PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text having been depleted, Thomas Nelson Publishers requested us to produce a second edition. Changes herein are few in the text and apparatus, and largely consist of correcting typographical errors, chiefly accent marks. We also thought it would be helpful to provide a brief preface to summarize the detailed introduction.

RECEPTION OF THE MAJORITY TEXT

The editors are gratified that several schools and classes are using our Testament as a text and that the demand is extensive enough to warrant a second edition.

Those who are friendly to the Majority Text viewpoint are pleased to have a compact and easy-to-read edition of a text that has only been discussed and written about heretofore. Those who are neutral have welcomed the edition as a contribution to the open market of ideas in a science that has not yet produced the final answer. Even those of an opposing viewpoint have largely agreed that it is useful to have such an edition. This is true because our text can help in making comparisons with other text forms. For example, it is much easier to sense the impact of the triple trisagion in Revelation 4:8 by seeing it in print than merely by reading the little Latin word nonies in the Nestle-Aland apparatus.

WHAT THE MAJORITY TEXT IS

The Majority Text is a text that employs the available evidence of the whole range of surviving manuscripts rather than relying chiefly on the evidence of a few. To us it is unscientific to practically ignore eighty to ninety percent of the evidence in any discipline.

For all intents and purposes since Westcott and Hort's time, the readings of the majority of manuscripts have been rejected as "late and secondary." Much of the support for this approach has been the theory that there was an official ecclesiastical recension thrust upon the church in the fourth century, thus explaining the preponderance of so-called Byzantine manuscripts thereafter. Another support was that no manuscript evidence before the fourth century apparently supported Byzantine readings. Further, a handful of alleged conflations was used to suggest that the traditional text was full of them. (Actually, all manuscripts have some.) History has not yielded any evidence of such a recension, and this aspect of the theory is now largely abandoned.
Second- and third-century papyri now support many readings that were once dismissed as "late." Furthermore, many of the "conflations" can be just the opposite: a fuller text from which part has dropped out by such things as homoioteleuton, stylistic or theological considerations, or sheer carelessness.

We hold that ultimately the history of the transmission of each book of the New Testament should be traced by means of a genealogical tree. This method failed under Westcott and Hort precisely because they refused to give the proper weight and role to the majority of the extant manuscripts. But when the whole range of evidence is properly used, genealogy becomes the most viable and promising option for determining which reading is original when the evidence is significantly divided. Unfortunately, this method is presently possible only in the Pergamum Adulterae and in Revelation because a large percentage of the materials has never been fully collated in the rest of the New Testament. In these two places, through the extensive work of von Soden and Hoskier, most of the manuscript evidence has been minutely collated. In the rest of the New Testament we were forced to rely heavily on von Soden's work, augmented by Tischendorf (further augmented by Legg in Matthew and Mark). There is much work to do in New Testament textual criticism, especially if one believes in carefully sifting all the evidence rather than in leaning so heavily on the small body of Egyptian manuscripts that happen to be our oldest extant copies.

HOW TO USE THIS EDITION

In most of the New Testament you will find two apparatuses. The first apparatus is the one of greatest interest to us, because it details divisions within the Majority Text tradition. Rather than listing the sigla of scores of individual manuscripts, we use a form of shorthand to indicate how much of the majority tradition supports a reading. For example, one that is supported overwhelmingly by the tradition, ordinarily eighty-five to ninety percent, is indicated by the large German ét, the symbol chosen by Kurt Aland for the Majority Text as a whole. If the Majority Text is largely united but with defections in some strands, the boldfaced Roman M is used. When there is a real division, the M* (pt = the Latin partim) indicates the divisions. Sometimes—because the individual uncial and papyri cited are on the side not chosen for the text—it appears, from a superficial reading of the symbols, that support for the chosen reading is weaker than for its rival. But it must be understood that the M* on the left of the "vs" in any case represents more manuscripts than the uncial or papyri cited on the right. Because it has been traditional to put special weight on our oldest codices (X, B, and A) and more recently on the even older papyri, we decided to detail this material in the apparatus.

The Coptic G stands for the Egyptian manuscripts which largely form the basis of most critical texts. Each book has a slightly different
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formula, indicated in the beginning of the apparatus of that book, of the manuscripts that support the Egyptian tradition. When all or nearly all are united, the letter G is used. When there is significant division, they are listed individually.

The second apparatus is of special interest to those who prefer the Critical Text (ct = found in Nestle-Aland* and UBS) or are anxious to know how it compares with the Majority Text. Here the sigla so familiar to users of the Nestle tradition are utilized. These are explained in the full introduction. One new symbol that we have invented is a little black dot in front of a word to show that it is merely a spelling variation with no real difference in meaning. The second apparatus shows how often the textual evidence is divided between the vast majority on one side and the Egyptian manuscripts on the other. At times some of the latter also support the Majority Text.

In the passage about the adulterous woman, there is a single apparatus using numbered footnotes. Here the varied strands are divided into M* through M** (the same division von Soden uses, except that we substitute the M for his lower case mu). Though we heavily depend on his detailed work here, our interpretation of the evidence is quite different from his.

In Revelation the remarkably accurate work of Hoskier, augmented by the more recent work of Schmid, makes it possible to have much greater detail than anywhere else, all in one apparatus. Here the evidence is divided using the letters M* through M**. In this one book the Majority Text agrees with the Critical Text more than twice as often as it conforms to the Textus Receptus. This is no doubt partially due to the TR's being originally based on a very narrow manuscript foundation. It is interesting to note that some of the readings that are chosen as original are rougher Greek (more Semitic, for one thing), which is logical, considering the constraining circumstances of the author in exile.

Finally, it should be stressed that we consider our text to be a significant step forward for the discipline of New Testament textual criticism. But at the same time we recognize the large amount of work yet to be done. If our premises are correct, the development of genealogical histories for every New Testament book is a desideratum. It will take many minds and hands to accomplish the task, but if future researchers conclude that we have pointed them in the right direction, the editors will feel most gratified. We will also be grateful to God for granting the strength to do our part.

Arthur L. Farstad
Zane C. Hodges
INTRODUCTION

The New Testament was originally written by its inspired authors in the Greek language. Through many centuries, until the invention of printing (about A.D. 1450), it was handed down in handwritten copies. Of these there now survive approximately 5,000 complete or partial manuscripts. The available witnesses to the text of the New Testament are far more numerous than for any other ancient book.

The process of reconstructing the original wording of the Greek New Testament is known as textual criticism. The history of this discipline is long and complicated. But the most basic question that must be answered has always remained the same. That question is: How should the surviving materials be used in order to recover the exact wording of the autographs?

The two most popular editions of the Greek New Testament in use today are those produced by the United Bible Societies (Third Edition) and by the Deutsche Bibelstiftung (the Nestle-Aland Text, Twenty-sixth Edition). These two texts are nearly identical. Although eclectic, both rely heavily on a relatively small number of ancient manuscripts that derive mainly from Egypt. Among these, Codex Vaticanus (B) and Codex Sinaiticus (x) are the most famous uncial (large letter) manuscripts. The most important papyrus witnesses in this group of texts are the Chester Beatty papyri (p45-46 48) and the Bodmer papyri (p56-75). The text which results from dependence on such manuscripts as these may fairly be described as Egyptian. Its existence in early times outside of Egypt is unproved.

In contrast to this kind of text stands the form of text found in the vast majority of the remaining documents. This text is recognizably different from the Egyptian text and has been appropriately designated the Majority Text. It is true that the documents that contain it are on the whole substantially later than the earliest Egyptian witnesses. But this is hardly surprising. Egypt, almost alone, offers climatic conditions highly favorable to the preservation of very ancient manuscripts. On the other hand, the witnesses to the Majority Text come from all over the ancient world. Their very number suggests that they represent a long and widespread chain of manuscript tradition. It is necessary, therefore,
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It was their opinion that the great mass of surviving Greek manuscripts descended from an authoritative ecclesiastical revision of the text produced sometime about the fourth century. The locale where the revision might have been made was Syrian Antioch. As a result they held that the majority of the Greek manuscripts were of secondary character and should be accorded little weight in determining the original text.

Subsequent scholarship has wisely discarded the term "neutral" to describe the Egyptian group of texts. The theory of a Syrian recension has also been widely abandoned. In spite of this, the critical texts in current use differ relatively little from the text published by Westcott and Hort a hundred years ago. In fact, the discovery of the papyri has been thought by some to strengthen the claims of Westcott and Hort about the superiority of \( \text{\textit{\textalpha}} \) and \( \text{\textbf{B}} \).

This point has especially been urged in connection with \( \text{\textit{\textgamma}}^{\textit{\texteta}} \), a third-century text substantially similar to \( \text{\textbf{B}} \). But actually \( \text{\textit{\textgamma}}^{\textit{\texteta}} \) proves nothing more than that the kind of text found in \( \text{\textbf{B}} \) is earlier than \( \text{\textbf{B}} \) itself.

Today scholars generally do not argue that the Majority Text stems from a revision of earlier texts. Instead it is often viewed as the result of a long-continued scribal process. But this view is usually presented in vague and general terms. This is not surprising, because it is virtually impossible to conceive of any kind of unguided process which could have resulted in the Majority Text.

The relative uniformity within this text shows clearly that its transmissional history has been stable and regular to a very large degree.

It is often suggested that the intrinsic character of the Majority Text is inferior to the Egyptian. This too was one of Westcott and Hort's arguments. But this approach usually partakes of an unduly large element of subjectivity. The fact is that excellent reasons almost always can be given for the superiority of the majority readings over their rivals. In sum, therefore, the Westcott-Hort tradition in textual criticism has failed to advance convincing objections to the authenticity of the Majority Text.

A MAJORITY TEXT METHOD

The premises which underlie the present edition and determine its methodology are two. Both of these premises need to be clearly understood by the users of this text.

(1) Any reading overwhelmingly attested by the manuscript tradition is more likely to be original than its rival(s). This observation arises from the very nature of manuscript transmission. In any tradition where there are not major disruptions in the transmissional history, the individual reading which has the earliest beginning is the most likely to survive in a majority of
INTRODUCTION

documents. And the earliest reading of all is the original one. Unless an error is made in the very first stages of copying, the chances of survival of the error in extant copies in large numbers is significantly reduced. The later a reading originates, the less likely it is to be widely copied.

It should be kept in mind that by the time the major extant papyrus texts were copied, the New Testament was well over a century old. A reading attested by such a witness, and found only in a small number of other manuscripts, is not at all likely to be a survival from the autograph. On the contrary, it is probably only an idiosyncrasy of a narrow strand of the tradition. The only way in which the acceptance of a substantial number of minority readings could be justified is to reconstruct a plausible transmissional history for them. This was, of course, precisely what Westcott and Hort tried to do in defense of \( \text{\textit{A}} \) and \( \text{\textit{B}} \). But the collapse of their genealogical scheme under scholarly criticism has nullified their most essential argument. Nothing has replaced it.

In the present edition, wherever genealogical considerations could not be invoked, readings overwhelmingly attested among the manuscripts have been printed in the text. But this leads to a second premise.

(2) Final decisions about readings ought to be made on the basis of a reconstruction of their history in the manuscript tradition. This means that for each New Testament book a genealogy of the manuscripts ought to be constructed. The data available for this in the standard sources is presently inadequate, except for the Apocalypse. In this edition, therefore, a provisional stemma (family tree) of manuscripts is offered for that book only. Textual decisions in Revelation are made on the basis of this genealogical reconstruction. Also, a provisional stemma is offered for John 7:53–8:11; and here, too, decisions about the text are based on stemmatic factors.

It is true, of course, that most modern textual critics have despaired of the possibility of using the genealogical method. Nevertheless, this method remains the only logical one. If Westcott and Hort employed it poorly, it is not for that reason to be abandoned. In fact, the major impediment to this method in modern criticism has been the failure to recognize the claims of the Majority Text. Any text-form with exceedingly large numbers of extant representatives is very likely to be the result of a long transmissional chain. All genealogical reconstruction should take this factor into account. If persistent preference for a small minority of texts cannot be surrendered, then naturally genealogical work will prove impossible. Its impossibility, however, will rest on this preference and not on the intrinsic deficiencies of the method itself. The present edition is in no way fettered by a predilection for a small handful of manuscripts, whether very ancient or somewhat later. It seeks to track the original text in the vast body of the surviving documents. Where possible, this has been done stemmatically.

THE BASIC APPARATUS

Since for most of the New Testament stemmatic work is not yet feasible, the present edition operates within this reality. The apparatus for all but John 7:53–8:11 and the book of Revelation takes a basic form which must now be described.

(1) The First Apparatus. In all cases where the available sources indicate that there is a significant division within the surviving manuscripts, the problem is assigned to the first apparatus. This stands, wherever it is required, immediately below the text material. Also assigned to this apparatus is another class of variant. The 1825 Oxford edition of the Textus Receptus was employed as a working base against which the manuscript data were compared. Wherever our text differs from the Oxford Textus Receptus, the variation is noted in the first apparatus. Only in a few instances of typographical errors and in certain kinds of spelling variants is this not the case.

(2) The Second Apparatus. In the second apparatus are to be found all the places, not already included in the first apparatus, where this edition differs from the United Bible Societies and Nestle-Aland texts. Here, too, only some spelling variations are excluded from consideration, along with typographical errors in the other texts. When this apparatus is used in conjunction with the first one, the reader of this edition will have before him all the significant differences between the Majority Text and that found in the other two widely circulated editions.

(3) Footnotes and Sigla. If a variant reading is to be found in the first apparatus, this fact is indicated in the text by a footnote number placed after the last word affected by the variation. If a variant is found in the second apparatus, a different set of sigla is employed. These are as follows:

1. signifies the addition of one or more words at the point indicated.
2. signifies the omission of the word before which it is placed.
3. signify the omission of the words enclosed by these two signs.
4. signify the transposition of the words enclosed by the two signs.
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Papyri:
\[ p^{37}, \text{third or fourth century (Matthew 26:19-52)} \]
\[ p^{45}, \text{third century (extensive portions of the four gospels and Acts)} \]
\[ p^{46}, \text{ca. 200 (extensive portions of the Pauline corpus and Hebrews)} \]
\[ p^{47}, \text{third century (extensive portions of Revelation)} \]
\[ p^{66}, \text{ca. 200 (extensive portions of John)} \]
\[ p^{72}, \text{third or fourth century (1 Peter 1:1-5:14; 2 Peter 1:1-3:18; Jude)} \]
\[ p^{75}, \text{third century (extensive portions of Luke and John)} \]
\[ p^{88}, \text{fourth century (Mark 2:1-26)} \]

Uncials:
\[ \mathbf{X}, \text{Codex Sinaiticus, fourth century (New Testament)} \]
\[ \mathbf{X}, \text{Codex Alexandrinus, fifth century (most of New Testament)} \]
\[ \mathbf{X}, \text{Codex Vaticanus, fourth century (lacks 1 Timothy to Philemon, Hebrews 9:14 to end, Revelation)} \]
\[ \mathbf{X}, \text{Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, fifth century (extensive portions of New Testament)} \]

It will be observed from this list that each of the four gospels is represented by at least two papyrus texts, though \[ p^{37} \] (Matthew) and \[ p^{88} \] (Mark) are merely fragments. For the remaining sections of the New Testament, there is one papyrus representative. Since the purpose of this edition is the presentation of the Majority Text tradition, further citation of the papyri was not considered necessary. The major extensive papyrus texts of early date are included along with the four famous uncial manuscripts. With the citation of all these, the user of the Majority Text apparatuses can gain a reasonably good perspective of the Egyptian type of text. A deliberate decision was made not to include the readings of Codex Bezae Cantabriigenensis (D, fifth century) because its highly idiosyncratic text would have needlessly enlarged the apparatus. Yet, occasionally, when none of the regularly cited witnesses supports the variant found in the second apparatus, D is mentioned. So also, on the same basis, are the manuscripts L (eighth century), R (sixth century), W (fifth century), Θ (nineth century), Σ (sixth century), 074 (sixth century), and the minuscule families f1 and f19.

Where a consensus of the manuscripts representing the Egyptian texts exists, they are cited corporately under the siglum Coptic \( \mathbf{G} \). But the composition of \( \mathbf{G} \) varies from book to book and can be learned from the information given just before the first apparatus on the initial page of each book. If a regularly cited manuscript reflects the Egyptian texts, but is extremely fragmentary, it is normally excluded from \( \mathbf{G} \) in the book in question. To do otherwise would have necessitated calling attention to its hiatus repeatedly. But if not included in \( \mathbf{G} \), the reader can assume that its nonappearance in the apparatus indicates its testimony was not available.

A summary of the value of \( \mathbf{G} \) is:

- Matthew, Mark
- Luke
- John
- Acts
- Romans through 1 Thessalonians
- 2 Thessalonians
- 1 Timothy through Philemon
- Hebrews
- James
- 1, 2 Peter
- 1 John
- 2 John
- 3 John
- Jude
- Revelation

In those books where \( \mathbf{G} \) represents just three manuscripts, this siglum is only used when all three agree. Where \( \mathbf{G} \) has four representatives, it is used where at least three agree. The reading of the other member is then given separately or cited in parentheses with a preceding \( h. \) (hiatus). Where there are five representatives of \( \mathbf{G} \), the siglum is only cited if four agree. The reading of the other witness is either given or a hiatus is indicated. If the reading of a manuscript at any point cannot be determined
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with certainty, it is either left uncited or is followed by a superscribed "x". If it is included within G, its reading should be regarded as certain.

The readings of the 1825 Oxford Textus Receptus are indicated by the siglum TR. The concurrence of United Bible Societies Third Edition and the Nestle-Aland Twenty-sixth Edition is represented by CR (critical texts). If the two editions diverge, they are indicated by U and N respectively. In places where these editions employ brackets in their text, the presence of brackets is signaled by [CR]. How many of the words in the variation unit are included within the brackets by these texts must be determined by examining one or the other of the texts. But if the variation unit includes only a single word, naturally that is the bracketed word.

The signs + and | indicate that the word or words following them are either added or omitted. But — may appear by itself to indicate that all of the words in the text involved in the variation are omitted by the witness(es) in question.

36 εἰναὶ ΜCA, CR vs +μεν Μ'. TR
16 τοῦτος ντ'B vs Μ; Α, (—μακριος το αυτο in verse 16 του)

Where there is a transposition involving more than two words, this may be represented in the apparatus by a series of numbers. Thus a variation like '2.41 shows that the first word of the text herein is placed after the fourth word by whatever witnesses are then mentioned. Numbers may also be used to indicate omissions. A variant like '241 would signal not only transposition, but the omission of the third word of the text.

As is usual in the citation of manuscripts, an * after the manuscript designation (e.g., p56 or C*) indicates the manuscript has undergone correction at some point in the variation unit. The * indicates the reading before correction. In this edition the readings of correctors are not given. If a manuscript cited is enclosed by parentheses — as (x) or (B) — this means that the manuscript exhibits an orthographical variation of the reading with which it appears. This is to be distinguished from a citation like (—κ) or (σταθηναι B). The former represents an omission in κ and the latter a substitution in B.

The present edition does not cite the testimony of the ancient versions or church fathers. Nor are the lectionary texts considered. This is not because such sources have no value for textual criticism. Rather, it is due to the specific aims of this edition, in which the primary goal has been the presentation of the Majority Text as this appears in the regular manuscript tradition.

(4) Reading the Apparatus. If the sigla just considered are kept in mind, the apparatus of this edition can be read easily.

In the first apparatus, the entry begins with a superscribed numeral indicating the number of the footnote in the text to which

the cited material refers. This is followed by the number of the verse in which the variant is found. Next come the words in the text which are affected by the variation in question. After these words comes the Majority Text evidence followed by the evidence of any of the regularly cited manuscripts which support this text. After a comma, TR or CR may be cited if either of these likewise supports the text. Following vs the next reading is given with the evidence cited in the same sequence as before. Additional variants, if any, have the same format.

In the second apparatus, the number of the verse appears first. This is followed by the variation siglum found in the text. Then comes the variant itself and the evidence for it. If one or more manuscripts have a minor variation from this reading, this variation is then added in parentheses along with the manuscript(s) containing it. If there is more than one such minor variation, any additional ones are added within the same parenthesis. Separate minor variations within a parenthesis are set apart by a semicolon. Following vs the evidence for the Majority Text reading. Minor variations of this reading are handled in the way just described. If, however, there is a third major variant, this also appears in parentheses, but the evidence for the Majority Text is separated from the parenthesis by a semicolon. Additional major variations also may appear within the parenthesis similarly set apart by a semicolon.

42 ταφαιναι ντ'B vs Μ; Α: (ταφαιναι ντ'κτ., ταφαιναι A)

Since it is the function of the second apparatus to give variants in which the United Bible Societies and Nestle-Aland texts differ from the Majority Text, it is normally unnecessary to employ the siglum CR in this apparatus. The first cited reading is that of CR unless otherwise noted. Exceptions may occur when the two editions diverge, in which case the sigla U and N are employed to alert the reader to the presence of brackets in the two editions being compared, the siglum [CR] appears in the second apparatus where appropriate. This siglum can, in fact, appear on the same side as the evidence for the Majority Text reading if the other editions retain the words of the text within brackets. In that case, the evidence for omitting or altering them is what is given first.

It also should be understood that in both apparatuses, a parenthesis not set off from the preceding evidence by a semicolon will often contain only the portion of the preceding reading that is changed. For example, in Mark 3:25 the second apparatus entry is:

25 '2.41 κε (σταθηναι für σταθηναι B) vs Μ; Α

This means that in the transposition supported by κε, B alters the word σταθηναι to σταθηνα, but otherwise supports the word order of κε. When the text is consulted, it will show that σταθηναι is the
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word numbered 1. Of course, \( \text{M} \) and A support the text exactly. It will be noted that in a variation like this the siglum \( \text{T} \) is employed, rather than \( \text{F} \). This is because B’s difference from the Majority Text reading involves more than a simple change of word order.

When the evidence supporting the Majority Text is set off by a semicolon from a following parenthesis, then the full reading of the manuscript(s) within the parenthesis is given. This is illustrated in Mark 11:2:

\[ 2 \text{οὐτω ἀνθρώπων} \text{B} \ (\text{ν} \text{C}) \text{vs} \text{M}; \text{ποιμνοτε ἀνθρώπων} \text{A} \]

Here the siglum \( \text{F} \) has been used rather than \( \text{T} \), since the text contains only the word ἀνθρώπων. B has the lengthened reading οὐτω ἀνθρώπων, which is also found in \( \text{M} \) in the sequence ἀνθρώπων οὔτω. M (a slightly reduced majority as compared to \( \text{M} \)) supports the text. The third major variant, set off from M by the semicolon, is that of A and is fully given.

Sometimes a Greek word appearing in the first or second apparatus will have one or more of its letters enclosed in parentheses. The parenthesis indicates that the manuscripts cited have a spelling variation at this point. The most common occurrence of such a parenthesis is in instances of \textit{nú} movable. The orthography of this edition follows the general practice of the mass of manuscripts in omitting this \textit{nú} before consonants. But it was felt the reader should be reminded that when such a word is in question in the apparatus, the witnesses may or may not have the \textit{nú}. Usually uncial and papyrus readings are cited with the \textit{nú}, not enclosed in parentheses, since they normally write it. Whether they actually have it at any given point has not always been checked. But if an uncial or papyrus reading is cited without it, it may be assumed that it is lacking in this instance. Many very common itacisms in the manuscript witnesses specifically cited are totally disregarded, and no parentheses are used either to enclose the letters themselves or the manuscripts. It was felt wise, however, to regularly indicate the alternation in the ending -\textit{αι} by enclosing in parentheses the manuscript which italicised this ending. This was done because the form in question has not always been checked. Similarly left out are the orthographic fluctuations in \textit{ενυμένοντα} and in such a word as \textit{αἰσχροτοί}. The -\textit{οο}/-\textit{ττ} variation is ignored.

Abbreviations in the manuscripts of the \textit{nomina sacra} are not considered, nor are other abbreviations except in rare instances.

It often happens that in the first apparatus the siglum TR is given after a reading of the Oxford Textus Receptus with no manuscript data cited. This should not be construed to mean that the Textus Receptus has absolutely no manuscript evidence supporting it, though this occasionally can be true. Rather, it means that none of the regularly cited witnesses support the variant, including none of the subgroups of the Majority Text. A variant reading found in the second apparatus also may occasionally appear without any manuscript citation. This means that none of the materials regularly referred to in the apparatus support the reading of the United Bible Societies and Nestle-Aland texts. If, however, these editions are supported by significant uncial or papyrus evidence not regularly mentioned, this evidence is usually given.

(5) \textit{Determination of the Text}. If no variant reading is cited in either apparatus, the reader may assume that the printed text is, to the best of the editors’ knowledge, attested by \( \text{M} \) or \( \text{M}' \). In either case the text thus qualifies as the Majority Text reading. The siglum \( \text{M} \) indicates concurrence with all the Majority Text subgroups (so far as is known). That is to say, the Majority Text as a whole is essentially united in such cases, though naturally any or all of the subgroups may have some members that defect. It is important to note that when \( \text{M} \) is printed, the consensus even includes von Soden’s I texts (our \( \text{M}' \)) which are to be understood to support the text by a substantial margin. When the support within \( \text{M} \) is not so great, insofar as determination of this is possible from von Soden’s material, \( \text{M} \) is reduced to \( \text{M}' \).

If \( \text{M} \) is printed, and no siglum indicates the defect of a specific subgroup, it may be assumed that the reason for \( \text{M} \) is to be found in the reduced margin of support for the text within \( \text{M}' \). But \( \text{M} \) is also printed whenever a specific Majority Text subgroup defects by itself. Such instances are included in the first apparatus in order that the reader may trace the data of von Soden on such matters more easily. Thus the user of this text may discover from the first apparatus the places in which (according to von Soden) a group like \( \text{M}' \), for example, has a distinctive reading as over against the rest of the majority tradition.

But \( \text{M} \) is not allowed to stand in the apparatus when a defecting subgroup is joined by substantial evidence from the rest of the majority representatives. Such readings are designated \( \text{M}' \), \( \text{M}'' \) readings (in the gospels) also appear wherever the Majority Text reading cannot claim the support of a strong consensus of von Soden’s \( \text{K}^* \) texts along with a similar consensus from at least two of the other three groupings: \( \text{M}' \), \( \text{M}'', \) and \( \text{M}'' \). Thus a seriously divided \( \text{K}^* \) testimony suffices to produce \( \text{M}' \) even if the other three groups
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are united. But hardly ever do the other three present a cohesive testimony if Kε does not.

In choosing a text reading from among Mετ variations, a strong preference was normally accorded to the reading of Kε where this group was essentially united. Of all the groupings within the majority tradition, Kε seems the most likely not to be traceable to an archetype short of the original text itself. It remains possible, pending further analysis, that within Kε are to be found several strands going back independently to the autographs. By contrast it is probable, as von Soden thought, that the large group Mετ (Kε) is traceable to a single source which is not the original text. The same is probably true of Mε when its unity holds up under investigation. Mε is hardly a group at all, and its actual connections with the rest of the majority tradition must be discovered by future genealogical study of its constituent elements.

Where Kε itself was sharply divided within an Mετ reading, the rival variations were weighed both in terms of their distribution within the majority tradition as a whole and with regard to intrinsic and transcriptional probabilities. Occasionally a transcriptional consideration outweighs even a preponderance of contradictory testimony from Kε. For example, in the Mετ reading found in Luke 22:30, the phrase εν τῷ βοσκεῖται μου was omitted in 10 of the 13 manuscripts from Kε which von Soden examined. Not only is this Kε sample much too small to be satisfactory, but the omission could be due to homoioteleuton in the light of the pou which follows τραπεζαίς. According to von Soden, Mε reads for inclusion as does a very large majority of Mε. It is clearly possible that an error of omission like this could have happened even more than once in the Kε texts. It is perhaps less likely that the phrase suggested itself to a scribe because of the βοσκεῖται in verse 29. Thus the episits, with preference going to von Soden's Kε (as over against his Kε and Kε) in much the same way as preference was given to Kε in the gospels. In the Acts and epistles, Mε again represents von Soden's I texts. In these sections of the New Testament as well as in the gospels, the texts are hardly to be distinguished from the majority tradition as a whole.

As all who are familiar with von Soden's materials will know, his presentation of the data leaves much to be desired. Particularly problematical to the editors of this edition was the extent to which
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his examination of the Kε materials appeared to lack consistency. As the specific statements show, at times only a few representatives of Kε in the gospels or of K in the Acts and epistles were examined by him. How often this was true where he gives no exact figures we are left only to guess. His other Kε subgroups suffer from the same shortcoming. That such procedures jeopardize the accuracy of any independently constructed apparatus is self-evident. But the generalized data of the other sources (such as Tischendorf or Legg) were of little value in correcting this deficiency. In the final analysis, if the present edition was to be produced at all, the statements of von Soden usually had to be accepted. However, where our text differs from what von Soden considered the common (Koine) reading, it should be assumed that it is due to further research, or to conflicting data within von Soden's volumes.

What is urgently needed is a new apparatus for the gospels, Acts, and epistles, covering the entire manuscript tradition. It should include complete collations of a very high percentage of the surviving Majority Text manuscripts. Such an apparatus could then be used to determine the actual distribution of rival variants within the majority tradition. Beyond this, it could provide the indispensable base from which definitive stemmatic work could be done.

THE APPARATUS FOR JOHN 7:53–8:11

The materials furnished by von Soden for the famous story of the woman caught in adultery are much more adequate than those he provides for the rest of the New Testament. Here, in fact, von Soden completely collated all available copies of this pericope, more than nine hundred altogether. Though the precise data of these collations must be painstakingly gathered from his discussions (and not from his apparatus alone), in at least it is accessible. From it the editors of the present text have constructed a provisional stemma. This represents their understanding of the transmissional history of this narrative.

It is clear that the textual troubles which overtook the pericope began early. It is omitted by the most ancient witnesses for the Egyptian tradition, namely, εις, εις, εις, και, and B. It was also evidently absent from C and even from A, which in the gospels often sides with the Majority Text. But the joint testimony of these manuscripts, except perhaps for A, simply may point to a very ancient copy from which the passage was missing.

There is no compelling reason to doubt that the story is originally Johannine, despite the prevailing contrary opinion. Among the marks of Johannine style which it exhibits, none is clearer than the phrase in 8:6: τοῦτο δὲ ἐξέλεγκεν περιπληκτικός ουκ ὁ Βασίλειος. This is a pure and simple Johannism, which is evident by comparison with 6:6; 7:39; 11:51; 12:6, 33, and 21:19. Likewise the
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use of the vocative γυναι (8:10) by Jesus to address a woman is a Johannine characteristic (cf. 2:4; 4:21; 19:26; cf. also 20:13, 15). The phrase μητέρα ομήρου (8:11) occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, except John 5:14, and the historic present of διομοι (8:3) is consonant with John’s frequent use of this idiom.

Nor is the narrative improperly suited to the place where it is found in the overwhelming majority of the nine hundred copies which contain it. On the contrary, a setting at the Feast of Tabernacles (cf. 7:2, 14) is ideal for the story. It was on just such an occasion, when Jerusalem was crowded with pilgrims, that stragglers might be thrown together with the resulting sin around which the story centers. An interview with a woman in a court of the temple would likely have been in the Court of the Women. And that is evidently where Jesus was, as the reference to the “treasury” in 8:20 indicates. Moreover, the way in which the woman’s accusers are driven to cover by the moral exposure which Jesus brings upon them furnishes a suggestive introduction to the initial Johannine reference to the Lord as the Light of the World (8:12). The setting of the incident at daybreak is likewise suitable (cf. 8:2) since the rising sun furnishes the natural backdrop for the same title. It is in fact to the sun (not the temple candelabra, as Hort thought) that the title Light of the World refers (cf. 9:4, 5, 11-9).

Finally, as the Qumran finds have shown (cf. 1Q5 ii 6-7), the thought of forgiveness of sin experienced here by the woman is properly linked to the phrase “light of life” (8:12).

In view of the features of Johannine style that have been noted and the narrative’s almost unique suitability to this context, the idea that the passage is not authentically Johannine must finally be dismissed. If it is not an original part of the Fourth Gospel, its writer would have to be viewed as a skilled Johannine imitator, and its placement in this context as the shrewdest piece of interpolation in literary history! Accordingly, the consideration of the narrative’s text that follows assumes its Johannine authenticity.

Von Soden distinguished seven subgroups among the Greek manuscripts containing the pericope. These he designated with the siglum μ (for μοιατικοι) and by a superscribed numeral. In the apparatus of the text presented herein von Soden’s μ has been changed to M, but his superscribed numbers have been retained. Thus our M₁ = his μ₂, M₂ = his μ₂, and so on. (This M₂ is not to be confused with the M₂ cited elsewhere in the gospels.) In von Soden’s own stemmatic reconstruction of the textual history of the pericope (cf. Die Schriften, 1, Part 1:524), M₁ stands nearest the archetype, while M₂ is the farthest removed. But von Soden’s preference for M₁ is unjustifiably influenced by his high regard for B (TAFD) and its close allies in this group. As usual, despite its age (fifth century), D is an idiosyncratic text, and M₁ as a whole is not very useful in reconstructing the original form of the story.
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While a brief introduction is not the medium for fully explaining how a stemma can be constructed, the general contours of the method can be stated. A valid stemma must have the power to explain the descent of the readings in a natural way. Each hypothesized intermediate archetype must show itself to be the starting point of more than one reading which appears below it on the stemma, but not above. Where there is mixture, as there always is, the stemma should be able to disclose the probable source of most of it. Moreover, the readings found high on the stemma should quite often easily be seen as the natural progenitors of readings lower down which developed from them. In particular there ought to be some readings treated as original which are noticeably superior to their rivals. When a stemmatic tree can pass all these tests at once, it has a high probability of being correct.

Below is given the projected family tree for the seven M groups containing the pericope. Some discussion of its justification will follow. A solid line indicates direct descent, while a broken line signifies mixture. The direction from which the mixture came is shown by the arrow. Greek letters designate the intermediate, but lost, connecting archetypes which the genealogy must necessarily presuppose. The stemma then is as follows:

From this diagram it can be seen that M₆ is viewed as the original form of the pericope from which all the other groups are descended. M₆ is a substantial group which includes approximately 250 manuscripts. Very many of these are associated with Johannine
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texts which von Soden identifies with K. But M* had its own stemmatic development, as its nearly even division on certain readings attests. Future investigators could profitably pursue the stemmatic analysis of M* itself.

Another large and influential group is found in M², comprising some 280 manuscripts. The large number of its representatives suggests that its origins are early. But the text it exhibits, over against M*, shows marks of revision. M² is a grouping of approximately 260 texts, many of which are to be associated with von Soden’s K family. It has only one distinctive reading of its own (at 8:7) and is otherwise a composite of M* and M³. An examination of its variants shows that M² is the source from which corrections were made on a base that was fundamentally M*.

The remaining groups are much smaller and their fundamental texts a bit harder to determine. The largest group among these is M² which comprises only about forty manuscripts. All of these, along with M³, show signs of derivation from a common archetype, which on the diagram is designated α.

The plausibility of the proposed stemma can be shown by a consideration of some of the variant readings, which, although not exhaustively discussed herein, will be sufficient to illustrate the general method by which stemmatic problems were resolved.

These are the variants to be considered:

(1) 7:53 αηθέους M⁶ 6 7
   αηθέους M⁴
   επορευθησαν M³ 5
   επορευθησαν M² 2

The original reading is the Johannine word αηθέους, preserved by M⁴ and M³*. As the stemma suggests, M⁴ exhibits mixture from M³, but only in 7:53–8:11 which (as von Soden has shown) was often treated separately by the documents. A portion of M⁴ was revised to the plural αηθέους. The reading επορευθησαν belongs to the archetype α. It is an obvious contextual harmonization with the same verb in 8:2 and was probably thought to improve the style. The change to a plural in M⁴ and M³ either may have been made independently or is an evidence of mixture.

(2) 8:2 βαθέως ηλέθεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς M⁶
   παρεγευτο M² 3 4 5 7

The word βαθέως, retained by M⁶, is not used by John elsewhere. But its appearance in the phrase ὁ Ἰησοῦς βαθέως in Luke 24:1 does not mean it is a Lucan word. It is likely that the expression ὁ Ἰησοῦς βαθέως was as idiomatic as our own “early morning,” and if so there is no reason why John should not use it in the one narrative where it is needed. On the other hand, the ηλέθεν of M⁶ is a typical
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Johannine word, while John uses παραγγέλει elsewhere only in 1:23. The dropping of ὁ Ἰησοῦς by all but M⁶ is suspicious, since the λέγει παρεγευτο covers approximately the same space as Ἠχηνοικόν would when the nomen sacrum is used. It appears as though Ἠχηνοικόν might have been illegible to the scribe of the archetype α, or a precursor of that archetype. If so, παρεγευτο would be the scribe’s conjecture. This conjectural emendation also could have led to the accidental omission of βαθέως. M⁶ introduced here the reading of M⁴.

(3) 8:3 + πρὸς αὐτὸν M³ 2 4 6 7
   − πρὸς αὐτὸν M⁴ 5

This reading remains very questionable, with M⁴ split almost evenly between adding and omitting the phrase. Until M⁴ is further analyzed, it is hard to know what its original reading (and that of the autograph) was. In any case, the widespread influence of the numerous M⁴ manuscripts has led to extreme fluctuation in the tradition. Perhaps πρὸς αὐτὸν was regarded as redundant by some scribes, coming so soon after the same phrase in verse 2. But the decision here could go either way, in the light of available knowledge.

(4) 8:3 + τῷ M⁴ 5 6
   − τῷ M³ 2 5 7

The stemma adequately accounts for this variant. The reading − τῷ is a mere scribal omission made in archetype γ, which M⁴ picks up from M³, as usually happens.

(5) 8:4 εἶπον M³ 4 6
   λέγουσιν M² 2 5 7

John uses both the past and present tenses of the verb λέγω/εἶπον in his gospel. The stemma, however, suggests that λέγουσιν originates with the archetype γ. The present tense is then a contextual harmonization with the same tense of γας γας in the preceding verse, since γας γας and λέγουσι belong to the same sentence. M⁴ revises to M³ here too.

(6) 8:4 ταυτὴν εὐρομεν M⁶ 7
   αὐτὴ ὁ γας εἶληται M⁴ 3 4
   αὐτὴ ὁ γας κατειλήπται M¹
   αὐτὴ ὁ γας κατελήφη M⁵

The ταυτὴν εὐρομεν of M⁴ and M⁵ has an overwhelming claim to originality. The scornful use of the demonstrative pronoun is a clear Johannine trait (cf. 6:52; 7:15; 10:30; 21:21; but especially 9:29). The verb εὐρομο also is frequently used by John. Surely it is not conceivable that a scribe originated a variant like this, while the reading αὐτὴ ὁ γας εἶληται would easily be worked up from
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the γυναικα ... κατελθημενην of verse 3. The stemma also is able to show how a further harmonization occurred in archetype 6 with the addition of the prefixed κατα. M5 then changed to an aorist. The M7 editor left his basic text untouched here. Naturally, the subsequent μοιχειουμενην of M6 and M7 had to become μοιχειουμεναι in M1 2 3 4 5, which it did.

(7) 8:5 εν δε τοι νοοι ημων Μυσωνις M2 3 4 6
ου εν δε τοι νοοι ημων Μυσωνις
ου εν δε τοι νοοι ημων ημων
Another Johannine trait is the use of ημων after νοοι. The Fourth Gospel is distinctive in its use of expressions like “our/your/their law.” Stemmaologically, it seems likely that the original reading retained by M6 and M7 was reintroduced via mixture into M2 and a portion of M3. The reading of M1 2 3 4 6 would have been the reading of archetype α. M6 3 represents the reading of archetype δ. It should be noted that whenever a partim reading is given only once in the apparatus (as here for M11), this means that the remaining members of the group are too divided to cite.

(8) 8:5 μεθεοι M11 2 3 4 6
διαβολεοθαι M11 5 7
Clearly the correct word and the only one used elsewhere by John (10:31, 32, 33, 11:8) is the verb μεθεοι. The lugubrious-sounding διαβολεοθαι can perhaps be traced to the redactor of M5, from which group it touched M7. Alternatively, διαβολεοθαι may belong to archetype δ, and a part of M11 has then been revised from another source, likely M6.

(9) 8:5 + περι αυτης M11 2 3 4 6 πατ
- περι αυτης M11 5 6 7 πατ
The construction περι λεγειν περι is Johannine (cf. 1:22 and 9:17). Of 216 stable M6 manuscripts, von Soden reports a margin of 134 to 82 in favor of + περι αυτης. The omission can probably be traced to the archetype δ. But it is not certain whether this archetype was affected by a strand of M6 or has itself influenced a branch of the M6 texts. Probably the former is true. Once again, M6 appears to be influenced by M5, while a portion of M5 reintroduces the words. Alternatively, the omission originates with M6 and affects a portion of M11. A decision on this point is not important. But see variant (11).

(10) 8:6 κατηγορειν κατα M11 2 3 4 6 7 κατηγορειν M11 5 6 7 κατα
Both κατηγορεω (5:45 twice) and κατηγορεια κατα (18:29) are used by John. (The omission of κατα in 18:29 by M*, B, and a few others is likely to be a mere scribal fault. It stands against M6, A, C, and W.) Here stemmatic considerations permit a decisive choice.
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nine hundred manuscripts containing the pericope. Of course the use of this siglum does not imply that all eight hundred agree with the text, but the bulk of them do so. If $M^*$ secedes from this consensus, but does not carry any other family with it, the siglum becomes $M$. All combinations of witnesses other than those just mentioned are treated as equivalent to an $M^*$ reading and are included in the apparatus. But instead of the generalized $M^*$ designation used elsewhere, the individual family groups are specifically mentioned. If no entry is found in the apparatus at any point, the reader may conclude that the printed text has the value of either $M$ or $M^*$.

The editors encourage all serious students of the text of the New Testament to analyze the data offered in the apparatus, which may also be supplemented by consulting von Soden (Die Schriften, I, Part 1:486-524; Part 2:717-763). Only if the stenographic reconstruction is searchingly evaluated can its provisional nature be advanced to the level of practical certainty. This calls for the cooperation of many minds.

THE APPARATUS FOR THE APOCALYPSE

In the book of Revelation the student of the text no longer depends on the work of von Soden. Replacing von Soden's apparatus is H. C. Hoskier's two volume study of the manuscripts, Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse (1929). In what remains an impressive model for all future work of this kind, Hoskier assembled a detailed presentation of the variant readings found in all of the Greek manuscripts accessible to him. There is a total of 256 minuscules (small letters) in his list. When the manuscripts not collated by him are subtracted from this list, and certain other adjustments are made, there remain 215 texts. Of these only 11 can be identified as copies of surviving manuscripts, so that if they too are left out of consideration, the valuable minuscule witnesses amount to 204. Since Hoskier's time, fresh manuscript accessions have increased this total somewhat, but for the purposes of this edition Hoskier's materials are sufficient. Of course $\varphi 77$ was unknown to Hoskier, and its readings have been added to those of $\Pi$, $B$, $A$, and $C$ for the apparatus of this text.

The other modern investigator whose work on the Apocalypse was indispensable to the editors is Josef Schmid. Schmid's study of the text of Revelation builds heavily upon the data furnished by Hoskier, and his conclusions appear in his Studien zur Geschichte des Griechischen Apokalypse-Textes (I 1/2, II, 1955-56). Schmid found the manuscripts of the Apocalypse to divide into four fundamental text-forms which he calls Andreas, $K$ (the Koine), $\varphi 77$, $\Pi$, and $A$ and $C$. Of these, he accords the highest status to $A$ and $C$ as the best representatives of the original text. But Schmid
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M\(^*\) comprises a large group of manuscripts which, in the present apparatus, includes the witness of 29 documents. The text of M\(^*\) is essentially a closed entity in which only a small amount of significant variation occurs among the family members. Very many, but by no means all, of the manuscripts reflecting M\(^*\) are to be found at Athens. It seems not unlikely that they reproduce an ancient and respected exemplar which was once the possession of that monastic center.

Both Hoskier and Schmid refer to this group as "Complutensian" since it is clearly the text of M\(^*\) that was represented in the famous Complutensian Polyglot, the New Testament of which was printed in 1514, though not actually circulated until some years later. In Schmid's view, M\(^*\) is a mixture of Andreas and K (M\(^*\)), and in this he is no doubt correct. The problem for stemmatology is to determine which of these constituent elements constitutes the base and which the intrusive element. The conclusion seems inescapable that the M\(^*\) base was in fact M\(^*\). This appears from a number of considerations.

In beginning with M\(^*\) shares two readings of M\(^*\) that are probably scribal faults. At 22:15 M\(^*\) joins M\(^*\) to read πας φιλαν for πας ο φιλαν. The article would very easily be dropped by a scribe, and the resulting phrase is contrary to the author's usage. The same error is shared also by Κ and Α, with significant stemmatic implications for them as well. Correctors easily overlook a small falling like this. Additionally, M\(^*\) joins M\(^*\) again in the omission of και το τεγομενην (21:15) by homoioteleuton. Naturally both of these instances, if viewed in isolation, might be credited to coincidence. But the additional consideration must be taken into account that if M\(^*\) is the correcting element, some of the choices made by the redactor of M\(^*\) are very peculiar. Thus at 3:7, M\(^*\) goes with M\(^*\) in the remarkable reading, ο ανοιγοι και αεικει και ερημην ο ανοιγος και αφεις και ο νεανιος. When compared with the manuscripts Andreas versions of this, it is hard to see why a redactor would have selected the M\(^*\) text if it did not already stand in his exemplar (see the apparatus for the data). The same might be said of the peculiar order of words in 13:13, where M\(^*\) and M\(^*\) have και ου και εκ του ουρανου και παντες επι την γην ης. If one of the Andreas readings had stood in the text of M\(^*\) already, the redactor's preference here for M\(^*\) would be strange. A similar observation is pertinent to the variant τους εμους at 13:14, the choice of which by a reviser is hardly explicable.

By contrast, the readings in which M\(^*\) joins Andreas normally appear to be just such readings as a redactor would naturally pick up. The presence of the data (which, of course, this discussion only briefly considers) strongly favors the conclusion that M\(^*\) is fundamentally an M\(^*\) text heavily reworked in the direction of
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Andreas. If this is so, \(M^*\) can add nothing to the resolution of the textual problems of the Apocalypse. This conclusion has already been reached by Schmid.

\(M^*\) and \(M^\alpha\) are subgroups of the family of manuscripts associated with the commentary of Andrew, bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia. The life and work of Andrew are usually assigned to the late sixth and early seventh centuries. This may well be too late, but in any event the text-form which Andrew used is much older. The conclusion of a fourth-century date for the Andreas type is necessitated by the observation (made by both Schmid and Bousset) that many of the corrections of \(\xi\) by \(\xi^*\) are from this type. Since \(\xi^*\) is the siglum assigned to the nearly contemporaneous correctors of \(\xi\)'s text, the exemplar they employed must be at least as old as \(\xi\) itself. That it was, in fact, much older is not improbable. In any case, Andrew himself was likely enough to have utilized the most respected manuscript available to him as the text on which he commented. There is no reason why the parental exemplar of the Andreas text-type could not go back well into the second century.

But, as Schmid has also concluded, the Andreas text-form is a recension in which many of its readings are gratuitous revisions of the original text. These revisions often reflect either a stylistic improvement or a reverential embellishment. Thus at 1:11, Andreas has the addition, εγώ εμί το \(A\) και το \(Ω\) τον Προτοσ και τον Εσποτος, drawn from 22:13 (cf. 21:6). The repeated addition of αγγελός in chapter 16 is another example of the reviser's at work. The original text reads αγγελός in 16:3 only, but the Andreas redactor added it in 16:4, 8, 10, 12, and 17. \(M^\alpha\) completes the process by adding it also at 16:2 (as does \(M^*\)). The reverse process appears in \(\xi^7\), A, C, and \(\xi\), where the αγγελός of 16:3 is deleted in conformity to the other locations. Only \(M^\alpha\) has a reading not readily explicable as a scribal correction, for what scribe would be likely to add αγγελός for the second instance only? Yet the resulting text is stylistically good: "the first ... the second angel ... the third ... the fourth ... and so on." This is where we meet the work of the original author.

There is no substantial reason to believe that Andreas and \(M^*\) have any stenotic relationship to each other except in the original itself. In the present editors' view, the readings in which Andreas and \(M^*\) concur are to be treated as original. \(M^\alpha\) and \(M^\beta\) are cited separately to exhibit the fact that their mutual prototype was closer to \(M^\alpha\) than either of them is individually. For the purposes of the apparatus of this edition, the text of \(M^\alpha\) was determined by the witness of thirteen manuscripts, and the text of \(M^\beta\) by the witness of twenty-four (see Tables, p.xlv f). The reconstruction of the text of Andreas which Schmid has published (Studien, I, Part 1) more nearly reflects \(M^\alpha\). But it is probable that \(M^\beta\) at times preserves the original Andreas text as at 2:21, which reads, και \(\sigma\) θελει.
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μνημοσύνη with \(M^\alpha\) b c. \(M^\alpha\) has lost the phrase, but the comment of Andrew here suggests he knew it.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the character of the Egyptian witnesses \(\xi^7\), B, A, and C. That these texts pair off in the way Schmid suggests need not be disputed. \(\xi^7\) and \(\xi\) are one branch of the family and A and C are another. But Schmid's judgment that A and C represent a kind of "neutral text" for the Apocalypse must be rejected. In fact, all four of these witnesses are in reality mixed texts of Andreas and \(M^\alpha\). A number of minuscules of the same character augment the representatives of this text-form. Those which Hoskier investigated are the following (related manuscripts are linked by hyphens): 1006-1841-2040, 1678-1778-2020-2080, 2051 2062, 1611, 1854, 2050, and 2329. Schmid claims 2344 as a valuable addition to the miniscule allies of the Egyptian texts.

Schmid's evidence that both Andreas and \(K\) are older than \(\xi\) need not be repeated here (cf. Studien, I, Part 2: 121-135). His arguments are persuasive. It remains only to observe that if these text forms already antedate and influence \(\xi\), it is even more probable that they would likewise influence the texts of A and C which are later than \(\xi\) by perhaps a century. That A and C could somehow be the repositories of a relatively "neutral" text over against the remainder of the Greek tradition is improbable on its face. A few examples of the inferiority of the text represented in the Egyptian witnesses must suffice to illustrate their secondary character.

Of considerable interest are three variants of a similar nature. The reading adopted in the text of this edition is given first.

5:12 την δυναμιν και τον πλουτον και σοφιαν και άγιον εκτος etc. \(M^\alpha\) b
tην δυναμιν και πλουτον etc. \(M^\alpha\) b \(KA\), TR Cr

9:15 εις την αραν και εις την ημεραν και μηνα και εναντον \(M^\beta\)
eις την αραν και την ημεραν εκτ. \(M^\beta\)
eις την αραν και ημεραν και μηνα etc. \(M^\alpha\) b \(KA\), TR Cr

10:11 επι λαος και επι ενδυοι και γλωσσαις και βαιμεους πολλος \(M^\beta\) b c e
επι λαος και ενδυοι etc. \(M^\beta\) b \(KA\), TR Cr

It will be observed in the texts of \(M^\alpha\) and \(M^\beta\) that the article or the preposition, or both, is repeated before the second member of the union, but not before subsequent ones. The Egyptian witnesses, along with \(M^\beta\), have smoothed what appears to be a stylistic irregularity, and the words in question are allowed to stand at the beginning of the series only. In an exactly analogous variant at 3:17, A retains the article before ειςεβαιος along with \(M^\alpha\) b c e, while it is
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deleted in Μ* Χ. The proposition that the repeated word or phrase was added in all these places by a redactor can hardly be taken seriously. This kind of addition is without parallel. It is clear that the usual scribal predilection for smoothness and consistency is at work in the elimination of the word. In Μ* and Μ>, as the cited evidence shows, this smoothing process has only been partially carried through. It seems clear that Μ* and Μ> consistently preserve a stylistic trait of the author that in other texts had a tendency to disappear under scribal correction. The Egyptian texts do not perform well in these instances.

Though it is not possible to offer more than a random selection of examples, the inferiority of the Egyptian witnesses is not hard to see in other places as well. The following list of variations is worth noticing in this connection:

1:6 βασείλεια ierεις Μ* b Χ, AC, Cr βασείλεια και ierεις Μ* Χ, TR
5:10 βασείλεια και ierεις Μ* b c e x, TR βασείλεια και ierεις Α, Cr βασείλεια και ierεταιεια Χ

In these passages only Μ* b c x have escaped the scribal tendency toward assimilation. (C is lacking at 5:10.) In Μ* 1:6 is assimilated at 5:10. In Α the reverse has taken place, while on the other hand Χ assimilated ierεις to βασείλεια by altering it to ierεταιεια.

13:14 τους εμούς τους κατακινήτους Μ* e τους κατακινήτους Μ* b Χ, AC, TR Cr

It is almost impossible to imagine a scribe inventing the reading of Μ* and Μ> Yet its meaning, upon reflection, is simple. The author foresees that the second “beast” will delude “my own people who dwell on the earth.” The original omission of τους εμούς was easily made by homoioteleuton (τους — τους), and thereafter the shorter text would no doubt appeal to correctors who tended to suspect interpolations.

18:24 αματα προσηται και αμαται Μ* b c e αμαται προσηται και αμαται Μ* AC, TR Cr

Here the Semitic plural αματα in the vast bulk of the documents is altered to the more normal singular by Μ*, Χ, Α, and C.

20:12a ηνοεσαν Μ* ηνοεθησαν Μ* Α, Cr ανευφηθαν Μ* ανευφηθαν Μ* ΤR ανευφηθα

The impersonal third plural ηνοεσαν, employed as a Semiticizing passive equivalent, disappears everywhere but in Μ*. Assimilation to the following ηνευφηθη is a regular passive, has occurred.
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21:4 καὶ εξαλείψει απτ αυτων παν δακρυον απο των ορθαλμων αυτων Μ* Χ καὶ εξαλείψει παν δακρυον απο των ορθαλμων αυτων Μ* c e x, (tr for απο Χ, Cr) καὶ εξαλείψει ο Θεος παν δακρυον απο των ορθαλμων αυτων Μ* e (tr for απο Α, TR)

The nominative redundancy involved in απτ αυτων … αυτων is again resolute of Semitic speech. Its correction by scribes was to be anticipated, as was also the reverence addition of ο Θεος. If απτ αυτων did not stand in the original text, it is hard to imagine anyone wishing to add it. Clearly, the scribes’ propinquity for eliminating seeming roughness in the author’s style is once again at work.

The question remains, however, on which side of the stemma the Egyptian texts should be placed. The solution to this problem is aided by the group 1006-1841-2040 which, as Schmid also saw, belongs among the witnesses to the text found in the old manuscripts. Significantly, at 15:2 the family reads the erroneous transposition of Μ* mentioned earlier, εκ της εκκονος και εκ της θεριας αυτου. (The manuscripts 1006-1841, however, drop the awkward autou.) This suggests that the Egyptian family of texts is descended from Μ*, though naturally the offending transposition has been corrected in most of them. Nevertheless, the many agreements which Μ b, Χ, Α, and Κ share with Μ* against Andreas can then be explained as survivals of their base text. Thus an agreement like the one at 22:15, where the article after πας is dropped by Μ*, Χ, and Α (though Χ also transposes πας και πως), sharply sets one side of the family tree of the Apocalypse against the other. In the same way the agreement of πας with Μ*, in reading the Semitizing construction εκ του κατανου 15:8, is again the survival in one Egyptian manuscript of the Μ* base reading lost by the others. The scribal correctors could not resist improving this to render it as the regular genitive (—εκ του) after γεμισθη.

Further analysis of the textual problems of the Apocalypse cannot be undertaken here except to mention three famous various readings that have found favor at one time or another. Thus the reading θενον for λειυν at 15:6, supported by Α, Κ, and others, is clearly a scribal blunder, despite its defense by Hort (cf. Α, Χ την αγαθην την γεννην 12:12). The singular reading of Α at 5 ν (—μου) cannot possibly be correct. The loss of individual words in the manuscripts is the most common of all scribal faults. The possibility that a fifth-century text here preserves the original against the rest of the Greek tradition is infinitesimally small. Finally, the reading απο ο μων και ο γνω … is an error of the same kind in which the nomen sacrum form ΘΥ was particularly
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susceptible to accidental omission. Comparison with the following constructions in verses 4b and 5 will show that the nominative is used for the apposition with a word in the oblique case (cf. Studien, I, Part 2: 239-40). The author originally wrote: ἀπὸ Θεου ὁ ὄν καὶ ο̣ν καὶ ο ἔρωμεν.

In the apparatus of the Revelation text, the siglum M stands for the consensus of M* + ε, while ℓV represents M* plus any three of the remaining four groups. Often ℓV represents all five groups. But the constituents of M remain always the same whenever three groups divide against the two others. The defection of either M* or M* effectively negates the use of this siglum. This was true of M*, despite its small size numerically, because it stood at the top of the stemma on the branch opposite that of M*. But also M*, notwithstanding its secondary character, is a witness to the M* type of text whenever they agree. The concurrence of all three produced both numerically and stemmatically a Majority Text reading in the truest sense.

As was the case with John 7:33-8:11, the Apocalypse apparatus was not divided into two parts. To have done so would have complicated the reader’s efforts to compare the data with the proposed stemmatic reconstruction. Additionally, the number of disagreements with the Oxford Textus Receptus was much greater than in the other books of the New Testament. Thus the size of the first level of apparatus would have been much enlarged in any event. The inclusion of everything in a single apparatus, despite its fullness, seemed the only sensible procedure.

As with John 7:33-8:11, when a family group is cited, it may be inferred that a substantial majority of its representatives concur. A partim designation indicates a significant split. If only one partim citation appears for the group in question, the remainder of its members may be too divided to cite for another reading. Alternatively, where ℓV or M appear, the remainder of the group (or most of it) might be comprehended within these sigla.

Due to the more precise information furnished by Hoskier, it was possible to include a larger number of spelling variations in the Apocalypse apparatus. But even here the variations on the movable nu are treated as they were in the other parts of the New Testament.

A few smaller families of texts are ignored in the apparatus of this edition, along with the minuscule allies of the older Egyptian witnesses, and some isolated texts not easily identified with one of the main groupings. It was not felt that any of the excluded witnesses would alter the basic shape of the stemmatic reconstruction of the Apocalypse. For the convenience of the reader, the manuscripts whose testimony was taken into account for the five M groups are listed in the Table of Manuscript Families (p. xlVf.). In the list, the standard New Gregory numbers are given first and are followed by the numerical identifications used by Hoskier.

STYLE CONSIDERATIONS

The format, typography, and punctuation of the Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text were chosen to produce the greatest possible clarity and beauty, as well as to promote ease of reading, especially for new students of Greek. The typeface selected is noted for its readability, and since it is not italicized like many Greek typefaces, it is especially appealing to those accustomed to languages in the Roman alphabet. For easy reference the verse numbers in the present work are located at beginnings of verses, rather than in the margin.

English Subtitles. Studies in psychology of learning demonstrate that the classical languages, being highly inflected and difficult for most moderns, are more easily learned when the paragraphs are introduced with suggestive titles in a living language. The quickly understood English titles trigger the brain to expect the vocabulary one is likely to encounter in such a paragraph. Care has been taken to make the titles objective and factual rather than interpretive. Chiefly in the gospels the reader will also find cross-references underneath many paragraph titles. These give parallel or related paragraphs in the other gospels and occasionally elsewhere. It should not be assumed that the cross-reference is necessarily to the same incident or occasion, although it often is.

Punctuation. As is generally known, the most ancient New Testament manuscripts had virtually no punctuation, and only gradually were various breaks indicated. The period and the comma are used in Greek as in other languages of the world, but the little dot above the line is used for both a colon and a semicolon. These three marks of punctuation have been retained.

One punctuation mark has been changed and one has been added. It was decided that since the Greek question mark (.) is so widely used for a major break in most languages, it would be helpful to replace it by the almost universally used question mark. Today even Hebrew uses this question mark. While a student eventually comes to associate what to him looks like a semicolon with the idea of a question, it never achieves the impact of the universal modern question mark.

It was also considered that in a modern edition of the New Testament there should be at least some sentences ending with an exclamation mark. While widespread use of this symbol would be foolish, a careful and judicious employment of it seems helpful. It is here used less than in the German tradition and more than in the British. Certainly there are some sentences, especially in the
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Apostle Paul, that are exciting enough for an exclamation mark. As the English writer, Dorothy L. Sayers, expressed it, referring to the Incarnation, “If this isn’t exciting, for heaven’s sake, what is?”

Quotation Marks. It has only been traditional to use quotation marks in the Greek Testament except, in some editions, for quotations from the Old Testament. Experience has shown that Greek and Latin classics are easier for students to read when quoted material and conversations are indicated by some sort of quotation marks. Surely in the classic of classics of Christendom, the Greek New Testament, advantage should be taken of this helpful device.

Not only have quotation marks been used, but in a conversation of two or more speakers, each new speaker’s words are indented. In such dialogues as those of our Lord with Nicodemus in John 3, and with the Samaritan woman in John 4, the frequent clear indication of change of speaker adds clarity and interest to the reading. Because Semitic style tends to be very clear in introducing speakers, or even redundant from a western viewpoint, when there is no indication of a new speaker it has been assumed that the quotation continues until there is a clear break.

While English quotation marks are used for ordinary quotations, French quotation marks, called guillemets, are implemented to distinguish Old Testament quotations in this New Testament.

Old Testament Quotations. Complete agreement as to what constitutes an Old Testament quotation is impossible, since many of the quotations are not word for word, and others are from a translation of the Old Testament. Many, however, are quite obviously direct quotations rather than allusions or merely the use of Old Testament language. The references for Old Testament quotations are given at the bottom of the page, below the second apparatus.

Capitalization. The most ancient manuscripts of the New Testament were written in full-capital letters (uncials), and these later were replaced by the so-called minuscule script in which everything was written in what today might be called lower-case letters. In minuscule texts the beginnings of sections were often marked by larger letters, a practice reflected in most current printed Greek texts by capitals. It has become fashionable in recent decades to capitalize less and less, and so even the word for God is not capitalized in most modern Greek Testaments. A common practice is to capitalize the first sentence in a paragraph and certain sentences within the paragraph. The editors decided that it is very arbitrary to capitalize the opening words of some sentences and not others; so all sentences in this edition begin with a capital letter. It was also decided that the Christian tradition of capitalizing the names of the persons of the Trinity would be followed in the present work. Also capitalized are most of the titles of our Lord, such as “Alpha and Omega”, “Son of Man”, and several names. The ancient manuscripts indicated so-called holy names (sanctum sacrum) in a special way, and it was considered that humanistic capitalization was a suitable counterpart to this ancient tradition.

Poetic Form. Quotations from the Psalms and other poetic portions of the Old Testament, as well as a few New Testament selections that are cast in high literary language, such as the Beatitudes, are identified by contemporary poetic structure, generally with the left margin indented and justified. Quotations shorter than two lines as a rule are not indented, except where they occur in a series with longer quotations (see the quotations of Jesus at His temptation).

Titles. The titles of the books of the New Testament are those in general modern use. No effort was made to consult the textual tradition, either for these or for the subscriptions which so often appear in the manuscripts at the ends of books. It cannot be assumed that the superscriptions and subscriptions found in the Greek manuscripts have the same transmisssional history as the manuscripts themselves. Their use could too easily be influenced by local tradition and practice in the period when the manuscripts were copied. Nevertheless they are worthy of special study for the light they may shed on the history of the text. But such a study lies beyond the scope of the present edition.

CONCLUSION
The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text is presented as a further contribution to the history of the textual criticism of the New Testament. We join all who have labored in this demanding discipline in admitting that the history is by no means complete. The work can never be final until we are assured of holding a replica of the autographs of the New Testament in our hands.

The present volume embodies over twenty-five years of study in the field of textual criticism. Aided by the resources of other scholars named herein, and the industry of many dedicated minds and hands, the editors have examined and organized the evidence which persuades them of the validity of the majority approach to resolving the textual issues of the New Testament. We believe that serious and open-minded consideration of the data by others entrusted with the task of New Testament textual criticism will confirm our conclusions.
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In the meantime the words of Isaiah, as quoted by the Apostle Peter, are a source of encouragement to all who pursue a precise text of the Holy Scriptures:

«Πάσα σάρξ ως χώρτος,
Και πάσα δόξα ἀνθρώπου ως ἄνθος χώρτου.
Εξεράθη ὁ χώρτος,
Και τὸ ἄνθος αυτοῦ ἔξεπεσε.
Τὸ δὲ ρῆμα Κυρίου μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.»

TABLE OF MANUSCRIPT FAMILIES OF THE APOCALYPSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
<th>M° (represented by 74 manuscripts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>046</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>498</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>506</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>517</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>617</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>627</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>632</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>664</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>808</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Gregory</th>
<th>Hoskier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>919</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>935</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1352</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1626</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1719</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1728</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1734</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1849</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2039</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2048</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2058</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2070</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2075</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2076</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2077</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2079</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2138</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2200</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2256</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2258</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2305</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2349</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xlv