to write θύμα.

5.10 τίνος Χρυσότις [Τηρῶν] (C)

A majority of the Committee was impressed by the support of Ῥ Ῥ and many other Greek, versional, and patristic witnesses reading Χρυσότις Τηρῶν, yet because Τηρῶν is absent from several important manuscripts (including K B 614), it was decided to enclose the word within square brackets, indicating doubt that it belongs in the text.

[In view of the tendency of scribes to add rather than omit sacred names, the shorter text is to be preferred. B.M.M.]

5.10 καταρτίσαι, στηρίξει, οὐκομήσει, θημελώσει (B)

Similarity of ending of the successive verbs accounts for the accidental omission of οὐκομήσει by Ῥ Ῥ and the ancestor of Ἰ and of θημελώσει by B Φ at. The replacement with optative forms (οὐκομήσει, θημελώσει) in several later witnesses (614 630 1505 2412 α) reflects scribal or editorial modification.

5.11 τὸ κράτος (B)

The variation of position of ἰς ὄνομα (before κράτος in K K P 049 056 0142 88 104 181 326 330 α; after κράτος in 33 81 614 630 945 1505 1739 1881 α), as well as its absence from such witnesses as Ῥ Ῥ A B Φ vg eth, can be explained best on the assumption that it is a later intrusion into the text, derived from 4.11. Other singular and sub-singular variants occur, derived from traditional doxologies.

5.11 εἰλικρίνεια (B)

Considering the almost universal tendency to expansion in doxologies, a majority of the Committee preferred the shorter reading, supported by Ῥ Ἰ B 36 307 1365m cop φ arm.

5.13 Ἐβαπτώσει (A)

Instead of Ἐβαπτώσει a few minuscules (474 1518 2138) read Ἡγάμη.

5.14 ἐγένετος (A)

Instead of ἐγένετος, the scribes of several minuscule manuscripts (436 1735 2464 α) read ἐγένετο, thus imitating the familiar Pauline expression διέγενον ἰματίαν (Ro 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Th 5:28); lectionary 422 combines both expressions, ἐγένετο ἰματίαν καὶ ἐγένετος.

5.14 Χρυσότις (A)

The Textus Receptus, along with K K P 81 614 1739 Ἰτῶν φυλήν cop φ arm adds θυμοῦ, and 629 substitutes κρῆνα ἴμμα. In view of the tendency of copyists to expand the sacred name, the Committee preferred to adopt the shorter text, supported by representatives of several types of text, including A B Ψ 334 307 1365m, 1441m Ῥ Ῥ vg syr harm cop φ[σερμος arm] epoθ (ὥς ὡς lacks the entire final clause).

5.14 omit ἰματίαν. (A)

Although most witnesses, as might be expected, conclude the epistle with ἰματίαν (including K K P 614 1739 Byz Ἰτῶν Ἰτῶν φυλῆν cop φ arm), what must have been a strong liturgical temptation to add the word was resisted by the copyists of A B Ψ 81 629 945 1241 1881 cop φ φ Ψ.
The substantive συγκληρονομός, being derived from an adjective of two terminations, is both masculine and feminine.


The Second Letter Of Peter

1.1 Σημεῖον (B)

The weight of external support for the two readings is almost equally divided (Σημεῖον Ν A K P 049 056 0142 1739 syripharm arm α; Σημεῖον Π - B Ψ 81 614 δ - vg syr cp arm eth al). The Committee was agreed that transcriptionally it is more likely that Σημεῖον is a correction of Συμεὼν than vice versa, since Σημεῖον is used of Peter in only one other passage in the New Testament (Ac 15.14).

1.2 τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰσραήλ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν (A)

Among the variety of readings here, the Committee chose what it regarded as the earliest and the origin of the other readings. The absence of τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ Ἰσραήλ in P Ψ and other witnesses can be accounted for by parablepsis, when the scribe’s eye passed from τοῦ to τοῦ. Other readings incorporate various amplifications reflecting the piety of copyists.

1.3 ἵνα δέξης καὶ ἀρέτης (B)

Although the reading of the Textus Receptus διὰ δέξεως καὶ ἀρετῆς is an exceedingly ancient reading (B C*, P C - arm), a majority of the Committee preferred ἵνα δέξης καὶ ἀρέτης (Ν A C P Ψ 33 81 614 1739 ip - vg syr cp arm (Speculum)) on the strength of the following considerations: (a) it is attested by a broad spectrum of witnesses, including all ancient versions; (b) the presence of several other instances of διὰ in the context makes it more likely that διὰ would have been written by mistake for ἵνα than vice versa; and (c) ἵνα is a favorite word with the author of 2 Peter, occurring six other times in three chapters.

1.4 σήμερον καὶ μέλλοντα ἡμῖν ἐπανηγγέλλετα

The order of words varies greatly:

- ισχια καὶ μέλλοντα ἡμῖν ἐπανηγγέλλετα
  - Π - 206 255 429 489 614 1611 1898 2143.
- ισχια καὶ μέλλοντα ἡμῖν ἐπ.
  - K L 0142 many minuscules.
- ἡμῖν καὶ μέλλοντα ἐπανηγγέλλετα
  - P (ἰσχια: A; ισχια: Ψ) 5 33 69 81 88 104 218

The reading that best explains the origin of the others appears to be (b). A desire to relate the pronoun more closely either to the verb or to τίμια resulted in reading (a) on the one hand, and readings (c) and (d) on the other. The sequence of μέλλοντα καὶ τίμια in (d) and (e) may have originated in an accidental or deliberate omission of τίμια καὶ and its later insertion from the margin. The readings ισχια of A and ισχια of Ψ have been confirmed to the following γενέτητι.

1.5 τῆς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν ἐπιθυμίᾳ φθοράς (B)

The earliest form of text appears to be that supported by A B al. Inasmuch as the verb ἀποφεύγειν, which is not used by any other New Testament author, properly takes the accusative case (as in 2.20 below), several witnesses read τὴν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἐπιθυμίᾳ (Π - Ν) and Π - also reads φθοράς.

1.6 ε在过渡 to δε (B)

By moving δε from following τοῦ to precede τοῦ (Ν Π Ψ C* 33 81 1739 al), the adverbial expression ε Переход to δε is divided in two. This reading, obviously faulty, is probably the origin of the reading in A (ε Переход δε).

1.10 στοιχεῖασεν ἑρμοίον ... ποιησάει (A)

After στοιχεῖασεν several witnesses, including Ν A Ψ 81 630 and the Latin, Syriac, and Coptic versions, replace the complementary infinitive construction (which occurs regularly in the New Testament after στοιχεῖασεν) with the i.e. construction; by a lapsus calami, however, at the close of the clause Ν A and a few other witnesses absentmindedly retain the infinitive instead of the subjunctive τούθηκε (which, by itacism, was pronounced like ποιησάει and ποιησάει). At the same time these witnesses introduce an edifying explanation, διὰ τῶν καλῶν (ἑρμοίον ἔργων). In view of the several variations among these expansions, the Committee regarded the shorter reading of Π - B C Κ P 614 1739 al as original.

1.17 οὐκ οὗτος μοι ὁ ἀγαπητός μου οὗτος ἐστιν (B)

The original text appears to have been preserved only in Π - B (the Coptic and Ethiopic are ambiguous), all the other witnesses having conformed the reading to the traditional text in Matthew, οὗτος ἐστιν οὐκ οὗτος μοι ὁ ἀγαπητός (Μ 3.17-17.5). The expanded reading of P 1175 (οὗτος ἐστιν οὐκ οὗτος μοι ὁ ἀγαπητός οὗτος ἐστιν) suggests that an ancestor of each read as Π - Β and B, but that when the assimilated reading was adopted the copyist overlooked deleting the words οὗτος ἐστιν at the close.
likely to change the noun to the infinitive than the reverse. From the point of view of intrinsic probability, the noun gives better sense ("an example [or warning] to ungodly persons of things in store for them") than the verb ("an example [or warning] to those about to do wrong [act impiously]"). In order to represent the balance of probabilities, it was decided to enclose the sigma within square brackets.

2.11 παρά κυρίου (C)

As between παρά κυρίου, read by Β Ψ K P 88 1739 arm al, and παρά κυρίων, read by Ψ 056 0142 330 al, a majority of the Committee preferred the latter as the more difficult reading. In order to avoid attributing βιάζομαι κυρίων to God, scribes altered κυρίου to κυρίων or omitted the prepositional phrase entirely (as in Ψ 033 33 81 614 vg cop sa, bo cop eth Speculum). The omission also may reflect scribal recollection of the parallel account in Jude 6, which lacks any mention of the presence of the Lord.

In view of the absence of the prepositional phrase from a wide variety of Greek, versional, and patristic witnesses, one suspects that scribes added it either in the form παρά κυρίου or παρά κυρίων. If such a phrase is to be included in the text at all, the least unsatisfactory decision is to adopt the reading of the great uncials (K B C), but to enclose the words παρά κυρίων within square brackets. B.M.M.

2.13 ἄδικον μενού (B)

The reading ἄδικον μενού, which is supported by early and diversified witnesses (Ψ72 Β P Ψ 1175 1852 syr sa, bo arm), involves a very rare construction with μενον, and therefore copists introduced the less objectionable κακομενοῦ (Κ A Ψ K 049 most minuscules vg syr cop arm). The author seems to have tolerated the unusual grammatical construction in the interest of contriving a play on the words ἄδικον μενού. ...ἀδίκος ("defrauded of the hire of fraud," J. B. Mayor, Com. p. 339; see also Schrenk in Kittel's Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, s.v. θρησκευτικός, at end).

2.14 τροφή (A)

Instead of τροφή, K reads τροφῖν ("nourishment") and Ψ72 ungrammatically reads τροφῆς.

2.15 ἀπάτησις (B)

In view of the probability that the original reading of Jude ver. 12 is ἀπάτησις (see comment on that passage), a majority of the Committee was of the opinion that the author of 2 Peter consciously altered Jude’s expression, substituting (as he does elsewhere) a more generalized expression, ἐν ταῖς ἀπάτησις κακών, which is strongly supported by Ψ72 Κ Α Ψ K P 33 81 614 syr cop sa, bo arm, and for which the presence of κακῶν is a supporting argument. The reading ἄπαθεν (A Β Ψ 424° 623 1827 vg syr cop arm) is then a scribal assimilation to the prevailing text of Jude.
Instead of μοιχαλίδας ("an adulteress"), which is strongly supported by Β 81 and most minuscules, Ψ al read μοιχεῖας

(“adultery”), while Ν A 33 al read μοιχαλίδας, a word not known elsewhere.

2.15 Βοούρ [A]

The reading Βοούρ, a name not found elsewhere, is strongly supported by almost all Greek manuscripts, and by most early versions. The reading Βοούρ, found in Β 453 vg syrh cop arm, is the prevailing spelling of the Septuagint. The singular reading of Ν* (Βεωρόφορ) is no doubt due to the conflation of Βοούρ with a marginal correction —οφορ.

2.18 ὀλίγως [A]

Among the palaeographically similar readings (ολίγως: ολίγως: ὀλίγως), ὀλίγως, a rare word that occurs nowhere else in the New Testament or the Septuagint (although Aquila has it in Is 10.7), appears to be original. As regards external evidence, ὀλίγως is supported by representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (ολίγως: Α Β Ψ 33 vg syrh cop arm), though the oldest of the extant readings, seems to be devoid of due to the conflation of Βοούρ with a marginal correction —οφορ. It is not strange that copyists and translators introduced a variety of modifications. Thus, several witnesses retain εἰρέθηται but qualify it with other words: (a) the Sahidic version and one manuscript of the Harcanean Syriac version insert the negative, and (b) the Bodmer Papyrus (ολίγως) adds ἀλλ’ες ("the earth and the things in it will be found dissolved") – an expedient, however, that overloads the context with three instances of the same verb. Other witnesses either (c) omit εἰρέθηται and the accompanying clause (so Ψ vg Pelagius αδ, or substitute another verb that gives more or less good sense. Thus (d) C reads ἀφαιρεθήσεται ("will disappear"), and (e) A 046 049 056 0142 33 614 Byz Lect syrh cop arm εὑρήσηται ("will be burnt up").

Because εἰρέθηται, though the oldest of the extant readings, seems to be devoid of meaning in the context (even the expedient of punctuating as a question, "Will the earth and the things in it be found?"") fails to commend itself, various conjectural emendations have been proposed: (a) after ἐγών the word ἐγώ has fallen out (Bradshaw), "the earth and the things in it will be found useless"; (b) εἰρέθηται is a scribal corruption of μετέτρεψε or μετέτρεψεν (Hart), "the earth and the things in it will flow"; (c) αὐτάκεραται (Naber), "… will flow together"; (d) πυρεθρεθήσεται (Olivier), "… will be burnt to ashes"; (e) ἐπορευθήσεται (J. B. Mayor), "… will be taken away"; (f) κρυφθήσεται (Eb. Nestle), "… will be judged"; (g) μηθήσεται (or ἐξαιρεθήσεται) (Chase), "… will be healed (thoroughly)"; (h) πυρθήσεται (Vansitratt), "… will be burned."
and weight, including [12,72] K A C 33 81 614 vg syrh h copm bo arm eth. On the other hand, if the word were present originally, it is difficult to account for its absence in such notable Eastern and Western witnesses as B 1739 Augustine Bede, as well as several other minuscules (82 440 522 1175 1241 1881). In order to reflect this conflict between external and internal considerations, the Committee thought it best to include ἡμις but to enclose it within square brackets, suggesting a considerable measure of doubt as to its right to stand in the text.

Footnotes

1 The genitive is used with παρά 78 times in the New Testament, as compared with 50 times with the dative and 60 times with accusative (J. H. Moulton. Prolegomena, p. 106).

2 In support of Hort’s conjecture, cf. 1 Enoch 1:6 where, in a similar context, some witnesses read τοις διὰ τρίτου γης ἡμις (“so that the mountains shall waste away”).

The First Letter Of John

1.4 ἡμις (B)

Although the reading ἡμις is widely supported (A C K L almost all minuscules vg syrh h copm bo arm eth), a majority of the Committee preferred ἡμις because of the quality of its support (it is read by the Alexandrian text and one Old Latin manuscript: K A* B P Ψ 33 τττττ τττττ), and because copyists were more likely to alter γράφομεν ἡμις to the expected γράφομεν ἡμις (compare ἡμις after ἀπαντῆσαν ἡμις in verses 2 and 3) than vice versa.

1.4 ἡμις (A)

Instead of ἡμις (read by B L Ψ 049 88 326 ττττ vg copm al), the Textus Receptus, following A C K L P 33 81 614 1739 most minuscules vg syrh h copm bo arm al, reads ἡμις. As regards transcriptional probability, copyists who recollected Jn 16.24 (ἀνάθεμα ἡμις ἡμις) would have been likely to alter ἡμις to ἡμις. As regards intrinsic probability, ἡμις seems to suit best the generous solicitude of the author, whose own joy would be incomplete unless his readers shared it; whereas copyists, insensitive to such a nuance, would have been likely to alter ἡμις to the more expected second person ἡμις.

2.4 ἄλληδες (A)

Instead of “the truth,” several witnesses (Ψ 436 945 1505 al) weaken the statement by reading “truth”; on the other hand, K and a few other witnesses strengthen it by expanding to read “the truth of God.”

2.6 [οὗτος] (C)

The external evidence for and against the presence of οὗτος is rather evenly divided (K C Ψ 81 al for; A B 33 2464* al against).

From a transcriptional point of view, the word might have been accidentally omitted following οὗτος. On the other hand, it might have been added as an emphatic correlative with the preceding καθὼς. In light of such considerations, the Committee considered it best to include the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

2.7 ἄγιαπτοι

Instead of ἄγιαπτοι (strongly supported by K A B C P vg syrh h copm bo arm al) the Textus Receptus, following K L and most minuscules, reads ἄσκληποι. The latter word, which the author of 1 John almost never uses in the vocative (only in 3.13), crept into the Byzantine text of the present passage because of its customary usage as the introductory word in lectionary pericopes derived from the apostles.
The external evidence supporting ἡμι/ν is extensive and diversified, including Ν Α C 81 614 1739 Byz Lect it6 vg syrhb cophs arm eth Augustine Theophylact. A few witnesses (B 69* 241 1241 1881 2127 it) read ἰμι/ν, which is either the result of scribal confusion between η and ν, or a deliberate accommodation to the expression ἁπεγράφου ἰμι/ν in 1:2 and 3.

Instead of τὸ αὐτός, which is strongly supported by Ν B C P about twenty minuscules vg syrb cophs arm eth Athanasius Augustine al, the Textus Receptus, following A K L most minuscules cophs Theophylact al, reads τὸ αὐτό. The latter construction (ὁ αὐτός), which has the appearance of a scribal emendation, occurs nowhere else in either the Fourth Gospel or the three Johannine Epistles.

Although it can be argued that the words καὶ ἰμι/ν are an explanatory gloss introduced by copyists in order to affirm the reality of the state previously described, it is much more likely that they are genuine, being supported by representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (PG 62:1906 Ν A B C 33 61 614 1739 it6, it5 vg a). The absence of the words in several of the later witnesses (K L most minuscules), followed by the Textus Receptus, is due either to scribal oversight, perhaps occasioned by graphical similarity with the preceding word (καλοθεοφυλακτικόν), or to deliberate editorial pruning of an awkward parenthetical clause.

A majority of the Committee preferred the reading ἁμαρτίας, supported by A B 33 1739 it6, it5 syrb cophs arm, and regarded the reading with ἰμι/ν (Ν C K L it7 most minuscules vg syrb cophs arm eth) as the result of scribal assimilation to such passages as 2:2 and 4:10.

It is difficult to decide whether καὶ (which is read by Ν C 665 P Ψ 1739 it6 syrb arm eth) was added by copyists in order to provide a closer connection with what goes before; or whether, because of the preceding word (ὁ ἰμι/ν), copyists accidentally omitted καὶ (A B K L 33 61 614 Byz Lect it5 vg syrb cophs arm eth). A majority of the Committee preferred to retain the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets in order to indicate considerable doubt that it belongs there.
After a variety of witnesses add τῶν ἀνθρώπων (C K L Ρ 61 Byz Lect a) or τῶν ἀνθρώπων αὐτοί (P 056 614 Syr αβγ κοπ 81 arm) and (b) because copyists were more likely to add than to delete an object that completes the thought of the participle.

3.19 [καὶ] εἰς τούτο [C]

As in the case of 3.13, the balance of external evidence and of internal probabilities warrants the use of square brackets around καὶ.

3.19 γνωστεύει [A]

The Textus Receptus, following K L and a great number of minuscules, has assimilated the future tense to the present tense so as to accord with the frequently occurring formula εἰς τούτο γινώσκομεν (2.3; 3.24; 4.2; 5.2).

3.21 ἡ καρδιά [ἡμῶν] μὴ καταγινώσκῃ [C]

In the following tabular arrangement the eleven different readings are subsumed under four principal readings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκῃ</td>
<td>B Origen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ</td>
<td>C 1852 2464 Origen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν (A) Ρ 133 322 436 945 (1241) 1739 John-Damascus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκει ἡμῶν</td>
<td>A 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκει ἡμῶν</td>
<td>1241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν μὴ καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν (N) K 049 056 0142 81 104 181 326 330 451 614 623 629 630 (1243) (1505) 1844 1877 1881 2127 2412 2492 (2495) Byz Lect if vg syrarm eph Origen Didymus Ps- Athanasius (John-Damascus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδιά ἡμῶν μὴ καταγινώσκη ἡμῶν</td>
<td>2127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν</td>
<td>2495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν</td>
<td>1505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκῃ ἡμῶν</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἡ καρδιά μὴ καταγινώσκει ἡμῶν</td>
<td>049 1243 John-Damascus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the one hand, it can be argued that reading (1) is original and that ἡμῶν is a natural addition supplied by copyists in accord with the usage of the preceding verses. On the other hand, a majority of the Committee was unwilling to adopt a reading that may be the result of Alexandrian pruning (B Origen), and preferred to follow those witnesses that read ἡμῶν after καρδιά, in which position the pronoun can serve also as the object of the verb. In view, however, of the general excellence of codex Vaticanus, it was thought best to enclose the pronoun within square brackets. (The reading καταγινώσκως of Ν is, of course, a scribal blunder, and the replacement of ἡμῶν by ἡμῶν in a variety of witnesses arises from the circumstance that in later Greek both words were pronounced alike.)

4.3 μὴ ᾧμολογεῖ [A]

In place of μὴ ᾧμολογεῖ several versional and patristic witnesses substitute the remarkable reading λέει (“Every spirit that annuls Jesus is not of God”) or σωλίτ (“severs”). Although several scholars (including Zahn, Harnack, Büchsel [in Kittel], Preisker) have argued that λέει is the original reading, the Committee preferred μὴ ᾧμολογεῖ because of overwhelming external support. The origin of λέει is probably to be sought in second century polemic against Gnostics who made a distinction between the earthly Jesus and the heavenly Christ.

4.2 τὸν θεόν [A]

A majority of the Committee considered it probable that the shortest reading τὸν θεόν, which is supported by good representatives of both Alexandrian and Western types of text (A B 1739 if vg cop65 irenæus65 Clement a), was expanded by copyists with additions derived from the previous verse (Ἰησοῦν ἡμῶν ἐν ἀσέμενη ἑξίσσουσα). The variety of the supplements is a further indication that they are secondary modifications of the original text.

4.10 ἄναπτεται [B]

As concerns the weight of external evidence, the two readings are more or less equally supported. From a transcriptional point of view, scribes would be likely to assimilate the perfect tense to the following verbs, which are aorist.

4.19 ἐρμηνεύεται [A]

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is ἐρμηνεύω, which is adequately supported by A B 5 322 323 424 945 1241 1739 1881 it65 vg af. Feeling the need of an accusative object after the verb, especially when it was (wrongly) taken to be the hortatory subjunctive, some copyists added τὸν θεόν (N 33 81 614 syr65 cop65 a) and others αὐτὸν (K L Ρ most minuscules).

4.20 οὐ δύναται ἐρμηνεύειν. [A]

Instead of the negative οὐ, which is strongly supported by the Alexandrian text as well as by other witnesses Ν Ρ 1739 syr6.
5.1 καὶ τὸν (C)

On the one hand, the absence of καὶ in B Ψ 048 33 62 326 2298 if' vg cop² arm eth al. substitutes the interrogative τὸν. The latter appears to be an improvement introduced by copyists in order to heighten the rhetorical style.

5.2 ποιόμεν (B)

The expression τὸς ἐνσαλᾶς εὐσεβ. ποιόμεν (B Ψ 33 ποιόμεν) 81 614 1379 if' vg syr² h cop² arm eth al. is extremely rare in the New Testament (elsewhere only in the inferior text of Ῥε 22:14). In Ν K L P and most minuscules the verb is replaced by the much more usual τηρόμεν, thus harmonizing with ver. 3 and other passages in 1 John (2:3, 4, 5; 3:22, 24).

5.6 αἰματος (A)

The original reading appears to be αἰματος, which is well supported by a variety of witnesses, including representatives of both the Alexandrian and the Western types of text (B Ψ 1379 if' vg syr² Tertullian al). Copyists who recalled ἀιματος (E Λέκκος και πενταμετρος) introduced ποιόμενος either (a) as a substitution for αἰματος (43 241 463 945 1241 1831 1891) or as an addition (b) after αἰματος (P 81 88 442 630 915 2492 arm eth) or (c) after αἰματος (Ν Α 104 424' 614 1379' 2412 syr² cop² Origen), occasionally appending αγία after ποιόμενος (39 61 326 1837).

5.7-8 μαρτυροῦντες, 8 τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὸ τέλος καὶ τὸ αἷμα (A)

After μαρτυροῦντες the Textus Receptus adds the following ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ, ὦ Πέτρε, ὦ Λέγος, καὶ τὸ Ἀγίου Πνεύματος καὶ σῶσι οἱ τρεῖς ἐν εὐαγγ., (B) καὶ τρεῖς εἰσόη οἱ μαρτυροῦσιν ἐν τῷ γῇ. That these words are spurious and have no right to stand in the New Testament is certain in the light of the following considerations.

(A) EXTERNAL EVIDENCE. (1) The passage is absent from every known Greek manuscript except eight, and these contain the passage in what appears to be a translation from a late recension of the Latin Vulgate. Four of the eight manuscripts contain the passage as a variant reading written in the margin as a later addition to the manuscript. The eight manuscripts are as follows:

61: Codex Montfortianus, dating from the early sixteenth century.
88: Variant reading in a sixteenth century hand, added to the fourteenth-century Codex Regius of Naples.
221: Variant reading added to a tenth-century manuscript in the Bodleian Library at Oxford.
429: Variant reading added to a sixteenth-century manuscript at Wolfenbüttel.
636: Variant reading added to a sixteenth-century manuscript at Naples.
918: Sixteenth-century manuscript at the Escorial, Spain.
2318: Eighteenth-century manuscript, influenced by the Clementine Vulgate, at Bucharest, Rumania.

(2) The passage is quoted by none of the Greek Fathers, who, had they known it, would most certainly have employed it in the Trinitarian controversies (Sabellian and Arian). Its first appearance in Greek is in a Greek version of the (Latin) Acts of the Lateran Council in 1215.

(3) The passage is absent from the manuscripts of all ancient versions (Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Slavonic), except the Latin; and it is not found (a) in the Old Latin in its early form (Tertullian Cyprian Augustine), or in the Vulgate (b) as issued by Jerome (codex Fuldensis [copied a.d. 541–46] and codex Aminatius [copied before a.d. 716]) or (c) as revised by Alcuin (first hand of codex Valla in the ninth century).

The earliest instance of the passage being quoted as a part of the actual text of the Epistle is in a fourth century Latin treatise entitled Liber Apologeticus (chap. 4), attributed either to the Spanish heretic Priscillian (died about 385) or to his follower Bishop Instantius. Apparently the gloss arose when the original passage was understood to symbolize the Trinity (through the mention of three witnesses: the Spirit, the water, and the blood), an interpretation that may have been written first as a marginal note that afterwards found its way into the text. In the fifth century the gloss was quoted by Latin Fathers in North Africa and Italy as part of the text of the Epistle, and from the sixth century onwards it is found more and more frequently in manuscripts of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate. In these various witnesses the wording of the passage differs in several particulars. (For examples of other intrusions into the Latin text of 1 John, see 5.17, 5.5, 5.6, and 20.)

(B) INTERNAL PROBABILITIES. (1) As regards transcripational probability, if the passage were original, no good reason can be found to account for its omission, either accidentally or intentionally, by copyists of hundreds of Greek manuscripts, and by translators of ancient versions.

(2) As regards intrinsic probability, the passage makes an awkward break in the sense.

For the story of how the spurious words came to be included in the Textus Receptus, see any critical commentary on 1 John, or Metzger, The Text of the New Testament, pp. 101 f.; cl. also
On the basis of ἐν ηῶν 049 88 1739 al a majority of the Committee preferred ἐαυτῷ, a reading that the minority regarded as a secondary development from ἐαυτῷ understood in a reflexive sense.

Among the several readings, ἐαυτῷ, which is well supported by representatives of a variety of types of text (B K P Ἠ 614 Ἄ syr Ἄ Ῥ s, h al cop), is to be preferred. The other readings (except the accidental omission by the first hand of the Vulgate codex Amiatinus) arose from a desire to make the negative clause correspond more exactly to the preceding positive clause.

After ὁ ὤμοιος τῷ θεῷ ἦκει several Latin witnesses (vg ms Julianus of Toledo) add, without Greek authority, the following doctrinal expansion: et carnum induit nostri causa et passus est et resurrexit a mortuis; adsumpsit nos et dedit… ("[The Son of God has come] and was clothed with flesh for our sake, and suffered, and arose from the dead; he has received us and given...").

The reading that best explains the origin of the others is τῶν ἀλήθειῶν, which is supported by representatives of several early types of text (B 81 syrbr arm Speculum). In order to clarify the reference of the adjective, copyists added ὡς ὀ, either before τῶν

The negative ὡς, which is strongly attested, is lacking in several Greek and versional witnesses, probably for dogmatic reasons.

The ambiguity of reference intended by the words ὁ γεννήθης ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (a reading strongly attested by witnesses of all textual types) prompted copyists to introduce one or another change in the interest of clarification of meaning. (See also the following comment.)

After ἐκόλουθον the Textus Receptus, following K L P 81 614 Byz Lect, reads ἀκριμάνλ, a common liturgical addition. The earlier text, without ἀκριμάνλ, is strongly supported by the best Alexandrian and Western witnesses (Ἀ Β 33 it vg Speculum a).

Footnotes

1 For the evidence see Vetus Latina; Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; xxvi, Epistulae Catholicae (Freiburg, 1966), p. 361.
The Second Letter Of John

ver. 1 ἐκλεκτῆ κυρίε

Although either or both nouns may be taken as proper names, and hence capitalized according to modern usage (“to the elect Kyria [or, Cyria],” or “to the lady [or, the dear] Electa,” or “to Electa Kyria [or, Cyria],”), the Committee understood the words to be used metaphorically of a local congregation.

ver. 3 παρὰ Τιμοθεῷ Χριστοῦ (A)

Before Τιμοθεῷ the Textus Receptus, in accord with K L P most minuscules syṛ arm at, reads κυρίου. Since it is more likely that copyists would have added rather than deleted such a word, the Committee preferred the shorter text, which is supported by good representatives of early types of text (A B 81 1739 vg cop⁴).

ver. 5 κυρίε

It is possible to take κυρίε as a proper name (see the comment on ver. 1).

ver. 6 ἀπολάβητε ... ἀπολάβητε (A)

Superior manuscript evidence supports the second person verbs, which are also congruent with μὴ ἑλθεῖτε ταύτας. See also the following comment.

ver. 6 εἰργασάμεθα (B)

Despite the relatively meager external evidence supporting the reading εἰργασάμεθα, an internal consideration the Committee was

persuaded that the delicate nuance ("... that you do not destroy the things which we, apostles and teachers, wrought in you") is more likely to be due to the author than to copyists. On transcriptional grounds also this reading best explains the origin of the second person verb, which arose through a levelling process.

ver. 9 διδάχῃ (2) (A)

After the second διδάχῃ the Textus Receptus, following K L P most minuscules cop⁴, adds κοι Ὀρθοτοῦ. This reading is obviously secondary, the result of scribal assimilation to the first part of the sentence. Likewise διδάχῃ κύριο, read by certain versional and patristic witnesses (syr很开心̣ Lucill), originated from a similar desire to relate the two clauses more closely. The shorter reading is strongly supported by K A B Y 81 1739 vg cop⁴ at.

ver. 11 ποιήσας
The Third Letter Of John

ver. 4 οὐκ ἔχω χαράν (A)

Although the reading χάριν (B 5 57 1891 2143 2298 2492 vg cop[b] Hilary) may seem to be intrinsically superior, expressing "the divine favour in a concrete form" (Westcott, Commentary, ad loc.), the Committee considered it to be a transcriptional modification and preferred the more Johannine χαράν, which is strongly supported by Β A C K L P 81 614 1739 syr[σ] cop[c] arm eth.

ver. 9 εἴρηκας τι (B)

The reading that best explains the origin of the others appears to be εἴρηκας τι, read by Δ A B 048 1241 1739 (cop[σ]) arm. In order to prevent the reader from drawing the conclusion that an apostolic letter was lost, the reading εἴρηκας τι (I would have written ...) was introduced into Δ 33 81 181 614 vg al. Other copyists, to avoid undue depreciation of apostolic authority, omitted τι (C K L P Ƥ most minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus). The readings εἴρηκας τι (B cop[σ]) and εἴρηκας αὐτή (326) are obviously transcriptional errors.

ver. 15 ὄψημαι.

After ὄψημαι several of the later witnesses (L 307 321 378 467 614 1836 1837 1838 vg mss) append the liturgical ὄνομα.

The Letter Of Jude

ver. 1 τοῖς ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἑγγεμβρύοις (A)

Instead of ἑγεμμέμνους, which is decisively supported by Υ B A Β Ƥ 81 1739 vg syr[σ] cop[σ] arm eth Origen Lucifer al. the Textus Receptus, following K L P and most minuscules, reads ἑγεμμέμνους. The latter reading, which is modeled upon 1 Cor 1:2, was introduced by copyists in order to avoid the difficult and unusual combination ἐν θεῷ πατρὶ ἑγεμμέμνους.

ver. 1 καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τετραγόνοις (A)

The omission of these words in a few witnesses was occasioned by parablepsis, owing to homoeoteleuton (ἡγεμονεῖ ἡμεῖς ... τετραγόνοις).

ver. 3 ἠμῶν (A)

As between ἠμῶν and ἵμων, the former is strongly supported by such excellent witnesses as Δ Β 33 81 322 323 424 c 665 1241 1739 1881 2298 2344 vg cop[σ] arm eth Origen Cyril Jerome Bede; ὡμῶν (A B 33 81 322 323 424 665 1241 1739 1881 2298 2344 vg cop[σ] eth Origen Cyril Jerome Bede; ὡμῶν (A B 33 81 322 323 424 665 1241 1739 1881 2298 2344 vg cop[σ]) arm eth Origen Cyril Jerome Bede; ὡμῶν (A B 33 81 322 323 424 665 1241 1739 1881 2298 2344 vg cop[σ] eth Origen Cyril Jerome Bede; ὡμῶν (A B 33 81 88 915), a majority of the Committee was of the opinion that the reading was difficult to the point of impossibility, and explained its origin in terms of transcriptional oversight (κ'ς being taken for κ'ς). It was also observed that nowhere else does the author employ ἵμων alone, but always Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. The unique collocation Ἰησοῦς Χριστός read by Υ (did the scribe intend to write θεὸς χριστός,}
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“God’s anointed one”?) is probably a scribal blunder; otherwise one would expect that Χριστός would be represented also in other witnesses.

The great majority of witnesses read ὃ before κύριος, but on the strength of its absence from ΝΨ and the tendency of scribes to add the article, it was thought best to enclose ὃ within square brackets.

[Critical principles seem to require the adoption of Θησοῦς, which admittedly is the best attested reading among Greek and versional witnesses (see above). Struck by the strange and unparalleled mention of Jesus in a statement about the redemption out of Egypt (yet compare Paul’s reference to Χριστός in 1 Cor 10.4), copyists would have substituted (ό) κύριος or ὃ θεός. It is possible, however, that (as Hort conjectured) “the original text had only ὃ, and that ὃ θεός was read as οτικός and perhaps as οτικός: (“Notes on Select Readings,” ad loc.).

The origin of the variations in the position of ὃ is best explained by assuming that it originally stood after εἰλικτάς (as in å7 A B C2 L 049 33 81 104 132 330 436 451 629 945 1877 2127 a); because, however, the word did not seem to suit εἰλικτάς, and because the following τὸ δεύτερον appeared to call for a word like πρῶτον, ὃς was moved within the ὃς-clause so as to qualify σῶμα τοῦ B.M.M. and A.W.

ver. 8 κυρίοτερα [A]

Instead of the more abstract κυρίοτερα, a few witnesses read the plural κυρίατες.

ver. 12 ἀγάπαται ξωμόν [A]

Instead of ἀγάπαται, which is strongly attested by Β K L most minuscules vg cop56;11e syh ναρ arm eth Ephraem Lucifer Augustine Palladius al; several witnesses, influenced by the prevailing text of 2 Pe 2.13, read ἀγάπαταις (82 378 460) and two read ἀγαπηταῖς (6 224).

ver. 19 ἰδιολογορίαταις [A]

In order to clarify the sense of the verb, C and a number of minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus, add ἵνα τοιοῦτος.

verses 22-23 [C]

The text of verses 22 and 23 has been transmitted in quite diverse forms. Some of the witnesses refer to three classes of people, while other witnesses refer to only two classes; and there are other variations as well.

I. The following witnesses distinguish between three classes of people, and differ as to the verb in the first clause:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. The following witnesses distinguish between only two classes of people, and involve several other variations as well:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>C*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>K L P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Still more condensed is the reading of å7: ή οὗς μὲν ἐκ τιρᾶ ἀρπάζοντες, διακρινόμενος δὲ ἐλέατε ἐν φύσε. Somewhat similar to this reading are also those of syh and Clement.

In view of the author’s predilection for arranging his material in groups of three (as in verses 4, 8, in the examples of judgment in verses 9-7, and of sin in ver. 11), a majority of the Committee was disposed to prefer as original the triple arrangement of the passage, and to regard the other forms as aberrations that arose partly from scribal inattentiveness, partly from indecision concerning the sense of διακρίνεσθαι in ver. 22 (in ver. 8 it means “to contend” with someone; here, however, it must mean “to doubt”), and partly from concern to provide a main clause after three (or two) relative clauses. (See also the following comments.)

ver. 22 ἐλέατε διακρινόμενος [C]

Instead of the verb “to have mercy on” (whether spelled ἐλέατε, as in Ν B C2 Ψ 68, or ἐλέατε, as in K L P 049 056 0142 Byz Lech),

several witnesses read ἐλέγχετε, meaning “convince” or “refute” (A C3 33 81 1739 vg cop56;11e arm Ephraem Cassiodorus). Although the latter reading was widely known in the ancient church (cf. the versions and fathers that support it), a majority of the Committee preferred to follow the testimony of the Alexandrian text (Β) and regarded ἐλέγχετε as a scribal modification introduced in order to differentiate the statement from that in the clause οὗς δὲ ἐλέατε in ver. 23, thus producing a sequence progressing from severity (“reprove”) to compassion (“show mercy”).

Instead of διακρινόμενος (å7) Ν A B C3 33 81 1739 a), the Textus Receptus, following most of the later witnesses (K P most minuscules), reads διακρινόμενος. The latter reading is obviously a secondary development, introduced by copyists in order to conform the participle to...
the nominative case in agreement with the following two participles in ver. 23 (ἀρπάζοντες and μισοῦντες).

ver. 23 αἷς δὲ σάξετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες (C)

Besides the highly condensed form of text in Ἱδ (see comment on verses 22-23), other witnesses (ṣy(h) cop(h) Clement(h) a) omit αἷς δὲ σάξετε and replace ἀρπάζοντες with ἀρπάζετε, thus providing a suitable main clause after the relative clause(s). Still other witnesses transpose the phrase ἐν φῶς ἀπὸ γῆς from the third relative clause to a position either after ἀρπάζοντες (C 630 sy(h) a) or before σάξετε (K L P 056 Byz Lect). The phrase, however, clearly belongs to the third clause, in which it supplies the reason for the addition of the explanatory phrase μισοῦντες... χῦνάσι. The singular reading of B καὶ αἷς μὲν ἔλατε διαιρεμένοις σάξετε ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες, αἷς δὲ ἔλατε ἐν φῶς ἀπὸ γῆς ("and those, whom you pity when they contend [or doubt], save and snatch from the fire, but some pity in fear"), can scarcely be correct, for it involves, as Hort admits, "the incongruity that the first αἷς must be taken as a relative, and the first ἔλατε as indicative." It is probable that the scribe of B accidentally omitted αἷς δὲ before σάξετε, in which case his archetype would have agreed with the text preserved in K A Ψ 33 81 1739 vg cop(h) arm Ephraem.

ver. 23 αἷς δὲ ἔλατε ἐν φῶς (C)

In accord with the decisions made on the preceding sets of variant readings in verses 22 and 23, the reading αἷς δὲ ἔλατε ἐν φῶς, which is strongly supported by a variety of early types of text (K A Ψ 33 81 1739 vg cop(h) arm Ephraem), appears to be superior to any of the other readings.

ver. 25 μᾶλα [A]

After μᾶλα, K L P and many minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus, add σοφοὶ, thus assimilating the doxology to Ro 16.27. (See also comment on 1 Tm. 1.17.)

ver. 25 ἕνα παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος

Several of the later uncial witnesses, as well as most minuscules (followed by the Textus Receptus), omit ἕνα παντὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος, perhaps because the expression did not seem to be appropriate in a doxology. The words are strongly supported by K A B C L 5 378 436 467 623 808 1827 1837 1845 1852 vg sy(h) cop(h) arm (eth) Ephraem.

Footnotes

1 For a full conspectus of variant readings here (and elsewhere in Jude), see C. A. Albin, Judasbrevet, traditionen texten tolkningen (Stockholm, 1962), pp. 596–631.


The Revelation To John

The title of the book in the earliest manuscripts (N C) is simply Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου (‘Ἐκκλησία Ιωάννου’). In later witnesses this brief title is modified in a great variety of expansions (sixty different wordings of the title are cited by Hort). What is probably the longest and most fulsome title is that of a manuscript at Mount Athos (no. 1775, copied a.d. 1847): ‘Ἡ ἀποκάλυψις τοῦ πανοικίδιον εἴσηγελθάντος, ἐπιστήμης φίλον, παρθένου, ἵπτημαν μετὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἰματίου τοῦ θεουλογίου, ἱδανίων Ζωλίμης καὶ Ζεβεδαίου, τεκνὸν ἐκ τοῦ τοιχοῦ Μαρίας, καὶ ἱδανίως τοῦ γενέσθαι (“The Revelation of the all-glorious Evangelist, bosom-friend [of Jesus], virgin, beloved to Christ, John the theologian, son of Salome and Zebedee, but adopted son of Mary the Mother of God, and Son of Thunder”).

1.5 λοιπὸν ἡμᾶς ἐκ (A)

Instead of λοιπὸν the Textus Receptus, following the later uncial (P 046), most of the minuscules, and several early versions (ṣy(h) cop(h) eth), reads λοιποῖς. The reading λοιποῖς is to be preferred because it has superior manuscript support (B N A C 1611 iφ sy(h) arm a); because it is in accord with Old Testament imagery (e.g. Is 40.2 LXX); and because it suits better the idea expressed in ver. 64. The reading λοιποῖς, which sometimes may have been pronounced like λοιποῖς, seems to have arisen “due to failure to understand the Hebraic use of ἐκ to denote a price...and a natural misapplication of 7:14” (Hort, “Notes on Select Readings,” ad loc.).

With the verb λοιποῖς the preposition ἐκ is naturally more appropriate than ἐκ; the early versions cannot discriminate between the two prepositions.

1.6 εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τοῦ αἰὼν (A)

The words τῶν αἰῶνων are absent from Ἰδ A P about thirty minuscules cop(h) Andrews, but are present in N C 046 1 1006 1111 1854 2053 Ἰδ(h) n. vg sy(h) arm eth Andrews Ἰδ(h) bav, c, p 4.9, 10, 5.13, 7.12, 10.6, 11.15, 15.7, 19.3, 20.10, 22.5. It is difficult to decide whether the shorter text arose accidentally through scribal oversight, or whether the words were added by copyists in accord with the customary liturgical formula. Since the fuller form occurs eleven other times in Revelation (1.18; 4.10; 10.6, 11.15; 15.7; 19.5; 20.10; 22.5), the Committee was reluctant to adopt τῶν αἰῶνων in the text here. At the same time, however, since copyists tended to expand such doxological formulas, it seemed best to enclose the words within square brackets, thus indicating doubt concerning their right to stand in the text.
After 1.8 the Textus Receptus, following K* 1 (2344) μηθές υπὸ παρ. adds ὑπὲρ θᾶ καὶ τέλος, and twenty other minuscules add ἐν ὑπὲρ θᾶ καὶ τέλος. If the longer text were original no good reason can be found to account for the shorter text, whereas the presence of the longer expression in 21.6 obviously prompted some copyists to expand the text here.  

Although πεπρωμένης is without syntactical concord in the sentence, it was preferred by the Committee not only because it is rather well attested (A C Primarius) but chiefly because it best explains the origin of the other readings. In order to remove the grammatical difficulty some copyists read πεπρωμένης (ι) 2053 the ancient versions αλλα, which qualifies κατάνα, and other copyists read πεπρωμένου (P 046 most minuscules), which qualifies αλλά τόθές.

2.7 ὑπὸ (A)  
A number of minuscules, influenced by the recollection of ὑπὸ μου in 3.2 and four instances of the expression in 3.12, have added μου to ὑπὸ in 2.7.

2.13 ἁπτιτικής  
Since the context seems to demand the genitive ἁπτιτικής, several modern exegetes (including Swete, Charles, Zahn) adopt Lachmann’s conjecture that, after accidental dittography of the definite article ἁπτιτικής, the first omicron was taken as a sigma. The Committee, however, regarded the conjecture as more ingenious than compelling.  

2.16 ὑπὸ  
The Textus Receptus, following P 1 2053 vg syr* αλλά omits ὑπὸ. A majority of the Committee preferred the reading with ὑπὸ, which is supported by A C 1006 1611 1854 syr* cop* ὑπὸ, and explained its absence in other witnesses as due either to transcriptional oversight (after ὑπὸ) or to taking µετανόησαν with the preceding ὁµοίως.

2.20 γνωσία (B)  
On the basis of what was regarded as preponderant testimony, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading γνωσία, without σου (N C P 1 1611 2053 2344 Old Latin vg cop* ὑπὸ arm eth Tertullian αλ.); the reading with σου (“your wife Jezebel”), which requires ἔγνωσάς in ver. 18 to be taken as the bishop or leader of the church at Thyatira, is supported by A C 1006 1611 syr* Cyprian αλ. and appears to be the result of scribal confusion arising from the presence of several instances of σου in verses 19 and 20.

2.22 κλίμα (A)  
Instead of κλίμα, which is decisively supported by K C P 1066 1611 1854 2053 2344 it* υπὸ vg syr* cop* αλ. several witnesses, wishing to increase the punishment threatened to Jezebel, have introduced various glosses. Thus, A reads φωλξεύτηρ, probably derived from ver. 10; 2071 and arm read κλίμακαν (“an oven, furnace”); 1597 and cop* read ἀνθηκέσσαν; and several (Latin) manuscripts known to Primasius read ἀκτίνωμα (“sorrow, affliction”).

2.22 γρηγορόν (A)  
Instead of γρηγορόν (which is strongly supported by K C P 1066 1611 2053 it* υπὸ vg syr* cop* αλ. Tertullian αλ.), the Textus Receptus, following A 1 1611 2081 2344 it* υπὸ arm eth Cyprian αλ. reads γρηγορόν. The latter reading appears to be secondary, having been introduced either unwittingly (a mechanical repetition of the preceding termination) or deliberately (so that the repentance should be for their own works rather than for another’s). Several singular readings reflect scribal eccentricities.

3.5 οὐκ (B)  
Instead of οὐκ (the Textus Receptus, following K* P 046 and most minuscules, reads οὐκ).  
A majority of the Committee preferred οὐκ, partly because of superior manuscript evidence (K* (A) C 1006 2344 it* υπὸ vg syr* cop* arm eth αλ.), and partly because οὐκ (which seems to be superfluous, may have therefore been corrected by copyists to οὐκ).

4.11 ἐγκαθιστήσας (A)  
The difficulty of the text (where we might have expected the sequence ἐκκαθιστήσας καὶ ἐγκαθιστήσας) was alleviated in several witnesses either by reading οὐκ ἐγκαθιστήσας or by omitting ἐγκαθιστήσας καὶ.

5.8 τοῖς [κανονίσεις] (C)  
The evidence for the presence of τοῖς κανονίσεις before περί ἀμβατάκα (324) K 1066 1611 2053 2344 2432 it* υπὸ vg syr* cop* arm Hipppolytus αλ. is fairly evenly balanced against the evidence for its absence (A P 4 1066 1611 it* vg eth Irenæus cop* αλ.); from the transcriptional point of view, through confusion with the two previous instances of τοῖς in the preceding line, the word may have been accidentally omitted. On the other hand, copyists may have inserted the numeral in imitation of 1.4-1.5-1.6. In order to represent the ambiguities of external and internal considerations, the Committee decided to print the word, but to enclose it within square brackets, thus indicating doubt whether it belongs in the text.

5.8 τοῖς (A)  
Although the evidence for τοῖς is slight (A αλ.), this reading best accounts for the origin of the others. Wishing to provide ἡγούμενας with a more exactly determined object than is found in
the words ἐκ πᾶντος φυλῆς κ.τ.λ., some scribes introduced ἡμᾶς either before τῷ θεῷ (94 2344 al) or after τῷ θεῷ (K 1006 1611 2053 al), while others replaced τῷ θεῷ with ἡμᾶς (1 2065* Cyprian al). Those who made the emendations, however, overlooked the unsuitability of ἡμᾶς with αὐτῶν in the following verse (where, indeed, the Textus Receptus reads ἡμᾶς, but with quite inadequate authority). See also the following comment.

5.10 καί (A)

The third person pronoun, which is overwhelmingly supported, was replaced by ἡμᾶς in several versional and patristic witnesses, followed by the Textus Receptus.

5.10 ἐμπλεκόμεθα

Of the three variant readings, it is obvious that ἐμπλεκόμεθα (2432 al) is a secondary development, arising from the introduction of ἡμᾶς in the preceding verse (see the comment on ver. 9). It is more difficult to choose between ἐμπλεκόμεθα, supported by K P 1 1845 1854 2053 2344 it εἰς vg syr cop arm al, and ἐμπλεκόμεθα, supported by A 1006 1611 it εἰς. A majority of the Committee, noting that in 20.5 codex Alexandrinus mistakenly reads ἐμπλεκόμεθα for the future tense, preferred ἐμπλεκόμεθα here, as more suited to the meaning of the context.

5.13 καί (5) (B)

In order to provide a verb for the relative clause (with or without an additional relative pronoun), after διαλέγομεν some witnesses read ἐστιν, καί (A 1006 1611* 2344 al), others read ἦν ἔστιν, καί (P 046 1 2073 2081 al, followed by the Textus Receptus), and still others read ὤν ἔστιν, καί (1826 2053 al). The text that seems to have given rise to these modifications is simply καί, supported by K 1611* 2065 2432 al.

6.1 ἔρχομαι (B)

After ἔρχομαι, which is well supported by A C P 1 1006 1611 1854 2053 vg cop arm al, several witnesses add (as though the verb “Come!” were addressed to the Seer) καί ἰδὼν (K 046 about 120 minuscules it εἰς syr arm al) or καὶ ἰδὼν (296 2049 and Textus Receptus). The singular readings ἵδονι (arm) and εἰς νῦν (it εἰς) are due to freedom in translation.

6.2 καί εἰδον (B)

The words καί εἰδον are absent from 046 about 100 minuscules (most of which add καί ἰδὼν in ver. 1; see previous comment) al. The Committee preferred to include the words (a) because of preponderant testimony, including K (A C Εἰδον) P 1 1006 1611 2053 2344 εἰς vg syr cop arm al, and (b) because the omission can be either accidental (καὶ ἰδεῖν καὶ ἰδοῦν), or deliberate on the part of copyists of the manuscripts that read καὶ ἰδὼν at the close of ver. 1 (who therefore would naturally have regarded καὶ εἰδοὺς as superfluous). The singular readings εἰδοὺς (cop εἰς) and καὶ ἰδοῦς καὶ εἰδοὺς (syr εἰς) are due to freedom in translation.

6.3-4 ἔρχομαι, καί (B)

As in ver. 1, after ἔρχομαι, which is here well supported by A C P 1 1006 1611 1854 2053 vg syr εἰς, cop arm al, several witnesses (including K 1826 2073 2344 it εἰς) add καί ἰδὼν, while a few others (296 2049 followed by the Textus Receptus) add καὶ ἰδέω. (See also the comment on ἔρχομαι in ver. 1.)

6.5 καί (B)

See the comment on ver. 1.

6.6 καί εἰδον (B)

See the comment on ver. 2.

6.7 ἔρχομαι (B)

See the comment on ver. 1.

6.8 καί εἰδον (B)

See the comment on ver. 2.

6.17 καί (A)

Although the reading καὶ ἰδὼν is supported by A P 046 almost all minuscules cop arm al, it appears to be the easier reading, having been introduced to avoid the ambiguity of ἰδὼν (which is strongly supported by K C 1611 1854 2053 2344 εἰς syr arm al) and to carry on the reference to τῆς ὑπόθεσις τοῦ ἀρχιερείου of the preceding verse.

8.1 ἀνέβη

Although K P and almost all minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus, read ἀνέβη, the Committee preferred ἀνέβη, which is supported by A C 1006 1611 1841. The reading ἀνέβη seems to be an assimilation to the six instances of ἀνέβη ἤρχονται in chap. 5. (For another example of ἀνέβη with the indicative in the book of Revelation, see 4.9.)

8.8 μετά
The word ἀγέλασθαί is absent from 046, about 125 minuscules, syrᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ. A majority of the Committee preferred to include the word on the basis of its presence in such diversified witnesses as Μ, A, P 052 1006 1854 2053 2344 itᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ. ὑγ σφφ.ᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ. The word may have been omitted because it seemed redundant with καλώμενον.

8.13 ἀρχή

Instead of ἀρχή (which is decisively supported by Μ A 046 most minuscules ὑγ σφφ.ᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ) the Textus Receptus, following P 1 680 2059 2060 2081 2166 2286 2302 armᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ, reads ἀγέλασθαί. The substitution may have been accidental (a scribe misread ἀρχή as ἀληθῶς), but more likely it was deliberate, since the function ascribed to the eagle seems more appropriate to an angel (cf. 14.6). Furthermore, ἀρχή, the Apocalypse) written ἀγέλασθαί, ἀγέλασθαί would probably have taken the place of ἀρχή, cf. 7.2 8.3 (H. B. Swete, The Apocalypse of St. John, ad loc.). The two readings are conflated by 42 ἀντί ἐπελεύσθη ἀγέλασθαί ὡς ἀρχή.

9.12-13 οὐκέτα μᾶλλον. Καὶ ἀκόντι

Since μᾶλλον ἀκόντι (or μᾶλλον ἀκόντι) almost always begins a sentence or clause (elsewhere in Revelation the phrase occurs at the close of a sentence only in 1.19 and 4.1), many witnesses (0027, more than 100 minuscules, syrᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ) join μᾶλλον ἀκόντι to ver. 13. In order to smooth the juncture several witnesses either move the initial καὶ of ver. 13 so as to precede μᾶλλον ἀκόντι (046) or omit it altogether (𝔓⁴⁷ Μ 61 69 456 469 664 2058 2344 syrᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ). The text adopted is adequately supported (A P 1 172 2053 2023 it syrᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ) and is in accord with the author’s manner of introducing previously mentioned angels (8.1 8.10 12.9 11).

9.13 μᾶλλον ἐκ τῶν [κοσμίων] κεράτων (C)

The weight of the external evidence for the presence and for the absence of κοσμίων is almost evenly balanced. Among internal considerations, on the one hand it is possible that the word was added in order to make an antithesis to κεράτων μᾶλλον and a parallelism with τῶν κοσμίων ἐγγέλοντος of ver. 14; on the other hand it is possible that the word was accidentally omitted in transcription when the eye of the scribe passed from τῶν ἀκόντι to the last letters of κοσμίων. In view of such considerations a majority of the Committee thought it best to include the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets. Among the singular readings the omission of μᾶλλον ... κεράτων in Ψ⁴⁷ is noteworthy.

9.21 φαρμάκων

The Committee preferred φαρμάκων, which occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, partly on the basis of external support (𝔓⁴⁷ Μ C 1006 1854 2053 a) and partly because copists would have been more likely to alter it to the more specific φαρμακά (εἰμι) (A P 046 2053 2344 a), which occurs in 18.23 and 3a 5.20, than vice versa.

10.4 θελακίσθη αὐτῷ ἐπὶ βραχαί, ἡμέλλον γράφειν (B)

Instead of θελακίσθη (which is read by A C P 046 1006 1611 1854 2053 2344 syrᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ armᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ) several witnesses, including Ψ⁴⁷ several minuscules copᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ armᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ; substitute θέλακτα. A majority of the Committee, impressed by the external evidence, preferred θελακίσθη and considered θέλακτα to be an exegetical modification, similar to other interpretative rewritings of the text found in sporadic witnesses.

10.6 καὶ τὴν θελακισθήναι καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ (A)

The omission of καὶ τὴν θελακισθήναι ... αὐτῇ by a number of witnesses (including Ψ⁴⁷ A 1611 2344 itᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ) is probably accidental, arising from homoeoarëct and homoeoteleuton. The predominant weight of the external evidence (𝔓⁴⁷ C P 1006 1854 2053 itᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ) favors the originality of the words, as does also the impression that they are appropriate to the completeness of the formal discourse of the author.

10.10 βιβλιαρίαν

In view of the variation between βιβλιαρίαν in verses 2 and 9 and βιβλίον in ver. 8, it is not easy to decide in ver. 10 between βιβλιαρίαν (A C P 1 α) and βιβλίον (Ψ 046 1854 a). A third reading, βιβλία, has only minuscule support, including 1006 1854 2053. On the basis chiefly of the weight of external evidence the Committee preferred βιβλιαρίαν, to which also Ψ⁴⁷ seems to point with βιβλιαρίαν.

11.1 ἀρχή (A)

The unusual construction of ἀρχή ... λέγων, calling for adjustment, was relieved in some witnesses (Ψ⁴⁷ 046 1854 2329 2351 a), followed by the Textus Receptus, by the insertion of καὶ εἰσῆλθε υἱὸν αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν ἀγαλματίδιον.

11.12 ἐξώθηκεν (1) (A)

The reading ἐξώθηκεν is to be preferred on both external and internal grounds: (a) it is strongly supported by Ψ⁴⁷ A P 046 1006 1611 1854 2053 itᵃᵇᵃᶜｃᵃ armᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ; and (b) copies who understood the ἐξώθηκεν to be the inner courtyard were puzzled by the expression τὴν κατά μέν τὴν ἐξώθηκεν, and therefore changed the adverb to ἔξωθηκεν (Ψ about thirty-five minuscules syrᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ).

11.12 ἡκουάσαν (B)

Instead of ἡκουάσαν Ψ⁴⁷ Ψ⁴⁷ is the preferred reading of many minuscules copᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ armᵃᵇᵃᶜᶜᵃ; read ἡκουάσαν. Not only does the weight of external evidence favor ἡκουάσαν, but since the Seer constantly uses ἡκουάσαν.
throughout the book (24 times), copyists were more likely to substitute ἣκουσαν for ἤκουσαν than vice versa.

11.17 ὅτι (B)

The reading ὅτι, in the view of a majority of the Committee, is to be preferred because of superior external evidence (K* A P 046 1 1611 1854 2053ὑπονομα τοῖς ἐκθετομένοις) and because it best explains the origin of the readings. The addition of ὅ ἐργάζεσθαι ὅτι (051 1006 sixteen minuscules ὑπονοματικά and the Textus Receptus) is a typical Byzantine accretion, in imitation of the tripartite expression in 1:4. If so, the reading may be a scribal blunder.

11.18 τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις

The reading τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις, which is strongly supported by ὑπονοματικά (A C 2321 2322 2329 2344 2351), is to be preferred to the easier reading τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις (K* P 046 almost all minuscules).

11.19 ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ

On the one hand, the reading with the article is supported by superior external evidence (A C about 30 minuscules including 1006 1828 2020 2073ὑπονοματικά τῷ αὐτῷ arm et al); on the other hand, however, since it has the appearance of being a grammatical correction, the reading ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ (K* ὑπονοματικά) may seem to be preferred. In view of the weight of the external evidence, a majority of the Committee preferred the reading with the definite article, and explained its absence in other witnesses as the result of transcriptional oversight.

12.10 κατήγορος

Codex Alexandrinus reads κατήγορος, a hapax legomenon in the New Testament, whereas all other witnesses (including ὑπονοματικά C P 046) read the more usual Greek word κατηγόρος. A majority of the Committee preferred κατήγορος, which, it was judged, was more likely to be altered to κατήγορος than vice versa. A minority of the Committee, while acknowledging that for the book of Revelation codex Alexandrinus is a remarkably good witness, preferred κατήγορος, agreeing with Tasker that in the present instance “it may well be that the fifth-century scribe of A is [merely] reflecting the usage of his day and not copying from a manuscript which retained the original reading κατήγορος.”

12.18 καὶ ἐστάθη (B)

Instead of καὶ ἐστάθη, which is well supported by ὑπονοματικά (A C about 25 minuscules (including 1854 2344) andὑπονοματικά arm et al, the Textus Receptus, following P 046 051 most minuscules ὑπονοματικά) reads καὶ ἐστάθη (preceded by a full stop). The latter reading appears to have arisen when copyists accommodated ἐστάθη to the first person of the following élloı́.

13.1 ὄνομα τοῖς (C)

On the one hand, the reading ὄνομα may have arisen from ὄνομα through the accidental omission of τοῖς after ὄνομα, on the other hand, however, after the plural κεφαλῆς, copyists may have tended to alter ὄνομα to ὄνομα. On the strength of the two most important witnesses (A 2053) a majority of the Committee preferred to print ὄνομα in the text, but to enclose the last two letters within square brackets in order to represent the opposing evidence.

13.6 τοῖς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦσας (B)

Among the several readings a majority of the Committee preferred τοῖς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ σκηνοῦσας on the grounds of its superior external support (it is read by (K*) A C (1006) 1611 2053ὑπονοματικά 2344) and its being the more difficult reading. The presence of καὶ before τοῖς (in ὑπονοματικά 046* 051 most minuscules and early versions) appears to be due to copyists who wished to alleviate the strained syntax. In view of occasional omissions in ὑπονοματικά the Committee regarded its reading ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ as a secondary modification, introduced probably because of the syntactical difficulty. The singular reading of συνόν is probably due to the freedom of the translator.

13.7 καὶ ἐστάθη αὐτῷ πάλιν, ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγγελων καὶ νυκτί ἄνθρωποι [A]

The absence of the clause καὶ ἐστάθη αὐτῷ in a variety of witnesses (ὑπονοματικά C P 046 about 50 minuscules (including 2053ὑπονοματικά arm) is no doubt due to oversight in transcription, the eye of the scribe passing from the first to the second instance of καὶ ἐστάθη αὐτῷ. Several minuscules (1859 2020 2065 2432) introduce ἐπὶ τῶν ἄγγελων from the following clause, while other secondary witnesses modify the order of words (1611 1854 arm).

13.10 εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπένει (B)

The epigrammatic style of the saying has perplexed the scribes (and interpreters!). The reading εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπένει (A ὑπονοματικά) best accounts for the origin of the others. The absence of one of the two instances of εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, although rather widespread (ὑπονοματικά C P 046 1006 1611 2053) appears, to be the result of accidental oversight in transcription. The absence of a verb with the first clause prompted various copyists to attempt to improve the text by adding either ἐπένει (616 1828 1854 1862 1888 2322ὑπονοματικά ναφθάνειν arm) or ἐπένει (2059 2081 Arethas, followed by the Textus Receptus), or by altering the construction to εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν (94 104 459 2019).

The reading ἔχει εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπενεί (051 and about 130 minuscules), which can scarcely be translated, must be regarded as a scribal blunder (ἐχεἱς being written instead of εἰς); it is thus a further development of the second reading mentioned above ὑπενεί. 
Among a dozen variant readings, the least unsatisfactory appears to be ἀποκτάνθηται, supported by codex Alexandrinus. As in the first two lines of the verse, the third and fourth lines teach fulfillment of the will of God. Perhaps under the influence of such sayings as Μ 26.52 (πάντες γὰρ οἱ λαβόντες μέγαμα εἰς μεγαρίχι ἀπολλεῖται), copyists modified in various ways the difficult Greek construction (which, as Charles points out, seems to be a literal rendering of a distinctively Hebrew idiom). οὐμενόν ἢ χρήματα ἢ ἐνθέατρα ἢ βασιλείαν ἢ αἰῶνας ἢ ἐν οὐρανοῖς ἢ στέρματα ἢ σίδηρα ἢ πέτρας ἢ χρυσά κ. τ. l.

If anyone is to be slain with the sword, he is to be slain with the sword—introduced the idea of retribution (persecutors will be requited in strict accord with the lex talionis) – an idea that is contrary to the reading of Alexandrinus, where the subject throughout the verse remains the Christians themselves.5

13.15 οὐκείναις [καὶ] οὗτος (C)

The word οὐκείναις, which seems to be indispensable with ἀποκτάνθηται, stands after οὐκείναις in A P 1006 2065 al, and before ἀποκτάνθηται in 051 1 1854 2073 and the Textus Receptus. The latter reading, which is supported by inferior external witnesses, is an obvious scribal amelioration of the difficulty occasioned by οὐκείναις followed by two verbs in the subjunctive. The omission of οὐκείναις in N 466 1611 1859 al appears to be accidental, resulting in a shift of subject (“that even the image of the beast should speak; and he shall cause that as many as...should be killed” ASV)6. In view of the multiplicity of readings, no one of which clearly explains the origin of the others, a majority of the Committee thought it best to include οὐκείναις in the text, but to enclose the word within square brackets.

13.17 καὶ [A]

The absence of καὶ in N* C about 25 minuscules (including 1611) syr, h cop* a,b1 al appears to be a secondary modification arising from misunderstanding the relationship between verses 16 and 17. When the οὐκείναις clause was taken to be dependent upon οὗτος, καὶ was naturally regarded as superfluous, whereas the clause is no doubt to be taken as dependent upon οὗτος and therefore coordinate with the ἀποκτάνθηται clause. The text is supported by 36 N* K* A* P 046 051 1006 1854 2344 it* vg arm eth al.

13.18 ἐξήκοντα ἕξα (A)

Instead of ἐξήκοντα, which is strongly supported by 36 N* K* A P 046 051 all extant minuscules it* vg syr, h cop* a,b1 arm at δέκα is read by C some manuscripts known to Irenaeus (who, however, says that 666 is found “in all good and ancient copies,” and is “attested by those who had themselves seen John face to face”) and Tischendorf. According to Tischendorf’s 8th ed., the numeral 616 was also read by two minuscule manuscripts that unfortunately are no longer extant (nos. 5 and 11; cf. C. R. Gregory, Prolegomena, p. 676).5 When Greek letters are used as numerals the difference between 666 and 616 is merely a change from ι to ι (666 = χιζ + 616 = χιζ). Perhaps the change was intentional, seeing that the Greek form Neron Caesar written in Hebrew characters (םונא) is equivalent to 666, whereas the Latin form Nero Caesar (ונא) is equivalent to 616.

14.1 τὸ (1) (A)

The presence of τὸ before δρᾶνον is strongly supported by N A C at, it is lacking in K* P 051 and a number of minuscules, followed by the Textus Receptus.

14.3 [ἐκέρ] (C)

The weight of the external evidence supporting the presence of ἐκέρ (A C 1006 1861 2042 it* vg syr, h cop* a,b1 arm eth al) is about equal to that supporting its absence (C6 N P 046 1611 1854 2053 (2344) it* syr* cop* it* arm eth al). It is difficult to decide whether the word was mechanically introduced by copyists as an echo of ver. 2, where it appears three times, or whether it was dropped, either accidentally or in imitation of 5.9, where the expression ἐκέρ οὐκείναις ἐκέρ καθίσει occurs without ἐκέρ. In order to represent the even balance of external evidence and transcriptional probabilities, the word was retained but enclosed within square brackets.

14.5 ἔμμαθα

The introduction of the connective γὰρ (36 N 046 1006 1611 2344 it* vg* syr, h cop* it* al, followed by the Textus Receptus) is a natural addition for copyists to make, especially in view of the expression παρθένους, γάρ ἐμμαθα in the previous verse; whereas there is no reason why the word should have been deleted. The reading without γάρ (A C 1854 2053 2081 it* vg al) is more solemn, and entirely appropriate for the author (cf. 16.6). The reading δὲ ἔμμαθα (051 2056 2131 2254) is obviously secondary.

14.5 ἐστιν

After ἐστιν two minuscule manuscripts (296 2049) and several Latin witnesses, followed by the Clementine Vulgate and the Textus Receptus, add ἐν καθισμῷ τούτῳ τοῦ θόλου. Eleven other minuscules (including 424 617 1888 2018 2084) add after ἐστιν the clause ἀκούσαν οὗ τόν ἔκαθεν οἱ ἀκολούθουσαι τῷ ὀρφινῷ, a gloss derived from ver. 4.

14.6 ἀλλὰν ἐκεῖνον (B)

The most difficult reading, which is strongly supported by A C 1006 1611 2053 2344 it* vg syr, h cop* arm Cyprian al, is to be preferred. The absence of ἀλλὰν (36 N* K* 046 most minuscules cop* Orien al) is either an accidental omission (due to the similarity of the first letters, ἀλλὰν and ἀκούσαν) or, more probably, a deliberate excision owing to its seeming lack of relevancy (for no individual angel has been mentioned since 11.15).
The reading that seems to explain best the origin of the others is ἀλλὰς ἄγγελος δεύτερος, which is supported by Π (C deuterou) P 051 1611 2053 αι (the versional evidence is without much force) and by the sequence of ἀλλὰς ἄγγελος τρίτος in ver. 9. This sequence, which agrees with the author’s style in 6:4–10:1, 15:1 (where an adjective used in addition to ἄλλος is placed after the noun), is altered in A 046 more than one hundred minuscules Primasius αι to ἀλλὰς δεύτερος ἄγγελος, while other witnesses, followed by the Textus Receptus, eliminate the tautological ἄλλος. The reading ἀλλὰς δεύτερος δεύτερος (P 1006 1814 1854 2040 syn) appears to presuppose the reading ἀλλὰς ἄγγελος ἄγγελος δεύτερος, from which ἄγγελος was accidentally omitted in transcription because of the similarity of letters in ἄλλος and ἄγγελος. (See also the comment on 14.3.)

Although the shorter reading ἐλεγει (P Π 336 582 620 628 1216 cop αι) may be thought to be primitive, and the other readings scribal expansions, it is perhaps more probable that ἐλεγει is original, for it is strongly supported (N A C P 051 1006 1611 1854 2344 it Π ειδον vg syn rh h cop arm Speculum αι) and is in the style of the Apocalypse. The readings ἐλεγει αι (046 and ninety minuscules), καὶ ἐλεγει (205 2018 2019 2050), and ἐλεγει καὶ (218 522) are obviously secondary.

On the one hand, it can be argued that ἐξήλθεν was inserted by scribes from ver. 17, sometimes after ἄγγελος (N C P 046 most minuscules it syn rh h cop arm αι) and sometimes after ἄγγελος (051 1854 2073). On the other hand, repetition is characteristic of the author of the Apocalypse, and the absence of the verb in ἐξήλθεν (P 1611 2053 αι may be due to either accidental omission or deliberate excision by scribes who considered it unnecessary in view of its presence in the preceding verse. Because of the balance of such considerations, a majority of the Committee preferred to follow N C 1006 αι and to include the word in the text, but to enclose it within square brackets, thus reflecting considerable doubt that it belongs there.

Instead of 1600 stadia, a reading well supported by N A C P 046 most minuscules, versions, and patristic references, several inferior witnesses read 1606 stada (χιλιῶν ἐξακοσίων 112, 1876 2014 2036 2037 2042 2043 2046 2047 2074 2082 Andrew); a few other witnesses read 1200 stada (χιλιῶν διακοσίων, N 253 506 syn); but the numeral seems to be better to symbolic interpretation. One Old Latin manuscript (1500) reads mill quingenti ("1500"); and χιλιῶν has been accidentally omitted in 2065 and by the first hand of codex Amiatinus.

The weight of external evidence supporting the reading ἔθνων (N A P 046 051 most minuscules it rh h cop arm eth Cyprian αι) is nearly the same as that supporting ἐλιῶν (P Π 94 469 1906)

Although the reading ἔλθων is strongly attested (A C 2053 αι) and was widely circulated at an early date, in the opinion of the Committee it is a transcriptional error that, despite a superficial parallel with Eze 28:13, makes no sense; it is particularly inappropriate with the adjective κακοποιητής, which, on the contrary, is altogether appropriate with τῶν ἁγίων. The reading of the Textus Receptus (agnost. of 296 2049, neither of which was available when the Textus Receptus was formed), appears to have arisen from confusion of the Latin compendia for sanctorum (sclorum [sic]) and saeculorum (sclorum [- αὐτῶν]); “saint” is also read by several Latin writers, including Victorinus-Pettavius, Tyconius, Aprianius, and Cassiodorus.

The words ἐκ τοῦ ικανοῦ, which are adequately supported by N A C P 1 2020 2057 2329 vg arm Andrew and Primasius, are omitted (perhaps because they were regarded as somehow inappropriate in the context) in 046 about ninety minuscules arm and Patristic references, several inferior witnesses read 1606 stadia (χιλιῶν ἐξακοσίων 112, 1876 2014 2036 2037 2042 2043 2046 2047 2074 2082 Andrew); a few other witnesses read 1200 stada (χιλιῶν διακοσίων, N 253 506 syn); but the numeral seems to be better to symbolic interpretation. One Old Latin manuscript (1500) reads mill quingenti ("1500"); and χιλιῶν has been accidentally omitted in 2065 and by the first hand of codex Amiatinus.
The mystic place-name, usually spelled in English “Armageddon” (based on one form of the late Byzantine text), is spelled Ἀρμαγέδών in A E and about 95 minuscules. Another form of the word, lacking the first syllable, is spelled either Μαγέδών (046 1611 2053 2063) or Μαγεδών (about 80 minuscules). Other orthographic variations occur in one or more witnesses, including the following (information concerning the breathing and accentuation is not available for all readings): Ἀρμαγέδων (2054), Αρμαγέδων (2049 2081), Αρμαγέδων (2029), Άρμαγέδων (N 2028 2033 2044 2054 2069 2083 2186), 'Αρμαγέδων (2091), Αρμαγέδων (2065), Άρμαγεδών (205 206 209 2045), Μαγεδών (1828), Μαγεδών (2015), and Μακεδών (61 69). Still other spellings occur in the early versions.

16.17 καί τοῦ θυελλού (A)

The phrase καί τοῦ θυελλού, which is supported by the preponderant weight of witnesses, has undergone a variety of modifications in various manuscripts. It is replaced by καί τοῦ θεοῦ in N; by τοῦ θυελλοῦ in 051*; and is expanded by the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ in still other witnesses.

17.4 πορνίας αὐτῆς (B)

Among the several readings πορνίας αὐτῆς appears to be best attested, being supported by A 1006 2344 vg syr† al. The substitution of τῆς γῆς for αὐτῆς seems to be due to a copyist’s blunder. Codex Sinaiticus presents the conflated reading πορνίας αὐτῆς καὶ τῆς γῆς (cf. the Sahidic “of her fornication with those of the earth” and the Bohairic “… with all the earth”).

17.8 ὑπάγει (B)

Orthographically ὑπάγει (A 1611 2053 al) differs very little from ὑπάγεται (N P 046 051 1006 1854 al), for in Greek manuscripts final ν is often represented merely by a horizontal stroke over the preceding letter. In the context the present indicative is the more difficult reading, which copyists would have been prone to alter to the infinitive after ἀπήλλαξεν (A C 69 2031). The substitution of the present indicative is the more difficult reading, which copyists would have been prone to alter to the infinitive after ἀπήλλαξεν (A C 69 2031).

18.2 οἱ φυλακαὶ πατρίδος θηρίου ἀκαθάρτου (C)

The multiplicity of variations among the witnesses, though complicated, is set forth clearly in the following tabular arrangement (drawn up for the Committee by Dr. Klaus Junack), where the three main elements are represented by 1, 2, and 3, and the five groups of readings are represented by A, B, C, D, and E.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18.12 ζύλου (A)

It will be observed that amid the variety of readings each concludes with καί μεμισθεὶς, except that quoted by Primasius, who transposes the second and third elements. The similarities of the beginning and ending of the three main elements gave ample occasion for accidental omission. The Committee was of the opinion that all three elements (each of which involves an allusion to Is 13.21; 34.11) probably belonged to the original text of Revelation; since, however, καί μεμισθεὶς is absent from such important witnesses as N 2053 2080 vg al, it was decided to enclose these words within square brackets.

18.3 τὸ οἴνοον τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (B)

The reading that seems to explain best the origin of the others is τὸ οἴνοον τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας, read by N 046 1006 1859 2138 cop. The difficulty of understanding the expression, as well as carelessness on the part of copyists, led to such modifications as τὸ οἴνοον τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (P 051 about 90 minuscules it; and is expanded by the addition of τοῦ θηρίου in still other witnesses). The substitution of θηρίου after τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (A 1611 2053 it; vg eth† al, τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (792 1854 2070† syr† al), τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (C), and τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ θηρίου (συρ† Ps-Ambrose). The substitution of θηρίου after τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (A 1611 2053 it; vg eth† al, τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (792 1854 2070† syr† al), τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (C), and τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ θηρίου (συρ† Ps-Ambrose). The substitution of θηρίου after τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (A 1611 2053 it; vg eth† al, τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (792 1854 2070† syr† al), τοῦ θηρίου τῆς πορνίας (C), and τοῦ θηρίου τοῦ θηρίου (συρ† Ps-Ambrose).
To the scribes of several witnesses (A 1006 1841) the mention of vessels made of wood did not seem to be congruent with the materials that followed, and therefore they substituted λίγοι for ξύλοι.

18.17 ὅτι τῶν πλέον (B)

The reading ὅτι τῶν πλέον ("the who sails for (any) part") is strongly supported by A C about 100 minuscules, including 1006 1854, ita, vg, as well as by Ν 046 0229 al, which insert τόν before τῶν. The unusual expression with τῶν (though one similar to it occurs in 1 Cor 12.3) prompted copyists to substitute one or another interpretation, as (a) ὅτι τῶν πλέον πλέον (P 051 about 100 minuscules a), (b) ὅτι τῶν πλέον πλέον (469 582 2076* 2254 cop), (c) ὅτι τῶν πλέον πλέον (svs), (d) ὅτι τῶν πλέον πλέον (2053 2062, cf. cop* "who sail in the rivers"), (e) "those who sail from a distance" (Ps-Ambrose), and (f) ὅτι τῶν πλέον ὁ ἄρμας (1 1004 2049 2186 Hippolytus), which passed into the Textus Receptus ("the company in ships" AV).

18.22 καὶ πάς τεχνής τῆς τέχνης (B)

The absence of πάς τεχνής in Ν A cop is probably accidental; the words are adequately attested by C P 046 051 most minuscules ita vg syn* cop* al, and are in harmony with the author's style, but would scarcely have been inserted by copyists. The addition of καὶ before πάς (2053 2138 Ps-Ambrose) is probably a mechanical blunder in transcription, suggested by the repeated use of καὶ in the first half of the verse. Because of homeoteleuton several witnesses accidentally omit one or another of the clauses that end in ἐν τοῖς ἔστι.

19.5 [καὶ] οἱ φεβομένοι [C]

The presence of καὶ is attested by A 046 051 and almost all other witnesses; on the other hand the word is absent from Ν C P cop* cor.* Was the word added by copyists to avoid the asyndetic construction, or was it deleted lest the unwary reader, not seeing that it means "even," imagine that "those who fear God" constitute a different group from "all of his servants"? In the opinion of the Committee the external evidence and the transcriptional probabilities are so evenly balanced as to suggest the advisability of using square brackets around καὶ.

19.6 κύριος ὁ θεὸς [γεμών] [C]

It is difficult to decide whether ἐσμῶν was omitted in some witnesses (A 1 254 792 1006 2023 2040 2065 2070 2186 syn* cop* eth) because it was felt to be inapposite with the expression κύριος ὁ θεὸς (none of the other instances of the expression in Revelation has the possessive pronoun: 1.8 4.8 11.17 16.3 16.7; 21.25); or whether, on the other hand, copyists introduced the pronoun after ἐσμῶν in accordance with the usage in verses 1 and 5. In view of the weight of evidence supporting the pronoun Ν A 046 1611 1854 2053 2344 ita* vg syn* cop* cor* al ἐσμῶν was retained in the text, but enclosed within square brackets in order to express doubt whether it belongs there.

19.7 ὁδόμησεν (C)

If ὁδόμησεν (Ν Ν 046 051 most minuscules) were original, it is not easy to account for the origin of the other readings. The future tense ὁδόμησεν, though attested by Ν A 2053 al, is intolerable Greek after two hortatory subjunctive verbs, and must be judged to be a scribal blunder. The least unsatisfactory reading appears to be ὁδόμησεν (P and 25 minuscules), which, being the irregular aorist subjunctive and used only rarely (4.9 in Ν and six minuscules: 206.6.37 in Ν and D), seems to have been intentionally or unintentionally altered in the other witnesses to one or another of the other readings.

19.11 καλομένος [παπασ] καὶ ἀληθινός (C)

Although it might be supposed that the reading παπασ καὶ ἀληθινός (A P 051 1 2042 2081 a) is original, and that καλομένος was added by various transcribers either before or after the phrase, or after παπασ, a majority of the Committee considered the omission of the word to be either accidental (καλομένος καὶ) or deliberate (lest it be imagined that the Rider is merely called Faithful and True), and preferred to adopt the reading attested by 046 94 1006 1611 1841 1854 2053 2062 2065 2073 2138 2329 a. The reading of Α arose after a scribe, following the short reading represented by A P al, replaced καλομένος, but inserted it at an incorrect position. In view, however, of the divergent positions of καλομένος, it was thought best to enclose the word within square brackets.

[The reading of Ν (παπασ καλομένος καὶ ἀληθινός) seems to explain best the origin of the other readings. The word καλομένος was transferred to a position either before παπασ or after ἀληθινός so as to permit the customary connection of the two adjectives παπασ καὶ ἀληθινός (as in 3.14; 21.5; 22.6). The preferred sequence of text, therefore, is παπασ [καλομένος] καὶ ἀληθινός, B.M.M.]

19.12 [ὁς] (C)

The ὁς before φιλὸς is attested by A, about 20 minuscules, most ancient versions, and several important patristic witnesses. Furthermore, the use of the word is a characteristic of the author of the Apocalypse. On the other hand, however, it is lacking in four uncials (Ν 046 051) and about 170 minuscules, as well as the Armenian version and Hippolytus. Its presence can be explained as due to scribal assimilation to the similar expression in 1.14. So inductive is the evently balanced evidence that the Committee considered it best to retain the word enclosed within square brackets.

19.13 βεβαιοῦντον (B)

Among the many variant readings βεβαιοῦντον appears to be both the best supported (A 046 051 most minuscules cop* arm a) and most likely to provoke change. Either the absence of αὐτῷ with the following ἓξάμετρα or, more probably, the feeling that the context (and
perhaps also the recollection of Is 63.3 made [άπτομαι less appropriate to express the sense than βαίνει or its collateral βαίνει, prompted copyists to substitute έρρωταμενον (172 256 792 1006 1341 1778 1862 2017 2040 2065 2070 Origen), or έπισταμένον (P 2019 2321 2329 Origen), or έρρωταμενον (2053 2062 Origen), or έρρωταμενον (105 1611 Origen), or, in order to heighten the description, περιπεριμένον (N* Irenaeus), later corrected to περιπεριμένον (N*). (The versional and non-Greek patristic evidence often cited for the several forms of βαίνει and βαίνειον tends to be ambiguous.)

20.2 ὁ δὲ άρχοντας

After τῶν δρώκοντα τοῦ Textus Receptus, following most witnesses (N P 046 A P most minuscules), reads τῶν δρώκον τῶν άρχοντας, thus avoiding the inconcinnity of the nominative ὁ άρχοντας (A 1678 1778 2090). The latter reading is in accord with the linguistic usage of the book of Revelation, which employs the nominative case for a title or proper name that stands in apposition to a noun in an oblique case. Eleven minuscules accidentally omit τῶν δρώκον and read only τῶν άρχοντας.

20.6 [τά] (C)

The external evidence for the presence of the article τά before χίλια ἐτη (N P 046 about thirty minuscules cop*), is almost evenly balanced by the evidence for its absence (A 051 most minuscules cop* arm Andrew Arethas). Likewise, transcriptional and intrinsic probabilities are so indecisive that a majority of the Committee thought it best to include the word but to enclose it within square brackets.

20.9 ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ (A)

Among the seven variant readings ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ has in its favor the preponderant weight of external evidence (A about 25 minuscules cop* Tyconius Augustine Primasius a). The reading ἐκ τοῦ
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οὐρανοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ (046 and about 120 minuscules) appears to be an expansion introduced by copyists in imitation of 21.2 and 10. The other variants involve deliberate or accidental modifications of the preposition(s) or of the sequence of clauses in the expanded reading. In codex Sinaiticus the words from πρὸ ἐπὶ λέμπην of ver. 10 are supplied by N*, the lines having been accidentally omitted by N*.

21.3 Ὄρθρονα

Instead of Ὄρθρονα, which is attested by N A 94 vg Irenaeus* Tyconius Ambrose Augustine Haymo, the Textus Receptus, following P 046 almost all minuscules and most versions, reads οὐρανοῦ. The latter appears to be an assimilation to ὀυρανοῦ of ver. 2.

21.3 λαοί (B)

It is difficult to decide between the reading λαοί, which is supported by N A 046 2053 and twelve other minuscules it* Irenaeus* and the reading λαῶς, which is supported by E P almost all minuscules and versions and many Fathers. Has the author followed the prophetic Scriptures that consistently speak of the one people of God (e.g. Jr 31.33 [= LXX 38:33]; Zch 8.8)? In that case, λαοί was introduced by copyists who pedantically conformed the word to the preceding αὐτοί. Or, did the author deliberately modify the traditional concept, substituting “the many peoples of redeemed humanity for the single elect nation, the world for Israel” (Swete)? In that case, λαῶς betrays the hand of the emender who conformed the reading to the imagery of the Old Testament. Chiefly on the basis of what was taken to be slightly superior manuscript evidence a majority of the Committee preferred λαοί.

21.3 [μετ᾽] αὐτῶν έσται [αὐτῶν θεοῖς]. (C)

Once again it is singularly difficult to determine the original reading. Was the expression αὐτῶν θεοῖς (or θεοῖς αὐτῶν) omitted (N 046 most minuscules) because it seemed to be totally superfluous, or was it added as a marginal gloss, derived from Is 7.14 and 8.8? If
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it be argued that the preceding clause (καὶ αὐτοί λαοί λαοῖς ἐστοί) requires some such parallelism as provided by αὐτῶν θεοῖς or θεοῖς αὐτῶν, the question arises whether these words are the author’s or were supplied by a perceptive copyist. Moreover, in choosing between αὐτῶν θεοῖς and θεοῖς αὐτῶν, one is faced with conflicting considerations. The former order, involving the emphatic position of αὐτῶν, seems to be contrary to the author’s usage elsewhere (only in 18.5a does such an order appear). The latter order, however, may have arisen as an attempt to avoid the sequence αὐτῶν θεοῖς αὐτῶν. After considerable discussion the Committee concluded that the least unsatisfactory procedure was to print the text of A, but to enclose the words αὐτῶν θεοῖς within square brackets.

21.4 [τῶν] τά πράγματα (C)

On the one hand it can be argued that the reading τά πράγματα, which is strongly supported by A P 051 1006 1611 2053 a, is original and that copyists sought to avoid asyndeton by inserting τῶν or γάρ. On the other hand, however, it is altogether possible that the shorter reading originated through an accident in transcription when, because of the preceding γαρ, copyists overlooked τῶν, in order to represent the balance of probabilities the Committee decided to include τῶν enclosed within square brackets.

21.12 [τά οὐνάματα] (C)

Whether scribes considered that the words τά οὐνάματα were superfluous in the context, and therefore omitted them (N P 051 a), or that they were needed for the sense, and therefore added them (A 1611 1841 1854 a), it is difficult to decide; consequently, the Committee preferred to retain the words, but to enclose them within square brackets.
In favor of (4), which is read by $\text{K}^{\text{lt}}$, is the fact that elsewhere in the book of Revelation $\text{AV}(\text{N})$ is used twelve times (in 8.3 with πάντων) to designate the Christian believers. Reading (2), adopted by the Textus Receptus, is attested by only one Greek manuscript (296) and shows the influence of 2 Cor 13.13 and 2 Th 3.18. Reading (6), which has the most extensive testimony (046 051 about 180 minuscules syr $\text{cop}^{\text{th}}$ arm Andrew Arethas), appears to be a conflation of (1) and (4). Readings (3), (5), and (7) are supported by quite insignificant evidence. On the basis of the weight of codex Alexandrinus (4th century), which is joined by manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate and by Tyconius (a.d. 380) and Beatus (a.d. 788), a majority of the Committee preferred the shortest reading, μετά πάντων.

The Textus Receptus, following $\text{K} 046 051$ almost all minuscules vg syr $\text{cop}^{\text{th}}$ arm eh al concludes the book with δωρεάν. It, however, this word were present originally, it is difficult to account for its omission in such witnesses as A 1006 2065 2053 2432 it $\text{cop}$ ar, gig $\text{arm}$ Andrew Arethas), appears to be a conflation of (1) and (4). Readings (3), (5), and (7) are supported by quite insignificant evidence. On the basis of the weight of codex Alexandrinus (4th century), which is joined by manuscripts of the Latin Vulgate and by Tyconius (a.d. 380) and Beatus (a.d. 788), a majority of the Committee preferred the shortest reading, μετά πάντων.

The concluding words of the book have been transmitted in curiously diverse forms. Apripius and Primarius omit ver. 21.
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Footnotes

1. H. C. Hoskier, Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse; Collations of all Existing Greek Documents ..., (London, 1929), pp. 25–27.
2. It will be noticed that in the Greek text alpha is spelled out, whereas omega is represented by the letter. The reason for this difference arises from the fact that Greek grammarians did not invent the name αυτων (in distinction from δυο μικρου) until long after the Apocalypse had been written (see Metzger, Manuscripts of the Greek Bible [Oxford, 1981], p. 6, note 13).
3. It is also possible to translate (as Zahn prefers), "Go!"
6. For a variety of other numerals in several minuscules and in Armenian witnesses, see H. C. Hoskier, Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse, II (London, 1929), pp. 364 f.
8. As an example of what nonsense scribes can produce, cf. the absurd reading of $\text{K}^{\text{lt}}$ (τον προβάτα του Κυρίου) instead of τον προβάτα του Κυρίου.

---
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| (1) | μετά πάντων | | | |
| (2) | μετά πάντων | τιμήν | | |
| (3) | μετά πάντων | ἡμῶν | | |
| (4) | μετά | τῶν ἁγίων | | |
| (5) | μετά | τῶν ἁγίων | σου | | |
| (6) | μετά πάντων | τῶν ἁγίων | | |
| (7) | μετά πάντων | τῶν ἁγίων | αὐτῶν | | |
### Appendix

**Supplementary List of Greek Manuscripts**

Here and there in the commentary occasional reference is made to a variety of witnesses, chiefly Greek minuscule manuscripts, which are not cited in the text-volume. The following list of 246 such witnesses supplies the kind of information that is given for Greek manuscripts in the Introduction of the text-volume, namely, an indication of the contents and date of each manuscript. In the column headed "Content," the letter "e" refers to one or more of the Gospels; the letter "a" to the Acts and/or the Catholic Epistles; the letter "p" to one or all of the Pauline Epistles; and "r" to Revelation. For more extensive information (i.e. whether a manuscript is fragmentary; whether it contains a commentary; the dimensions and layout of its pages; its present location), one may consult the reference volumes compiled by Gregory and by Aland, mentioned above on p. xiii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0151</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0211</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>er</td>
<td>1297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>12927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XIII/XIV</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>442</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1357</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII/XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII/XIV</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>267</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1322</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI/XII</td>
<td>1295</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>661</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1341</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X/XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>665</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1354</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>680</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1355</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>697</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>726</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1402</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743</td>
<td>ear</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1405</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>782</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1521</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>794</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1555</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>807</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1570</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>823</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1579</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>850</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1592</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>1445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1604</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1642</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>1278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1704</td>
<td>eapr</td>
<td>1541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>941</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1738</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>990</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1753</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>999</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1765</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1070</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1799</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1076</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1819</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1099</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1108</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1827</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>1295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1149</td>
<td>eap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1178</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1188</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI/XII</td>
<td>1845</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1194</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1200</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1223</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1874</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1245</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1270</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1279</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XI</td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>XVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1288</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td>apr</td>
<td>XI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Abbreviations: e—Gospels; a—Acts; c—Catholic or General Epistles; p—Pauline Epistles; r—Revelation. Roman numerals indicate approximate date of origin.

#### Papyri

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>e III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>e VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>e VII/VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>e III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>e IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>e III/IV?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>a IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>c III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>p IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>p VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>p III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>p III/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>p III/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>p IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>r III/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>e IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>a IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>p III/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>e early III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>c III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>e IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>e III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>c early III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>r IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>e late IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>p about 600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>p III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>e III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>a III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>p III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>p VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>e IV/V?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>e VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>e III/IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>a about 300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>e III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>p III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>e VII/VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>a VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>r VII/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>e VI/VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>ea III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>p about 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>r late III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>a late III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>p late III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>a IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>p about 400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>e about 125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>ea III</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>c V/VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>e VII/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>a V/VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>a IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>cf. 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>e VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>e VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>p about 700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>e IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>e about 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>e about 200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncials</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N 01</td>
<td>eacpr</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 02</td>
<td>eacpr</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 03</td>
<td>eacpr</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 04</td>
<td>eacph</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 05</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 06</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[E 07]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 08</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[F 09]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 010</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[G 011]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 012</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[H 013]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H 015</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I 016</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[K 016]</td>
<td>cp</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L 019</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[L 020]</td>
<td>aep</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[N 022]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[O 023]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[P 024]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[P 025]</td>
<td>eacpr</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Q 026]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 029</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0113</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W 032</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z 035</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ 037</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θ 038</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Σ 040</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Σ 042]</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ψ 044</td>
<td>eacpr</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[046]</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>048</td>
<td>acp</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>050</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>058</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>059</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>060</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>+084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI/VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>cf. 073</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>087</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>cf. 0293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092a</td>
<td>cf. 0293</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092b</td>
<td>cf. 087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>+0123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>098</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>099</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>cf. 070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>cf. 083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>cf. 029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>cf. 0106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121a</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0121a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121b</td>
<td>cf. 0243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>cf. 095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>cf. 070</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>cf. 029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>cf. 0102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>cf. 029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>c VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>e VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>v/vi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>e X</td>
<td>about 1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>e VIII</td>
<td>1052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>c VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>p V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>p V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>e VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>p VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>e VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>p V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>p VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>e VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>e IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>p IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>e IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>e V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>e VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>e VII/VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>e VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>e VIII/IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>e X/XI?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>e VI/VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minuscules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>e X-XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>e XI-XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>e XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>e XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>eacp IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36a</td>
<td>a XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>e XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>acp 1044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>p 1087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>e XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>e XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>e XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>e about 1122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>e 1052</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>a X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>e XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>er e XIV, r XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>e 1013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>p XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>p XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>a X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>c XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>c XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>p XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>p XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Cp XI/XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>a XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>p 1092</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>543</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>565</td>
<td>e IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579</td>
<td>e XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>597</td>
<td>e XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>610</td>
<td>a XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>614</td>
<td>a XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
<td>e XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>788</td>
<td>e XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>826</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>828</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>892</td>
<td>e IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945</td>
<td>ac XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>983</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1006</td>
<td>er XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1010</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1067</td>
<td>c XIV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1071</td>
<td>e XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1175</td>
<td>acp X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1241</td>
<td>acp XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1243</td>
<td>ec XI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Contents</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1292</td>
<td>ec XII</td>
<td>1339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1319</td>
<td>p XII</td>
<td>1342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1409</td>
<td>ac XIV</td>
<td>1424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1505</td>
<td>ec XII</td>
<td>1506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1573</td>
<td>p XII/XIII</td>
<td>1582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>cr XII</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1689</td>
<td>e 1200?</td>
<td>1709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1735</td>
<td>c X</td>
<td>1739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1841</td>
<td>r IX/X</td>
<td>1846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1852</td>
<td>cp XIII</td>
<td>1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>cp XIV</td>
<td>1891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>p X</td>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>r XII</td>
<td>2050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2053</td>
<td>r XIII</td>
<td>2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2127</td>
<td>p XII</td>
<td>2138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>p XIV</td>
<td>2298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2329</td>
<td>r X</td>
<td>2344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2351</td>
<td>r X</td>
<td>2377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2427</td>
<td>e XIV?</td>
<td>2464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2818</td>
<td>cf. 36a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Version</td>
<td>Abbr.</td>
<td>Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>spcr</td>
<td>IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VII/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>XII/XIII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX/X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>ea</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Version</th>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>V/VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII/IIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>ar</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>acr</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>IV/V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>XIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>ac</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII/IIX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>IX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>XV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>XII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VI/VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>VIII/VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>VI/VII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITa</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>VII/VIII</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Principal Symbols and Abbreviations

*(See Introduction, pages 47–52)*

- { } enclose a letter A, B, C, D which indicates the relative degree of certainty for the reading adopted in the text.
- [ ] in the text enclose words whose presence or position in the text is regarded as disputed; in the critical apparatus, immediately following the symbol Byz, enclose the symbols for certain Byzantine witnesses (see p. 4*).
- [ ] enclose passages which are regarded as later additions to the text, but which are of evident antiquity and importance.
- ( ) in the critical apparatus, indicate that a witness supports the reading for which it is cited, but with minor differences; in the discourse segmentation apparatus, indicated minor differences of detail in segmentation, while the authority supports in general the segmentation for which it is cited.
- [ ] indicated negligible differences in the witness of selected Byzantine manuscripts to the reading attested.
- * the reading of the original hand of the manuscript.
- ? indicates that an early version is probably in support or a reading, but that there is some doubt.

1/2, 2/3, 5/7 etc. indicate the statistics for variant readings in multiple instances of a passage. The second number indicates the number of times the passage occurs in a lectionary manuscript of a Church Father; the first number indicates how many times the reading attested is supported.

**AD** Apostoliki Diakonia (1968)

**Byz** the reading of the majority of the Byzantine witnesses.
**Byz** a part of the Byzantine manuscript tradition.

**cmt** citation in the commentary section of a manuscript where the reading differs from the accompanying Greek text.

**Diatessaron** see p. 38f.

**ed** the reading from an edition of a Church Father when it differs from a reading in the papyrus tradition of his text.

**FC** La Bible en Français Courant (1982)

**fr** a citation from a Greek fragment of the work of a Greek Church Father which is preserved complete only in translation.

**I** a lectionary manuscript, identified by the superscript number following it.

**l** reading of the lectionary edition of the Apostoliki Diakonia, Athens.

**lhexi** shows the relative frequency of a reading in the multiple occurrence of the same passage in a single lectionary manuscript. The second number of the fraction indicates the number of the times the passage occurs in the manuscript; the first number indicates how many times the reading attested.

**LA** the Latin translation of a Greek Church Father.

**Lect** the reading of the majority of the lectionaries selected, together with the text of the edition published by Apostoliki Diakonia, Athens.

**Lectpt** A part of the lectionary manuscript tradition (at least 10 manuscripts) which differs from the rest (also designated Lect).

**Lectpted** A part of the lectionary manuscript tradition in agreement with the edition by Apostoliki Diakonia.

**lem** in the Church Fathers, a citation from a lemma, i.e., the text of the New Testament which precedes the commentary (cmt) in a commentary manuscript.

**Lu** Luther Version (revised 1984).

**LXX** the Septuagint or Greek translation of the Old Testament.


**mg** textual evidence contained in the margin of a manuscript.

**ms** manuscript(s) of an early version, or of a Church Father’s text, when differing from the edited text.

**NA** Nestle-Aland (7th revised printing, 1983).


**NJB** New Jerusalem Bible (1985).


**pp** a reading from the papyrus stage of the tradition of a Church Father’s text when it differs from an edition of the Father.

**RSV** Revised Standard Version (1971)

**Seg** La Nouvelle Version Segond Revisée (Bible à la Colombe, 1978)

**[sic]** an abnormality reproduced exactly from the original.

**supp** a portion of a manuscript of a Church Father’s text supplied by a later hand where the original is missing.

**TEV** Today's English Version (1976)

**Theodotion** Theodotion’s text of the Greek Old Testament.

**TOB** Traduction Oecuménique de la Bible (1984)

**TR** Textus Receptus (Oxford, 1889)

**v** the text of a manuscript of the New Testament when it differs from another reading given in the margin (**mg**), or in the commentary section (cmt) which accompanies the text of a Church Father.

**v** the most probable reading of a manuscript where the state of its preservation makes complete verification impossible; or the apparent support of a Church Father for the reading cited, where stylistic and contextual factors do not permit complete certainty.

**v.r.** variant reading.

**v** a variant reading specifically designated in a manuscript as an alternative.

**VP** La Biblia: Versión Popular (1983)


(1) Bracketed manuscripts are uncials with a Byzantine text, cited following the group symbol Byz.
(2) See footnote 7, page 24.