

PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS REGARDING  
THE PERICOPE ADULTERAE BASED UPON  
FRESH COLLATIONS OF NEARLY  
ALL CONTINUOUS-TEXT MANUSCRIPTS  
AND ALL LECTIONARY MANUSCRIPTS  
CONTAINING THE PASSAGE

MAURICE A. ROBINSON

The collation of the Pericope Adulterae (PA) in all Greek NT MSS provides a base for further investigation of this text-critically complex portion of Scripture. Preliminary findings indicate that (1) many omissions and positional relocations of the PA reflect liturgical concerns; (2) no «Byzantine text» exists within the PA; (3) correction of MSS was relatively infrequent, leaving lines of transmission relatively independent; (4) Codex Bezae (the earliest Greek MS to contain the PA) cannot be the parent of any stream found among later witnesses; (5) other transmissional streams appear to have ancient roots predating those of Codex Bezae; (6) Silva New's «Patmos Family» is extended from 4 to at least 33 MSS; (7) some new lesser family groups also appear to exist; (8) commentary MSS often reflect their common archetype and should not be counted as separate witnesses; (9) obelization of the PA dominates primarily amid the later K' type of text; (10) collation of all portions of the NT is still needed.

*The great task of textual criticism for the generation of scholars who are now beginning their work is the rewriting of the history of the text and the recreation of theory.*

E. C. COLWELL, 1955<sup>1</sup>

The *Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung* in Münster, Germany was the venue for the present writer's sabbatical leave during the academic year 1997-1998. The *Institut*, founded by Kurt Aland and currently under the able direction and supervision of Barbara Aland, not only serves as the official registry center for all known Greek manuscripts (MSS) containing the New Testament, but also possesses microfilm copies of nearly all of those MSS in a single location – a collection carefully and painstakingly assembled over the past 40 or more years. The present writer's research topic was the investigation and collation of the portion of text known as the *Pericope Adulterae* (Jn 7.53-8.11, hereafter PA) in all available continuous-text MSS preserved within the massive microfilm archives of the *Institut*.

This project was proposed with a fourfold purpose: (1) To provide a complete conspectus of all relevant Greek collation data for this pericope which would serve the academic community at large; (2) to organize and classify such data in order to determine stemmatic ties and genealogical interrelationships among the MSS; (3) to investigate the

<sup>1</sup> Ernest Cadman Colwell, «Foreword» to Bruce M. Metzger, *Annotated Bibliography of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament 1914-1939*, Studies and Documents 16 (Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, 1955), viii.

transmissional history of this controversial pericope; and (4) to attempt a reconstruction of the original form of the text of this pericope. Note that the matter of the «autograph authenticity» of the PA is secondary within the scope of the present research, even though much of the evidence may tend toward various conclusions<sup>2</sup>.

Although he did not deal with the PA in particular, W. J. Elliott in 1976 wrote a brief but compelling article entitled «The Need for an Accurate and Comprehensive Collation of All Known Greek NT Manuscripts with their Individual Variants noted *in pleno*»<sup>3</sup>. The title reflects the fact that even in our most comprehensive critical editions (whether UBS, Nestle, IGNTP Luke, or even the Münster *Editio Critica Maior* [ECM] in James)<sup>4</sup>, we simply do *not* have sufficient data to allow a comprehensive understanding of the whole of the Greek NT manuscript tradition, whether in its textual alignments and interrelationships, its degree of support for variant readings<sup>5</sup>, or indeed, even the original form of the text. Only a comprehensive collation of «all known Greek NT MSS *in pleno*» will allow for such conclusions firmly and soundly to be drawn<sup>6</sup>. In the interim, NT textual criticism frequently is confronted with the situation criticized by Herman Hoskier in the preface to his 1929 volume containing collations of all MSS of the Apocalypse available to him: «We have had too many... hasty deductions from insignificant or insufficient data»<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> The present writer holds to the theory of Byzantine-priority and considers the PA original to John on internal, structural, and external text-critical grounds. The PA appears in most MSS which otherwise reflect the Byzantine Textform; however, there is no unified «Byzantine» text within the PA. Thus, various questions regarding its transmissional history must remain open and undetermined.

<sup>3</sup> In J. K. Elliott, ed., *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol. 44 (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 137-143.

<sup>4</sup> Kurt Aland et al. eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 4th rev. ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1993) [UBS<sup>4</sup>]; idem, *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993) [NA<sup>27</sup>]; The American and British Committees of the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, vol. 1, 1984; vol. 2, 1987); Barbara Aland et al., *Novum Testamentum Graecum: Editio Critica Maior: IV. Die Katholischen Briefe, 1. Lieferung: Der Jakobusbrief*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997).

<sup>5</sup> As an example, the Mk 16.19 variant, κριος ησους, is supported in the Nestle-Aland 27th ed. apparatus [NA<sup>27</sup>] by 15 named Greek MS witnesses plus «others» (*al.*). Information supplied to me from Ulrich Schmid in Münster shows that this variant is actually read by 85 Greek MSS, so the «others» in this case actually reflect an additional 70 MSS, many of which may be of significance for reconstructing the history of transmission.

<sup>6</sup> Part of the problem exists in the attempt of even the most thorough critical editions to be all-inclusive, including in their apparatus not only Greek MS data but also complete versional and patristic testimony. While such additional material might serve various purposes, far more complete critical apparatuses exist for those versions and fathers. It seems that the time spent in sifting those extraneous materials could be spent better in increasing rather than limiting the number of Greek MSS collated and cited in such editions.

<sup>7</sup> Hoskier, Herman C. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929), vol. 1, xxxviii.

As concerns methodology, certainly a shorter NT book existing in a small number of Greek MSS (e.g., around 600 for the Epistles) easily could be collated *in pleno* for all such MSS. When a book is long, however, and the number of manuscript witnesses increases threefold, the complete collation of all Greek MS witnesses not only will require more time, but also moves beyond what a single scholar could hope to accomplish in a lifetime. The Gospels are a case in point – not only are they far more extensive than the smaller epistles, but at any given point there probably are over 1600 MSS which testify to the text and require collation.

The most practicable method for fulfilling Elliott's vision seems to be this: in any given book, all MSS need to be collated *in pleno*, but the amount of text should be reduced to a quantity proportional to the number of MSS existing for that portion of text. This will allow a single scholar to provide a complete conspectus of manuscript evidence for such a passage<sup>8</sup>. Within the Epistles, this might break down into single-chapter divisions in which all MSS would be collated. For the Gospels in particular, given the massive quantity of extant MSS for those portions, the solution seems to be a reduction of the amount of text collated to the pericope level. Such was the intent of the present writer's sabbatical research, and the results exceeded expectations: within the span of nine months the complete collation of the PA has been accomplished, not only in all available continuous-text MSS held on microfilm within the Münster archives, but also in over 100 lectionary MSS in the time left over within that nine-month period. What is more significant is that this particular pericope probably presents *more* variation than any other segment within the Gospels or anywhere else in the NT. Therefore, the collation of all known MSS within any other pericope or short chapter could be accomplished in even less time than that required for the PA.

If collation of all known MSS does not proceed on some such basis, one probably can despair of seeing *complete* results for any given portion of the NT text within the next century, even though complete data at any given point should be a prerequisite for text-critical decisions as well as for interpreting the transmissional history of the NT text. The Münster *Institut* has accomplished this task, but only in part, in test readings within its various *Text und Textwert* volumes<sup>9</sup>. These

<sup>8</sup> In theory, collation should be performed by more than one collator, each checking his or her own work at least twice. In practice, given the dearth of interested volunteer collators, it still is preferable to have one collator perform the task in a proper and thorough manner rather than to postpone indefinitely any future collation research. Most published collations already are the work of individual scholars, and have not been double-checked. While there are some inevitable errors present in such published collations which a second collator's work might have corrected (the present writer noted a number of errors in previously-published PA collations during his Münster research), these are not so extensive as to negate the value or impede the use of the published material.

<sup>9</sup> Kurt Aland, ed. *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1987 [Catholic Epistles]; 1991 [Romans; 1-2 Corinthians; Galatians-Ephesians]; 1993 [Acts]).

provide complete collation and statistical information for selected variant units, but not yet for the complete text of any given NT book, chapter, or pericope<sup>10</sup>. That series of course was intended primarily to serve as a screen for selecting the limited number of MSS which would be fully collated and reported in the *ECM*, and was not intended to go beyond that purpose.

At present, the PA has now been collated in virtually all continuous-text MSS containing the passage in a manner fulfilling Elliott's desideratum. In John 1665 collations of the PA area were performed among the continuous-text MSS, as well as 107 PA occurrences in 103 lectionary MSS. The complete collation information for each MS was recorded on specially-prepared sheets which include not only the major and minor readings found in any given MS, but also all orthographic variations (including cases of movable -v), outright blunders and nonsense readings, as well as any corrections made to the text of a MS. Additionally, the various *nomina sacra* and other shorthand abbreviations, the presence of rubricated letters, the insertion of lection notes (αρχη, τέλος, feast day indicators, and lection *incipits*), as well as the line breaks within all collated MSS were included. One thus can see how extensive a compilation can be amassed for a single pericope over a nine-month period.

All this collation work requires data entry and computerized sifting before major conclusions can be drawn. The intended publication of this project will require two distinct parts: (1) the publication of the Text and Apparatus of all collated MSS containing the PA, as well as a collation of the surrounding text of Jn 7.51<sup>b</sup>-8.13<sup>a</sup> in those MSS which both contain and omit the PA, as a «control» portion framing the PA area. This volume will also list and tabulate relevant items such as obelization, use of *nomina sacra*, the scribes and correctors of the MSS and other related material. (2) A second volume will seek to interpret the data in regard to grouping the MSS according to their relative textual patterns, determining from stemmatic analysis which MSS might be descended from common archetypes in a family-type relationship, and attempting to reconstruct the original form of the PA based on the likelihood of which pattern of readings seems best to reflect that which served as origin of all the other patterns. Such a procedure transcends the praxis of modern eclecticism by not attempting to deal with readings on a variant-by-variant basis – a procedure which often makes the latter end worse than the beginning by creating a resultant text which has no known existence in either MS, versional, or patristic witnesses.

All those projects remain in the future. At present, the best interim solution is to offer some brief but pointed preliminary observations

<sup>10</sup> Future volumes are projected in the gospels which will include a limited number of test pericopes in which all MSS will be fully collated. The complete collation of all pericopes in a given gospel is *not* intended, however.

which can be discerned from the data collated and the evidence amassed. The present discussion divides into four primary areas of observation: (1) The omission of the PA and its location in MSS which contain it; (2) the textual history and transmission of the PA; (3) family and type relationships among the PA MSS; and (4) prospects for future collation research. The various points covered are numbered sequentially for reference purposes.

### Observation 1: The Omission, Inclusion, and (Re)Location of the PA<sup>11</sup>

(1) The Greek MSS which omit the PA fall into three categories: (a) MSS reflecting the Alexandrian texttype and/or an Egyptian provenance; (b) Byzantine-era MSS containing commentary or catena; and (c) MSS which omit due to lectionary-related or other, unknown reasons<sup>12</sup>. The Alexandrian/Egyptian witnesses which omit are well known from the critical apparatuses and their number is limited: the 13 Alexandrian witnesses (to which can be added the third century P<sup>39vid</sup>)<sup>13</sup> are the following: the early MSS are P<sup>66</sup> (II), P<sup>75</sup> (III), S/01 (IV), B/03 (IV),

<sup>11</sup> The most extensive analysis of the PA and its text-critical situation is found in the monograph by Ulrich Becker, *Jesus und die Ehebrecherin: Untersuchungen zur Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte von Joh. 7<sup>53</sup> - 8<sup>11</sup>*, BZNW 28 (Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1963). Becker discusses the Greek MS witnesses on an extremely limited basis (pp. 9-13), giving versional testimony over twice the space (pp. 14-25, 178-180), and patristic data even more (pp. 92-104, 117-150, 181-187).

<sup>12</sup> As a parallel, Kurt Aland in 1964 tabulated the total number of MSS which either (a) omitted the PA in whole or in part; (b) omitted the PA in the main text but had it inserted in the margin by a corrector; (c) relocated the PA to a location other than after 7.52; or (d) obelized the PA in whole or part. (Kurt Aland, «Glosse, Interpolation, Redaktion und Komposition in der Sicht der neutestamentlichen Textkritik», in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen* [Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1964], 15-16). This article was reprinted in 1968 with unchanged totals in Aland's volume, *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*, ANTF 2 (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1967) 42-44. Needless to say, the current collation project, deriving from the expanded holdings of the Münster Institut, has rendered obsolete Aland's summary totals of 34 years past; it also should be noted that Aland's summary did *not* list the individual MSS in each category (nor was such a listing readily locatable in Münster upon my inquiry); the present research *does* have specific MSS identified for each category along with summary totals, though these are not included in the present paper due to space limitations.

<sup>13</sup> This papyrus (P<sup>39</sup>) is a single 3rd century leaf containing Jn. 8.14-22. It is written on both sides, 25 lines to the page, with an average 13-15 letters per line. Its text is Alexandrian. The page ending at 8.22 is numbered 0Δ (= 74), which indicates that this gospel either circulated separately or it stood first within a codex. The present writer attempted a textual reconstruction from Jn 1.1 to the point where P<sup>39</sup> is extant, conforming to its known specifications; Jn. 5.3<sup>b</sup>-4 was omitted in the process (since the MS shares affinities with B). There seems to be no doubt on the basis of this reconstruction that the PA could *not* have been present in the MS. This of course is not surprising, given the textual affinity and provenance of the fragment.

W/032 (IV)<sup>14</sup>, C/04<sup>vid</sup> (V) and T/029 (V); the later Alexandrian uncials which omit are N/022 (VI), L/019 (VIII), Y/034 (IX), Δ/037 (IX), Ψ/044 (IX), and 0211 (IX). The Alexandrian/Egyptian continuous-text MSS quite likely reflect a localized archetype which did not contain the PA, whether due to critical concern or lectionary/liturgical influence (discussed below).

Three of these MSS have copying circumstances which raise questions about their omission by indicating an apparent knowledge of the existence of the PA: MS B/03 (IV) has marginal double dots at Jn. 7.52 (termed «umlauts» for convenience) which appear to indicate that the original scribe of that MS had some knowledge of the pericope variant<sup>15</sup>. This is not surprising, since the same scribe left an extensive blank space of 1½ columns after Mk 16.8 (which concludes that gospel in Vaticanus) – a circumstance unique within the NT portion of that MS. MS

<sup>14</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 3rd edition. (Oxford: University Press, 1992), 57, notes that MS W/032 is Alexandrian in the portion Jn 5.12-21.25.

<sup>15</sup> See Philip B. Payne, «Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34-5», *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 250-262. The «umlaut» term is coined by Payne, who provides strong evidence that the double dots were original to the first hand of Vaticanus, since the later corrector who retraced all the letters of that MS apparently failed to retrace some of the «umlauts». Payne has been challenged on this point by Curt Niccum («The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14.34-5», *New Testament Studies* 43 [1997] 244-245), but Niccum presents a very weak agenda-based argument, claiming that the «umlauts» are from the hand of the 15th-century scribe who prepared the minuscule supplement replacing the missing NT portions of Vaticanus. This claim is made on the sole basis of the presence of two similar «umlauts» on the first leaf of the supplied portion. Niccum also suggests without sufficient proof that this scribe was Sepulveda. The present writer considers Niccum's hypothesis doubtful in the extreme, not only because the «umlauts» on the 15th-century portion are to the present writer visibly *not* by an identical hand, but also because Niccum had an agenda related to the textual variant at 1 Cor. 14.34-35 in which a late date for the «umlauts» was preferable. The Sepulveda connection (Niccum, 245, n.20) is also extremely tenuous, being based on a letter from Sepulveda to Erasmus regarding 365 agreements between Vaticanus and the Vulgate (there are over 800 «umlauts», most of which do *not* reflect Vulgate readings, and many of which stand alongside points where B agrees with the Vulgate). Niccum also appeals to *one* reading, nearly unique to Vaticanus, that also is marked with an «umlaut», and happened to be remarked upon by Erasmus in his *Annotationes* (in a context wholly divorced from Sepulveda). On this highly tenuous basis Niccum concludes that Sepulveda «must have shared this list of readings with Erasmus». Niccum's case is further damaged by his appeal (Niccum, 245, n.18) to T. C. Skeat's article, «The Codex Vaticanus in the Fifteenth Century», *JTS* 35 (1984) 456-465. Skeat not only does *not* mention the umlauts, but characterizes the 15th-century restorer as generally bumbling and incompetent, and thus not likely to be the one involved in any massive text-critical comparison such as Sepulveda mentioned to Erasmus (Sepulveda also assisted Cardinal Cajetan with some preparation for a Vatican Greek NT prior to 1534; McClintock and Strong, s. v. «Sepulveda»). Skeat also notes that the re-inking process apparently dates to the 9th or 10th century: if certain «umlauts» were *not* then re-inked, then not only are the clear but faint «umlauts» original to the first hand of Vaticanus as Payne noted, but also (as Skeat's data suggests), the «umlauts» themselves must be «quite unconnected with the fifteenth century restoration» (Skeat, 461, n. 10).

L/019 (VIII) omits the pericope, but after 7.52 leaves blank 5¾ lines which remain in column 2 as well as all of column 1 and 2/3 of column 2 on the next page. MS Δ/037 (IX), on the same leaf as 7.52 has 5 lines of text containing παλιν through λεγων of 8.12; it then leaves the remainder of that page blank; the next page commences anew with 8.12 παλιν. The remaining three uncials which omit, along with other non-Alexandrian MSS, are the following: A/02<sup>vid</sup> (V) (usually Byzantine in the gospels), Θ/038 (IX) (generally considered «Caesarean»); also X/033 (X) and 0141 (X), both commentary MSS, and not normally expected to contain the PA.

Among the minuscule MSS usually deemed significant which omit the PA are 33 (IX), 565 (X), 22 (XII), 157 (XII) and 1241 (XII). MS 565, however, apparently contained the PA at the end of John, though the leaf is now missing<sup>16</sup>. The large number of other Byzantine-era continuous-text MSS which do not contain a commentary and yet omit the PA most probably do so for lectionary-based reasons (discussed below); these are not enumerated for reasons of space.

(2) In contrast to the early MSS which omit the PA, William Petersen recently has provided strong evidence suggesting that the PA not only was known, but was circulating as part of John's gospel in the mid-second century, since it appears that the author of the apocryphal *Protevangelium Jacobi* made use of a copy of John's gospel which contained the PA during that era<sup>17</sup>.

(3) All other continuous-text MSS (totaling around 1350) include the PA, almost all at the traditional location following Jn 7.52. These include the remaining 14 uncials D/05 (V), E/07 (VIII), F/09 (IX), G/011 (IX), H/013 (IX), K/017 (IX), M/021 (IX), U/030 (IX), V/031 (IX), Δ/039 (IX), Π/041 (IX), Ω/045 (IX), S/028 (X), and Γ/036 (X), plus the vast majority of minuscule MSS. These latter similarly are not listed here for reasons of space. It should be noted that one remaining uncial, MS 047 (VIII), reflects an anomaly: it *omits* 7.53-8.2 and *contains* 8.3-11.

(4) Beyond the MSS which include the PA at the traditional location, there are other continuous-text MSS which omit the passage at 7.52 and

<sup>16</sup> George D. Kilpatrick, «Codex 565 of the Gospels», *Theologische Zeitschrift* 25 (1969) 130, correctly states that «after Jn. xxi. 25 comes an introductory note» to the PA. Kilpatrick errs, however in continuing «and then vii. 53-viii. 11». Since the leaf containing such is missing, one simply cannot know which verses originally were included, though it is true that by analogy with MSS 1 and 1582 (to which 565 is apparently related), it does appear likely that 565 would have included the entire PA rather than merely the lectionary portion, 8.3-11.

<sup>17</sup> William L. Petersen, «Οὐδε εἶπω σε [κατα]κρινω. John 8:11, the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, and the History of the *Pericope Adulterae*», in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical: Essays in Honour of Ijtzje Baarda*, William L. Petersen, Johan S. Vos, Henk J. De Jonge, eds., *Supplements to Novum Testamentum* 89 (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 191-221. Petersen is tentative in his claims, primarily due to the text-critical concerns regarding the authenticity of the PA in Jn, as well as its omission and relocation in various witnesses.

relocate it elsewhere. These include those MSS which have the PA at the end of John (26 MSS, 13 of which are XI<sup>th</sup> century, 10 of which are commentary MSS, and 2 of which [MSS 1 XII and 1582 X] are from f<sup>1</sup>); 1 MS (1333 XI) which includes the PA at the beginning of John, while omitting it at 7.52; one MS (1434 XII) which includes the PA *twice* – at 7.52 (original hand) and at the beginning of Jn (supplied by a later hand); 9 MSS reflecting the common archetype of f<sup>13</sup> which relocate the PA to follow Lk 21.38; 2 MSS (225 and 1128, both XII) which relocate the PA to follow Jn 7.36; 1 MS (981 XIII) which relocates the PA to follow Jn 8.20; 1 MS (2691 XV) which relocates the PA to follow Jn 8.14<sup>a</sup>; and 17 MSS which relocate the PA to follow 8.12 in various configurations. Of these latter, 9 commentary MSS have a partial inclusion of 8.12<sup>a</sup> *preceding* the PA and continue anew with 8.12ff *following* the PA; 5 continuous-text MSS close the Pentecost lesson with the *full* verse 8.12, followed by the PA, then 8.12ff once more; one MS follows 7.52 with 8.12-13, the PA, and then 8.12-13ff a second time. To this list also should be added a small number of MSS which contain 7.53-8.2 and omit the lectionary segment 8.3-11; these skip directly from 8.2 to 8.12 or conclude 8.2 with 8.12<sup>b</sup>, λεγων εγω ειμι, and continue from that point, omitting entirely from 8.12 παλιν to just before λεγων.

(5) The MSS which contain commentary normally do not comment on material excluded from the Lectionary Cycle. Some of these MSS, following patristic precedent, exclude from their main NT text those portions not included among the publicly read pericopes. Two types of commentary/catena MSS exist: (a) those which contain commentary/catena in the *margins surrounding* the NT text; and (b) those which contain blocks of text *interspersed sequentially* with blocks of commentary.

Some MSS within the latter category do *not* contain the entire NT text, but only selected portions, and at times only the beginning and concluding words of the text segment being commented upon. In such interspersed-text MSS, the commentary is the primary matter, and it is questionable whether such MSS should be considered within the same category as «normal» continuous-text MSS. The MSS with interspersed commentary have a transmissional history which is separate from that associated with non-commentary continuous-text MSS or MSS which contain commentary/catena surrounding the main text. Interspersed commentary MSS in most cases reflect a *single* patristic archetype and all copies derived from that archetype generally reflect only that single source, both for commentary and NT text. Only where substantial evidence exists for presuming the NT text of an interspersed commentary MS to have derived from some other source than the commentary archetype does the NT text reading of such a MS possess independent value (e.g., cases where the PA appears within an interspersed commentary MS when the archetype originally did not contain such).

It is possible that minuscule MSS which are accompanied by a

surrounding catena or commentary *may* derive from single archetypes, but, given the manner of preparation of MSS with surrounding commentary (which is similar to that of other continuous-text MSS), this is less likely to be the case<sup>18</sup>.

(6) The standard practice of the Lectionary system omitted the PA at its normal location because it would have interfered with the flow of the lesson for Pentecost and its content was not pertinent to the theme of that day's lesson. Had the Pentecost lesson (beginning at Jn 7.37) ended at 7.52, the anomaly would be a lesson ending on a note of doubt («Search and see that out of Galilee a prophet does not arise»); hence 8.12 was appended as a fitting conclusion.

(7) The PA must predate the introduction of the lectionary system, since as noted above it interrupts the major feast lesson for Pentecost<sup>19</sup>. If the omission were original, it would be wholly illogical to insert the PA at 7.52 when a simple minor relocation (e.g., to follow 7.36 or 8.20 as in a few MSS) could have avoided the awkwardness caused by splitting the Pentecost lesson. Such also would have eliminated the need for lection instructions to appear in various MSS telling the reader to skip over the PA (υπαγε, υπερβαλε, or a line of obeli) during the Pentecost lesson, as well as the concomitant instruction to resume (αρξου) at 8.12. Even a PA relocation following 8.12 would have been less problematic than the post-7.52 position it actually occupies. Since the lectionary lessons for (at least) the major feasts and Sundays may have had a mid-second-century origin<sup>20</sup>, this factor would be of great significance in regard to those early witnesses which omit the PA.

<sup>18</sup> Among the MSS collated at Münster were many containing surrounding commentary in various stages of completion. The procedure involved in preparing such MSS was obvious: the main continuous text of the entire gospel was written out first, centered on the page with ample margins to contain the commentary. The commentary then was added piecemeal, often from various source documents, many of which in their respective commentaries reflected different NT text variants from those found in the centered continuous text already prepared for the MS.

<sup>19</sup> This is discussed in an extended excursus by John William Burgon, «Appendix 1: Pericope de Adultera», in his *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*, ed. Edward Miller (London: George Bell and sons, 1896), 232-265, with special attention to versional, lectionary and patristic testimony on pp. 247-253, 253-257 and 257-259 respectively.

<sup>20</sup> This position was held by C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche, 1900-1909), 1:337; 3:1216-1217; and Frederick Henry Ambrose Scrivener, *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, 4th ed., ed. Edward Miller (London: George Bell & Sons, 1894), 75-76. On the lectionary system, see also John William Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark* (Oxford: James Parker & Co., 1871), 195-204, 207-209, 214-219 (the antiquity of the Pentecost lesson is mentioned on pp. 203 and 219). Metzger comments on Gregory's dating, «Whether these dates are too early, it is not for the present writer to judge» (Bruce M. Metzger, «Greek Lectionaries and a Critical Edition of the Greek New Testament», in Kurt Aland et al., eds., *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitate und Lektionare: Der gegenwärtige Stand ihrer Erforschung und ihre Bedeutung für die Griechische Textgeschichte* [Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972], 483).

(8) Whatever the date for the institution of the major feast day lections or the Sunday lessons in general, the Saturday lessons likely were developed soon afterward, followed by the weekday lessons. The Menologion portion of the lectionary (readings for saint's days and special occasions), however, likely dates only from the fourth century onward, with scattered lessons added to it into the 8th century. In addition, copies of the Menologion vary according to the specific saints honored at various locations, and as a result, the PA appears in some Menologion MSS but not in others, either as a reading for Theodora (11 or 18 September), Pelagia (8 October, the most common date), Euphemia (1 March), Mary of Egypt (1 April)<sup>21</sup>, or in a special section devoted to ceremonies (διαφορά) related to the confession of sin, grating of forgiveness, and ultimate restoration, particularly in regard to women. In almost all cases, the Menologion reading contains only verses 8.3-11.

Even allowing for a looser structure among Menologion MSS, the PA as contained therein presents a major transmissional problem. If within the Menologion, the primary PA reading is *only* 8.3-11 as opposed to the entire 7.53-8.11 pericope found in almost all continuous-text MSS<sup>22</sup>, this

The present trend within modern eclectic theory is to consider the lectionary system as beginning no earlier than the 4th century and likely later. Such dates seem far too late, however; since, as Metzger notes, «Casual remarks preserved in the writings of Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, John Chrysostom, and other patristic authors, indicate that specific Scripture lessons for specific days seem to have been customary in their localities. Indeed, ... nearly three-fourths of Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew either begin at the first verse of a known lectionary pericope, or at the first verse after the close of a pericope» (Metzger, «Lectionaries», 483). Since no one doubts that the Sunday lessons and those of the major feasts such as Easter and Pentecost were the first items incorporated into a lectionary-type system, the integrity of the Pentecost lesson as familiarly structured (Jn 7.37-52; 8.12) would seem secure. If so, it would be highly unlikely that the PA could «intrude» at a later date between the penultimate and ultimate verses of that lection, and the case favoring the integrity of the PA within its traditional location receives strong support.

<sup>21</sup> Most Menologion lectionaries read the PA in honor of Pelagia, followed in equal proportion by Theodora, Mary of Egypt and Euphemia.

<sup>22</sup> The abridged Menologion PA text is reflected in some continuous-text MSS: 10 out of the 28 MSS which place the PA at either the beginning or end of John have *only* 8.3-11 and *not* the entire pericope - a clear indication of lectionary influence. There are further anomalies among the MSS which can only be explained as due to lectionary-based confusion between the Synaxarion and Menologion: as noted above, the uncial MS 047 (VIII) omits 7.53-8.2 while containing 8.3-11; several other MSS (including 754, 937, 1168, 2133, 2693 [xi]; 2757 [xii]; 759, 2525, 2533 [xiii]) contain 7.53-8.2 and *omit* only the Menologion portion 8.3-11, often with a transitional leap to 8.12<sup>b</sup> λέγων. The only explanation for such anomalies is the influence of the lectionary system which led various scribes to assume that the portion of text read in the Menologion (8.3-11) and *not* in the Synaxarion Pentecost lesson (7.37-52; 8.12) should be similarly excluded from the main text of their continuous-text manuscripts. Were this not the case, the presence of 7.53-8.2 in some continuous-text MSS which omit 8.3-11 becomes inexplicable. MS 900 (XIII) reflects greater confusion: it contains *only* 7.53 and omits *all* of 8.1-11!

raises serious questions regarding the 7.53-8.2 «transitional statement» which is excluded from the lectionary text yet is present among nearly all continuous-text MSS containing the PA. The transitional statement is *not* necessary to the context: Jn 7.52 in the continuous-text MSS could easily have been followed directly by 8.3-11 in order fittingly to close out the pericope concerning the «last day, the great day of the Feast» (in John's original context, the Feast of Tabernacles) *without* including a transitional passage which transfers the subsequent events to a point early on the next day. If such an introductory or transitional statement as 7.53-8.2 was never necessary, and if such were not part of the primary PA text within the Menologion, there is *no* reason why such should have been invented and/or inserted at this point within the continuous-text MSS unless the PA itself were original to that location<sup>23</sup>.

(9) All the PA relocations among the continuous-text MSS reflect a desire and intent to preserve the continuity of the Pentecost lesson as a unit. This is so, regardless of whether the PA occurs after 7.36; 8.12; 8.13; 8.14<sup>a</sup>; 8.20; at the beginning or end of John's gospel, or at Lk. 21.38<sup>24</sup>. Convenient lection breaks already exist at Jn 7.37, 8.12, and 8.21<sup>25</sup>, and these clearly have contributed to the matter of lectionary-based relocation. Further, some MSS which relocate the PA outside of John's gospel nevertheless label it as coming εκ του κατὰ Ιωάννου, demonstrating (in standard lectionary manner) not only a *knowledge* of its origin, but also of its *source*, despite its excision from the main text of John for lectionary-related purposes.

<sup>23</sup> Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to John*, NIC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), deals with the PA in an appendix (882-891) since he does not consider it original to John. Morris nevertheless senses the problem of the 7.53-8.2 introductory passage, and suggests (without evidence) that it comes from a supposed non-canonical gospel in which the PA first appeared. Morris' comments (883) are telling [emphasis added]: «This verse [7.53] shows that the story *originally was attached to some other narrative*, but what that was we can only guess»; «Again» [8.2, *palin*] indicates that the narrative from which this story was taken *included a previous visit or visits to the temple*. Evidently *it also included a reference to teaching*. Of course, *everything* Morris claims as «necessarily characteristic» of the contents of this «lost gospel» is fulfilled within the immediate context of the undisputed portion of John. Unproven speculation regarding non-extant sources seems nugatory when the canonical context itself provides a sufficient and adequate solution.

<sup>24</sup> Metzger, «Greek Lectionaries», 495, specifically mentions the Lk 21.38 repositioning of the PA in F<sup>13</sup> as well as the lesser-known relocation by F<sup>13</sup> of Lk 22.43-44 after Mt 26.39 as cases where the influence of «lectionary usage has been exerted upon non-lectionary manuscripts». These same points are also urged by Donald W. Riddle, «The Character of the Lectionary Text of Mark in the Weekdays of Matthew and Luke», in Ernest Cadman Colwell and Donald W. Riddle, eds. *Prolegomena to the Study of the Lectionary Text of the Gospels*. Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament, vol. 1 (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1933), 22-25 and by Ernest Cadman Colwell, «Method in the Study of the Text of the Gospel Lectionary», *ibid.*, 19-20. This was more recently restated by T. Van Lopik, «Once Again: Floating Words, their Significance for Textual Criticism», *New Testament Studies* 41 (1995) 286-289.

<sup>25</sup> See the lection tables in Gregory, *Textkritik*, 1:343-386, and Scrivener, *Plain Introduction*, 80-84.



(10) MSS which are obelized apparently were so marked for lectionary-related reasons. This was also Van Lopik's conclusion<sup>26</sup>, and seems certain to be correct. Metzger greatly overstates the situation when he claims, «Significantly enough, in many of the witnesses which contain the [PA] it is marked with asterisks or obeli, indicating that, though the scribes included the account, they were aware that it lacked satisfactory credentials»<sup>27</sup>. The earliest obelized MS is E/07 of century VIII, from a time in which the lectionary system was already fully implemented. The next cases of obelization are 5 MSS in century IX (Λ/039, Π/041, Ω/045, 399 and 2500), followed by 11 MSS in century X, 47 MSS in century XI, 34 MSS in century XII, 46 MSS in century XIII, 86 MSS [!] in century XIV, 33 MSS in century XV, and 13 MSS in century XVI, with one MS each in centuries XVII and XVIII. The large number of obelized MSS in the later centuries are directly related to the growth of the so-called K<sup>x</sup> text (discussed below), and are clearly tied to the lectionary equipment which characterize the MSS of that subtype. In view of the utter lack of obelization before the 8th century, Metzger appears to have assumed a far greater scribal interest in text-critical matters than such a late date warrants and anachronistically projects Alexandrian classical philological concerns into an era in which they no longer apply.

Metzger also neglects the converse: in contrast to the 16 MSS which obelize through the 10th century, there are 46 MSS within the same time period which contain the PA and indicate *no* trace of «doubt» regarding its authenticity (if obelization even were to indicate such). The «obelization rate» among PA MSS through century X is 17/62 = 27%. Should the time frame be reduced to only the 9th century and earlier, there remain 8 non-obelized versus 6 obelized MSS which contain the PA – an «obelization rate» still of only 6/14 = 43%. It is far easier to understand the obeli as serving their proper purpose as instructional aids to the lector when having to skip over a portion of text which was not part of a given lection than to presume a sudden upsurge in text-critical acumen during a low point within the medieval period in which textual criticism was not of as much concern as in the early era of MS transmission.

Based on these data, it is highly unlikely that the Alexandrian/Egyptian MSS which exclude the PA did so through a misreading of early obeli as a sign of omission or possible inauthenticity in terms of classical Alexandrian text-critical scholarship. There simply is *no* evidence of pre-8th century obeli within the extant MS base. This does not, however, rule out omission of the PA in those pre-8th century early witnesses due to lectionary considerations which required the skipping of portions of NT text and which may have affected their local archetype.

<sup>26</sup> Van Lopik, «Floating Words», 289-291.

<sup>27</sup> Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1971; corr. ed. 1975; 2nd ed. 1994), in loc. Jn. 7.53-8.11. The quotation remains identical in both editions.

(11) The early Fathers do not comment on the PA primarily because it was not read during the normal Synaxarion-based lectionary cycle. It especially seems the case that the silence regarding the PA among basically Byzantine-text Fathers such as Chrysostom or Gregory of Nyssa needs to be explained in light of lectionary practice<sup>28</sup>. In fact, as Metzger notes<sup>29</sup>, «no Greek Church Father prior to Euthymius Zigabenus (twelfth century) comments on the passage», even though it was obviously well known and had been included in MSS from at least the 5th century onward, and was present in the majority of Johannine MSS circulating in Euthymius' own day. As for Euthymius, even though he may have been the first named Greek Father actually to comment on the passage, Metzger says that Euthymius «declares that the accurate [ακριβώς] copies of the Gospel do not contain it»<sup>30</sup>. Contrary to Metzger's intended interpretation, it is likely that the term ακριβώς was not being used by Euthymius in a text-critical sense. Indeed, it is doubtful whether textual criticism was *ever* a major patristic concern, let alone a major concern of ordinary scribes, whether Byzantine or of any era. Metzger's own articles on explicit patristic references to textual variants demonstrate the paucity of examples which were cited even during an era of most frequent concern<sup>31</sup>.

On the other hand scribal *accuracy in copying* continually was urged as the scribal ideal<sup>32</sup>. Allowing this observation, it well may be that

<sup>28</sup> See James A. Brooks, *The New Testament Text of Gregory of Nyssa*, *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers*, ed. Gordon Fee (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 264, 266: «In Matthew, John, and Paul Gregory is most closely related to Metzger's Byzantine type of text. ... He is one of the earliest writers whose quotations support the Byzantine text more often than any other. This makes Gregory highly significant in the history of the text». Cf. Metzger, «Greek Lectionaries», 483 (quoted in n. 20 above) where Chrysostom is mentioned along with other fathers who apparently were familiar with a lectionary system, even though these Fathers normally do not comment on passages otherwise excluded from the lectionary cycle.

<sup>29</sup> Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, in loc. Jn. 7.53-8.11 (the quotation remains identical in both editions). Zigabenus may not have been the first to comment on the passage: MS 1293 (XI) actually contains commentary on the pericope, dealing with the Mosaic law regarding stoning – the earliest commentary MS to do so.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid.

<sup>31</sup> See Bruce M. Metzger, «Explicit References in the works of Origen to Variant Readings in New Testament Manuscripts», in his *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan Jewish, and Christian*, *New Testament Tools and Studies*, 8, ed. Bruce M. Metzger (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 88-103; also «St. Jerome's Explicit References to Variant Readings in Manuscripts of the New Testament», in Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson, eds., *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament presented to Matthew Black* (Cambridge: University Press, 1979), 179-190.

<sup>32</sup> Scribal accuracy and fidelity to one's exemplar was stated as a primary concern by Fathers such as Cassiodorus and Theodore of Studios; text-critical skill or discernment was never a primary scribal guideline. As Colwell noted, «The nature of the text copied was a matter of no concern to some [most?] of the scribes in the late middle ages» (Ernest Cadman Colwell, «The Complex Character of the Late Byzantine Text of the Gospels», *JBL* 54 [1935] 220). Karl Christ (*The Handbook of Medieval Library History*, rev. Anton Kern, trans. & ed. by Theophil M. Ott [Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press,

ακριβώς implies nothing about the text-critical acumen of certain scribes, let alone the quality or «autograph authenticity» of the type of text contained within such MSS<sup>33</sup>, but may refer specifically to those MSS which were copied carefully and accurately, which then could serve as recommended exemplars for future copyists<sup>34</sup>. The ακριβώς designation also might indicate especially those MSS prepared and intended for ecclesiastical and liturgical use; this possibility would particularly be viable by the time of Euthymius. If so, ακριβώς would indicate not only careful and accurate copying, but could include both lectionaries as well as those continuous-text MSS equipped with a lectionary apparatus (i.e., with rubricated ἀρχή and τέλος at the beginning and end of lections, incipit phrases in the margins, and notes indicating the day or feast on

1984]), 27 and 57, states that «detailed requirements for the accuracy necessary for correcting copy were issued as early as Cassiodorus» who required (in regard to Latin copying, but *mutatis mutandis* applying equally to Greek scribal activity) that «the scribe had to be very precise; [and that] the primary rule was that the end product must be an exact reproduction of the original». James Westfall Thompson, *The Medieval Library* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1939), 316, mentions «some of the penalties which [Theodore of Stoudios] imposed for inferior or slipshod work. ... The monk who failed to keep his copy and the original clean, to mark exactly the stops and accents, and to observe lines and spaces was subjected to a penance of one hundred and thirty prostrations. If he wandered from the text of the original, the penalty was three days' exclusion from the community; if he read the text carelessly, he was compelled to live on bread and water for three days; if he broke his pen in a fit of petulance, the offense had to be purged by thirty prostrations». None of these requirements dealt with text-critical skill in any manner. See also Nicolas Oikonomides, «Mount Athos: Levels of Literacy», *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 42 (1988). Washington, DC: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1988, 170-71, where, in addition to discussion of Theodore, Oikonomides states that «Michael Psellos also attributed considerable importance to accuracy and consistency in spellings». Conspicuous by its absence among these medieval patristic sources is any serious concern for text-critical matters during the Byzantine era.

<sup>33</sup> J. Neville Birdsall, «The Text of the Gospels in Photius», *Journal of Theological Studies*, n.s. 7 (1956), 197, noted that «the text of John used by Photius [Constantinople, 9th century] is not Byzantine», nor is it «definable as the text of any one manuscript or group». Birdsall strays well beyond his data, however, when he makes the unwarranted claim (in utter conflict with the extant MS evidence from that time period!) that «we can assume that in Photius' time the Byzantine text was not the dominant text in Greek Christendom; and that it was either unknown to him or not approved by him». What can be said is what by now should be obvious: Photius happened to use a basically «mixed» text, and expressed no text-critical concern with its particular readings; like most Byzantines, he simply accepted it as a reasonably faithful and accurate scribal production which was representative of the canonical NT text. As Frederik Wisse states («The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels», in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission*, ed. William L. Petersen, [Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989], 45, «There is no evidence for the Byzantine period or for an earlier date of efforts to eliminate divergent copies of New Testament manuscripts».

<sup>34</sup> Marc Drogan, *Medieval Calligraphy: Its History and Technique* (Montclair, NJ: Allenheld & Schram, 1980), 8, states, «A scriptorium with a reputation for accuracy produced sought-after copies, and it was a matter of great concern that errors not be introduced accidentally into the copying, only to be copied again and again. So a scribe's work, proofread and corrected by the monastery's elders, was a thing of great value».

which to read a given lection, as well as any instructions regarding portions of text to be skipped within a particular lection). Such a hypothesis indeed finds direct fulfillment among the K<sup>r</sup> group of MSS, discussed below.

## Observation 2: The Textual History and Transmission of the PA

(12) There is no Byzantine Text of the PA, even though the mass of Byzantine-era MSS contain the PA in the traditional location without question or comment regarding either its canonicity or authority<sup>35</sup>. The same MSS which generally contain a Byzantine consensus text throughout the gospels nevertheless divide significantly within the text of the PA. Von Soden correctly claimed that at least seven distinct types of PA text circulate among the extant MSS<sup>36</sup>, and it is likely that even more types exist – perhaps 10 or 11 – all within the MSS which elsewhere generally comprise the nearly-unified «Byzantine» tradition. In this regard von Soden is correct: the text of the PA is probably the key to understanding the history of gospel MS transmission. The textual history of the PA is totally bound up with the transmissional history of the MSS which generally concur in the remainder of Jn – and this affects not only the MSS which contain the PA but the MSS which exclude it. This PA/Johannine transmissional history in many cases will dovetail with that of any other gospel(s) copied by the same scribe and bound within the same codex.

(13) There is yet another significant factor at work: the present writer previously theorized that, even though corrective alteration on the grand scale involving massive and wholesale textual revision was extremely rare, there probably was a steady and continual cross-comparison process by which MSS were corrected from second exemplars which inexorably would result in a steadily improving approximation to the autograph text<sup>37</sup>. This reflected a modified

<sup>35</sup> The number of MSS containing doubtful comments is limited: two minuscule MSS have a marginal comment that τὸ κεφάλαιον τοῦτο [the PA] τοῦ κατὰ Θωμᾶν εὐαγγελίου ἐστίν, though such is not paralleled in the Nag Hammadi Thomas or any other similarly-named source. A few other MSS state that the PA is found in the τετραεὐαγγέλιον [sic], which, if not superfluous, may suggest something more than the four canonical gospels. A few MSS have notes stating that some ancient MSS do not have the passage; others have notes saying the ακριβώς copies do not have it (as discussed above).

<sup>36</sup> See Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, 2 vols. in 4 parts (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911-1913), «Die Textgeschichte der Perikope von der Ehebrecherin (Jo 7, 53-8, 1)», vol. 1, pt. 1, 486-524, as well as his extensive discussion of the PA as found among Byzantine MSS, vol. 1, pt. 2, 712-806. Von Soden did not include the lectionaries in his tabulations, and it seems that at least two additional PA types also appear among those MSS.

<sup>37</sup> Stated in Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont, *The New Testament in the Original Greek according to the Byzantine/Majority Textform* (Atlanta: Original Word, 1991), xxx-xxxi.



«process» view of transmissional history and had an intrinsic degree of plausible merit. However, contrary to this writer's earlier speculations, the extensive collation of the PA MSS has conclusively demonstrated that cross-comparison and correction of MSS occurred only *rarely* and *sporadically*, with little or no perpetuation of the corrective changes across the diversity of types represented.

If cross-correction did not occur frequently or extensively in that portion of text which has more variation than any other location in the NT, and if such corrections as were made did not tend to perpetuate, it is not likely that such a process occurred in those portions of the NT which had less textual variety. In light of this, textual critics of any persuasion should not claim that the text will slowly or «inexorably» tend toward conformity within a single standard, whether such is thought to reflect the autograph or not. Nor can one easily argue continual «mixture» among the MSS which somehow will tend toward ultimate conformity, even allowing that such did occur from time to time — the lack of systematic and thorough correction within the PA as well as the lack of perpetuation of correction patterns appears to demonstrate this clearly. Cross-comparison and correction *should* have been rampant and extensive within this portion of text due to the wide variety of textual patterns and readings existing therein; instead, correction occurred sporadically, and rarely in a thoroughgoing manner.

Since this is the case, the phenomenon of the relatively unified Byzantine Textform *cannot* be explained by a «process» methodology, whether «modified» or not. It matters not whether the «process» is considered to have created and perpetuated the Byzantine Textform out of textually diverse materials or whether the Byzantine Textform as an entity is viewed as a continually self-refining and self-purifying process perpetuating the autograph. Colwell and others simply err in stating the oft-repeated theme which is so necessary for the hypothesis<sup>38</sup>: the «process» phenomenon (including minor or massive mixture) did *not* occur transmissionally on a systematic-enough basis so as radically to affect the developmental history of the text. This therefore re-validates Hodges' original claim against a «process» view of transmission:

No one has yet explained how a long, slow process spread out over many centuries as well as over a wide geographical area, and involving a multitude of copyists, who often knew nothing of the state of the text outside of their own monasteries or scriptoria, could achieve this widespread uniformity out of the diversity presented by the earlier forms

<sup>38</sup> See examples of «process» advocacy in Ernest Cadman Colwell, *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, New Testament Tools and Studies, 9, ed. Bruce M. Metzger (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), specifically in the following articles (original publication dates bracketed): «Method in Grouping New Testament Manuscripts» [1958], 15-20; «Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types» [1961], 47-49, 53; and «Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program» [1968], 164-169.

of text. ... An unguided process achieving relative stability and uniformity in the diversified textual, historical, and cultural circumstances in which the New Testament was copied, imposes impossible strains on our imagination<sup>39</sup>.

Based upon the collated data, the present writer is forced to reverse his previous assumptions regarding the development and restoration/preservation of the Byzantine Textform in this sense: although textual transmission itself is a process, it appears that, for the most part, the lines of transmission remained separate, with relatively little mixture occurring or becoming perpetuated. This appears certain in regard to most MSS within the vellum era; the MS evidence predating the fourth century is limited and localized and cannot provide a statistically accurate view of NT transmissional history in that period. «Mixture» does occur in varying degrees among both the early papyri and the early vellum MSS, probably confirming Scrivener's original claim (reaffirmed by Colwell) that

It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected, originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Irenaeus and the African Fathers and the whole Western, with a portion of the Syrian Church, used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephen thirteen centuries later, when moulding the Textus Receptus<sup>40</sup>.

<sup>39</sup> Zane C. Hodges and David M. Hodges, «The Implications of Statistical Probability for the History of the Text», Appendix C in Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text*, rev. ed. (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1980), 168.

<sup>40</sup> Scrivener, *Plain Introduction*, 2:264-265. Cf. Colwell, «Establishing the Nature», 55, wherein he notes that «the overwhelming majority of readings were created before the year 200»; yet due to his «process» predilections, Colwell continues to claim (with an almost total absence of evidence) that «very few, if any, text-types were established by that time». The inherent fallacy in Colwell's argument remains Hodges' statement as quoted in the main text. It is far easier to consider the mixed texts found in scattered localized MSS of the second and third centuries as deviations from one or more pre-existing texttypes than to suppose that order (in the sense of well-delineated texttypes) ever could later arise out of such chaos by means of an uncontrolled process. That the limited amount of papyri preserved from Egypt which predate the fourth century are insufficient for making widespread generalizations or drawing definite conclusions can be demonstrated by comparing the *post*-fourth century papyri and vellum fragments from Egypt against the text which appears in the more complete vellum MSS from the same era. There is no question that the Egyptian fragmentary material from the later period provides a highly incomplete picture of Empire-wide transmission; the same should hold in regard to earlier fragments preserved from a period in which more complete and diverse witnesses are lacking. Epp makes too sweeping a generalization when he states (Eldon J. Epp, «The Significance of the Papyri for Determining the Nature of the New Testament Text in the Second Century: A Dynamic View of Textual Transmission», in William L. Petersen, ed., *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century: Origins, Recensions, Text, and Transmission* [Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1989], 89; cf. also 79-84, 89-90) that the inter-Empire communication evidenced among *secular* Egyptian documents demonstrates that «the various [NT] textual groups

Colwell of course is not entirely incorrect. The very fact of this great diversity within the PA among the MSS comprising the Byzantine Textform proves (as Colwell stated long ago) that

There is no homogeneity in the late medieval text of the gospels. The universal and ruthless dominance of the middle ages by one text-type is now recognized as a myth. ... Uniformity was never more than a fond dream; the text «received by all» was a printed text, not a manuscript recension<sup>41</sup>.

Certainly, all the types of PA text are distinct, and reflect a long line of transmission and preservation in their separate integrities. But what does this say about the behavior of the same MSS when they contain a near-common preservation of the remaining text of John? Apparently several things: (a) scribes were basically faithful to their task (this was granted previously); (b) they basically preserved for the most part that which had been presented to them in the exemplars they were copying *without* major change or mixture occurring from comparison with other exemplars; (c) the lines of transmission generally were *not* intermingled or altered in any significant degree by scribal activity during (at least) the vellum era.

In support of these claims stands the following evidence: (a) the PA is included in the bulk of those MSS which otherwise present a nearly unified Byzantine Textform in the remainder of John as well as in the other gospels they contain; (b) the forms of the text of the PA divide radically into perhaps 10 or more different forms and remain for the most part uncorrected and definitely *not* conformed into a «Byzantine Standard» — even with a thousand years available for the working out of such a conforming «process»; (c) the so-called «Byzantine» MSS actually reflect well-preserved *separate* transmissional lines which never seriously intermingled with each other during (at least) the vellum era; (d) the relative independence of the separate lines of transmission reflected in the PA implies that, instead of *one* unified «Byzantine Textform», there actually exist *many* separate lines of transmission which under normal text-critical terminology would be labeled «text-types» in their own right; (e) the fact that these separate transmissional lines happen to concur outside the PA is no more significantly different

presented by our Egyptian papyri represent texts from that entire Mediterranean region». With no supporting NT documentary evidence, Epp's claims exceed the more reserved comments of Colin H. Roberts (*Manuscript, Society, and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1977 [London: Oxford, 1979], 4), who emphasized more the widespread *inter-Egyptian* communication and commerce in its secular context and who did not extend the evidence *ex silentio* further than it legitimately could reach.

<sup>41</sup> Colwell, «The Complex Character», 212. Cf. also Colwell, «Establishing the Nature», 53: «The Greek vulgate — the Byzantine or Alpha text-type — had in its origin no such single focus as the Latin had in Jerome».

than the fact that *all* MSS of *all* texttypes tend to agree regarding *ca.* 90% of the base text of the NT. In the case of the «Byzantine» MSS the ten or more PA-determined «texttypes» tend to agree on a base text which is itself only somewhat higher in its percentage of common text (98% or thereabouts) than that which obtains among all MSS of all texttypes.

(14) It thus appears that the Byzantine minuscule MSS preserve lines of transmission which are not only independent but which of necessity had their origin at a time well before the 9th century. The extant uncial MSS do not and cannot account for the diversity and stability of PA textual forms found among even the earliest minuscules of the 9th century, let alone the diversity and stability of forms which appear throughout all centuries of the minuscule era. The lack of extensive cross-comparison and correction demonstrated in the extant MSS containing the PA precludes the easy development of any existing form of the PA text from any other form of the PA text during at least the vellum era. The early uncials which contain the PA demonstrate widely-differing lines of transmission, but not all of the known lines. Nor do the uncials or minuscules show any indication of any known line deriving from a parallel known line. The 10 or so «texttype» lines of transmission remain independent and must necessarily extend back to a point long before their separate stabilizations occurred — a point which seems buried (as Colwell and Scrivener suggested) deep within the second century.

(15) The earliest Greek MS containing the PA is Codex Bezae of the 5th century. However, the PA text of Bezae in no way could have been the parent of any other known type of the PA text due to its «wild» and aberrant nature. Rather, the Bezan text must be the *result* of various alterations which occurred much earlier. Bezae thus must represent a near-final *descendant* of a complex line of transmission; it remains the parent of no other known lines, although there are two MSS which apparently demonstrate Bezan corrective influence (1071 [XII] and 2722 [X]; the affinity of the latter apparently was unknown until the present research)<sup>42</sup>. Nearly a century ago Lake suggested that MS 1071 or its exemplar was partially corrected by comparison with Codex Bezae<sup>43</sup>. MS 2722, however, is estimated to be a century earlier than MS 1071, and it apparently is not the archetype of 1071 even though it is almost a duplicate in the PA. This is because MS 2722 has some errors (including one by homoioteleuton) which are absent in 1071. Both MSS therefore

<sup>42</sup> The microfilm of MS 2722 at Münster was extremely blurred and was dubbed «unreadable»; this situation apparently left the MS unexamined from the time of its original photography. It was only with great effort that the present writer was able to collate the PA from this film and establish its affinity in that location with MS 1071 and Codex Bezae.

<sup>43</sup> See Kirsopp Lake, «Texts from Mount Athos», in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica: Essays chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism by Members of the University of Oxford*, vol. 5 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1903), 147-149.

likely have descended from a now-lost uncial archetype which contained the original Bezae corrections. To recap: since no other known MSS reflect readings similar to Codex Bezae in the PA, and since Bezae itself could not have given rise to any other extant versions of the pericope, it is clear that Bezae itself must have derived from earlier MSS which contained forms of the PA more closely aligned to those found in the later uncial or minuscule MSS<sup>44</sup>.

(16) In regard to cross-correction, a number of MSS which omit the PA in their main text do have the PA supplied *en bloc*, either in the margin or at the end of John. But this differs from the issue of sporadic or wholesale cross-comparison and correction within an existing PA text, as discussed above. Here the matter is not the correction of an existing text, but inserting *en bloc* a text taken wholesale from a different exemplar to supply a total lack. It is noteworthy that the marginal PA insertions themselves do *not* tend to receive further correction once they are added.

### Observation 3: Family and Other Relationships among MSS

(17) It should be recognized that the assignment of some MSS to specific groups by Von Soden, Gregory, Nestle, Aland, Metzger, and others may be incorrect. A careful examination of the collated data will be required before the grouping of witnesses successfully can be established for the PA.

(18) The so-called «Patmos family» of four MSS identified by Silva New in Mark<sup>45</sup> can now be shown to contain a far larger number of members than previously suspected. Three of the four Markan Patmos members also are extant in the PA and clearly contain readings peculiar to their family type, many of which reflect «editorial» activity. Such readings serve as pointers toward identifying other hitherto unknown members of the Patmos family. As an example, 62 non-Patmos PA MSS conclude Jn 8.8 with the comment that Jesus wrote in the ground *εως εκαστου αυτων τας αμαρτιας* (the earliest of these MSS and the only uncial is U/030 IX). The members of the Patmos family have the addition, but as *εως εκαστου τας αμαρτιας* (omitting *αυτων*). They then change the *οι δε ακουσαντες* of 8.9 into *και αναγινωσκοντες* – certainly a more «appropriate» reading, considering the altered context. Analysis of such pointers now has increased the membership of the

<sup>44</sup> Within the «Western» tradition, the Old Latin lines of transmission reflect other forms of the PA which differ from that of Codex Bezae and which come closer to various lines within the remaining Greek MS tradition. See Adolf Jülicher et al., eds., *Itala: Das Neue Testament in Altlateinischer Überlieferung*, vol. 4: «Johannes-Evangelium» (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1963), 83–87.

<sup>45</sup> Silva New, «A Patmos Family of Gospel Manuscripts», *Harvard Theological Review* 25 (1932) 85–92.

Patmos family in John to a large group of 33 MSS, dating from the 11th through the 16th century. This discovery requires more detailed examination, since all Patmos members appear to stem from a common archetype (the new family members have no direct ties to Patmos itself; New's original four MSS were more coincidental to Patmos than anything else). As a body, the Patmos MSS primarily reflect the text of their common archetype, and should not be considered independent witnesses to the text. The archetype needs to be reconstructed and treated as a single witness in a manner similar to that of f<sup>1</sup> and f<sup>13</sup>.

(19) Other «family» relationships which appear to be certain revolve around the eight MSS associated with Theodore Hagiopetrites of Constantinople<sup>46</sup> at the end of the 13th century (MSS 74, 90, 234, 412, 483, 484, 856, 1594); also the seven MSS copied by George Hermonyme of Paris in the 15th century (MSS 17, 30, 30<sup>abs</sup>, 70, 287, 288, 880). It likely can be demonstrated that each of these MSS stem from their respective common exemplars<sup>47</sup>, since MSS copied by a single scribe will generally be related; all these count for little more than their common archetype.

(20) The so-called K<sup>r</sup> group of Von Soden<sup>48</sup> has been tested and found to reflect a distinct type of text, first by David O. Voss<sup>49</sup> and more recently by Frederik Wisse<sup>50</sup>. Wisse tested the K<sup>r</sup> group in Luke 1, 10, and 20 using what has come to be known as the Claremont Profile Method, and listed 212 MSS which fit within the K<sup>r</sup> group profile in Luke. The same group of MSS was examined by the present writer in regard to the PA in John, and the results were surprising: 134 out of the 212 Lukan K<sup>r</sup> MSS collated in the PA (9 MSS out of the 221 do not contain the PA due to lacunae or other causes) are marked with asterisks or obeli – 63% of the total. What is most remarkable is that this obelized K<sup>r</sup> group reflects almost *half* (48.2%) of the *total* number of MSS which obelize the PA (278 MSS). This strongly suggests that obelization is very much a K<sup>r</sup>-related phenomenon, and that it primarily dominates among the MSS comprising that textual group<sup>51</sup>. The point is made clearer when

<sup>46</sup> Cf. Franz Delitzsch, «Die Sieben von Theodoros dem Hagiopetriten geschriebenen Minuskulen», as well as his discussion of the related copy of a Theodore MS («Der wiederaufgefundene Codex Fabri») in his *Handschriftliche Funde*, vol. 2 (Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1862), 51–53, and 54–57.

<sup>47</sup> Even though MS 30<sup>abs</sup> is supposedly a direct copy of MS 30, it is debatable whether MS 30 represents the common exemplar of the Hermonyme family, or whether it too shares a common archetype with the remaining members.

<sup>48</sup> See von Soden, *Die Schriften*, vol. 1, pt. 2, 758–765, 793–805. Also the K<sup>r</sup> index, vol. 1, pt. 3, 2162–2179.

<sup>49</sup> David O. Voss, «Is von Soden's K<sup>r</sup> a distinct type of Text?» *JBL* 57 (1938) 311–318.

<sup>50</sup> Frederik Wisse, *The Profile Method for the Classification and Evaluation of Manuscript Evidence: as applied to the continuous Greek text of the Gospel of Luke*, Studies and Documents 44, ed. Irving Alan Sparks (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), pp. 92–94.

<sup>51</sup> Note that no significance should be attached to the form or style of such line-by-line marks (generically called obeli for convenience), whether they appear in the form of

one examines the K<sup>r</sup> MSS which Wisse claims have a «perfect» group profile: out of 59 such MSS deemed «perfect» K<sup>r</sup> in Luke, 49 of these (83%) obelize the PA (one MS from the «perfect» group is excluded since it does not contain John). This indicates that PA obelization indeed is a significant characteristic of the primary or even initial form of the K<sup>r</sup> group, and that the presence of obeli in non-K<sup>r</sup> MSS (at least those after the 11th century) might be due to K<sup>r</sup> influence more than any other cause.

The MSS of the K<sup>r</sup> group will have to be carefully examined to see how they hold up within their specific PA subtype(s). Also, the non-obelized K<sup>r</sup> members need to be examined to see whether they reflect the same type of PA text as those obelized. Following this, the remaining obelized PA MSS need to be carefully examined regarding the type of text they contain<sup>52</sup>. It remains undetermined whether any MSS shifted texttype and became K<sup>r</sup> in John while not having been such in Luke, or whether any Lukan K<sup>r</sup> witnesses changed type once in John's gospel. For the most part, MSS generally should retain similar textual affiliation when copied from a single exemplar, even when different books are considered, unless somewhere in that MS's history block mixture happened to occur (e.g. MSS W or 33, as well as some within Wisse's study which changed alignment within the three Lukan sample chapters<sup>53</sup>; these do not necessarily reflect a norm, however). There of course will be exceptions, but in general these should be few.

(21) Certain classes of commentary MSS basically descend from a single archetype and should be counted as nothing more than their original ancestor except in cases where their NT text differs radically from that normally found in commentary MSS of a particular type. This particularly applies in the case of the PA, where its omission in commentaries of identical type has no significance beyond the archetype of each commentary, regardless of how many MSS testify to such. Theophylact is the

a obelus (÷), asterisk (\*, ✱, +), tilde (~), dot (.), arrow (>, <, », «), or straight line (—). Such forms seem to reflect scribal preferences (even within the K<sup>r</sup> group), and in some cases the symbols used are identical to those denoting OT quotations within the same MS. Although the variant forms perhaps could indicate genealogical interrelationships, the fact that many obeli were added by a rubricator or a later hand subsequent to the completion of the main text hopelessly complicates the matter. Note also that the cases cited concern line-by-line obeli, and *not* a single beginning obelus or a single closing metobelus.

<sup>52</sup> As noted above, many continuous-text MSS were *not* obelized by the original scribe but by a later hand. Sometimes a subsequent general reader marked the passage with rapidly-drawn ticks (—), but in many cases the obeli were added by a rubricator who was responsible for inserting the lectionary apparatus within such continuous-text MSS *after* the main text had been completed by the primary scribe. The K<sup>r</sup> MSS are noteworthy in that the original scribe tended to include the lectionary-related material in his own hand rather than relying upon a later rubricator.

<sup>53</sup> Regarding MS W, see Bruce M. Metzger, *Text of the New Testament*, 56-57; for MS 33 see Thomas A. Geer, «The Two Faces of Codex 33 in Acts», *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989) 39-47.

leading case in point: 79 Theophylact MSS omit the PA altogether, yet these reflect only the original archetype penned by Theophylact and are of no more value than a single witness. Of far more worth among the Theophylact MSS are the 17 which *contain* the PA — especially since the PA contained therein differs from MS to MS.

The same principle applies to other commentary witnesses, whether Chrysostom or Niketas (both of whom omit the PA), or Euthymius Zigabenus (who includes the PA): the PA omission or inclusion at most reflects the archetype within the commentary tradition — a tradition which circulated separately from that of the continuous-text MSS of the NT. Only if something out of the ordinary appears would a commentary witness become particularly significant for the study of transmissional history. Apart from such significant variance from the text of the archetype, the reading of all commentary MSS should count only as *single* witnesses to their respective archetypes, and these should be treated primarily as *patristic* witnesses to the text rather than continuous-text NT MSS.

#### Observation 4: Future Collation Prospects

(22) Here the present writer speaks only for himself, and in no way intends negation or deprecation of the work being performed by those indefatigable scholars involved with either the IGNTP or the ECM; this conclusion merely expresses a personal *desideratum*. As stated at the commencement of this paper, W. J. Elliott is correct: *all* Greek NT MSS need to be collated *in pleno* and placed in a publicly accessible (preferably public-domain) database as soon as possible. If microfilms of all such MSS were readily available for scholarly use through interlibrary loan without restriction or limitation (especially regarding publication), and were a sufficient number of trained volunteer collators available (including students), such a project could be accomplished in a few years' time; but such simply is not going to happen. The IGNTP will continue its slow, painstaking and valuable work with only a limited number of minuscules being collated due to the logistics of the situation; the Münster Institut similarly will continue slowly working on its own valuable projects, continuing with the General Epistles and the ECM as well as with further volumes in the *Text und Textwert* series, having eliminated the majority of Byzantine witnesses during their initial screening process. In both cases the number of MSS collated and reported *in pleno* will be large, though far smaller than the total available; this is necessary to keep the respective projects within reasonable proportions, even if such is not the ultimate ideal.

It was suggested above (p. 2, n. 6) that perhaps both the IGNTP and the Münster Institut attempt too much in their respective editions. While they each collate a limited portion of all known Greek conti-

nuous-text MSS, both agencies exclude many more «typical» or «run-of-the-mill» Byzantine MSS. Yet from a practical standpoint such MSS would be the simplest to report in an apparatus, since they have fewer overall differences from the *Textus Receptus*<sup>54</sup>. In place of a comprehensive collation of all known Greek MSS, these editions (following the precedent of Tregelles and Tischendorf, as well as Legg) instead include a comprehensive summary of versional and patristic data along with the evidence of the Greek MSS selected for publication. Yet critical editions exist for both the fathers and versions which are far more comprehensive than the summaries cited in either the IGNTF or ECM volumes, which are themselves primarily devoted to the testimony of the Greek MS witnesses, even if the selection of such is limited. Already the current *Handausgaben* such as NA<sup>27</sup> (and to a lesser degree UBS<sup>4</sup>) provide a reasonable (if not always complete or accurate) patristic and versional overview, and there seems to be no good reason for duplication of such within a comprehensive edition primarily devoted to the evidence of Greek MSS.

While one should be sincerely thankful for the data presented in the IGNTF or ECM volumes (both of which provide much more complete and accurate information than any previously-available edition), it would have been far better for both IGNTF and Münster to fulfill Elliott's desire and present a complete collation *in pleno* of all known continuous-text Greek MSS, referring the inquirer to the various versional and patristic critical editions when need required.

With the longer books of the NT—particularly the gospels—the task admittedly is complex. In such a case, the collation methodology needs to be altered. While the *in pleno* collation of all known Greek MSS *should* occur, the time required for one person to collate even a single gospel in a single MS tends to postpone the discovery of significant data for an indefinite period. The best approach seems to be the collation of a single chapter or pericope, followed by the publication of the complete text and apparatus for that portion *before* attempting to publish any major textual analysis of the data. To delay the prompt publication of raw data

<sup>54</sup> The Oxford 1873 TR is the collation base for the IGNTF; the Münster *Institut*, however, collates against their own Nestle-Aland<sup>27</sup> Greek text — a complication which increases the number of variants to be noted as a MS approaches the prevailing Byzantine Textform, and one which requires extensive conversion of earlier collations to the NA<sup>27</sup> base or *vice versa* in order to make practical comparisons. Although there is merit in Daniel Wallace's suggestion that the Byzantine Textform would be a more appropriate and preferable collation base (Daniel B. Wallace, «The Majority Text: A New Collating Base?», *New Testament Studies* 35 [1989] 609-618), there is no compelling reason to abandon the various TR editions which have served as the *de facto* collation standard for the past two centuries, especially since the need to convert older collations to the new Byzantine standard would fall under the same condemnation as that stated above regarding NA<sup>27</sup> as a collation base (the problem is already complicated to a minor degree by the various TR editions used for collation; at least the IGNTF has settled firmly on the Oxford 1873 edition, which is a welcome standard).

inevitably postpones the scholarly use of such data. There is no need for a Dead Sea Scrolls mentality to afflict NT textual research; to provide the raw data to the scholarly world in timely fashion should be the prerequisite for NT textual scholarship in the 21st century.

That such a task indeed *can* be done is exemplified by the present research: the PA is the gospel pericope containing a greater proportion of textual variants than any other segment of the NT. It has been now collated in nearly all extant continuous-text MSS and over 100 lectionaries *in pleno*, and this task was completed in a nine-month period. Other gospel pericopes of similar length likely could be collated in a shorter time. The present writer not only would zealously seek such opportunities, but indeed, he plans further visits to Münster to continue collating the PA among the barely-tapped lectionary MSS. May additional laborers be granted who likewise will assist in reaping such a bountiful harvest in other portions of the Greek NT!

Maurice A. ROBINSON  
Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587 (USA)