SCRIBAL HABITS AMONG MANUSCRIPTS

OF THE APOCALYPSE

-- Maurice Arthur Robinson

James L. Sweet
Major Professor

Evaluation: Overall, satisfactory.

(1) Form. Satisfactory plus. There were some errors of form, punctuation, and grammar.

(2) Research. High minus. This was an outstanding piece of research. It made excellent use of primary sources.

(3) Presentation. Satisfactory. There was some tendency to digress and to use "sermonic" language. It tended to be judgmental and censorious.

Accepted on April 1, 1982

J B Murphy
Acting Associate Dean for the Graduate School

Deposited in Library April 20, 1982

Keith C Wills
Director of Libraries

SCRIBAL HABITS AMONG MANUSCRIPTS OF THE APOCALYPSE

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Theology

Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary

Fort Worth, Texas

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of New Testament

by

Maurice Arthur Robinson

May 1982

Copyright 1982
Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Fort Worth, Texas 76122

No part of this dissertation may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the Committee for the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, School of Theology.

A B S T R A C T

Maurice Arthur Robinson, "Scribal Habits Among Manuscripts of the Apocalypse." Ph. D. Dissertation, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, May 1982. pp. 411.

Lacking detailed research data, textual handbooks have postulated how scribes "likely" would have corrupted the New Testament (NT) text. Yet Ernest C. Colwell's short study of scribal habits in three early papyri[1] found many generalizations to be *contradicted* by actual evidence!

Colwell's experiment is now vastly expanded, utilizing Herman C. Hoskier's collations of 220 manuscripts (MSS) of the Apocalypse[2] within a sample base covering 40% of that book. Following Colwell, the *singular readings* of each MS were taken as evidence of *individual* scribal habits (*shared readings* could reflect historical/genealogical ties).

The singular readings of each MS were tabulated from Hoskier's collations and mathematically projected (when necessary) to provide a common standard of comparison (six Tables appear). Exemplification of accidental and deliberate scribal corruption is followed by a detailed scrutiny of ten MSS which illustrate the types and range of scribal practice in the Apocalypse. These conclusions follow:

---

[1] Ernest C. Colwell, "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits," in his *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, vol. IX; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), pp. 106-124.

[2] Herman C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929).

(1) Generalizations concerning scribal habits *are* faulty; the textual handbooks thus need *drastic* revision.

(2) Manuscript correction from *different* exemplars effectively curbed the widespread perpetuation of purely *scribal* corruption.

(3) "Byzantine-era" scribes were mostly *careful*, with "nonsense-variety" singular readings predominant.

(4) Massive "Byzantine corruption" *never* occurred; yet the disparity between the Byzantine and Alexandrian textypes *requires* re-editing *somewhere*.

(5) Early "Egyptian" scribes (MSS ℵ, A, C) plus a *very few* Byzantine-era scribes were both extremely careless *and* highly "editorial."

(6) Deliberate revision likely occurred within *local* situations where scribal *freedom* was common.

(7) The extant Egyptian MSS may reflect a *defective* "sample of Antiquity" from that locale. In either case (6) or (7) their value seems diminished.

(8) *De majorem ad minorem*, the complex transmissional history of the Apocalypse suggests that the present findings *may* be applied cautiously elsewhere in the NT, where transmission was relatively *less* complicated.

(9) The "Majority Text" theory of textual transmission derives greater support from the present findings than do current eclectic methodologies (whether "reasoned" or "thoroughgoing").

(10) Progress in NT textual criticism requires a return to *both* Westcott-Hort *and* Burgon-Scrivener-Miller; the *full* collation of *all* NT MSS; the clear delineation of their individual scribal habits; and the accurate determination of their textual interrelationships.

In Memoriam

KENNETH WILLIS CLARK

1898 - 1979

אַל תְּבַקֵּשׁ אִישׁ הַסְּעָרָה
לְדַעַת דֶּרֶךְ הָרוּחַ׃

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2. METHODOLOGY OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH 12

Extracting Data from Hoskier 12
Difficulties in the Use of Hoskier 13
Criteria for Singular Readings 15
What Type of Singular Readings are Included 16
The Nonsense Reading 17
The Dislocated Reading 17
The Sensible Singular Reading 18
Itacistic Spellings and Other Orthographic Differences . . . 20
Harmonization to General Usage 21
Harmonization to Remote Parallels 21
Harmonization to Immediate Context 22
The Work of Correctors 22
What Type of Singular Readings are Excluded 24
Corrected Readings Not Meeting the Criteria of this Study . . 24
Singular Readings of Accents or Diacritical Marks 24
Obscure or Ambiguous Data 24

CHAPTER 3. A GENERAL REVIEW OF THE DATA EXTRACTED FROM HOSKIER 26

Location and Brief Description of the Data 26
Table 3: Incomplete Manuscripts 26
Table 4: Incomplete MSS within the Sample Base Chapters . . . 26
Table 5: Gross and Projected Tabulations per MS 27
Table 6: Singular Readings by Manuscript 28
A General Summary of Accidental Variation 29
Spelling Errors 30
Pure Nonsense 30
Transposition of Letters 31
Itacistic Errors 32
Non-verbal 33
Verbal 33
Copying Errors 35
Misreading of Uncial Letters 35
Misreading of Minuscule Letters 36
Attraction to Nearby Forms 37
Haplography and Dittography 39
Dittography of a Single Letter 40
Dittography of One Syllable (or One-Syllable Words) . . . 40

Dittography of One Multiple-Syllable Word 40
Dittography of a Short Clause 41
Dittography of a Long Clause 41
Haplography of a Single Letter 43
Haplography of One Syllable (or One-Syllable Words) . . 44
Haplography of More than One Syllable 44
Haplography of One Multi-Syllable Word 45
Haplography of a Short Clause 45
Haplography of a Lengthy Clause 46
Haplography of a Single Line or More 48
Transposition of Words 50
Phonetically-Caused Accidental Variation 52
Phonetic Nonsense 52
Letter Omitted Phonetically 52
Letter Added Phonetically 52
Wrong Letter Written (At Times Corrected) 52
"Real" Word Produced, Nonsense in Context 52
"Sensible" Reading Produced 53
eneral Summary of Intentional Variation 54
Minor Intentional Changes 55
Incorporation of Glosses 56
Substitution of an "Easier" Reading 58
Expansion or Addition of Divine Names 60
Reduction or Omission of Divine Names 60
Substitution of Divine Names 61
Harmonization to Parallel or Familiar Passages 64
Conflation of Two Variant Readings 68
Deliberate and/or Wanton "Editorializing" 74

ER 4. A PARTICULAR REVIEW OF SCRIBAL HABITS IN ECTED MANUSCRIPTS 74

Overview of Individual Manuscript Data 76
The Importance of Table 5 78
Additional Data of Significance 83
Examination of Selected Individual Manuscripts 83
The Selection of the MSS to be Examined 84
The MSS Regularly Cited in UBS^3/Apocalypse 87
Guidelines for Manuscript Examination 88
Greg. 1859/Hosk. 219: An "Extremely Careful" Scribe . . . 89
Greg. 104/Hosk. 7: An "Average +" Scribe 91
Greg. P (025)/Hosk. P: An "Average −" Scribe 92
Itacism 92
Phonetic Change 92
Dittography 92
Homoioteleuton 93
Greg. 1006/Hosk. 215: Another "Average −" Scribe 93
Itacism 94
Dittography 94
Homoioteleuton 94
Wrong Iota Adscript 94

Attraction to Similar Forms 94
Haplography 94
(5) Greg. 1828/Hosk. 124: A Somewhat Careless Scribe 95
Dittography 96
Homoioteleuton 96
Haplography 96
Attraction/Assimilation 96
Confusion of Letters 97
Protection of Orthodoxy 97
Stylistic Change 98
Verb Alteration 98
(6) Greg. 1611/Hosk. 111: A "Careful Editor" 99
Itacism 99
Homoioteleuton 99
Orthographic Change 99
Transpositions 100
Stylistic Improvement 100
Verb Changes 100
Elimination of a Semitism 101
"Logical" Change 102
Major Alterations 102
(7) Greg. A (02)/Hosk. A: A Less Careful Editor 104
Itacism 104
Phonetic/Orthographic Variation 105
Homoioteleuton 105
Attraction/Assimilation 105
General Stylistic Improvement 106
"Logical" Change 106
Substitution of Less Familiar Words 107
Theologically-Motivated Variation 109
(8) Greg. C (03)/Hosk. C: A Careless Scribe/Careful Editor 113
Itacism 114
Dittography 114
Homoioteleuton 114
Attraction to Nearby Forms 114
Metathesis of Letters 114
Pure Nonsense 115
Orthographic Changes 115
Stylistic Improvement 115
Logical or Explanatory Change 115
Removal of a Difficulty 116
A Transposition 116
Amplification of a Verb Form 116
Theological Alteration 117
Intentional "Bumbling"? 117
(9) Greg. 1854/Hosk. 130: An Extensive but "Sloppy" Editor 118
Itacism 120
Dittography 120
Homoioteleuton 120
Confusion of Uncial/Minuscule Letters 122
Attraction and Assimilation 125

Conflation 126
Stylistic Improvement 127
"Logical" Changes 129
Alteration for Theological Purposes 132
Other Deliberate Alterations 134
(10) Greg. K (01)/Hosk. K: An "Editor" to be Reckoned With 135
Itacism 153
Phonetic Errors 153
Orthographic Peculiarities 154
Dittography 154
Homoioteleuton 155
Haplography 160
Transposition of Words 161
Intentional Omissions 165
Intentional Additions 167
Minor Stylistic Expansions 167
Explanatory or Emphatic Addition 168
Theological Addition 169
"Correction" of Presumed Difficulties 169
Undetermined Reason for Change 171
Intentional Substitutions 172
Stylistic Improvements 172
"Logical" Alterations 173
Theologically-Motivated Substitutions 175
Cases of Major Editing 178
Closing Observations 182

CHAPTER 5. RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT 188

What Has Been Learned 188
What Yet Remains to be Done 230

TABLES 250

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY 402

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. Concordance of Hoskier Numbers with Current Gregory-Aland Numbers 251

TABLE 2. Concordance of Gregory-Aland Numbers with Hoskier Numbers: Together with Data concerning Manuscript Content and Date . . . 256

TABLE 3. Incomplete Manuscripts: A Compilation of Scattered Data from Hoskier 262

TABLE 4. Verses Lacking from Manuscripts within the Sample Base Chapters: A Correlative Examination and Percentage Evaluation . . . 268

TABLE 5. Gross and Projected Tabulation of Singular Readings: Arranged According to Descending Totals 272

TABLE 6. Singular Readings By Manuscript Within the Chapters Examined 280

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Every text-critical student soon becomes familiar with what is generally a recognized ritual each time a manuscript reaches completion. Conventionally, every "new" scribe offers regards (somewhat haphazardly) in placing near the end of the text a *colophon*, thanking God that he has thus been enabled to complete his arduous task of copying his manuscript and acknowledging the aid and assistance of those who have gone before him. Today the *preface* has usurped the place of the colophon, but it too represents the final words written in a manuscript and serves the same purpose as the ancient colophon, though in somewhat greater detail.

The present study of the individual copying habits of Greek scribes in MSS of the Apocalypse falls under the category of New Testament Textual Criticism and as such will conform to certain standardized conventions for research in that discipline. Although such conventions should be familiar to those who labor in this field, they are here recounted in order to preclude any misunderstanding:

(1) Greek words from the Biblical text normally are *not* accented nor furnished with breathings. This is due both to the varying systems of accentuation practiced by medieval scribes and to the near-total *lack* of accents and breathings

among the earliest extant manuscripts. Exceptions to this practice occur generally in cases where the *presence* of an accent or breathing serves a clarifying purpose (e.g., ἡ *vs.* ἢ *vs.* ἦ) or in quotations from other writers.

(2) The text-critical symbols and abbreviations utilized herein conform to those found in the "Master List" of the United Bible Societies' *The Greek New Testament*,[1] pp. xlvii-liii. To that list can be added the self-explanatory "NT" (for "New Testament"), "OT" (for "Old Testament") and "MS/MSS" (for "Manuscript/Manuscripts"). The reader is expressly cautioned *not* to confuse the superscript numerals following a *Greek* word with *footnote* references! Such merely indicate the subsequent appearance of that same Greek word within a single verse! All footnote numbers will follow *English* words.

(3) For the special purposes of this study, in order to make collation references as clear as possible, the manuscript numbers assigned to MSS of the Apocalypse by Herman C. Hoskier[2] are utilized throughout without special identification. Wherever the current Gregory-Aland numeration appears, it will *always* be identified by "Greg." or "Greg.-Aland" preceding the number of the MS. When the Hoskier number appears

---

[1]Kurt Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1975). This work is usually cited as "UBS[3]" in the present study.

[2]Herman C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929), II:11-21. See Tables 1 and 2 of the present study for the proper correlation between the two numbering systems.

in tandem with the Gregory-Aland number, it will be preceded by "Hosk." Any MS number standing alone, without "Greg." or "Hosk." preceding, will *always* refer to the Hoskier number.

(4) The word "textype" has its peculiar spelling due to the deliberate choice of the present writer. This merely follows his earlier practice in his Master's Thesis, the reason for such spelling being stated therein thus:

> None of the various spellings of this word (e.g., "text type", "text-type", "texttype") do justice to its nature as a technical term. The writer has therefore coined the form "textype" both in order to unify its spelling, and to portray its technical nature. Except when quoting another writer, this new term will be utilized throughout this thesis.[1]

By way of acknowledgement I must offer special thanks for aid and encouragement to my major professor, Dr. James A. Brooks; also to Professor Zane C. Hodges of Dallas Theological Seminary for special advice and counsel on many pertinent matters. So too to Mr. William G. Pierpont of Wichita, Kansas (whose welcome letters have been a constant source of encouragement during the many days of typing and re-typing); and to Dr. Wilbur N. Pickering of Wycliffe's Summer Institute of Linguistics, now serving in Brazil—as much for his gentle disagreements as for his warm recognition that "we are a *school*

[1] Maurice A. Robinson, "Textual Interrelationships Among Selected Ancient Witnesses to the Book of Acts" (Th. M. Thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975), p. 4, n. 12. In other writers the problem of spelling "textype" is *further* intensified by haphazard capitalization of one or both "T's" in the word. The present proposal is merely for simplification and standardization. The syllabification proposed is "tex·type" (cf. below, p. 210, line 5).

of thought." And finally, many thanks to Mr. Robert Zimmerman, who helped start me on this road long ago ("The cause was there before we came"): he was right *then*, and is even more right *now*! Thank you all, my dear friends!

Beyond these dear friends I must especially thank my wife Renee for seeing me through these many years of classwork and research; my parents for their welcome support during the typing process; and Jean-Paul Pierre, for *not* "helping Daddy" as much as he could have! To all others who shared in the development of this project, I remain ever grateful: for all of us, our concern is with the *accurate* determination of the "autograph" form of God's inerrant Word. May the present study be a *small* contribution toward the realization of that most excellent goal!

And thus this "colophon" is finished, along with the entire dissertation. The present writer understands at long last the wisdom inherent in the closing colophon of Hosk. MS *143*:

ὡσπερ ξενοι χαιρουσι πατριδα βλεπειν
οὑτω και οἱ γραφοντες τελος βιβλιου!

ΕΠΙΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ

Uncritical rejection of all theory because it is incomplete and wrong on occasion is foolish and harmful; intelligent criticism of standard material, no matter how long it has been accepted, is sensible and wholesome.

—Reuben Fine, *Ideas Behind The Chess Openings*, p. 6.

Oh every thought that strung a knot in my mind,
I might go insane if it couldn't be sprung.
But it's not to stand naked under unknowing eyes:
It's for myself and my friends my stories I've sung.
. . . . . .

But if the arrow is straight
And the point is slick,
It can pierce through the dust
No matter how thick.

So I make my stand
And remain as I am,
And bid farewell . . .

—Bob Dylan, "Restless Farewell"

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

New Testament textual criticism seems eternally beset with unfinished tasks. Attention is given first to those subjects which most obviously merit detailed research: the study of newly-discovered manuscripts (MSS), the analysis of shared readings among various "significant" MSS in order to classify them into groups or textypes, and the attempt to discern the "autograph" reading of the inspired writers by application of sound text-critical methodology. It thus should be no wonder that other matters which do not immediately contribute to the achievement of these goals become neglected—"temporarily" at first, but "permanently" in effect, due to the continuing discovery of new MSS and the ongoing research into the data already available.

One such area of neglect has been the study of readings found in but a single MS, unshared by the great host of MSS: the "singular reading." The very uniqueness of such readings is part of the reason for their neglect—they are of *no* use in textype grouping of MSS, nor are they likely to represent the autograph text, despite the claim of the "thoroughgoing

[1] See Ernest C. Colwell, "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings," in his *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (New Testament Tools and Studies, IX; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), p.104 [This collection hereafter is cited as "*Studies*"].

eclectic" school that such might be the case.[1] Rather, the singular reading is more likely than not the peculiar creation of the particular scribe of that one MS and was *not* transmitted from MS to MS over a lengthy history.[2] Colwell suggests that we can make such a judgment "with confidence in view of the wealth of manuscript attestation for the Greek New Testament,"[3] and he is no doubt correct. The simple practice of cross-correcting a MS by a different exemplar (a practice which we know occurred even in the second century)[4] would, in the process of time, eventually eliminate singular readings from further perpetuation. We have but "pictures in time," frozen for our study in the extant MSS. Most if not all of these singular readings so preserved in our MSS would have totally disappeared in the very next "copying generation"; as it is, we are privileged to be able to study the peculiarities and proclivities of many New Testament scribes over a vast period of textual history.

---

[1]This position is primarily represented by George Dunbar Kilpatrick and J. Keith Elliott. It has been adequately refuted by Gordon D. Fee, "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism—Which?" in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick*, ed. J. K. Elliott (Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, vol.44; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976), pp.174-197.

[2]Colwell, "Classifying," p.104, speaks of "the high probability that in a tradition so richly evidenced as that of the New Testament, the original reading has survived in some *group* or *type* of text" [Emphasis my own]. Such sharply contrasts with Hort's view that "even when B stands quite alone, its readings must never be lightly rejected" (Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, one-volume edition [New York: Macmillan rep.ed., 1953], p.560).

[3]Ernest C. Colwell, "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits," *Studies*, p.108.

[4]E.g., in P^{66}. Cf. the chapters on this head in Gordon D. Fee, *Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics* (Studies and Documents, 34; Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1968).

Of what value, then, are these scribal peculiarities? On the surface, their value seems small since they cannot aid in classifying MSS nor are likely to reflect the autograph text. Yet they do possess an inherent value generally unnoticed by the textual critic in his varied attempts to attain autograph certainty. Colwell has spoken to this point:

> The Singular Readings have a value in the initial appraisal of the work of the scribe in a particular manuscript. If his pages are crowded with them, he is a careless or rash workman. Moreover a study of his singular readings will reveal habits and inclinations that will aid in the appraisal of his readings which are not singulars.[1]

Later, in his landmark study of singular readings in three early papyri of the Gospels,[2] Colwell stated quite unequivocally that "a careful study of what scribes actually did, with a resultant catalogue of readings produced by scribes, is *essential* for textual criticism."[3] His reasons for such an assertion are quite clear:

> Its primary purpose is to gain knowledge of an individual scribe's habits, and thus to increase skill in the evaluation of that manuscript. Also its purpose is to gain knowledge of the habits of scribes in general—of the processes of corruption—and thus to increase skill in the evaluation of readings. Ultimately it will sharpen tools for establishing the kinship of manuscripts; it will disencumber the *apparatus criticus*, and will support . . . an increased use of external evidence.[4]

---

[1] Colwell, "Classifying," p.104.

[2] Colwell, "Scribal Habits." The three early papyri examined by Colwell were P^{45}, P^{66}, and P^{75}—each dating from the late second or early third century and clearly exemplifying the restricted nature of Colwell's "model" study.

[3] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p.107. [4] Ibid., p.108.

Colwell's article should be studied quite carefully in order to comprehend the significance of the data gained from singular readings. A detailed summary of Colwell's findings is not necessary, for his study concerned a different textual area and MSS of different date from those of the present research; however, it would be well to note the *general* conclusions made by Colwell, which can be summarized thus:

Scribes can be classified according to their general degree of carefulness, their most frequent or habitual types of error, and their proclivity to alter deliberately the text which lay before them in an exemplar.[1] Once a scribe has been so classified, some guidelines concerning the testimony of the MS containing his work can be drawn:[2] does a MS tend to omit much by homoiotelcuton—that is, is the *scribe* of that MS prone toward parablepsis? If so, then the testimony of that MS may well be valueless in any variant of omission where such could have occurred by homoioteleuton. Does the scribe often confuse Omicron and Omega (homophones)? If so, the testimony of that MS in a variant unit where an o/ω interchange exists[3] would become practically valueless—such a MS's testimony could not be relied upon even if its textual allies read unitedly within

[1] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," pp.111-123, where a number of examples are provided.

[2] Ibid., pp.123-124, lists both general and specific guidelines concerning the application of the singular reading data to other variant units within the three early papyri Colwell examined.

[3] E.g., Rom.5:1, where MSS are divided between εχωμεν and εχομεν.

such a variant, for no one MS within a textype grouping can be relied upon always to agree with the "textype consensus."[1]

What remains then, once a MS has been classified as to its scribal "character," is the certain assurance that readings shared with other MSS—both within its own textype and without—which do *not* line up with the determined scribal tendencies of that MS are the most likely to be genuine, and thus the most useful readings to be found in that MS. This principle of favoring the "non-generic" or "uncharacteristic" readings while neglecting or minimizing those readings which fit the peculiar tendency of a scribe is of course stressed by Colwell. He affirms that "if the conjectures as to transcriptional probability are to be soundly based, they must rest upon a knowledge of scribal habits."[2] He further cautions that without such knowledge, "there is always the risk of reading deliberate intention into unintended error."[3]

With the value and significance of the study of scribal habits declared and supposedly given an impetus by Colwell's researches, it is curious that overall there seems to be

---

[1]Cf. Ernest C. Colwell, "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," *Studies*, pp.56-62. After meticulously eliminating readings which were singular and those which may have been caused by scribal accident (cf. p.57), Colwell still was forced to acknowledge that textype groups might possess only a 70% agreement between any two members of the group (p.59)—and 30% of all remaining variants allows a *wide* area for textype crossing ("mixture")! Thus, there is *no* "automatic certainty" as to whether a MS is truly reading "with its textype" where a scribal habit equally may be to blame.

[2]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p.107. [3]Ibid., p.110.

little or no interest in seeking out data thus to clarify MS testimony to the text of the NT. Instead, our critical editions merely cite variant readings on a "per-MS" basis, whether such readings be singular or shared with other MSS. Such readings are to be examined in light of their internal quality and of those MSS which testify to them. MS age, locale, textype, and "quality" are all cited as important factors, but *nowhere* in our modern critical handbooks are we instructed carefully to examine a MS for its scribal tendencies based upon a study of its singular readings. This is despite Colwell's careful demonstration of the need for such research as a preliminary to rightly dividing the textual evidence: "Until we have . . . [such] data, critics of the Greek New Testament will be *handicapped and inadequate* in struggling to remove corruptions from the text."[1]

Yet Colwell's urgings are not new: our collection of textual evidence adequate to the task may be "new," having been amassed for the most part only since the early portion of this century. But in the last quarter of the nineteenth century John W. Burgon as much as demanded the same study of scribal habits in his "Canons of Textual Criticism" outlined in his posthumous volume on the *Causes of Corruption* of the New Testament text:

---

[1]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p.108. Emphasis my own. Such a handicap may be evidenced in the divergent textual theories now current, whether in "rigorous" or "reasoned" eclecticism or the "Majority Text" school—the failure to take *all* the data into consideration (including scribal habits) might readily foster an unconsciously biassed view of textual history.

> . . . Irregularities which fall under these last [i.e., scribal] heads are only tolerable within narrow limits, and always require careful watching; for they may easily become excessive or even betray an animus. . . . From cases of excusable oscitancy they degenerate, either into instances of inexcusable licentiousness, or else into cases of downright fraud.
>
> Thus, if it be observed in the case of a codex (*a*) that entire sentences or significant clauses are habitually omitted:—(*b*) that again and again in the course of the same page the phraseology of the Evangelist has upon clear evidence been seriously tampered with: and (*c*) that interpolations here and there occur which will not admit of loyal interpretation:—we cannot but learn to regard with habitual distrust the Codex in which all these notes are found combined.
>
> . . . Now suppose the case of [such] a MS. . . . ;—Suppose further that the same MS. abounds in worthless paraphrase, and contains apocryphal additions throughout:—What are we to think of our guide then? There can be but one opinion on the subject. From habitually trusting, we shall entertain inveterate distrust. *We have ascertained his character.* We thought he was a faithful witness, but we now find from experience of his transgressions that we have fallen into bad company. His witness may be false no less than true: confidence is at an end.[1]

Despite Burgon's limited resources and his prejudice against all non-Traditional Text readings due to certain methodological weaknesses,[2] he yet anticipated the basic principle espoused by Colwell. But Burgon was anticipated in this regard by Hort, who boldly stated "KNOWLEDGE OF DOCUMENTS SHOULD PRECEDE FINAL JUDGEMENT UPON READINGS."[3]

---

[1] John William Burgon, *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels*. Arranged, completed, and edited by Edward Miller (London: George Bell & Sons, 1896), pp.20-21. Emphasis my own. Burgon died in 1888.

[2] For example, the theological "Church Preservation" argument weighed quite heavily with Burgon and so slanted certain aspects of his case. The reader should not assume, however, that Burgon was unacquainted with or did not research the data available to him; on the contrary, Burgon was a careful and accurate scholar.

[3] Westcott and Hort, *NT in Original Greek*, one-volume edition, p.543. The present writer considers that Hort did not act correctly upon this key principle when formulating his textual theory.

Hort, however, skipped some steps that should have been mandatory for the correct fulfillment of his stated goal. Instead of commencing his research into the "knowledge of documents" with an examination of the *scribal character* of the MSS to be utilized in preparing an edition of the Greek NT, Hort first turned to the matter of "genealogy" and used such a principle to reduce the scope of inquiry by virtually eliminating the Byzantine-type MSS from further consideration.[1] He then progressed to a theory of the "internal evidence of readings" (scribal habits were *not* included under this head) and thence to the study of the "internal evidence of *groups* of MSS."[2] Hort never did turn to a serious consideration of scribal habits, despite the promise inherent in his basic principle.

Sad to say, such remains the situation of modern textual criticism. All who have come after Hort have skipped the same preliminary step, just as they have continued to reject the Byzantine textype as a possible candidate for the original text. Perhaps Wilbur Pickering *does* have a point when he suggests that all modern textual critics are under "the psychological grip of W-H."[3]

---

[1]Cf. Brooke Foss Westcott and Fenton John Anthony Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek*, 2 vols: [Vol. 2] "Introduction and Appendix" (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882), pp. 30, 39, 90, 146, 187, and 207.

[2]Ibid., pp. 187-230. The theory as presented by Hort seems rather contrived, and should not be confused with modern grouping methods nor modern eclecticism's internal principles of evidence. Hort's "internal" criteria amount to acceptance of those readings having the "ring of genuineness" in his mind's ear, and nothing more.

[3]Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1977), p. 29.

While it is true that a discussion of "Transcriptional Probabilities" depending in part upon the "habits of scribes" appears within the standard text-critical handbook of our day,[1] what in fact is referred to is *not* the careful study of the individual characteristics of the various scribes responsible for our vast collection of NT MSS, but only some *generalizations* concerning supposed scribal habits which are manifested within the entire *body* of NT MSS in varying degrees. Too often these generalizations are assumed to apply in *any* case of textual variation, wholly apart from the careful analysis of a MS's particular scribal habits.[2]

Such generalizations merely summarize Westcott and Hort's own view concerning "scribal characteristics"[3] which was formulated in the absence of the hard data of individual scribal evaluation. Burgon's later criticism of Westcott and Hort on this head thus seems justified.[4]

---

[1]Bruce Manning Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2nd. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1968), p.209.

[2]Ibid., pp. 209-210. These "general habits" are introduced by phrases such as "Scribes would frequently . . ." and "Scribes would sometimes . . . ." To leap from these *possibilities* to the *probability* that a scribe would *always* do such and such would be a great error of judgment. Clearly, *some* scribes should have been quite careful while other scribes were quite careless—but regarding either of these categories generalizations simply do not apply!

[3]Cf. Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," pp. 22-30 for their discussion of "Transcriptional Probability." Both W-H and Metzger actually rely upon canons espoused by Griesbach in the latter portion of the 18th century, before the modern age of NT textual criticism began. Cf. Metzger, *Text*, pp. 119-121 with pp. 209-210.

[4]See in this regard John William Burgon, *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established*. Arranged, completed, and edited by Edward Miller (London: George Bell & Sons, 1896), pp. 53-58 (regarding the "respectability" of MSS). Note especially the closing statement: "If they [the MSS] go wrong continually, their character must be low" (p. 58).

The present study thus represents a first attempt toward rectifying the situation: it is proposed that the singular readings of a large number of MSS be examined over an extended portion of NT text in order to determine some basic data concerning scribal characteristics. These data will include both the examination of the generalizations previously put forth by text-critical scholars as well as the consideration of the new statistical data to be derived from the present research. Conclusions will then be drawn regarding the proper place and use to be made of scribal-habit data within NT textual criticism.

Of necessity the area selected for research must be that portion of the Greek NT for which we possess the fullest available evidence from MS collation, and that is the book of the Revelation (the Apocalypse). For this one book of the NT alone nearly all extant MSS have been collated, thanks to the thirty years' labor of Herman C. Hoskier,[1] whose collations cover 220 MSS of the Apocalypse out of the approximately 290 such MSS now known to exist.[2] Such a large number of MSS-in-collation should serve adequately both to determine which readings are truly singular and to provide a sound representative sample with which to work so that fair and accurate conclusions can be drawn from the derived data.

---

[1]Herman C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929), II:5 ("Introductory").

[2]Tables 1 and 2 of the present study list all the MSS collated by Hoskier. The complete listing of all Apocalypse MSS can be found in Kurt Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. I. Gesamtübersicht* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963), updated in his *Materialien zur Neutestamentlichen Handschriftenkunde, I.* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969).

The method of research for the present study will be outlined in detail in the next chapter but may be summarized as follows: all MSS collated by Hoskier will be searched for singular readings within a limited sample portion of the text of the Apocalypse. These readings will then become the basis for general and specific observations concerning scribal habits, and conclusions will be drawn on this basis.

The Apocalypse possesses a textual history far different from that of the other NT books: there is no single "Byzantine" text extant for this book,[1] nor has any other NT book suffered such vicissitudes in gaining full canonical status.[2] Its pattern of textual preservation thus differs from all other NT books, and one might think that therefore no extended application could be made to the other NT books of the data derived in the present study. But this is only partially correct: although the *specific* findings of this research must remain peculiar to the Apocalypse, the *general* observations concerning (primarily) Byzantine-era scribes certainly will possess value toward determining scribal habits extant in MSS of other NT books. This is especially the case when the same MSS containing the Apocalypse also contain other NT books copied by the very same scribe—a frequent phenomenon which will be noted in the course of this study.

---

[1]Cf. Zane C. Hodges, "The Ecclesiastical Text of Revelation—Does It Exist?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 118 (1961): 113-122.

[2]Cf. A. H. McNeile, *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, 2nd ed., rev. by C. S. C. Williams (Oxford: Clarendon, 1953), pp. 337-339, 356-359.

CHAPTER 2

METHODOLOGY OF THE PRESENT RESEARCH

Extracting Data From Hoskier

Although complete examination of MS data should be the ideal in text-critical research, it is often difficult to strive for such when one has no concept of where the data might lead. Clearly, those MSS should be investigated which appear to be the most promising in terms of providing the best data for the immediate inquiry. But in the present case, we know little or nothing about the MSS under investigation and even less about the singular readings each possesses. Therefore a limited statistical sampling of each of the 220 MSS Hoskier collated is in order. Such a procedure will allow a cursory examination of those MSS with few or no singular readings and permit a detailed study to be made of those MSS with a larger concentration of singular readings.

A broad base of research of course is necessary: it would not do merely to examine the opening chapters of the Apocalypse, since scribes may have been more careful when commencing their work. Nor would it do simply to study the last few chapters, since scribes may have been less careful there. Rather, what is called for is a limited sampling

drawn from the entire Apocalypse, with each MS allowed to provide sufficient evidence concerning its scribe's habits as he copied that book (insofar as the MS in question is extant in the portions of text to be examined).

The present study will examine the singular readings which appear in chapters 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20 and 22 of the Apocalypse. These ten chapters contain 163 verses out of the total 404 verses in the book, slightly over 40% of the whole. Such a sample base should suffice to provide adequate data for the present investigation. Future research may begin from this base, conducting more detailed studies upon those MSS which seem to be the most interesting (in terms of scribal habits) in light of the present data.

Difficulties in the Use of Hoskier -

Although Hoskier's second volume provides the full collation of the 220 MSS he examined,[1] it must be pointed out (to Hoskier's discredit) that his *format* and *manner of presentation* are most disconcerting! The crowded appearance of the page as well as the frequent Latin abbreviations (to which Hoskier does not provide a key) delay the user of his work unnecessarily; so also the continual interspersion of versional evidence *in pleno*. But far worse are the instances of Hoskier dividing the presentation of the data to suit his own theories of textual affinity between the Greek MSS and the ancient versions, e.g., that *from the very first* there

[1] Volume 1 of Hoskier's *Apocalypse* contains a full description of the MSS Hoskier collated, interspersed with adventure tales and textual theory-spinning. One may rejoice that *description* of MSS predominates!

were bi-lingual and even tri-lingual MSS, and that subsequent cross-influence from such multi-lingual witnesses is responsible for the bulk of the differences within our extant Greek MSS.[1]

In order to "demonstrate" his theories, Hosker felt free to re-arrange the presentation of evidence throughout his second volume. Thus the reader might find a simple lengthy omission obviously caused by homoioteleuton divided under three separate entries, each providing only a portion of the omission—all so Hoskier can "demonstrate" that the MS in question in at least a *part* of the evidence sides with some other key MS or (especially) a version! The result is a confused presentation of what should have been a "simple" collation.[2] Untangling the web thus woven by Hoskier's machinations

---

[1]Cf. Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:xv-xvii for many clear examples of this theory. Hoskier admits (p. xvi) that "it is our privilege to unriddle the phrases and disentangle the webs"—and so he has tried to do! Other scholars have never accepted Hoskier's thesis on this point. Further, very few bi-lingual MSS are today extant, and only one tri-lingual MS. It thus becomes quite difficult to believe Hoskier's argument *de minorem ad majorem*.

[2]A single illustration of the above-mentioned circumstance should make clear the difficulties faced by those who use Hoskier. Upon consulting *Apocalypse* II:466-467 regarding the evidence of MS 63 (Greg, 2029), one finds the following three entries, spaced at a great distance from each other (the other MSS cited are those given by Hoskier, so that the reader may see the supposed "method" in his madness):

—ποιησαι την γνωμην αὐτου και 16 39 63 [*non* 62] 120 [*non* 67] 136 153 162.[*non* 163] 180 (*arm.* 2.) *aeth.*

—και ποιησαι μιαν γνωμην A 18 21 62-63 (62**mg.*: και μιαν γνωμην ποιησουσι, *nil in* 63) 72 73 79 80 100 103 112 113 135 136 138 139 170 191 200 220 250 251 *Beat. Tyc.*2 *gig vg.*

—και δουναι την βασιλειαν αυτων 63 [*non* 62].

Hoskier's own presentation makes it clear that MS 63 does possess a singular reading, but it appears to be "singular" *only* in the final case! But the *truth* is that, since the entire amount of text involved includes the

often consumes more time than likely was necessary for Hoskier initially to subdivide his data! It is especially this time-consuming resolution of Hoskier's collation data which has forced the limited-sampling methodology upon the present research. Perhaps future collators will do their best to make collation evidence as *clear* as possible and leave their theory-spinning for separate publication![1]

Criteria for Singular Readings

While "singular readings" obviously are the topic of study in the present research, certain guidelines must be observed when selecting such readings for inclusion in or exclusion from the data base; inclusion of all *apparent* singular readings would not aid the intention of the basic research. One may begin by re-stating the definition of a singular reading, i.e., a reading characterized by want of attestation from any other witness *of the same category*.

---

words καρδιας αυτων ποιησαι την γνωμην αυτου, και ποιησαι μιαν γνωμην, και δουναι την βασιλειαν αυτων τω θηριω, MS 63 has simply omitted by homoioteleuton from αὐτων[1] to αυτων[2]—and it is *this* which is alone among MSS. Note also that MS 136 in the above example *actually* omits from ποιησαι[1] through γνωμην[2], apparently as a result of line-skipping. This too is a "singular reading"—yet who could tell this at all from Hoskier? Worse still, Hoskier has even confused himself within this same area of text! He gives as a separate entry the following:

—την γνωμην αυτου και ποιησαι 187 222

—which results in the *identical* reading previously cited as caused by omission of ποιησαι την γνωμην αυτου και! Without further detail, let it be noted that within this same section MSS 18 and 84* are both cited as possessing singular readings: closer examination will show that the readings of both MSS are *identical*, and thus not singular at all! Such are the difficulties one must overcome when trying to dislodge data from Hoskier!

[1] Yet cf. the sample format for the Greek apparatus of James submitted by its editor (Kurt Aland, "Novi Testamenti Graeci Editio Maior Critica: Der gegenwärtige Stand der Arbeit an einer neuen grossen kritischen Ausgabe des Neuen Testament," *New Testament Studies* 16[1969/70]: 177)!

There of course exist singular readings among, e.g., Old Latin MSS, Coptic MSS, and Church Fathers as well as among Greek NT MSS. The present research is limited to the last category primarily because such represents the original language of the Apocalypse, but secondarily because the Greek MS testimony far outnumbers all other evidence.

Therefore in the present study a reading is considered "singular" if it appears in *one and only one Greek MS*, whether supported by versional/Patristic testimony or not. This is not to neglect the possibility that Greek MSS were at times adapted to current versional or Patristic readings; indeed, the "singular" Greek readings of Codex Bezae (D) of the Gospels and Acts are time and again supported by Old Latin MSS (though Bezae is basically alone in this regard among Greek NT MSS). Versional or Patristic support cited by Hoskier notwithstanding,[1] a reading will be utilized in the present study wherever it has been determined (after careful scrutiny) to be unsupported by the remainder of the *Greek MSS* alone.

What Type of Singular Readings are included

After granting that readings which satisfy the definition of "singular" given above will alone be examined in this study, the reader should be made aware of precisely what types of singular readings will be examined and what items will be

[1]Hoskier frequently cites Greek singular readings as having versional or Patristic support. This seems unusual unless he is merely trying to bolster his "versional-influence" theory. The user of Hoskier may thus do well to take such "evidence" with several grains of salt.

excluded from this study. It should be apparent that the bulk of the readings to be examined herein would never appear in critical apparatuses since they have no merit sufficient to warrant their "possible" autograph status. This has already been pointed out in the introductory chapter.

Colwell has provided a rather concise list of what one may expect in singular readings,[1] which can be restated thus:

1. *The Nonsense Reading.*[2] The accidental scribal error which produces a word or words which are unreadable and/or yield no sense whatever accounts for a good many singular readings. In the three early papyri Colwell examined, between 10% and 40% of all singulars were Nonsense Readings.[3] Yet there is an importance attached to such readings, since these serve to show in what ways the individual scribe tends to commit *pure error*, which tendencies may have significance or application when trying to explain strange but *sensible* singulars of that same scribe elsewhere in his MS.

2. *The Dislocated Reading.*[4] Colwell thus indicates those readings caused by a slip of the eye which result in either haplography (by the eye skipping ahead) or dittography (by

---

[1]Colwell, "Classifying," pp. 101-105 and "Scribal Habits," pp. 111-114. Note that the readings selected for this study are those which Colwell *rejected* in "Classifying," since such did not fit his purpose.

[2]Colwell, "Classifying," p. 101, provides further detail.

[3]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 111. These early papyri figures occur in the context of an extremely large number of singulars (1,649 for all three papyri). Perhaps the proportion of nonsense readings increases as the overall number of singular readings declines? Such seems logical.

[4]Colwell, "Classifying," pp. 102-103; cf. "Scribal Habits," p. 112.

the eye skipping behind). Although a purely accidental type of error, the resultant reading may either be nonsensical or (at least apparently) sensible. In a very few cases the resultant reading may be fully sensible, and this even in cases of dittography![1] Colwell concluded that the scribes of the three early papyri "have a worse than average record" under this category.[2]

3. *The Sensible Singular Reading.*[3] The readings of this category alone are cited sporadically in critical apparatuses, more often than not due to the MSS which contain them rather than to any "intrinsic merit" they might have (no matter how "good" a reading may appear to be, if it be singular there is little to commend it). Those few singular readings which appear in our critical apparatuses are generally limited to the MSS considered "best" by modern opinion: the early papyrus and vellum witnesses and those later MSS which differ in a significant degree from the standard Byzantine text. The present study, however, will include sensible singular readings from MSS which (for the most part) are *not* valued so

---

[1]In Apoc. 18:2 appear the words επεσεν επεσεν in approximately 50% of the Greek MSS; the other 50% (approximately) read επεσεν but once. Either reading could be explained as due to dittography or haplography respectively. Amid this near-equal division MS *P* (Greg. 024) comes forth with a *singular* reading of επεσεν επεσεν επεσεν! Certainly (?) MS P can be judged guilty of dittography because its reading is singular, but who can rightly adjudicate where the MSS remain evenly divided?

[2]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 112. Colwell (citing Dain) also claims that such haplography/dittography represents "the most frequent scribal errors" to be found among MSS.

[3]Colwell, "Classifying," pp. 103-104.

highly, nor are "early" nor "differing from a standard type"—it is the very "commonness" of most MSS herein examined which makes this study of such importance. Colwell examined three of the earliest papyri, each of which differed frequently and significantly from the "standard" Byzantine textype.[1] It is entirely possible that, rather than fulfilling his purpose, viz., "to gain knowledge of the habits of scribes in general,"[2] Colwell unintentionally may have provided a biassed sample which only gives knowledge of scribes confined to one time period (*Saec.* II/III), one geographical area (Egypt) and a non-Byzantine type of text!

In contrast, the present study proposes to examine singular readings from 220 MSS (rather than three) of date ranging from the third century through the nineteenth and of locale which can only be described as pan-Hellenic, pan-Mediterranean. Certainly the examination of a great number of MSS from widely diverse locales and time periods should provide a better opportunity "to gain knowledge of the habits of scribes in general" than Colwell's extremely limited study.[3] The present study should thus furnish an excellent overview of those areas in which scribal habits (demonstrated via singular readings) may have a significant effect upon other variant readings which the MS in question shares with other MSS, especially when that MS is not otherwise related to those

---

[1] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," pp. 108-109. [2] Ibid., p. 108.

[3] Note that Colwell's second purpose, viz., "to gain knowledge of an individual scribe's habits, and thus to increase skill in the evaluation of that manuscript" (p. 108), remains valid and well-accomplished.

other MSS.[1] By this means the determination of textual groupings will be re-directed to the proper examination of shared readings which do *not* merely reflect scribal peculiarities.

4. *Itacistic Spellings and Other Orthographic Differences.*[2] While readings which fall under this category are often nonsensical, at times the result does make sense. The textual problems caused by itacistic confusion are well known and can be serious.[3] The problems caused by mere questions of orthography are not as serious, since these generally reflect local dialectic form or a scribe's mispronunciation of a word in his mind (which was then copied erroneously).[4] A number of readings from this category have appeared in our critical apparatuses, for the meaning often can be seriously affected. The present concern, of course, is with each and every orthographic difference reflected in singular readings, since a scribe's propensity toward such usage directly affects his testimony where itacism or orthography might be the cause—and this despite the number of witnesses otherwise supporting such a MS!

---

[1]Claims of MS interrelationship which are found to be based upon the peculiar habits of the scribes of those MSS without other substantial support will crumble upon careful examination.

[2]Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," pp. 110-111. Colwell found the three papyri possessed "numerous" cases of itacistic and orthographic variation. Noteworthy is his finding that orthography did not remain consistent even within the same MS of that early period.

[3]Cf. the frequent confusion between υμων and ημων in the MSS, the variation between -η/-ει, and especially Rom. 5:1 εχομεν/εχωμεν.

[4]The confusion between ελαβον and εβαλον and between βαθος and παθος, for example, can all be attributed to this cause.

5. *Harmonization to General Usage.*[1] Since the Apocalypse is written in a style which violates the normal conception of good grammar, being "a grammar of Ungrammar,"[2] it should be no wonder that scribes of later centuries would be tempted to "correct" various faults which they perceived in the text. They in fact may have believed the fault to have originated with a previous scribe rather than the inspired author and thus felt they could "restore" the text to autograph purity. The problem with this type of scribal alteration should be far more prevalent in the Apocalypse than in the Gospels where Colwell's study of scribal habits was centered.[3]

6. *Harmonization to Remote Parallels.*[4] The situation in the Apocalypse here is far different from that which prevails in the Gospels, where Synoptic parallels abound. Even so, there remains ample opportunity for a scribe to "help out" or to "clarify" the text by introducing words and phrases from elsewhere within the Apocalypse. Individual scribes who were diligent enough to search out such parallels before copying the book must have been well-steeped in the content of the Apocalypse. Such familiarity might suggest a certain degree of mysticism on the part of the scribe, since otherwise

---

[1]Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 114.

[2]A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), p. 136. The term is Benson's. Further detail on the grammatical solecisms of the Apocalypse can be found in Robertson, pp. 413-416.

[3]Colwell found only eleven cases of this type of alteration among the three early papyri. Cf. "Scribal Habits," p. 114.

[4]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 113.

the Apocalypse would not have been a "familiar" NT book, being in no way a part of the Lectionary cycle.[1]

7. *Harmonization to Immediate Context.*[2] This wide-ranging category includes changes made by the scribe which may have been due to a conscious desire to smooth out the text[3] or to the unconscious act of attraction to similar forms.[4] Colwell found this type of scribal alteration to be most frequent:

> . . . The influence of a neighboring word, of a balancing clause in the same sentence, of the familiar phraseology of the Gospel in question, was evidently inescapable. Harmonization to immediate context is usually mentioned incidentally in our manuals. It needs to be given headlines on the front page.[5]

We thus should not be far amiss if we anticipate a large number of changes to fall under this head in the Apocalypse!

8. *The Work of Correctors.* Although generally ignored by Colwell, this category must be addressed in regard to the

---

[1]Kurt Aland et al., eds., *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed. (London: United Bible Societies, 1975), p. xxviii [hereafter cited as "UBS" or "the UBS text"]. Surprisingly, neither Metzger's *Text of the NT* nor J. Harold Greenlee's *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964) mentions this fact. Yet this is of great textual significance for two reasons: (*a*) the Apocalypse has *no* single "Byzantine" text as do all the other NT books. Perhaps this may be due to the *lack* of a Lectionary form of this book, which would have acted as a standardizing influence. (*b*) the utter lack of "familiarity" with the Apocalypse caused by its not being read in services might tend to "turn scribes loose" with regard to its text—at least much more so than with any other NT book. Thus the confused transmissional history of the Apocalypse *might* be directly attributable to its non-use within the Lectionary system!

[2]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 113.

[3]Ibid. Colwell offers six varied examples of this phenomenon.

[4]Ibid. Colwell offers two examples of this phenomenon.

[5]Ibid. Among the three early papyri Colwell examined, he found 83 cases of harmonization to the immediate context out of a total of 104 instances of harmonization of *all* types!

present study. One must determine whether, if a scribe errs and then he or a later scribe corrects the error—this alone among MSS at such a point—, this is a "singular" reading or not. After careful consideration, the following guidelines have been established to determine the "singularity" of corrected readings:

(a) To be considered "singular" for the purposes of this study, *either* the original text *or* the correction must be "singular" among MSS.

(b) It does not matter whether the fact of correction itself be "singular." If both text and correction are to be found in other MSS (whether there "corrected" or not), the reading will *not* be considered "singular" in this study.

(c) It sometimes happens that *both* the text and correction are "singular" among MSS. When this occurs, the exact form of the text and correction as cited by Hoskier will appear, generally marked "*sic*," as, e.g., "οοθλαμων [*sic*]."[1]

(d) It should be noted that Hoskier's manner of presentation of MS corrections often leaves much to be desired, and misinterpretation *can* occur. Thus, in some cases a text plus correction is labelled "*sic*" when Hoskier is unclear (to this writer) as to the singularity of the text, the correction, or both.

---

[1]I.e., both "οφθλαμων" and the corrected form "οοθαλαμων" are singular. Obviously the correction is simply erroneous because the scribe failed to delete the superfluous α from the main text of the corrected form which should have read simply "οφθαλμων."

What Type of Singular Readings are Excluded

From the preceding list it should be obvious that the purpose of this study is to include far more than to exclude. Nevertheless, there are a few cases where readings obviously "singular" were not pertinent to the study of scribal habits *per se*. These may be classed as follows:

1. *Corrected Readings Not Meeting the Criteria of this Study*. The reasons for including or excluding certain readings where correction has occurred were given under section 8 preceding and need not be repeated. Those restrictions in effect will cause the bulk of all corrections to be excluded from the provenance of this study.

2. *Singular Readings of Accents or Diacritical Marks*. Since the autograph form of the text did not possess these markings (which were introduced at a later period), they are totally excluded from consideration in the present study.[1] In truth (as a cursory examination of Hoskier's data will show), the cases of singular accentuation or diacritics are few and far between, and most of these are attributable to pure scribal error since only a limited few such changes could actually have any effect upon the meaning.

3. *Obscure or Ambiguous Data*. The difficulty in trying to unravel Hoskier's data has already been mentioned. Because of Hoskier's confusing presentation of MS evidence it often

---

[1] Yet Hoskier has gone to great pains to detail even the least alteration of accent or diacritical mark! It would have been far more useful to textual criticism had he indicated where each MS's lines had ended—a task which would have required about as much time as accent-sophistry!

cannot be determined whether a reading is singular or not. This problem is further compounded by Hoskier's arbitrary division of the evidence into widely-separated units of variation. Conceivably a researcher could comb a single page of Hoskier for singular readings and find, say, ten such, but on a second examination he might add three "new" singular readings previously missed and exclude two of those first thought to be singular!

While every attempt has been made to include those readings which on all counts are truly singular and to exclude those readings which have any degree of doubt about them, it is impossible to claim perfection in the accomplishment of this task. Had Hoskier adopted a less confusing format and had he not been overly-concerned with "proving" his private textual theories, perhaps a far greater degree of confidence could be expressed regarding the singular readings culled from the sample base chapters of this study. Nevertheless, the greater number of the readings so gleaned is indeed sufficient for the intended purpose of this study, the evaluation of MSS by examination of individual scribal habits. And to this we shall proceed.

CHAPTER 3

A GENERAL REVIEW OF THE DATA EXTRACTED FROM HOSKIER

Location and Brief Description of the Data

Due to the statistical nature of singular reading data, the extensive citation of the evidence will be found in the Tables at the end of this volume. The primary data of this study appears in Tables 3-6, a brief summary of which is now included.

Table 3: Incomplete Manuscripts

Not all of the 220 MSS collated by Hoskier contained the entire Apocalypse. In fact, over one-third of them (79 MSS) lack various portions of that book. Table 3 lists each of these incomplete MSS and the specific portion(s) of the Apocalypse they are lacking (even if the missing portion lies outside the sample base chapters of the present study). Further explanation of the data contained in this Table will be found therein.

Table 4: Incomplete MSS within the Sample Base Chapters

This Table lists on a per-chapter basis the lacunae possessed by the various MSS utilized in this study. Only the sample base chapters are included in this Table, so that the reader will be able to visualize the actual extent of

the lacunae in any one MS within the area under consideration. This Table concludes with a percentage calculation of the amount of text extant in each MS within the sample base chapters. Further explanation is furnished at the head of this Table in its proper location.

Table 5: Gross and Projected Tabulations per MS

Although it may not be readily apparent, this Table serves as the vital statistical link between the proper examination of the fragmentary MSS and those which are complete within the sample base chapters. Statistically, the only way direct comparison can be made between items where one set is complete and another fragmentary is by the process known as "projection." The fragmentary witness is thus compared with the complete witness on the basis of what the fragmentary witness *should* possess were its incomplete data extended to the point of "completion." Projection is a mathematical tool whereby all MSS utilized in this study might be compared on an equal basis.

Table 5 is divided into three sections: (a) the raw or gross number of singular readings per MS (whether complete or fragmentary), listed in descending numerical order; (b) the projection table for the incomplete MSS, accompanied by the formula for projection; (c) the fully projected table of witnesses on an equal footing, also listed in descending numerical order. Further explanation of all three parts of this Table will be found in the proper location.

Table 6: Singular Readings by Manuscript

This, the longest Table, contains a full and complete listing of all singular readings found within the sample base chapters of this study. These readings are grouped on a per-MS basis in their order of appearance within each MS. This mode of presentation was selected as most germane to the present topic of study, viz., the examination of the habits of *individual* scribes. Had one been concerned with the various types of singular readings as a whole, the readings of this Table would have been arranged solely in order of appearance rather than on a per-MS basis, with little or no regard for the MSS possessing such.

The examination of singular readings on a per-MS basis is highly important. Such will prevent the aberrancies of a few "wild" scribes from being considered "normative" when scribal habits *per se* are being discussed. Nevertheless, there are a number of summary observations which can be made with profit concerning the singular readings found among Greek MSS of the Apocalypse (and, by extension, of the NT as a whole).[1] The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a short overview of these observations, which must necessarily be incomplete. Space and the scope of this study simply do not permit a detailed catalogue of *all* singular readings

[1]This point has been touched upon on p. 11 above. It may here be re-affirmed that the *specific* matters peculiar to the Apocalypse obviously cannot transcend that limit. These include the "ungrammar" question, the lack of outside Synoptic parallels, and the two competing "Majority" texts within this book. However, in light of the primary purpose of this study, the *generalizations* about scribal habits, particularly in the Byzantine era, are of *direct* importance and deserve *immediate* application.

which illustrate any one conclusion. Instead, approximate results will be stated, illustrated by a few examples. The next chapter will examine the specific habits found among scribes of individual MSS, but one first should scan the general data in order to become acquainted with the relative frequency with which scribes made textual alterations.

A General Summary of Accidental Variation

As might be expected, most singular readings fall under the category of accidental rather than intentional variation. Most scribes correctly perceived their duty to be that of a faithful copyist of what lay before them and not to be an "editor" or "improver" of the text. Were this not the case, we might find ourself today in the unenviable position of possessing far greater MS data for the NT than for any other ancient work, yet being less able to restore the text with confidence than editors of the classics! But the fidelity of scribes in copying their exemplars is amply attested, and one can easily "weed out" most of their peculiar readings as having been the result of pure accident. Most of these errors in fact produced nonsense which is easily corrected; however, there are some cases where a tolerably "sensible" reading seems to have arisen by accident and one might suspect intentional alteration to have occurred. But these are few indeed.

A brief selection of accidental variants illustrated by examples gleaned from the present research follows.

Spelling Errors

Most accidental errors are included in this category, and the result of such error is usually nonsense. A letter may be omitted for unknown reasons, letters may be altered because they sound or look like other letters, transposition of letters or words may occur, etc. Some such errors can be illustrated in the sections below.

Pure Nonsense. In these and the following examples the MS is listed first in italics using Hoskier's number. This is followed by the specific chapter and verse location of the example and the collation of the error follows that. Note that the *correct* form of the word precedes the error. Explanatory notes are added as necessary.

39 in 20:6 αγιος) αιος
81 in 10:10 κοιλια) υοχυια
98 in 17:14 αρνιου) αρκιου
104 in 12:10 ουρανω) ουρ$\overline{ουνω}$ *(full form + nomen sacrum)*

In none of these cases does the reading "make sense" as it stands. However, a small application of logic or (even better) comparison with another exemplar would easily have allowed later scribes to relieve the confusion. Note however that without checking a second exemplar an error such as that in MS *98* could wrongly be "corrected" so as to read "bear" in the text instead of "lamb"—which would cause further confusion for later scribes who might copy this MS! However, MS *98* was copied in A.D. 1515 and thus did not have much (if any) opportunity to confuse later scribes with this blunder. The same with MS *81*: what attempts

later scribes might have made to resolve "υοχυια" can only be guessed at (assuming they did not have a second exemplar with which to compare and correct). Here too one should be thankful that this MS was copied in the 16th century and not before!

Transposition of Letters. This unconscious act on the part of the scribe occurs quite frequently, generally resulting in nonsense. At times, however, a "real" word may be produced which (taken freely in context) may make "sense" of a sort. Examples of this category include the following:

81 in 12:4 εβαλεν) ελαβεν*
113 in 10:3 μυκαται) κυμαται
147 in 12:6 (TR) τρεφωσιν) τερφ-
152 in 20:4 δια[1]) δαι*

Although the final two cases produce nonsense which is easily corrected, the first two cases produce what might have seemed "reasonable text" to the scribe. The reading of MS *81* is a "real" word, and in context the concept of one-third of the stars being "taken" to earth rather than being "cast" to the earth might have seemed plausible. Had this MS not been copied in the 16th century, the erroneous reading might have found wider perpetuation quite readily.

The transposition of letters in MS *113* (copied in the 13th century) might have appeared to later scribes as a corrupt plural of κυμα (wave). However, the contextual need for the sound of a *lion* effectively ruled out this possibility. Nevertheless, it would not have been surprising had a later scribe seeking to resolve this anomaly chosen to [illegible] λεων

and then "correct" κυμαται into the proper form κυματα— a good complement to the φωνη μεγαλη being described (which no scribe ever seems to have created).

Itacistic Errors. Although itacistic spellings can at times be attributed to local dialect or convention, in the great majority of cases itacistic spellings are purely the creation of the individual scribe. The scribe is rare who adopts a peculiar itacistic form and never varies from such: generally the "correct" spelling stands together in the same MS with any number of "incorrect" spellings caused by itacism. Most cases of itacistic error derive from the scribe's own pronunciation of a word he has just read and temporarily stored in his memory prior to writing it.[1] Itacistic error is by far the most frequent of all scribal habits: close to one-half of all the singular readings in the present study may be attributable to itacism in its various forms. To see evidence of this, the reader need only scan Table 6 below.

Most itacistic errors produce "resolvable nonsense," i.e., it is plain what word was intended, though the spelling does not conform to "approved orthography." In a small number of cases itacistic error produces a different reading altogether of the "sensible" variety, particularly verb forms ending in -ει/-η or with the center of verbs where the -ο-/-ω- fluctuation may alter the mood.

---

[1]Cf. Metzger, *Text*, p. 16, to see the steps of this process.

A sampling of itacistic errors from what would otherwise be an indefinite list follows:

Non-Verbal

39 in 20:1 αλυσιν) αλησιν
69 in 3:2 λοιπα) λυπα
72 in 1:17 πρωτος) προτος
218 in 1:14 κεφαλη) καιφ-

Verbal

81 in 22:17 ειπατω) ευπ-
152 in 20:10 εβληθη) -θει
156 in 7:17 εξαλειψει) -ψη
159 in 20:2 εστι) εστη *(alters the root!)*
187 in 3:5 (TR) εξομολογησομαι) -σωμαι
214 in 17:8 μελλει) μελλη
241 in 17:6 ιδων) ειδον

Those readings which fall under the "resolvable nonsense" category can easily be restored to the correct orthography; these include especially those non-verbal forms listed above. However, at least *some* of the readings in the verbal category present resolution difficulties. For example, in MS *156*, where the future indicative is replaced by the aorist subjunctive; or with MS *214*, where the present indicative is replaced by the present subjunctive. And MS *241* presents an even more interesting case: the change from ιδων to ειδον may have been due solely to *attraction* from ειδον which begins 17:6 and not necessarily to itacism. Nevertheless, *either*-form could legitimately be read in the text, and it is most surprising that no other scribes followed the 12th-century MS *241* at this point. Yet it cannot be emphasized

too strongly that the reason such otherwise plausible (and at times quite acceptable) readings were *not* perpetuated beyond the single MS in which they appear is that scribes generally were *quite careful* in their work. A "new" reading which *might* be valid in context had to face the three tests of comparison with the original exemplar, comparison with the text most familiar to the scribe's mind, and (at times) comparison with a second exemplar to resolve remaining conflicts. This "threefold cord not easily broken" served as a significant preservation factor for the NT text, and such preservation is amply attested by the fact that ca. 90% of the text of the NT found in *all* MSS (of whatever textype) is *identical*!

One need only examine the data of variant readings to observe the fidelity with which the Scriptures were transmitted throughout history. The number of errors and variant readings to be found within individual MSS can be counted in the hundreds of thousands. As soon as we eliminate readings which are not shared in two or more MSS the number of errors almost disappears and the number of real variant readings drops dramatically! By the time we are looking at readings shared by a dozen or more MSS, there actually are very few readings of serious consequence left to consider. Unknown and unknowingly the individual scribes were performing by their simple labor the greatest preservational service that the NT text could have. Both the great mass of Greek MS witnesses and the evident care taken to weed out illegitimate readings in the copying process helped to preserve the NT

text almost entire in each and every MS! This point will be studied later; for the moment, a new category of accidental variation will be discussed:

Copying Errors

Mistakes often occurred in the process of copying: the hand or eye might skip from one line to another or from one word to another (especially if both possess a similar ending or beginning); a letter or group of letters may be misread; a word may become "attracted" to declensions or conjugational forms of nearby words, etc. These accidental errors often transcend the problems of simple spelling errors, though most such readings still produce nonsense. Simple comparison with the parent or another exemplar still would allow easy resolution of such difficulties. Examples of this class of error include the following:

Misreading of Uncial Letters

ℵ in 17:2	οιvου) οικου	*(cf. uncial* N *and* K
A in 12:11	ουκ) ουχ	*(cf. uncial* K *and* X
C in 12:10	χριστου) κυριου	

Although the first two cases are obvious, that of MS *C* might be puzzling; this is a clear case of uncial confusion which produced a singular reading in the *exemplar* from which MS *C* was copied! The exemplar obviously abbreviated the *nomen sacrum* at this point, and instead of $\overline{\text{XY}}$ the scribe of the exemplar wrote $\overline{\text{KY}}$—the identical confusion of uncial K and X found in MS *A* above! But this was only in MS *C*'s exemplar; MS *C*'s scribe, by writing the sacred name in plain quite

honestly, thus *obscured* the source of this simple error. Yet the reading was not perpetuated beyond this 5th-century MS for the simple reason that this "unique" reading produces "theological nonsense," i.e., a "Lord" *superior* to God Himself is thus created instead of "God and His Christ."

MS ℵ's error of οικου for οινου, though certainly stemming from uncial confusion, nevertheless produced a reading which might be considered "sensible." Instead of "being drunk from the *wine* of her fornication," the dwellers of the earth are now said (metaphorically?) to "be drunk from the *house* of her fornication." Yet the fact that this reading is found in no other MS beyond the 4th-century MS ℵ tends to indicate that later scribes were not convinced in the slightest to depart from the text most familiar which appeared in all other MSS known to them.

Misreading of Minuscule Letters

28	in 5:8	χρυσας) χριστας	(cf. χρυσος χριστος
29	in 10:11	δει σε) δευτε	(cf. δεισε δευτε
84	in 17:14	εκλεκτοι) εκλεπτοι	(cf. -λεκτοι -λεπτοι
120	in 1:1	αυτω) αυτου	(cf. αυτω αυτου
233	in 3:3	μνημονευε) μνημονεβε	(cf. -ευε -εβε

Although many errors of this class produce "resolvable nonsense," there still are many cases where a "sensible" construction can be placed upon the error (cf. MSS 28 and 29 above). While the sensible readings thus created might be the "more difficult," they certainly cannot represent the autograph text! Misreading of letters occurs less frequently than the spelling errors examined previously.

Attraction to Nearby Forms. This error occurs when the scribe is so heavily influenced by other words in the immediate context as to alter the words he is presently copying. This can result in different cases, tenses, or even whole words being substituted for what lay in the exemplar. This type of error is quite frequent, although one cannot identify instances of such merely by examining the collations in Table 6 below. Rather, the entire surrounding context must be carefully examined in order to determine the presence of attraction. The examples of attraction given below are thus followed by a short contextual description for each variant:

62 in 7:3 του Θεου) τους Θεου [*sic*]
77 in 22:17 το Πνευμα) ο νυμφιος*
92 in 20:3 επανω αυτου) επανω ϕψτϕψ αυτου [*sic*]
122 in 12:10 νυκτος) νυκτας
200 in 3:4 εχεις) εχω

The ungrammatical τους Θεου of MS *62* was caused by the words τους δουλους which immediately precede.

MS *77*, confronted with the unusual autograph reading, "The Spirit and the Bride say, 'Come'," was led to conform the sentence to what might have been "expected" by the appearance of "bride" in the text, viz., "the Bridegroom and the Bride." Although this reading might also be explained as an *intentional* change for approximately the same reason, simple attraction appears to be more likely since *accidental error* is always far more prevalent in MSS than *intentional alteration*.

The scribe of MS *92* simply was influenced by the ω of επανω so as to write the next word with an omega as well. However, the scribe was alert enough to catch the error and immediately correct it (perhaps because nonsense resulted).

The scribe of MS *122* was influenced by ημερας immediately preceding and thus wrote νυκτας instead of νυκτος. Had the scribe been grammatically ignorant and desired to *intentionally* make all forms "agree," the result would have been the same. But accidental attraction still appears to be most likely.

MS *200* presents an interesting case: the attraction here is not to a nearby word or form but to a repeated phrase, viz., "Yet I have somewhat against you." Without noticing that here the Sardinian church was being commended, the scribe expected the *condemnatory* phrase and conformed his reading to such (cf. 2:4, 20, and especially 2:14, where ολιγα appears in the *judgmental* phrase whereas in 3:4 ολιγα appears in the *complimentary* phrase).

While attraction is rampant throughout the singular readings of the sample base chapters, the limits of this study preclude a more detailed listing of such. The reader will do well to examine all readings of Table 6 [illegible] so as to determine attraction where such is present.

---

[1]By convention, the *scribe* of a MS may be referred to as the MS itself without straining the intended meaning. In the remainder of this paper such will be the usual convention.

Haplography and Dittography. Among pure copying errors this category is most prevalent and must be considered the primary scribal bane in the accidental-error field. As is well known, dittography involves copying a letter, word or phrase more than once due to the eye skipping backward when looking at the exemplar. Haplography involves the omission of a letter, word or phrase due to the eye skipping forward when returning to the exemplar.

While dittography/haplography sometimes occurs by skipping one or more *lines of text* forward or backward, it is far more frequently the case that the skip is occasioned by words of similar beginning (*homoioarcton*) or similar ending (*homoioteleuton*).[1] The scribe's eye falls upon a letter or combination of letters which are identical or closely similar to those he had just copied. He then begins copying from that false point instead of the correct location.

Dittography usually produces nonsense which is easily resolved since the obvious cause of the nonsense (the repetition) is present. The few cases of dittography which possess a sensible interpretation might naturally cause later scribes problems resolvable only by consultation of other MSS.

Haplography, on the other hand, while frequently producing nonsense also produces readings which might be inter-

---

[1]Greenlee, *Introduction*, pp. 63-64, uses "homoioteleuton" to describe only the *omission* occasioned by such. Metzger, *Text*, p. 189, uses "haplography" to describe the same error. Neither term is precise, but each is used conventionally. The present work uses both terms interchangeably.

preted sensibly. What for later scribes was worse was the lack of any "obvious" clue that an error of haplography had occurred. Even if nonsense were the result, only comparison with another exemplar would resolve the difficulty (unless the scribe attempted restoration from his own mind). But if such an omission produced a tolerably "sensible" reading, there would be little likelihood that a scribe would even notice the error, and no correction would be made. Since dittography/haplography was such a frequent error, a larger number of specific examples follow.

Dittography of a Single Letter

149 in 17:11 ογδοος) ογγ-
156 in 15:3 οδοι σου) οδοις σου
158 in 17:3 ερημον) εερ-
164 in 12:4 συρει) συρρει
180 in 7:17 (TR) απο) ααπο

Dittography of One Syllable (or One-Syllable Words)

36 in 7:2 εκραξεν) + εν *(sensible!)*
152 in 20:2 τον οφιν) τον τον οφιν
167 in 20:7,12 τα) τα τα
181 in 12:5 παντα τα) παντα τα τα
186 in 3:7 εν) ἐν εν
223 in 7:6 χιλιαδες^{2}) χιχιλιαδες

Dittography of One Multi-Syllable Word

165 in 22:18 επιθησει) επιθησει επιθησει
179 in 1:9 καλουμενη) καλουμενη καλουμενη
216 in 22:11 δικαιος) δικαιος δικαιος
233 in 17:17 (MT) μιαν) μιαν, μιαν
250 in 7:2 εχοντα) εχοντα· εχοντα [sic]

Each of the preceding readings is self-explanatory save for that of MS *250*. In the latter case, the punctuation inserted between the dittographed words indicates that it was *not* the scribe of MS *250* who was responsible for the error but the scribe of MS *250*'s *exemplar*. The scribe of MS *250* merely was trying to "make sense" out of what had been vouchsafed to him (even so, it is only by straining the context that *any* "sense" can be made). This indicates great *care* on the part of the scribe rather than *creativity*, since the easier course would have been simply to remove the offending word. This seems to be one of the few cases (cf. MS *C* above, p. 35) where a singular reading can be traced back to the *exemplar* used rather than to the scribe himself.

Dittography of a Short Clause

44 in 3:12 (MT) το ονομα) το ονομα το ονομα το*
180 in 10:8 (MT) το ανεωγμενον) 1-2-1-2
187 in 12:15 στοματος αυτου) 1-2-1-2

In the case of MS *180* the first two words appear at the foot of one page while the repetition begins the next page. This common phenomenon is less frequent than simple eye-skipping types of dittography in the exemplar being copied.

Dittography of a Long Clause

61 in 7:17 Θεος) + πηγας υδατων και εξαλειψει ο Θεος
63 in 20:4 ειδον) + αγγελον καταβαινοντα εκ του ουρανου*
154 in 7:7 *init.*) + εκ φυλης Νεφθαλειμ ιβ̄ χιλιαδες
155 in 15:8 του Θεου) + του ζωντος εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων. Και εγεμισθη ο ναος καπνου εκ της δοξης του Θεου

These longer dittographies deserve further explanation:

(*a*) MS *61*'s scribe skipped backward in his exemplar from θεος παν to ζωης πηγας, where the same combination of -ς π- appeared in the text.[1] Since the dittography encompasses 28 letters it is possible that the scribe's eye simply moved up one or more lines in his exemplar so as to fall upon the same combination of letters.[2]

(*b*) In the case of MS *63* a more extensive dittography was "in process," but the scribe was alert enough to catch the error before completing the duplicate passage. His eye had accidentally slipped back from και ειδον of 20:4 to και ειδον in 20:1—an entire *paragraph* almost reduplicated! Yet the scribe must have realized that the opening words of 20:1 were strangely familiar and re-read his copy. The error was caught and the scribe marked the five already-dittographed words as erroneous.[3] He then was able to continue as usual.

(*c*) With MS *154* the scribe's eye was already wearied from a repeated list of "12,000 from the tribe of . . ."; he thus slipped back from 7:7 to 7:6 (over two tribes) and for the second time included the 12,000 from the tribe of Naphthali. Yet he did not continue by repeating the tribe of Manasseh (as would be expected), but immediately began to

---

[1] N. B., there is no need for an *entire* word ending or beginning to be present in order to cause haplography/dittography; one letter will do!

[2] It would not be surprising were the -ς π- of the one line in his exemplar positioned directly above the -ς π- of the other line. Such cases are frequently to be met with among the MSS.

[3] This was common practice, due to the difficulty of trying to "erase" a MS by scraping or washing. Future readers would simply pass over words so obelized.

write verse 7 correctly. Since no correction of this duplicate "Naphtali" entry appears, one may assume that the scribe unawares committed *haplography* hard upon his dittography, skipping forward *and* backward within a matter of words.[1] Had it not been for the unforeseen haplography, the dittography would actually have been *more* extensive!

(*d*) Finally, in MS *155* the lengthy dittography was caused by skipping back from του Θεου in 15:8 to του Θεου of 15:7. Between 2-4 lines must have been skipped in the exemplar since the dittography encompasses 70 letters. Again, this is not at all unusual.

Haplography of Various Lengths. The cause of the haplography in the following cases is usually homoioteleuton or homoioarcton (both can be adequately described by "hom."). Other causes of haplography which are less easy to determine will not be illustrated under this head, although a few examples of apparent line-skipping (in the absence of "hom.") will be provided since such seems to have been quite a frequent type of error. The examples of haplography follow.

Haplography of a Single Letter

C	in 10:1	ως στυλοι) ως τυλοι (or ω στυλοι
36	in 17:1	αγγελων) αγελων*
152	in 12:9	ο οφις) ο φις*
218	in 5:6	τεσσαρων) τεσαρων

The preceding examples need no explanation. However, it may be noted that the "either/or" case of MS *C* is due to the fact

[1]Under the contextual circumstances, such is hardly unusual!

that uncial MSS were written with no division between words—a reason why single-letter "hom." may be *more* frequent among uncial MSS than among minuscule MSS.

Haplography of One Syllable (or of One-Syllable Words)

152 in 15:4 παντα τα εθνη) παντα εθνη*

153 in 12:4 καταφαγη) καφαγη*

155 in 20:7 χιλια) χια

174 in 15:4 ονομα) ομα

MS *152* obviously skipped from τ to τ (conventionally written τ⌒τ); being misled by the occurrence of the syllable τα twice in succession.[1] MS *153* skipped from the *first* α to the *second* α (= α^1⌒α^2, where specific distinction is necessary). MS *155* skipped ι⌒ι; and MS *174* skipped ο⌒ο. Single-letter "hom." appears very frequently among the MSS.

Haplography of More than One Syllable

12 in 7:9 (MT) ουδεις εδυνατο) ουδυνατο

41 in 1:13 ενδεδυμενον ποδηρη) ενδεδυρη

This class of error is actually rarer than other types of haplography, though attributable to the same cause. MS *12* here commits what may be termed "partial haplography" in that it skips from δυ⌒δη. Yet such is not so far removed from "pure" haplography as one might think: in later Greek both υ and η were pronounced alike (as "ē"), and thus a case of "phonetic 'hom.'" has occurred! Other cases of phonetic error will be examined elsewhere in this study.

---

[1]This convention was originated by Hermann Freiherr von Soden in his *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, 2 vols. in 4 parts; Vol. 2: "Text mit Apparat" (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911). The entire haplographic omission may be written as τα⌒τα.

Haplography of One Multi-Syllable Word

12 in 10:8 ουρανου) ——

42 in 1:13 μαστοις) ——

In MS *12*'s context, ουρανου is immediately preceded by του; the haplography thus was -ου∩ου- . As for MS *42*, the phrase in context is προς τοις μαστοις, and it can be easily seen how τοις∩τοις was likely to occur (with or without the inital -ς/-σ). The one-word haplographic omissions are also less frequent than the single-letter omissions mentioned above. However, the two *most* frequent cases of haplographic omission are those which follow:

Haplography of a Short Clause

156 in 5:7 και ηλθε). —— (και∩)

176 in 12:2 (MT) εκραζεν ωδινουσα) —— (-ουσα∩)

200 in 1:19f. [19]μετα ταυτα. [20] το μυστηριον) μετα το μυστηριον (-τα τ-∩)

210 in 15:7 τοις επτα αγγελοις επτα φιαλας) τοις επτα φιαλας (-οις επτα∩)

Each of the above instances can be understood once the context is examined. Hitherto all cases of haplography illustrated have produced nonsense readings; beginning with this category a perhaps-plausibility attaches to some of the haplographic readings. Certainly the reading of MS *156* is "sensible" and would hardly be noticed by later scribes. So too the reading of MS *176*. Perhaps these "sensible" omissions might have found currency had they not appeared in MSS of the 15th and 16th centuries respectively.

The reading of MS *200* really does not make sense, though (to a scribe hurriedly reading over what he had just copied)

the *aura* of sensibility is present. Unless the difficulty were noticed and comparison/correction made against a second exemplar, later scribes might have been tempted to reproduce this error. But this 10th-century MS remains alone in this reading, though it might have been expected to claim many descendants in later transmissional history.

The reading of MS *210* is pure nonsense and would obviously have been corrected by later scribes who might chance to use such a 13th-century MS for their exemplar.

Haplography of a Lengthy Clause

53 in 3:21 ο νικων δωσω αυτω καθισαι μετ' εμου) —*
($_{20}$μετ' εμου ∩ $_{21}$ μετ' εμου)

152 in 10:1 και το προσωπον αυτου ως ο ηλιος, και οι ποδες αυτου) —*
(MT -ς αυτου^{1} ∩ ^{2})

152 in 10:3 φωνη μεγαλη ωσπερ λεων μυκαται· και οτε εκραξεν) —* (εκραξεν^{1} ∩ ^{2})

164 in 20:13 και εδωκεν η θαλασσα τους εν αυτη νεκρους) — (και^{1} ∩ ^{2})

176 in 15:2 και εκ της εικονος αυτου) —
(-ου και εκ τ-^{1} ∩ ^{2})

187 in 12:16f. ^{16} ηνοιξεν η γη το στομα αυτης, και κατεπιε τον ποταμον ον εβαλεν ο δρακων εκ του στοματος αυτου. ^{17} και ωργισθη ο δρακων επι τη γυναικι και) —
($_{16}$ τη γυναικι και ∩ $_{17}$)

Many of these long omissions caused by haplography are either sensible or apparently so. It would thus seem that later scribes would freely reproduce them, but this was not the case. It remains to their credit that they were so careful in copying as not to admit otherwise "reasonable" variants into their text. Upon examining each of these omissions, one finds the following:

The omission of MS *53* produces a strange reading, but not necessarily nonsensical. Surely the 16th-century readers of that MS could comprehend believers supping with Christ "at His throne" without worry that only "sitting on the throne" was granted to those who overcame!

On the other hand, MS *152*'s omission produces obvious nonsense, making the rainbow upon the angel's head to be like "pillars of fire." While some scribes might have been led to perpetuate this reading due to the symbolic nature of the passage, none did (to the best of our knowledge); this 11th-century MS stands alone both here and in the following variant.

Note that the *same* scribe omits two lengthy passages in the same MS in rapid succession! Certainly he was not very careful in copying this portion of text. The resultant reading is a little stiff but not wholly unreasonable: "And he cried out; the seven thunders gave forth their voice." The text normally would read, "And he cried out with a loud voice, as of a lion roaring; and when he cried out, the seven thunders gave forth their voice."

The omission in MS *164* is fully sensible. There indeed seems to be no need to burden the reader with "and the sea gave up the dead in it" when Death and Hades are the topic. Were it not for the greater likelihood of accidental omission, one might be tempted to suggest a deliberate excision here by an "editing" scribe of the 14th century. But again, even in such a "satisfying" variant, no later scribes followed.

Similarly, MS *176* reads quite sensibly after the omission of "and of his image." The average reader of this 16th-century MS would hardly notice the loss, being fully entranced with the mention of the Beast and the Number of his Name.

Regarding the longest omission illustrated, the 12th-century MS *187* omits 107 letters, an equivalent of 4-6 lines in his exemplar. The result is pure nonsense: "And the earth helped the woman, and went off to make war against the rest of her offspring." Had later copyists of this MS not been too concerned with what they were copying, this nonsense reading might have slipped by since it does "read correctly" syntactically. But the reading does not appear in later MSS.

Haplography of a Single Line or More. Whereas the previous lengthy omissions were caused by "hom.," such cannot be the cause of the following omissions. Neither (in most cases) can deliberate editing be postulated. Rather, the scribe's eye in each case must have skipped from the end of one line to the second or third line following during the normal process of copying. This type of error is much rarer than those caused by "hom.," but it is not therefore wholly unusual.

214 in 22:12 και ο μισθος μου μετ' εμου, αποδουναι εκαστω ως το) —

216 in 5:2 και ειδον αγγελον) —

218 in 12:3f. [3]διαδηματα· [4]και η ουρα αυτου συρει το τριτον) —

233 in 3:9 αλλα ψευδονται· ιδου ποιησω αυτους ινα ηξωσι) —

MS *214*'s omission runs 39 letters, indicating a skip of probably two full lines of the exemplar—but in the proof-

parent rather than the parent exemplar of MS *214*! This is determined from the addition of two final words by MS *214*'s scribe (which also appear in two other MSS which do not have the error): "Behold, I come quickly; a work shall be to him *as a reward*" (ο μισθος). The scribe of MS *214* likely added "as a reward" in order to provide *some* sensibility to a difficult reading, perhaps being familiar with those words in other MSS known to him. This then is one more case where singular error in a lost exemplar might legitimately be assumed. Another case follows.

The short omission of 15 letters in MS *216* may indicate a one-line skip in an uncial predecessor (since uncial MSS generally possessed fewer letters to the line). The result is quasi-sensible and may have passed without serious notice, i.e., "seven strong seals crying in a loud voice." In a symbolic work like the Apocalypse such personification would not be out of place but might even be quite acceptable.

MS *218* omits 35 letters, one or two lines in its exemplar. The resultant reading, though difficult, is not nonsensical *per se*: "And upon his heads were seven of the stars of heaven, and he cast them into the earth."

Lastly, MS *233* omits 37 letters, one or two lines of the exemplar. The result is entirely sensible: "Saying they are Jews, and are not; and they should prostrate themselves before your feet." All the preceding readings appear in MSS of the 15th and 16th centuries, but in any case it would be unlikely

that such erroneous readings would ever have gained much currency. This would not be due to the straining of sensibility in context, but rather to the carefulness of the average scribe who was a careful workman and thus a good watchdog over the sacred text. Simple cross-checking against his own MS and/or another exemplar would serve as the strongest safeguard against the perpetuation of erroneous readings, whether "sensible" or not. The MSS themselves amply testify that such cross-correction took place on a regular basis.

Transposition of Words. When accidental, transposition of words is closely related to haplography. The phenomenon is frequent among the MSS and greatly evidenced by the singular readings of the present study. Accidental transposition generally occurred when the scribe's eye glanced ahead one or more words and he began to write the word to which his eye had skipped. If he immediately realized his error (of haplography), the omitted words could be inserted following the out-of-place word in most cases, since Greek is a rather flexible language in this regard.[1]

Although *intentional* transposition of words for emphasis may have occurred at times, it is unlikely that such was a common practice. The slight change of emphasis which would result generally would not have been worth the trouble of deliberate editing. Examples of transpositional error follow:

---

[1]Where such could not be done, the omitted words were usually inserted in their correct location *supra linea*. Such is demonstrated graphically throughout Hoskier's *Apocalypse*.

P^{18}	in	1:6	η δοξα και το κρατος) ∿4-5-3-1-2
18	in	22:1	(MT) καθαρον υδατος ζωης) ∿2-3-1
149	in	10:9	λεγων αυτω δουναι μοι) ∿3-4-1-2
184	in	1:7	φυλαι της γης) ∿2-3-1
219	in	7:16	(MT) ουδε διψησουσιν ετι, ουδ' ου μη πεση επ' αυτους ο ηλιος) ∿1-2-3 *to the end of this passage.*

The transposition of MS P^{18} *may* have been due to haplography and subsequent recovery as mentioned above, but it also might have occurred as an adjustment (whether conscious or not) to the "more familiar" phrasing of a remote but liturgical parallel, viz., "the power and the glory" of the doxology in the Lord's Prayer.[1] In Apoc. 1:6 a similar phrase appears in a similar doxology, which even ends with "forever and ever, Amen."[2] Thus the possibility of liturgical attraction may rank equally with accidental recovered haplography as an explanation for this transposition.[3]

The other cases of transposition are all clearly or blatantly accidental (cf. that of MS *219*, in which the poetic parallelism has totally been destroyed!), and require no further comment.

---

[1]That the Lord's Prayer was in liturgical use at a very early date is evidenced by the *Didache*, written ca. A.D. 80. The wording of the doxology in that document differs from the canonical text, just as the reading of P^{18} substitutes κρατος for the δυναμις of Matt. 5:13.

[2]The doxology of Matt. 5:13 ends only with "forever, Amen."

[3]If liturgical attraction from Matt. 5:13 be accepted, then MS P^{18} would become the earliest Greek MS to allude to the presence of the doxology in MSS of the 3rd or 4th centuries (cf. the critical apparatuses of Matt. 5:13 for detailed evidence). Yet the evidence of the *Didache* certainly suggests such might be the case! But it is difficult for modern opinion to accept such an allusion when it is believed that the Matthean doxology did not even exist in Egyptian MSS of P^{18}'s date. Perhaps a reconsideration of this point is warranted?

Phonetically-Caused Accidental Variation. At times the scribe's own pronunciation or mispronunciation of words (either aloud or in his mind)[1] caused him to put down a wrong spelling. Nonsense is the primary product of such error, but is usually resolvable. In the few cases where a "real" word is created, such generally does not fit the context; truly "sensible" readings thus produced are rare indeed. Various examples of this type of error follow:

Phonetic Nonsense

147 in 15:6 οι επτα) οιπτα*

Letter Omitted Phonetically

245 in 3:18 (MT) εγχριη) εχ-

Letter Added Phonetically

118 in 17:4 μαργαριταις) μαρχγ-

148 in 20:15 εβληθη) εμβ-

167 in 1:12 λυχνιας) λυγχ-

174 in 7:8 χιλιαδες[1]) χιδλ-

Wrong Letter Written (At Times Corrected)

κ in 20:13 ο θανατος) ο τα θανατος [sic]

154 in 20:10 ο ψευδοπροφητης) ο πψευδ- [sic]

"Real" Word Produced, Nonsense in Context

180 in 3:10 ερχεσθαι) ερχεται

210 in 10:8 λαλουσα) λαβουσα

"Sensible" Reading Produced

154 in 7:9 και λαων) καλων*

180 in 3:18 βλεπης) βλεψεις

187 in 1:3 ακουοντες) ακουσαντες

---

[1]Cf. Metzger, *Text*, p. 16, where the "four fundamental operations" of the copying process are explained. Metzger expressly mentions that "in antiquity" the scribe was "no doubt reading half-aloud."

200 in 1:16 και εχων) κατεχων

None of these phonetic errors requires comment. Even those readings which are "sensible" can be recognized as clearly secondary within the context. The fact that no other scribe chose to reproduce even the "sensible" readings of these MSS (ranging from the 10th-15th centuries) speaks well of the care with which Byzantine-era scribes performed their work.

At this point the general summary of accidental variation must end. Many more examples could have been provided from the present data for each case listed above as well as for many other types of accidental error not illustrated above, but space does not permit more than what has been presented already. Our attention must now turn to a more significant type of variation.

A General Summary of Intentional Variation

The area of intentional change differs radically from that of accidental variation. Here one finds only "sensible" readings, introduced (basically) out of a sincere desire to help the reader or to "improve" the text where something seemed confusing or obscure. There is little or no evidence that textual alterations in the Apocalypse were ever made from heretical motives;[1] perhaps the rise

[1]Pickering makes "heretical corruption" a key point of his theory (cf. *Identity*, pp. 43-44, 107-110). However, he seems to have ignored his own contention (p. 104) that there "would be added vigilance" over textual transmission which "would discourage them [the heretics] from taking liberties with the text" (p. 106). The Fathers were keen watchdogs against heretical corruption, but Pickering basically denies this.

of the millennial controversy and the development of the doctrine of supererogatory works might affect a scribe's treatment of texts bearing upon those aspects, but even these areas reflect doctrinal disputes *within orthodoxy* and not an intrusion of heretical beliefs from outside the fringes of "normal" textual transmission.[1]

Among the various types of intentional alteration some indeed *may* have been accidental in origin, such as the substitution of a preposition or a synonym or an alteration to what was considered "good" grammar. But since absence of intention cannot be determined where deliberate change might be suspected, all such readings have been subsumed under the present head. A sampling of the various types of intentional alteration follows.

Minor Intentional Changes

The readings of this category are those which do not materially affect the sense of the passage in question, though they may provide a different "slant" or emphasis. Many of these may in fact have been accidental, so little do they "improve" the text. Certainly the "gloss" category which heads the list was accidental: had the scribe realized his error he certainly would have corrected it. Yet the act *was* deliberate, making a marginal comment in the exemplar a part of the text in the copy. The scribe probably thought

---

[1] This is not to deny that *some* NT textual variants now extant in MSS *may* have originated as readings created and/or favored by heretics. But such readings as now may exist in our MSS have little or no "heretical" slant. All blatantly heretical readings were expunged long ago!

he was "doing the right thing" by (supposedly) *re-inserting* a phrase that had slipped out of his exemplar which a later reader had caught and inserted in the margin. Lack of attention to the context in such nonsensical readings only serves to indicate that the scribe was being a mere mechanical copyist and nothing more! We now shall proceed to sample these minor intentional variants in more detail.

Incorporation of Glosses. As mentioned above, a reader may have written in the margin of the exemplar a comment (explanatory or otherwise) which was then inserted into the *text* by the next scribe. Such incorporation of gloss material appears to have been rare indeed, and easily corrected due to the resultant disruption in continuity. Two examples of plain and clear gloss-incorporation follow:

137 in 20:6 ετη) + δυο ζωας και δυο νεκρωσεις ἤ γουν, θανατος εκ της θειας γραφης

219 in 22:21 αμην) + ιλεως εσο τοις πασι $\overline{\text{κε}}$ [sic]

The comment of the 13th-century MS *137* reads, "Two lives and two deaths, or, even so, death from the Sacred Scriptures" (commenting upon the canonical phrase, "Upon these the second death has no power, but they . . . shall reign with Him a thousand years." The interruption of the text (which continues, "And when the thousand years are over") is obvious, and easily explains why this gloss was not perpetuated.

The reading of MS *219* (14th century) is merely an in-text colophon ("Mercy be unto all, O Lord") which was copied unthinkingly from the end of the exemplar. The lack of "Amen" would clearly indicate such is not the end of the

book, and would thus alert later scribes to its spuriousness.

Substitution of an "Easier" Reading. A scribe at times might replace a difficult word with a synonym or other form which was more familiar to him. Also, when a referent was unclear or obscure, he might replace it with a word which made plain the confusing term. Examples of such "easier" substitutions include the following:

90 in 12:16 δρακων) διαβολος
92 in 12:18 θαλασσης) γης
100 in 20:9. ηγαπημενην) μεγαλην
102 in 1:4 χαρις) χαιρειν
108 in 1:1 . ιησου χριστου) ιωανου [*sic*]
218 in 17:1 πορνης) πολης [*sic*]

MS *90* simply identifies the Dragon with the Devil. This is quite reasonable since the same identification is made in the canonical text of Apoc. 12:9, 12 and 20:2. Certainly the open identification of the "Devil" is an "easier" reading than the symbolic "Dragon." Was the scribe really conscious of his alteration, or was it done subconsciously?

MS *92* merely is being logical: how could anyone stand "on the sand of the *sea*"? The sea is obviously water. Thus the overly-alert scribe perhaps *assumed* an error to exist in his exemplar, and "corrected" the text to read "the sand of the *earth*"! This error was never corrected in the MS, which suggests that it was never carefully read by later users.[1]

[1]It may not be without significance that this error appears in the same 16th-century MS (Greg. 61) which was presented to Erasmus in order to force the inclusion of the *Comma Johannaeum* in 1 Jn. 5:7 in the third edition of his Greek New Testament. If it be true that this MS were

On the other hand, MS *100* makes a "logical improvement." The reading "the camp of the saints and the *great* city" is certainly a more apt phrasing than "the camp of the saints and the *beloved* city," especially when αγαπαω is nowhere else applied to inanimate objects in the Apocalypse and when μεγας frequently describes a πολις therein.[1]

MS *102* merely inserted "Greeting" where it "properly" should occur in epistolary form. Although this reading might have been culturally superior in the 14th century when this MS was copied, no other scribes followed suit.

MS *108* makes perhaps the most "logical" alteration of all, beginning the book with "The Apocalypse of John" rather than "of Jesus Christ." This change obviously derived from the uninspired *title* of the book (Αποκαλυψις Ιωαννου); the alert scribe simply conformed the opening line of the text to what is proclaimed in the title of the book! Although motivation for such a change existed from at least the 4th century (when the basic form of the title became fixed), it remained for this single 13th-century scribe to so alter the text of 1:1—an amazing testimony to the general fidelity of scribes in all generations!

The alteration in MS *218* parallels that of MS [illegible], except that the *noun* rather than the adjective is altered

---

put together somewhat "on the quick" (Cf. Metzger, Text, p. 101; and idem, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [London: United Bible Societies, 1971], pp. 716-718), the present reading may betray the rapidity with which the MS was copied as well as the basic attitude of the scribe toward his speedy task!

[1]Cf. Apoc. 14:8; 16:19; 17:5, 18; 18:2, 10, 16, 18, 19 and 21.

to produce a similar phrase. Thus, instead of "the judgment of the great *whore*," MS *218* reads "the judgment of the great *city*." This lapse on the part of the scribe is understandable, since in Apoc. 17:5 the great whore is clearly identified as representing the great city of Babylon.

Many cases of "easier" reading substitution are to be found among the MSS, but this fact should not be construed as blanket evidence that the "difficult"-reading generally should be preferred. All textual judgments made on the basis of internal criteria should be but *tentative* as regards any single principle of evidence. It is only in the convergence of *all* lines of evidence that a reading can be established with confidence!

Expansion or Addition of Divine Names. The textual handbooks continually suggest that scribes tended to add or expand divine names wherever possible.[1] The present study suggests that this assumption is unwarranted: although some scribes did expand the divine names, they did so rather infrequently. Most scribes did not alter the divine names at all. Further, those same scribes which at times did expand the divine names at other times *shortened* or *omitted* them—often within a matter of verses![2] All that can be said

[1] The comments found in Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, in loc. 2 Cor. 4:6, 14 (p. 579) are typical: "Pious scribes could not resist adding Ἰησοῦ before or after Χριστοῦ"; ". . .the ever-present tendency of pious scribes to expand by adding κύριον [before Ἰησοῦν]" (Emphasis my own). A modification of such statements might now be in order.

[2] The examination of a relatively full textual apparatus such as that of Von Soden will provide multiplied examples of both expansion and reduction of divine names within the same "key" NT MSS.

from this is that Hoskier's *dictum* still holds true: "We have had too many cheap and hasty deductions from insignificant or insufficient data."[1] Some examples of expansion/addition of divine names as well as reduction/omission follow.[2]

16	in 20:4	του Θεου) Ιησου του Θεου*
28	in 3:13	εκκλησιαις) + του Θεου
28	in 5:1	θρονου) + του Θεου
98	in 22:14	αυτου) + του Θεου
100	in 17:3	πνευματι) + Κυριου
113	in 5:6	γην) + Κυριου
143	in 22:20	λεγει) + ο Θεος
152[2]	in 1:4	Θεου) + πατρος και Κυριος Ιησους Χριστος
200	in 20:4	Ιησου) + Χριστου
208	in 22:16	$\overline{\Delta\alpha\delta}$) + ο Χριστος ο Θεος
210	in 15:4	σου[1]) + Κυριε*

The expansion or addition of the divine name in each of the preceding cases is obvious and needs no comment. Whether such was done out of "pious motives" or simple familiarity with the more common liturgical form of these names cannot be determined. Such expansions likely were made in the scribe's mind while transmitting what he had just read onto his copy; if so, the motivation for such change may have been totally subconscious—a halfway step between deliberate alteration and unintentional error. The important thing to note is that in this and the next two classes of variation the meddling with the divine names on the part of the scribes

---

[1] Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I: xxxviii.

[2] It should be noted that most of these divine names (*nomina sacra*) were customarily abbreviated in the MSS. Hoskier, however, generally does not indicate the presence or absence of a *nomen sacrum* abbreviation in his apparatus, save in the case of "David" (noted above).

is the *exception* rather than the rule. Few indeed are the places in the text and/or the scribes who sought to modify the divine names.

Reduction or Omission of Divine Names. The reversal of the preceding process occurs nearly as frequently. But in this case, the replacement of the divine name with a pronoun seems to be the usual practice rather than the total omission of the divine name (though such does occur). Some examples of both these cases follow.

39	in 15:8	του Θεου) αυτου
56	in 1:2	Ιησου) του
69	in 15:1	του Θεου) αυτου
100	in 15:3	του Θεου) αυτου
113	in 7:11	τω Θεω) αυτω
130	in 20:4	του Θεου) αυτου
146	in 22:6	ο Θεος) —
200	in 1:8	Κυριος ο Θεος) ο Θεος sic
200	in 1:2	Ιησου Χριστου) αυτου
218	in 1:1	ο Θεος) —

If comparison be made with the preceding category, the reader will note that MSS *100*, *113* and *200* are cited for both expansion and reduction of divine names. Other similar parallels could be cited for additional MSS. This clearly tends to indicate that scribes were *not* solely "addicted to expansion" as has hitherto been claimed. Rather, they were truly individualistic *at each point* where they chose to differ from the text contained in their exemplar.

Substitution of Divine Names. Closely related to the preceding instances are those cases where the scribe chose

to substitute a divine name for another word, divine or otherwise. Many of these changes may be subconsciously motivated (as suggested earlier), but a good number indeed appear to be deliberate for alteration of emphasis. Some examples of this phenomenon follow.

28 in 5:8 χρυσας) Χριστας (?)
31 in 1:4 Θεου) Κυριου
57 in 20:4 θηριω) Θεω
63 in 20:4 Ιησου) του Θεου
136 in 12:10 Θεου^{2}) Ιησου *vid.*
189 in 12:17 Ιησου) Κυριου

The readings of MSS *28* and *57* appear to have been conformed to that which was the more familiar phrasing (to their minds). MS *63* appears to have been attracted to the reading of the next clause; MSS *31* and *136* offer greater glory to Christ while MSS *63* and *189* accord the greater glory to God the Father. In many of these cases, simple confusion of the abbreviated *nomina sacra* may have occurred, and such readings may be the result of pure accident. However, the chances of unintentional alteration decrease in proportion to the complexity of the alteration. This will be illustrated in the final three sections of this chapter.

Harmonization to Parallel or Familiar Passages. This category is not so frequent in the Apocalypse as in the other NT books (particularly the Synoptic Gospels). Attraction to nearby forms as a special type of "harmonization" has already been described on pp. 37-38 above. Here we treat of that intentional harmonization to near or remote passages which

supposedly "demonstrates conclusively the harmonistic bent of the early church."[1]

In the Apocalypse as in the Gospels, Colwell's rule holds true: the nearer the parallel, the more frequent the harmonizations, and the more remote the parallel, the fewer the harmonizations.[2] Since there are few truly "parallel" passages in the Apocalypse, the cases of harmonization remote from nearby forms are limited indeed, but the following examples should suffice to illustrate the point:

A	in	1:17	πρωτος) πρωτοτοκος
8	in	22:13	ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος, η αρχη και το τελος) ~ 7-8-10-2-3-5 (— 1,4,6,9)
67	in	5:1	εσωθεν και εξωθεν) εσωθεν και εμπροσθεν και οπισθεν
108	in	5:3	βιβλιον) + και λυσαι τας σφραγιδας αυτου

In the case of MS *A* the parallel is only slightly remote since πρωτοτοκος had previously appeared in Apoc. 1:5.[3] MS *A* also reads the same singularly in 2:8 (a chapter not utilized in the present study), which suggests the alteration was deliberate,[4] perhaps for a doctrinal emphasis: "I am the *first-born* and the Last." Note, however, that in 22:13,

---

[1]Gordon D. Fee, "A Critique of W. N. Pickering's *The Identity of the New Testament Text:* A Review Article," *Westminster Theological Journal* 41 (1979): 412. The present writer has questioned the severity of such a "bent" in an as-yet-unpublished study of Fee's contentions.

[2]See Colwell, "Scribal Habits," pp. 112-114. That which Colwell demonstrated by way of example is here reduced to a principle.

[3]The word only appears seven other times (7x in the NT: Lk. 2:7; Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:15, 18; Heb. 1:6; 11:28 and 12:23). Each occurrence is fraught with doctrinal significance!

[4]Such dual singular readings of doctrinally-significant words certainly seem to have been created for a purpose; perhaps in this case to emphasize Christ as the "firstborn from the dead."

where the phrase ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος recurs for the third and final time, MS *A* leaves πρωτος unchanged. Perhaps by that point the parallel had become *too* remote!

MS *8* harmonizes to a more remote parallel: the two clauses following "I am the Alpha and the Omega" in 22:13 are reversed to harmonize with the "model" form in 21:6 (which reads only the "Beginning and Ending" clause after the Alpha/Omega statement). The scribe perhaps thought the order of words in his exemplar was in error and duly adjusted the "erroneous" order.[1]

In MS *67* the scribe was not content with the Majority[2] description of the sealed book as γεγραμμενον εσωθεν και εξωθεν, but reached back to the description of the numerous eyes of the four living creatures (which appeared εμπροσθεν και οπισθεν) in 4:6 and then semi-conflated the phrasing of 5:1. Perhaps the scribe was concerned with the codex form of the book rather than the scroll form,[3] since a codex but not a scroll could be written upon on the front, the back, and within.

MS *108* offers the clearest example of harmonization to be found among the present examples. His addition in 5:3 is

---

[1]Note that in 1:8 MS *8* does *not* follow a minority (38%) of MSS in adding αρχη και τελος to the Alpha/Omega clause. The minority reading there seems to have been due to harmonization with 21:6 also.

[2]The *Textus Receptus* (TR), following its base MS *1*, reads the curious semi-conflation εσωθεν και οπισθεν. Other MSS (ℵ, *[illegible]*, *169*, *204*, *216*) also present various conflatory examples, but only three MSS (*120*, *169*, *216*) truly conflate both passages. Apart from these MSS, neither εμπροσθεν nor οπισθεν appears in any Apocalypse MS.

[3]The codex form of the NT was in use by (at least) the early second century, but John's vision was clearly that of a scroll.

of precisely the same phrase which followed the identical words (ανοιξαι το βιβλιον) at the close of the preceding verse (5:2). This harmonization appears to have been intended to "round out" the response to the question uttered in the previous verse.

Conflation of Two Variant Readings. Here there can be no question that the scribe deliberately acted as an editor, certainly with good intentions. The scribe was faced with either a reading unfamiliar from that to which he was used, or he knew from comparison of MSS that more than one reading appeared in a certain place of Scripture. With no certain resolution of the difficulty, he simply combined the two or more readings into one in his current copy according to whatever degree of skill he may have possessed. The combined reading thus produced is termed a *conflation*.

Conflation is a phenomenon common to MSS of all textypes but appears in *very low frequency* within any single MS.[1] Yet conflation should have occurred more frequently in the MSS of the Apocalypse than in other NT books because of the equally-divided "majority" tradition peculiar to that book.[2] There should have arisen many times more opportunity to resolve

---

[1]Cf. Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Identity of the New Testament Text: Revised Edition* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1980), "Appendix D: Conflation or Confusion?" pp. 171-200. The present writer contributed to the data in that Appendix. The data of the present research tend to support the conclusion expressed by Pickering therein, viz., that "henceforth no one may reasonably . . . characterize the 'Byzantine' text-type as being 'conflate' nor argue therefrom that it must be late" (p. 200).

[2]Cf. Hodges, "Ecclesiastical Text," for an explanation of these issues. More detail can be found in Josef Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, 3 vols. (Munich: Karl Zink, 1955-56), Teil 2, "Die alten Stämme," pp. 11-13.

cases of conflict between those traditions via conflation.

But the data simply do not bear out this hypothesis. Although scribes of the Apocalypse here and there *did* conflate the readings of the two leading textual traditions (the Av and Q textypes), such was quite a rare occurrence even within any single MS. One cannot argue widespread conflation elsewhere from any number of *suspected* or merely *possible* examples supported by a large number of MSS when the data of individual MSS indicates that scribes were not "conflation-prone." Yet such has been the stance of critical opinion for more than a century when the readings of the Byzantine textype are called into question. The following statement by Metzger is typical of current opinion:

> What would a conscientious scribe do when he found that the same passage was given differently in two or more manuscripts which he had before him? *Rather than make a choice* between them and copy only one of the two variant readings (with the attendant possibility of omitting the genuine reading), *most scribes incorporated both readings* in the new copy which they were transcribing. This produced what is called a conflation of readings, and is *characteristic of the later, Byzantine type of text.*[1]

Such a statement, originating antecedent to Metzger,[2] reflects a key point of modern textual theory but simply does not tally with the data of the present study. One might rightly suspect that the original utterance of such an opinion was made on the basis of but a cursory examina-

---

[1] Metzger, *Text*, p. 200. The emphasis is my own. Note especially the mention of "most scribes" and the final clause.

[2] Certainly with Westcott and Hort, but perhaps with Griesbach ultimately. Metzger is not to be blamed for repeating what was apparently sound data from other sources. His critique of von Soden's NT textual apparatus was soundly based upon Kirsopp Lake's data; Lake had

tion of only a small number of MSS at a time predating the numerous collations printed in the late 19th century. The hard data of the present study certainly do not tally with such an opinion. This allows a rule to be formulated: apart from extensive testing within a large data base, the textual scholar should be reluctant to accept any claim regarding what scribes were or were not likely to do!

The following examples of conflation offer some indication of the type and frequency of such deliberate editorializing. In almost every case the conflation cited is the *sole* instance of such found among the singular readings of that MS within the sample base chapters of this study. *None* of the scribes of the MSS examined appears to be "conflation-prone," despite the constant conflict between the Av and Q "majority" textypes in the Apocalypse. This includes for the most part those same Byzantine-era scribes which were thought responsible for widespread conflationary practices elsewhere in the NT. But if there are very *few* instances of conflation to be found among the scribes of the 4th-15th centuries[1] in an area of text which might have been supposed to *encourage* conflation on a large scale, there thus appears to be little likelihood that "most

---

accepted as sound Hoskier's critique of von Soden. But Hoskier himself was hopelessly confused by von Soden's apparatus and misinterpreted von Soden's evidence too frequently. Yet *no* subsequent testing of Hoskier's assertions ever occurred! This has been detailed by the present writer in his "Von Soden's Folly: The Greek New Testament That Failed?" Ph.D. Seminar Paper, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fall 1977, pp. 48-60, 67-76.

[1]The period of the dominance of the Byzantine textype, during which *ca.* 95% of all extant MSS were copied.

scribes" would be prone to conflate in the remainder of the NT where the generally-accepted Byzantine textype brooked little opposition. The examples of conflation follow.

ℵ in 17:4	αυτης (54%) της γης (45%)	αυτης και της γης
22 in 3:1	οτι (51%) και (41%)	και οτι
28 in 7:14	ελευκαναν αυτας (44%) ελευκαναν στολας αυτων (33%) ελευκαναν τας στολας αυτων και ελευκαναν αυτας	
138 in 22:7	προφητειας (MT) ταυτης (4 MSS)	προφητειας ταυτης*
143 in 3:3	γρηγορησας (MT) μετανοησης (ℵ* *solus*)	μετανοησης μηδε γρηγορισις [*sic*]
201 in 3:7	αυτην (44%) και κλειων (25%)	αυτην και κλειων
214 in 20:8	ως η (64%) ωσει (34%)	ωσει η
240 in 12:15	ως (MT) εις (3 MSS)	ως εις

Special comment need not be directed to these examples since the manner and method of conflation in each case is self-evident. The MSS listed here span from the fourth century to the sixteenth, with equal representation in centuries X-XVI. Conflation indeed *was* sporadic, appearing among MSS of all textypes in limited degree. Pickering's recent conclusion thus finds nothing but confirmation from the data of this study, viz., "The specter of 'Syrian [i.e., Byzantine] conflation' has been laid to rest."[1]

[1]Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, pp. 199-200. Although there is no "Byzantine" textype in the Apocalypse, the comment is appropriate, *mutatis*

Deliberate and/or Wanton "Editorializing." Most of the deliberate alterations made thus far were made in an attempt to "restore" the text to what the scribe thought must have been the original form or (in the case of conflation) to at least "rescue" the original from possible loss. In this final section, however, the scribe ceases to be concerned with textual preservation but considers himself qualified to re-edit the text into the form God "must have intended" before the writer John had "corrupted" the heavenly message! Yet it must be stressed that *most* scribes did not engage in this practice but did little more than their appointed task of faithfully copying that which lay before them in their exemplar. It is only here and there that any real editorializing took place, and only a very few scribes are guilty of such frequent editorial alteration that the receipt of the sacred deposit saw real corruption under their hands.

The examples which follow range from the relatively insignificant changes to the highly serious. The discussion concerning each case will be proportionate to the degree of significance of each alteration.

87 in 10:10 ην) εγενετο

95 in 3:5 ζωης) + ταυτης

137 in 20:6 ο δευτερος) —*

143 in 1:1 ην εδωκεν . . . Ιωαννην) της γενομενης εις εμε Ιωαννην την αποστολον

---

tis mutandis, when speaking of the so-called "Byzantine mind-set" of the medieval scribes who in the rest of the NT indeed were responsible for the preservation and perpetuation of the Majority (Byzantine) Text.

146 in 7:5-8	*Omit verses 5-8 and replace them with the following summary statement:* Και λεγει λοιπον απο εκαστης φυλης δωδεκαχιλιαδας τους σφραγισθεντας.
189 in 20-21	*Rearrange the order of verses as follows (other internal changes not here included):* omit 20:1-3, include in the following order 20:7, 8, 9, 10, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14^{a}, 15 (20:6, 13 are also omitted); 21:1-6, at which point the Apocalypse is brought to an end; with subscription following.
250 in 12:10	Χριστου) Αντιχριστου$^{vid.}$ (!)

MS *87* is guilty of little more than stylistic editorializing. Since 10:9 has the angel declaring that once John eats the scroll, εν τω στοματι σου <u>εσται</u> γλυκυ ως μελι, it becomes easy to see why the phrase in verse 10 (και <u>ην</u> εν τω στοματι μου ως μελι γλυκυ) should have been altered to describe "more accurately" the situation as "εγενετο."

The one-word addition in MS *99* subtly shifts the emphasis from eternal life to the temporal situation. The concern of this 12th-century, works-oriented scribe was not with his name being blotted out of the Lamb's Book of Life, but with the promise that *current* "overcoming works" will secure his place in the "book of *this (present)* life"!

The situation is similar in MS *137*. There the text has been altered to guarantee that *Death* (rather than the "second death") will have no power over those who have a part in the first resurrection. This change may reflect the apocalyptic concern which reached a peak in the 12th-14th centuries (MS *137* is of the 13th century). Perhaps the hope of Christ's imminent return encouraged a belief that "millions now living

will never die," so long as they are believers and maintained their good works.[1] That more than casual error was responsible for this omission is evident from MS *137*'s treatment of closely-related "second death" passages. In 20:14 MS *137* along with 33 other MSS omits the clause, ουτος ο θανατος ο δευτερος εστιν. In 20:5 MS *137* omits the first sentence in company with 34% of all MSS, but singularly inserts an editorial gloss which asks, Τί ἐστιν ἡ πρωτη ἀναστασις καὶ τί ὁ δευτερος θανατος; Yet MS *137* did not alter mention of the "second death" in 2:11 (where, interestingly, MS *137* singularly omits του δευτερου) nor in 21:8 (where 10 other MSS omit the phrase "which is the second death"). The real concern of the scribe may have been restricted to those places in the text where current opinion saw real difficulty.[2] The restoration of ο δευτερος in 20:6 by a later scribe may indicate a waning of the apocalyptic controversy or (more likely) a return to textual fiedlity occasioned by comparison and correction from another MS.[3]

---

[1]Cf. Bernard McGinn, *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), for a detailed explanation of medieval apocalypticism with documentary evidence; especially pp. 88-285 which cover A.D. 1000-1500, in which most extant minuscules of the Apocalypse were copied. The phrase "millions ... die" is an oft-repeated slogan of the modern apocalyptic Jehovah's Witnesses.

[2]The large number of MSS which alter the text in matters concerning the "second death" suggests that this concept must have been a *crux interpretum* in the medieval period. It is almost certain that then-current apocalyptic views contributed heavily to such concern.

[3]It is interesting to note that the resultant text of MS *137* in 20:6 after ο δευτερος was omitted might have served as a source text for Dylan Thomas' poem "And Death Shall Have No Dominion" (θανατος ουκ εχει εξουσιαν). It would not be surprising were some literary/textual critics to suggest Thomas used MS *137* as his source!

MS *143* reflects the same scribal concern with the conflict between the title of the Apocalypse ("of John") and the statement of the first verse ("of Jesus Christ") which was demonstrated in MS *108* earlier (pp. 56-57 above). Here the scribe obviously thought the first verse could *not* so have stood originally and thus "restored" the text to the presumed "original" form which stated that the Revelation "came unto *me*, John the Apostle"!

The scribe of MS *146* obviously did not relish the prospect of copying the recurring phrase εκ φυλης $\overline{\text{ι}}$ $\overline{\text{ιβ}}$ χιλιαδες twelve times. He thus produced the "Reader's Digest" condensation, "And he called the rest: from each tribe 12,000 having been sealed," as an easy means of by-passing the drudgery yet (supposedly) remaining true to the text. It is remarkable that no other scribe so chose to ease his burden when copying the twelvefold list!

With MS *189* a peak of blatant editorializing is reached. The scribe simply has chosen to rearrange the verses in the order which suits him, discarding those which do not fit in with what he believes to be the "best" text. There are a number of internal alterations within these rearranged verses, each of which also appears to be editorially determined (see the complete listing of such in the proper location of Table 6 below). All these singular changes partake of the same radical nature as the verse rearrangement. This scribe is rightly characterized by Hoskier as follows:

> . . . In the course of these studies of MSS. and their copyists it has not fallen to my lot to meet with anything more deliberate in the way of critical editing. . . .
>
> The changes, including numerous omissions, are deliberate, for the scribe is perfectly capable of straightforward and accurate copying when he has a mind to do so.[1]

Hoskier gives three pages of the more "formidable" singular readings of this MS, almost every one of which stems from editorial rather than mere scribal activity.[2] But MS *189* is not alone: MS *143* (cited above) has nearly as much editorial alteration as MS *189* when only the internal textual changes are considered, and it is in the internal text where most editorial activity occurs. Few scribes have MS *189*'s boldness totally to rearrange the order of verses and even entire chapters to suit their textual or theological fancies!

MS *250*'s alteration of "Christ" into "Antichrist" is interesting in that the term αντιχριστος otherwise does not occur in the Apocalypse but is confined to five appearances in the Johannine Epistles. Apocalypticism rightly may be suspected as the cause of this error. The Voice from Heaven had announced that "just now" the salvation, power and kingdom of God had appeared—but the Satanic-Divine conflict had not occurred! What better reason to oppose the final clause to the first half of the verse by reading "the dominion of the Antichrist" instead of "the dominion of Christ"? One

---

[1] Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:621-622. On p. 623 Hoskier notes that "at xix. 10 begins a general shortening by tachygraphy as if he were anxious to economize vellum." This might partially explain the scribe's editorial activity, save for the fact that on his last page "he might . . . have squeezed in the rest of ch. xxi"!

[2] Ibid., pp. 623-625.

should not underestimate or discount the impact which current apocalypticism may have had upon scribal habits![1]

A great number of cases of intentional variation have not been able to be discussed in this chapter due to space limitations within this *general* review of the data. These include such items as change of prepositions (whether free or in compound verbs) for a different emphasis, corrections of supposed "bad grammar" insofar as such clashed with current style, "patchwork" attempts to fill in gaps or skips in the exemplar, etc. Much could be written on each of these worthy subjects as with the preceding categories of variation. Some examples of what can be accomplished with more detailed examination will appear in the next chapter.

---

[1]McGinn, *Visions*, p. 145, speaks of "the sheer extent of material" which appeared between A.D. 1200-1500 in the category of apocalyptic. Most such works drew heavily upon the Apocalypse (among many other sources); it then should not be unusual to find the process at times reversing itself. The surprising thing is how few variants within the Apocalypse MSS possibly can be traced to extra-Biblical apocalyptic sources (or even extra-Biblical sources in general)! One should rather have expected a somewhat *greater* tendency to deliberately alter the text of the Apocalypse to reflect current trends than that of any other NT book, but this simply was *not* the case: most scribes were faithful!

CHAPTER 4

A PARTICULAR REVIEW OF SCRIBAL HABITS IN SELECTED MANUSCRIPTS

An Overview of Individual Manuscript Data

Although the lengthy catalogue of scribal corruptions presented in the preceding chapter may make it appear that textual alteration so permeated transmissional history as to be considered epidemic, the impression is not justified by the actual data of individual scribal performance. The results of this study tend to support quite the opposite conclusion, viz., that the majority of scribes were actually *quite careful* in their general copying and similarly resisted the manifold temptations deliberately to *edit* rather than merely *transmit* the NT text.

This is demonstrated in Table 5 of the present study which lists the number of singular readings per MS in both raw and projected totals. A detailed explanation of those data appears within that Table and need only be summarized here. Table 5 represents the only excursion into statistical analysis of the present study, and the reason should be plain: statistics can often be more confusing than the data they are intended to illustrate, especially to the lay reader untrained in such niceties. Further, the average reader confronted by a massive array of statistical data is generally

quite willing to believe *anything* claimed by the statistician in lieu of the distressing task of dissecting the data piece by piece to see whether the claims be true.[1] Add to this the possibility of cunningly manipulated data on the part of the presenter (so as to give misleading impressions),[2] and one might well desiderate an abolishment of statistical research altogether!

The latter wish of course cannot be granted. The present study from the beginning is statistical in nature. A limited sampling procedure of base chapters reduced the study to manageable proportions.[3] Had the total number of MSS been much larger only a sample portion of them could have been taken. Even within the limited sample base selected, so much data has been amassed that only a small portion of such can be examined in the present work.[4] Thus a certain amount of statistical material is necessary in order to accomplish anything. But this is a far cry from trying to live *by* the statistical method, and the reader should welcome the absence of interminable pages of evaluative tables in this report.

---

[1] Cf. Darrell Huff, *How to Lie With Statistics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1954), p. 8: "The secret language of statistics . . . is employed to sensationalize, inflate, confuse, and oversimplify." On p. 74 Huff speaks of "the daze that follows the collision of statistics with the human mind," and suggests that, no matter *what* the claim, if statistics are present *en masse*, "hardly anybody will notice."

[2] Ibid., p. 120: "A great many manipulations and even distortions are possible within the bounds of propriety." Huff suggests that "without writers who use . . . words with honesty and understanding and readers who know what they mean, the result can only be semantic nonsense" (p. 8).

[3] Huff, pp. 13-21, strongly supports the limited sampling method, so long as the sample "is large enough and selected properly" (p. 13).

[4] Table 6 of the present study, containing only raw data, runs *ca.* 120 pages, single-spaced! Total analysis is of course quite impossible.

The Importance of Table 5

From what has been written about the proclivities of scribes in the textual handbooks of the past hundred years the expectation entertained upon commencement of the present study was that the MSS of the Apocalypse would possess in the aggregate a rather large number of singular readings. Most of these were expected to be of the itacistic or nonsense variety with a small number of deliberate changes in places where the scribe considered the text difficult or in need of reconstruction. With *ca.* 40% of the Apocalypse being examined it was not too much to expect between 50-100 singulars per MS, with perhaps 10-15 of these being deliberate alterations on the part of each scribe.

The actual tabulation of the gross number of singular readings per MS (Table 5*a*) thus came as quite a surprise. The present writer's expectations, based upon what had long been written, were unduly inflated! Yet examination of the major critical apparatuses of von Soden and Tischendorf[1] shows singular readings to be highly prevalent, especially among the esteemed Old Uncial MSS and the regularly-cited minuscule MSS of those apparatuses.[2] One thus might expect

---

[1]Von Soden, *Die Schriften*, vol. 2: "Text mit Apparat"; Constantine von Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Editio Octava Critica Maior, 2 vols. (Leipzig: Giesecke und Devrient, 1869-72).

[2]Such minuscule MSS were generally selected for regular citation because they tended to support the Old Uncial type of text over against the Byzantine/Majority MS tradition. This principle of selection is at last stated plainly in the UBS[3]: minuscule MSS which are "cited systematically" were so chosen *solely* "because they exhibit a significant degree of independence from the so-called Byzantine manuscript tradition" (UBS[3], p. xix).

the same situation to prevail among other MSS at least in the same proportion as that found among the Old Uncials and those minuscules with which they are allied.

The data indicate, however, that such expectations were erroneous. Based only upon the *raw* (unprojected) data, one can see that the *average* number of singular readings per MS was only 18 within a base covering 40% of the entire Apocalypse. But more significantly, the *mean* (or, technically, *median*)[1] number of singulars per MS is only 8.2 ! This suggests a *mean/median* number of singulars per MS for the *entire* Apocalypse of only 20.5—far fewer than could ever have been anticipated from what appears in the critical editions!

Yet estimations based upon unprojected data must be suspect, since correct projections of fragmentary data would certainly raise both the average and the median figures. Table 5*b* provides the accurate estimation of the total number of singulars which could "normally" be expected for the sample base chapters were the fragmentary MSS in fact complete within that section.[2] Following this, the projected data are reintegrated into the complete list in order that the whole body of MSS might be compared on substantially an equal basis.[3]

The result of all this is that the initial findings are

---

[1] I.e., the number of singulars from which an equal number of MSS extends both higher and lower in total proportion.

[2] Explanation of the methodology of projection is provided immediately preceding Table 5*b*.

[3] "Substantially" because of the irrational nature of scribal activity (which may vary significantly from chapter to chapter or even from verse to verse). Cautions to this effect appear throughout Table 5.

still confirmed. Although the *average* number of singulars per MS has risen to nearly 25 after projection, the *mean* or *median* has only increased slightly to 10.5 singulars per MS. Comparison of the median in both unprojected and projected totals confirms the fact: the bulk of copyists were indeed quite careful and made few errors and/or intentional changes. Yet a small percentage of MSS did create a large enough number of singular readings peculiar to themselves so as to throw the *average* (but not the *median*) far out of proportion. The supposed "propensity" of scribes to alter and corrupt the text they were transmitting thus seems to be the *exception* rather than the rule.[1]

Additional Data of Significance

Rather than increase the size of the Tables in this study, it will suffice to summarize other significant findings of the present research. Examination of the data contained within Table 6 should allow ready verification of the following conclusions:

(a) Most singular readings result from error and produce nonsense.

(b) Itacism is the most frequent type of error, but is not common to all scribes in the same proportion. Nor do scribes commit the same itacistic errors at all times. Each scribe has his own peculiarities, likely due to the speech and dialectical differences of his particular time and locale.

---

[1]The median of 10.5 singulars per MS within the sample base chapters would indicate a median of only 26.25 singulars per MS in the entire Apocalypse! Not to be lost sight of is the fact that 11 MSS (5%) had *zero*

(c) Homoioteleuton is the next most frequent cause of error, producing either haplography or dittography according to scribal peculiarity. Some scribes reduplicate more often than they omit; some omit/add single letters more often than words or phrases; some are seemingly addicted to this type of error while others are relatively immune.

(d) Sensible readings appear in a ratio of about 3:7, i.e., only about 30% of all singular readings "make sense" in any way. Fully one-half of these sensible readings *may*—and the conditional is stressed—have arisen unconsciously as the scribe's mind smoothed or explicated the text before the words were written down. These include such items as the addition of connectives, changes of verb tense, and especially attraction to neighboring forms of nouns or verbs. Other items which may be included herein are intensification by the addition of personal pronouns or by compounding verbs with prepositions or even the transposition of words.[1]

(e) The remaining half of the sensible singular readings (*ca.* 15% of all singular readings) fall under the category of deliberate alteration. Change in this category was conscious and intentional, and was usually made to smooth out or to clarify the text either grammatically, syntactically, or by means of word substitution.

---

singular readings, and only 4 MSS of these 11 were fragmentary! This indicates extraordinary care in copying on the part of those 7 MSS which are fully extant within the sample base chapters but which possess no singular readings whatever.

[1]Some of these of course produced contextual nonsense and were accidental.

(f) Incorporation of glosses is extremely rare, as is the practice of conflation. The infrequency of the latter category becomes a serious concern in light of all that has been built upon such a principle since the days of Westcott and Hort toward the elimination of the Byzantine textype as a serious contender for autograph status.

(g) Most MSS show little or no evidence of deliberate editorializing. Even among those variants which are clearly "deliberate," the desire to smooth cannot be equated with a wish to reconstruct the text in the scribe's own image. However, there *are* a few MSS (usually those with an inordinately large number of singular readings) which clearly betray widespread editorial activity. These MSS also appear to possess an extremely large number of accidental errors which seems inexplicable apart from postulating some sort of "scribal Peter Principle,"[1] which states in effect that, once a scribe reaches a certain level of incompetence beyond which he cannot improve, his mind seeks out pursuits more suited to his imagined ability and he thus attempts to refashion the text "as it should have appeared." The net result is the

---

[1]Cf. Laurence J. Peter and Raymond Hull, *The Peter Principle* (New York: Bantam, 1969), p.7: "In a Hierarchy Every Employee Tends to Rise to His Level of Incompetence." This leading principle of Peter and Hull's satire may well possess validity. The "scribal Peter Principle" of the main text above represents the logical outworking of Peter's chapter on "Creative Incompetence" (pp. 127-138). By this means the errant and editorializing scribe *may* have been trying to avoid further scribal duties by (a) corrupting the text to show he could not be trusted to do his job; or (b) demonstrating by his deliberate alterations that a "management" position is what he really desired ("would rather be *writing* instead of merely *copying*"). Behind this humorous explanation lurks a need for *some* psychological explanation of the error-plus-editorializing phenomenon, especially in view of the small number of MSS so involved!

curious amalgam of scribal error and editing in high degree within the same MS. Such certainly is a far cry from the "typical" scribe who creates few singular readings, most of which are of the "simple error" variety!

(h) The extremely large number of singular readings which were never perpetuated beyond the MS in which they appear[1] strongly supports the notion that most MSS were carefully checked against the exemplar and/or a second MS by the scribe himself or another reader.[2] This view runs somewhat counter to the prevailing assumption of the handbooks that MSS steadily tended to accumulate scribal errors throughout the centuries with apparently little or no substantial correction taking place.[3] Yet were this so, the lack of perpetuation of the truly "sensible" singular readings which read more smoothly or "correctly" or which otherwise "improve" the text seems puzzling. If such indeed were "easier" or "more attractive" for the scribe, why were they not picked up and perpetuated? According to theory, such readings should have become utterly dominant within the Byzantine textual tradition, but they did not—a strange anomaly, to say the least!

---

[1]Save for the very few cases in which transmission of a singular reading from the exemplar might be postulated. Cf. pp. 35-36, 48-49 *supra*.

[2]The αντιβαλλων or διορθωτης. Cf. Metzger, *Text*, pp. 15, 22.

[3]Despite the recognition of the corrector's function (cf. note 2 above), the handbooks continue to foster a misleading impression of scribal activity. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. xxiii, states, "The Byzantine form of the Greek text . . . was disfigured . . . by the accumulation over the centuries of *myriads* of scribal alterations" [Emphasis mine]. So too Greenlee, *Introduction*, p. 61: ". . . each ms. [contained] its own characteristic textual variants. These mss. would then be further

(i) Because a good number of nonsensical singular errors appear which do not seem to stem from a minuscule exemplar, the case may be that far more of our extant minuscule MSS were copied from *uncial* exemplars than has hitherto been suspected. Otherwise one would be faced with the highly unusual circumstance that an excessive number of uncial-based errors were faithfully transmitted without correction through an unknown number of minuscule descendants. Such a supposition, if true, may not hold equally for other NT books, since the extant evidence suggests that the Apocalypse was less copied than any other NT book.[1] It thus would be more likely to possess *fewer* "copying generations" between the centuries than those books frequently read or used in liturgical worship. Perhaps the Apocalypse MSS which were bound up with miscellaneous works rather than other NT books are those most likely to have been copied from separately circulating uncial exemplars?[2]

---

copied, with the resulting copies tending to contain the characteristic variants of the parent ms. plus some additional errors." Strict application of such statements would require that the most recent (late Byzantine) MSS be a mass of errors, with the original NT text barely visible. This mistaken opinion would derive further support from statements such as Metzger's "Of the approximately five thousand Greek manuscripts . . . no two agree exactly in all particulars" (*Textual Commentary*, p. xxiv), were it not recognized that *all* Greek MSS, of *whatever* textype, *are* in exact agreement regarding *ca.* 85-90% of the total NT text! Such a situation could not have arisen save through general scribal fidelity at all times and in all locales.

[1] I.e., fewer MSS of the Apocalypse are extant than for other NT books while more copies of the Gospels exist than any other NT books (reflecting proportionally the neglect or use of such books in liturgical services).

[2] Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I: xxvi-xxvii, discusses the miscellanies with which "no less than forty" minuscule MSS of the Apocalypse are bound. He considers such MSS quite valuable, since they represent a stream of tradition *outside* of ecclesiastical authority and control.

An Examination of Selected Individual Manuscripts

Although it is impossible to discuss the scribal characteristics of each of the 220 MSS Hoskier collated it is yet necessary to examine a small selection of MSS in order to see what different habits exist among scribes of the Apocalypse. A purely random selection of MSS would not properly cover the range of scribal habits;[1] therefore, a useful but non-arbitrary system of selection was utilized which would include examples of all types of scribes, both "good" (with few singular readings) and "bad" (with many singulars).

The Selection of the MSS to be Examined

The UBS[3] apparatus is characterized by the systematic selection of MSS considered to be of text-critical value. These MSS vary from book to book but remain consistent within any one NT book. The papyri and uncial MSS are automatically cited "wherever they provide data for a variant included in the apparatus."[2] A more limited selection of minuscule MSS is regularly cited, based upon their "significant degree of independence from the so-called Byzantine manuscript tradition."[3] An initial selection of MSS might therefore properly be made on the basis of regular citation in UBS[3]/Apocalypse.

---

[1]Nor would it be fair to scholars, to whom, e.g., the weight of MS *236* (copied in A.D. 1847) might be minimal (although the *quality of text* within a MS ought to be more important than the *date of copying*!).

[2]UBS[3], p. xi, stated specifically of the papyri but with application to the uncial evidence "because of their value in determining the text" (p. xv).

[3]UBS[3], p. xix. This although in the Apocalypse there is *no* real "Byzantine manuscript tradition" but only the competing Av and Q types of text (which would become a "Majority" tradition *only* when agreed).

The MSS Regularly Cited in UBS³/Apocalypse. Using only the Gregory-Aland numbers,[1] the following MSS (papyri, uncial, and minuscule) are regularly cited in the Apocalypse in UBS³:

P^{18} P^{24} P^{47} ℵ/01 A/02 C/03 P/025 046 051 052 0207 0229 1^{r} 88 94 104 1006 1611 1828 1854 1859 2020 2042 2053 2065 2073 2081 2138 2344 2432 2495.

Of these 31 MSS, six were unknown to Hoskier (P^{47} 0207 0229 2344 2432 2495) and four are so highly fragmentary (though collated by Hoskier) as to be of little value for the study of scribal habits (P^{18} P^{24} 051 052). The list is thus reduced to 21 MSS—a number still too large for detailed examination but a useful base from which to select. These MSS are now listed in ascending order of the number of singulars each possesses in order to obtain an overview of their data. The final projected number of singulars for each MS is given in italics below that MS's Gregory-Aland and Hoskier numbers and the indication in Roman numerals of the century within which each MS was copied:

Greg.#	1859	2073	2138	2020	2081	104	P/025	94	1006
Hosk.#	219	169	246	38	179	7	P	18	215
Saec.	XIV	XIV	XI	XV	XI	XI	IX	XII	XI
#/Singulars	*4*	*5*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*9*	*14*	*14*	*15*

Greg.#	1828	1^{r}	88	2042	046	2053	1611	A/02	C/03	1854
Hosk.#	124	1	99	100	B	146	111	A	C	130
Saec.	XII	XII	XII	XIV	X	XIII	XII	V	V	XI
#/Singulars	*23*	*24*	*25*	*26*	*28*	*35*	*36*	*51*	*67*	*67*

Greg.#	2065	ℵ/01
Hosk.#	159	ℵ
Saec.	XV	IV
#/Singulars	*90*	*172*

[1]Conversion into Hoskier numbers can be made from Table 2 of this study, save for those MSS unknown or uncollated by Hoskier.

The MSS listed above fall into various categories (indicated by ‖) on either side of what might have been considered the "average" scribe with 10.5 median singulars. Taking the categories in order, the scribes of the above MSS may be characterized as (*a*) extremely careful; (*b*) more careful than average; (*c*) less careful than average; (*d*) careless; (*e*) overly careless; (*f*) extremely careless/editorial; (*g*) "wild" and editorial. It will be noted that the weighting on each side of the hypothetical "average" of 10.5 singulars is in imbalance (in the ratio of 6:15). This imbalance is perhaps due more to the editorial choice of MSS differing from the "Byzantine" type than any other factor. One will view with mixed emotion the fact that the great "Old Uncials" (ℵ, A, C) all fall into the latter two categories, those with the most singular readings. Although such says nothing about the *type* or *quality* of text each of these MSS contains, a general scribal carelessness and/or crass editorial activity is thereby hinted at. Such might seriously affect the testimony of these MSS in readings which could reflect the carelessness or editorial activity of their scribes.[1]

Since it is essential that a representative sample of MSS with diverse scribal habits be presented, certain guidelines for reduction of this 21 MS array became paramount: (*a*) at least *one* MS from each of the seven categories should be

[1]Even if most singular readings of the Old Uncials were itacistic or nonsensical, one would have to carefully examine such MSS to ensure that readings which may typify such errors were not accorded equal weight with other readings of those MSS. Caution and intelligence are the key.

examined; (*b*) each of the Old Uncials should be examined due to their significance throughout the NT; (*c*) a *real* attempt to understand individual scribal habits must be made.

Especially due to the last of these guidelines, the following examination necessarily must be weighted toward those MSS with a larger number of singular readings. One may thus object that those MSS with few singular readings are being "shortchanged"; but such in fact is a testimony to the *carefulness* and *accuracy* of such "good" scribes when carrying out their appointed task! It thus becomes one of the strangest paradoxes of scribal research that the MSS *least* able to be characterized are those which are the *more typical* of actual scribal practice, whereas those MSS which are *most readily* characterized regarding scribal habits are those which in fact are the *least typical*![1]

In this light, Colwell's study of the three early papyri with their numerous singular readings[2] may now be recognized as a study of *atypical* MSS or of MSS typical only of one early period in Egypt rather than of the MSS normally to be found across the broad range of evidence.[3] It *may* be the case that care in copying increased (proportionately) as

---

[1]Obviously a median-type MS with, say, 15 singulars or less is simply *incapable* of classification as to "characteristic habits" of its scribe; too few cases of such occur. On the other end of the spectrum, however, *abundant* evidence exists whereby to characterize the scribe! Thus the paradox.

[2]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 109, claims 1,649 singular readings divided thus among the early papyri: $P^{66} = 482$; $P^{45} = 275$; $P^{75} = 257$, "plus 635 itacisms" unequally divided among the three papyri.

[3]Colwell of course did not realize his selected papyri might be atypical since no previous study of scribal habits then existed.

time went on and as better opportunities for copying were provided through monasteries and scriptoria.[1]

Following the preceding guidelines, the following MSS were selected for fuller examination. Each MS selected contains other NT books beside the Apocalypse and some are regularly cited by UBS[3] elsewhere in the NT:[2]

MSS to be examined (Gregory-Aland numbers) in increasing order of number of singular readings: 1859, 104, P/025, 1006, 1828, 1611, A/02, C/03, 1854, ℵ/01.

Guidelines for Manuscript Evaluation. One could not attempt to explain every singular reading of each of these MSS. Although such easily can be done for those MSS with few singulars, those with a high number of singulars are far too "heavy" in this regard for individual reading evaluation. Therefore, a summary evaluation will often be presented concerning such a MS's scribal habits similar to Colwell's treatment of the three early papyri.[3] Striking readings will be discussed more frequently than those which actually "characterize" the individual scribe (the latter will be handled

---

[1]As the date of copying becomes more recent, fewer MSS fall into the "careless - wild" divisions (cf. the performance of Hosk. MSS *E*, *F*, and *P* over against that of the Old Uncials; then compare the latter with the minuscules). This point is significant since it is virtually certain that "most significant variants existed by the end of the second century" (Pickering, *Identity*, p. 108 [= *Identity: Revised*, p. 114]). Most scribal variants thus appear to have been created during a period of *great scribal carelessness* as well as *great scribal freedom*, two factors which became increasingly restricted as time wore on. Perhaps one should thus exercise greater caution when evaluating the testimony of the early papyri and Old Uncials than might be needed when examining the minuscules.

[2]Namely, MSS ℵ, A, C, P/025, 88 and 104. MS 88 was not selected for detailed examination because it is so heavily projected that its data would be almost meaningless.

[3]Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," pp. 110-112, 116-118.

in summary fashion). Cases of deliberate editorial activity will be given a greater proportion of space in the following discussion, since these are significant for understanding a scribe's manner of handling the text before him. The MSS will be examined in the ascending order of singulars given on the preceding page, progressing from the "extremely careful" to the "wild and editorial" scribes. The discussion will be proportioned to the number of singulars in each MS, insofar as such is possible.

(1) Greg. 1859/Hosk. 219: An "Extremely Careful" Scribe

With only four singular readings—well below the median of 10.5—it is evident that this scribe was quite careful. Hoskier himself remarked on this head that

> . . . the handwriting is rough and somewhat crude, but the scribe does not make many blunders. . . . A pretty good record, especially when an unusual type of text [Hoskier's "Group 61" of the "Coptic" family] is being copied.[1]

Examination of the four singular readings[2] suggests that the scribe's one real weakness was "hom.", for in three of the four singulars "hom." was clearly (or likely) in operation: (a) In 7:8, the final clause of the twelvefold repetition is omitted by "hom." (b) In 7:16, three words are transposed within an 11-word clause, with the resultant reading less satisfactory than the common text. "Hom." of ετι ∩ ετι

---

[1]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:697-698. According to the colophon, the scribe of this MS was the 14th-century monk Nicholas (cf. II:649).

[2]Here and in the remainder of this chapter the singular readings pertaining to each MS will not be reduplicated. The full listing of all singular readings within the sample base chapters of this study appears in Table 6 below and should be consulted simultaneously with the reading of this chapter.

must have caused the initial disruption, but the scribe caught the error after finishing the clause and there re-inserted the omitted words. He then placed (*teste* Hoskier) β and α over the central words of each clause as an instruction to later users of the MS to re-adjust the text into "proper" order.[1] (c) In 22:19, the omission of τησ αγιασ appears to be the result of "hom." (-ς τ-∩-ς τ-) since deliberate omission would serve no real purpose.

The remaining singular reading in 22:21 is actually the predecessor's *colophon* which has been erroneously copied into the text. MS *219* has its own colophon,[2] which indicates that the in-text colophon was *already* in MS *219*'s exemplar as a part of the text (this in light of the present scribe's utter carefulness), i.e., such represents a "second-generation" colophon unintentionally transmitted by otherwise careful scribes through one or possibly two copying generations.[3]

Thus MS *219* reflects very careful work on the part of its scribe: a remarkable workman with only a slight tendency to err through "hom."—one of *many* careful copyists of the Apocalypse.[4]

(2) Greg. 104/Hosk. 7: An "Average +" Scribe

The scribe of this MS has created but nine singular readings within the sample base chapters (just below the

---

[1]It is noteworthy that two other MSS (Hosk. *109* and *200*) also omit ετι ∩ ετι by "hom." but without any correction.

[2]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, II:649, gives this colophon in full.

[3]To go beyond more than two copying generations without correction would be highly unusual when the cause of such error is obvious.

[4]Table 5 lists 73 MSS which possess four or less singulars, of

median) and can thus be characterized as *slightly* better than average, but not as extremely diligent as the scribe of the preceding MS. MS 7 (as Greg. 104) should be familiar to users of UBS[3] since it is therein cited regularly from Acts - Jude.[1] Assuming that the same scribe was responsible for all portions of this MS,[2] the scribal habits determined for the Apocalypse properly may be carried over to the other NT books contained therein. Present data thus may aid in the evaluation of its readings in variant units elsewhere in UBS[3] where MS 7 (104) is cited.[3]

The besetting fault of this scribe appears to be itacism. The following itacistic interchanges are found among his nine singular readings:

η for ι (3:2) η for ει (20:6)
ι for η (15:6) ι for ει (17:6)
ω for ο (10:4; 17:6; 20:4; 22:1)

As might be expected, most of these instances result in nonsense. Mispronunciation seems more to blame than either orthography or deliberate alteration.[4] Such itacism occurs

---

which 63 remain after projection. One may thus approximate 28% of *all* Apocalypse scribes as being of the "extremely careful" variety!

[1]The UBS[3], p. xix, states that the Apocalypse of this MS is regularly cited. Such does not appear to be the case. Yet, had the editors *not* intended to cite this MS in the Apocalypse, such should have been specifically noted (cf. the treatment of MS Greg. 181, pp. xix, xxi). Nevertheless, discussion of MS 7 is here included due to its importance (as Greg. 104) elsewhere in UBS[3].

[2]Hoskier normally mentions changes of hands within a MS, whether in the Apocalypse or elsewhere. Hoskier's silence in this regard concerning this MS allows one to assume only one scribe copied the entire MS.

[3]I.e., to *reduce* the value of its testimony in variants which may have arisen due to scribal causes demonstrated by this study.

[4]Error through mispronunciation easily could occur within the four basic steps of the copying process; cf. Metzger, *Text*, p.16. Four of the

commonly in various degrees of severity according to the scribe. Such *may* reflect the amount of literacy/learning possessed by the scribe more than any other factor.[1] By such a standard, both the present scribe and that of the preceding MS would appear to be quite literate.

The two non-itacistic readings which remain are of a mixed variety. In 3:15 a word ending is altered from -ν to -ς due to attraction from the word immediately preceding and the two words following.[2] In 20:3 δει is omitted either through haplography (but not "hom.") or deliberate choice.[3] In none of the singular readings, however, can intentional change be proven. The general care and accuracy of this scribe seems to suggest accidental error in each instance.

(3) Greg. P(025)/Hosk. P: An "Average -" Scribe

This MS is regularly cited in UBS[3] from Acts through the Apocalypse. In the absence of contrary evidence, it once more may be assumed that the same scribe copied the other NT books

---

itatistic changes produce "real" word forms but nonsense (or extremely strained "sense") in context. E.g., in 20:6 the change from εχει to εχη (if taken as a deliberate alteration from the indicative to the subjunctive) produces a sense difficult to construe. In such cases it is far easier to suppose itacism than deliberate alteration.

[1]Cf. Hosk. MS *15* (Greg. 2087), which holds 8th place among *unprojected* MSS with 68 singulars but *1st* place in projection with the astonishing total of *567* singulars! Yet this fragmentary MS (containing only 3:3-4:8) shows little or no signs of deliberate editing (in contrast with most other high-total scribes). Rather, the scribe is patently *illiterate*, making the "best" attempt he can to copy the text correctly (perhaps from dictation?), for nearly every singular reading he creates is a misspelling or itacism! Yet this is the *only* "atypical" scribe to be found among the high-total MSS: all others seem to *edit* as much or more than they *err*.

[2]The "real" word οφελος is formed, but the context is strained.

[3]If deliberate, the final clause *must* be directly connected with the preceding sentence. The "sense" thus made is no better than that found in the common text (which makes deliberate alteration unlikely).

in this MS and that his scribal habits as demonstrated in the Apocalypse will carry over into the other portions copied by him. Note that this 9th-century MS is the first *uncial* to be examined in this chapter.

With only 12 (projected to 14) singulars, this scribe also characterizes himself as generally careful, though a little less so than the median scribe might be. The detailed examination of his singular readings bears this out: *none* appear to be the result of deliberate alteration. His erroneous habits may thus be characterized as follows:

Itacism. The following cases of itacism occur:[1]

ει for η (3:3)	ει for ι (7:12)	ι for η (12:15)
ο for ω (7:9)	ω for ο (3:4; 12:15; 22:4)	

Phonetic Change. MS *P* reads -γκ- for -κκ- in 17:3, 4.

Dittography. Single-letter dittography occurs at 3:12, where -ν- is reduplicated. Single-word dittography occurs at 17:1, where τας is written twice.

Homoioteleuton. In 17:4 approximately 80 letters (3-4 lines) have been omitted by either *direct* "hom." of -ς ∩ -ς or by "phonetic/itacistic hom." of -ιτατς ∩ αυτης. However, since no other case of "hom." appears within the sample base chapters, such cannot be considered a "characteristic" habit of this scribe. In fact, the present case of "hom." *may* even

---

[1] Two cases produce "real" words but nonsense or difficulty in context. Also, in 3:12 ε for αι occurs and in 12:12 αι for ε; but these are equally shared with other MSS which possess slightly different spellings of the same words. Examination of MS *P*'s singulars outside the sample base chapters might establish whether this type of itacism is truly "characteristic" of MS *P* and not simply genealogically derived from other MSS.

derive from the *exemplar* of MS *P* rather than from *P* itself![1]

Apart from itacism and a slight tendency toward dittography MS *P*'s scribe appears to have been a careful workman, typical of the near-"average" scribe determined herein.[2]

(4) Greg. 1006/Hosk. 215: Another "Average -" Scribe

This MS represents a minuscule within the same category as that of the uncial MS *P* above. It was copied two centuries later than MS *P* but similarly reflects a near-"average" type of scribe. As with MS *P*, so with MS *215*: *unintentional* error accounts for nearly all the variants (though a greater number produce "sense" in context).[3] The following errors are found within MS *215*'s singular readings:

Itacism. Fewer itacistic errors appear than in the preceding MSS. One finds ει for η (10:7); ι for η (20:5); ο for εω (20:12); and υ for ο or α (22:14).

---

[1]The present "hom." error results in a "sensible" reading, with the description of the adornment of the woman continued apart from the "interruption" of the "cup" clause. Such is precisely the type of error in an exemplar which would *not* be caught, even by a careful scribe!

[2]One needs to comment on the spelling of ποταμοφορητον in 12:15. Eleven other MSS share five different spellings of this NT *hapax legomenon* (which is also rare in classical/secular usage; cf. Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, rev. and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie [Oxford: Clarendon, 1968]; and James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans rep. ed., 1972]). What is amazing is that the nearly 200 MSS which remain were able to spell this rare word *correctly*, with *no* variation! To have done so in the face of itatistic temptations and/or "better orthography" indicates the great amount of *care* taken by most scribes in copying—*accuracy* was more important than any other factor, it seems!

[3]While it is of course *possible* that any sensible reading *may* have been created deliberately, in the absence of *clear* editorial activity on the part of a scribe his innocence should be presumed. This because *accidental error* predominates by far over *intentional alteration*.

[4]This itacism results in a "sensible" reading, but cf. note 3 above. Again, accidental error within this category predominates.

Dittography occurs in 3:9 (ως ως) and 20:1 (-τατα-).

Homoioteleuton occurs in 17:1 (with a "sensible" result)[1] where "great" is omitted by -ης της ∩ -ης της.

Wrong Iota Adscript appears in 5:11 and 15:7 (ζωιων).[2]

Attraction to Similar Forms occurs twice: in 15:2 (from επι following) and 15:4 (where attraction from the beginning of the verse seems responsible for reading σε $\overline{\text{ΚΕ}}$ in place of ενωπιον σου—a reading likely accidental).[3]

Haplography (apart from "hom.") appears in 22:6, 15, where nonsense is produced by writing the article οἱ as ὁ preceding a plural word. A mere slip of the pen caused this.

There remain but two readings which *may* be intentional in origin: (1) The initial και of 3:1 is omitted. Such is not necessary to the sense and is anticipated by 2:1 (MT). Against this, however, is the fact that και remains the normal opening for each subsequent letter to the churches (cf. 2:8, 12, 18; 3:1, 7, 14). In every case but 3:1, MS *2175* retains the και, thereby arguing against deliberate alteration in 3:1. Perhaps και in the exemplar had been abbreviated (as is common) as ϛ, and was intended for later rubrication by the original scribe but was then missed during the process of rubrication?[4]

---

[1]If deliberate, attraction from 17:15, 16 might be the cause, since "great" is omitted there in the common text. But in light of this scribe's overall performance, such seems highly unlikely.

[2]N.B., iota *adscript* is not "wrong"; the use of such where even an iota *subscript* could not normally appear *is* an error.

[3]The awkwardness of the assimilated reading argues strongly for the accidental interpolation; the common reading is much "smoother."

[4]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:690, states that "the scribe is his own

(2) In 12:11 αυτου is written for the common text αυτων[2]. Such effectively transfers the meaning of the clause from "not loving *their* souls unto death" (those who overcame Satan) into "not loving *his* [Satan's] soul unto death." This appears to be quite logical in context and *may* have been deliberate, though in light of this scribe's remaining performance accident seems more likely.[1]

The evidence in the aggregate thus does not suggest deliberate motivation in the alterations of this MS. Most changes are certainly accidental, and those which *might* have been intentional each produces a reading less good than the original common text. This scribe is near-"average" and quite honest in the performance of his duty.

(5) Greg. 1828/Hosk. 124: A Somewhat Careless Scribe

Carelessness begins to show its face in the 18 singular readings of this MS (by projection, 23 singulars). Accompanying the increase in error one finds clear intentional variation for the first time in this chapter. This is of significance, for the scribe is beginning to become editor! Hoskier suggested that such might be the case:

> It is a MS. very easy to read, but difficult to date. . . . There are a few marginal corrections, *chiefly alternative readings, some by the scribe* or a contemporary, and others later.[2]

---

rubricator," and that "he has . . . missed some and then indicates the miss by a line . . . in the margin"—but *no* such line is mentioned at present!

[1]Had the exemplar written αυτων in suspension (αυτω^{-}), failure to note the suspension plus the close resemblance in minuscule script of ω and ου could have caused the variant (which would not easily have been caught by the scribe himself or a later corrector).

[2]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:424. Emphasis my own.

Itacism is almost totally absent in this MS,[1] but accidental error still predominates. The other common errors are well represented and may be illustrated by the following:

Dittography. A two-word phrase in 10:11 is written twice, hard upon an entire phrase in 10:10 that had been only partially ~~reduplicated~~ before being caught by the scribe (*solvere ambulando*). With only these two cases of dittography present within the sample base chapters, it well may have been the case that the scribe was interrupted or distracted at this point in his work rather than demonstrating "characteristic" habits.

Homoioteleuton occurs three times: (1) in 1:20, where -ων ∩ ων occurs (the letters involved appear in direct sequence); (2) in 3:18, where αγορασαι is omitted from "semi-hom." of σοι ∩ -σαι; and (3) in 12:9, where 10 words (40 letters or *ca.* 2 lines) are omitted due to εβληθη ∩ εβληθησαν. Thus a greatly varied tendency toward "hom." *is* present in this scribe.

Haplography (without "hom.") occurs in 1:11, where the final ς of ειϛ is omitted for no good reason.[2]

Attraction/Assimilation occurs in four places: (1) in 3:5, where the "more familiar" form βιβλιου is written for the rarer Apocalypse form βιβλου (MT);[3] (2) in 10:3, ελαλησαν is made to end in -σεν by attraction to εκραξεν preceding; (3) in

---

[1]Only an ω/ο interchange seems possible, and this only if the singular reading in 15:4 is an *intentional* change!

[2]Such haplography may also account for the unusual abbreviation of σρι for σωτηρια in 17:10 (where σρια normally would be expected).

[3]βιβλου occurs only twice in the Apocalypse while βιβλιου appears *ca.* 23x (allowing for a few textual variants). Note that in the other case of βιβλου (20:15), MS *124* reads with the common text, a clear indication that the reading of 3:5 was accidental.

12:15 ποταμον becomes -μος from the influence of ως which precedes; and (4) in 15:5 της becomes τος because of ναος preceding. Especially in the latter three cases a true "habit" is demonstrated of attraction and assimilation to the endings of preceding words. This is the first *consistent* habit to be observed in this scribe.

Confusion of Letters may have occurred in 17:9 where the scribe writes the nonsensical απανω for επ' αυτων of the common text.[1] Confusion of minuscule υ and ω coupled with mental metathesis of other letters may have wrought the false reading; or possible bungling of the variant επανω αυτων (found in but 2 MSS, neither of which is genealogically related to MS *124*) may have caused such to arise.

The accidental errors of this scribe are overshadowed by the amount of *intentional* alteration within his handiwork. Such may be classed under the following heads:

Protection of Orthodoxy. In 5:6 τα επτα πνευματα του θεου are "adjusted" into τα επτα πνευματα τα προς θεου — an alteration clearly designed to protect the doctrine of the Trinity! It is no surprise that the orthodox might alter the NT text for dogmatic reasons: the amazing thing is that such alteration was *not* widespread.[2]

---

[1]The closest sensible word related to this form is απανωθεν, found in the LXX 9x. However, neither απανωθεν nor επανω (if such be what the scribe intended) standing alone makes much sense in this passage.

[2]Within the entire variant unit at 5:6 there appears only one other case where orthodox considerations *may* have motivated scribal "adjustment": του θεου is omitted by two closely-related MSS (MSS *149* and *186*, close cousins *teste* Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:509). In such a passage of dogmatic difficulty it would seem more scribes might have altered the text.

Stylistic Change. In 3:1 the scribe demonstrates his familiarity with both the Av and Q textypes by semi-conflating their respective readings of ὅτι ζῃς and καὶ ζῃς into ὅ-καὶ ζῃς. Such knowledge of competing textype readings is a hallmark of the "editorial" scribe! In 3:3 a deliberate transposition to alter the emphasis occurs, viz., "Remember therefore *and keep* how you have received, and repent." In 10:4 the incongruity of an "extra" angel being inserted between the sixth and seventh angels has motivated the scribe to identify the angel of 10:1 as *the seventh angel*, who is not even prophesied until 10:7 and who does not even sound his trumpet until 11:15 ![1]

Verb Alteration. The alteration in 15:4 from προσκυνησουσιν (MT) into -σουσιν (by itacism for -σωσιν) may reflect a deliberate change to the subjunctive, allowing the uncertainty whether "all the nations" would actually worship God. Such a possibility of disobedience would tally well with the "judgment" clause which follows. Although -σουσιν may be the result of accidental haplography of a single letter (υ),[2] it yet is true that the scribe *did* alter an indicative into a subjunctive in 17:16 (*cum* 12 MSS) with correct orthography (-σωσιν) in that location.[3] Deliberate alteration thus remains an equal possibility in 15:4.

---

[1]Simple attraction from 10:7 could hardly explain this variant. It clearly did not arise from accident!

[2]Such did occur one other time within the sample base chapters (1:11), but at the *end* of a word. Cf. the mention of this instance on p. 96 above.

[3]MS *124* is there singular only in that a *corrector* has restored the Majority reading (as also in 15:4). But in 15:4, *no* other MS reads the subjunctive, whether correctly or misspelled!

Within MS *124* accidental error still predominates. Yet the clear introduction of intentional alteration which accompanies the increase in accidental error suggests a correspondence between the two which should be watched!

(6). Greg. 1611/Hosk. 111: A "Careful Editor"

Beginning with this 12th-century MS intentional change begins to predominate. Hoskier himself characterizes this "most interesting MS." as "clearly a critical one."[1] The "singular readings are exceedingly interesting," especially in light of the "carefulness and consistency of the scribe."[2] The number of singulars has now risen to 36, well above the median. The following accidental errors tend to predominate:

Itacism. Although Hoskier claims that "the scribe is almost entirely free from itacism,"[3] the following cases appear within the sample base chapters (some of these are doubtful considering the amount of editorial activity):

η for ε (20:15) ω for ο (7:1 [?], 9; 22:16 [?])
η for υ (22:2)[4]

Homoioteleuton occurs in 5:11, where two letters are omitted by ι∩ι, and in 10:6, where three words (14 letters) are lost through και τ-∩και τ-.

Orthographic Change of two types appears: (1) the frequent addition of movable ς on αχρι, but preceding a consonant (τ); and (2) The addition of Iota Adscript ("correctly," i.e. where today one would place an Iota Subscript) at 3:18

---

[1]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:362. [2]Ibid., I:356, 357. [3]Ibid., I:357.

[4]Hoskier notes (I:356) that 21:27-22:21 has been supplied by a later hand who *copied* the original scribe's work. Either scribe could here be to blame.

(twice); 7:11; and 15:3.

Transpositions occur in 3:18 (involving four words) and 12:5 (three words). The first of these may have arisen from initial omission by "semi-hom." of σοι ∩ -σαι followed by the immediate re-insertion of the omitted material. The second case admits of no easy explanation, but must be accidental as nothing is to be gained intentionally by the transposition. With no other cases of transposition within the sample base, accidental error seems responsible for these two instances; this especially in light of the great amount of editorial activity otherwise manifested by this scribe, to which attention will now be turned.

Stylistic Improvement. The various changes which fall under this head include (1) the addition of an article in 5:12;[1] (2) the addition of the conjunction και in 7:12;[2] (3) the omission of the conjunction άλλα in 17:12;[3] and (4) the amplification of the negative ουκ into ουδε in 20:4.[4] Alterations dealing with larger entities will be given separate treatment below.

Verb Changes occur in several places, two of which are

---

[1]MS *111* has added the article before *every* anarthrous noun in this verse (other MSS share the rest with MS *111*). It is remarkable that MS *111* was the *only* MS to be *fully* consistent in such additions!

[2]This was helped along by attraction to the six και's preceding.

[3]The scribe perhaps believed that *no* contrast is considered to be present in the te[illegible].

[4]Ουδε actually "fits better" within the series of negatives. That this change was deliberate and not mere attraction to the cases of ουδε which precede is evident from the fact that the και *ante* ουκ of the common text has also been lost.

noteworthy: (1) in 1:12 the aorist participle is changed into the present participle, perhaps to emphasize what John saw in the *process* of turning; (2) in 20:3 the verb form εβαλεν is amplified into ενεβαλεν — a verb which occurs but one other time in the NT![1] One here is faced with the strange anomaly of the *rarer* word being substituted for that which is more common,[2] a flagrant violation of one of the cardinal principles of textual restoration ("the more difficult reading is less likely to be original"). Should such practice be found to exist in any quantity, the handbooks might need to be rewritten on this point![3]

Elimination of a Semitism occurs in 1:14 where the scribe adds ἦν after κεφαλη so as to provide a "handle" for the predicate adjective λευκαι. Yet the addition in this place is puzzling: more preferable would have been its insertion either before or after λευκαι or even at the head of the sentence (ἦν δε η κεφαλη). This writer would suggest that the scribe was trying to "restore" an error in his exemplar: if the exemplar had dittographed the final η of κεφαλη, the nonsense thus produced might have caused the present scribe to suppose the final ν had been omitted from the "needed" linking verb (which otherwise did not appear in this sentence). Such a supposition might be reinforced if the dittographed κεφαλη η stood at the end of a line, where the ν would usually be suspended

[1]Εμβαλλω is *hapax legomenon* in Lk. 12:5. It is significant that both there and in Apoc. 20:3 the preposition εις follows.

[2]Such a practice will be seen elsewhere within this scribe's work.

[3]Other instances of this "violation of principle" will be noted throughout this paper.

thus: η¯. If the exemplar were faded or worn such an explanation would gain credence.[1] The Semitism thus was eliminated, but not (apparently) for stylistic reasons.

"Logical" Change at times seems to have occurred. In 17:15 εισι was changed to εκει, perhaps because the scribe could not accept the literal identification of the "many waters" with "peoples and nations." He therefore simply allowed the "peoples" to be "there" *at* the waters! Similarly, in 20:8 the "number" of Gog and Magog becomes the number of *Satan* (the referent in 20:7) by the addition of αυτου after αριθμος.

Major Alterations. Two cases of severe editing appear within this MS. (1) In 7:1 υιων Ισραηλ is altered into των Ισραηλιτων—but "Israelites" occurs *nowhere* else in the Apocalypse and "Israel" is by far the more common NT term![2] Once more the *more difficult* reading has been substituted for the *easier* reading, against the established canons of NT textual

---

[1]Other places within this MS suggest that its exemplar was either worn or faded at a place where an error occurred. For example, in 7:1 the reading επι δενδρων may have occurred due to haplography in the exemplar whereby τι was omitted by "hom." of ι^ι (4 MSS *do* thus err here!). The scribe of MS *111*, realizing that the resultant επι δενδρων read strangely, simply altered it to δενδρων, presuming itacism had occurred. He gave no thought to the possibility of "hom." since one does not look for what cannot be seen! Cf. with this the reading of MS *226*, επι των δενδρων—a further step along in the same problem!

Again cf. 20:3 where for και μετα ταυτα MS *111* reads μετα ταυτα δε. Note that the word δει follows immediately. Dittography may have occurred in the exemplar, producing (perhaps in unseparated uncials?) και μετα ταυτα δε δει. In such a case either the και or δε would be superfluous. The scribe thus opted to retain the δε and dispense with the και. Note that 4 MSS here read μετα δε ταυτα δει — likely another step on the same "restorative" path!

[2]"Israel" occurs 69x in the NT, 3x in the Apocalypse; "Israelites" occurs only 9x in the NT, five of these in Acts!

criticism![1] (2) In 5:13 a lengthy phrase is thrice "adjusted" so as to produce an encomium to the Lamb *from God* who sits upon the throne![2] This was not done without reason: a list of similar phrases in 5:12 is addressed *solely* to the *Lamb*; the scribe thus thought there was no reason to make God the Father the co-recipient of the same praises in 5:13. The text was thus adjusted both with a view toward stylistic consistency and with an orthodox exaltation of the person of Christ (at the expense of God the Father).

Although additional examples of deliberate editorializing by this scribe could be adduced, the instances already cited clearly indicate the degree of intentional alteration found herein as compared with the amount of unintentional error. That such changes were effected with "good intention" on the part of the scribe does not mitigate the fact that the text of the Apocalypse *has* seen corruption at his hand. One thus should be careful in making use of this MS in variants where editorial activity *may* have occurred. Ultimately ~~one~~ must conclude that opinions concerning the "usual" habits of scribes must be discarded or modified *as soon* as the scribe abandons his proper function for that of an "editor." In truth, "editorial" MSS may be the most difficult to utilize properly in all of NT textual criticism!

---

[1] Any attempt to argue an *accidental* cause of the error due to confusion of υιων with των and the subsequent "agreement alteration" to "Israelites" will not stand up against the simpler explanation based upon intentional alteration. Elaborately contrived "explanations" are always *weak*!

[2] The MT παντας ηκουσα λεγοντας, τω καθημενω επι του θρονου και τω αρνιω has been altered to read παντας ηκουσα, λεγοντος του καθημενου επι του θρονου, και τω αρνιω δοθησεται.

(7) Greg. A (02)/Hosk. A: A Less Careful Editor

With 51 singulars MS *A* represents a great leap from the 36 singulars of the preceding MS. Obviously the scribe of MS *A* was either quite careless or quite an editor, or a mixture of both. Although MS *A* is a very important MS, being one of the great "Old Uncials" from the 5th century and regularly cited in UBS[3] throughout the NT, no weight can be attached to its performance elsewhere in the NT on the basis of its scribal habits in the Apocalypse. According to Milne and Skeat the scribe who copied the Apocalypse copied no other NT book.[1] Yet it is possible that analysis of the Apocalypse scribe *may* offer some indication of the degree of scribal care exercised and the degree of editorial activity permitted in the scriptorium wherein it was produced.[2] Such a supposition of course cannot be tested in the present study, but a careful examination of MS *A*'s singular readings elsewhere in the NT contrasted and compared with the present findings would be a worthy project for future research.

The accidental errors of MS *A* fit into the usual pattern, though more such errors occur. The following predominate:

Itacism occurs less frequently than might have been expected. Most frequent is the substitution of ει for ι (8x),

[1]See the Appendix concerning the scribes of Codex Alexandrinus (*A*) in H. J. M. Milne and T. C. Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus* (London: The British Museum, 1938), p. 93.

[2]Like the other great "Old Uncials" MS *A* was certainly the product of a scriptorium, with a number of scribes contributing to its total content of LXX and NT plus apocryphal books of both the Old and New Testaments. The question thus arises: *if* the director(s) of a scriptorium *tolerated* a high degree of error and *permitted* high editorial activity

followed by ι for ει (2x). Single instances occur of ο for ω (22:16) and ω for ου (5:9). A few "sensible" readings also may have been caused by itacism, but this cannot be fully established in light of the amount of deliberate alteration.

Phonetic/Orthographic Variation occurs twice without question: γ for κ in 22:8 and τεσσαρες twice for -ρας in 7:1.

Homoioteleuton occurs frequently, though it is surprising that *no* cases of dittography appear within the sample base chapters. Some readings ostensibly produced by "hom." *are* sensible and may reflect editorial activity; such prevails even among the "most likely" cases here adduced. In 7:1, επι της γης is omitted[1] through ς∩ς; in 7:4 a six-word phrase (35 letters, *ca.* 2 lines) is omitted[2] by αυτων ∩-μενων; in 7:9 the "semi-hom." of ιδον∩ιδου has resulted in the loss[3] of και ιδου; and in 10:2 ανεωγμενον is lost[4] by -ον∩-ον. Only careful study can determine whether these were truly accidental.

Attraction/Assimilation occurs frequently, but the result is generally nonsense. Attraction to the ending of a word either preceding or following appears to have occurred in 1:1;[5] 7:1; 17:3; and 12:13. Nonsense assimilation to nearby forms

---

to "pass" the reading of the διορθωτης (if any) without correction (perhaps in the rush to get a MS "out"), of exactly *what* value is a MS produced under such license to NT textual criticism? How can one distinguish "real" readings of normal transmission from those produced editorially if a great number of MSS from the same scriptorium read alike in such places?

[1]Sensible but accidental, else why was "earth" not removed in 7:2,3?

[2]"Sensible" without damaging the context; easily overlooked.

[3]"Makes sense" and eliminates a Semitism! Deliberate?

[4]"Sensible," but if deliberate ανεωγμενον of 10:8 should have been omitted or modified (3 MSS *do* so omit in 10:8).

[5]The accidental attraction in 1:1 of τω δουλω to του δουλου from

seems to have occurred in 7:9 and 12:12.[1]

The preceding cases represent the most frequent types of accidental error in MS *A*. The intentional alterations far overshadow the occasional slips and may be illustrated thus:

General Stylistic Improvement. In 1:10 MS *A* adds the pronoun εγω for emphasis and in 22:8, 13, omits the definite article. In 12:7 τε has been added to reflect the "both/and" implication of the context, while in 12:12 an explanatory και has been inserted for a smoother reading. In none of these minor alterations was the change "necessary," but such was made to suit the scribe's stylistic pleasure.

"Logical" Change occurs sporadically. An *extreme* case of logic appears in 12:16 where the common text τον ποταμον is altered into το υδωρ. This because the previous verse did *not* say "a river" came out of the dragon's mouth but only "water *as* a river"! The scribe thus dutifully "corrects" his text to read "the water" rather than "the river."[2] In 3:10 the simple change from οτι to και subtly alters the context so as to render the love of 3:9 wholly independent from the "works" response of 3:10.[3] In 12:1 the notion of "being clothed with the sun" must have been uncomfortable to the scribe, who altered the text into "looking round about the

---

του αγγελου αυτου preceding (and αυτου following) appears more likely than a deliberate reading of "sent by the angel *of* his servant John"— unless an emphasis upon guardian angels was intended!

[1]Επι in 7:9 appears to have come from 7:10, but whence comes the αγαπην of 12:12? From ηγαπησαν in 12:11? Or from misreading γην?

[2]This cannot be mere attraction to υδωρ of 12:15; the inclusion of the article in 12:16 indicates deliberate connection.

[3]Four MSS read και οτι conflate, providing a *different* emphasis!

sun"[1] (περιβλεπομενη instead of περιβεβλημενη). In 20:4 perhaps confusion generated by the *hapax legomenon* πεπελεκισμενων ("beheaded") caused the scribe to "correct" the text into the more familiar form πεπολεμημενων ("having made war").[2] Such changes in the interests of logic and clarity reveal the depth to which an editorial scribe will go to "perfect" his product.

Substitution of Less Familiar Words. The same "violation" of text-critical principle demonstrated in the previous MS reappears in MS *A*: the *rarer* or *more difficult* word replaces the "easier" form in the common text.[3] In 17:15 MS *A* reads ειπεν for λεγει, seemingly a common substitution—but ειπεν otherwise occurs in the Apocalypse only 6x whereas λεγει is found *ca.* 90x! Was the scribe perhaps offended by the historical present?[4] Accidental attraction from ειπεν in 17:7 seems unlikely without the assimilation of ο αγγελος as well. The change must be deliberate, toward the *less common* form!

---

[1]It should be additionally noted that περιβλεπω, though perhaps more palatable to the scribe of MS *A*, is actually the *rarer* word, occurring only 7x in the NT, none of these in the Apocalypse. The verb περιβαλλω occurs 24x in the NT with 12x of these in the Apocalypse! What "ought to be" in textual criticism is not always the case!

[2]Here the scribe replaces a *rare* word (*hapax* in the NT) with one more familiar to the Apocalypse (πολεμεω occurs 6x in the Apocalypse and only in Jas. 4:2 besides). Later MSS might have been accused of a "Crusader mentality" had they initiated such a change; MS *A* merely "improves" the text.

[3]The rule giving preference to the "more difficult" reading needs to be reformulated: while such may apply to the "average" scribe's work, once a scribe becomes "editorial" in high degree *nothing* is beyond the realm of possibility and the "normal" canons of criticism can no longer apply across the board without careful examination of the variant involved.

[4]Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 867, notes that outside of Matthew, Mark, and John the historical present is "rare in the rest of the N.T." But cf. MS *A* in 1:12, where the change is made from the imperfect ελαλει to the historical present λαλει: was the initial ε dropped accidentally or did the scribe alter according to his fancy? The previous note's caution applies here too!

Similarly, in 22:8 the synonym προ is substituted for the common reading εμπροσθεν. But προ otherwise does not occur in the Apocalypse while εμπροσθεν appears 3x (both words occur 48x in the entire NT). In addition, the scribe of MS *A* has used προ to describe *place* rather than its normal use of describing *time*: this rare usage "occurs only in four [other] instances" in the NT![1] MS *A*'s scribe has seized upon a word otherwise foreign to the Apocalypse and opted for a rare use of that word as well: the established canons of NT textual critcism are ill-equipped to cope with such an anomaly![2]

Again, in 20:3 dissatisfaction with the reading επανω αυτου has resulted in the substitution of εμμενως αυτον. This editorial change amplifies the reading from "put a seal upon him" to "sealed him steadfast." But εμμενως is not a Biblical word (NT or LXX), nor does it appear in extra-biblical literature[3] (but επανω occurs twice in the Apocalypse and 18x in the rest of the NT, 16x of such in the Gospels). It appears that the scribe of MS *A* has simply coined a form appropriate to his

---

[1]Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 621. The four other cases are Ac. 12:6, 14; 14:13; and Jas. 5:9. Robertson further notes (to the benefit of the common reading) that "εμπροσθεν . . . is more common in this sense [i.e., of place] in the N.T."

[2]In both 22:8 and 19:10 the phrase "to fall εμπροσθεν the feet of the angel" occurs—but MS *A* reads correctly in 19:10! (MS *B* [046] in 19:10 reads ενωπιον for εμπροσθεν, substituting the more common word [36x in the Apocalypse] for the rarer [3x]). The fact that MS *A* is correct in 19:10 does not allow the assumption of accident in 22:8 but only that the scribe edited on a sporadic basis, as it suited him.

[3]Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, cite only εμμενης, εμμενεως as adverbial forms within the classical tradition—and such adverbial use there even appears rare. The related εμμενω occurs 3x in the NT outside the Apocalypse (Ac. 14:22; Gal. 3:10; and Heb. 8:9; also in the Alexandrian text at Ac. 28:30), but those occurrences are all *verbal* whereas MS *A*'s coined form is *adverbial*. Might MS *A* have intended εμμενεως but erred in the writing of such?

editorial purposes with little or no thought given to the integrity of the text as originally transmitted to him.[1]

Theologically-Motivated Variation. Several cases of alteration to suit specific theological purposes appear in MS *A*. Some of these are clearly designed to protect the orthodoxy then current, but others appear to reflect the peculiar views of either the scribe or scriptorium. In 1:13 ομοιον is altered into ομοιωμα, likely because the common text ("one *like* the Son of Man") might not necessarily be speaking of "*the* Son of Man"—which might cause Trinitarian doctrinal problems! The text is thus altered into "the [very] *likeness* of the Son of Man," perhaps with passages like Rom. 1:23 and Php. 2:7 in mind.[2]

The alteration of πρωτος into πρωτοτοκος in 1:17 (and 2:8) has already been discussed above, pp. 62-63. Although this change has already been attributed to (perhaps?) accidental causes, one should keep in mind that it was the *doctrinal* significance of πρωτοτοκος which subtly encouraged such a change!

The omission of the definite articles in 7:14 may reflect a particular exegesis of the passage. Instead of εκ της θλιψεως της μεγαλης the scribe has only εκ θλιψεως μεγαλης. The change *may* have been made solely to harmonize with the anarthrous form in 2:22 or perhaps because no previous "Great Tribulation" has been detailed in the text. However, in light of

---

[1] Cf. in this regard MS *A*'s singular κατηγωρ in 12:10 for the common text κατηγορος. Because this singular reading has been held authentic by most modern critics, the grammars and lexicons have been forced into the most unusual gyrations to "explain" what is obviously (to this writer) a scribally-coined word!

[2] Ομοιωμα (6x in NT) is also the *rarer* word (again!); the common reading of ομοιος is by far more familiar (47x in NT, 22x in the Apoc.).

then-current apocalyptic speculation, the scribe *may* have deliberately intended to eliminate the concept of a *definite* (seven-year?) "Great Tribulation" period which would precede the establishment of the millenial kingdom.[1]

In 22:18 MS *A* omits επ' αυτον with a theologically dramatic result. The common text applies the curse to him who dares "add to this book" by the threat of the plagues described therein coming "upon him." MS *A* by omitting these two words alters the text to mean addition by anyone will result in the *intensification* of the plagues therein *upon all*! How MS *A*'s scribe thus becomes an exception must remain a mystery.[2]

The final verse of the Apocalypse (22:21) is also singular in MS *A* and apparently created from theological motives. The entire verse in MS *A* reads as follows, with the singular portion commented upon below:[3]

Η ΧΑΡΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΚΥΡΙΟΥ ΙΗΣΟΥ ΜΕΤΑ ΠΑΝΤΩΝ.

---

[1]MS *A* was copied in the 5th century, the era of the "City of God," in which the millenium was considered already present. In such an atmosphere any concept of a "Great Tribulation" to occur *before* the millennium would be foreign. Modern dispensational extravagance on the same head similarly has reinforced those today who hold an amillennial viewpoint: it is easier to *reject* such notions than to deal seriously with such. Note that the "previous mention" of the "Great Tribulation" in John's mind may have been that in Matt. 24:21 which, though anarthrous, appears to refer to a period of time similar to that in Apoc. 7:14.

[2]Perhaps he thus intends to warn *other* editorially-minded scribes to perform only their proper function? Note that the parallel sin of taking words away from the text still results in MS *A* in the loss of *individual* rights concerning the Tree of Life!

[3]The uncial [redacted]ds are undivided in MS *A*. Note that the united Majority tradition (Av + Q) reads the last verse thus: Η χαρις του Κυριου Ιησου Χριστου μετα παντων των αγιων· αμην. *No* variant from the Majority tradition is supported by more than 20 MSS, and that peak is reached *only* regarding the omission of the final αμην! Cf. UBS[3], Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, and Hoskier's *Apocalypse* in loc. for a conspectus of the evidence.

While other differences from the common text in MS *A* are shared with a few other MSS,[1] the final words (μετα παντων) reflect the singular contribution of MS *A* in this verse. The resultant reading thus becomes universal in outlook, extending "the grace of the Lord Jesus" to "*all*"—not merely "all the saints" or "all of you (who are believers)," but to *all* mankind without apparent restriction!

Although this singular reading has been thought original by critics from Tischendorf through the Nestle[26]/UBS[3] editorial committees (though with a high degree of uncertainty),[2] strong objection has been made to such a decision by eclectic critics who (unlike the Majority Text school) otherwise might hold no brief against the mere *singularity* of this reading. J. M. Ross flatly states that MS *A*'s reading here is "plainly inconsistent with the style [and] character of the book."[3] Ross cites R. H. Charles on the same head:

> The Apocalypse cannot have ended with the words 'with all.' Such a grace would have been wholly at variance with the thought of the Seer. Only the saints or those seeking to be saints can receive such a grace. Hence the reading of A vg is simply defective. . . .

---

[1]In summary, Χριστου is omitted by 18 MSS (including ℵ); αμην is omitted by 20 MSS (not including ℵ), as mentioned above; and 11 MSS alter, add, or subtract from των αγιων. A number of other minor variants *not* found in the reading of MS *A* also occur within this verse but are neglected here as non-pertinent to the matter under discussion.

[2]The variant unit in UBS[3] has been given a "C" rating which indicates "a considerable degree of doubt" regarding its "originality" (UBS[3], p. xiii). On the other hand, Metzger's *Textual Commentary* in loc. does *not* appear to reflect the same degree of doubt (though such might be implicit).

[3]J. M. Ross, "The Ending of the Apocalypse," in *Studies in NT Language and Text* (Kilpatrick *Festschrift*), p. 340.

[4]R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John*, 2 vols. International Critical Commentary Series (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920 rep. ed., 1963), II:446 (quoted in Ross, p. 340). Charles

In light of the clear theological alteration present in MS *A* it becomes difficult to comprehend the reasoning of the UBS[3] Committee in their selection of what amounts to "the shortest reading" primarily "on the basis of the weight of codex Alexandrinus."[1] A different decision might have resulted had the "weight" allotted to such a MS been adjusted in proportion to the amount of clear editorial activity demonstrated therein.[2]

Another theologically-motivated change may appear in the omission of ημας in 5:9. The presence of ημας in the common text *could* allow the interpretation that *only* the 24 elders and the four living creatures were actually "redeemed . . . out of every tribe, tongue, people, and nation." If carried over into verse 10 the implication might be that *only* these 28 redeemed ones could be kings or priests—certainly a concept for concern within the 5th-century church![3] Truly the common reading with ημας present is the "more difficult" reading, and this has been recognized by modern critics who go counter to their usual principles in favoring MS *A*'s singular reading here.[4]

---

favors either the reading of MS ℵ or the Majority, but Ross champions another singular reading (that of Greg. 2329 = Hosk. 200) as original. Yet Ross' preferred reading is actually a *misquote* of Greg. 2329 in two serious places! Ross in fact favors (on the basis of internal evidence) a reading which appears in *no* Greek MS—though he is unaware of the fact!

[1]Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 769.

[2]Yet the UBS[3] Committe discounts the "weight" of the united Majority tradition because such "appears to be a conflation"! In light of the present evidence concerning the *rarity* of conflation, let alone the wholesale adoption of such by nearly all MSS, such a summary judgment is questionable.

[3]In verse 10 MS *A* omits singularly τω Θεω ημων, perhaps to eliminate the perceived distinction between an earthly and heavenly priesthood or kingship belonging to the 28 redeemed ones alone.

[4]This point is buried in Metzger's *Textual Commentary*, p. 738: "Those who made the [supposed] emendations [with ημας, i.e. *every* MS but *A*!] . . . *overlooked the unsuitability* of ἡμᾶς with [the Majority Text] αὐτούς in

Overall, MS *A* shows itself as a MS which has been heavily edited for both stylistic and theological purposes. Even its many accidental variants may reflect such an editing process, though this of course cannot be proven. The careful examination of MS *A*'s performance in the remainder of the NT should now be a prerequisite, even though different scribes were responsible for the other portions: the guiding hand of the scriptorium might be weightier than that of any scribe!

(8) Greg. C (04)/Hosk. C: A Careless Scribe/Careful Editor

This, the famous Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus, has fewer singular readings (35) than the preceding MS, but due to its fragmentary nature has been projected to a higher total of proportionate singular readings (67). This too is one of the highly-regarded "Old Uncial" MSS and is regularly cited by UBS^3 throughout the NT. The results herein obtained should thus be of significance when evaluating MS *C*'s testimony elsewhere in the NT.

Accidental variation and deliberate alteration seem to be about equally divided in this MS in contrast to MS *A*, where intentional change predominated. More pure nonsense appears

---

the following verse" [Emphasis mine]. One must ask whether the Byzantine-era scribes *were* thus so uncircumspect in their "addition" of ημας that *every* scribe but one was so "blinded." Also, the possibility that MS *A*'s reading *might* have come about accidentally is never mentioned, yet Hoskier (*Apocalypse*, II:155) notes that one column of MS *A* ends just before ημας and that the next column begins just after ημας. He therefore suggests that the word was "*perd. inter duas columnas*," which may be a reasonable explanation of the difficulty, though not fully acceptable (to this writer) in light of MS *A*'s singular omission of τω Θεω ημων in v. 10 (mentioned in the preceding note). The point to be stressed herein is that one must take into account *all* possible explanations concerning readings in a unit of variation, and not merely accept that which *seems* the most likely.

among the accidental variations as well. A summary of unintentional error follows.

Itacism. The following cases of itacism appear within the sample base chapters:

ι for ει (1:16; 3:8; 7:6; 10:2) αι for ε (15:4)
ει for ι (1:16; 10:2) ε for αι (3:12)
ε for ει (7:11) οι for υ (10:3)
ου for ω (15:2) ι for η/ε/ει (7:11)

Dittography occurs only in 3:7-8 where ουδεις is twice written ουδε εἷς (in undivided, unaccented uncials). That such was accidental is demonstrated by the appearance of the *correct* form in the first portion of 3:7.

Homoioteleuton occurs three times: (1) in 1:9 νησω is reduced to the nonsensical σω by 2-letter "hom." of η∩η; (2) in 10:1 the single letter ς is omitted where -ς σ- occurs (in undivided uncials = "hom." of C∩C); (3) in 15:2-3 a nine-word phrase (37-39 letters, *ca.* 2-3 lines) is omitted because of του θεου και[1]∩[2]. "Semi-hom." may have occurred in 10:2, where τον δεξιον was omitted (ου∩ον, perhaps made easier by a faint initial line on the N of the exemplar).[1]

Attraction to Nearby Forms may have occurred in 12:14 and 15:2 *if* simple itacism is not the cause. For example, the reading of εκαι for εκει in 12:14 *may* have been caused by attraction from καιρον which follows *or* by itacism.

Metathesis of Letters (if not due to itacism) may have

[1]The omission is "sensible" but not likely deliberate, else mention of the "*left* foot" would not have remained at the end of that verse. It is possible that true "hom." might have occurred had MS *C*'s exemplar read (by attraction) αυτου του δεξιου.

occurred in 1:16 and 10:2, where MS *C* twice writes χιρει for χειρι.

Pure Nonsense with no immediate cause appears frequently in this MS. Examples include (1) the omission of τ from τη in 10:2; (2) the addition of an initial ε to δαιρυον in 7:17; (3) the omission of δια[1] in 1:9; and (4) μη for μητε[2] in 7:1 (where only μητε fits stylistically). Such pure nonsense betrays a general carelessness on the part of MS *C*'s scribe.

Orthographic Changes include (1) reading τεσσερακοντα for τεσσαρακοντα in 7:4;[1] (2) the addition of a final ν to the indeclinable Μανασση in 7:6; (3) a similar change of ending in the case of Νεφθαλειμ (changed into -λειν) in the same verse (7:6); and (4) the change of εξελθον into -θαν in 15:6.

The following intentional types of variation occur:

Stylistic Improvement. This seems to have been the most frequent cause of intentional change. In 3:4 εαυτων is written for αυτων to produce a "better" reading; in 10:4 επτα[2] is omitted, being unnecessary to the sense; so too the omission of επι in 12:17.[2] In 15:8 αχρι is replaced by the stylistically "superior" αχρις ου. Such changes clearly indicate that the scribe of MS *C* had an eye toward the finer points of style and sought personally to "improve" that which he transmitted.

Logical or Explanatory Change is also frequent. In 1:3

---

[1]So too MS *C* in company with other MSS at 13:5; 14:1, 3; 21:17.

[2]The omission of επι in 12:17 may have been due to its construction with οργιζομαι since the only other NT transitive occurrence of this verb (Matt. 5:22) has no preposition accompanying it.

τουτους is added following λογους, a change which more clearly defines "the words of the prophecy" as "*these* words of the prophecy."[1] In 3:8 the finite verb ετηρησας is altered into a participle by omission of the intial ε (perhaps to stress the *continuing* state of "keeping" Christ's words?).[2]

Removal of a Difficulty, whether real or imagined, may have occasioned the omission of εν τη χειρι in 10:8. Instead of "take the opened book *in the hand of* the angel" MS *C* reads "take the opened book *from* the angel." While the common text poses no real problem, MS *C*'s alteration produces a "smoother" text. Similarly, in 12:14 και ημισυ καιρου was omitted, likely because of the difficulty in defining "half a time."[3]

A transposition occurs only in 12:15, where the phrase ινα αυτην ποταμοφορητον ποιηση is rendered less "difficult" by transferring ποιηση to the more "usual" position following ινα. No real change of emphasis results, so stylistic improvement seems to have been the reason for the alteration.

Amplification of a Verb Form occurs in 12:12, where σκηνουντες is compounded into κατασκηνουντες (a verb otherwise not found in the Apocalypse).[4] No real change in meaning results

---

[1]Cf. in this regard the 13 MSS which add ταυτης following προφητειας with a similar result ("the words of *this* prophecy").

[2]Yet cf. the nonsense variations concerning initial letters mentioned on the preceding page (in 7:17 and 10:2). Nevertheless, this present variant does not appear to be of the accidental variety.

[3]But then what is a "time"? Yet scribes seem to have had no difficulty with the expression apart from MS *C*. Could "semi-hom." of καιρους ∩ καιρου perhaps accounts for MS *C*'s reading?

[4]Κατασκηνοω occurs 4x elsewhere in the NT while σκηνοω occurs 4x in the Apocalypse and only once elsewhere in the NT (Jn. 1:14). The scribe once more has produced the *rarer* reading instead of the "easier" form!

beyond a basic intensification. It thus seems to stem from a stylistic preference for the compounded word rather than from any desire to alter the meaning.

Theological Alteration appears to have occurred only once within the sample base chapters, viz., the change in 12:11 from τον λογον της μαρτυριας into την μαρτυριαν *solus*. An explanation of this change may depend upon the 5th-century date of MS *C*: by that time μαρτυρια had gained the meaning of testimony through violent death. It was no longer so much the "word" of one's testimony that mattered but the willingness to offer one's life in such testimony. The final words of 12:11 ("and they loved not their soul unto death") provided reinforcement for such a view. MS *C* thus altered the early portion of the verse to read "and they overcame . . . through their μαρτυρια" rather than "through *the word of* their μαρτυρια"—clearly a theological change![1]

Intentional "Bumbling"? In two places the scribe's alterations produce contextual nonsense, yet the changes appear to have been the result of deliberate alteration rather than of accident. (1) In 12:4 εστηκεν is changed into the impossible form εστηκει. Was the scribe trying to "correct" the person of the verb into what he *thought* was the proper 3s form? No other reason seems as likely.[2]

---

[1] Hoskier, *Apocalypse* in loc., notes that the Bohairic version substitutes αιμα for λογον so as to read "the blood of martyrdom"! While attraction from "the blood of the Lamb" preceding might be argued, such appears less likely than that the cause of martyrdom was in view.

[2] In fact, simple attraction should have caused the ν to remain! Perhaps conversion into the historical present might have been intended, but the writing of such was "botched" by the ε already beginning the word.

(2) Similarly, in 12:10 Χριστου is altered into Κυριου, technically making Christ superior to the Father! Although a misreading of the *nomen sacrum* in the exemplar may have caused this change ($\overline{\text{XY}} \rightarrow \overline{\text{KY}}$), it is equally possible that the scribe of MS *C* deliberately desired to stress the Lordship of Christ but failed to notice the difficulty introduced into the context.[1]

Overall, MS *C* appears somewhat less inclined toward editorial activity than MS *A* but does possess much more accidental error than is found in MS *A*. Yet in either case the amount of editorial activity should cause concern and care when evaluating the readings of such MSS in variants where editorializing on their part may have taken place. The contrast is not between MSS *A* and *C* but between either of them with their high number of intentional singular readings and careless error and the "average" Greek NT MS with *ca.* 10-11 singulars, most of which latter are accidental! To this contrast future critics should turn their attention.

(9) Greg. 1854/Hosk. 130: An Extensive but "Sloppy" Editor

This 11th-century MS is characterized both by the amount of error it contains and the amount of deliberate editing performed by the scribe. Hoskier notes that

> . . . in nearly every other verse we have a new reading. . . . All, however, with exceedingly few exceptions, make perfectly good sense.[2]

---

[1]Cf. pp. 35-36 above, where the *accidental* case for MS *C* in 12:10 is stressed. Against any view of accident here is the fact that several MSS have variations in context at this precise point, created from widely disparate causes. But none is so wild as MS *250*, which reads αντιχριστου for the common text Χριστου!

[2]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:442.

Hoskier, however, believes that all the *sensible* singular readings of this MS derive from the scribe's *exemplar* while the *errors* are "due to the scribe's own infirmity."[1] Such an argument *e silentio* seems precarious without clear evidence. There simply is *no* easy explanation as to how a relatively "sloppy" scribe might have obtained a scribally "pure" MS which had been heavily edited and after copying such neither the errors of the "sloppy" scribe nor the emendations of the learned editor have left *any* further trace among the many Apocalypse MSS now extant!

It is far simpler to maintain the original thesis of this study, viz., that a singular reading is presumed to be the creation of that particular scribe *unless* there is *strong* evidence supporting the descent of *individual* singular readings (not all!) from a now-lost exemplar.[2] In the case of the present MS there appears little or no likelihood that Hoskier's strange amalgam has taken place; such is too problematic for practical purposes. One could claim the same for *any* MS at

---

[1]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:454, restated specifically in I:444, "His text . . . flows steadily along, and the stranger [sensible] readings show no sign whatever [!] of manipulation by him, but owe their origin exclusively [!] to the uncommon exemplar used." He even places the origin of such sensible readings back *two* copying generations, else the present scribe "would show some sign of hesitation" as he copied such unusual material (I:445)! Such statements indicate (to the present writer) both shallow reasoning and gratuitous assumption!

[2]The initial statement of this position was given on p. 2 of the present study. Such was Colwell's working thesis in his own study of singular readings ("Scribal Habits," p. 108). Colwell specifically stated that such an assumption "can be made *with confidence* in view of the wealth of manuscript attestation for the Greek New Testament" (Ibid.). While *some* such singular readings within any MS *may* have been copied from a predecessor, certainly not *all* nor even *most* would ever fit this pattern without finding perpetuation in one or more other MSS (and thus losing their singularity). Hoskier's thesis simply cannot stand, whether for this or *any* MS!

will, and one would then be reduced to the absurdity that *all* singular readings might be ancient (not only the "sensible" ones) and that *none* reflects the handiwork of the extant scribe! The present assumption will remain as before, therefore, and the 67 singulars of MS *130* will generally be considered peculiar to this one scribe.

As Hoskier noted, accidental error occurs nearly as frequently as intentional alteration. A representative sample of both these scribal habits follows.

Itacism. The scribe is remarkably free from itacism with only one case appearing within the sample base chapters. In 10:5 the scribe writes ι for ει. In the related category of phonetic variation the substitution of ο for α occurs in 5:13 with a nonsensical result.

Dittography is also rare in this MS: only the reduplication of ουπω in 17:2 occurs, with an apparent partial dittography in 17:5 (where αυτης is added after αυτης ονομα; but the resultant reading is "sensible").[1]

Homoioteleuton is the overly-besetting fault of this scribe. A good number of obvious cases of "hom." appear, as well as a number of variants which could either be intentional or caused by "hom.". In 3:18 -λλ- is reduced to -λ-; in 1:9 an omission of 19 words (*ca.* 72 letters or 3-4 lines) results from

[1] Perhaps the scribe caught his error in progress and resumed writing at the proper location, allowing the partial dittography to stand because it "made sense" (i.e., "on her forehead *her* name was written"). It is not likely that such a change would have been deliberate since the referent is clearly defined at the end of the verse—but in such a case one cannot always account for what a scribe might do!

"hom." of $\overline{\text{ΙΥ}}$ $\overline{\text{ΧΥ}}$∩$\overline{\text{ΙΥ}}$ $\overline{\text{ΧΥ}}$ or (following another variant possibility) εν $\overline{\text{ΙΥ}}$∩ εν $\overline{\text{ΙΥ}}$. In 3:10 the "sensible" reading resulting from the omission of οληϛ may have come about by -ηϛ∩-ηϛ or by deliberate excision of what may have been thought a pleonasm.[1] In 5:2 μεγαλη is omitted due to η∩η, while in 5:6 the final syllable of κερατα is omitted by α∩α. In 5:14 και προσεκυνησαν appears to have been dropped through "semi-hom." of -σον και∩-σαν και, producing the "sensible" but peculiar reading "and the elders fell down."

In 20:9 the scribe apparently noticed his error of "hom." and tried to patch it up as best he could. He seems to have skipped from την[1]∩[2], omitting four words (21 letters, 1 line).[2] While the resultant text was "sensible," the scribe (for once) caught his error and immediately "restored" the text by *adding* και την παρεμβολην *after* πολιν (the word to which he had skipped)! This attempt at "restoration" still left out the words των αγιων, producing the strange reading "and they encircled the city and the beloved camp." Yet this was *less* awkward than would have been "the beloved camp of the saints" had *full* restoration of the phrase been initiated!

In some cases, although "hom." might readily describe what may have happened, the resultant text seems so much like an edited product that it simply cannot be determined whether the

[1] Because of clear deliberate editorial activity in the very next clause, not to mention the possible editorial alteration at the beginning of this verse, the omission of οληϛ well may be deliberate!

[2] The "hom." may have been fuller, encompassing την π-∩ την π-.

omission was accidental or not. In 20:9 εκ του ουρανου is omitted, producing the sensible reading "and fire came down from God and devoured them." The omission may have been deliberate to remove the redundancy ("from God out of heaven") or may have been caused by "hom." of Θεου∩ουρανου — yet the required reading for "hom." to take place appears in only 7% of all known MSS! Mere *probability* therefore favors deliberate omission for editorial purposes.

A similar case appears in 5:9-10, where 17 words seem to have disappeared through "hom." of -ς τω Θεω ημ-[1]∩[2]. Yet the sensible reading which results seems designed to "prove" a point of great theological concern in the 11th century when this MS was copied, viz., "You [Christ] have sanctified to our God kings and priests, and they shall reign upon the earth"! Was the cause accidental, or was the text manipulated to provide a proof text for both the divine right of kings and the authority of the hierarchal priesthood?[1]

Although further examples of either nonsensical or "sensible" (perhaps deliberate) "hom." could be presented, it is hoped that the preceding examples will inform the reader of both the frequency and type (especially the ambiguity between accident and intent) of this variation in MS *130*.

Confusion of Uncial/Minuscule Letters. The scribe's exemplar (if only one) had to be either uncial or minuscule. Yet

---

[1]In the same place MS *200* has a similar omission clearly caused by "hom." But the emphasis of the resultant text (though near-nonsense) in that MS is in support of the priesthood of the believer (if anything)!

there are several errors which suggest that the scribe at times misread an uncial exemplar and at other times misread a minuscule exemplar! Since the numerous deliberate alterations found in this MS indicate the scribe was clearly an "editor," it is not impossible that he made use of more than one exemplar in preparing his "edition" of the Apocalypse.[1]

In 7:1 the scribe produces nonsense when he writes Ισραηλ in full for ινα. Yet if he misread the INA in an *uncial* exemplar as the *nomen sacrum* $\overline{\text{IHA}}$ (which confusion could occur easily if the lines were faint), the rise of MS *130*'s confused reading is easily explained. Similarly, in 20:6 εσονται has been altered into the nonsensical (in context) λεγονται. In the Majority Text the conjunction αλλ' precedes εσονται (but MS *130* reads the full form, αλλα).[2] If the MT be original, the undivided uncial text would read AΛΛΕCONTAI. With or without a possible dittographed Λ in the exemplar (to produce the nonsensical αλλ' λεσονται), the uncial C (= Σ) could easily be misread as a Γ if the lower portion of the letter were faint (i.e., Ϲ *sic*). These variations clearly suggest that either an uncial exemplar *was* used by this scribe *or* that these nonsense readings were already present in his exemplar (the *reverse* of Hoskier's thesis!). Yet the high degree of

---

[1]This theory possesses much more likelihood than Hoskier's contrived thesis (cf. p. 115 above). The "editorial" scribe *precisely* would be the one most suspect of using more than one codex to prepare his basic copy; such is radically different from the "normal" practice of *later* comparison and correction by a second exemplar!

[2]Two other MSS (ℵ and *146*) read the full form αλλα here. Such more likely reflects individual orthographic preference than what was contained in the exemplar. The present case is unaffected in either situation.

editorial activity, designed to produce a "better" text, should suggest that any nonsense in the exemplar would have been corrected. It thus appears more likely that any errors now present in MS *130* were the creation of this "editorial" scribe alone, for it is far easier to overlook one's own mistakes than those of others.

Error from misreading minuscule letters appears in 3:5 where the ending of περιβαλειται has been changed to -τω. Only in minuscule script can αι and ω be easily confused. Similarly, in 12:6 the scribe writes (*in pleno*) οκταηοσιας for διακοσιας. This changes the "1260 days" into "1860"—a number which conflicts with the "42 months" of 11:2 and 13:5. Such can only be attributed to a misreading of alphabetic numerals in the exemplar. The alphabetic form of "1260" is ασξ while that of 1860 is αωξ. Confusion of σ and ω could only occur among minuscule letters, particularly if the σ were attached to the α as would be normal.

Thus the scribe seems clearly to have used at least two exemplars in the preparation of his MS, adding and substituting therefrom as his editorial desires led. That he varied from one exemplar to the other is indicated by the occurrence of the uncial errors in chapters 7 and 20 and the minuscule errors in chapters 3 and 12. Further, it is evident that the scribe was familiar with varying textual traditions from different MSS because of his conflations and/or resolutions of such competing traditions (to be discussed shortly). It thus comes as no surprise that both an uncial and minuscule exemplar

may have been used as sources for this MS.

Attraction and Assimilation to nearby words is also frequent in this MS. In 3:10 ηγαπησας is substituted for ετηρησας. The change may have been deliberate if the scribe thought "you have *loved* the word of my patience" read better than the common reading "you have *kept* the word of my patience." However, the works-salvation atmosphere of the 11th century should have caused the Majority reading to remain. Thus, accidental assimilation to ηγαπησα occurring three words earlier (modified by the scribe as necessary) seems to best account for the present reading.[1]

In 3:17 ελεεινος is replaced with αληθινος, resulting in the strange commendation "you are truthful" in a list of *faults*! The term obviously was imported by attraction from verse 14 preceding (where it appears as an appellation of Christ).

In 5:2 the order of ισχυρον κηρυσσοντα is transposed,[2] but due to the influence of κηρυσσοντα now preceding the (re-)insertion of ισχυρον becomes corrupted into ισχυρα!

In 5:8 ειληφεν is substituted for ελαβεν, likely through attraction to ειληφεν in the preceding verse. However, this alteration may well be deliberate since a "smoother" reading is produced.[3]

Finally, in 15:2 the ending of κιθαρας is altered into

---

[1] Αγαπαω (o[illegible] more!) is the *rarer* word, occurring only 4x in the Apoc. while τηρεω occurs 11x therein. However, αγαπαω is far more frequent in the rest of the NT, and this may account for the change.

[2] Perhaps from "hom." caught and immediately corrected.

[3] I.e., it is more logical to read the same verb form concerning the same action. Note that MS *218* here makes the *reverse* substitution!

-αν due to εχουσαν which precedes. Deliberate alteration was not in view, unless the scribe ignorantly considered that the glass sea, being but one object, could only hold "one harp"! But such does not seem to fit the logic of this scribe.

These accidental errors, many of which *may* have in fact been intentional, pale into insignificance when compared with the equally numerous cases of intentional change. The scribe is clearly a major editor and his capabilities are remarkably demonstrated in the plethora of deliberate changes to be found in this MS. Examples of such changes now follow.

Conflation. Although it has been noted (pp. 64-67 above) that conflation of two or more competing textual traditions is a rare occurrence among MSS, the present scribe has conflated *thrice* within the sample base chapters—a higher frequency of such than appears in any other Apocalypse MS!

In 1:9 the Majority (66%) reading εν $\overline{\text{Χω}}$ $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ and the TR (27%) reading $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ $\overline{\text{Χυ}}$ have been conflated to produce εν $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ $\overline{\text{Χυ}}$—an unusual reading.[1] In 17:4 the scribe has conflated the reading of MSS *12* and *67* (πονηριας αυτης) with that found in 43% of all MSS (πορνειας της γης) to produce the hybrid πόνηριας της γης, a "smoother" reading.[2] Lastly, in 12:4 the scribe produces what might be termed a "non-conflation" in an attempt to resolve the conflicting Majority (οπως, 62%) and TR (οπου, 35%) traditions, substituting ινα in place of both readings. Such

---

[1]Such may have occurred in the wake of the "hom." which follows immediately (cf. p. 120 above) or, conversely, may have indirectly *caused* the following "hom."!

[2]Neither MS *12* nor MS *67* are considered related by Hoskier (*Apocalypse* I:8-11), while MS *130* is wholly "independent." Note that the MT

an alteration would *not* have occurred were the scribe unaware of the two competing textual traditions![1] Nevertheless, conflation still remains an *infrequent* phenomenon even in this "most-conflated" MS. Its presence clearly indicates the true intentions of the scribe.

Stylistic Improvement appears frequently and may be illustrated by the following examples: (1) in 1:13 three words have had their accusative endings in -ον altered into the nominative ending -ος. The verb "to be" is lacking, and the scribe honestly must have thought the nominative was intended, without thinking about the "difficulty" of the resultant reading.

(2) In 3:16 οτι is omitted to allow a *fact* rather than a *reason* to be stated (i.e., "*thus* you are lukewarm"). In the same verse the aorist infinitive εμεσαι (following μελλω) is replaced with the more usual[2] present infinitive εμεσειν.

(3) In 10:8 the feminine participle λαλουσα (modifying η φωνη) is altered into the masculine λαλουντος because the scribe wants the linkage with ο αγγελος to be unambiguous.[3]

(4) A similar transfer of referent occurs in 15:2, where the plural participle εχοντας is altered into the singular εχουσαν solely because the scribe "apparently would apply εχουσαν to θαλασσαν."[4]

---

reading here (54%) is πορνειας αυτης — as smooth as MS *130*'s conflation!

[1]The scribe thus declares for the reading οπως, but in a way which will no longer allow scribal confusion between two words which appear similar but differ greatly in meaning. Note that the MT οπως occurs nowhere else in the Apoc. while οπου occurs 8x.

[2]Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 857: "The aorist infinitive is rare with μέλλω."

[3]This is but *one* item taken from a 13-word alteration!

[4]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:452.

(5) In 15:4 the phrase ου μη φοβηθη σε is altered into σε μη φοβηθη. The transfer of σε is clearly for emphasis, and the omission of ου likely stemmed from a belief that the double negative was too strong in context.[1]

(6) In 17:8 although MS *130* already follows a minority textual tradition (16%) in reading και παρεστιν for the Majority reading (73%) και παρεσται, the scribe has chosen to explain and emphasize the expression by reading και οτι παρεστιν. Perhaps οτι occurring five words earlier may have helped the alteration along; however, accidental attraction seems out of the question.

(7) In 17:12 the nominative plural βασιλεις is altered into the alternate form βασιλειαι, likely to avoid possible confusion with the accusative plural βασιλεις which occurs later in the same verse. Thus, an unambiguous form was substituted.

(8) In 20:10 εβληθη is added following θηριον under partial influence from εβληθη in the first part of the verse. The present addition supplies the "missing" verb to the Semiticizing final clause ("where also the Beast and the False Prophet [are]") so as to read "where also the Beast *was cast* and the False Prophet."[2]

---

[1]Otherwise ου μη occurs frequently before the subjunctive (both in the Gospels [66x] and the Apocalypse [18x]); cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 1174. In such situations the result of the double negative is (as would be expected) a strengthening of the negation. The fact that not all persons known to the scribe actually "feared God" perhaps influenced his decision.

[2]Such also accounts for the addition of εβληθησαν in 2 MSS (accommodating their reading to the compound subject of the clause). But MS *130* elsewhere shows a concern with Semitic phraseology when parallelism is in question (to be discussed below).

(9) Finally, in 22:17 the indicative λεγουσιν is altered into the participle λεγουσαι, likely to make the invitation of the Spirit and the Bride continuative rather than static. The preceding stylistic changes are all typical of the performance of the scribe in this category of variation.

"Logical" Changes occur as frequently as those of stylistic alteration, although their candor is often startling. In 1:12 βλεπειν is altered into επι—and why not, for *how* could one "see" a voice? The scribe thus makes the simplest alteration which would remove the difficulty and has John turn "upon" (or "toward") the voice which he *heard*! The process continues in 1:17, where both the Av and Q traditions agree that "he placed his *right* hand upon me" is the correct text.[1] But such a statement must have grated against the scribe's logic since 1:16 clearly stated that "His *right* hand *held seven stars*"! It would thus be logically impossible for that same hand to have been placed upon John in the very next verse. By omitting δεξιαν from the text, the scribe allowed free reign to the *left* hand![2]

In 3:3 the present imperative μνημονευε is altered into the aorist imperative μνημονευσον to produce a more "logical" emphasis. Instead of "*continue* to remember" the scribe would

---

[1]Both traditions, however, differ on another matter: Av offers the fuller reading (την δεξιαν αὐτου χειρα) whereas Q omits the unnecessary χειρα. Av has 41% MS support while Q represents 55%.

[2]In omitting δεξιαν, the scribe of MS *130* was forced to transpose and/or alter his text to read την χειρα αυτου. It thus seems likely that MSS of *both* textual traditions were before him once again (cf. pp. 126-127 above).

read "*begin* to remember"[1]—an alteration more suited to the context. In 3:11 the singular ὃ is changed into the plural ὅσα, likely for the "obvious" reason that the Philadelphians have more than *one* good thing (cf. 3:8-9)! In 10:4 αυτα is added after γραφειν, likely to show that John was not writing his *own* words but *precisely* what "the seven thunders" had said. Such agrees with the implications of the statement by the heavenly voice in 10:4.[2]

In 10:5 ειδον (first person) is changed into ειδες (second person)[3] because the scribe wrongly assumed the quotation of the heavenly voice *continued* into verse 5. In 12:14 εις[1] is omitted to prevent "the desert" from being "the place" prepared for the woman to be "nourished" (such would be difficult in the desert wilderness).[4]

One of the most insightful "logical" changes made by this scribe occurs in 15:3, where Μωϋσεως becomes Μωϋση and την ωδην[2] is omitted. Such a change demonstrates sharp ingenuity on the part of the scribe. He must have examined the Song of Moses in the OT (Deut. 33) and could not locate therein the

---

[1]Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 855, for this distinction. Note also that MS *130* makes the *same* alteration in 2:5, along with 7 other MSS.

[2]In 10:4 the scribe singularly declares that the voice comes from the *seventh* heaven—a concept nowhere found in the NT! Common theological *folklore* is thus inserted to suit the topic (cf. *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* [1962], s.v. "Heaven," by T. H. Gaster, 2:552)!

[3]The scribe writes ιδες by itacism, but this is not unusual (18 MSS write ιδον for [redacted] common reading.

[4]Although the resultant text seems stilted ("that she might fly [over] the desert into her place"), the alteration is part of one grand editorial change. Cf. p. 126 above concerning the change from οπως (*vid.*) to ινα in the same verse!

words of Apoc. 15:3-4. He therefore alters the Apocalypse text to read "they sang the song *to* Moses"—removing the apparent contradiction![1] The omission of την ωδην[2] which follows allows Moses (in the alteration) to stand forth as a "servant of God *and of* the Lamb," in accord with orthodox Trinitarianism! In the same vein, δοξαση of 15:4 is replaced with θαυμαση to produce the "proper" parallelism, "Who shall not fear you, Lord, and *be amazed at* your Name?"[2]

In 17:18 της γης is altered into αυτης, allowing the woman to exercise rule "over *her* kings" rather than "over the kings *of the earth*"—perhaps to protect the "divine right" of kings from church interference? Finally, in 20:10 λιμνην is changed into καμινον for the "obvious" reason that a "*lake* of fire" is far more difficult to visualize (away from volcanic activity) than a "*furnace* of fire."[3]

---

[1]MSS *C*, *8*, and *84** omit the entire phrase "the song of Moses the servant of God" for likely the same reason. The Bohairic version (*teste* Hoskier) adjusts the text into "the song of the Lamb [sung] *with* Moses the servant of God"! A few other witnesses also alter the text here.

[2]Elsewhere MS *130* also emends in accord with Semitic syntax. In 12:10 βασιλεια becomes σωτηρια and η[2] (*ante* δυναμις) is omitted to produce the synthetic parallel, "Now has come salvation and power, even the *salvation* of our God and the dominion of His Christ." In 17:17 τας καρδιας is changed into την καρδιαν (with αυτων following) to "correctly" reflect Semitic idiom, e.g., Hebrew בִּלְבָּם (Cf. the Hebrew and LXX versions of Isa. 51:7; Ps. 37:15; 74:8; Ecc. 3:11; 9:3; Lev. 26:36; also the Majority reading of Jas. 3:14 in the NT [a strongly Semitic treatise!]).

[3]The same change is made in 19:20 (but *not* in 20:14, 15; 21:8). Perhaps attraction from Matt. 13:42, 50 may have caused this partial change *if* such reflects the [illegible]*ction read* on the day he copied chs. 19-20a or if the scribe were extremely well-read in the NT. Only in those Matthean verses does the phrase "furnace of fire" otherwise occur in the NT!

Alteration for Theological Purposes. A number of changes occur in this category in MS *130*, some designed not so much to "protect orthodoxy" as to satisfy the scribe's own views. In 3:10 the phrase πειρασαι τους κατοικουντας has been altered into κατωικουν [*sic*] πειρασαι τους ληστας (reading ". . . the world indwelt [?], to test *the robbers* upon the earth")! Such a change is "logical" since the same verse *exempts believers* from that hour (at least those in Philadelphia). The scribe thus resolves another apparent contradiction.

In 5:9 the phrase εσφαγης και ηγορασας has been altered and reduced to the single word ηγιασας. When coupled with the "apparent" case of "hom." which follows immediately,[1] the resultant reading effectively obliterates the concept of vicarious substitutionary atonement through the blood of Christ while elevating the authority of the priesthood! Perhaps Anselm's view of the atonement in conjunction with the efficacy of the Eucharist (as consecrated by the priesthood) had influenced the scribe of MS *130* to make such a change:[2] both the present scribe and Anselm were contemporaries of the 11th century. At any rate, it is clear that the text has been altered blatantly to reflect one particular theological viewpoint.

In 12:17 the omission of των λοιπων seems clearly editorial (although "hom." of τ∩τ *could* have occurred). Instead of

---

[1] Cf. p. 122 above, where the resultant English text is quoted in full. The "hom." there appears more and more *not* to be the result of accident but a part of one grand theological alteration!

[2] Cf. the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 1963 ed., s.v. "Anselm, Saint," by John Arthur Kemp: "Anselm . . . puts the essence of the redemption for the individual in his union with Christ in the Eucharist. . . ." (1:1026).

the dragon departing to make war with "the rest" of the woman's seed (the *singular* του σπερματος), he proceeds solely to make war with "her (*one*) seed," i.e., Christ![1] Additional stimulus for such a change may have come from the medieval identification of the woman of Apocalypse 12 with the Virgin Mary.[2] If there were in truth other *literal* children comprising "the rest of her seed," the dogma of Mary's perpetual virginity might be called into question! There thus was a good "theological" basis for MS *130*'s alteration—the only wonder is that no other scribe thought such a change to be necessary![3]

A final example of theological alteration is found in 20:4 where του Θεου is changed into αυτου, effectively transferring the referent from God the Father to Christ! The resultant reading, "through the testimony of Jesus and through *His* word," may reflect an intentional heightening of Christ's function as "revelator of the New Testament." Such would readily fit the medieval exaltation of the Person of Christ.[4]

---

[1]Paul's semantic concern over the singular "seed" in Gal. 3:16 here strikes home! Might MS *130*'s scribe have been influenced by Paul thus?

[2]For a summary history of this interpretative view see Raymond E. Brown et al., *Mary in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), pp. 235-239, especially footnote 512 on p. 235, wherein thirteen Fathers who held such a view are enumerated.

[3]Hippolytus, who *did* hold the woman to be Mary (cf. the previous note), altered his text (*teste* Hoskier) to read "the rest of *the saints*." The Ethiopian version reads "to make war with *the sons of* her seed," i.e., the *spiritual* sons of Christ, meaning *believers* in general. MS ℵ, however, goes to the other extreme and reads των επιλοιπων του σπερματος αυτης!

[4]The only accidental explanation for such a change would require "hom." in the *exemplar* of MS *130* of υ^υ in του Θεου (or $\overline{\text{Θυ}}$), producing the nonsense phrase τον λογον του. This the scribe of MS *130* might have "restored" to αυτου—but restoration to the *original* text would still have been more likely in light of NT usage! Thus, because of the *difficulty* in accepting the *accidental* explanation, a *deliberate change* becomes most likely!

Other Deliberate Alterations. The present section illustrates readings of various classes not previously mentioned. In 3:2 the scribe writes στησον (a more common root word) for στηρισον, changing the command from "strengthen" to "make stand the things which remain." Perhaps the scribe supposed an error to exist in his exemplar since στηριζω occurs only here in the Apocalypse (12x in the NT), while ιστημι occurs 21x in the Apocalypse (*ca.* 150x in the NT), and is thus the word more to be "expected." Certainly the similar appearance of the respective imperatives of each root contributed to this change.[1]

Correction of a *real* error in his exemplar appears to have occurred in 15:6-7. MS *130* omits the lengthy passage εκ του ναου . . . τεσσαρων ζωων and fills the gap with the linking ἃς. The *only* explanation for such a change seems to be a "hom." existing in MS *130*'s exemplar of ε̲κ̲ ∩ ε̲δ̲ωκε (omitting 22 words or 103 letters, *ca.* 3-5 lines in a predecessor). Such an accidental omission would have resulted in nonsense, and (rather than compare with a second exemplar) this editorial scribe easily saw that the difficulty could be patched by the addition of ἃς. The text thus emended read, "And the seven angels having the seven plagues went forth, *which* (plagues) he gave to the seven angels . . . ." Unless the scribe had some reservations about angelic clothing, no other explanation for so omitting a long section of text and patching the break seems likely.

---

[1]Simple non-"hom." haplography of -ρι- also could have effected the change accidentally. Such an error likely would not be caught later on.

In 7:12 the order of "blessing and glory" is reversed, perhaps to harmonize with the order of those two terms in 5:12 (but cf. 5:13!). However, this transposition also may have occurred due to "hom." of η ∩ η, caught and corrected at once.

Finally, in 7:1 επι τας becomes εις *solus*. The change *must* have been deliberate, yet the resultant reading is *far* more difficult than the common text!—"Four angels standing *into* (the) four corners of the earth"? Perhaps the scribe intended the idea "*sent into* (the) four corners of the earth, there to *stand*." At any rate, the scribe has created a reading otherwise not to have been expected!

Overall, the scribe of MS *130* is shown to be quite an editor: of the same caliber as the scribe of MS *A* but far more careless in personal copying quality. Had this scribe been less concerned with "improving" the text his utterly careless errors might have been fewer. As it is, the combination of flagrant error and extensive editing in this MS should urge great caution upon the critic who utilizes such in an "authoritative" sense—so too with *any* MS in which the phenomena of careless error and serious editorial revision by the scribe are present in any great degree!

(10) Greg. ℵ(01)/Hosk. ℵ: An "Editor" To Be Reckoned With

The final MS to be examined in this chapter is the famous fourth-century Codex Sinaiticus discovered by Tischendorf in the last century. The weight accorded this MS by contemporary NT textual criticism[1] makes the study of its scribal habits of

[1]Second only to the Codex Vaticanus (Greg. B/03, not extant in the Apocalypse).

more than general interest. The fact that MS ℵ possesses 172 singular readings within the sample base chapters—nearly three times as many as the preceding MS *130*—indicates either an overly-careless scribe, an editor of great proportion, or a combination of both in high degree.[1] It thus becomes incumbent upon the present research to examine carefully the *entire* situation surrounding the text and scribes of this important MS in order to assess its peculiarities properly.

A careful study of the different types of handwriting found in Codex Sinaiticus was made in 1938 by Milne and Skeat.[2] They did not examine singular readings *per se* but were primarily concerned with determining how many scribes worked on the original MS in both its LXX and NT portions (including the apocryphal books found in both testaments of MS ℵ), along with the number of correctors which had adjusted the text at various times throughout history. Certain of their data have significance for the present study and may now be summarized:[3]

In the Apocalypse *two* scribes produced the original text of MS ℵ; Milne and Skeat label these scribes "A" and "D." The "D" scribe began the work on the Apocalypse but only completed 1:1-5^{a}, ceasing his work after copying νεκρων in 1:5. The re-

---

[1]Cf. Table 5 of this study. Among the raw (unprojected) totals MS ℵ stands in the *second-highest* place. Even after projection of all other MSS, MS ℵ remains in the *fourth-highest* place! Surely *something* was at work to cause such!

[2]Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of Sinaiticus*, op. cit.

[3]The information presented herein has been gathered from Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of Sinaiticus*, pp. 94-112 ("Table of Concordance") and pp. 40-50 (correctors of MS ℵ).

mainder of the book (1:5^{b}-22:21) was executed by Scribe "A." These same two scribes were responsible for the *entire* NT in MS ℵ, and their respective contributions may be outlined thus:

Scribe "A" copied Matt. 1:1-16:9; 18:12-24:34; 26:7-end.
Mark 1:1-14:54.
Luke 1:56-end.
Acts - Colossians (entire).
1 Thess. 1:1-2:14.
2 Thess. - Titus (entire).
Heb. 1:1-4:15; 8:1-end.
James - Jude (entire).
Apoc. 1:5^{b}-end.

Scribe "D" copied Matt. 16:9-18:12; 24:36-26:6.[1]
Mark 14:54-end.
Luke 1:1-56.
1 Thess. 2:14-end.
Heb. 4:16-8:1.
Apoc. 1:1-5^{a}.

It will be noted that in no case was Scribe "D" responsible for any *entire* NT book nor, indeed, for more than a modicum of the whole NT. Since Scribe "A" thus was responsible for both the bulk of the Apocalypse as well as the NT, the results obtained herein concerning his scribal habits should carry over readily into the other portions of the NT that he copied.

Data concerning Scribe "D" is insufficient in the Apocalypse to allow characterization of his performance in any part of the NT copied by him.[2] Yet there remains one interesting

[1]The alert reader might notice that Matt. 24:35 is skipped in these listings. This is for the simple reason that MS ℵ* *omits* that verse! Such now appears to have been purely accidental, occasioned by the change of scribes (and the failure of Scribe "D" to begin properly!). Were this fact not in view, the omission might have been considered clearly deliberate!

[2]The present study shows only *five* singular readings within the Scribe "D" portion of 1:1-5^{a}. No categorization of this scribe's habits properly can be made from so little data.

fact noted by Milne and Skeat: the surprising information that Scribe "D" served as contemporary corrector (αντιβαλλων or διορθωτης) over those portions copied by Scribe "A" and vice versa![1] Thus, corrections by what is termed "א^{a}" in our critical apparatuses actually reflect the *alternate* primary scribe of MS א throughout the NT. Even so, the singular readings of Scribe "D" (whether as "א" or "א^{a}") in the Apocalypse simply are not numerous enough for characterization of his habits.[2] The singulars of Scribe "D" in Table 6 thus stand merely as a matter of interesting record.

The great textual authority ascribed to MS א beginning with its discovery and continuing to the present time has allowed various opinions of its scribal character to be made (considered *apart* from the *text* it otherwise transmits). Such opinions naturally vary according to the estimate made of the total value of this MS but still have much in common. Both Westcott and Hort and Burgon commented on this head in the last century. Opposite as they may have been, both sources contribute something toward an *expectation* of what should appear in the findings of the present study. Westcott and Hort characterized the scribe[3] of MS א as follows:

> [א is] a scribe of different character [than B]. . . . Omissions and repetitions of small groups of letters are rarely to be seen; but on the other hand all the ordinary lapses due to rapid and careless transcription are more

---

[1]Milne and Skeat, *Scribes and Correctors of Sinaiticus*, pp. 40-50. This fact holds good for the entire NT.

[2]Scribe "D" (as "א^{a}") is cited only 16x in the present study. Scribe "A" as "א^{a}" appears not at all singularly within 1:1-5^{a}.

[3]No distinction is made between Scribes "A" and "D," but this reference most certainly includes Scribe "A" who copied most of the NT in MS א.

> numerous, including substitutions of one word for another [Example cited from Apoc. 7:15]. Some of these substitutions have a kind of sense of their own which is out of all relation to the context [Examples follow]. *The singular readings are very numerous, especially in the Apocalypse*, and scarcely ever commend themselves on internal grounds. It can hardly be doubted that *many of them are individualisms of the scribe himself* . . . but some doubtless are older. . . . Many . . . are probably *of Alexandrian origin*. . . . The fact that Origen's name occasionally stands among the accessory authorities [i.e., Fathers and Versions] is a warning [?!] against hasty rejection [of MS ℵ's singulars].[1]
>
> [In the Apocalypse,] *evident individualisms* of the scribe, or of one of his immediate predecessors, *come forth in much greater luxuriance* than before [i.e., in the rest of the NT], as also they do in the Epistle of Barnabas which follows the Apocalypse in the same handwriting; this less scrupulous treatment of the text being perhaps connected with the ambiguous authority of the Apocalypse in the canonical lists of Cent. IV.[2]

Westcott and Hort further note that "orthographies apparently Alexandrian occur also in ℵ."[3] But such statements (including the "Alexandrian origin" quoted above) need to be taken cautiously in light of Westcott and Hort's view of the "neutral" quality of the B-ℵ consensus as opposed to their concept of a *separate* "Alexandrian text."[4]

Passing notice also is given Scribe "D" in his capacity of corrector. Favorable mention of his work is made thus:

> The "corrector" proper ($ℵ^a$) made use of an excellent exemplar, and the readings which he occasionally introduces take high rank as authorities.[5]

---

[1] Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," pp. 246-247. Emphasis in this and the following quote is my own.

[2] Ibid., p. 260. [3] Ibid., p. 265.

[4] Cf. ibid., pp. 129-132 for an overview of their distinction between the "neutral" and "Alexandrian" types of text (the term "neutral" was left uncapitalized as a deliberate propaganda devide to enhance the supposed "autograph" quality of the B-ℵ union). Today, B and ℵ *are* "Alexandrian"!

[5] Ibid., pp. 270-271. To this cf. Herman C. Hoskier, *Codex B and Its*

On the other extreme, Burgon vehemently declares MS ℵ to be "that most careless of careless transcripts,"[1] being

> [one] of the most corrupt copies in existence . . . [which] can be proved to be wrong time after time.[2]
>
> It is conspicuous for habitual carelessness or licence: it often by itself deviates into glaring errors.[3]

Although Burgon and Westcott/Hort would have differed sharply concerning the *quality of text* MS ℵ contains apart from its singular readings, their respective statements concerning the idiosyncracies of MS ℵ are in reality quite close.[4]

Burgon's views are echoed somewhat less intensely by his disciple Hoskier (who produced more than a dozen books and a larger number of scholarly articles concerning the NT text, both in Greek MSS and early versions). Hoskier writes thus concerning the scribal characteristics of MS ℵ (in contrast with other early MSS, especially MS B):

> The scribes of ℵ and B were men of entirely different character. That of ℵ [presumably Scribe "A"?] was a critic, and interested (too interested) in his work. He of B was quite uninterested in his work, and gives evidence of being a professional penman.[5]

Allies: A Study and an Indictment, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914), I:54 n., concerning Matt. 6:5 in which the Alexandrian and Western readings differ: "ℵ* [Scribe "A"] leaves out ουκ εσεσθε by mistake. ℵ^{a} [Scribe "D"] in correcting gives και οταν προσευχη ουκ εσεσθε (showing he knew both readings)." Thus ℵ^{a}/Scribe "D" most certainly *was* a critical editor, though the *quality* of his work may not necessarily have been as "excellent" as Westcott and Hort supposed.

[1]Burgon, *Causes of Corruption*, p. 38.

[2]Idem, *Traditional Text*, p. 25. [3]Ibid., p. 160.

[4]Whereas Westcott and Hort would have praised the quality of the remaining text of MS ℵ (especially when in agreement with B), Burgon would have condemned the same in favor of the unanimity of the mass of *all* MSS. That both groups of scholars agree concerning MS ℵ's singulars in general is but a recognition of hard fact.

[5]Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, I:396.

> It is clear that both ℵ and W [Codex Washingtonianus] were using some critical helps. Possibly some early Egyptian commentary.[1]
>
> The scribes of ℵB in their N.T. copying seem also to have been influenced by some O.T. phraseology which lingered in their minds.[2]
>
> It must have been the *scribes* of ℵ and B who took many of the liberties visible in their texts.[3]
>
> "The watchful scholars of Alexandria" . . . were far from being "watchful," but they did enjoy "niceties" even if not consistent in the application of them.[4]

Thus the scribal habits of MS ℵ are viewed from a different angle. Likely Westcott and Hort, Burgon, and Hoskier are all basically correct in their estimate of MS ℵ's singulars, despite their textual disagreements otherwise.[5]

One might think that the singularities of MS ℵ would pale into insignificance when compared with the presumed "high" quality of text it otherwise contains. Yet Hoskier strikes the proper note, echoing Burgon:

> The minute examination . . . of the idiosyncracies [singular readings] of ℵ and B, and the sides which they take in combination otherwise, *form the necessary foundation for any deductions which are to be drawn in certain other weighty matters.*[6]

---

[1] Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, I:400. [2] Ibid., I:246.

[3] Ibid., II:13 n. The emphasis is Hoskier's. As evidence of this contention Hoskier cites Matt. 7:25, 27, where B and ℵ differ over the spelling ηλθ̲αν/ηλθ̲ον in both places with the peculiarity that "within [these] three verses . . . they *reverse* their choices" (i.e., in Matt. 7:25 MS ℵ reads -θ̲ον but in 7:27 reads -θ̲αν; MS B, on the other hand, reads -θ̲αν in 7:25 but -θ̲ον in 7:27—the diametric opposite!). Such certainly occurred due to scribal lapses and not to textype readings!

[4] Ibid., I:387. The quoted phrase is from Westcott and Hort, *NT in Original Greek*, one-volume edition, p. 550 (cited wrongly by Hoskier as p. 549).

[5] Hoskier's own textual theories (cf. pp. 13-15 of the present study) were radically different from those of either Westcott and Hort or Burgon, despite his having been an understudy of Burgon and sharing a general antipathy toward the Alexandrian text.

[6] Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, I:407. The emphasis is Hoskier's.

> My point is that, unless you find out first whether P^{46} [or *any* MS] is a chronic bungler, *or not*, you cannot assess [certain readings of that MS] at anything like [their] true value.[1]

> Indeed Burgon's whole contention amounts to no more than this . . .: that the truth is to be recovered from the side-testimony of documents . . . , taking into account local and other influences at work on the actual scribes or editors. . . . In other words, . . . it is with *minutiae* we have to deal at the outset.[2]

> It is impossible to reconstruct a text without a thorough previous knowledge of the history, antecedents and morality of the witnesses.[3]

> The credibility and reliability of witnesses depends upon their character as ascertained by their habitual behaviour in ordinary life.[4]

> All this accumulation of variants . . . is the necessary prelude and the only scientific method of approach to an assessment of the value of the respective witnesses who appear in Court at the difficult places.[5]

Such was Hoskier's ongoing contention which, in effect, has been adopted as the thesis of this entire study.[6] There certainly is nothing unsound in such a view, as the preceding pages have amply demonstrated. But because the "very important" MS ℵ must now undergo scrutiny, more numerous objections might be expected to stem from those who would preserve the presumed weight of its testimony against any possibly "bad" results herein to be demonstrated. Certain of these objections therefore *must* be addressed.

(1) MS ℵ possesses more singular readings in the Apocalypse than elsewhere in the NT. Allowing this assertion of

---

[1]Herman C. Hoskier, *A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester Beatty Papyrus P^{46} (circa 200 A.D.)* (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938), p. 42. The emphasis is Hoskier's.

[2]Herman C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament (Gospels)*, 2 vols. (London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910-11), I:vii.

[3]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:xvi. [4]Ibid., I:xviii, n. [5]Ibid., I:xviii

[6]Cf. pp. 3-7 above, especially the views of Burgon, Hoskier's mentor.

Westcott and Hort[1] to be accurate, it nevertheless remains the case that (by their own admission) MS ℵ's "singular readings are very numerous" *throughout* the NT![2] Indeed, Hoskier has noted that "the general *character* of the B recension" (meaning the Alexandrian textype with MS ℵ a main component) "remains the same" throughout the NT.[3] Such a "character" is demonstrated most clearly within the *singular readings* of its leading MSS which reflect, according to Hoskier,

> . . . the same desire for individuality at the expense of truth, the same ideas of finessing, the same ideas of harmony, occasional bold excisions, and distinct version sympathy which is clearly *non-neutral*.[4]

A comparison of the number of singular readings of MS ℵ in the Gospels against those found in other leading "Old Uncials" was made by Burgon, whose partial results were included in his published works.[5] In a preliminary comparison, Burgon found that

> In the Gospels [as a whole] . . . B has 589 readings *quite peculiar to itself*, affecting 858 words,— ℵ has 1460 such Readings, affecting 2640 words.[6]

MS ℵ thus surpasses MS *B* (Vaticanus, Greg. 03) in singular readings in the Gospels by a factor of approximately 2.5 (or

---

[1]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," pp. 246, 260; quoted above, p. 138f.

[2]Ibid., p. 246. [3]Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, I:419.

[4]Ibid. Emphasis here and in the preceding note original. Hoskier's biassed opinion of the MSS representing the Alexandrian textype is shown in this quotation as well as his "versional-corruption" thesis. The user of Hoskier *must* discern the *underlying* truths contained within Hoskier's statements and not be misled or repulsed by his propaganda!

[5]John W. Burgon in *The Revision Revised* (London: John Murray, 1883), p. 337, speaks of having "laboriously collated" MSS ℵ, *A*, *B*, *C* and *D* "off and on" over an eight-year period. His data thus derives from *personal* knowledge of these MSS, certainly in comparison with *other* critical works!

[6]Ibid., p. 319. Emphasis original.

of 3.0 if the actual *words* involved are counted). Burgon then made a second comparison to underscore the point: where MSS ℵ, *A*, *B*, *C* and *D* "are collectively available" within the Gospels (i.e., all are extant over identical portions), the number of singular readings of each MS stands as follows:

MS ℵ has 443 singulars;
MS *A* has 133 singulars;
MS *B* has 197 singulars;
MS *C* has 170 singulars; and
MS *D* has 1829 singulars.[1]

Except for the "wild and nefarious" Codex Bezae (D, Greg. 05),[2] MS ℵ clearly possesses the largest number of singular readings among the great "Old Uncials" in their commonly-shared Gospel portions. Once again the number of singulars possessed by MS ℵ exceeds that of MS *B* (Vaticanus) by a factor of 2+! Such certainly tends to indicate that MS ℵ's scribal habits "remain the same" at least *proportionately* throughout the NT![3] In light of such findings, Burgon's declaration takes on added significance:

> One *solid fact* like the preceding [concerning the singulars of ℵ and B in the Gospels] . . . is more helpful by far to one who would form a correct estimate of

---

[1]Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 14.

[2]Cf. Frederick H. Scrivener, *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis: Being an Exact Copy* . . . (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978 rep.ed.[1864 original]), pp. xlv-lxiv, "On the Character of the Greek Text of Codex Bezae," where the clear editorial nature of this MS *via* "interpolation" (p. xlix) and "loose and explanatory paraphrase" (p. liv) well accounts for its multitude of singularities. Cf. also Metzger, *Text*, p. 50: "No known manuscript has so many and such remarkable variations from . . . the normal New Testament text." Codex Bezae is thus a *unique* specimen of editorial activity!

[3]Although Codex Vaticanus (*B*) is not extant in the Apocalypse, the comparison made by Burgon is sufficient to demonstrate that MS ℵ *does* have a proportionately greater number of singular readings than other uncial MSS of contemporary date and textual value.

> the value of a Codex, than any number of . . . "reckless and unverified assertions," not to say peremptory and baseless decrees.[1]

In summary, the reduced number of singular readings of MS ℵ outside the Apocalypse does *not* lessen its scribe's culpability in such places since MS ℵ still possesses *far* more singular readings in the other NT books than its "Old Uncial" contemporaries (Codex Bezae excepted). The results thus obtained for MS ℵ in the Apocalypse may therefore be carried over to the other NT books with only the smallest of necessary changes.

(2) The question of the canonicity of the Apocalypse has affected its transmission.[2] Such a fact cannot be denied. The canonical issue must have been a factor in the exclusion of Apocalypse readings from the Church Lectionary system, and the paucity of extant Apocalypse MSS certainly testifies to the diminished interest in ecclesiatical promulgation of that book.[3] Yet one fairly must ask whether lack of general canonicity necessarily results in the looser handling of a text. Westcott and Hort mention that the apocryphal NT book of Barnabas in MS ℵ possesses a similarly high incidence of singular

---

[1]Burgon, *The Revision Revised*, p. 319. The quoted statement reflects criticism of *Burgon's* first essay in that book (which originally appeared in the [London?] *Quarterly Review* of 1881-1882.

[2]Suggested by Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 260 (cf. p. 139 above where the relevant portion is quoted).

[3]Cf. *IDB*, s.v. "Canon of the NT," 1:520-532, especially p. 530 which treats of "the questioning of Revelation" by Dionysius of Alexandria (!) and the wavering views of Eusebius in the 4th century (when MS ℵ was copied), the period of great concern to Westcott and Hort. The fewer than 300 MSS of the Apocalypse today extant reflect a total *half* that known for the Pauline and Catholic Epistles and only *one-ninth* that known for Gospel MSS (the Lectionaries being excluded from this count).

readings,[1] yet no mention is made of MS ℵ's care or lack of such in copying the Shepherd of Hermas (which follows Barnabas)[2] although the evidence of singular errors should have sufficed for comparisons to have been drawn.[3]

Further, were it only canonicity which produced an excellent standard of copying, one would be entirely at a loss when trying to discern the "original" text of non-Biblical works. But such simply is *not* the case. Most scribes seem to have been faithful transmitters of what lay before them: this has become evident in the case of the MSS of the Apocalypse, and there is no reason to suspect such care would utterly degenerate once the Biblical arena was forsaken. Rather, since MS ℵ is seen to possess a *higher* incidence of singular readings *throughout the NT* than other contemporary NT MSS, it is not at all surprising to see this trend continue in the Apocalypse. There the competing Av and Q textypes may have contributed to the increase in MS ℵ's singular readings more than any other cause![4]

There was yet another "control" factor which prevented "non-canonical carelessness": Hoskier has noted that the MSS

---

[1]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 260 (quoted above, p. 139).

[2]According to Metzger, *Text*, p. 44, prior to Tischendorf's discovery of MS ℵ the Shepherd of Hermas had "hitherto [been] known only by title." Westcott and Hort thus were severely limited in their analysis of this work.

[3]I.e., should the number of pure scribal *errors* approximate those of the Apocalypse, the otherwise undiscernible editorial alterations *might* be assumed to be present in a proportionate manner. The question is whether the Shepherd was well copied (and left unmentioned by Westcott and Hort) or whether they simply did not examine the scribe's handiwork in that book.

[4]The scribe of MS ℵ may have formulated his editorial task as a retention of the "best" of both textypes augmented by his own deliberate deviations from either or both in the interests of textual "improvement." Such would naturally tend to increase the number of singular readings!

of the Apocalypse reflect two *separate* streams of transmission which bear *no* relation to the Av or Q textypes. The division into these streams revolved directly around the question of canonicity:

> Before official acceptance of the Apocalypse into the Canon . . . , especially by those in the East, it circulated freely from the earliest times among mystical writings, and we find it outside the N.T. included in Collections of Miscellanies, which embrace the writings of authors dealing with the occult, like Psellus, *etc.*
>
> Herein is a great gain for us. We have therefore *two* streams of testimony for the text of this book, and they never coalesce, but at Athos today side by side we will find the Church standards and the independent texts (in Collections of Miscellanies) [having been] copied and re-copied independently.[1]
>
> This,—our gain—, is not shared by the other books of the N.T. . . . Our authors on N.T. criticism . . . have failed to observe the value and significance of this independent transmission.[2]

Hoskier further contends that these two streams

> . . . only join far back and high amongst the hills near the primal fount, . . . and [the MSS of the "Miscellaneous" stream] have come down the centuries probably untainted [!?] by ecclesiastical bias or revision. This control is not available in the other books of the New Testament.[3]

Hoskier therefore suggests that the "independent collateral line" can serve as an excellent "check" on that which has undergone "ecclesiastical standardization."[4] On the basis of his examination of both transmissional streams Hoskier contends that "the same difficulties are recalled in *both* lines of transmission."[5] Yet one might ask, does a commonalty

---

[1] Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:xxvi-xxvii. Hoskier states that "no less than forty [cursive MSS] are bound up with other writings" *apart from* any NT books (p. xxvii). If those bound with *both* miscellanies *and* NT books be included (e.g., MS ℵ with Barnabas and the Shepherd), the total would be *ca.* 50.

[2] Ibid., p. xxvii. [3] Ibid., II:7. [4] Ibid., I:xxvii. [5] Ibid.

of *difficulties* necessarily indicate a commonalty of scribal *care*? A simple test was devised. Taking all the MSS bound with miscellanies of any kind (even if NT books are present),[1] the present researcher compared the mean number of singulars for such MSS in both gross and projected totals against a similar total derived from examination of a "control" group of MSS which contained *no* extra-biblical miscellanies.[2]

The result was quite surprising. The MSS containing miscellanies possessed a gross mean of *16* singulars per MS while those MSS without extra-biblical books had a mean of *14* singulars per MS—a *low* total in any case. However, when *projected* totals were utilized, the MSS of *both* groups possessed the *same* mean of only *18* singulars per MS! Such a wholly unanticipated agreement left this writer fully convinced that the *same* degree of scribal care was present in *both* streams of transmission and that therefore the question of canonicity generally did *not* affect the text of the Apocalypse in either stream of transmission (MSS of both the Aν and Q textypes are fully represented in *either* stream). The low total of the mean in both groups of MSS continues to support the thesis that (regardless of their view of the canonicity of the Apocalypse) *most* scribes treated the MSS they were copying with a care befitting their worth (in terms of the labor required to

[1] This because MS ℵ, containing other NT books, is the case in point.

[2] These data were taken from Table 5 of this study. There were 46 MSS containing miscellanies over against 58 which did not contain such (in the control group). The MSS comprising each group were the following: (*a*) the MSS with miscellanies, ℵ *A B C P 13 17 28 29 31 32 38 45 50 58 81 102 106 121 122 126 140 141 143 147 148 152 154 155 158 167 169 172 176 177 178 188 200*

produce such, as well as the costly vellum utilized, also produced by a laborious process).[1] There was no need to waste effort and expense to produce an unworthy copy; thus the same general scribal care ought to be present even in purely secular works of the manual-production era (though this has not apparently been tested).[2] The fact that MS ℵ abounds with singular readings in the Apocalypse thus says *nothing* about the scribe's view of the canonicity of the Apocalypse,[3] but *much* about the *scribe* of MS ℵ as compared with nearly every other copyist of that book!

(3) A final objection to the categorization of MS ℵ as possibly the product of a "wild and careless editor" might stem from the commonly-held thesis that "*most* significant variants existed by the end of the second century."[4] By strict application of this principle one might suggest that MS ℵ's scribe was really only responsible for his *errors* of transmission

---

201 204 206 217 232 233 236 251; (*b*) those without miscellanies, *P.Oxy.1079, P.Oxy.1080, E 1 15 21 35 36 39sup 41 43 49 59 61 62 63 65 67 68 72 73 77 79 80 90 96 100 103 112 114 119 120 123sup 136 137 138 139 144 145 146 159 162 164 166 170 171 174 179 184 189 193 194 202 203 216 218 241.* A similar tally would likely result were MSS of the Av textype pitted against those of Q. Table 5 of this study indicates an *overall* high degree of care on the part of the scribes which appears unlimited by textype or transmissional history.

[1]Cf. Metzger, *Text*, pp. 4-5, 12, 15-21, for examples of the immense labor (and drudgery) involved in producing a NT manuscript copy.

[2]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 108, specifically states that "until we have the equivalent of Havet [L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Paris, 1911)] with Greek data, critics of the Greek New Testament will be handicapped and inadequate in struggling to remove corruptions from the text." Havet compared scribal habits among *all* types of MSS.

[3]The mere *inclusion* of the Apocalypse within MS ℵ should denote acceptance of its canonicity; so too that of Barnabas and the Shepherd!

[4]Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, p. 114, provides a litany of textual critics who have put forth this opinion (which the present writer shares).

while his *sensible* singular readings were supposedly transmitted faithfully from his early exemplar. Such sensible readings would thus derive from a period at least 150-200 years *earlier* than MS ℵ and would be truly "ancient."[1]

As has been previously pointed out,[2] such a contention introduces new variables *e silentio* which, if accepted, would render *nothing* certain in NT textual criticism![3] Edwin Yamauchi, in discussing "negative constructions" (arguments from silence), distinguishes sharply between matter supported by "tradition" or that which we firmly *possess* (the MSS themselves in the present case) and that which lacks "traditional" support or pure *theory*.[4] Yamauchi's thesis can be summarized under two heads:

(1) Negative constructions *cannot* be placed upon elements of *tradition* simply because there is no other external corroboration, and (2) negative constructions *can* be placed upon any *theory* which *lacks* the backing of tradition *if* no external corroboration can be brought forth. In other words, the burden of proof in the present case must rest upon those who would

---

[1]Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, p. 114, quotes Colwell on this point: "The overwhelming *majority* of readings were created before the year 200." But Colwell specifically *excluded* singular readings from such a statement! Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 108; "Classifying," p. 104; and especially "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program," *Studies*, pp. 161-162.

[2]Cf. pp. 1-2, 18-19, 33-35, 81-82, and 119-120 above.

[3]Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 483, quotes Griesbach (in Latin) on the similar case of the presumed "originality" of 1 Jn. 5:7 which, if genuine, would result in the NT text "*universus plane incertus esset atque dubius*."

[4]Edwin Yamauchi, "Do the Bible's Critics Use a Double Standard?" *Christianity Today* 10 (1965): 179-182.

argue that all or most of MS ℵ's sensible singular readings derive from previous MS generations. So long as such a theory cannot be satisfactorily established from *external corroborating evidence*, its basic argument from silence cannot stand! As Yamauchi has succinctly concluded,

> To reject the testimony of the traditions [the MSS as they stand] . . . for a purely hypothetical reconstruction is to substitute an alternative that demands not only great ingenuity on the part of its sponsor but on the part of others even greater "faith" than to trust the traditions themselves.[1]

Acceptance of this position seems to be the only sane and logical way for the present study to proceed in order to attain results of lasting value. Only one with a deep-seated textual prejudice would attempt to argue otherwise in the light of *all* the data concerning singular readings presented herein.[2]

The present contention is further supported by the fact that those MSS with the highest degree of singular *error* also tend to possess the highest degree of singular *editorial alteration*. Were MS ℵ's scribe in truth an incompetent bungler who just "happened" to utilize an exemplar representing "a very pure line of very ancient text,"[3] one might legitimately ask to be shown at least *one* other MS which possessed a similar high number of *sensible* singular readings *without* the concomitant mass of singular *errors* which appear to accompany *every* MS of this class like a swarm of flies! But such a MS does not

---

[1]Yamauchi, "Double Standard," p. 182. What then does Yamauchi's thesis suggest about the "traditional" (Majority) text of the NT?

[2]Such prejudice is continually demonstrated in Hoskier's *Apocalypse*: any MS differing widely from either Aν or Q becomes "ancient in text," and more valuable than MSS of the recognized textypes!

[3]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 251, speaking of Vaticanus (B).

exist, neither among the MSS already discussed nor among the MSS which have been merely tabulated in the Tables of this study.[1] Yet the present findings have revealed that by far the *majority* of scribes were quite careful—why then cannot at least *one* highly-careful "editor-of-degree" be found among the MSS of the Apocalypse? Rather, it seems to be the case that only the "maverick" scribes, who were themselves quite incompetent in general copying, thought themselves capable of re-forming the text in their own image—and the scribe of MS ℵ appears to have been among them.[2]

The preceding "defense," though necessary to ward off any initial objections to the findings of the present study concerning MS ℵ's scribal habits, yet remains but a mere assertion until the same scrutiny be given MS ℵ as has been given the MSS previously discussed in this chapter. A general survey of the singular readings of MS ℵ therefore follows, beginning as

---

[1]One can verify this by examining the various types of deliberate alteration present in all MSS with, say, 50+ singular readings as listed in Table 5 below. Among all the MSS which might be thus examined, the *only* exception to the "high error/high editing" syndrome is MS *15* (Greg. 2087). But this MS has been noted above (p. 91, n. 1) as a purely *illiterate* production with *no* "editorial designs" on the part of its scribe! Its text of Apoc. 3:9 may serve to demonstrate this claim: the *singular* words are underlined (mostly itacisms) and the two "real" textual variants (non-singular) are doubly underlined: Ηδου διδουμι εκ της σηναγογης του Σατανα τον λεγοντων εαυτους Ιουδειους ενε, και ουκ εισιν, αλα ψευδονται· και ποιησο αυτους ια ηξουσιν και προσκυνησουσιν ενιπιον των ποδον σου, και γνωσιν τε ωτι εγαπισα σε. In this *single* verse *seventeen* words are singular to MS *15*! The two "real" variants are shared by 34 MSS and 62 MSS respectively, but MS *15*'s testimony to ηξουσιν is weakened by his clear itacism in διδουμι (for διδωμι) at the head of this same verse! As stated above, there are *no* MSS which demonstrate the *reverse* phenomenon of high editorializing accompanied by few errors.

[2]Hoskier (cf. n. 2 on the previous page) would elevate these "maverick" MSS into *dozens* of independent "textypes," each localized in but a single MS! Cf. his discussions in *Apocalypse*, vol. I, s.v. MSS *18 32 36 47 56 65 95 108 109 111 113 130 143 164 166 167* and *200*. Is this rational?

usual with the accidental types of variation:

Itacism. Among MS ℵ's accidental variants, itacism is by far the cause of most "nonsense" readings while "hom." runs a close second. The most frequent itacistic interchange found in MS ℵ is that of ι for ει, which occurs some 32 times within the sample base chapters.[1] Next most frequent is ε for αι, which occurs 5 times.[2] The remaining itacistic interchanges of MS ℵ within the sample base chapters are the following:[3]

ι for οι (22:19)	υ for οι (3:7)
α for αι (5:4)	α for ο (5:4)
ο for α (17:2)	αι for ε (17:12)
ει for ι (7:7)	ου for υ (12:14)
ε for ι (1:5[b])	ει for ε (1:5[b])

υ for υο (22:8[?])

Most itacistic alterations are "resolvable nonsense," although a few sensible readings may also have resulted from this cause.[4]

Phonetic Errors which produce nonsense are also quite frequent. These mostly typify the time (4th century) and place (Egypt) wherein MS ℵ was copied,[5] and might be expected to occur

---

[1]The locations are the following: 1:9, 12, 17; 3:2, 4, 11 (*ter*), 13; 5:9, 10, 12; 7:6, 9; 10:11; 12:5, 6, 10; 15:8; 17:2, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 17; 20:3; 22:6 (*ter*), 8, 20. Also, ι for either ε, ει or η occurs in 7:11 (*bis*).

[2]The locations are the following: 3:17; 12:5; 17:8, 10, 17.

[3]Readings of Scribe "D" (1:1-5[a] and as ℵ[a] elsewhere) will *not* be noted except in footnotes where appropriate due to paucity of data. In the present case, Scribe "D" has only three independent itacisms: ει for η in 1:1, and ι for ει in 1:11 and 3:16. Such suggests MS ℵ's whole scriptorium was thus affected with the ει/ι syndrome, likely typical of regional dialect.

[4]One place where itacism *may* have contributed to a sensible reading is in 1:5, where MS ℵ (in company with *ca.* 50 other MSS) reads λυσαντι instead of the "Majority" (Aν plus some Q) λουσαντι; cf. the itacisms of MS ℵ which involve υ above.

[5]Cf. José O'Callaghan, "El cambio δ > τ en los papiros bíblicos," *Biblica* 54 (1973): 415-416 for early examples of a similar phonetic error localized in Egypt (few today would dispute MS ℵ's Egyptian origin).

in greater frequency (due to Coptic influence) than in those MSS copied elsewhere in the Greek Mediterranean at later dates. Such phonetic alterations include the following:

νγ for γγ (22:10) τ for θ (20:13)
ζ for σ (1:11) ζ for δ (17:10)
ζεστρος for ζεστος (3:16)

Also within the phonetic category is one case of metathesis: in 7:17 the scribe writes δρακυον for δακρυον (perhaps with the δρακυ of 21:4 in mind?).

Orthographic Peculiarities are rare in MS ℵ. Ιωαννης is spelled with but one ν by both Scribe "A" and Scribe "D" in 1:1, 4, 9 (but *not* by Scribe "A" in 22:8).[1] "Naphtali" is given the "usual" LXX end-form (-λι) instead of the common reading (-λειμ).[2] Also the unusual *nomen sacrum* $\overline{\text{IHY}}$ appears instead of the usual $\overline{\text{IY}}$ in 22:20 (otherwise regular in MS ℵ; perhaps the scribe here hesitated between writing out the full form and abbreviating as normal, all in the final rush to complete the copying of the entire LXX + NT?).[3] None of the preceding changes affect the meaning in any way.

Dittography similarly is a rare occurrence in MS ℵ, with only three possible cases of such. In 1:9 and 22:17 the scribe

---

[1]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 159, note that the single-ν form is found "almost always (121/130) in B," but in MS ℵ "only in parts [then thought to have been] written by the scribe of B." The problem of Scribe "A" in 1:9 caused Westcott and Hort to posit that even *that* page was copied by Scribe "D" (= Vaticanus' scribe!). However, it is simpler to allow "hom." to have affected Scribe "A" in 1:9 both in light of his performance in 22:8 as well as his propensity for "hom." (cf. pp. 155-160 below)!

[2]Yet in Matt. 4:13, 15, Scribe "A" reads -λειμ with the Majority! In the LXX minor fluctuations between -λι and -λειμ occur among MSS ℵ, B, and especially A; but the usual LXX form is -λι in *all three* main MSS.

[3]Might this suggest *nomina sacra in pleno* in MS ℵ's exemplar?

reduplicates the initial letters of two different *nomina sacra* producing $\overline{\text{ΙΙΥ}}$ and $\overline{\text{ΠΠΝΑ}}$ respectively. In 7:13 a five-word phrase (25 letters = 2 lines in an uncial exemplar) is written twice due to backward line-skipping (no possible "hom." skippage backward to similar letters exists). In 20:1 there is a case of "semi-dittography," whereby αλυσεσιν is written for αλυσιν. The original error of ε for ι likely was caught in the copying process and the correct ending inserted, but without obelizing the faulty -σε-.

Homoioteleuton, on the other hand, runs rampant in MS ℵ and stands second only to itacism as the chief type of scribal error in this MS. Such well might have been expected since (as Burgon notes)

> there does not exist a source of error which has proved more fatal to the transcribers of MSS. than the proximity of identical, or nearly identical, combinations of letters. . . . The result is often sheer nonsense.[1]

Burgon further notes that

> the occasions are without number when minute words have dropped out of ℵB and their allies,—and yet have been faithfully retained, all through the centuries, by the later Uncials and despised Cursive copies.[2]

Although many of these omissions *could* have been caused by "hom.", Burgon doubts it because the MSS involved each

> . . . omit so many words, phrases, sentences, verses of Scripture,—that it is altogether [?] incredible that the proximity of like endings can have much to do with the matter. Inadvertency may be made to bear the blame of some omissions: it cannot bear the blame of shrewd and significant omissions of clauses, which invariably leave the sense complete.[3]

---

[1]Burgon, *Causes of Corruption*, p. 37. [2]Idem, *Traditional Text*, p. 194.

[3]Idem, *Causes of Corruption*, p. 23.

Hoskier is quick to lend support to Burgon's bold opinion, albeit primarily for the benefit of his own theory:

> We might conclude that many of these [singular] omissions by ℵ* were mere errors, yet I can state that over fifty per cent. of them have support from Old Syriac, Sah, Boh, Aeth or Latin.[1]

The present data agree with Burgon and Hoskier that MS ℵ (at least in the Apocalypse) seems to be plagued with numerous omissions of "minute words" and slightly longer phrases which appear to have arisen accidentally through "hom." However, the present researcher does *not* concur with their suggestion that only "some" such omissions were truly accidental or inadvertent while the remainder (perhaps 50%+ !) were "shrewd and significant" changes made deliberately, countenanced in this regard by supposed "versional" testimony. Such a contention is *not substantiated* by the present data of the Apocalypse!

Instead, the data from the sample base chapters supports a *scenario* in which MS ℵ's scribe *often* commits *errors* of "hom." which *at times* produce a "sensible" but generally strained meaning in context. Only *rarely* do any of these "hom." errors produce an "improvement" in the text sufficient to posit deliberate editorial activity in such a case!

The most frequent type of "hom." in MS ℵ is that of a single word (8x).[2] Two-word omission by "hom." occurs twice,[3]

---

[1] Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, II:1. It seems that either Hoskier's "versional corruption" thesis must be faulty or else the scribe of ℵ* must have been a genius of his day to be able to select readings from so many versional traditions!

[2] In 1:20 (5 letters [= 5ℓ]); 3:7 (3ℓ); 3:12 (2ℓ); 7:15 (2ℓ); 12:12 (5ℓ); 12:14 (3ℓ); 17:11 (3ℓ); and 22:3 (3ℓ).

[3] In 1:11 (8ℓ); and 20:8 (6ℓ).

and three cases of 3-5 words being omitted occur.[1] Of the single-word cases, two involve the definite article,[2] two involve a preposition,[3] and there is one case each of omission of a conjunction,[4] an adjective,[5] an adverb,[6] and of the linking verb "to be."[7] Examination of some of these cases of "hom." which produce a supposedly "sensible" reading will demonstrate the unlikelihood of their having been produced deliberately.

In 1:11 ο βλεπεις is omitted by -σης ∩ -εις, perhaps further aided by the identical pronunciation of η and ει (the tendencies of MS ℵ toward such phonetic confusion of these vowels has been discussed above under itacism). The resultant reading is the command "write in a book and send it to the seven churches," leaving unexplained exactly *what* is to be so written. The "sense" produced is greatly impoverished.

In 1:20 a Semiticizing verbless sentence results from the omission of εισιν[1]. Yet the next sentence *retains* εισιν[2]— an inconsistent "editorial practice" were the first omission deliberate![8] Considering that the verbless sentence is "more difficult" to construe, the probability of εισιν[1] having been excised deliberately seems slight indeed. Rather, "hom." of

---

[1]In 20:1 (3 words/10-12ℓ); 20:2-3 (5 words/22ℓ); and 20:12 (4 words/21ℓ).

[2]In 3:7 and 12:14. [3]In 3:12 and 7:15. [4]In 17:11.

[5]In 12:12. [6]In 22:3. [7]In 1:20, discussed *infra* in the text.

[8]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, in loc., suggests Sahidic versional support for the omission of εισιν[1], but only with intent to bolster his own theory of influence from the versional readings in bi- and tri-lingual "original" or at least "early" MSS as the cause of almost every known variant. Cf. his discussion in I:xxiii, where this omission in 1:20 is cited as one of the "proof texts" for his theory! The *truth* is that the difficulties involved in comparing Coptic syntax with that of Greek are so manifold as to *preclude* such "proofs" as Hoskier offers! Cf. J. Martin Plumley, "Limitations of

-σιωνˆ-σινˆ appears far more likely (the presence of -σι- in both portions perhaps being another contributing factor).

In 3:7 την is omitted by νˆν. Had deliberate omission occurred, it would have had to have been due to the fine stylistic point that no previous reference to "the key of David" had appeared in the text. But the imagery is a direct allusion and paraphrase of Isa. 22:22—and that source adequately serves as the "previous referent" for the author's purpose![1]

In 3:12 the preposition εν is similarly omitted by νˆν. Although the text can "make sense" without the preposition, the resultant reading is less smooth and provides no appreciable difference in meaning. Thus on both stylistic and contextual grounds the omission does not seem to be deliberate.

In 12:12 the omission of μεγαν (again by νˆν)[2] might seem deliberate since nowhere else in the Apocalypse does μεγας modify θυμος. The scribe may thus be supposed to have

---

Coptic (Sahidic) in Representing Greek," in Bruce M. Metzger's *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), pp. 141-152. This does *not* deny sporadic versional corruption in *more substantial* areas of variation, however.

[1] I.e., the Apocalypse is literally *filled* with OT allusions. On this text cf. A. Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935 [rep. ed. 1971]) in loc. Isa. 22:22. It is noteworthy that the "normal" LXX text here is a *paraphrase* of the Hebrew (και δωσω την δοξαν Δαυιδ αυτω, και αρξει, και ουκ εσται ο αντιλεγων) whereas MS ℵ reads *explicitly* (*sic, teste* Rahlfs, και δωσω και αυτω την κλιδα οικου Δαυιδ επι τω ωμω αυτου, και ανοιξει και ουκ εστε ο αποκλιων, και κλισει και ουκ εσται ο ανοιγων). Note that in Apoc.3:7 the text of MS ℵ is *not* harmonized or assimilated to its *own* text of Isa. 22:22, in Apoc.3:7 MS ℵ reads *sic*: ο εχων κλιν τον Δαδ και ανυγων και ουδις κλισει και κλειων και ουδις ανυξει.

[2] It is obvious that the scribe's besetting fault was *homoioteleuton* in its most literal sense—he became confused as he looked at the *end letters* of words! It is only because Greek words so often end in ν that so many examples of "hom." by νˆν are cited herein.

accommodated his text to this presumed "stylistic" trait of John. But this possibility is offset by the fact that μεγας is a word *characteristic* of the Apocalypse, occurring over 80x in that book (= 42% of *all* NT occurrences)! Although deliberate editing might be urged because MS ℵ's reading is the "more difficult" (and presumably "more original" therefore), accidental omission by "hom." clearly appears the likely cause.[1]

In 20:1 the phrase εκ του ουρανου is omitted by ε∩ε (or even εκ∩εχ- phonetically) resulting in a "sensible" but stylistically impoverished reading. Since εκ του ουρανου occurs over 15x in the Apocalypse (7x in conjunction with καταβαινω as here and 2x in relation to an angel as here) and that MS ℵ did not so "alter" the other occurrences of this phrase, any possibility of deliberate alteration here seems remote indeed.[2]

Of these "most likely" candidates for deliberate editing rather than accidental "hom.", *not one* has sufficient weight to posit deliberate alteration! Burgon and Hoskier both seem to have overreacted on this matter as a result of their textual views which were bent upon destroying the testimony of all MSS witnessing to the Alexandrian textype. The frequent cases of utter nonsense produced by "hom." in MS ℵ (footnoted above) are

---

[1]The similar "hom."-based omission of τον *ante* τοπον in the close context of 12:14 (where the article of previous reference should have been mandatory; cf. 12:6) should serve as a clue regarding the accidental nature of the omission in v. 12 preceding.

[2]The close context "hom." omissions in 20:2-3 (αυτον∩αυτον), 20:8 (-αις∩-ης, perhaps "phonetic hom."), and 20:12 (ηνεωχθη[1]∩[2])—each nonsensical or illogical in context—should again serve as a "tip-off" that the omission in 20:1 was purely accidental. Yet how many might argue the "originality" of MS ℵ in 20:1 since it would have been "natural" for scribes to "complete" the phrasing so as to "harmonize" with 10:1 and 18:1!

sufficient evidence that, whatever amount of "editing" may be present in MS ℵ in other regards, the cases of omission by "hom." are all certainly what they appear to be—at least in the sample base chapters!

Haplography. A number of omissions occur which cannot be attributed to any cause but that the scribe's eye just *skipped* over letters, words, or lines in his exemplar. Such a habit is not surprising in view of his propensity toward "hom.": the *cause* of both types of variation is the same eye-carelessness.

In 1:7 αυτον[2] is omitted, producing nonsense; in 3:10 τηρησω is similarly omitted.[1] In 17:15 ἡ *ante* πορνη is omitted where it stylistically is required; in 20:9-10 a 19-word phrase (77ℓ) is omitted resulting in the near-nonsense "And (the) Lake of Fire and Brimstone came down (to earth)"![2] The "wandering eye" of Scribe "A" should be watched for cautiously throughout his NT portions in view of this category, and any of his omissions which seem "unexplainable if not original" (whether in the presence or absence of "hom.") must be viewed skeptically.[3] The evidence suggests that omissions of MS ℵ—even when "sensible"—if *unsupported* by other MSS of its own textype are *more*

---

[1]The omission in 3:10 perhaps may have arisen from "semi-hom." of σε∩-σω. Such a possibility becomes more likely in view of the *clear* case of "semi-hom." (producing nonsense) in 5:1, where -νου∩-νον occurred.

[2]Scrivener, *Codex Bezae*, p. xxiii, n. 3, suggests on the basis of good textual evidence that MS ℵ was "probably" copied from an Egyptian papyrus document with lines "containing on an average from 12 to 14 letters, or, when small letters are added on to the end of the line, as many as 16." The skippage in 20:9-10 may therefore have been of 4-6 lines in the exemplar.

[3]Too often critics seem to defend the "more difficult" reading by suggesting that such "could not otherwise have arisen" were it not "original." This seems to amount to circular argument in favor of the reading already preferred on the basis of internal evidence (with or without additional

likely to be due to scribal oversight than either deliberate editing or the preservation of "ancient" readings from its exemplar.

Transposition of Words occurs less than 10x within the sample base chapters of MS ℵ, which suggests that such may have occurred due to the "wandering eye" of the scribe—only in these cases he was able to catch his error and attempt restitution as soon as possible *via* the transposed form. Had transposition been a major part of the "editorial revision" process (i.e., to alter the emphasis or meaning), such should have appeared more frequently. Nevertheless, it cannot be totally ruled out that *some* of these few transpositions in MS ℵ may have been intentional.

Accidental cases of transposition are clearly demonstrated by the following examples: in 1:11 the clause και εις Σμυρναν (written Ζμυρναν *sic*) is transferred from before Pergamos and Thyatira to after these cities. Such transposition puts the order of the seven churches out of array when the letters to the seven churches in chs. 2-3 are considered! While some might give preference to MS ℵ's reading as the "more difficult" reading,[1] the simple omission (by "hom." of -ν και εις$^{1 \cap 2}$) of the words by accident and their immediate "restoration" following Thyatira remains the obvious explanation for

---

external support). The present study has shown that the scribes themselves often *created* the "more difficult" readings—both accidentally and deliberately! A more *solid* base of argument is needed within the internal canons!

[1]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, in loc., notes that MS ℵ's peculiar spelling of "Smyrna" is shared by sy^{s}. One wonders whether such "versional support" might cause Hoskier to value the singular transposition more highly!

the transposition in this case.[1]

Other cases of transposition occasioned by "hom." which was soon caught and corrected occur within 3:16 (-τος ∩ -τως, affecting 2 words), 5:2 (-ον ∩ -ον, affecting 2 words), 5:8 (εχ- ∩ εκ-, affecting 2 words), and 15:8 (εισ- ∩ εις, affecting 4 words). The sense is weakened rather than "improved" in each of these cases; there should be no doubt whatever that accident has thus occurred.[2]

Yet there are other cases of transposition which *cannot* be attributed to "hom." that has been immediately restored. Although unintentional haplography yet may have caused such transposition by immediate restoration of the omitted words, the general "stylistic improvement" resulting from such transpositions makes deliberate alteration more likely. The following examples of such deliberate transpositions will illustrate the point:

In 1:16 φαινει is transferred to a position preceding ως ο ηλιος, "improving" the sentence by eliminating an apparent Semitism.[3] In 10:9 the phrase και καταφαγε αυτο is transposed into αυτο και καταφαγε to produce the more "logical" reading, "Take it and eat," rather than the awkward "Take and eat it."[4]

---

[1]One wonders whether such replacement within the text (to the detriment of the context) might not reflect a careless attitude on the part of the scribe, since it would have been just as easy to insert the correction in the margin with a note indicating the proper location for re-insertion. The support of the Bohairic version in 3:16 notwithstanding, the transposed form is clearly secondary.

[3]I.e., changing the sentence from the verbless "His face [was] as the sun shines in its strength" into "His face shines as the sun in its strength."

[4]The common reading, however, follows the word order of the phrases as in 10:10 (και κατεφαγον αυτο and οτε εφαγον αυτο). On such weak internal grounds some critics would argue that the Majority reading is "secondary"!

In 17:9 the phrase βασιλεις επτα εισιν is altered to read επτα βασιλεις εισιν in perfect harmony with other similar phrases in the immediate context.[1] Such "accomodation" to the author's "more usual style" may have been unconscious due to the attraction from the close-context parallels, but the support of the Sahidic, Bohairic, and Ethiopic versions for the same change makes deliberate alteration far more likely.[2]

A final case of transposition in which intent or the lack of such caused its creation appears in 3:8 where the phrase "I know your works" is altered from οιδα σου τα εργα into οιδα τα εργα σου. This phrase, which appears in each of the seven ecclesiastical letters, varies in order. The common text has τα εργα σου in 2:2 and 2:13 while σου τα εργα appears in 2:9, 19; 3:1, 8 and 15. The scribe of MS ℵ in 3:8 has thus opted for the *less usual* phrasing, with no particular pattern or other benefit being served by such an alteration. This seems to suggest the *accidental* hypothesis of initial haplography immediately restored; yet, the agreement of MS ℵ with the Syriac and Latin versions cannot here be discounted. Only because the text is not "improved" does accidental alteration appear more likely. Otherwise, the versional support might suggest (at the very least) some *influence* upon the scribe of

---

[1] I.e., επτα ορη εισιν in 17:9[a] and δεκα βασιλεις εισιν in 17:12.

[2] As previously stated, versional *influence* upon MSS produced in areas where such versions were commonplace is *not* denied, and may in fact have been a leading cause of many variants found in minority-text MSS. Acceptance of this principle does *not* require acceptance or agreement with Hoskier's far-fetched thesis that such corrupting influence could *only* have occurred by way of bilingual or (especially, in Hoskier's view) *trilingual* MSS!

MS ℵ toward following a certain word pattern.[1]

It is noteworthy that in each of the variations in the Majority text between τα εργα σου and σου τα εργα only a *slim minority* of MSS alter the common text at any time, and in one case (3:15) *no* MS varies the order.[2] This is all the more surprising since current critical theory would suggest that the "harmonistic bent of the early church"[3] would create an overwhelming temptation on the part of scribes to harmonize *all seven* occurrences of this phrase into one "standardized" form! Once more, theory falls by the wayside in the light of hard data.[4]

When the deliberate alterations of MS ℵ are considered, one can clearly see that the scribe (careless as he may have been in basic copying skill) was an extensive *editor* in his own right. Whether such editorial activity reflects the emphases of his scriptorium or merely his own bold alterations cannot be determined. The contemporary corrector ($ℵ^a$ = Scribe "D") *may* have restored many of the singularities of Scribe "A",

---

[1]The importance of the correct application of this principle cannot be overemphasized! One must not react as Hoskier, who posited versional corruption whenever any single version agreed with a Greek MS or MSS. In the present case, the transpositions of MS ℵ, the Syriac, and the Latin versions could each have arisen totally *independent* of one another!

[2]In 2:2, 4 MSS reverse the order; in 2:9, 1 MS; in 2:19, 1 MS. Also, in 3:1 MS *102* conflates thus: σου τα εργα σου. In 2:13 *no* MSS alter the clause, but MS ℵ and 11 other MSS *omit* τα εργα σου και with a "sensible" result (perhaps deliberate? Yet with little or no real gain).

[3]Fee, "Critique of Pickering," p. 412.

[4]Cf. Metzger, *Text*, p. 197: "The temptation to harmonize discordant parallels or quotations would be strong *in proportion to* the degree of the copyist's familiarity with other parts of the Bible" [Emphasis mine]. Since all *seven* instances of "I know your works" occur in the *close context* of

but because of Hoskier's haphazard reporting of the data one only knows that ℵ* was corrected to the TR reading in most cases. *Which* corrector of MS ℵ was responsible—the contemporary ℵ^{a}, the seventh-century ℵ^{c} group, or others—Hoskier does not tell! However, it does seem more likely that the ℵ^{c} group would have the greatest desire to alter the singularities of ℵ*/Scribe "A" since they were engaged in "a thoroughgoing effort to correct the text to a different standard,"[1] that standard generally being the Majority Text elsewhere in the NT and (likely) one or the other leading "majority" textypes (Aν or Q) in the Apocalypse (which parallel the TR in varying degrees). Further, since most contemporary corrections of Scribe "D"/ℵ^{a} are as wildly editorial as the original readings of ℵ*,[2] the supposition seems justified that it was the ℵ^{c} group which usually corrected to a TR-type standard where Hoskier is unjustifiably silent. In any case, it is to the singular editorial alterations of ℵ*/Scribe "A" that present attention must be directed.

Intentional Omissions are rare and generally minor in nature. In this regard, MS ℵ truly fulfills Greisbach's general-

---

Apoc. 2-3, the scribe of each MS should have been *quite familiar* with the parallel portions! Where then is evidence of the "strong tempatation to harmonize" such "discordant parallels"? So too for the Synoptic Gospels: even there, *most* scribes made harmonizing changes only *infrequently*; had they not done so, the Byzantine textform would possess a character radically different from that which obtains at present!

[1] Metzger, *Text*, p. 46.

[2] For example, the transfer in 12:13 of ο δρακων to the more "logical" position following εβληθη; or the conflation in 17:15 of ℵ*'s ταυτα and the Majority reading τα υδατα into ταυτα τα υδατα; or the similar conflation in 20:12 of ℵ*'s επι and the Majority reading ενωπιον, producing the reading ενωπιον επι.

ization that

> scribes were much more prone to add than to omit. They scarcely ever deliberately omitted anything, but they added many things; certainly they omitted some things by accident, but likewise not a few things have been added to the text by scribes through errors. . . .[1]

It is certain that MS ℵ's scribe was prone more toward deliberate addition than omission (though *accidental* omissions abound). Whether many or most of his additions derive from error (as Griesbach suggests) remains to be seen, but his deliberate omissions were certainly not blatant corruptions of devious design.[2] They fall for the most part under the category of stylistic improvement, e.g., the definite article is omitted in six places (15:4; 20:8, 12; 22:1, 3, 17). Two of these occur before a proper name (Γωγ in 20:8 and Πνευμα in 22:17), which may reflect Coptic influence—linguistic rather than versional—upon the scribe of MS ℵ at work in Egypt since Coptic does not admit of the definite article before a personal name."[3] The article is omitted also in 22:1, 3 before the word "throne" for an undeterminable reason; but such omission twice within a similar phrasing almost certainly was deliberate and not due to accidental haplography.

Similarly, omission of the conjunction και occurs in 1:18; 17:11; and 20:4. Stylistic improvement may be postulated in

---

[1]Quoted in Metzger, *Text*, p. 120. In light of what has been stated above in the present study, p. 86, one begins to suspect that all such early generalizations were made on the basis of examination of *atypical* MSS, i.e., those possessing singular readings in a degree sufficient for categorization, rather than concentrating upon *typical* "careful" MSS!

[2]This despite Pickering's misleading impression in *Identity: Revised*, pp. 113-116. Note that this answers *only* for the single scribe of MS ℵ and *not* for MS ℵ's *shared readings* within the Alexandrian textype!

[3]Plumley, "Limitations of Coptic," p. 148. This point may have great

each of these cases, as well as Egyptian versional influence.[1] The only case of omission remaining is that of either εκει or ετι in 22:3 (εκει is supported by 52% of the MSS and ετι by 46%). Which reading was present in MS ℵ's exemplar cannot be determined; however, Scribe "D"/ℵ^{a} is cited (for once) by Hoskier as restoring the reading ετι, which one might presume was that current in MS ℵ's scriptorium. There yet remains a possibility that the omission of either word was accidental;[2] if so, then the *intentional* omissions of ℵ* are reduced to the minor article and conjunction cases—hardly severe editing!

Intentional Additions present a radically different picture: MS ℵ is *filled* with singular additions which range from the purely stylistic to the more extensive changes. These additions may be grouped as follows:

(*a*) *Minor Stylistic Expansions*. Explanatory και is added in 3:14 *(bis)*; 17:15; 20:6, 12, 14; and 22:4. Conscious stylistic improvement was the motive for such changes. Minor prepositions are added to the text in 12:12 (εις); 15:4 (ενωπιον); and 20:10 (οπου)—yet the latter two prepositions were *not* added for mere style improvement but to *alter* the meaning and emphasis of the text. The addition in 15:4 changes the phrase

---

implications regarding the Alexandrian text's anarthrous Ιησους, which is so prevalent in the Gospels (The Majority reading usually is arthrous).

[1]The Sahidic, Bohairic and Ethiopic versions support the omission in 17:11, while the Sahidic and Bohairic support that in 1:18. Cf. Plumley, "Limitations of Coptic," p. 149, regarding "the pervading practice of asyndeton" in the Coptic language and versions. Might the scribe of MS ℵ thus have been influenced?

[2]Either ετι or εκει *might* have been omitted by "hom." of ι∩ι, occasioned by εσται preceding. But the verse makes good sense without

from "Your [God's] righteousnesses are manifest" into "righteousnesses (done) before You are manifest"—an emphasis upon *human* rather than *divine* works![1] The addition in 20:10 deliberately reinserts οπου of five words earlier so as clearly to distinguish the Beast from the False Prophet.[2] Also in this category is the addition of the conjunction ἤ as a link between 22:17 and 18 concerning the curse upon the corrupters of the text: "Let he who desires take of the water of Life freely, *or* I testify . . ."—an interesting linkage!

(*b*) *Explanatory or Emphatic Addition*. Where the text did not seem sufficiently clear or was thought to lack the proper degree of emphasis the scribe made such small alterations as were necessary to resolve the problem. In 1:8 the "Alpha - Omega" phrase is made more emphatic by adding και εγω after Αλφα so as to read "I am the Alpha, *even I*, and the Omega." In 12:4 το τριτον is added following το τριτον των αστερων so to increase the emphasis: "And his tail swept away the third part of the stars, *the third part* of the heaven."[3] Again, in

---

either word ("And there will be no ~~curse~~, and the throne of God and of the Lamb will be in it [the New Jerusalem]"). The change certainly seems to be a deliberate "improvement." Cf. the omissions of τα[2] in 15:4 and και[3] in 17:11, both of which *may* be due to "semi-hom." but which in context certainly appear to have been deliberate.

[1]Accidental corruption might be suggested due to ενωπιον σου in the previous clause, but the omission of τα[2] *ante* δικαιωματα clearly indicates deliberate alteration!

[2]Both το θηριον and ο ψευδοπροφητης are linked by και. However, even though the definite article appears before each term thus linked, the Granville Sharp rule does *not* apply, for "if the gender is different, there is . . . usually the repetition of the article" even if the two terms describe one and the same personage (Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 788). Thus the reason is present for the scribe's solicitude!

[3]Had such been partial dittography caught in the process of copying, there should have been obelization of the added words (cf. ℵ* in 3:7); so

22:10 τουτους is added following λογους to clarify the point, viz., "Do not seal up *these* words of the prophecy." Finally, in 17:8 the return of the Beast is further emphasized by reading και παλιν παρεστε [*sic* for παρεσται]. Each of these changes reflect deliberate and managed editorial activity on the part of the scribe and/or scriptorium responsible for MS ℵ.

(*c*) *Theological Addition* occurs only twice, but both times in the interest of *orthodoxy* rather than heresy or heterodoxy. In 7:10 the acclamation of the great multitude ("Salvation to our God who sits on the throne and to the Lamb") is liturgically expanded by the addition of the familiar conclusion εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων, αμην.[1] In 15:2 the phrase "holding harps of God" is expanded into "holding harps of *(the) Lord* God"—a term quite common in the Apocalypse.[2] Such perhaps was influenced by the presence of Κυριος ο Θεος in 15:3; yet direct assimilation did not occur because of the different noun cases involved—the change was *deliberate*![3]

(*d*) *"Correction" of Presumed Difficulties.* The scribe here has perceived the text before him to be (in his mind)

---

too it has already been seen (above, pp. 154-155) that dittography of any kind was rare in MS ℵ. The change therefore is likely deliberate.

[1]Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 538, suggests that "quasi-liturgical statements" like that in 7:10 would have "tempted" copyists to add a fitting conclusion since "the general tendency was to expand liturgical formulations" (pp. 539-540). It is noteworthy that in this place *no* other scribe made *any* expansion similar to that of MS ℵ—not even an "Amen"! Such seems strange in view of the "general tendency" proffered by textual *theory*!

[2]The term "the Lord God" occurs in 1:8; 4:8; 11:17; 15:3; 16:7; 18:8; 19:6; 21:22; and 22:5, 6.

[3]Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. 570, suggests that "in view of . . . the *natural proclivity* of scribes to expand the sacred name, it is perhaps remarkable that *any* witnesses should have resisted such pressures" [Emphasis

either corrupt or misleading. Apparently without consulting other exemplars (or, upon so doing, concluded that they too were in error) nor his scribal overseer, the scribe made an individual "judgment call" and "resolved" the real or imagined difficulty. A small number of such cases appears in MS ℵ, among which are the following:

In 10:3 perhaps an error in MS ℵ's exemplar of φωναι for βρονται left the scribe confused.[1] He thus added ως after εκραξεν^2 so to read "And when he had cried out, *it was as if* seven *voices* had uttered by their own voices." The scribe's judgment here prevailed, although a simple reading of the context in 10:4 or comparison with any other MS might have resolved the difficulty. In 12:8, on the other hand, it is easy to see the difficulty perceived, since MS ℵ's text (certainly that of his exemplar) reads ισχυσαν with 38% of the MSS rather than ισχυσεν (59%). While the Majority singular form leaves *no* ambiguity ("And he [the Dragon] did not prevail"), the plural form of MS ℵ is unclear as to the proper subject—is it "Michael and his angels" or "the Dragon and his angels"? The scribe therefore tried to clarify the situation by adding προς αυτον

---

mine]. Yet MS ℵ once more stands *utterly alone* in such expansion! One must conclude that the scribes simply do *not* perform as theory proposes!

[1] I.e., MS ℵ* singularly reads φωναι in place of βρονται *as well as* reading singularly + ως *post* εκραξεν^2. However, it is extremely unlikely that *both* singular readings were created deliberately by MS ℵ's scribe since the accepted text ("And when he had cried out, the seven thunders uttered their own voice") enjoys no difficulty whatever. Thus, the addition of ως would *not* have taken place unless the "difficult" φωναι *pro* βρονται had *already* stood in the text of his exemplar! The exemplar's error likely occurred from attraction to φωνη at the beginning and/or φωνας at the end of the same verse.

after ισχυσαν: "And they did not prevail *against him*."[1] But this only adds to the confusion since the final clause ("nor was there found a place *for him*")[2] now becomes ambiguous—the first αυτον referring to Michael and the second αυτω to the Dragon! Because of MS ℵ's "helpful" correction, his last state is worse than his first!

(*e*) *Undetermined Reason for Change*. A case of clear editorial activity with inferior results appears in 22:14. MS ℵ along with 14 other MSS[3] begins the verse "Blessed are those who *wash their robes*," but MS ℵ continues singularly (as can best be construed), "that their authority shall be [established]; *but as for the authority concerning* the Tree of Life, even by the gates shall they enter into the city." This resultant reading, caused by the addition of ως δε η εξουσια after η εξουσια αυτων, though certainly "difficult," is less clear by far than the common reading ("that their authority shall be over the Tree of Life, and by the gates, etc."). Such may reflect a gloss accidentally (and partially) incorporated into MS ℵ's text or the attempted correction of an error in his

---

[1]The Bohairic version adds προς αυτους in the same place, certainly for a similar "clarifying" purpose. But this time the referent of ισχυσαν has been reversed! The "cure" in both cases is worse than the "disease"!

[2]MS ℵ* here reads τοτε for τοπος, with nonsense in context; such must have arisen accidentally from confusion of letters and could not have been intentional.

[3]This slimly supported reading of MS ℵ + 14 MSS which begins the verse, though favored by most modern critics, certainly seems (to the present writer) a harmonization to 7:14, where the "redeemed" [=martyrs?] of the great tribulation period are similarly described (who better to have the authority to enter the city and eat of the Tree of Life?). The Majority reading ("keeping the commandments") is otherwise in full accord with 12:17 and 14:12, and likely would not have been substituted for the "poetic" imagery had the reading "washing their robes" been original.

exemplar.[1] Little else can be said of MS ℵ's editorial adding.[2]

Intentional Substitutions occur in MS ℵ in a number *double* that of deliberate additions. Within *this* category of intentional variation the editorial skills of the scribe come into greatest play and reap their greatest harvest. The following classes of variation appear within this category:

(*a*) *Stylistic Improvements*, usually involving substitutions of case, tense, or form. In 1:13 εν μεσω is replaced by the single word μεσον, perhaps an "easier" reading though the sense is unaffected.[3] In 3:9 the present διδωμι is changed to the perfect δεδωκα, perhaps to render the Jews of the first century and onward as members of the "synagogue of Satan" (?), or merely to note the giving over as an accomplished fact.[4] In 5:13 the relative ὅ (*ante* εστιν) becomes το—likely because MS ℵ's scribe mistakingly took the unaccented ο of his uncial exemplar as the definite article ὁ, certainly an "error" when modifying the *neuter* κτισμα! His "correction" of such an "error" was therefore dutiful and in good faith.

In 7:9 the relative ον is changed to ος (referring to οχλος); a common alteration in accord with NT style elsewhere.[5]

---

[1] A gloss easily may have begun "ως δε η εξουσια . . ."; or, a dittography may have been present in MS ℵ's exemplar (η εξουσια η εξουσια) which the scribe resolved as well as he could without further checking.

[2] Scribe "D" as ℵ^{a} has a few interesting additions, mostly stylistic (cf. 1:11; 10:9; 12:14) and none significant. The seventh-century ℵ^{c}, however, adds πεντε in 12:6, keeping the woman in the wilderness 1265 days! Who knows what may have motivated such an alteration?

[3] Note that μεσον is the *rarer* form in the Apocalypse (only in the phrase ανα μεσον in 7:17 besides). Although εν μεσω occurs 6x more, MS ℵ's scribe changed none of these—was "interest" lost in such "improvement"?

[4] Sahidic support of the perfect *may* indicate versional influence!

[5] Robertson, *Grammar*, pp. 715-716, speaks of such case-assimilation as

Similarly, in 12:11 αυτοι is changed into ουτοι to reflect "normal" apposition.[1] Apart from these cases there are few alterations which appear to have been made for sheer style.[2]

(*b*) *"Logical" Alterations.* Where the scribe perceived or imagined a difficulty to exist a useful alteration was ready at hand, whether "proper" or "extremely foolish"[3]—a reasonable range of variation for this particular scribe! In 1:7 the simple alteration of one letter (changing πας to παρ') produces the extremely "logical" reading "And one shall see Him *with* the eye" instead of "And *every* eye shall see Him." In 5:1 εσωθεν is changed to εμπροσθεν to more accurately describe the contents of a *scroll*.[4] In 5:4 the aorist ευρεθη is altered into the future ευρεθησεται to accord with the fact that this *is* a vision of the *future*! In 5:13 the phrase και επι της θαλασσης must have raised the problem of how creatures might live *upon* the sea; so, along with some other changes,[5]

"common in the N.T.," being "in a sense an after-refinement"; also that "it is usually the accusative case that is assimilated into another oblique case."

[1]Cf. Robertson, *Grammar*, p. 698.

[2]While the changes in word order in 10:7 (του αγγελου του εβδομου) and 17:10 (αὐτον μειναι δει) *may* have been deliberate, a strong case can be made that both such readings arose from either "hom." (10:7) or haplography (17:10) which immediately was caught and corrected. This contention is bolstered by the fact that both "new" word orders are *atypical* of Apocalypse style.

[3]The latter category is exemplified best by the change in 10:1 of ιρις into θριξ—*certainly* the cloud-clothed angel had "*hair* upon his head"! So much for the preservation of poetic imagery!

[4]MS ℵ and a small number of other MSS also substitute και οπισθεν for the Majority και εξωθεν which follows, quite in keeping with the "scroll" imagery. Note too that 5 MSS have εμπροσθεν *added* to the Majority reading in various locations, whereas MS ℵ merely *substitutes*.

[5]I.e., MS ℵ and 24 other MSS omit α εστι after θαλασσης. MS ℵ alone thus reads "And those *in* the sea, *even* all in these [categories]."

the phrase was rewritten into και τα ἐν τη θαλασση, with versional support as well for this change.[1]

In 7:4 ηκουσα (1s) is altered into ηκουσαν (3p) for the fitting reason that the four angels had just been addressed: why then should they not wait (cf. 7:3) until "*they heard* the number of those sealed"?[2] In 12:1 η σεληνη becomes την σεληνην, making the "moon" as well as the "sun" a part of the woman's clothing (perhaps sandals?). This change likely was occasioned by the lack of a verb in the Semitic-style clause[3] και η σεληνη υποκατω των ποδων αυτης. In 15:6 the phrase λινον καθαρον λαμπρον is made plural and transposed for emphasis into καθαρους λινους λαμπρους. Such a change is logical, for it is the clothing of the *seven* angels which is being described!

In 17:2 the change of ν to κ makes the text read "the *house*" (οικου) rather than "the *wine* (οινου) of her fornication." Obviously, the trafficking of the "kings of the earth" with the Whore included fornication as well as drunkenness, committed "from the *house*" whence she plied her trade![4] Lastly, the change in 20:15 of ευρεθη into ευρεθησεται mirrors the alteration (discussed above) in 5:4, with the notable differ-

---

[1]The fact that the Bohairic, Ethiopic, Syriac, and Armenian versions read the same as MS ℵ clearly suggests versional *influence* upon ℵ* here.

[2]Had it not been for this consideration, the change might have been dismissed as accidental from attraction to the four words which follow, each ending in -ν. But attraction has *not* been seen as a "characteristic" of this scribe! Deliberate alteration thus appears more likely.

[3]Yet simple case-attraction might account for the accidental assimilation of the nominative into the accusative. But cf. the preceding note.

[4]Οικος otherwise does not occur in the Apocalypse; but then neither does the strange phrase οινος της πορνειας (but οινος does occur 8x in other contexts, notably in connection with "wrath").

ence that the following εβληθη is *not* similarly accommodated.[1]

(c) *Theologically-Motivated Substitutions* appear more frequently than the preceding areas of theological change. Not all changes within this category are due necessarily to a theological *motive* but do express a certain theological *viewpoint*.

In 3:3 the standard reading γρηγορησης is replaced by the theological term μετανοησης. Yet attraction from μετανοησον in the preceding clause will not account for the radical change in emphasis: while the repetition of the command "watch" (also in verse 2) is apt to the context, far more effective is the blatant theological warning "If you do not *repent* I will come as a thief"!

In 3:14 κτισεως is changed to εκκλησιας to amplify Christ in His relation to His people. No longer is He merely "the beginning of God's *creation*" but "of the *Church* of God"![2] In 5:10 the scribe has abstracted the concept of the redeemed being made "kings and priests" by changing -εις in both words into -ειαν. It thus becomes "*a kingdom* and *a priesthood*"— a concept more in keeping with the fourth-century ecclesiastical structure.[3] In 5:13 the phrase και το κρατος is replaced with the similar-appearing παντοκρατορος. Yet mere confusion of

---

[1]For MS ℵ to have been consistent in 20:15 εβληθησεται should have replaced εβληθη. The Armenian version *does* make both alterations, to the chagrin of MS ℵ *and* of Hoskier's "versional influence" theory!

[2]Although accidental attraction from εκκλησιας at the beginning of the same verse might be argued, the deliberate theological motivation for such a change appears to be the stronger argument. Note too that the expression "the beginning of the Church of God" appears nowhere else in the NT; it therefore is the "more difficult" reading, but hardly "original."

[3]Cf. 1:6, where ℵ* reads similarly βασιλειαν ιερεις with 65% of the MSS rather than βασιλεις και ιερεις of 27% of the MSS.

letters likely did not produce such a reading wherein the meaning is altered subtly toward an Arian-style position (reading, "to the Lamb (be) blessing and honor, and the glory *of/from the Almighty* forever and ever."[1] This is not to say that MS ℵ's scribe altered his text with clear intent to support Arianism, but only that the change was theologically motivated and even may have been made in the interests of normative orthodoxy. No one would have objected had this reading originally stood in the text; it is only because such a reading as created by MS ℵ *might* be misused by the heterodox that any "problem" exists. The remaining theological alterations of ℵ* within the sample base chapters of the Apocalypse do *not* otherwise suggest Arian leanings,[2] and blanket accusations to that effect are *not* warranted by the data.[3]

In 7:15 the majesty of Him who sits upon the throne is heightened by the fixing of a deliberate gulf between His personage and the redeemed who came out of the Great Tribulation (cf. 7:14). The statement that "He will tabernacle among them"

---

[1]The difference is subtle but significant, for the Arian position considered that Christ's "dignity as Son of God [was] bestowed on Him by the Father on account of His foreseen abiding righteousness" (*The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, s.v. "Arianism," p. 80). Such heterodox theology would have been "normal" in 4th-century Egypt, the birthplace of this doctrine. Cf. Colin H. Roberts, *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt*, The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1977 (London: Oxford University Press, 1979), pp. 49-73. Roberts notes non-Christian religious influences which clearly contributed toward approval of open heterodoxy within normative Christianity in Egypt; "the process was slow and distinctions sometimes remained blurred" (p. 72).

[2]Among the singulars of Scribe "D"/ℵ^{a} one reading *may* have Arian overtones. In 7:10 τω αρνιω is changed into του αρνιου, reading "the salvation *of/from the Lamb* belongs to our God" instead of "to our God . . . *and to the Lamb*."

[3]Modern pseudo-scholarly "defenders" of the Textus Receptus over against other textual theories (including that of the Majority Text!) are

(σκηνωσει επ' αυτους) is reduced to the mere announcement that "He shall *know* them" (γινωσκει αυτους). Such may reflect the growing influence of the mediative priesthood as a go-between for the laity and the Godhead, or may be accidentally based upon phonetic confusion or metathesis of letters. In 12:6, however, a future mediatrix (if the Woman were thought to be Mary)[1] is slighted in order to give greater glory to the Son: the pronoun αυτην (referring to the Woman) is altered into αυτον (referring to the Child). The flight of the Woman into the wilderness thus is no longer for her *own* safety, but that the angels (so it appears) "may nourish *Him*"(her Child) for the duration of the 1260 days![2]

In 20:13 εκριθησαν is changed into the compound form κατεκριθησαν, which subtly alters the meaning from "they *judged* each one" into "they *condemned* each one according to their works"! Thus those resurrected *following* the Millennium (dispensationalists take note!) have *absolutely* no possibility of salvation in the final judgment of the second death! The remaining theological variations of MS ℵ within the sample

---

the chief offenders in this regard. Organizations such as the "Dean Burgon Society" follow Burgon in making this claim (along with the idea that *Origen* [d. 254] was the "creator" of the Alexandrian textype—totally *neglecting* the evidence of P^{75}, which possesses a thoroughly Alexandrian text though written *ca.* 75 years *earlier*) but choose to ignore any adverse data such as the present. However, the present writer maintains that the above finding does *not* allow the dismissal of Arian leanings in MS ℵ either within or outside the Apocalypse when such readings appear *in concert* with other Alexandrian allies: more investigation is clearly needed to either prove or disprove this point.

[1]Cf. above, p.133, notes 2 and 3, for further discussion.

[2]It is perhaps unlikely that MS ℵ's scribe held the Woman to be Mary since he singularly intensified λοιπων of 12:17 into επιλοιπων (referring to the "remainder" of the Woman's offspring!). Such should have been *minimized* rather than *intensified* had Mary been in view.

base chapters are either insignificant[1] or likely accidental;[2] but sufficient evidence of MS ℵ's deliberate theological alterations has been presented already.[3]

(*d*) *Cases of Major Editing* appear with perhaps the frequency one might expect in a MS with so many singulars. The purpose of such editing usually is obscure and only guesses can be made concerning most instances of this phenomenon. Two significant instances of major editing in MS ℵ appear within the sample base chapters. In 3:16 the Majority reading contrasts sharply with that of ℵ* (singulars doubly underscored):

> Majority Text: Ουτως οτι χλιαρος ει, και ου ζεστος ουτε ψυχρος, μελλω σε εμεσαι εκ του στοματος μου.
>
> Text of ℵ*: Οτι ουτως χλιερος ει, και ουτε ζεστρος ουτε ψυχρος ει, παυσε του στοματος σου.

While the errors of ζεστρος and χλιερος can be dismissed as due to poor scribal habits,[4] the same cannot be said for the remaining variants in this verse. The transposition of ουτως *post* οτι subtly alters the emphasis from "*thus, because* you are lukewarm" into "*because* you are *so* lukewarm." The addition of ει following ψυχρος is purely stylistic, designed more

---

[1] E.g., although 20:12 is a passage of theological importance, there is not much significance in having the dead stand *at/upon* (επι, ℵ*) the throne rather than *before* (ενωπιον) the same.

[2] E.g., in 12:17 του Θεου (ℵ*) *pro* MT Ιησου (or, *cum* 22 MSS, του Ιησου) may be due to attraction from του Θεου of the preceding verse rather than from any theological motive.

[3] Scribe "D" writing as ℵ* in 1:1 changes δουλοις into αγιοις, quite possibly with theological intent. Scribe "A" (as ℵ^{a}) immediately changed that reading back to that of the Majority (*teste* Hoskier).

[4] Ζεστρος plainly derives from attraction to ψυχρος following; χλιερος also appears in MS *130*—a MS possessing "intense sympathy" with MS ℵ according to Hoskier, *Apocalypse* I:442.

to emphasize the present condition of the Laodicean church than anything else.

The major revision of the final clause of 3:16, however, is most striking! Instead of the familiar "I am about to vomit you out of my mouth," MS ℵ reads (in popular terms) "Shut your mouth!" This well serves the connection with the next verse, beginning with "because you are saying . . .". One must wonder, however, *why* such a change was made; certainly the command to "shut up" is *less* striking than the emetic imagery. Might the change reflect a strong view of eternal security (to those *within* the fourth-century church) whereby the idea of *total* rejection by Christ of His people (in the worst manner!) might seem to be an impossible occurrence? One cannot know the true motives affecting MS ℵ's scribe here, but he *did* choose to alter the text radically nevertheless![1]

In 22:2-3[a] appears an interesting case of extensive editing, apparently a bold attempt to "correct" problems created because of an omission in the exemplar of MS ℵ. The Majority[2] reading contrasts sharply with the "shorter" reading of MS ℵ:

> Majority Text: Εν μεσω της πλατειας αυτης και του ποταμου, εντευθεν και εντευθεν, ξυλον ζωης, ποιουν καρπους δωδεκα, κατα μηνα εκαστον αποδιδους τον καρπον αυτου· και τα φυλλα του ξυλου εις θεραπειαν των εθνων. Και παν καταθεμα ουκ εσται εκει·

---

[1] It should be noted that the editing did *not* stop with 3:16; in the very next verse the phrase συ ει ο ταλαιπωρος becomes ταλειπωρος ει in MS ℵ*!

[2] Within the Majority reading the Aν and Q textypes are twice divided: Εντευθεν[2] is the reading of Aν with 50% support; Q reads εκειθεν with 45% of the MSS. Also, ουκ εσται εκει is the Q (53%) reading, while Aν (47%) reads ουκ εσται ετι; cf. pp. 166-167 above on the latter point.

και ο θρονος του θεου και του αρνιου εν αυτη εσται . . . .

Text of ℵ*: Εν μεσω της πλατιας αυτης, και του ποταμου ενθεν· και ποιουν καρπους δωδεκα, κατα μηνα εκαστον αποδιδους τους καρπους αυτου· Και τα φυλλα των ξυλων εις θεραπειαν εθνων, και παν καταγμα ουκ εσται. Και θρονος του Θεου και του αρνιου εν αυτη εσται . . . .

Beyond the singular changes (doubly underscored), MS ℵ* also omits in concert with other MSS εκει and ο *ante* θρονος in the next to the last line of the Majority reading. Other minor changes which provide less MS support to MS ℵ* include the itacistic spelling of πλατιας (*cum* MSS *E* and *104*); τους καρπους for τον καρπον (*cum* MS *65*); and the omission of των *ante* εθνων (*cum* MSS *146* and *155*). The present concern, however, is not with these minor variations but with the three singular readings underscored above, for *there* the *real* editing has taken place.

The most radical alteration involves the replacement of the phrase εντευθεν και εντευθεν ξυλον ζωης with the terse ενθεν και. The resultant text is difficult to construe, no matter how one reads or punctuates it.[1] Scrivener correctly has pointed out that the reading ενθεν και ενθεν ξυλον ζωης must have stood either in MS ℵ's exemplar or (more likely) a generation further back.[2] This "pre-exemplar" (used by the

[1]Even in MS ℵ*'s corrected format (cf. the next note), the verse has to be connected with the preceding verse so as to read, "He showed me a river of the water of Life . . . flowing from the throne . . . in the midst of [the city's] street, even from the river hence. And producing 12 fruits, each month in turn giving its fruit, and the leaves of the [fruit] trees were for the healing of nations."

[2]Scrivener, *Codex Bezae*, p. xxiii, n. 3 (cont. on p. xxiv). This ur-text

scribe of MS ℵ's exemplar) thus had a "complete" text of 22:2. As the scribe of MS ℵ's exemplar copied that MS he inadvertently omitted a portion of that verse through line-skippage,[1] producing the quandry faced by the scribe of MS ℵ of a defective exemplar with which to work. The present scribe then tried to "patch up" the damage as best he could while leaving intact the strange text found in his exemplar.

Since there was no longer any mention of the *one* "Tree of Life" in the first part of 22:2, the puzzling statement about "the leaves of *the* tree" in the latter part of the verse needed explanation. The particular was therefore altered into the general and he therefore wrote that "the leaves of *(all) the trees* (were) for the healing of nations." To this he connected the first phrase of 22:3, but altered καταθεμα ("curse") into a more "proper" word for the new context, καταγμα ("fracture"). There thus "shall be no *fracture*," thanks to the healing leaves of "*the trees*"![2] Other minor changes, such as the

---

reading, according to Scrivener, "appears certain from the fact that this manuscript [MS ℵ] is singular in having ενθεν for the first εντευθεν." Add to this the fact that Scribe "D" (as ℵ^{a}) *corrected* the text of his contemporary (Scribe "A"/ℵ*) to read ενθεν και ενθεν, and the case becomes doubly strong!

[1]Scrivener, loc. cit., calculated that the exemplar or pre-exemplar of MS ℵ had between 12 and 16 letters per line. Allowing an "average" 14 letters per line in the pre-exemplar, the cause of the error easily can be seen, reading the text thus (the solid line shows where the line-skippage occurred to produce the reading of ℵ*):

ΚΑΙ
ΤΟΥΠΟΤΑΜΟΥΕΝΘΕ
ΚΑΙΕΝΘΕΝΞΥΛΟΝΖ
ΩΗΣ|ΠΟΙΟΥΝΚΑΡΠΟ
ΥΣ

[2]It should be noted that καταγμα otherwise does *not* appear in either the NT or LXX, but is a word drawn directly from the medical classics (cf. Liddell and Scott, *Lexicon*, in loc.). Once more the *rarer*/"*more difficult*" reading is found to be the creation of the scribe rather than the "easier."

omission of εκει/ετι, have either already been discussed (cf. pp. 166-167 above) or are of little concern in comparison with the major editorial alterations found in this section.

Many other readings of MS ℵ might have been discussed in this section,[1] but sufficient data have been examined to allow a fair consideration of the scribal habits of this important MS. Metzger has stated that "scribes who *thought* were more dangerous than those who wished merely to be faithful in copying what lay before them."[2] The chief scribe of MS ℵ indeed *was* a "thinker"; so too a small number of other scribes among the Apocalypse MSS—a distinct *minority*. One must return to the peculiar paradox (cf. p. 86 above) that "those MSS which are *most* able to be characterized scribally" (such as MS ℵ) "are those which are the *least* typical," whereas "the MSS *least* able to be characterized are those which are the *most* typical of scribal practices."

One should not lose sight of the great bulk of "typical" MSS (illustrated by the first four or five MSS examined in this chapter) when considering the claims of atypical MSS (which have filled the greater portion of this chapter). Metzger has declared a valuable principle which can be applied to the evaluation of MSS by way of their scribal habits:

---

[1] Notably the conflation of MS ℵ in 17:4 (cf. pp. 64-67 above; to that discussion it may be added that both the Sahidic and Bohairic versions support MS ℵ in that conflation—a *clear* case of "versional influence"!

[2] Metzger, *Text*, p. 195. Metzger apparently was speaking of the later Byzantine scribes, in accord with current theory. As has been demonstrated in this study, however, most scribes of that class were exceedingly faithful to their task. The "thinking scribes" were rather (by and large) those of the *ancient* and *Alexandrian*-type MSS!

> Those witnesses that are found to be generally trustworthy in clear-cut cases deserve to be accorded predominant weight in cases when the textual problems are ambiguous and their resolution is uncertain.[1]

Such a statement has direct application toward the use of scribal-habit characterizations in textual research. If a MS possesses a high degree of error and editorializing (which two items usually go hand in hand, cf. above pp. 80-81) in its *singular* readings, its value elsewhere should shrink accordingly. "He that is faithful in a little will be faithful in much," and *vice versa*. This principle begs *no* initial questions about the *textype* to which a MS belongs.

It is no surprise that the three leading "Old Uncials" of the Apocalypse (MSS ℵ, *A*, and *C*) appear among the "Top 30" MSS—those with the greatest number of singulars—nor does it seem pure accident that these MSS are strong witnesses to the Alexandrian textype elsewhere in the NT,[2] due to their Egyptian origin.[3] Yet the common bond is *not* necessarily the *type of text* these MSS otherwise contain (unless one can establish that the other [later] MSS within the "Top 30" similarly contain a type of text differing greatly from either "majority" tradition [Aν or Q]).[4] Rather, the connection truly seems to

---

[1] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. xxvi. The *intent* of this passage concerned agreement with readings determined "best" on the basis of *internal* criteria (the Hortian method), but *mutatis mutandis* it is directly applicable to the evidence concerning scribal habits.

[2] [redacted] *A* is Alexandrian outside the Gospels; MSS ℵ and *C* throughout the NT. Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, xxix-xxx, and *Text*, pp. 213-216.

[3] The Egyptian origin of these MSS is not seriously questioned. N.B. that the Oxyrhynchus papyri were *not* included within the "Top 30" because of their fragmentary nature (though also of "Egyptian" origin).

[4] Although not conclusive by any means, an examination of the "Top 30" MSS in comparison with the "independent" MSS favored by Hoskier (cf. *Apoca-*

be the *mental atmosphere* surrounding the scribes involved: if laxity be permitted or tolerated in *general* copying habits, the scribe feels free to engage in personal editorial activity as well. The tension between "care" and "laxity" seems to have fluctuated during different time periods. Hoskier has noted that

> Dates [of copying] . . . mean but little . . . except as to the probable accuracy of the copying men in the Scriptoria. Thus, between 950 and 1175 the ratio of accuracy among scribes is far higher [!] than before or later. It reached its highest point concurrently with . . . the "Gothic" period.[1]

Similarly, there was a time of great *laxity* which prevailed "from very early days, but undoubtedly increased during the copying from A.D. 350 to 850."[2] The "Old Uncials" fall within this earlier period, and within the later era more than *twice* as many minuscules of the "Top 30" were copied between centuries XIV-XVI as those from the "good" period of centuries X-XII.[3]

---

lypse, II:24, "Important Single Documents") reveals the surprising fact that of the 17 MSS so listed by Hoskier 6/17 appear within the "Top 30" projected totals (7/17 unprojected), yet out of the "Bottom *70*" (the most careful MSS) only 2/17 appear in either projected or raw totals! Further, if the upper range be similarly extended to include the "Top 70," the number rises to 12/17 projected MSS (11/17 unprojected)! And these MSS were selected by Hoskier as "independent" because their *text-as-a-whole* differed significantly from the Av and Q "majority" traditions! Variance from the Majority tradition in the rest of the NT thus *may* be similarly symptomatic of scribal "independence" both in editing and in carelessness.

[1]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:444.

[2]Ibid. Hoskier attributed this laxity to "reflex polyglot action" in accord with his particular "versional influence" theory. He nevertheless correctly indicates that such laxity *did* then exist. Perhaps once "mass production" of critically-edited texts began following the legitimization of Christianity in the early 4th century the copying standards and/or expectations *were* relaxed in the rush to "produce." The scribes were thus left freer both to err and to edit than at other periods.

[3]I.e., 7 MSS in the "Top 30" (excluding the highly-projected MSS) date between centuries X-XII while 15 MSS date between centuries XIV-XVI (cf. Table 5c with the "Date" column of Table 2 below).

The *mood of the time* thus appears to have affected scribal activity to a significant degree.

In addition, the "Old Uncials" (and early papyri) were each copied under *less* than optimum conditions—historically, physically, and mentally—which contributed to their combined great carelessness and high editorial activity. Burgon has pointed out that

> after the destruction of manuscripts in the persecution of Diocletian, and when the learned were pressing from all quarters into the [newly-legitimate] Church, copies must have been multiplied with great rapidity. There was all the more room for carelessness, inaccuracy, incompetency, and capricious recension. Several generations of manuscripts might have been given off in two or three years.[1]

Hoskier intimates agreement with this position, but from a different perspective:

> Documents of the age of ℵ and B are more likely to be full of [singular] "conjectural emendations" than those of the Xth century, when Church history and literature were practically formed for all time.[2]

The resumption of such laxity and boldness during centuries XIV-XVI might be partially due to the parallel weakening of the Medieval Church in the wake of the Renaissance, but even in this period the rule was *faithfulness* and *accuracy* rather than corruption![3]

In the early centuries things were far different: at first *all* MSS were copied on fragile papyrus, which had a "use-life" far briefer than the later parchment/vellum or paper MSS. Also,

---

[1]Burgon, *Traditional Text*, p. 73. N.B. especially his last sentence!

[2]Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, I:67, note.

[3]A similar examination of the "Bottom 35" MSS of Table 5c (with the same exclusions) shows 12 MSS copied quite carefully in centuries X-XII (an

the increased sacredness of the written Biblical text in later centuries would encourage a more careful treatment in copying, especially during the transition period when the change of script from uncial to minuscule required much recopying for Church use.[1] But in the first three centuries there obviously would have been a *greater* need for recopying of MSS due to the great and frequent wear suffered by the fragile papyrus from church and popular use (not to mention the continued loss of MSS from circulation due to sporadic persecution). There thus likely were *many more* "copying generations" (and more opportunity for corruption!) during the first three centuries of the NT MS period than perhaps intervened between A.D. 400 and the invention of printing in the fifteenth century![2]

Corruptions created during this early period would have had to have been weeded out slowly by repeated cross-correction with other exemplars, a process which eventually culminated in the restoration (basically) of the near-uniform text which later became prevalent throughout the Byzantine Empire. In

---

increase over those copied poorly in the same period!) and 20 MSS copied carefully in centuries XIV-XVI (proportionately fewer, but still an increase). Scribal fidelity in centuries X-XII over against laxity and editorial activity in centuries XIV-XVI thus seems supported. It does appear that in *any* era there were always *more* "careful" and faithful scribes than the reverse!

[1] I.e., between the 9th and 12th centuries—strangely concurrent with Hoskier's period of greatest accuracy! The present writer suggests that *here* is where Kirsopp Lake's "orphan children" fit in (MSS of the Byzantine textype which otherwise show no signs of interrelationship), for it must have been during this change-of-script era that "scribes usually destroyed their exemplars when they had copied the sacred books" (Kirsopp Lake, quoted in Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, p. 52; Pickering, however, erroneously seems to suggest that *every* exemplar MS was always thus "lost").

[2] This hypothesis and the greater portion of the remarks which follow in this and the next chapter reflect *solely* the speculations of the present writer based upon the data accumulated in this and other personal research.

this light, the greater diversity among *early* MSS (both from their contemporaries as well as from the mass of later MSS) is seen at once to be perfectly natural and expected.[1] The "Old Uncial" MSS (as well as Colwell's early papyri) are quite "in tune" with their time; the "wild" MSS of *later* periods, however, are *de facto* "out of step" with most NT MSS of their era!

The present research thus serves only as a *beginning*: a small "data bank" from which textual tidbits can be drawn so as to suggest other avenues of approach and research.[2] Although hardly the "final word" concerning scribal habits, the present study does serve as a "road map" for NT textual research. Further suggestions will be offered in the next and final chapter, but for now the basic task is complete.

---

[1]The problem faced by modern-day supporters of the Alexandrian text-type when attempting to account for the rise and dominance of the Majority Textform stems from this fact. It is difficult to explain how the unitary (basically) Byzantine Textform of the later period (when corruption was far *less* prevalent) could ever have derived from the highly-fragmented Alexandrian and/or Western textual bases (so inconsistent even among themselves). Westcott and Hort postulated the "Syrian [Byzantine] Revision"; modern critics have suggested the "widespread scribal corruption" of the Byzantine-era MSS. The former theory is virtually in abandonment; the present research suggests the same fate for that which is now current. Where goes theory now?

[2]For example, comparison of the "Top" and "Bottom 30" MSS will reveal that MSS containing the *entire* NT predominate in carefulness (12 MSS of the "Bottom 30"), joined similarly by those containing *most* of the NT (13 MSS containing Acts, Paulines, and the Apocalypse). MSS containing the Apocalypse *alone* account for the bulk of the "Top 30" (18 MSS). Also, MSS containing non-Biblical miscellanies appear more frequently in the "Top" (15x) segment rather than in the "Bottom" (1x), suggesting a less careful attitude among *some* scribes who did not copy the Apocalypse for Church use (cf. the discussion above, pp. 146-149). Yet, as has been mentioned, *most* scribes of miscellany MSS were *generally* careful: this present finding suggests only that they were not *fastidiously* so! Lastly, note that *three* of the four Graeco-Latin MSS of the present study (MSS *39*, *39sup*, and *69*) appear within the "Top 30"—a clear indication of corruption tendencies among the bilingually-constructed MSS (i.e., Hoskier *is* correct on this point, but hardly so in his thesis that *all* early MSS were similarly bi- or tri-lingual!). Such gems reflect only a *part* of the riches tabluated herein!

CHAPTER 5

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

What Has Been Learned

Since hitherto no *general* survey of scribal practice in MSS of the Greek NT ever has appeared and since Colwell's examination of the three early papyri was the only *particular* study of scribal habits yet performed, the accumulation of much new data was properly expected. What was *not* anticipated was the discovery that *most* scribes were quite careful and faithful to their task. Both the current handbooks and the findings of Colwell had suggested that a high degree of error and corruption (especially among the Byzantine-era scribes) was the "normal" state of scribal affairs. Yet abundant testimony as to the *true* state of this matter had been preserved in the writings of the *previous* generation of textual scholars though ignored or minimized in present-day manuals.[1] Burgon himself had declared from personal experience that

> A diligent inspection of a vast number of later Copies . . . and the exact Collation of a few, further convinced us that . . . later Copies, so far from "crumbling down salient points, softening irregularities, conforming differences"[1] and so forth,—on countless occasions, *and as a rule*,—preserve

[1]Alford's N.T. vol. i, *proleg.* p. 92.

[1]Perhaps so because the writers which called attention to this point (Burgon, Miller, Hoskier) stood *outside* the "textual mainstream" of their

> those delicate lineaments and minute refinements which the "old uncials" are constantly observed to obliterate.[1]

Burgon further stated,

> I venture to assert that no conviction will force itself so irresistibly on the mind of him who submits to the labour of exactly collating a few Cursive copies of the Gospels [or any other NT book], as that the documents in question have been executed with even extraordinary diligence, fidelity, and skill.[2]

Hoskier too speaks from personal experience with MSS both early and late in his Gospels/Apocalypse studies:

> A very noteworthy fact is the fidelity of nearly all scribes in copying. A single line [in the Apocalypse apparatus] generally suffices for me to inscribe the few vagaries of spelling of a very few untutored scribes in a host of places where one might expect much greater variety.[3]

> For the most part the scribes themselves are guiltless. . . . The scribes, are, ninety per cent., careful and honest.[4]

> Let us take courage and go forward. ¶ We are jealous that the Church's slow-gathered verdict should not be lightly put aside today. Our experience among the Greek cursives proves to us that transmission has not been careless, and they do represent a wholesome traditional text.[5]

---

own day and their data were not reproduced in the leading handbooks of that time. Even today current handbooks reflect the "mainstream" views of the past and fail to inform the reader adequately of the "scholarly opposition" to the Alexandrian textype manifested in the last century. Cf. Metzger, *Text*, pp. 135-136 (dismissing quickly "the anachronistic views of Burgon") and Greenlee, *Introduction*, pp. 81-82 (speaking of "The Final [!] Defense of the Textus Receptus)".

[1]Burgon, *Revision Revised*, pp. 337-338.

[2]Idem, *Traditional Text*, p. 222. [3]Hoskier, *Apocalpyse*, I:xxxvii.

[4]Ibid., I:xiii. Hoskier further states that "there is not so much error in pure transcription as one would suppose" since "there are certain verses which the scribes, one and all, seem to have left almost untouched" (I:xiv-xv; a list of 26 such verses follows).

[5]Hoskier, *Codex B and Its Allies*, I:416. Note that the present writer does *not* accept Hoskier's faulty deductions which seem to *contradict* the above assertion. These include the view that most *sensible* singular readings were reproduced *intact* from Ancestor MSS (cf. *Apocalypse*, I:xv) by

Such certainly is not the impression of scribal activity given by the current handbooks, though Metzger does attempt to soften the impression that all the scribes were "demons" by saying,

> Lest the foregoing examples of alterations should give the impression that scribes were altogether wilful and capricious in transmitting ancient copies of the New Testament, it ought to be noted that other evidence points to the careful and painstaking work on the part of *many* faithful copyists.[1]

The inference yet remains that "*most*" copyists were not so careful,[2] but such a judgment will have to be modified in light of the present findings, chief among which is the following:

(1) Scribes were *not* the "great corrupters" of the text as has been supposed. *Most* scribes—and especially those of the later "Byzantine era"—were extremely careful, their few corruptions being mostly accidental and the deliberate alterations being mostly stylistic changes of a minor nature. Such a conclusion appears to hold good for the entire NT since, if anything, the textual problems of the Apocalypse should have tended to *increase* corruption over that of the other NT books.[3] Other conclusions now can be hypothesized from this principle:

(2) Although Hoskier was correct that "far more 'polishing' took place after the original was launched than has been

---

"ignorant" but "conscientious" scribes and the idea that the more "sensible" singular readings a MS possesses, the more "ancient" is the text preserved therein (based upon the same presumption).

[1]Metzger, *Text*, p. 206 [Emphasis mine]. The "demon" metaphor (as well as a corresponding "angel" metaphor) derives from Richard A. Taylor's review of Pickering's *Identity* ("Queen Anne Resurrected?: A Review Article," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (1977): 377-381.

[2]Metzger's examples are solely concerned with readings which yield "no good sense" and are "manifestly erroneous." Far better would it have been to dwell upon the *overall* general carefulness of nearly *all* scribes!

[3]This despite the fact that "in the Apocalypse much (if not all) is

supposed hitherto,"[1] such "polishing" was confined to a small *minority* of scribes. Most such scribal "improvement" occurred in MSS wherein *great carelessness* in basic copying closely accompanied wanton *editorializing*. Yet neither should this fact have been unexpected, for in 1911 J. P. Postgate wrote,

> the virtues of a scribe are *honesty* and *care* (or in a single word *fidelity*) and *intelligence*. But it is rare to find these combined in a very high degree [!], and out of them we can least easily dispense with fidelity. Paradoxical as it may seem, the mechanical corruptions of a stupid but faithful copyist may tell us more than the intelligent copyings of a less faithful one.[2]

Thus (in Postgate's terms), scribes are usually either "stupid but honest" or "wise and dishonest,"[3] the latter also accompanied by a certain degree of carelessness. This agrees well with the present findings; but *why* such combinations prevail rather than, say, "stupid and careless" (such as the scribe of MS *15*; cf. above p. 152, n. 1), no one can say.[4]

As has been noted, the *early* MSS are literally *filled* with singular readings, predominantly of the "careless-plus-editorial" type. Such MSS appear only *infrequently* among the

---

different from elsewhere" (Kurt Aland, gen.ed., *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece*, 26th ed. [Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979], p. 53*). Mention already has been made of the competing Av and Q textypes, the non-ecclesiastical transmission line, and the "ungrammar" of this unique book—*none* of which was present to influence corruption in the other NT books!

[1] Hoskier, *Hebrews in P^{46}*, p. 63.

[2] *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed. (1911), s.v. "Textual Criticism," by John Percival Postgate, XXVI:713a. Italics original.

[3] "Dishonesty" = deliberate editorial alteration of the text regardless of other motives, whether good or bad.

[4] Is it not strange that, out of all the MSS examined in this study, *not one* demonstrated high editorializing *plus* great carefulness in copying? Nor was this selection "biassed": even those MSS *not* examined in detail which possessed high singular totals reflect the *same* mixture of great carelessness and editorializing as those MSS selected for specific study!

later documents; there the rule is *few* singular readings, most of which are *accidental* in nature. The question therefore has been raised (p. 187, n. 1 above) as to *how* the Majority Textform[1] *ever* could have arisen from the internally-conflicting Alexandrian and/or Western MSS had such indeed adequately reflected the "normal" state of textual matters in the first three centuries (including the "autograph era" itself).

The present writer would suggest that it is quite *possible*, even highly *probable*, that the extant early MSS of an *Egyptian* provenance are *not* representative samples of *all* Antiquity.[2] Even Hort recognized this possibility in writing that "ancient MSS in various ages have been for the most part little preserved and little copied."[3] Hoskier in fact documents the non-representative nature of the "Old Uncial" MSS in a 15-page listing of their readings in the Apocalypse which have *no* minuscule support whatever (most such readings in fact being *singular* to the "Old Uncial" in question)![4] Such continual divergence among the *oldest* MSS, especially when they belong to the same (Egyptian local?) textype seems to preclude any one of them from serving as a "typical" sample of ancient text except insofar as their textual fluctuations "typify" a general lack of scribal care in Egypt.

---

[1]This coined term better describes the aggregate "Majority Text" than the word "textype," since numerous "textypes" are contained within such.

[2]The capitalization of "Antiquity" to describe the *whole* of Antiquity follows the practice of Burgon; cf. Burgon, *Traditional Text*, pp. 40-43; and idem, *Revision Revised*, pp. 332-333.

[3]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 20.

[4]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I;xlviii-lxiv. Predominant in this list are MSS ℵ, A, B (= Greg. 046), C, and P. Apart from MSS P and B (respectively

There is clear evidence in other related fields that the *extant* samples of "Antiquity" are *not* "representative," for we possess only "evidence that is circumstantial in nature, often fortuitous in discovery, and always but partial in survival."[1] Especially when that which is today extant from Antiquity is preserved in but a few source documents ("samples"), there is a *high* probability that the "whole story" is not told. Such probability *increases* when the "samples" all derive from the same general locale.

In Medieval Europe the *Biblia Pauperum* once was a favorite instructional tool of the Catholic Church. Long before printing by movable type was current in Europe this picture-book "Bible" was actually *printed* from carved blocks of wood! It was immensely popular, and *thousands* of copies of various "editions" were produced by this "xylographic" method—yet today there is *not one* complete copy of a *Biblia Pauperum* to be found, nor are there many fragments preserved. The reason for such is simply that the copies had *worn out from use*![2] Were one to argue that these block-printed books were never very popular since the remaining fragments are few and well-nigh ruined, he would argue against other written historical data concerning their great popularity and thus be proven wrong!

But what about the NT MS situation, where external corroborative testimony is lacking? The case of block-printed works of *Arabic* literature serves as a parallel: there is *no*

---

of the 9th and 10th centuries) which both possess *fewer* citations, the "Old Uncials" are fully viewed in utter conflict!

[1] Yamauchi, "Double Standard," p. 182.

[2] A larger discussion of the *Biblia Pauperum* can be found in Pickering,

mention whatever of such in all of written history![1] Yet in the latter half of the 19th century a number of fragments of such block-printed books in Arabic were found in the Fayyum region of Egypt (once more!), which books were printed in the 10th-12th centuries. Parallel to the *Biblia Pauperum*,

> the Fayyum texts . . . contain no complete books. What survive are single sheets of paper, parchment and, in one case, linen. . . . The fragments, moreover, are attractively designed and laid out, and make use of two-color printing, red and black. The scripts cover the whole range of Arabic calligraphy . . . suggesting that Arabic printing in Egypt was the product of long evolution [!] and must have employed a number of craftsmen.[2]

In a striking difference from the *Biblia Pauperum*, the utter lack of historical mention of Arabic block-printing serves to illustrate the point that the *extant* evidence from Antiquity may *fail* to provide a "representative sample." Lunde states,

> the inference to be drawn from these finds is hard to accept: that the history of printing has been *substantially wrong for centuries*. . . . [Yet] the block prints from Egypt provide irrefutable evidence that the Islamic world possessed the technique of block printing before Europe. These block prints are, in effect, the *missing link* in the evolution of printing.[3]

Identity: Revised, pp. 133-134. The information appearing therein was contributed by the present writer. Of special interest are the implications drawn therein concerning the general disappearance of *most* ancient NT MSS.

[1]The material discussed herein derives from Paul Lunde, "A Missing Link," *Aramco World* 32 (Mar.-Apr. 1981): 26-27. Lunde points out (p. 26) that this discovery "has never been publicized and only rarely discussed, outside [of] a small circle of specialists," so it is *still* "obscure"!

[2]Lunde, "Missing Link," p. 27. Fragments of the Qur'ān and other Arabic literature are included among the finds. Two photographs of such xylographic book-pages appear within the body of Lunde's article.

[3]Such significant discoveries in an area where history otherwise had been silent should caution one against hasty acceptance of *e silentio* arguments to the effect that "no early Byzantine-type MS exists" and/or "no early Father used a Byzantine text." The present writer suggests a faulty methodology at work in such statements beyond the argument *e silentio* which *can* be refuted in a lengthy and detailed manner, but space does not permit that luxury within this presentation.

Yet who would have even *begun* to suspect this "missing link" had ever existed—indeed, who would have even postulated a *need* for such within the "transmissional history" of printing? Like the case of the *Biblia Pauperum*, "Antiquity" has *not* been properly represented by the extant evidence!

Even in the quotations and/or allusions from the NT in the writings of the early Fathers there can be no certainty that a true "representative sample" of ancient NT MSS can be traced. Jaroslav Pelikan notes that the exegesis of John 1:12-13 from the second through fifth centuries so seriously affected its Patristic textual transmission that the Majority reading (found today in *all* Greek MSS without serious alteration)[1] would be virtually *unknown* or condemned as an invention of the heretics if the early Fathers were our *only* "representative sample" of Antiquity! Pelikan comments at length on this point:

> Interpretation [of] the Christian understanding of the person of Chirst . . . was bound to have implications for the doctrine of man. An intriguing example of such reflection is the history of John 1:12-13 . . . : "To all who received him, who believed in his name, he gave power to become children of God; *who were* [textual variant: *who was*] born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh nor of the will of man, but of God." *Many, perhaps even most, of the quotations of this passage in the Christian writers of the second and third centuries contained the reading "who was!"* (which also appeared in some Latin and Syriac codices of the New Testament),[2] which would seem to be an explicit reference to the virgin birth of Jesus. . . . [Irenaeus'] quotations of the passage . . . read it in the singular, as a reference to the special circumstances of Christ's birth. *Tertullian went so far as to label the plural* [i.e., the Majority] *reading a Gnostic distortion*

---

[1] A few MSS differ from the Majority reading, but none to the effect that this minority Patristic reading is supported.

[2] The UBS[3] mentions it[b] (sy[c]) and (sy[p mss]) only as supporting the Patristic reading, along with *seven* early Fathers. The Majority reading is supported by *nine* Fathers, nearly all later than those favoring the minority reading.

> *of the passage*, insisting that the passage *proved* that Christ was the Logos made flesh, but that "as flesh, he is not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of man" because he was born of a virgin [Tertullian, *Carn.* 19.2; 24.2]. . . . Jerome was too good a textual scholar to accept "who was born" as the proper reading in John 1:13; but his ascetical theology . . . put such a premium on virginity . . . that he no longer needed this reading of the verse to make the point.[1]

Thus, even the vast majority of early Fathers might fail to present a proper picture of the true state of early textual matters. If such can occur among writers who were separated by both distance and time (whereby distortion due to the paucity of early data might have been thought safeguarded), it should not therefore be thought unusual that MSS emanating from but *one* local area (though of various dates) similarly might present a *non*-representative sampling of the state of the NT text in the early centuries. It is *always* a strong possibility that a "sample from Antiquity" is *not* typical of *all* Antiquity if the sample is preserved in only a few source documents!

In light of the later unitary Textform found in *ca.* 80-85% of the extant NT MSS it seems increasingly more difficult to believe that such *ever* could have arisen from the "typical" samples of Egyptian antiquity we possess today. Rather, Hort's initial premise (!) stated that

> in the ordinary course of things the most *recent* manuscripts would *at all times* be the most numerous, and therefore the most generally accessible. Even if multi-

---

[1] Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine*, vol. I: "The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)" (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971), pp. 287-289. Emphasis my own. The mention of Jerome apparently refers *solely* to the reading of the Vulgate; so too UBS[3].

> plication of transcripts were not always advancing, there would be a slow but continual substitution of new copies for old.[1]

This is later followed by the logical deduction that

> as soon as the numbers of a minority exceed what can be explained by accidental coincidence, . . . their agreement in error, if it be error, can only be explained on genealogical grounds.[2]

And therefore, Hort admits,

> a theoretical presumption indeed remains that *a majority of extant documents is more likely to represent a majority of ancestral documents at each stage of transmission* [!] *than vice versa*.[3]

Were Hort to be given the credence he deserved while upon *firm* ground the basic disagreement between the Majority Textform as found in the mass of "later" copies and the "early" Alexandrian and Western "samples" of Antiquity easily could be resolved. Allowing this initial premise of Hort and the deductions therefrom to hold true, one easily can maintain that the *majority* of MSS at *all* stages of transmission *should* have contained the Majority Textform—the extant "limited sample" of *Egyptian* antiquity to the contrary! Like the block-printed books, *most*

---

[1]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 10. [2]Ibid., p. 45.

[3]Ibid., emphasis my own. Hort *immediately* qualified this "theoretical presumption" by stating "but the presumption is too minute to weigh against the smallest tangible evidence of other kinds." But his "tangible" evidence is speculative—*historia secundum Hort*—being primarily based upon the supposed frequent "Byzantine conflation" (which the present study has shown *not* to be the case) among later MSS as certain "proof" that a third-century "Byzantine revision" had taken place. Without this "revision" Hort knew his theory could not stand! Present-day scholars willingly dismiss the "revision" thesis as untenable but retain the "conflation" hypothesis as evidence of the secondary nature of the Byzantine Textform (cf. D. A. Carson, *The King James Version Debate* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979], pp. 44-45, 110-111, for a recent restatement of the view that the conflation theory "is a reasonable [!] way of accounting for the appearance in history of this [Byzantine] text-type about A.D. 350."). Aside from conflation, the "smallest tangible evidence" which Hort could adduce to overturn his "theoretical

early MSS (and presumably most of those possessing the Majority Textform) simply had "worn out" from constant use, were lost, seized, or otherwise destroyed. The chance silence of historical discovery means little: an early Byzantine papyrus MS might be discovered at any time, just as the Alexandrian and Western papyri fragments were discovered. Indeed, until the discovery of P^{75} in 1955 there was *no* early MS evidence for the Alexandrian textype *as an entity* before Codices Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (ℵ) of the fourth century! Codex Alexandrinus (A) of the fifth century contains a clearly Byzantine text in the Gospels and Codex Washingtonianus (W) of the same century has a text of the Gospels which fluctuates between the Majority and minority textypes—unless one is prepared to argue as did Hort for a "Byzantine revision" which produced such a Textform full-blown, the likelihood of *early* papyrus MSS reflecting the Majority Textform remains high. Further, it has been noted that the Egyptian "scribal minority" were both *careless* and *editorial*: the texts they so distorted could hardly have served as "parents" for the Majority Textform—but the *reverse* easily could have occurred!

---

presumption" amounts to this: no one knows how many copies might be made from a single exemplar, nor were all exemplars preserved for a uniform length of time, let alone to the present day; *Q.E.D*, "*every* ground for expecting *a priori* any sort of correspondence of numerical proportion between existing documents and their less numerous ancestors in any one age [including the present!] falls to the ground" (p. 45). Such reasoning in light of the basic presumptions which *already* had been set forth as valid makes *no* "logical sense"! Yet on this slim basis the *hard evidence* of the 85%+ agreement of nearly all MSS with the Majority Textform is allowed to fall to the ground in favor of *pure speculation* which parallels the thesis that an ape at a typewriter might eventually produce some Shakespearian lines! Hort tries to bolster his argument by claiming that "this is true

(3) It appears from the present data that *generalizations* as to what a scribe "usually" would or would not do are useless. *General* principles simply do *not* apply to most *specific* situations! Long ago Hoskier lamented that "we have had too many cheap and hasty deductions from insignificant or insufficient data"[1]—and the area of scribal habits is one in which data have not been hitherto forthcoming! Metzger has properly urged that "it is important to see not only what *might* happen, but also what *has* happened in the copying of manuscripts."[2] Such knowledge is an utter prerequisite before suppositions as to "transcriptional probability" can be expounded, for such "depend upon considerations of . . . the [known] habits of scribes."[3] Yet until now much of NT textual criticism has been concerned with "the probabilities of what a scribe *might* have done"[4] without evidence sufficient to support its own contentions! But Hort himself sounded the proper note against easy acceptance and application of generalizations:

> if we look behind the canons laid down by critics to the observed facts from which their authority [supposedly] proceeds, we find, first, that *scribes were moved*

---

even in the absence of mixture; and mixture . . . does but multiply the uncertainty" (p. 45). Yet Hort did *not* go on to explain *how* such "wild" mixture—and mixture certainly *did* occur in high degree through cross-comparison and correction of MSS—stemming from the early Alexandrian and Western MSS (so inconsistent even among themselves) was able to produce the virtually *intact* and *self-consistent* Majority Textform in most MSS. Rather, Hort opted for an "easier" solution *via* the "Byzantine Revision" thesis. The same option is rejected by modern critics in favor of a "process" view. But no "process" which begins with thoroughgoing *mixture* could of itself ever result in a *unitary* Textform—such a view parallels the "ape theory"!

[1]Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:xxxviii. [2]Metzger, *Text*, p. 186. Italics his.
[3]Ibid., p. 209. [4]Greenlee, *Introduction*, p. 114 (quoted out of context).

> *by a much greater variety of impulse than is usually supposed*; next, that *different scribes were to a certain limited extent moved by different impulses.*[1]

Hort thus indicates that all scribes are *not* alike, and generalizations concerning what any scribe or group of scribes *may* have done in any particular case are tenuous at best. Yet current textual praxis vigorously applies such generalizations in cases where such might aid the case of an opposing variant![2] One need only skim the handbooks to see such generalizations running rampant. Note the following examples:

> If a scribe makes an *intentional* change in the N.T. text, he is *more likely* to add than to omit.[3]
>
> *In general*, the shorter reading is to be preferred.[4]
>
> *In general*, the more difficult reading is to be preferred [since the scribe] *would be tempted* to make an emendation.[5]
>
> A scribe is *more likely* to change a word which gives difficulty into a word which seems easier to understand.[6]
>
> When [scribes] found that the same passage was given differently in two or more manuscripts which [they] had before [them]. . . *most scribes* incorporated both readings in the new copy which they were transcribing. This . . . is *characteristic* of the later, Byzantine type of text.[7]

---

[1]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 25. Emphasis here and in the following quotations my own. Hort further stated that "the professional training of scribes can *rarely* obliterate individual differences of accuracy and conscientiousness"!

[2]*Most* current statements concerning what scribes were "likely" to do are issued when the reading so opposed is that of the Majority of MSS; the very same possibilities are often minimized or neglected when they could apply to Alexandrian or Western "preferred" readings!

[3]Greenlee, *Introduction*, p. 114. Harmonization and conflation are included therein as part of the "more likely" types of addition.

[4]Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. xxvii. A list of exceptions (accident and some deliberate shortenings) follows; the *general* priciple still holds.

[5]Ibid., p. xxvi. Metzger specifically excepts readings which are "so difficult that [they could] have arisen only by accident in transcription" (p. xxvii); in most cases it is the "difficult" *Byzantine* readings which are so judged!

[6]Greenlee, *Introduction*, p. 115. [7]Metzger, *Text*, p. 200.

> Scribes did not *commonly* shorten readings intentionally merely to eliminate . . . duplication or repetition.[1]
>
> Scribes would *frequently* bring divergent passages into harmony with one another.[2]
>
> The expansion of Ἰησοῦ . . . by the addition of Χριστοῦ . . . is a *natural* scribal accretion.[3]
>
> The clause καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ . . . is a *typical Byzantine gloss*, prompted by the desire to provide a balanced statement.[4]
>
> The *general tendency* was to expand liturgical formulations.[5]
>
> The *general tendency of scribes* is to make modifications in the interest of generalizing the reference of aphorisms.[6]
>
> Copyists are *more likely* to have omitted the pronoun [σε], thus generalizing the Apostle's statement, than to have inserted it.[7]

Such comments typify and literally overflow the pages of text-critical literature, both that current and that which has appeared over the past century. But there have been *no* studies which by force of evidence should have made such generalizations commonplace! The single limited project of Colwell in fact offered confident support to *none* of the above general statements! The scribes of Colwell's three papyri (P^{45}, P^{66}, and P^{75}) differed *radically* from each other in their peculiar habits even though they "come from the same period and from the same general area"![8] Colwell expressly notes that

> Each scribe has a *personal* coefficient of the frequency of his mistakes. Each has his own *pattern* of errors. . . . On these last and most important matters, our three scribes are *widely* divided.[9]

---

[1] Greenlee, *Introduction*, p. 121. Emphasis here and in the other block quotations my own.

[2] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. xxvii. [3] Ibid., in loc. Rom. 3:26.

[4] Ibid., in loc. Rom. 14:6. [5] Ibid., in loc. Rom. 16:20.

[6] Ibid., in loc. 1 Cor. 7:15. [7] Ibid., in loc. 1 Cor. 8:10.

[8] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 111. All three papyri are dated *ca.* A.D. 150-200 and derive (as usual in the case of early MSS) from Egypt.

[9] Ibid., p. 114.

Such great diversity in types and patterns of error among scribes who also "created readings which can properly be called 'editorial'"[1] in their own individual styles certainly does not tend to reinforce generalizations as to what these scribes would or would not be likely to do! Nor does the situation improve when the *specific* habits of these three scribes are examined. For example, the "likelihood" that a scribe will *add* rather than *omit* becomes a hollow promise when considering the scribe of P^{45}; Colwell notes that

> As an editor the scribe of P^{45} wielded a sharp axe. . . . The dispensable word is dispensed with. He omits adverbs, adjectives, nouns, participles, verbs, personal pronouns—without any compensatory habit of addition. . . . He [deliberately] shortens the text in at least fifty places in *singular readings alone*. . . . If the subject of the verb can be understood, it is not expressed. . . . One word is made to serve for several.[2]

Nor is P^{45} alone in this "propensity toward omission," for both "P^{45} and P^{75} omit more conjunctions than they add";[3] with P^{75} alone "one of his habits is to omit personal pronouns";[4] and "all three scribes omit articles more often than they add them."[5] Also, in the area of harmonization to "remote parallels" (i.e., between one Synoptic Gospel and another), Colwell found such harmonizations "are *not* frequent,"[6] but harmonization to the "immediate context" (i.e., attraction to a neighboring word, addition of a balancing clause, change of tense or case, etc.) is *by far* the most common form to be found among the early papyri.[7]

---

[1] Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 118. [2] Ibid., pp. 118-119. Emphasis his.
[3] Ibid., p. 120. [4] Ibid., p. 121. [5] Ibid., p. 120.
[6] Ibid., p. 113. Emphasis mine. [7] Ibid. Colwell provides examples.

The preceding items as well as others which could be cited from Colwell's 1965 study[1] demonstrate that current generalizations as to scribal habits did not appear to be valid *then* and, in light of the present study, do not appear to be valid today! All such pronouncements have derived from long-held *theory* as to scribal habits without follow-up from detailed *research data*. One cannot be confident in pronouncing upon what scribes would or would not do in any given instance in the absence of detailed investigation,[2] yet such appears to be the true legacy of Hort: whatever *hard data* he considered (which was obviously convincing to him!) over the nearly thirty years he jointly worked with Westcott in constructing his NT text[3] is *not* provided the reader of his "Introduction." There remain therein only *eight* questionable examples of "Syrian [= Byzantine] conflation" upon which the promulgation and subsequent acceptance of his theory rests![4]

This Hortian mentality all too easily allows *theoretical* generalizations concerning scribal habits to become accepted as *proven fact* when no such proof was forthcoming. Upon such "facts" *additional* generalizations and theories are built, and many things thus become confused. Even Colwell was not

---

[1]Originally published as "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text," in *The Bible in Modern Scholarship*, ed. J. Philip Hyatt (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965), pp. 370-389.

[2]Yet even Colwell succumbs in his detailed study by *nullifying* the significance of the "editorial" functions of the three scribes in suggesting that their role "was to *select* rather than *create* readings" ("Scribal Habits," p. 118)—such reflects a return to *Hoskier's* position that *all* "sensible" singular readings *antedate* the MSS in which they appear!

[3]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 16.

[4]This fact was central to the refutation of Hort's theory in Burgon,

immune but himself later generalized concerning what *all* scribes were "likely" to have done on the basis of his own study of only *three* early papyri![1] Yet Colwell was among the *more cautious* of textual scholars: other writers have allowed the generalizations concerning scribal habits to establish *as fact* the theory of the "progressive deterioration" of the NT text due to massive scribal corruption![2]

Hort quite naturally promoted this view since it was necessary to the achievement of his primary goal, the overthrow of the Byzantine text and the subsequent enthronement of MSS B and ℵ as the primary "neutral" or "near-autograph" representatives of the NT text (today's "Alexandrian" textype).[3]

The Revision Revised, e.g., pp. 257-268. Burgon's replies are especially pointed in regard to the "unadduced" evidence of Hort; e.g., "we are never told which the 'Readings distinctively Syrian' *are*,—although they are henceforth referred to in every page"! (p. 267). Cf. also Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, pp. 58-62 and especially pp. 171-200. Modern scholars, though *rejecting* many of Hort's contentions, nevertheless *retain* as a primary doctrine the "secondary" nature of the Byzantine Textform—a "fact" which derives strictly from Hort's "non-proof" (as refuted by Burgon)!

[1]In his later "Hort Redivivus" Colwell referred to the "Scribal Habits" findings as proof that "scribes do not automatically, as scribes, copy accurately," citing the "almost two hundred nonsense readings" of P^{66} in support (p. 165). The reader thus was left with the impression (perhaps believed by Colwell himself) that such was typical of *most* scribes' work. Colwell further asserted on the basis of his limited sampling of but *three* early Egyptian MSS that "the scribes" (in general) of the first three centuries "enjoyed a remarkable freedom from control" (p. 165). Again, this is a *petitio principii e silentio* that these *three* early Egyptian papyri are *truly* "representative" of *all* early MSS within those 200+ years!

[2]Such a theory is often reflected in the *epithets* attached to the Majority Textform. Metzger's remarks in his *Textual Commentary* are but typical: he speaks of the "debased" and "corrupt" Byzantine text, which has been "disfigured" by "scribal alterations" accumulated "over the centuries" (pp. xxi, xxiii *bis*). Such epithets immediately *prejudice* the otherwise open-minded reader against the Majority Textform! The present writer thus suggests that *excision* of such epithets should be a priority.

[3]This entire *scenario* is stated explicitly in Colwell's *earliest* and *latest* textual articles; cf. "Genealogical Method," pp. 64-66, and "Hort Redivivus," pp. 158-159.

Hort stated his leading principle on this head in two complementary forms:

> Repeated transcription involves multiplication of error; and the *consequent* presumption that a relatively *late* text is *likely* to be a relatively *corrupt* text.[1]
>
> Repeated transcription *tends* to multiply corruption of texts, and the subsequent mixture of *independent* texts [tends] *to confuse* alike their sound and their corrupt readings.[2]

Hort could only make such statements because he was arguing from *e silentio* presumptions concerning scribal habits and the reconstructed history of the text as *he* saw it. To Hort the "autograph" text was viewed as basically irrecoverable, and textual "history" only began "late" (in the second century) amid a number of *competing* textypes (the "Syrian" = Byzantine excluded, of course).[3] From this basis alone Hort derived his view that *all* extant MSS reflect the "mixture" of *many* pre-existing "independent" texts. But by Hort's own definition, "mixture" amounts to the *cross-correction* of MSS by different exemplars![4] Hort further admits that such cross-correction "has taken place on a *large scale* in the New Testament";[5] and that this took place from the *earliest* days is evident from the numerous corrections now to be found in the papyri of the second and third centuries (which were unknown in Hort's day)![6] Yet Hort considered all this as part of a wide-

---

[1] Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 5. Emphasis mine.

[2] Ibid., p. 15. Emphasis mine. [3] Ibid., pp. 90-119, 162-179.

[4] Cf. ibid., pp. 5, 8-9. [5] Ibid., p. 8.

[6] The corrections of P^{66} (2nd century) by an exemplar of different type has already been noted (p. 2, n. 4 above). Cf. Colwell, "Quantitative Relationships," pp. 60-62, in which P^{66}/P^{66c} and $\aleph^{*}/\aleph^{c}$ are treated as *separate*

spread tendency to *corrupt* rather than to *correct* or *restore* the NT text![1] Hort seems to have forgotten that these texts were *never* wholly *independent* but in fact were *interdependent*, all deriving from the *same* autographs and sharing a large amount (*ca.* 80%) of "common text" (though each deviated in its remaining text in particular patterns *away* from what *once* also had been "common text," i.e., the autographs!).

Yet Hort tacitly acknowledged (though he never would have approved this choice of words) that in the process of time cross-correction with other exemplars *would* tend to *remove* errors and deliberate alterations both from *individual* MSS and from *small groups* of MSS where their text had deviated from the autograph reading! The result of such a process would be the promulgation of the actual *autograph* reading amid the *majority* of MSS in a proportion that would grow increasingly *larger* as time wore on! This premise is stated rather technically by Hort in the following words:

> Every transcription . . . involves the chance of the introduction of some errors: and even if the transcript is revised by comparison with its exemplar[2] . . . , there is no

---

witnesses because of the radically different nature of their correctors' text. It is interesting to note that Colwell states (p. 62) that "the bulk of singular readings occur in P^{66} and ℵ," to which he appends the remark, "(careless scribes?)"—and this was a study of 205 places of variation in *John 11* (p. 60)! The character of MS ℵ thus truly seems *consistent*!

[1]This is wholly "logical" *if* Hort's premise be granted that such mixture occurred among texts (Alexandrian, Western, and "neutral") which had appeared *full-blown* in their uniqueness *circa* A.D. 125-150. But to grant such a premise requires the *negation* of all textual history leading up to that point and the *neglect* of the ultimate *interdependence* of *all* MSS regardless of textype!

[2]Or, more likely, with a *different* exemplar. Hort does not mention this possibility although such is prerequisite for his *entire* "mixture" thesis (cf. his "Introduction," pp. 47-52). Yet the simple recognition of

> absolute security that *all* the errors will be corrected. When the transcript becomes itself the parent of other copies . . . its [remaining] errors are for the most part reproduced. Those only are likely to be removed which at once strike the eye of a transcriber as mere blunders destructive of sense, and even in these cases he will often [?] go astray in making what seems to him the obvious correction.[1] In addition to inherited deviations . . . each fresh transcript is liable to contain fresh errors, to be transmitted in like manner[2] to its own descendants.[3]

This basic premise was more technically enhanced soon after:

> In books widely read [such as the NT] transmission *ceases* after a while to retain exclusively the form of diverging ramification. Manuscripts are written in which there is an *eclectic fusion* of the texts of different exemplars, either by the simultaneous use of more than one at the time of transcription,[4] or by the incorporation of various readings noted in the margin[5] of a single exemplar from other copies. . . . This mixture . . . of texts previously independent,[6] has taken place on a *large* scale in the New Testament. Within *narrow geographical areas* it was doubtless at work from a *very early* time, and it would *naturally* extend itself with the increase of communication between *distant* churches.[7] There is reason to suspect that its greatest activity on a *large* scale began in the second half of the third century, the interval of peace between Gallienus's edict of toleration and the

---

this fact allows the present reconstruction! Was Hort unaware of this?

[1]But this concerns *only* the *copying* process! Cross-comparison and correction came *later*, and likely would have removed *most* if not *all* remaining or "new" blunders as well as well-intentioned but "wrong" individual corrections.

[2]This "like manner" *includes* the ongoing cross-correction process which was designed to *weed out* those very errors! Hort seems to have forgotten this most important point when stating his own theory.

[3]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 5. Emphasis mine.

[4]Except in the case of highly-editorial scribes this situation was not likely a frequent occurrence.

[5]The present study indicates that *most* corrections and/or variant readings were placed directly *above* the word or words in question rather than in the margin.

[6]As noted above, the more correct word is "*inter*dependent"!

[7]Such communication already operated at a *high* level in even the *earliest* times as the data of early church history in regard to heresy clearly indicates!

> outbreak of the last persecution [that of Diocletian]. At all events it was in *full operation* in the fourth century . . . [and during] the *many* centuries of comparatively *simple* [!] transmission that followed.[1]

Once these statements are connected with those previously cited[2] it becomes obvious that the Majority Text position more than any other receives strong support from Hort's *initial* presumptions. This also explains *why* Hort felt the utter necessity of postulating the "Byzantine revision" hypothesis so as to *otherwise* account for the later dominance of that Textform. The Byzantine Textform could *not* have arisen through a normal cross-correction "process" since Hort's preliminary observations would thus require the Byzantine Textform to be at least *closer* to the autograph than Hort's "neutral" text![3]

Modern scholars, though rejecting Hort's "revision" hypothesis, have consistently *failed* to recognize the wondrous working of the cross-correction process and in so doing have *by-passed* what Hort could not legitimately neglect! One need only compare some current statements with those of Hort to see the difference in emphasis:

> Copies of the New Testament books were carried to various localities by the Christians, each ms. containing its own characteristic textual variants. These mss. would

---

[1] Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 8. Emphasis mine.

[2] I.e., the presumptions that "in the ordinary course of things the most *recent* manuscripts would *at all times* be the most numerous, and therefore the most generally accessible" and that "a majority of *extant* documents is more likely to represent a majority of *ancestral* documents *at each stage of transmission* than *vice versa*" (Hort, "Introduction," pp. 10 and 45). Emphasis my own.

[3] It thus is strange to see the "process" view of the Byzantine text being urged by modern critics (cf. Colwell, "Method in Establishing the

> then be further copied, with the resulting copies tending to contain the characteristic variants of the parent ms. plus some additional errors.[1]
>
> Congregations in and near a large city . . . were provided with copies of the Scriptures in the form which was current in that area. As additional copies were made, the number of special readings and renderings would be both conserved and, to some extent, increased, so that eventually a type of text grew up which was more or less peculiar to that locality.
>
> At the same time the distinctiveness of a local text tended [?] to become diluted and mixed with other types of text [!]. . . . On the whole, however, during the earliest centuries the tendencies to develop and preserve a particular type of [local] text prevailed over the tendencies leading to a mixture of texts [!]. Thus there grew up several distinctive kinds of New Testament text.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In a more precise sense, however, the Byzantine form of the Greek text . . . was *disfigured* . . . by the accumulation over the centuries of *myriads* [!] of scribal alterations, many of minor significance but some of considerable consequence.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . . The reader will have seen how, during about fourteen centuries . . . , numerous *changes* and *accretions* came into the text. Of the approximately five thousand Greek manuscripts . . . that are known today, *no two agree exactly* in all particulars. Confronted by a *mass* of *conflicting* readings [?], *editors must decide* which variants *deserve* to be included in the text and which should be relegated to the apparatus.[2]

The current view of "steadily increasing corruption" seems to hold that, at a point soon after the completion of the autograph, texts carried to various locales had so soon increased

---

Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," *Studies*, p. 53; Colwell here argues that *all* textypes represent the *end result* of a lengthy "process"!). All who claim such have failed to take note of Hort's "preliminary observations" mentioned above. Nor can the "process" view (which urges the steady *divergence* of MSS either in "local texts" or full-blown textypes) explain the eventual *convergence* of these highly-differing types into the near-unitary Byzantine Textform! Cf. the detailed refutation of the "process" view by Zane Hodges in Appendix C of Pickering's *Identity: Revised*, pp. 168-169.

[1] Greenlee, *Introduction*, pp. 60-61 (cf. above, pp. 81-82, notes).

[2] Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, pp. xvii, xxiii, xxiv. Emphasis my own.

in corruption that "Local Text" forms came into existence.[1] For some nearly unexplainable reason (episcopal "control"?), the "Local Texts"—produced after steady *divergence* from the autograph—became *stabilized* for quite some time. Some such "Local Texts" were so widespread as to become minority textypes, such as the Alexandrian or Caesarean. Yet for some unknown reason the *stabilization* effect ceased and the "steady corruption" process once more prevailed, producing the near-*unitary* Byzantine Textform as the peculiar result of "the accumulation over the centuries" of "myriads of scribal alterations."

But the problem with this thesis is that "steadily increasing corruption" *cannot* produce *both* divergence (the "Local Texts") *and* convergence (the Majority Textform)! Hort correctly declared that the ongoing process of cross-correction will (at some point) cause a *halt* to increasing corruption and in fact begin a *reversal* of the deterioration process which will culminate in the *restoration* of the original readings in the bulk of the MSS—yet modern opinion by-passes this consideration of Hort entirely!

The fact of the basic 90-95% *agreement* among the MSS comprising the Majority Textform nullifies the significance of the "mass of conflicting readings" phraseology. Yet such flows naturally from the presupposition of "steadily increasing corruption," just as does the suggestion that only "editors must

[1]N.B. that the Majority Text position does *not* disallow the place or importance of "Local Texts" (the "Alexandrian" is claimed as such!); it is only the *misuse* of this valid concept which is opposed by MT advocates.

decide" the true reading from among the 5000+ extant MSS just because "no two Greek MSS agree in *all* particulars"![1] Such ultimately derives from by-passing Hort's initial principles and concentrating on *theory* concerning what scribes "generally" would or would not do in any given instance. Such needs desperately to be corrected before any *real* progress can be made in NT textual criticism: current generalizations stem from theory in the *absence* of data; what is truly needed is theory *built upon* hard data!

In contrast, it is but *natural* to expect that a reading created by a minority of scribes would have a *short* "life-span" and be restricted (generally) to a small *local* region. Such readings would recur in transmissional history only on a *sporadic* basis, dependent upon the exemplars used. The MSS of *minority* textypes (such as the Alexandrian) fit such an expectation well, whereas the MSS of the Majority Textform (spread over a wide geographical and chronological area) do *not* readily fit into such a pattern! Yet modern theory consistently overlooks evidence which does not "fit" its historical reconstruction[2] and oversimplifies the evidence it does retain. The net result is a potentially *infinite* regress toward ever more remote "origins" which does not contribute materially to our understanding of what the autograph actually

---

[1] The *true* "mass of conflicting readings" occurs among the *minority* textypes, both among themselves and in contrast with the Majority Textform!

[2] But a unified and consistent "historical reconstruction" does *not* exist for the non-Majority texts! Cf. the remarks of leading scholars on this point in Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, p. 97, and Pickering's closing remark: "The crucial question remains—*what sort of a history does the evidence reflect?*" (Emphasis Pickering's).

read;[1] a *solid historical reconstruction* is prerequisite to achieving *any* degree of certainty concerning the NT text![2]

(4) If the "inferiority" of the Byzantine Textform thus derives from a faulty premise concerning the supposed corrupting influence of its scribes, what evidence remains which might provide a glimpse into a more solidly based transmissional history? First, Hort himself acknowledges that the NT text was *not* corrupted materially from at least the mid-fourth century onward but remained virtually intact[3] (the sparse currency of scribal variation generally being restricted to localized textypes and "family" groups). Most scribal errors and "editorial" changes were weeded out by the cross-correction process within one copying generation; few such readings could have lasted much longer.[4]

Secondly, the early MSS are seen to be more scribally corrupt—both in error and deliberate editing—than nearly all "later" MSS. Reasons for such great early corruption have already been suggested, but the possibility that the few extant "early" MSS might not provide a true "representa-

---

[1]Cf. Kenneth W. Clark's statement that today "we may be pursuing the retreating mirage of the 'original' text" (quoted in Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, p. 19). The present historical reconstruction reflects the outgrowth of numerous personal conversations with Professor Clark, though he would not have been in full agreement with this reconstruction.

[2]This is a key emphasis of Colwell throughout his works. Cf. his "Hort Redivivus," pp. 164-169, and his comment on p. 149 that "an amazing number" of recent text-critical works—including Metzger's *Text of the NT*—"make no serious effort to reconstruct the history of the manuscript tradition": this condition Colwell terms "deplorable"!

[3]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 8 (quoted above, pp. 207-208).

[4]This is evidenced by the utter non-perpetuation of so many singular readings and the numerous cases of readings shared by only 2-3 MSS as reported in Hoskier's *Apocalypse*. Why not in more? They were not perpetuated!

tive sample" of Antiquity—perhaps not even of *Egyptian* Antiquity—might allow that our earliest MSS and papyrus fragments represent the *dregs* of MS transmission rather than the "best" or "most frequently copied" MSS.[1] In other words, perhaps the only reason some of the early Egyptian MSS were preserved to the present day is that these were *not* widely used or frequently copied—and this might be due *precisely* to the presence of much scribal error coupled with much editing of texts otherwise "familiar." *No* copyist would desire to copy a NT book which continually differed in a MS exemplar from that with which he otherwise was familiar, either from public reading (lections) or private study![2]

The history of MS transmission clearly indicates that the standards of copying applied in the *later* period (from the 4th century onward) were quite *higher* than those affecting the *early* MSS.[3] *But*—if extant early MSS are indeed non-representative, preserved only because they were less used and/or copied than their contemporaries due to their high error and editorializing—it may be the case that *most* early MSS (no longer extant) *may* have reflected a *higher* copying standard than the extant evidence suggests. If so, Burgon's observations gain

---

[1]Cf. the discussion above, pp. 182-187. See also Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," pp. 6, 24 concerning the *mental attitude* of scribes (which could not but be affected by external *historical circumstances*) which might have produced such high error plus editorializing in *some* early MSS.

[2]This even if it were the *Alexandrian* textype which was to be copied by an *Egyptian* scribe familiar with that type: this supposition does *not* necessarily concern the *type of text* contained within a MS but only the "shock" of the great amount of *singular* error and editorializing which would have been plainly visible to early readers who were in any way "familiar" with the NT text!

[3]Cf. Colwell's discussion of "control," which was present in *some*

added significance and credibility:

> My general question is,—why throughout the Gospels [and most of the NT] are B and ℵ accounted so trustworthy, that all but the absolute disposal of every disputed question about the Text is held to depend upon their evidence?[1]
>
> These venerable monuments of a primitive age occasionally present us with deformities which it is worse than useless to extenuate—quite impossible to overlook.[2]
>
> If people would only examine B, ℵ and D in their bare unpresentableness, they would see the loss which those MSS. have sustained, as compared with the text supported by the overwhelming mass of authorities, and they would refuse to put their trust any longer in such imperfect, rudimentary, and ill-trained guides.[3]

The papyrus fragments of the NT which have been discovered since Burgon and Hort's day tend to support this supposition, since they similarly are filled with much scribal error and editorial activity. Colwell's study indicates that, *among singular readings alone*, the three early papyri examined contain the following types of corruption:[4]

	P^{45}	P^{66}	P^{75}
Itacisms	90	400	145
Nonsense/ Accidental	25	193	67
Sensible/ Editorial	250	289	190

Note well that these are *unprojected* figures, although the three early papyri are *each* in some degree fragmentary. This fact (unadressed in the "Scribal Habits" article) was earlier noted by Colwell, using P^{45} as an example. Colwell wrote,

---

early MSS and steadily increased through the centuries, in "Scribal Habits," pp. 117-118, and "Hort Redivivus," pp. 164-168.

[1] Burgon, *Traditional Text*, p. 69. [2] Idem, *Causes of Corruption*, p. 194.

[3] Idem, *Traditional Text*, p. 195.

[4] This chart was compiled from the data presented in Colwell, "Scribal Habits," pp. 110-112.

> . . . Add those lost in gaps, and the average is almost one [singular reading] to a verse. If, furthermore, the small size of many fragmented pages is taken into account, one must compute a total of from 2,000 to 3,000 Singular Readings in P^{45}, or an average of 10 to 15 or more to a page.[1]

Indeed, were such early MSS "typical" of their time and of general scribal practice throughout the entire Greek-speaking world, it becomes increasingly more difficult to explain the "rapid" rise of the Majority Textform out of such a confused "primal source"! The conclusion thus seems to be that such MSS containing much error and editorializing are *not* "good" or "typical" representatives of early documentary transmission![2]

---

[1]Colwell, "Classifying and Evaluating," p. 104.

[2]Although not part of the present study, the performance of the fragmentary MS P^{47} must be mentioned, being the *oldest* extant MS of the Apocalypse. This fragment was unknown to Hoskier at the time of his collations and thus not included therein. The present writer examined the text of P^{47} where it was extant within the sample base chapters (it contains only Apoc. 9:10-17:2) so as to compare the performance of this third-century MS on an equal basis with those of the present study. Collation of P^{47} was made from its *editio princeps* (Frederic G. Kenyon, ed., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible*, Fasciculus III: Revelation [London: Emery Walker, 1934 (Text), 1936 (Plates)]) and correlated with Hoskier's collations. There were 28 singular readings within the sample base chapters where P^{47} is extant (22% of the total sample base). After projection, P^{47} was estimated to have possessed 127 singulars within the sample base—a total which would place it among the "Top 10" MSS. Thus P^{47} is seen to be similarly typical of all early Egyptian-area MSS. Kenyon himself noted ("Text," p. xiii) that in the *entire* extant portion of P^{47} (7½ chapters) it possesses "80 singular readings." The present projection of 127 singulars over a 10-chapter base thus seems to be on target. Within the portion examined readings created by error are as common as deliberate alterations (just as with the other early Egyptian MSS). Among the errors, itacism occurs at 15:3 (ω for ου) and 15:4 (ι for αι). Although Kenyon claims that "ει for ι occurs frequently" ("Text," p. xii), no such cases appeared within the sample base, though ι for ει did occur in 10:11. Phonetic errors appear in 10:3 (χ for κ) and 12:4 (ϑ for χ), while the miswriting of a numeral occurs in 12:6 ($\overline{\rho\sigma\xi}$ for $\overline{\alpha\sigma\xi}$). Three cases of "hom." appear: in 12:9 (-ς ὁ ∩ -ς ὁ), 15:4 (-ος ∩ -ος), and 15:7 (-ων ∩ -ων). "Semi-hom." and other haplographies occur frequently, cf. 10:8; 12:9, 16; and 17:1. One lengthy dittography occurs in 15:2 (26 words/122ℓ, *ca.* 4-5 lines reduplicated). Attraction of a final letter to nearby forms occurs in 10:11; 12:2, 13, 14. Deliberate altera-

(5) The process of cross-correction ("mixture") normally would weed out both accidental error and deliberate alteration created by a single scribe within a very few copying generations. Similarly, even "Local Text" variations (minority textype readings) normally would become eliminated (in general) by the same process as a direct result of increased communication between distant churches. It thus becomes *extremely* unlikely that any individually-created or even "Local" variant reading ever would gain utter dominance throughout the Greek-speaking Mediterranean world, let alone for such to continually *recur* so as to produce a "new" (previously non-existent in the precise *pattern* of readings) textype which could "normally" assume "Textform" (dominance) status among nearly all extant NT MSS!

It thus becomes extremely difficult for modern critics continually to brand the Majority reading as the direct result of scribal alteration which *somehow* gained the upper hand! Even were such *true* in a few isolated cases, there simply is *no* legitimate way that such could occur *repeatedly*! But such is restated *continually* in the current handbooks as the "likely"

---

tions include transposition (for emphasis?) in 15:1; the grammatical change in 15:4 of εφανερωθησαν into -ρωθη (since the subject is a neuter plural); the omission of επτα *ante* βρονται (3x!) in 10:3-4 (perhaps his logic was offended?); the change in 12:13 of εδιωξεν into απηλθεν ενδιωξαι (a more "logical" narrative); the major re-editing of 10:4 to read "And I heard what things the thunders spoke, and I was about to write them" instead of "And when the seven thunders had spoken, I was about to write"; and finally, the "theological alteration" in 12:10 of εξουσια into σωτηρια, connecting the "salvation" previously mentioned with Christ! These represent only a few of the singular readings of P^{47}, but are sufficient to show how "typical" this papyrus MS is when compared to the other early Egyptian MSS similarly preserved by historical chance (or rejection!).

origin of the Majority reading. This can be seen, for example, in Metzger's *Textual Commentary* just within the first chapter of the Gospel of Mark. Note the following examples:[1]

(Mk. 1:1) There was *always* a temptation (to which copyists *often* succumbed) to expand titles and quasi-titles of books [The Majority reading is the "longest"].

(Mk. 1:2) It is *easy* to see . . . why *copyists* would have altered the words [into the Majority reading].[2]

(Mk. 1:8) The *tendency of scribes* would have been to add ἐν before ὕδατι [to produce the Majority reading].

(Mk. 1:14) The insertion of τῆς βασιλείας [the Majority reading] was *obviously made by copyists* in order to bring the unusual Markan phrase [?] into conformity with the much more frequently used expression "the kingdom of God."[3]

(Mk. 1:27) *More than one copyist* [the Majority Text scribes included] *accommodated the phraseology* in one way or another to the parallel in Lk 4:36.[4]

(Mk. 1:39[a]) [The Majority reading] ἦν was *introduced by copyists* from the parallel in Lk 4:44.[5]

(Mk. 1:39[b]) After ἦν had been substituted [by the Majority of scribes] for ἦλθεν in the preceding unit of variation, *it was natural* [for scribes] to *standardize*

---

[1]Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, pp. 73-77. All emphasis is my own.

[2]This question of alteration of "Isaiah" into "the prophets" or *vice versa* has been addressed by the present writer in an unpublished study. The Majority reading is shown therein to be more likely original than that of the Alexandrian textype due to simple *harmonization* on the part of the Alexandrian MSS with the other quotations of Isa. 40:3 in the other three Gospels. A brief summary of the present writer's case can be found in Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, pp. 89-90.

[3]But the *Alexandrian* reading ("the Gospel of God") is *itself* as "un-Markan" an expression as that of the Majority ("the Gospel of the Kingdom of God"). Yet there are *a number* of NT parallels to the Majority reading (cf. Lk. 4:43; 8:1; 16:16; Ac. 8:12), differing only in that the *verb* ευαγγελιζω is used in place of the *noun* form. There are *no* other NT parallels to the reading of the Alexandrian MSS!

[4]The intent of this statement is obscure: Lk. 4:36 (τίς ο λογος ουτος, ὅτι εν εξουσια κτλ.) *in no way* parallels the Markan Majority reading (τί εστιν τουτο; τίς η διδαχη η καινη αὕτη; οτι κατ' εξουσιαν κτλ.) any more than it does the *Alexandrian* reading in Mark (τί εστιν τουτο; διδαχη καινη κατ' εξουσιαν κτλ.)! What is the point?

[5]If so, why did not the scribes *fully* harmonize and add *in Luke* αυτων εις ολην from the Markan parallel? Harmonization should be *consistent*!

> the grammar [?] by changing εἰς to ἐν.[1]
>
> (Mk. 1:41) It is *easy* to see why ὀργισθείς [read by D it Ehpr] . . . would have *prompted over-scrupulous copyists* [including the Majority] to alter it to σπλαγχνισθείς.[2]

The examples cited above reflect an *initial* expression of the Majority Textform/Scribal Corruption presupposition which permeates nearly the whole of the *Textual Commentary*. The present findings concerning (especially!) the general carefulness of most *all* Byzantine-era scribes as opposed to the high proportion of error and deliberate editing found in the early Alexandrian and Western MSS should now require a *reassessment* of such *a priori* assertions concerning the "propensity" of later scribes thus to corrupt the NT text!

(6). Since most scribal errors and deliberate alterations soon would have disappeared under the cross-correction process, the question of the acceptance and perpetuation of Local Text patterns of reading (i.e., minority textypes) over an extended period of time must be considered from a wider perspective. Hort already has been quoted regarding the correct principle:

> As soon as the numbers of a minority exceed what can be explained by accidental coincidence, . . . their agreement in error, if it be error, can only be explained on genealogical grounds.[3]

---

[1]The *combined* comparison of *both* Mk. 1:39 units in UBS[3] will reveal that, apart from the Majority reading and that of the Alexandrian/Caesarean MSS ℵ B L Θ 892 sypal respectively, *none* of the remaining witnesses reads either ἦν . . . ἐν or ἦλθεν . . . εἰς in the "grammatically consistent" style which should have been so "natural"! Instead, *19 MSS*, both uncial and cursive, read the "ungrammatical" ἦν . . . εἰς! What does *that* say about "scribal tendencies"?

[2]Note that the "scribal corruption" thesis is raised as an "easy" suggestion even when the UBS[3] Committee ended up *supporting* the Majority reading (though this was tempered by a "D" rating)!

[3]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 45 (quoted above, p. 197).

However, Hort's *application* of this valid principle is seen only later in his "Introduction" when he summarily decreed on "good genealogical grounds" that it was the *Majority Textform* which was indeed "in error" and not to be trusted![1] And this is *partly* true: it *cannot* be mere "coincidence" that MSS in any large quantity could agree in reading the same pattern of variation continually without *some* sort of *close* genealogical connection. But again, as Hort declared, the process of cross-correction would have *prevented* any "Local" textype from ever gaining the preeminence; rather, the "Local" type slowly but certainly would become *assimilated* to the then-prevailing "majority" textype of that *region* and eventually to "the" Majority Textform as time and transmissional-history wore on![2] Thus, the *only* "genealogical connection" which should exist concerning the Majority Textform (exclusive of its many sub-textypes) is its link to the *common autograph*!

(7) The "genealogical connections" among MSS *within* a textype require separate study from those existing *between* diverse textypes. Wholly apart from the *singular* readings among MSS of the Alexandrian and Byzantine textypes, the degree of difference in *shared sensible readings* peculiar to MSS of each textype is *so* large—being counted in the *thousands* rather than

---

[1] Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," pp. 90-119. Hort's "good grounds" amounted to supposed widespread "Byzantine conflation" and the absence of "distinctively Byzantine readings" from Alexandrian and Western MSS (supported by the silence of the Fathers). Neither Hortian postulate can be maintained successfully in light of the present study and that of Harry A. Sturz, *The Byzantine Text-Type and New Testament Textual Criticism*, 3rd syllabus ed. (La Mirada, CA: Biola College, 1976), who has documented more than 150 cases of such "distinctive" readings in the early papyri!

[2] Cf. above, pp. 196-197, 206-208, where Hort is cited.

tens or hundreds—that such textual diversity could *never* have arisen from the "normal" and haphazard transmissional process, even in a "Local" area such as Alexandria! The same might be said for the "Western" and "Caesarean" textypes, insofar as readings peculiar to those types actually can be discerned. As long as transmission is "normal" the process *cannot* result in a *large* number of readings divergent from the autograph being perpetuated repeatedly in the same textypical *patterns* among even "Local Text" MSS![1] Only the action of an "outside force"—in this case actual *revision* by scholarly hands—can account for such great variance between textypes.

Hort recognized this fact, and he thus placed the heart of his theory squarely upon the presumption that it was the *Majority Textform* which was the product of organized scholarly revision.[2] Burgon immediately attacked such a supposition along with others, and Hort's "revision thesis" was later abandoned by subsequent critics.[3] The "Byzantine *process*" view is thus urged by today's critics to account for the rise and utter dominance of the Majority Textform—but it too has weaknesses.[4]

Why has Hort's central "revision" hypothesis been replaced with the "process" view? The reason such was discredited was

---

[1]Such "patterns" actually *characterize* the textype. Cf. the present writer's thesis, "Textual Interrelationships," pp. 113-128, which encompasses an excursus entitled "Patterns—The True Guide for Textual Grouping."

[2]Hort's view is summarized in Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, pp. 37-38.

[3]Cf. ibid., pp. 93-96 for examples of current thought regarding the non-existence of any "Byzantine revision" of the third century as Hort proposed. Beyond Burgon, critics such as Salmon, Cook, and Scrivener similarly opposed Hort's speculative "revision hypothesis" as a key weakness of his theory.

[4]Cf. the discussion above, pp. 206-212, concerning these weaknesses.

the *lack* of historical corroboration for such an event (which would have amounted to a full-fledged "revolution" against the text which hitherto had been current). Such an overturning of the text most used in favor of a newly-created text could *not* have happened silently, leading Burgon to declare securely:

> Apart however from the gross intrinsic improbability of the supposed Recension,—the utter absence of one particle of evidence, traditional or otherwise, that it ever did take place, must be held fatal to the hypothesis that it *did*. It is simply incredible that an incident of such magnitude and interest would leave no trace of itself in history.[1]

Yet it has been noted that the many *thousands* of differences between the minority textypes (including the Alexandrian) and the Majority Textform could *not* have arisen by any "normal" processes of MS transmission or "Local Text" development, but *must* have come about as a result of a revision deliberately made at some time and place within *early* transmissional history! If (as is generally granted) the Majority Textform was not the product of a revision-process, then it must have been the *Alexandrian* textype which resulted from an early revision![2] This indeed is the precise view of Colwell, who contrasted the respective origins of the Byzantine and Alexandrian textypes:

> The Greek vulgate—the Byzantine or Alpha text-type—had in its origin no such single focus as the Latin had in Jerome.[3]

---

[1]Burgon, *Revision Revised*, p. 293. Burgon's full discussion of this point (pp. 277-297) includes a masterful *reductio ad absurdum* of Hort's entire "Byzantine revision" hypothesis!

[2]This because the Alexandrian textype *alone* possesses sufficient cohesiveness to explain the extant data of all non-Majority MSS and textypes. Cf. the next three footnotes for the present writer's view on this point.

[3]Ernest C. Colwell, "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts," *Studies*, p. 53. The present writer partially

> The Beta text-type (Hort's "Neutral" [and today's "Alexandrian"]) is a "made" text, probably Alexandrian in origin, produced in part by the selection of relatively "good old mss." but more importantly by the philological editorial know-how of Alexandrians.[1]

Indeed, the close agreement between the *Greek MSS* possessing the Alexandrian textype and the Egyptian *Coptic versions* should make it clear that the Alexandrian type of text was *not only* a "Local Text" variation in Egyptian Greek NT MSS but was in fact a thoroughgoing *revision* intended for *all* Egypt, whether Greek- or Coptic-speaking![2]

It thus is not without significance that the present data indicate a "revision-mentality" pervading the scribes of early Egyptian MSS (as evidenced by the high degree of editorial alteration therein). If Egyptian scribes commonly knew that the MSS they were copying stemmed from an early "scholarly revision" made by the respected Alexandrian schoolmen in an attempt to "restore" the otherwise "lost" autograph,

---

disagrees with Colwell's conclusions concerning the "Western Text," viz., that it is "the uncontrolled, popular text of the second century" and "has no unity." There seems to be *more* "unity" remaining within that textype (apart from shared Majority readings) than can be explained by an "uncontrolled" and "popular" growth of corruption. In addition, the readings of this textype seem certainly to stem from the original *Alexandrian* revision rather than the Majority Textform (most "Western" MSS also stem from Egypt). Cf. note 2 below for evidence supporting this thesis.

[1] Colwell, "Nature of Text-Types," p. 54. Note that the *emphasis* is upon "philological editorial know-how"! The present writer suggests that the evidence indicates the Alexandrian text was produced by revision from "good old mss." of the *Majority Textform* and none other!

[2] Cf. the present writer's thesis, "Textual Interrelationships," pp. 98, 271-274, 299-300 and *passim*, wherein it can be seen that in Acts the *Greek MSS* of the Alexandrian textype (P^{45} P^{74} ℵ A B C 81) are *all* closely associated with the *Bohairic* version, and—coincidentally(?)—the Bohairic version stands as a "halfway house" between the *Greek Alexandrian MSS* and the *Latin Western MSS* (European Western: the Old Latin MSS *ar*, *c*, *e*, *h*, *l*, *ph*, and *r*, not to mention Jerome's Vulgate)! Such certainly *seems* to indicate the likely origin of the Western textype from the *Alexandrian revision*!

it would be no wonder were a scribe time and again to consider the revision "incomplete" and in need of further "personal correction." Hort himself offered an explanation of the converging factors which would allow and even encourage such "personal revision" of an already-revised text:

> The nature and amount of the corruption of [the] text . . . depends to a great extent on the peculiarities of the book itself, the estimation in which it is held, and the uses to which it is applied.[1]
>
> . . . The presence of a mental factor can often be traced in corruptions partly mechanical; and under the influence of a *lax conception* of the proper office of a transcriber distinctly mental causes of change may assume, and often have assumed, very large proportions. Even where the definite responsibilities of transcription were *strongly* felt, changes not purely clerical would arise from a more or less conscious feeling on a scribe's part that he was correcting what he deemed an obvious error due to some one of his predecessors; while, at times or places in which the offices of transcribing and editing came to be *confused* [!], other copyists would not shrink from altering the form of what lay before them for the sake of substituting what they supposed to be a clearer or better representation of the matter.[2]
>
> . . . Every change not purely mechanical made by a transcriber is, in some sense, of the nature of a correction. Corrections in such external matters as orthography and the like may be passed over, since they arise merely out of the comparative familiarity of different forms. . . . All other corrections, that is, those which bear any relation to sense, would *never* be made unless in the eyes of the scribe who makes them they were improvements in sense or in the expression of sense: even when made unconsciously, it is the *relative satisfaction* which they give to his mental state at the time [!] that creates or shapes them.[3]

It thus appears that in any locality where a "scholarly revision" had taken place scribes might feel free further to edit the text as they saw fit. This certainly happened in the case of Jerome's Latin Vulgate, which had so many "editorial" changes effected by scribes that the "original" text had to be

---

[1]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 5. [2]Ibid., p. 24. Emphasis mine.
[3]Ibid., pp. 26-27. Emphasis mine.

"restored" at least *four* times (all rather unsuccessfully) during the centuries of manual transmission.[1] The result of such a "revisionist mentality" at work is that, among *any* NT MSS or versions,

> . . . the more than 8,000 Vulgate manuscripts which are extant today exhibit the greatest amount of cross-contamination of textual types.[2]

Further observations by Hort can help account for both the scribal "laxity" among the early MSS and the "revision mentality" of the Greek-speaking scribes of that era. Allowing that the Egyptian scribes were familiar with the history of the "Alexandrian revision" (which was *not* held by Hort to exist), the comments of Hort take on added significance:

> . . . During the earliest centuries . . . the conception of new Scriptures standing on the same footing as the Scriptures of the Old Testament was slow and unequal in its growth . . . ; and the reverence paid to the apostolic writings, even to the most highly and most widely venerated among them, was not of a kind that exacted a scrupulous jealousy as to their *text* as distinguished from their substance.[3]
>
> . . . Pure clerical errors . . . pass imperceptibly into errors due to unconscious mental action . . . so that it is quite possible to intend nothing but faithful transcription, and yet to introduce changes due to interpretation of sense.
>
> . . . These hidden intrusions of mental action . . . are liable to multiply *spontaneously* where there is *no distinct perception* that a transcriber's duty is to transcribe and nothing more; and this perception is *rarer* and more dependent on *training* than might be supposed.[4]
>
> . . . The intention is still to transcribe language: but, as there is no special concentration of regard upon the

---

[1] C. Metzger, *Text*, p. 76. It should be noted that Jerome's *initial* revision as well as the subsequent "restoration" attempts are all historically documented. The same does *not* hold for either Hort's "Byzantine revision" *or* the present writer's "Alexandrian revision" hypothesis—but *some* revision *must* have occurred to create such differences between textypes!

[2] Ibid. [3] Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 7. Emphasis mine.

[4] Ibid., pp. 6-7. Emphasis mine.

> language as having an intrinsic sacredness of whatever kind [?], the instinctive feeling for sense cooperates largely in the result.[1]
>
> . . . . Changed feelings and changed circumstances put an end to the early textual laxity, and thenceforward its occurrence is *altogether exceptional*; so that the *later* corruptions are almost wholly [!] those incident to transcription in the proper sense, errors arising from careless performance of a scribe's work, not from an imperfect conception of it.[2]

Hort thus suggests that the scribe's *regard* for the NT text is linked with his desire or intent to "improve" the same. A high regard for the very *words* of Scripture (verbal inspiration?) will lead a scribe at least to *aim* for the *precise* reproduction of his exemplar's text. An equally high regard for the *sense* of Scripture considered apart from its *words* (dynamic inspiration?) would allow the deliberate editorial modification of those words when necessary to better bring out that proper "sense"! The general carelessness among editorial-type scribes might further indicate this greater regard for the *sense* over the *words* of Scripture (often only the "sense" as the scribe himself perceived it!).[3]

(8) By sheer *quantity* of examples for study the editorial/erroneous scribes have been utilized to establish generalizations as to what "scribes" were "likely" to do or not to do. Little or no regard has been given the majority of scribes who were generally *quite careful* and hardly "editors" of degree.

---

[1] W[illegible]cott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 7. [2] Ibid. Emphasis mine.

[3] One is also tempted to compare the *allegorical* method of exegesis—so prevalent at Alexandria!—with the *literal* exegesis which prevailed elsewhere. This too might be a partial (but important!) explanation of the combined laxity and editorializing found within early Egyptian MSS.

Yet once a scribe has abandoned his proper function for that of editor, his "habits" will differ radically from those practiced by "average" scribes bent upon the faithful accomplishment of their given task. Since most scribes of *early* extant MSS are of the "editorial" variety, one seriously might question the wisdom of some otherwise plausible axioms such as "in general, *earlier* manuscripts are more likely to be *free* from those errors that arise from repeated copying"![1]

Overall, it is more likely that MSS which (though early) derive from one locale and bear on their face clear evidence of much editorial activity were created in an atmosphere where textual revision commonly emanated from a "scholarly center" than that *later* MSS which betray *no* such evidence should have been the product of a "revisionist" age. The *known* text-critical work of Alexandrian scholars in the Greek *classics* provides *sufficient* reason for accepting an "Alexandrian" revision rather than a "Byzantine" in regard to the NT text.[2]

The lack of confirmatory historical evidence of such an event is *not* comparable to the same objection lodged by Burgon against Hort's "Byzantine revision". Burgon's point was

---

[1]Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, p. xxv. This generalization is qualified immediately by adding in "the *date* and *character* of the type of text that it embodies, as well as the *degree of care* taken by the copyist while producing the manuscript." But "date" and "character" are *subjective* notions, dependent upon one's textual perspective; so too the matter of "care" if reflected in "editorial" activity. Hoskier, for example, would make one highly-edited MSS *more valuable* than the rest because he thought such "preserved" an "ancient" text (this of course would produce a more *confused* situation than even *present* theories provide!).

[2]To the contrary cf. Gordon D. Fee, "p^{66}, p^{75} and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria," in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids:

express: there was *no* way that a revision "of such magnitude and interest" could pass unnoticed in history; but a "Local" revision (which never gained more than a *small* following or perpetuation in transmissional history) *hardly* would be expected to possess the historical documentation which might have been a necessity to support a theory of "revision" concerning the *dominant* Textform![1]

Yet it is undeniable that a revision *must* have occurred on one side or the other to produce the many *thousands* of differences between, e.g., the Alexandrian and Majority texts. It certainly appears plausible that the textype whose MSS *individually* bear evidence of high editorial activity should be thought *more likely* to reflect a parallel "editorial" nature in the text it otherwise *shares* among its members than those MSS within a textype that *do not* reflect much editorial activity. In other words, if a "revision mentality" appears among *individual* Egyptian scribes, there is an *increased likelihood* that the Egyptian (Alexandrian) *textype* in its differences from the Majority Textform *also* represents such a "mentality" at work by "scholars" on a grander scale!

(9) Even if it be granted that the Alexandrian textype is more likely to be the "revised" text than the Majority

---

Zondervan, 1974), pp. 19-45. Fee does not address the thousands of differences between the Majority and Alexandrian texts and the legitimate conclusion that revision *must* have occurred in one or the other textype. He instead tries to demonstrate grammatically and statistically that the Alexandrian text of extant early MSS (especially P^{75} and B) is a "very pure line of very ancient text." Yet Fee *nowhere* makes a case sufficient to establish the *unrevised* nature of that ancient Alexandrian text, nor can he *refute* the present theory that such *did* occur in the *early* second century!

[1]Cf. Burgon's statements above, p. 221.

Textform, the testimony of the Alexandrian MSS must not be ignored, nor that of any minority textype. Indeed, the very name "Majority" indicates the taking into account of *all* the available evidence with unnecessary subservience to no single item in particular. There is no need to attempt the discarding or minimizing of adverse evidence by various stratagems: as Burgon has declared,

> we have presented a strong case. . . . We submit that it has not received due attention from opposing critics . . . preceded by, or grounded upon, a searching examination.[1]

Just as was the case a century ago, NT textual criticism is so *overwhelmed* by available data (in contrast to that available for any other ancient work) that the first thought seems to be how to *reduce* the great mass of evidence to "manageable" proportions. Certainly it is "easier" to eliminate the many Majority/Byzantine MSS as "secondary" and "inferior" (based upon subjective *internal* grounds) than to be forced to deal seriously with such in painstaking detail—such has been the choice of Hort and other critics to the present day. This having been accomplished, one is left free to work with a *small number* of "significant" source MSS and their textual allies.

But if (as has been shown) there indeed be *no* secure ground for thus dismissing 90% of the available evidence, the *only* recourse is to return to the consideration of *all* MSS in their integrity (or lack of such). This alone should be the *proper* base from which to begin. Hoskier places the

---

[1]Burgon, *Traditional Text*, p. 225.

Alexandrian MSS in proper perspective for Majority Text theory, even though he himself followed his own speculations:

> . . . It is not to say that we must not *consult* ℵ or A [or any other Alexandrian MS]. It is to say that we must not bow down and worship them, and call ℵ a neutral text, from which there is no appeal. We have many scales to weigh the oldest MSS. in, only we have not always used them properly. We are not using them properly to-day.
>
> . . . We *can*, by a laborious process of induction, *eliminate* plain and clear errors, and probable errors. Instead of doing that, manifest errors of B and ℵ and C and A . . . are still perpetuated as each one sees fit. Burgon tried to indicate a scientific method, and has barely had a hearing. Westcott and Hort indicated a less scientific method, because they seem to have *imagined* standards—which do not exist—and, marry, they have had a full hearing and a large following. Why? The reason is sadly obvious. The latter method is taking, easy, and at first sight plausible to the beginner. The former is horribly laborious, although precious in results.
>
> . . . We *must* have a real *history* of the text. We have enormous material, imperfectly used. Let us get down to work, and hew good foundations, rather than deduce and dogmatise on superficial examinations.[1]

This but amounts to a call to *return* to the "rougher road" set forth by Burgon in his seven "Notes of Truth" nearly a century ago in opposition to the "taking, easy, and . . . plausible" views of Westcott and Hort.[2] The conclusions and speculations of the present study are themselves but *tentative*,[3] deriving from a *limited* selection of data; yet, aside from Colwell, no one else has even *begun* to grapple seriously with the great amount of available material which might shed light on scribal habits—this even though Hoskier's "convincing data *are* to hand

---

[1] Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:xlvii. Emphasis Hoskier's.

[2] Burgon, *Traditional Text*, pp. 40-67. These are restated with some current modifications in Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, pp. 139-148.

[3] It should especially be noted that the Majority Text theory does *not* claim to be able to provide *absolute certainty* regarding every unit of vari-

but unexamined."[1] *Some* of the data have been examined in the present study and a few observations concerning their apparent significance have been offered; but *all* the data have *not* yet been examined and thus no final or dogmatic conclusions can be maintained. The present writer offers his speculations as mere "food for future thought" in line with his unremitting adherence to Hoskier's cautious declaration that

> I am not now [prepared] to draw any final conclusions from such evidence. . . . It must take its proper place with other material, and be weighed in the future, and in the light of still further investigation. To deduce from fragmentary and incomplete evidence is a crime.[2]

What Yet Remains To Be Done

Among the many unfinished tasks of NT textual criticism a number of projects relating to scribal habits need completion. Much more than a mere surface-skimming is necessary to evaluate properly the role scribes played in the transmission and corruption of the NT text. The following suggestions seem worthy for future textual students to undertake, either individually or through large-scale team effort. Many years of research will be necessary, but without the accomplishment of these projects NT textual study will remain mired in a speculative miasm.

---

ation (the evidence at times is nearly evenly divided; cf. the Av and Q textypes in the Apocalypse), but does tend to suggest a *greater degree* of certainty than other current theories provide. Cf. "The Disaster of Eclecticism," pp. 14-20 of the present writer's "Textual Interrelationships." Nevertheless, even "Majority Text theory" remains but a *tentative* solution until *all* the data are in and a transmission-history which can meet all objections can be written!

[1]Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, p. 63, prefaced with this plea to critics: "Why stop to cross swords, and fill thousands of pages with discussions of readings" when only the *data* yet unknown can provide answers!

[2]Ibid., p. x.

(1) As far as possible, *every* Greek NT MS should be characterized concerning its individual scribal habits based upon the examination of its singular readings; these *alone* provide the unambiguous data and deserve to be explored in full. Such examination should be made (tentatively) against *all* readings which can be presumed "singular" by comparison with available apparatuses.[1] Colwell has set forth the prospectus for such a program in his various articles, notably the following points:

> The readings of individual manuscripts are the objective data with which ultimately the critic must deal. He should be familiar with a very large number of these, including readings that never find their way into an apparatus criticus. . . .
>
> The knowledge derived from a study of these readings will lead to an understanding of scribal habits and practices *without which the history of the manuscript tradition cannot be written.*[2]
>
> . . . The Singular Readings have a value in the *initial appraisal* of the work of the scribe *in a particular manuscript.* If his pages are crowded with them, he is a careless or rash workman. Moreover a study of his singular readings will reveal habits and inclinations *that will aid* in the appraisal of his readings which are not singulars.[3]
>
> At least for important witnesses (and ideally for *all* that are used) the peculiarities of the individual scribe *need* to be known. . . . The scribe's contribution *can* be identified—notably in singular readings. . . .[4]
>
> The goals of this study at this stage are to know the manuscript insofar as it is the product of the scribe who copied it. The scribe's *fingerprints* upon the codex are the object of search. . . . What was his pattern of errors?

---

[1]Comparison against Tischendorf and von Soden should suffice as an *interim* procedure for such research, which can be modified as more evidence comes to light (cf. suggestion #2 in the main text which follows).

[2]Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," p. 160. Emphasis in this and the following quotations is my own. The need for a transmission-history is paramount; cf. the present writer's "Textual Interrelationships," pp. 12-13, where (among others) Calvin L. Porter is quoted as saying "Textual criticism without a history of the text is not possible"!

[3]Colwell, "Classifying," p. 104.

[4]Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," p. 161. In the omitted final clause, Colwell would gratuitously *exclude* singulars which critical editors favored!

> . . . Was he a careful or a careless workman? . . . To what extent was he an editor as well as a scribe?[1]
>
> The identification of a scribe's habits in these special readings enables the student of a particular manuscript to discard[2] variants that otherwise would be regarded as part of the genetic strain of that manuscript. . . .
>
> . . . Each manuscript that establishes a landmark in the history of the manuscript tradition should have its fingerprints taken, and its value assessed.[3]

Such a procedure, if presently initiated, *will* provide valuable results for *individual MS evaluation* similar to that in chapter 4 of the present study. One need not possess *full* explanations concerning every singular reading of a MS before such a witness can be "fingerprinted"—as with Colwell's own study, "our figures probably *understate* the case," but in fact "*no* major conclusion . . . depends upon an absolutely exact tabulation"![4] MSS already collated can *now* be scribally-evaluated by comparison with the extant data in our textual apparatuses, with little worry that forthcoming *complete* data might overturn the valid conclusions thus derived.[5] Hort's vision thus

---

[1]Yet Colwell prefaces this question with the suggestion that only the *careful* scribes were "editors"—from his own data he should have known better, since *his* early scribes were "editorial" and *careless*!

[2]A better wording would have been "devalue" or "temporarily set aside," since other unknown variables might still offer value to such a reading, even toward helping to restore the autograph text!

[3]Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," pp. 161-162.

[4]Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 109. "Understatement" is even *more* likely in the present study due to the competing Av and Q textypes, the non-liturgical use, and the extra-ecclesiastical transmission peculiar to the Apocalypse. N.B. that there seems little doubt that a *full* tabulation of singular readings among Apocalypse MSS would yield results similar to those derived from the limited sample base examination.

[5]The principle stated at the close of the previous note here applies: one need *not* fear that future *full collation* of *all* Greek NT MSS might invalidate present research by "discovering" hitherto unknown support for current "singular" readings. In the present study, the investigation of p^{47} as a "bonus" MS (cf. above pp. 215-216, note 2) discovered *four* readings in P^{47} which made some otherwise "singular" readings among Hoskier's

can be fulfilled at the present day:

> . . . By care and study . . . elementary guesses[1] as to which reading scribes are likely in any particular case to have introduced [can be] replaced by judgements founded on previous investigation of the various general characteristics of those readings which can with moral certainty be assumed to have been introduced by scribes.[2]

(2) Yet the procedures suggested above, though necessary for the immediate evaluation of NT MSS, cannot claim to be a final goal. To evaluate properly the singular habits of individual scribes nothing less than the *complete collation* of *all* known Greek NT MSS is required! But precious little attention or devotion to such a task has been shown, despite the fact that calls for such a project have been made for the last one hundred years.[3] At present, the International Greek New Tes-

---

220 MSS "dual" (though they are still listed as "singular" in Table 6 in accord with the present purposes): in 10:4, P^{47} reads αυτας (with MS *128*) for αὐτα of the Majority; in 12:3, P^{47} omits αυτου (with MS *146*); in 12:9, P^{47} omits αυτου[1] (again with MS *146*); and in 12:16, P^{47} reads απο (with MS *100*) for the Majority's εκ. The two (unusual!) agreements with MS *146 may* reflect genealogical connections, but it equally may be the case (in the absence of further detailed study) that *all four* newly-"dual" readings arose *independently* and were in fact *individual* "scribal creations."

Nevertheless, *no* conclusions of the present study were thereby affected. Had the connection between those 4 MSS and P^{47} actually been genealogical, the "dual" reading merely becomes attributed to a once-"singular" reading in a common ancestor; if the readings arose wholly independent of one another, then for all practical purposes these "dual" readings *can* be treated as "singular" in evaluating the *individual habits* of the scribes involved! But in *no* case would it ever be likely that *all* or even *most* singular readings—even in a single MS—might find "new" external support. Such would require that scribes *never* erred or editorialized except in concert with others: a conclusion patently absurd! Therefore, the general conclusions (not to be confused with *generalizations!*) derived from the study of a MS's singular readings based upon *present* data should remain stable even in the face of *future* discovery!

[1] I[illegible], the "generalizations" about scribal habits which are not based upon hard data. Hort's term is piercingly correct!

[2] Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 24. The bracketed words were originally "have been"—but the task neither then nor now is accomplished!

[3] Beyond the expected names of Majority Text sympathizers such as Burgon, Miller, Scrivener, and even Hoskier, scholars such as Kirsopp

tament Project has faltered and virtually collapsed of its own accord, and Aland's "NT Graece Editio Maior Critica" (working in the short book of James, in which only a *selection* of MSS would be utilized rather than the *full* collation of *all* Greek MSS) after more than 13 years has produced little more in print than a sample page *format* (with "made-up" MSS)![1]

But there is encouraging pressure toward trying to accomplish in a relatively short time what has been desired, coming from both sides of the text-critical spectrum.[2] What is desired in the first instance is the simple *collation record* of *every variant* in *all known Greek NT MSS*—including manifest scribal errors and the like! The other grand-scale projects appear to have faltered because they attempted to "do too much" in a single work: inclusion of versional and patristic readings, the limiting of witnesses cited to those of subjective "value," etc. What is desperately needed at present is *not* the "trimmings," but the *hard data* concerning the exact contents of every extant Greek NT MS! Were such available today, *every* textual scholar would possess at first hand ready acquaintance with what *all* the Greek MS data—untrammeled

---

Lake, T. W. Manson, C. C. Tarelli, Günther Zuntz, and Kenneth W. Clark have all called for a Majority Text edition with *complete* collations of *all* known Greek NT MSS (cf. the present writer's unpublished paper, "Von Soden's Folly," pp. 61-64, where these calls are detailed).

[1]Cf. Aland's "Der gegenwärtige Stand" for the details and facsimile page of his proposed edition.

[2]The latest calls have come from Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, p. 150; and the eclectic scholar W. J. Elliott, "The Need for an Accurate and Comprehensive Collation of All Known Greek NT Manuscripts with their Individual Variants noted *in pleno*," in *Studies in NT Language and Text* (Kilpatrick Fs.), pp. 137-143.

by scholarly hypotheses—actually read. May such a project *soon* begin in earnest![1] Hoskier has set the proper tone:

> [We must] continue the investigation along impartial lines . . . to a deeper and clearer apprehension of the central problem. . . . The only *possible* chance of progress [lies in] examination of the many valuable documents which still abound among us, unesteemed, unopened, uncollated.[2]
>
> . . . An examination of the Greek cursive documents (great treasure of them as there is) would lead to *excellent* if not *decisive* results in the field of criticism. Yet scholars steadily refuse to devote themselves to them.
>
> They will travel thousands of miles to get a glimpse of a vth century fragment or even of an viii^th^ century MS., but because the bulk of the cursives range from 1000 down, no one examines them.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Now there is something *false* here, and something contrary to Christian spirit and endeavour.
>
> If we have a precious heritage, and if it is essential to get at its precise wording, we are neglecting the slow-gathered verdict of the Church on textual problems, and we are neglecting our own opportunities.
>
> What we want, and must have, are: reliable collations of existing Greek MSS.[3]

Hoskier himself has shown the way: his collations of the Apocalypse MSS represent the *only* attempt to collate all MSS which were available of any NT book—and this *before* the day of "easy" photography on microfilm! Hoskier completed his project almost *single-handedly*, under the necessity of much travel and/or the use of poor-quality photographic technique. Yet he accomplished this work *individually* within 30 years,[4] adding in such "extras" as particular accents or breathings and versional/patristic evidence! The slow pace of present-

---

[1] Had the proposed methodology been utilized by Aland, his James apparatus might have been completed in one or two years; in fact, it is conceivable that *all* known MSS could be so collated *in pleno* and published in a *series* of volumes within 25 years—and this *without* computer aids! *To* this the versional, patristic, and Lectionary data could be added later.

[2] Hoskier, *Genesis of the Versions*, I:434. Emphasis mine.

[3] Ibid., I:62. Emphasis mine. [4] Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, II:5.

day collation research seems criminal by comparison. Yet by utilizing the microfilm resources of Kurt Aland's *Institut für die Neutestamentliche Textforschung* in Münster, West Germany—a research center deserving all possible gratitude!—such may now be accomplished speedily and "painlessly." There thus remains *no* further excuse for delaying this task beyond the end of the present century.

(3) A *catalogue of scribal habits* arranged according to *individual MSS* is needed desperately.[1] Such could *now* be compiled for the Apocalypse MSS using Hoskier's data and be applied (with due caution)[2] in other NT books possessed by the same MSS. This would be an invaluable study tool, but would be strictly limited to those MSS concerning which we have *full* collations as measured against *all* other Greek MS evidence. Elsewhere, only *general observations* concerning scribal habits can be made (as outlined in point #1 above, pp. 231-233) until such time as *full* collations of *all* MSS become available. Once compiled, such a catalogue can be used to evaluate the testimony of "characterized" MSS in variant units where their individual habits might lessen or increase the weight of their testimony.[3] Postgate's cautionary attitude concerning textual

---

[1] Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," pp. 107-108. Colwell refers to Dain and Havet, and quotes Maas on this point. Colwell says such a catalogue is "essential" for NT textual criticism. The present stress on *individual* MS performance is deliberate: a "mass catalogue" will do little more than perpetuate stereotyped generalizations such as are now current.

[2] Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," p. 160, suggests that one cannot generalize the knowledge gained from one NT book to other books, along with other *caveats* of similar hue. But so long as one restricts application of data to the *same* scribe within a *single* MS, such indeed seems quite applicable!

[3] Colwell, "Classifying," p. 105, notes as an example that in P^{45} "the scribe often uses the simple verb as against the compund verb of the total

praxis needs carefully to be heeded:

> [In order] to judge whether a reading . . . stood in the archetype of our text . . . some precautions must be observed. . . . Since different scribes are prone to different kinds of error, we must ever bear in mind the *particular* failings of the scribes responsible for the transmission of our text.[1]

Only by keeping such particular habits in view can the *proper* evaluation of all MS testimony within a variant unit be made!

(4) The testimony of individual scribes who are found to be habitually careless plus highly editorial (which items have been seen usually to go together) should be utilized with great caution. No purely singular reading of such a MS (let alone to *any* MS in the present writer's judgment!) should ever be considered of "autograph quality."[2] With such a judgment even Hort initially agreed:

> . . . Where a minority consists of one document or hardly more, there is a valid presumption *against* the reading thus attested, because *any one scribe* is liable to err, whereas the fortuitous concurrence of a *plurality* of scribes in the *same* error[3] is in most cases improbable; and thus in these cases *the reading attested by the majority* is *exempt* from the suspicion of one mode of error which has to be taken into account with respect to the other reading.[4]

---

tradition. When then in agreement with others he uses the simple verb rather than the compound, what weight can be given to this agreement?" Cf. with this the present writer's disallowance of *part* of MS *15*'s testimony on the same basis (p. 152, n.1 above).

[1]Postgate, "Textual Criticism," p. 713a. Note, however, that Postgate rightly presupposes the *complete* collation of *all* MSS and their *full* availability in an *apparatus criticus*.

[2]Although such a judgment might sound harsh to modern thoroughgoing eclectics who often gamble upon the presumed originality of singular readings in the absence of any transmissional history, it in reality amounts to nothing less than the application of sound reason based squarely upon the facts of the documentary evidence—solid ground!

[3]"Error" = a "sensible" but non-autograph reading.

[4]Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 44. None can deny that Hort here lends support to a theory of "Local Genealogical Error" coupled with

Throughout this paper Colwell has been cited concerning his belief that a singular reading more likely is original to the MS in which it appears than any other possibility. In somewhat stronger terms Colwell urges that

> textual criticism must return to the position taken by Tischendorf in regard to singular readings: "A reading altogether peculiar to one or another ancient document is suspicious." This primary position of Tischendorf's [*sic*], which Tischendorf *failed* to follow with respect to Sinaiticus and Hort *failed* to follow with respect to Vaticanus, merits *the most rigorous observance*.[1]

The simple elimination of singular readings from "candidacy" status would greatly simplify the task of NT textual criticism and perhaps breathe new theoretical life into a stale discipline.[2] One should be under *no* compulsion to defend readings universally rejected within transmissional history solely to favor the "better internal evidence" of such or the "better quality" of the MSS possessing such. So to do merely imbues such MSS or internal principles with infallibility at such points. But infallibility *in part* ought rightly to lead to infallibility *in toto* for such MSS and/or principles—yet such was not the case even with Hort! Hoskier rightly states

---

"Majority Text Superiority." Hort's later theory therefore required the utter *abandonment* of this correct position in favor of the "Byzantine Revision" hypothesis, for only by that means could he gain theoretical support for the singular and sub-singular readings of B and ℵ which were "preferred" on *internal* principles! The implication of Hort's statement for the modern "process" theorists is that apart from *revision* on a *grand* scale, no "minority" textype can ever be expected to gain the superiority of number—let alone an 85-90% superiority such as the Majority Text enjoys!

[1] Colwell, "Hort Redivivus," p. 162. Emphasis mine. Burgon (*Revision Revised*, pp. 325-326) attributes Tischendorf's violation of principle to "parental partiality. But it is not on that account the less foolish"!

[2] This "staleness" was the thrust of Eldon J. Epp's "The Twentieth-Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 386-414.

concerning such principles:

> . . . Where the ancient authorities either indulge in vagaries or have singular readings all to themselves . . . unsupported by the so-called later testimony of the cursives (themselves, many of them, always remember, derived direct or nearly direct from other MSS. as old as our extant uncials) we can safely neglect them [!]. Where again they are supported . . . by a handful of later cursives, we can easily determine the *character* of these supporting witnesses . . . and see what weight if any to accord to the different readings.[1]

> To disprove the resultant facts but one course lays open, and that is to reaffirm one's belief in the infallibility of certain documents, but which ones? ℵ? or C? or A? or P? or B? or 56? or 95? or any other? Documents all *at variance among themselves*. . . . We cannot allow a choice of *parts* of each and say, "For chapter so and so, ℵ is my standard, for chapter so and so, another."[2]

It is but a small step from the elimination of singular readings from serious consideration to the elimination of those readings with but slim support. Indeed, such specifically was mentioned by both Hoskier and Hort in the preceding quotations.[3] Readings found in more than one MS but not in the Majority nor even in a substantial minority seem to possess but two explanations (apart from any "autograph" speculation): either (*a*) such readings arose *independently* on the part of the scribes involved; or (*b*) the erroneous reading was in an exemplar or ancestor *common* to all parties (genealogical ties). A *pattern* of shared readings among a minority of MSS indicates genealogical descent from a single exemplar or "Local Text" situation.

---

[1] Hoskier, *Apocalypse*, I:xxxvi. [2] Ibid., I:xlviii. All emphasis his.

[3] Yet hear Westcott and Hort *after* the "Byzantine revision" has become fact: "Readings of ℵ B should be accepted as the *true* readings until strong *internal* evidence is found to the contrary; . . . *no* readings of ℵ B can be *safely* rejected absolutely"! ("Introduction," p. 225). Also in their one-volume edition, p. 560: "Even when B stands *quite alone*, its readings must never be lightly rejected"! (Emphasis my own).

The examination of Hoskier's collations will reveal a number of "quasi-singular" readings shared by only a few MSS. The readings of this category which are nonsensical likely may have arisen independently; the shared sensible readings probably indicate some genealogical connection *if* the same groups of MSS are continually grouped together in a similar *pattern* of readings. Such "genealogical" connections lead *directly* toward textype relationships, and such readings therefore should *not* be summarily "discarded" even though they do not serve to establish the "autograph" text by themselves. They *do* serve a *very* useful function in aiding the establishment of a transmissional history built upon *data*.[1]

Even so, the overall *quality* of the MSS comprising such small groups or textypes must be evaluated in light of their scribes' *individual* performance by way of singular readings. If "editorial" and careless scribes are responsible for nearly all MSS within a small group or minority textype, such is not likely to generate confidence in the use of those MSS even when they are *agreed* in a reading which deviates from the Majority Textform! As Postgate has written,

> The fidelity of a scribe has to be judged chiefly by *internal* tests. . . . If faithful in small things, he is likely to be faithful in great.[2]

---

[1]Note that textual theories outside of the Majority fold need in such cases to establish the "dividing line"—i.e., at *what point* should minority readings be given *serious* consideration as to "autograph" status; and then, *how* does such fit in with their "transmissional history"? *Without* such a determination either an imbalanced history of transmission will result or one must needs become a "thoroughgoing eclectic"—neither being preferable!

[2]Postgate, "Textual Criticism," p. 713a. This truism is of *utmost* importance for NT textual criticism, and underscores the entire emphasis of the present study. Cf. above, p. 183, for a restatement of this view.

Thus, the *scribal performance* of a MS (demonstrated in singular readings) might be applied directly to that MS's performance within a Family/textype relationship, either to commend or condemn within individual variant units.[1]

(5) Whenever a large number of readings are shared by more than one MS in a *distinct pattern*, one may legitimately posit *genealogical descent* from at least *one* deliberately-revised ("editorial") ancestor. Readings only *sparsely* shared by the MSS of such a group are likely due to "mixture" (or "cross-correction") from another exemplar at indefinite times.[2] Readings which differ from the Family/textype but agree with the Majority Text are likely due to *subsequent* mixture;[3] readings which differ from *both* the Family/textype *and* the Majority must derive from some other source, such as individual scribal alteration or error, local tradition, etc. However, the *widespread agreement* of a number of MSS in readings which differ from the Majority Textform can *only* be explained as having descended from an editorially-revised exemplar *or* from an "edition" (a number of MSS ~~produced at~~ nearly the same time, perhaps from dictation in a scriptorium). The basic exception

---

[1]Hoskier comments to this point: "Examine the record of the witnesses . . . for some can be peremptorily challenged, as in a Court of Law, and excluded from the jury" (*Apocalypse*, I:xx). Such "exclusion" is not, however, absolute, but depends upon the variant unit in question. The proper method must be maintained! As Hoskier later states, "If instead of congratulating ourselves when we find an ally of ℵ say among the late cursives, we sit down and reason it out, we shall see *why* we are not to fall down and idolise the existing uncials because they are uncials" (I:xxxix-xl).

[2]Singular readings are of course generally presumed to be the creation of the particular scribe involved, as has been repeatedly stated herein.

[3]Note that this principle only applies when a *large* number of textype readings are possessed by a MS (i.e., it is a "member" of that textype). If

to all this is the readings which trace directly from the autograph—and *all* MSS of *all* textypes preserve a *very* large quantity of these as "common text"!

(6) Once the total number and pattern of shared readings among a minority of MSS becomes sufficiently large, the consideration of such readings as "revisionist" should be made. The explanation of so many variants in such a pattern no longer can be made on the basis of what *individual scribes* might have done, but on the basis of what "editorially-minded" scribes might have done *in concert*![1] As previously stated, *deliberate alteration* is far removed from simple scribal *error*; more so when such alterations are *numerous* and fit a specific *pattern*! The *crux* of present critical debate is precisely whether this principle can be legitimately applied to the Majority Textform as well as to minority textypes and Family groups: the Majority Text advocates say "No" (for the reasons outlined throughout this study) while all others say "Yes." Only a great deal of further study will allow resolution of the dilemma.[2]

---

on the other hand a MS possesses but ~~few readings of~~, say, the Alexandrian textype, it is *not* a member of such, and those readings may legitimately be attributed to "cross-correction" from an Alexandrian exemplar *later* in the transmissional history of that MS rather than *vice versa*.

[1]Yet this principle is constantly violated; as an example, cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary* s.v. Lk. 6:1, where it is admitted that the *hapax legomenon* δευτεροπρωτω "is certainly the more difficult reading" (it is also the *Majority* reading!) yet "it must not for that reason be adopted"! Rather, *because* the word is *hapax* it "appears to be a *vox nulla* that arose accidentally through a transcriptional blunder"! One then must wonder *how* such a "difficult" reading—the child of blunder!—was *ever* able to gain the ascendancy and to appear in *every* known Greek MS save *ten* (mostly of Egyptian origin)! One might also wonder whether the judgment would have been the same had the textual evidence been *reversed*.

[2]Hort's "Byzantine revision" hypothesis reflects the *direct* application of this principle. The "process" followers scrupulously avoid the

(7) It has been observed in Hoskier that many readings are supported by only 2-6 MSS, quite often with the same pairings of MSS recurring. This betokens *genealogy* in the highest sense[1] and suggests that, once *complete* collations of *all* extant MSS are available for a NT book,[2] the *stemma* of such interrelationships *can* be made successfully. If so, the problems of determining the "autograph" text might be resolvable by that means more than any other![3]

(8) The current textual handbooks need modification in light of the present data and the current rise of Majority Text theory. Theories based upon the "secondary nature" of the Byzantine textype as the result of "massive scribal corruption" no longer can stand, nor can such scribal alteration continually be blamed for the distinct *patterns* of readings to be found within the three major textypes (Alexandrian, Western, and Byzantine). The recognition of *revision* having taken place *somewhere* should become a priority for future theory to grapple with. Yet future theory should be based solely upon *hard data*, as Burgon long ago urged:

"revision model," but attribute the "editorial mind-set" to nearly *all* the Byzantine-era scribes in so doing—yet such is seen *not* to be the case!

[1]Cf. Colwell, "Scribal Habits," p. 107 (quoting Bévenot): "A great number of such common readings reveals a *connexion* . . . , whereas a small number of such common readings indicates little or no connexion."

[2]This perhaps explains why Hort, the champion of genealogy, never tried to apply such to the NT—he did not have the full data! Colwell, "Genealogical Method," pp. 63-83, critiques Hort's use of "genealogy" well.

[3]But cf. Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, pp. 43-47, where the doubts of Pickering as well as non-Majority Text partisans are set forth regarding the question of stemmatics in the Greek NT. Yet, if *full* collations of *all* (or nearly all) MSS ever become available, and *if* a stemma is *not* taken to imply *direct generational descent*, then the present writer *does* believe a stemma can be created. Among the Apocalypse MSS, for example,

> Questions . . . are not to be determined by internal considerations . . . nor by any subjective theory . . . on which experts and critics may be hopelessly at issue: but by the weight of the definite evidence actually producible and produced on either side.[1]

Metzger likewise is not unaware of the problems confronting modern criticism, and he offers the following caution to all:

> One of the perennial dangers which confront scholars in every discipline is the tendency to become one-sided and to over-simplify their analysis and resolution of quite disparate questions.[2]

The presumed inferiority of the Majority Textform and its MSS seems to derive from such "theoretical simplification" as Metzger mentions: the recognition that scribes *sometimes* did thus-and-so has frequently become the "fact" that *all* scribes "usually" or even "always" would do thus-and-so in similar cases. Yet to generalize about what *any* scribe might be "likely" to do on the basis of what *some* scribes did—especially in the absence of detailed evidence—amounts to a faulty textual logic in the extreme!

Yet the primary reason for all such generalizations (if actual *praxis* be a clue) seems to be to provide a means for eliminating the testimony of Byzantine/Majority readings and the mass of MSS which support them. This has brought current

---

careful examination of *dual* readings followed by *triple* readings, etc., up to readings supported by perhaps 10 MSS alone would perhaps give one all the insight needed to construct a *stemma* for that book and to posit some reasonable history of transmission which would account for the Av and Q textypes therein. Hoskier's own groupings (cf. *Apocalypse* II:23-24) are presented without detailed evidence (so too those of Schmid in *Studien*) but *must* have some factual basis, and can serve as guidelines in stemmatic research. Dissatisfaction with "genealogy" as *Hort* applied it should *not* dissuade us from the correct and balanced application of stemmatic research!

[1] Burgon, *Traditional Text*, pp. 228-229.

[2] Metzger, *Text*, p. 210.

critical thought to its present impasse: "the method does not have the solution," says Epp, and this is a "warning of trouble"![1] Similarly, both Colwell and Clark throughout their writings have hammered at the point that *somewhere* on the road commencing with Hort textual criticism of the NT has made a wrong turn![2] The discipline keeps wandering further afield when its proper course should be to *retrace* its erring steps to the starting point and begin anew. Burgon has tried to establish where that point of error lay:

> They weave ingenious webs, and invent subtle theories, because their paradox of a few against the many requires ingenuity and subtlety for its support.[3]
>
> [They] built up their own theory . . . without clearing the ground first by any careful and detailed scrutiny. . . . We hear constantly the proclamation made in dogmatic terms that they are right: no proof adequate to the strength of our contention has been worked out to shew that we are wrong.[4]
>
> In contrast, . . . we are nothing, if we are not grounded in facts: our appeal is to facts, our test lies in facts.[5]
>
> We are bound first to remark that the burden of proof [now] rests with the other side.[6]

If the textual "foundations" are thus destroyed, what can the "righteous critics" do but begin anew?

---

[1]Eldon J. Epp, "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?" *Harvard Theological Review* 69 (1976): 257. Epp concludes that "*every* eclectic method"—whether "rigorous" or "reasoned"—"is at best a *temporary* 'solution' to our basic problems in NT textual criticism, and . . . it is of the most *tentative* kind" (p. 256). Yet Epp staunchly considers himself a "representative of Westcott-Hort's views" (Epp, "Interlude," p. 405)! The criticism thus comes from *within* as well as from *without* the eclectic fold! Cf. further Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, chap. 2, "Eclecticism," pp. 21-30.

[2]Cf. *passim* the articles by both men listed in the Bibliography.

[3]Burgon, *Traditional Text*, p. 238. [4]Ibid., p. 226. [5]Ibid., p. 238.

[6]Ibid., p. 205. In the current "debate" Gordon Fee's "Critique of Pickering" represents the strongest case yet made for the "reasoned eclectic" position over against that of the Majority Text. However, there are

(9) Hoskier's *Apocalypse* volumes need to be re-edited in an easier-to-use format and supplemented with the full collations of the approximately 50 MSS of that book which Hoskier unintentionally missed or which were discovered after the publication of his 1929 volume.[1] The *format* of the *Apocalypse* collations is most pressing: Gregory-Aland numbers need to be substituted for those assigned by Hoskier and a consolidation of the evidence is a necessity![2]

(10) In light of the findings of the present study that most scribes were quite careful, especially in the later period over against the earlier, it seems certain that current theory must be drastically revised. But it is not so certain what shall replace it! To the present writer the Majority Text theory now returning to prominence appears to possess the best possibility of explaining *all* the hard data currently possessed—not merely in the area of scribal habits but among all aspects of NT textual research. But the full solution is "not yet," for neither the Majority Text theory nor any other theory can claim to provide certainty as to *every* reading preferred on either external or internal grounds. *Much more* research is needed,

---

plausible responses which *can* be made to each of his objections: cf. the mention made of this writer's unpublished response to Fee, p. 217, n. 2 above.

[1]Cf. Aland's *Kurzgefasste Liste* and Nestle-Aland[26] along with Aland's supplement in *Materialien*. The following MSS are thus indicated: p^{43} p^{47} p^{85} 0207 0229 1140 1597 1757 1769 1773 1780 2323 2344 2361 2377 2402 2403 2408 2428 2429 2431 2432 2433 2434 2435 2449 2493 2494 2495 2554 2582 2594 2619 2625 2626 2638 2643 2648 2656 2663 2664 2667 2669 2672 2681 2716 2723 2743 and 2759; *49 MSS* in all.

[2]Cf. the section above, pp. 13-15, on "Difficulties in the Use of Hoskier," especially the footnoted examples!

especially the full collation of *all* extant Greek NT MSS, before a fully workable theory of NT textual criticism can be developed![1]

(11) A return to Hort is needed—not to the Hort of speculation but to the Hort who was on solid ground before *theory* supplanted *data*.[2] This may be the key to real forward progress in NT textual criticism: follow Hort's premises implicitly as long as they are *sound* but shy away from any flights of fancy he might have taken. The task today is to call down those who might still be flying with Hort (though in different directions from those Hort himself took)!

The soundest points in Hort's "Introduction" steadily have lent support to the Majority Text position, and this was not by accident. Hort was a good enough scholar to recognize that there *was* a true case for the Majority Text theory and he did not attempt to sidestep the fact[3] but waited until such was initially stated before attempting to overthrow such a theory by his "Byzantine conflation" and "revision" hypotheses. The guidelines for present research were stated clearly by Hort:

---

[1]The present research has attempted to bring out various aspects of Majority Text theory which have been neglected under current viewpoints; the present writer hopes his discussion has not therefore been "slanted," but that all material cited has been based solidy upon the data!

[2]Numerous instances of Hort's pre-theory soundness have been adduced in the present study; such was also the thrust of Colwell's "Hort Redivivus."

[3]I.e., Hort simply could have argued (as did Tregelles) that "the *earliest* MSS are *best*," and left it at that. Many modern critics seem to do the same. There would then have been *no* need to posit Byzantine "conflation" or "revision"—which caused Hort more difficulty than he needed—but Hort knew he could not legitimately neglect the fact of the rise and utter dominance of the Majority Textform since he was trying to place his theory *squarely* within a transmissional-history framework! Modern theory *neglects* this framework, and thereby the question of the Majority Textform!

> . . . Evidence is valuable *only* so far as it can be securely interpreted.[1]
>
> . . . The *best* criticism is that which takes account of *every* class of textual facts, and assigns to each method its *proper* use and rank. The leading principles of textual criticism are identical for *all* writings whatever. Differences in application arise only from differences in the *amount, variety, and quality* of evidence: *no* method is ever *inapplicable* except through *defectiveness* of evidence.[2]

Yet Hort used ingenious webs and *e silentio* reasoning to overcome the strictures of this axiom. Modern critics retain his *conclusions*—especially concerning "Byzantine inferiority"—while rejecting his leading theoretical *principles*, thus seeking the *easiest* solution (for them) of textual difficulties. But if Hort's own *foundation* is removed under current praxis, how can anything ultimately *having been built upon it* continue to stand? The subjective preference for the Alexandrian textype based primarily upon *internal* criteria needs to be replaced with a studied examination concerning the *revisionist* nature of one or the other textype! It surely will be the *more complex* solution—the *well-researched* rather than the "quick- and easy"—which will lead one in the correct paths! *Detailed research* needs to supplant hasty application of generalizations which *superficially* appear by their simplicity to provide "strong" support for internally-preferred readings. "The road

---

[1] Westcott and Hort, "Introduction," p. 14. My emphasis here and below.

[2] Ibid., p. 19. Another "difference in application" is the *use* to which a MS was put. Pickering, *Identity: Revised*, continually faults Hort for treating NT MS transmission as "any other book," but fails to note these special considerations which Hort allowed that would *distinctly alter* the history of the NT text from that of "any other book"! Yet Pickering's "special transmission" is based primarily upon *heretical corruption* of all non-Majority MSS (cf. pp. 41-44, 115-116)—certainly a faulty emphasis!

not taken" is such because it is more *difficult* than "the road most travelled." A *broadening* of viewpoint is now required to regain firm control over this runaway discipline: mere *belief* that one's theory is soundly based does not guarantee such; it is only the *evidence of data* which can settle all appeals![1]

(12) Progress in the last quarter of the 20th century requires a return to Burgon, Scrivener, Miller, and Hoskier. As Burgon has stated (now in application to the present impasse),

> It is desirable that those Textual Students who have been disposed to undervalue this class [of MSS, i.e., the later minuscules] should weigh with *candor* and *fairness* the arguments existing *in favour* of it, which we have attempted to exhibit.[2]

To this Hoskier comments:

> . . . Let me say that Burgon's position remains absolutely unshaken. . . . He sought the truth wherever it might be recovered. . . . We seek the truth among *all* our witnesses, with unnecessary subservience to no one document or congeries of documents, deriving patently from a single recension. . . .
>
> What Dean Burgon was chiefly concerned about was the lack of a *scientific basis* for our textual criticism. . . .
>
> A scientific basis can only be obtained *after* we have made ourselves masters of a scientific knowledge of the real history of transmission. . . .
>
> . . . Much more can be learned if we will extend our examination. . . . Existing Sacred Manuscripts *teem* with information if we will only dig below the surface.[3]

> The time has gone by to speak of "good cursives" because they happen to support ℵ B in spots, or as 33 and a few in a more thorough manner. We must use them quite differently.[4]

The wisdom of such statements seems to have been reflected in the findings of the present study. Ναί, ἔρχου Κύριε Ἰησοῦ—"Even so, come Lord Jesus!"[5]

---

[1] Cf. Burgon, *Traditional Text*, p. 238, "If we condemn, it is because the *evidence* condemns." Emphasis here and below my own.

[2] Ibid., p. 223. [3] Hoskier, *Codex B & Allies*, I:415. [4] Ibid., II:113n.

[5] Apoc. 22:20, following the "Majority" (Av-based) text.

TABLES

TABLE 1

CONCORDANCE OF HOSKIER NUMBERS WITH CURRENT GREGORY-ALAND NUMBERS

The following concordance has been constructed from a close comparison of the manuscript data presented by Hoskier (in II:11-21, as well as the individual MS entries in volume I) against the data of Kurt Aland in his *Kurzgefasste Liste*. Additional verification has been sought and obtained from Josef Schmid's *Studien: Die Alten Stämme* (his vol. II).

It must be emphasized that Hoskier's own identification of his MS numbers with the then-current Gregory system now stands quite frequently at odds with Aland's revised numeration (the "Gregory-Aland" system). Uncritical use of Hoskier's conversion tables could thus lead to serious error, and it is in the hope of forestalling such error that the present concordance has been constructed.

The primary key toward establishing correct correspondence between the Hoskier and Gregory-Aland numeration systems necessarily has been the catalogue numbers assigned by the individual libraries possessing the various MSS. In almost all cases, such correspondence has been correctly established; the few remaining cases (marked with a circellus) are all but certain. Thus, the reader should be able to use this concordance with complete confidence when working from Hoskier in conjunction with modern critical apparatuses.

Symbols utilized:

< > = a fragmentary MS, cited in the collation volume by Hoskier as "*frag.*" where present *and* varying from the TR (MS F/052 the notable exception to this rule). It should be noted that such fragmentary MSS are *not* cited as possessing a hiatus where non-extant, though Hoskier *does* list hiatuses at the head of his apparatus for each verse with regard to all other MSS.

[ ] = with a Gregory-Aland number present, this indicates a MS which was not cited in the collation volume by Hoskier for various reasons (e.g. inaccesibility, lost, stolen, missing, or even being a copy of a printed TR). With only a dash (——) present in the Gregory-Aland column, this indicates that Hoskier has purposely left this number blank either because the purported MS in question did not contain the Apocalypse or because the MS did not in fact exist; some few cases also occur because Hoskier deliberately re-assigned MS numbers.

° = The library possessing this MS has changed its catalogue number since the time of Hoskier, and thus the catalogue numbers of Gregory-Aland and Hoskier do not agree, though it is virtually certain the MS identification is correct.

TABLE I—*Continued*

In the concordance which follows, the numbers assigned by Hoskier are given in the first column of each pairing, followed by the Gregory-Aland number. Footnotes have been appended where necessary, being indicated by a dagger (†) following the respective entry. To avoid confusion, no footnote numbers have been inserted; rather, MSS which have been so noted will have their respective Hoskier numbers listed at the foot of the page as an index, being cited according to *Hoskier's* numerical order.

HOSKIER	ALAND
ℵ	ℵ/01
A	A/02
B	046
C	C/04
E	051
< F	052 >
P	P/024
< P.Oxy.^{848}	0163 >
< P.Oxy.^{1079}	P^{18} >
< P.Oxy.^{1080}	0169 >
< P.Oxy.^{1230}	P^{24} >
1	1
2	82
[3	—]
4	91
[5	—]
6	314
7	104
8	110
9	325
10	60
[11	—]
12	181
13	42
14	69
< 15	2087 >
16	336
17	35
18	94
19	93
20	175
21	2014
22	632
23	367
24	627
25	149
26	506
27	517
28	2015
29	385
30	429^{b}
31	2016
32	2017
33	218
34	424
35	2018
36	2019
37	432
38	2020
39	1918
39^{sup}	866^{b}
40	141
41	2021
42	452
43	2022
44	180
45	459
46	209
47	241
48	242
49	2023
50	2024
51	18
52	337
53	467
[54	—]
55	468
56	469
57	296
58	2025
59	2026
[60	—]
61	2027
62	2028
63	2029
64	1934
65	2030
[66	—]
67	2031
68	2032
69	628

TABLE 1—*Continued*

HOSKIER	ALAND
70	386
[71	—]
72	2033
73	2034
74	617
75	456
[76	—]
77	2035
78	1948
79	2036
[79[a]	2036[abs]]
80	2037
81	2038
82	177
[83	339]
84	368
[85	—]
[86	—]
87	172
88	205
89	699[†]
90	2039[†]
91	1957[†]
92	61
93	1955
94	201
95	911[†]
96	2041
97	498
98	522
99	88
100	2042
101	205[abs]
102	582
103	2043
104	680
[105	—]
106	664
107	203
108	1852
109	256
110	824
111	1611
112	2082
113	792
114	2060
[115	866[b]][†]
[116	2063]
[117	886]
[118	2066]
119	2067
120	2056
121	2057
122	2058
123	{ 743 2419[†]
124	1828
125	919
126	920
127	1841
128	1849
129	1795[†]
130	1854
[131	1857]
132	1862
[133	1870]
[134	1872]
135	1876
136	2044
137	2045
138	2046
139	2047
140	2048
141°	2049
142	2004

[†]Hosk.89 ≠ Aland 466, as suggested by Hoskier.

[†]Hosk.90 ≠ Aland 713, as suggested by Hoskier.

[†]Hosk.91 is the minuscule supplement to Codex Vaticanus (B/03) of the NT.

[†]Hosk.95 ≠ Aland 2040, as suggested by Hoskier.

[†]Hosk.115 is collated by Hoskier under his number 39[sup].

[†]Hosk.123 has a supplied portion (3:3-4:8); that portion = Aland 2419.

[†]Hosk.129 ≠ Aland 2324, as suggested by Hoskier, but is instead the "missing" MS cited under Hosk.196. Nor does this MS = Aland 2349; that MS number, originally assigned by von Dobschütz, has been reassigned by Aland.

TABLE 1—*Continued*

HOSKIER	ALAND	HOSKIER	ALAND	HOSKIER	ALAND
143	2050	164	2070	187	1894
144	2051	165	250,	188	2084
145	2052	166	2305	189	2091
146	2053	167	2071	190	1328
147	2054	[168	2072]	191	1384
148	2055	169	2073	192	1503
149°	808	170	2074	193	2302
150	757	171	2075	194	1352[b]
151	922†	172	2076	[195	1785]
152	2059	[173	——]	[196	1795]†
153	935	174	2077	[197	1424]
154	2061	[175	——]	[198	1685]
155	2062	176	2078	[199	1760]
[155[A]	2350]†	177	2079	200	2329†
[155[abs]	1824]	178	2080	201	2351†
156	616	179	2081	202	2352†
157	986	180	620	203	1778
158	2064	181	1888	204	2595†
159	2065	182	1094	[205	1806]
160	1072	[183	——]	206	2436†
161	1075	184	2083	207	1597
162	2068	[185	1277]	208	2186
163	2069	186	1893	[209	2305]†

†Hosk.151 ≠ Aland 1380, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Hosk.155[A] ≠ the now (truly) "lost" Aland 2325, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Hosk.196: this MS is no longer "missing", as Hoskier thought, but is in fact Hosk.129, originally purchased by Hoskier himself!

†Hosk.200 ≠ Aland 2321, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Hosk.201 ≠ Aland 2322, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Hosk.202 ≠ Aland 2323, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Hosk.204 ≠ Aland 598, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Hosk.206: no longer "?", as stated by Hoskier.

†Hosk.209: Aland 2305 now = Hosk.166.

TABLE 1—*Continued*

HOSKIER	ALAND
210	1719
211	1728
212	1551
[213	2259]
214	1704
215	1006
216	2254
217	2258
218	2256
219	1859
220	1732
221	1733
222	1734
223	1617
224	1771†
[225	——]
226	1626
227	1745
228	1746
229	1740
230	1637
[230[a]	1771]†
[231	1652]
232	1774†
233	2196
[234	2114]
[235	1668]
< 236	1775 >
[237	1776]
< 238	1777 >
[239	——]
240	1678
241	2286
242	1864
[243	1903]†
244	1865
245	2200
246	2138
[247	2136]
[248	2116]
[249	1897]
250	1248†
251	254
[252	——]

†Hosk.224 ≠ Aland 2195, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Hosk.230[a]: Aland 1771 now = Hosk.224.

†Hosk.232: although the *Kurzgefasste Liste* states that Aland 1774 does *not* contain the Apocalypse, Aland later corrects this error in his "Additions and Corrections to the *Kurzgefasste Liste*" in the forefront of his *Materialien zur neutestamentlichen Handschriftenkunde I.*, ANTF 3 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969).

†Hosk.243: it should be noted that, although Hoskier did not include the readings of this MS in his collation volume (being a copy of a printed TR + a Complutensian-style MS), he did list the singular readings of this MS in I:737, and such have been utilized for the present study.

†Hosk.250: the *Kurzgefasste Liste* claims that this MS 1248 does *not* contain the Apocalypse; nor is this statement corrected in *Materialien*. However, W.H.P. Hatch, in his *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament at Mount Sinai: Facsimiles and Descriptions* (Paris: Geuthner, 1932) states quite positively that this MS indeed *does* contain the Apocalypse. Thus the above identification seems virtually certain, Aland to the contrary. Note also that Schmid, *Studien: Die Alten Stämme*, p.87, concurs with the present judgment.

TABLE 2

CONCORDANCE OF GREGORY-ALAND NUMBERS WITH HOSKIER NUMBERS TOGETHER WITH DATA CONCERNING MANUSCRIPT CONTENT AND DATE

The following Table serves a dual function. First and foremost, it serves as a *reverse index* to Table 1 which precedes—a most useful tool when using Hoskier to verify data presented within a modern critical Greek New Testament apparatus.

Secondly, this Table provides a brief conspectus of the contents and date of each MS collated by Hoskier. These data may well prove useful when examining the correlation of various singular readings with the contents-as-a-whole of their respective MS and/or with the date of the copying of such MS. The abbreviation system used for such data derives with but slight modification from that used in Aland's *Kurzgefasste Liste*. Dates given are by century unless the MS possesses a specific indication of date; all dates provided are those of the *Kurzgefasste Liste*, which at times differs from Hoskier.

Footnotes in this Table have been kept to a minimum, thereby avoiding unnecessary duplication of data already provided in Table 1.

Symbols utilized:

< > = The same usage as in Table 1, i.e. a fragmentary MS.

[ ] = The same usage as in Table 1, i.e. Hoskier made no use of this MS.

° = The same usage as in Table 1, i.e. absolute verification of the correspondence between the Gregory-Aland and Hoskier numbers has not been achieved.

( ) = Cross-references indicating either (*a*) a Gregory number which was changed during Aland's revision; or (*b*) a Gregory-Aland number which was cited *incorrectly* by Hoskier in his edition, which might mislead the unwary reader of Hoskier. Where instances of case (*b*) occur, the incorrect Gregory-Aland number (which appears first in the cross-reference) is followed by an (x).

e,a,p,r = The NT composition of the MS containing the Apocalypse. e = Gospels; a = Acts and Catholic Epistles; p = Pauline Epistles; and r = the Apocalypse itself. Use of these symbols gives only a *general* and not a *specific* guide to the MS contents; e.g. "e" might indicate only a fragmentary portion of a single Gospel or the entire fourfold Gospel corpus.

(m) = Indicates miscellaneous, extra-NT material is bound within the same volume. These include such items as Old Testament books, OT Commentary, NT Apocrypha, NT Lectionary, NT Lexicon, Patristic writings, Homilies, Lives of Saints, etc.; Eusebian Canons and Section Tables are *not* here included.

TABLE 2—*Continued*

K = The text of the Apocalypse is accompanied by a catena or by a commentary.

Ka = The accompanying commentary is that of Andreas, when expressly known.

Ko = The accompanying commentary is that of Oecumenius, when expressly known.

Kr = The accompanying commentary is that of Arethas, when expressly known.

(g-l) = The MS is Graeco-Latin.

(g-a) = The MS is Graeco-Armenian.

ALAND	HOSKIER	CONTENTS	DATE
< P^{18}	P.Oxy.^{1079}	r	III/IV >
< P^{24}	P.Oxy.^{1230}	r	IV >
ℵ/01	ℵ	eapr(m)	IV
A/02	A	eapr(m)	V
C/04	C	eapr(m)	V
P/025	P	apr(m)	IX
046	B	r(m)	X
051	E	r	X
< 052	F	r	X >
< 0163	P.Oxy.^{848}	r	V >
< 0169	P.Oxy.^{1080}	r	IV >
1	1	r	XII
18	51	eapr	1364
35	17	eapr(m)	XI
42	13	apr(m)	XI
60	10	er	1297
61	92	eapr	XVI
69	14	eapr	XV
82	2	aprKo	X
88	99	apr	XII
91	4	aprKr	XI
93	19	apr	XI
94	18	aprKa	XII
104	7	apr	1087
110	8	apr	XII
141	40	eapr	XIII
149	25	eapr	XV
172	87	apr	XIII/XIV
175	20	eapr	X
177	82	apr	XI
180	44	eapr	1273
181	12	apr	XV
201	94	eapr	1357
203	107	apr	1111
205	88	eapr	XV
205^{abs}	101	eapr	XV
209	46	eapr	XV
218	33	eapr	XIII
241	47	eapr	XI
242	48	eapr	XII
250	165	aprKr	XI
254	251	aprK(m)	XIV
256	109	apr(g-a)	XI
296	57	eapr	XVI

TABLE 2—*Continued*

ALAND	HOSKIER	CONTENTS	DATE
314	6	aprKo	XI
325	9	apr	XI
336	16	apr	XV
337	52	apr	XII
[339	83]		
367	23	eapr	1331
368	84	ear	XV
385	29	apr(m)	1407
386	70	eapr	XIV
424	34	apr	XI
429[b]	30	apr	XV
432	37	apr	XV
452	42	apr	XII
456	75	apr	X
459	45	apr(m)	1092
(466x	= 699)		
467	53	apr	XV
468	55	apr	XIII
469	56	apr	XIII
498	97	eapr	XIV
506	26	eapr	XI
517	27	eapr	XI/XII
522	98	eapr	1515
582	102	eapr(m)	1334
(598	= 2595)		
616	156	apr	1434
617	74	aprKr	XI
620	180	apr(g-1)	XII
627	24	apr	X
628	69	apr(g-1)	XIV
632	22	apr	XII/XIV
664	106	eapr(m)	XV
680	104	eapr	XIV
699	89	eapr	XI
(713x	= 2039)		
743	123	earKa	XIV
757	150	eapr	XIII
792	113	er	XIII
808°	149	eapr	XII
824	110	eapr	XIV
866[b]	39[sup]	r(g-1)	XIII
[886	117]		
911	95	aprKr	XII
919	125	apr	XI
920	126	apr(m)	X
922	151	eapr	1116
935	153	eapr	XIV
986	157	eapr	XIV
1006	215	er	XI
1072	160	eapr	XIII
1075	161	eapr	XIV
1094	182	eapr	XIII
1248	250	eapr	XIV
[1277	185]		
1328	190	er	XIV
1352[b]	194	r	XIV
(1380x	= 922)		
1384	191	eapr	XI
[1424	197]		
1503	192	eapr	1317
1551	212	er	XIII
1597	207	eapr	1289
1611	111	apr	XII
1617	223	eapr	XV
1626	226	eapr	XV
1637	230	eapr	1328

TABLE 2—*Continued*

ALAND	HOSKIER	CONTENTS	DATE
[1652	231]		
[1668	235]		
1678	240	eaprKao	XIV
[1685	198]		
1704	214	eapr	1541
1719	210	apr	1287
1728	211	apr	XIII
1732	220	apr	1384
1733	221	apr	XIV
1734	222	apr	1015
1740	229	apr	XIII
1745	227	apr	XV
1746	228	apr	XIV
[1760	199]		
1771	224†	pr	XIV
1774	232	er(m)	XV
<1775	236	rKa(m)	1847†>
[1776	237]		
<1777	238	rK	XIX>
1778	203	rKoa	XV
[1785	195]		
1795	129†	pr†	XII
[1806	205]		
[1824	155abs]		
1828	124	apr	XII
1841	127	apr	IX/X
1849	128	apr	1069
1852	108	apr	XIII
1854	130	apr	XI
[1857	131]		
1859	219	arK	XIV
1862	132	aprKo	IX
1864	242	apr	XII
1865	244	apr	XIII
[1870	133]		
[1872	134]		
1876	135	apr	XV
1888	181	aprK	XI
1893	186	apr	XII
1894	187	apr	XII
[1897	249]		
[1903	243	apr	1636]†
1918	39†	pr(g-1)†	XIV
1934	64	prKr	XI
1948	78	pr	XV
1955	93	pr	XI
1957	91	pr	XV
2004	142	pr	XII

†Aland 1771 ≠ Hosk.230[a], as suggested by Hoskier.

†Aland 1775: the copying date of 1847 AD is *sic!*

†Aland 1795 ≠ Hosk.196, as suggested by Hoskier. Note that the *specific* contents of this MS are the books of Hebrews and the Apocalypse *alone* (cf. Schmid, *Studien: Die Alten Stämme*, p.32).

†Aland 1903: although Hoskier did not include this MS in his collation volume, he did list the singular readings of this MS in I:737; thus, the full content/date matter is provided the reader for future reference.

†Aland 1918: note that Hoskier cites both Aland 1918 and 866[b] as his MS 39. In fact, Aland 866[b]/Hosk.39[sup] contains only Apoc.6:17-13:12. Note that the *Kurzgefasste Liste* does not claim MS 1918 as (g-1), *contra* Hoskier.

TABLE 2—*Continued*

ALAND	HOSKIER	CONTENTS	DATE
2014	21	rKa	XV
2015	28	r(m)	XV
2016	31	r(m)	XV
2017	32	r(m)	XV
2018	35	rKa	XIV
2019	36	rKa	XIII
2020	38	r(m)	XV
2021	41	r	XV
2022	43	rKa	XIV
2023	49	rKa	XV
2024	50	r(m)	XV
2025	58	r(m)	XV
2026	59	rKa	XV
2027	61	r	XIII
2028	62	rKa	1422
2029	63	rKa	XVI
2030	65	r	XII
2031	67	rKa	1301
2032	68	rKa	XI
2033	72	rKa	XVI
2034	73	rKa	XV
2035	77	rKr	XVI
2036	79	rKa	XIV
[2036^{abs}	79^{a}]		
2037	80	rKa	XIV
2038	81	rKa(m)	XVI
2039	90	r	XII
(2040 =	911)		
2041	96	r	XIV
2042	100	rKa	XIV
2043	103	rK	XV
2044	136	rKa	1560
2045	137	rKa	XIII

ALAND	HOSKIER	CONTENTS	DATE
2046	138	rKa	XVI
2047	139	rKa	1543
2048	140	r(m)	XI
2049°	141	r(m)	XVI
2050	143	r(m)	1107
2051	144	rKa	XVI
2052	145	rKa	XVI
2053	146	rKo	XIII
2054	147	rKa(m)	XV
2055	148	rKa(m)	XV
2056	120	rKa	XIV
2057	121	r(m)	XV
2058	122	rK(m)	XIV
2059	152	rKa(m)	XI
2060	114	rKa	1331
2061	154	r(m)	XV
2062	155	rKo(m)	XIII
[2063	116]		
2064	158	rKa(m)	XVI
2065	159	rKa	XV
[2066	118]		
2067	119	rKa	XV
2068	162	rKa	XVI
2069	163	rKa	XV
2070	164	rKr	1356
2071	167	rKa(m)	1622
[2072	168]		
2073	169	rKa(m)	XIV
2074	170	rKa	X
2075	171	rKa	XIV
2076	172	r(m)	XVI
2077	174	rKa	1685
2078	176	r(m)	XVI

TABLE 2—*Continued*

ALAND	HOSKIER	CONTENTS	DATE
2079	177	r(m)	XIII
2080	178	apr(m)	XIV
2081	179	rKa	XI
2082	112	r	XVI
2083	184	rKa	1560
2084	188	r(m)	XV
< 2087	15	r	XV >
2091	189	rKa	XV
[2114	234]		
[2116	248]		
[2136	247]		
2138	246	apr	1072
2186	208	arKa	XII
(2195x = 1771)			
2196	233	r(m)	XVI
2200	245	eapr	XIV
2254	216	rKa	XVI
2256	218	r	XV
2258	217	r(m)	XVII
[2259	213]		
2286	241	rKa	XII
2302	193	rKr	XV
2305	166†	rK	XIV
(2321x = 2329)			
(2322x = 2351)			
(2323x = 2352)			
(2324x = 1795)			
(2325x = 2350)			
2329	200	rK(m)	X
(2349 = 1795)			
[2350	155^{A}]		
2351	201	rK(m)	X
2352	202	rKa	XV
2419†	123^{sup}	rK	XIII/XIV
2436	206	r(m)	1418
2595	204	rKa(m)	XV

†Aland 2305 ≠ Hosk.209, as suggested by Hoskier.

†Aland 2419 is cited in Hoskier as MS 123, with no distinction made between this portion (Apoc.3:3-4:8) and the remainder of Hosk.123, which represents Aland 743. The present labelling of Aland 2419 as "123^{sup}" is merely for clarity.

TABLE 3

INCOMPLETE MANUSCRIPTS: A COMPILATION OF SCATTERED DATA FROM HOSKIER

The following Table presents a ready-reference list of all MSS collated by Hoskier which lack portions of the Apocalypse. Some MSS lack only a few verses; others lack nearly the entire book. This lack of text has been dealt with by Hoskier in three different ways:

(*a*) MSS which are extant for only a very small portion of the Apocalypse. These were treated by Hoskier as "fragments" within his collation and were not otherwise cited as possessing hiatus where non-extant.

(*b*) MSS which contain the greater portion of the Apocalypse but which nevertheless have some portions missing. These are for the most part indicated at the head of each verse within Hoskier's apparatus as possessing "hiatus" for that respective verse. Sometimes even the specific word at which the hiatus begins or ends is provided by Hoskier.

(*c*) Some MSS which possess certain types of lacunae are neglected by Hoskier in the collation volume entirely, although properly described in the introductory volume. These include cases where the MS involved no longer possesses a lacuna, but has had the gap supplied by a later copyist.

The extraction of these data from Hoskier's two volumes is a time-consuming task, though not difficult. For the benefit of the reader, they are here presented *in toto* in alphabetical/numerical order of occurrence, following Hoskier's numeration system. Where the specific word beginning or ending a lacuna is provided by Hoskier, this is also provided in the present Table. Additional notations accompany any entry where necessary.

In the data which follow, it must be noted that "*lac:*" precedes the missing portion of a MS where Hoskier has listed the hiatuses of such. Conversely, "*con:*" precedes the listing of the extant portion of a MS as reported by Hoskier. These italicized terms represent "*lacunae*" and "*quod in libro continetur*" respectively.

All MSS not herein mentioned are extant throughout the *entire* Apocalypse. It should be noted that indication of contents/lacunae in the present Table applies to the book as a whole, and not merely to the sample chapters utilized in the present study. In this light, the reader is advised to note that the following MSS which appear in the present Table are fully extant within the sample chapters selected for inclusion in this study: MSS 13, 21, 22, 98, 104, 156.

HOSKIER MS =	ALAND MS	CONTENTS/LACUNAE
C	C/04	*lac:* 1.1; 3.19-5.14; 7.14-17; 8.4-9.16; 10.10-11.3; 16.14-18.2; 19.5-22.21
E	051	*lac:* 1.1-11.14; 13.2-3; 17.1-3; 22.8-14.

TABLE 3—*Continued*

HOSKIER MS	= ALAND MS	CONTENTS/LACUNAE
F	052	*con:* 7.16-8.12.
P	P/024	*lac:* 5.9-10(in part); 16.12-17.1[a]; 19.21-20.9; 22.6-21.
P.Oxy.[848]	0163	*con:* 16.17-20.
P.Oxy.[1079]	p^{18}	*con:* 1.4-7.
P.Oxy.[1080]	0169	*con:* 3.19-4.2.
P.Oxy.[1230]	p^{24}	*con:* 5.5-8; 6.5-8.
1	1	*lac:* 22.16 (ο αστηρ) - 21. This is the famous Erasmian Codex, from whose lack of these verses Erasmus was forced to re-translate the Greek from the Vulgate Latin. Note that 26 other MSS collated by Hoskier also lack the end of the Apocalypse, generally with even more text missing than Codex 1 lacks; these represent approximately 12% of the Apocalypse MSS, excluding the fragments.
6	314	*lac:* 1.10-16; 9.11-17; 17.10[b]-18.8; 20.1-22.21.
8	110	*lac:* 6.15-8.1; 22.19-21.
12	181	*lac:* 17.9-14.
13	42	*lac:* 14.1 (επι[2]) -3 (ηγορασμενοι), but supplied by a later hand; 18.3-13, not supplied.
14	69	*lac:* 18.7-22.21 at present; however 18.7-20.15 had been known to exist and was collated by Mill, Jackson, and Wettstein, and their collations were used by Hoskier (and thus by the present researcher). Thus, only 21.1-22.15 is actually "missing" from this MS.
15	2087	*con:* 3.3-4.8.
21	2014	*lac:* 18.17-19.
22	632	*lac:* 19.1-6 (Text missing, but commentary and its "text" present; however, text embedded in commentary has been excluded from the present study, thus there are no tabulations covering this portion of MS 22).

TABLE 3—*Continued*

HOSKIER MS	= ALAND MS	CONTENTS/LACUNAE
24	627	*lac:* 3.20-4.10 (πρεσβυτεροι).
28	2015	*lac:* 17.5-22.21.
29	385	*lac:* 22.2[b]-18.
33	218	*lac:* 13.5-14.8; 15.7-17.2; 18.10-19.15; 20.7-22.21.
36	2019	*lac:* 19.21-22.21.
39	1918	*lac:* 1.1-3.17[a]; 6.17(ημερα)–13.12(ποιει). Note: MS 39[sup] (listed below) fills the gap in MS 39 between chapters 6.17-13.12. Hoskier does *not* distinguish in his collation between 39 and 39[sup]; Aland, however, *does* make such distinction, and this present Table thus follows Aland in the treatment of this MS.
39[sup]	866[b]	*con:* 6.17-13.12, exactly filling the lacuna in MS 39.
43	2022	*lac:* 1.1-14.17; 20.7-22.21 (Hoskier would have done better to treat this MS as a fragment!).
44	180	*lac:* 22.21.
45	459	*lac:* 20.4(επ'αυτους)–21.20.
52	337	*lac:* 10.4-11.1; 22.17(ελθε[1])–21.
55	468	*lac:* 19.18(χιλιαρχων) – 22.17(και[4]).
61	2027	*lac:* 22.8-21.
65	2030	*lac:* 1.1-16.20(εφυγε) (This MS too should have been treated by Hoskier as a fragment).
67	2031	*lac:* 8.13-9.3; 21.23-22.2(ζωης); 22.14-17. Note: although Hoskier states in I:213 that "lacunae exist" also at 2.11; 12.5; and 14.4, the case at 2.11 is treated in the collation as a simple omission, and there is no trace whatever in the collation volume of the other two cases.
68	2032	*lac:* 1.1-11; 2.20-3.16; 6.9-7.16; 9.6-21.18 (This MS also should have been treated as a fragment).

TABLE 3—*Continued*

HOSKIER MS	= ALAND MS	CONTENTS/LACUNAE
69	628	*lac:* 18.23-22.21.
87	172	*lac:* 14.5-14 (νεφελην); 21.13-22.21.
93	1955	*lac:* 14.17-15.7; 19.4-22.21.
95	911	*lac:* 20.11^{b}-22.21.
98	522	*lac:* 2.11-23.
99	88	*lac:* 3.14-22.21 (This MS most obviously should have been treated by Hoskier as a fragment!).
104	680	*lac:* 16.4^{b}-9.
109	256	*lac:* 15.7-16.4 from the Greek text of this Graeco-Armenian MS—yet Hoskier fails to list this portion as being in hiatus in his collation volume; 19.16-22.21 is absent from *both* the Greek and Armenian, and *is* correctly listed as being in hiatus.
114	2060	*lac:* 22.2-3.
122	2058	*lac:* 22.14^{b}-15.
123	743	*lac:* 3.1-4.11. However, 3.3-4.8 are present by a later hand, not distinguished in the collation volume of Hoskier. This 123^{sup} is counted separately by Aland, and is thus listed so in the present Table, below.
123^{sup}	2419	*con:* 3.3(ποιαν)–4.8(γεμοντα).
124	1828	*lac:* 18.22(ου μη^{2})–22.21.
125	919	*lac:* 19.6-22.21.
126	920	*lac:* 22.1-21.
135	1876	*lac:* 22.1-21.
143	2050	*lac:* 6.1-19.21 —but this without any break in the MS! The hiatus was either *deliberately* edited out, or the scribe *unconsciously* kept copying his exemplar, failing to notice the hiatus!

TABLE 3—*Continued*

HOSKIER MS	= ALAND MS	CONTENTS/LACUNAE
145	2052	*lac:* 5.1-5; 7.5 (χιλιαδες^2) – 22.21.
146	2053	*lac:* 7.5-8.
150	757	*lac:* 21.9-22.21, supplied by a later hand from a different exemplar; this latter cited by Hoskier as "150^{sup}".
155	2062	*lac:* 2.1 (ταδε) – 14.20.
156	616	*lac:* 18.16-19^a.
171	2075	*lac:* 1.1-12, 14-15; 3.5^b (ζωης) - 7^a ($\overline{\Delta\alpha\delta}$); 6.10-11; 7.1-2, 9-10; 15.7; 16.19; 18.12 (ελεφαντινον) – 13. Note: in the collation volume, the lacunae in chs.3, 15, 16, and 18 are not listed as such at the head of their respective verses. Within the apparatus, however, these lacunae are at times mentioned parenthetically, e.g. "171 *hiat.*" Why Hoskier chose this manner of presentation remains a mystery.
176	2078	*lac:* 4.1-7.9.
178	2080	*lac:* 17.1 (δειξω) – 14 (μετα); 22.16 (ταυτα) – 21.
186	1893	*lac:* 1.5-2.29; 10.6-12.11; 17.5 (μυστηριον) – 19.2; 19.21 (στοματος) – 21.4.
189	2091	*lac:* 1.1-10.7; 20.1-3,6,13; 21.7-22.21. N.B. that the apparent hiatuses in chs.20-21 are actually the result of skillful editing on the part of the scribe: the text actually reads in the following order without a break, omit 20.1-3, then include 20.7-11, 4-5, omit 20.6, then include 20.11-12, omit 20.13, then include part of 20.14-15, followed by 21.1-6, at which point the Apocalypse is fully brought to an end!
190	1328	*lac:* 10.9-11.6
191	1384	*lac:* 4.2-16.15; 22.12 (μου) – 21.
193	2302	*lac:* 2.8-13; 18.13 (και σιτον) – 22.21.
194	1352^b	*lac:* 1.1-2.10 (διαβολος); 12.13 (εδιωξε) – 14.8 (ηκολουθησε).

TABLE 3—*Continued*

HOSKIER MS	= ALAND MS	CONTENTS/LACUNAE
201	2351	*lac:* 14.1-3; 14.6-22.21.
203	1778	*lac:* 1.1-8.
208	2186	*lac:* 13.18-14.7; 15.5-16.11; 17.4-9 (καθηται).
214	1704	*lac:* 5.6^{b}-6.13.
218	2256	*lac:* 2.12-3.22 (this without any break in the MS text); 18.2 (και^{2}) – 12; 20.13-22.21.
219	1859	*lac:* 1.1-5.
222	1734	*lac:* 22.8-21 (supplied by a XVIth-century hand; the MS itself is dated 1015 AD — the earliest dated minuscule MS of the Apocalypse).
223	1617	*lac:* 8.8-9.15; 11.1-13.2.
226	1626	*lac:* 9.15-22.21.
228	1746	*lac:* 21.26-22.21.
229	1740	*lac:* 20.13-21.9.
232	1774	*lac:* 1.1-2.20^{a}; 4.11-5.12; 11.19-22.7.
236	1775	*con:* 1.1-13; 4.4-7; 19.19-21. (This MS is always cited by Hoskier in the collation as "*frag.*").
238	1777	*con:* 1.1-3; 10.7-11. (This MS also is always cited in the collation volume as "*frag.*").
245	2200	*lac:* 21.4 (απο) – 22.21. (But in fact, this MS actually is brought to an *end* at 21.4, δακρυον!)

TABLE 4

VERSES LACKING FROM MANUSCRIPTS WITHIN THE SAMPLE BASE CHAPTERS: A CORRELATIVE EXAMINATION AND PERCENTAGE EVALUATION

In the following Table the lacunae data from Table 3 preceding are incorporated with a short list of other verses which are lacking in various MSS for reasons apart from defects or missing portions of their present MSS. Some of these "missing" verses may be due to now-unknown lacunae in the exemplar used by our present scribes; other missing verses may be the result of accidental omission or deliberate editing by these present scribes. In any case, it thus becomes necessary to provide a full tabulation of the verses missing in a MS for which *no* testimony can now be derived.

In Table 3 preceding, *individual* MS data concerning lacunae has already been provided; these lacunae comprise by far the greater portion of the verses missing in the MSS. The present Table thus lists on a chapter-by-chapter basis verses missing *only* within the sample base chapters used for this study (chapters 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20, and 22). Only *whole verse* omissions have been added to the lacunae data of Table 3; smaller portions are here neglected, since such would not serve the basic purpose of the present Table, which is merely to provide an *approximate* indication of the percentage of sample base text extant within each MS utilized in this study.

The following data are divided into two sections within the listing for each chapter: (*a*) "Not present at all", indicating those MSS which are fully non-extant within that chapter, and thus offer *no* testimony whatever to the verses in question; and (*b*) "Lacking a portion", indicating those MSS which are extant only *in part* within that chapter, and the verses lacking are then specifically listed following the MS number. All MSS are listed in italics within this Table for clarity. Where missing verses are *not* the result of a fault in the parchment or paper (i.e. a lacuna), they are marked by a circellus (°) following such verse numbers.

Within the ten sample base chapters, there are altogether 164 verses. The final portion of this Table lists in fractional form the total number of verses *extant* within a MS out of the total 164 verses, which fraction is then converted to a percentage for easy comparison with other MSS. All MSS *not* included on this final list are 100% complete within the 164 sample base verses. The MSS in this closing portion are listed in alphabetical/numerical order, utilizing Hoskier's numeration.

::::::::::::::::::::::::::

Chapter 1 (contains 20 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*^{848}, *P.Oxy.*^{1080}, *P.Oxy.*^{1230}, *E*, *F*, *15*, *39*, *39*^{sup}, *43*, *65*, *123*^{sup}, *150*^{sup}, *189*, *194*, *222*^{sup}, *232*.

Lacking a portion: *P.Oxy.*^{1079} (1.1-3, 8-20); *C* (1.1); *6* (1.10-16); *67* (1.6)°; *68* (1.1-11); *171* (1.1-12, 14-15); *186* (1.5-20); *203* (1.1-8); *219* (1.1-5); *236* (1.2°, 14-20); *238* (1.4-20).

TABLE 4—*Continued*

Chapter 3 (contains 22 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *E*, *F*, *39*[sup], *43*, *65*, *123*, *150*[sup], *155*, *189*, *218*, *222*[sup], *236*, *238*.

Lacking a portion: *P.Oxy.*[1080] (3.1-18); *C* (3.19-22); *15* (3.1-2); *24* (3.20-22); *39* (3.1-17[a]); *68* (3.1-16); *99* (3.14-22); *123*[sup] (3.1-2); *171* (3.5[b]-7[a]).

Chapter 5 (contains 14 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *C*, *E*, *F*, *15*, *39*[sup], *43*, *65*, *99*, *123*[sup], *150*[sup], *155*, *176*, *189*, *191*, *222*[sup], *236*, *238*.

Lacking a portion: *P.Oxy.*[1230] (5.1-4, 9-14); *P* (5.9-10 in part); *137* (5.14)°; *145* (5.1-5)°; *214* (5.6[b]-14); *232* (5.1-12).

Chapter 7 (contains 17 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *E*, *8*, *15*, *39*, *43*, *65*, *99*, *123*[sup], *143*, *150*[sup], *155*, *189*, *191*, *222*[sup], *236*, *238*.

Lacking a portion: *C* (7.14-17); *F* (7.1-15); *12* (7.12)°; *68* (7.1-16 [Hoskier errs in claiming hiatus for verse 17]); *145* (7.5[b]-17); *146* (7.5-8)°; *171* (7.1-2, 9-10); *176* (7.1-9).

Chapter 10 (contains 11 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *E*, *F*, *15*, *39*, *43*, *65*, *68*, *99*, *123*[sup], *143*, *145*, *150*[sup], *155*, *191*, *222*[sup], *226*, *236*.

Lacking a portion: *C* (10.10-11); *12* (10.9)°; *52* (10.4-11); *186* (10.6-11); *189* (10.1-7); *190* (10.9-11); *238* (10.1-6).

Chapter 12 (contains 18 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *F*, *15*, *39*, *43*, *65*, *68*, *99*, *123*[sup], *143*, *145*, *150*[sup], *155*, *191*, *222*[sup], *223*, *226*, *232*, *236*, *238*.

Lacking a portion: *12* (12.2)°; *121* (12.9)°; *186* (12.1-11); *194* (12.13[b]-18).

Chapter 15 (contains 8 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *F*, *15*, *39*[sup], *65*, *68*, *99*, *123*[sup], *143*, *145*, *150*[sup], *191*, *201*, *222*[sup], *226*, *232*, *236*, *238*.

Lacking a portion: *33* (15.7[b]-8); *93* (15.1-7); *109* (15.7[b]-8); *171* (15.7); *208* (15.5-8).

TABLE 4—*Continued*

Chapter 17 (contains 18 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *C, F, 15, 39*[sup], *68, 99, 123*[sup], *143, 145, 150*[sup], *201, 222*[sup], *226, 232, 236, 238.*

Lacking a portion: *E* (17.1-3); *P* (17.1[a]); *6* (17.10[b]-18); *12* (17.9-14); *28* (17.5-18); *33* (17.1-2[a]); *178* (17.1[b]-14[a]); *186* (17.5[b]-18); *208* (17.4-9[a]).

Chapter 20 (contains 15 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *C, F, 6, 15, 28, 36, 39*[sup], *55, 68, 69, 93, 99, 109, 123*[sup], *124, 125, 145, 150*[sup], *186, 193, 201, 222*[sup], *226, 232, 236, 238.*

Lacking a portion: *P* (20.1-9); *33* (20.7[b]-15); *43* (20.7-15); *45* (20.4[b]-15); *95* (20.11[b]-15); *102* (20.5-6)°; *189* (20.1-3, 6, 13)°; *203* (20.7)°; *218* (20.13-15); *229* (20.13-15).

Chapter 22 (contains 21 verses)

Not present at all: *P.Oxy.*[848], *P.Oxy.*[1079], *P.Oxy.*[1080], *P.Oxy.*[1230], *C, F, 6, 14, 15, 28, 33, 36, 39*[sup], *43, 69, 87, 93, 95, 99, 109, 123*[sup], *124, 125, 126, 135, 145, 150, 189, 193, 201, 218, 226, 228, 236, 238, 245.*

Lacking a portion: *E* (22.8-14); *P* (22.6-21); *1* (22.16[b]-21); *8* (22.19-21); *12* (22.18-19)°; *29* (22.2[b]-18); *44* (22.21); *52* (22.17[b]-21); *55* (22.1-17[a]); *61* (22.8[b]-21); *67* (22.1-2[a], 14-17); *114* (22.2-3); *122* (22.14[b]-15); *178* (22.16[b]-21); *191* (22.12[b]-21); *222* (22.8-21); *222*[sup] (22.1-7); *232* (22.1-7).

++++++++++++++++++++++++++

MS *C* is extant in 85/164 verses = 52% of the sample base.
E in 70/164 = 43%
F in 2/164 = 1%
P in 136.5/164 = 83%
P.Oxy.[848] in 0/164 = 0%
P.Oxy.[1079] in 4/164 = 2%
P.Oxy.[1080] in 4/164 = 2%
P.Oxy.[1230] in 4/164 = 2%
1 in 158.5/164 = 97%
6 in 112.5/164 = 69%
8 in 144/164 = 88%
12 in 153/164 = 93%
14 in 143/164 = 87%
15 in 20/164 = 12%
24 in 161/164 = 98%
28 in 114/164 = 70%
29 in 147.5/164 = 90%

MS *33* in 131/164 = 80%
36 in 128/164 = 78%
39 in 80.5/164 = 49%
39[sup] in 46/164 = 28%
43 in 32/164 = 20%
44 in 163/164 = 99%
45 in 152.5/164 = 93%
52 in 151.5/164 = 92%
55 in 132.5/164 = 81%
61 in 150.5/164 = 92%
65 in 54/164 = 33%
67 in 157.5/164 = 96%
68 in 51/164 = 31%
69 in 128/164 = 78%
87 in 143/164 = 87%

TABLE 4—*Continued*

MS *93* is extant in 121/164 verses = 74% of the sample base.
95 in 138.5/164 = 84%
99 in 33/164 = 20%
102 in 162/164 = 99%
109 in 126.5/164 = 77%
114 in 162/164 = 99%
121 in 163/164 = 99%
122 in 162.5/164 = 99%
123 in 142/164 = 87%
123^{sup} in 20/164 = 12%
124 in 128/164 = 78%
125 in 128/164 = 78%
126 in 143/164 = 87%
135 in 143/164 = 87%
137 in 163/164 = 99%
143 in 92/164 = 56%
145 in 55.5/164 = 34%
146 in 160/164 = 98%
150 in 143/164 = 87%
150^{sup} in 21/164 = 13%
155 in 82/164 = 50%
171 in 143/164 = 87%
176 in 141/164 = 86%
178 in 145/164 = 88%

MS *186* in 102.5/164 = 63%
189 in 58/164 = 35%
190 in 161/164 = 98%
191 in 86.5/164 = 53%
193 in 128/164 = 78%
194 in 138.5/164 = 84%
201 in 102/164 = 62%
203 in 155/164 = 95%
208 in 154.5/164 = 94%
214 in 155.5/164 = 95%
218 in 118/164 = 72%
219 in 159/164 = 97%
222 in 150/164 = 91%
222^{sup} in 14/164 = 9%
223 in 146/164 = 89%
226 in 73/164 = 45%
228 in 143/164 = 87%
229 in 161/164 = 98%
232 in 66/164 = 40%
236 in 12/164 = 7%
238 in 8/164 = 5%
245 in 143/164 = 87%

The following MSS are extant for 164/164 = 100% of the sample base verses:
ℵ, A, B, 2, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 56, 57, 58, 59, 62, 63, 64, 70, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 94, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112, 113, 119, 120, 127, 128, 129, 130, 132, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 144, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 172, 174, 177, 179, 180, 181, 182, 184, 187, 188, 192, 200, 202, 204, 206, 207, 210, 211, 212, 215, 216, 217, 220, 221, 224, 227, 230, 233, 240, 241, 242, (243), 244, 246, 250, 251.*

*Note: MS *243* is included in the present study even though not included in Hoskier's collation; see Table 1, note *in loc.*

Summary: There are 147 MSS which offer complete testimony to the 164 verses which comprise the sample base chapters; 74 MSS offer incomplete testimony in varying degrees. The incomplete portion of 4 MSS has been at least in part supplied by a later hand. There are thus 225 separate witnesses which have been utilized in the present study; however *P.Oxy.*^{848} is non-extant within the sample base chapters, making the true total = 224 MSS/witnesses.

TABLE 5

GROSS AND PROJECTED TABULATION OF SINGULAR READINGS
ARRANGED ACCORDING TO DESCENDING TOTALS

The following Table is divided into three sections: (*a*) the total number of singular readings present within the sample base chapters for each MS utilized in this study (this before any classification of such readings has taken place); (*b*) the necessary adjustment (projection) to the gross total presented by incomplete or fragmentary MSS (listed in Table 4 preceding); (*c*) the implementation of such adjustments in order to provide an equal basis of comparison among all the listed MSS.

In each section of this Table, the MSS are grouped according to the total number of singular readings possessed by each MS. These are then arranged according to the descending order of such totals; thus, more than one MS may appear in any entry-line. *MSS which are incomplete or fragmentary are italicized in all three sections.* Projection only reflects an estimate of the number of singular readings a MS may have possessed within the sample base chapters when it once was complete.

The reader is cautioned not to place too much weight upon the projected totals provided in sections (*b*) and (*c*). A scribal habit—whether accidental or intentional—is by definition an *irrational* activity. Ordinary statistical procedure (i.e. projection) cannot in such a case be strictly applicable. Unless a scribe's singularities are spread equally throughout the extant portion of a MS, projection *per se* may be valueless. Further, MSS with a very small amount of extant text containing only a very few singular readings likely do *not* have any statistical significance whatever—projection to the contrary! With these warnings in mind, let the reader approach sections (*b*) and (*c*) of this Table.

++++++++++++++++++++++++++

(*a*) THE GROSS NUMBER OF SINGULAR READINGS PER MANUSCRIPT

Number of Singulars	Number of MSS per category	MSS comprising each category
221	(1)	113.
172	(1)	ℵ.
146	(1)	72.
131	(2)	200, *218*.
118	(1)	104.
95	(1)	*12*.
90	(1)	159.†

†Note: MS 159 also possesses 68 cases of omitted rubrication within the sample base chapters. Since these are the fault of the rubricator and not of the scribe (who performed this portion of his work correctly), they are not included among the singular reading totals.

TABLE 5—*Continued*

Number of Singulars	Number of MSS per category	MSS comprising each category
68	(1)	*15*.
67	(1)	130.
64	(1)	*143*.
61	(1)	152.
59	(1)	233.
57	(1)	*69*.
54	(1)	*36*.
51	(1)	A.
50	(1)	98.
46	(1)	59.
45	(1)	167.
43	(1)	*189*.
42	(1)	140.
40	(4)	*67*, 81, 84, 187.
39	(1)	*201*.
37	(2)	154, *226*.
36	(2)	111, *121*.
35	(3)	*C*, *122*, *155*.
34	(1)	*146*.
33	(1)	63.
29	(1)	156.
28	(4)	B, *28*, 106, 120.
27	(2)	*102*, 108.
26	(3)	*39*, 100, 210.
25	(3)	39^{sup}, 112, 151.
24	(2)	16, 144.
23	(4)	*1*, 56, 92, 164.
22	(3)	21, 149, 180.
21	(2)	*29*, 57.
20	(2)	*114*, 216.
19	(2)	*14*, *95*.
18	(6)	103, *124*, *194*, 204, 217, 240.

TABLE 5—*Continued*

Number of Singulars	Number of MSS per category	MSS comprising each category
17	(3)	119, 166, 170.
16	(5)	32, 53, 141, *145*, 174.
15	(6)	41, *203*, *208*, 215, 241, *245*.
14	(4)	18, 35, 40, 136.
13	(1)	182.
12	(3)	*P*, 30, 58.
11	(7)	17, 26, *33*, *44*, 91, *137*, *236*.
10	(4)	31, 207, *214*, 251.
9	(9)	7, *45*, *125*, 138, 139, 179, *193*, 220, 250.
8	(5)	*E*, 38, 78, 181, 188.
7	(11)	2, 50, *55*, *65*, 75, 77, *123*, *171*, 177, *222*, 246.
6	(11)	37, 42, *43*, 49, 80, *87*, 90, 147, *191*, 206, 212.
5	(13)	4, 13, 19, 20, 22, 23, *99*, 169, *176*, *178*, *186*, 211, (243).
4	(14)	*8*, 47, 48, *61*, *93*, *109*, *126*, 128, *150*, 160, *219*, 224, 227, 244.
3	(14)	*P.Oxy.*^{1080}, 64, 73, 89, 96, *123*^{sup}, 129, 148, *150*^{sup}, 153, 157, 172, *228*†, 230.
2	(22)	*P.Oxy.*^{1079}, 25, 46, 51, 62, *68*, 79, 82, 88, 101, 110, 127, 158, 161, 162, 165, 184, *190*, 202, 221, *223*, 242.
1	(12)	*6*, *24*, 27, *52*, 94, 107, 132, *135*, 142, 192, *229*, *232*.
0	(11)	*P.Oxy.*^{1230}, *F*, 9, 10, 34, 70, 74, 97, 163, *222*^{sup}, *238*.

Excluded (non-extant within sample base): *P.Oxy.*^{848}.

Within section (*a*), the *average* number of singular readings per MS is 18. Of much more significance, however, is the *mean* number of singular readings per MS, which is 8.2. Nevertheless, the large number of incomplete MSS may well distort these data as presented; therefore, section (*b*) which follows presents in four columns the necessary projection data for each of the 78 incomplete MSS: (1) the gross number of singulars within each incomplete MS from section (*a*) above; (2) the number of the MS itself; (3) the percentage of extant text that MS possesses within the sample base chapters (from Table 4, end); and (4) the projected number of singulars for each MS.

†(Category 3): MS *228* also possesses 3 cases of omitted rubrication, not here tabulated for the same reason as with MS 159 noted previously.

TABLE 5—*Continued*

The following projection is accomplished according to the formula $y/\% = x$, where y = the gross figure from section (*a*) reproduced in column 1 below; % = the percentage of extant text for a fragmentary or incomplete MS, as listed in Table 4 and reproduced in column 3 below; and x = the resultant projection, giving the number of singular readings within the sample base chapters which an incomplete MS may likely have possessed when it once was complete.

(*b*) PROJECTION TABLE FOR INCOMPLETE MANUSCRIPTS

Gross Number of Singulars	MSS	Percentage of Base Extant	Projected Number of Singulars
131	*218*	72%	182
95	*12*	93%	102
68	*15*	12%	567 (*sic!*)
64	*143*	56%	114
57	*69*	78%	73
54	*36*	78%	69
43	*189*	35%	123
40	*67*	96%	42
39	*201*	62%	63
37	*226*	45%	82
36	*121*	99%	[36]†
35	*C*	52%	67
	122	99%	[35]
	155	50%	70
34	*146*	98%	35
28	*28*	70%	40
27	*102*	99%	[27]
26	*39*	49%	53
25	*39sup*	28%	89
23	*1*	97%	24
21	*29*	90%	23
20	*114*	99%	[20]
19	*14*	87%	22
	95	84%	23
18	*124*	78%	23
	194	84%	21

†(Category 36): MSS whose projected number of singulars remains the same as the gross number are bracketed in column 4.

TABLE 5—*Continued*

Gross Number of Singulars	MSS	Percentage of Base Extant	Projected Number of Singulars
16	*145*	34%	47
15	*203*	95%	16
	208	94%	16
	245	87%	17
12	*P*	83%	14
11	*33*	80%	14
	44	99%	[11]
	137	99%	[11]
	236	7%	157
10	*214*	95%	11
9	*45*	93%	10
	125	78%	12
	193	78%	12
8	*E*	43%	19
7	*55*	81%	9
	65	33%	21
	123	87%	8
	171	87%	8
	222	91%	8
6	*43*	20%	30
	87	87%	7
	191	53%	11
5	*99*	20%	25
	176	86%	6
	178	88%	6
	186	63%	8
4	*8*	88%	5
	61	92%	[4]
	93	74%	5
	109	77%	5
	126	87%	5
	150	87%	5
	219	97%	[4]
3	*P.Oxy.*^{1080}	2%	150
	123^{sup}	12%	25
	150^{sup}	13%	23
	228	87%	[3]
2	*P.Oxy.*^{1079}	2%	100
	68	31%	6
	190	98%	[2]
	223	89%	[2]

TABLE 5—*Continued*

Gross Number of Singulars	MSS	Percentage of Base Extant	Projected Number of Singulars
1	*6*	69%	[1]
	24	98%	[1]
	52	92%	[1]
	135	87%	[1]
	229	98%	[1]
	232	40%	3
0	*P.Oxy.*^{1230}	4%	[0]
	F	11%	[0]
	222^{sup}	9%	[0]
	238	5%	[0]

Excluded (non-extant within sample base): *P.Oxy.*^{848}

It should be noted that projection is not possible for those MSS with zero singular readings; this ties in with the irrational nature of scribal habits referred to earlier in this Table. Section (*c*) of this Table which follows represents the re-arrangement of Section (*a*) in accord with the newly-projected numbers of singular readings above.

(*c*) PROJECTED TABLE OF SINGULAR READINGS PER MANUSCRIPT

Number of Singulars	Number of MSS per category	MSS comprising each category
567	(1)	*15.*
221	(1)	113.
182	(1)	*218.*
172	(1)	ℵ.
157	(1)	*236.*
150	(1)	*P.Oxy.*^{1080}.
146	(1)	72.
131	(1)	200.
123	(1)	*189.*
118	(1)	104.
114	(1)	*143.*
102	(1)	*12.*
100	(1)	*P.Oxy.*^{1079}.
90	(1)	159.†
89	(1)	*39*^{sup}

†Again, not including the 68 rubrication omissions cited previously.

TABLE 5—*Continued*

Number of Singulars	Number of MSS per category	MSS comprising each category
82	(1)	*226*.
73	(1)	*69*.
70	(1)	*155*.
69	(1)	*36*.
67	(2)	*C*, 130.
63	(1)	*201*.
61	(1)	152.
59	(1)	233.
53	(1)	*39*.
51	(1)	A.
50	(1)	98.
47	(1)	*145*.
46	(1)	59.
45	(1)	167.
42	(2)	*67*, 140.
40	(4)	*28*, 81, 84, 187.
37	(1)	154.
36	(2)	111, *121*.
35	(2)	*122*, *146*.
33	(1)	63.
30	(1)	*43*.
29	(1)	156.
28	(3)	B, 106, 120.
27	(2)	*102*, 108.
26	(2)	100, 210.
25	(4)	*99*, 112, *123*^{sup}, 151.
24	(3)	*1*, 16, 144.
23	(7)	*29*, 56, 92, *95*, *124*, *150*^{sup}, 164.
22	(4)	*14*, 21, 149, 180.
21	(3)	57, *65*, *194*.
20	(2)	*114*, 216.
19	(1)	*E*.

TABLE 5—*Continued*

Number of Singulars	Number of MSS per category	MSS comprising each category
18	(4)	103, 204, 217, 240.
17	(4)	119, 166, 170, *245*.
16	(6)	32, 53, 141, 174, *203*, *208*.
15	(3)	41, 215, 241.
14	(6)	*P*, 18, *33*, 35, 40, 136.
13	(1)	182.
12	(4)	30, 58, *125*, *193*.
11	(7)	17, 26, *44*, 91, *137*, *191*, *214*.
10	(4)	31, *45*, 207, 251.
9	(7)	7, *55*, 138, 139, 179, 220, 250.
8	(8)	38, 78, *123*, *171*, 181, *186*, 188, *222*.
7	(7)	2, 50, 75, 77, *87*, 177, 246.
6	(11)	37, 42, 49, *68*, 80, 90, 147, *176*, *178*, 206, 212.
5	(14)	4, *8*, 13, 19, 20, 22, 23, *93*, *109*, *126*, *150*, 169, 211, (243).
4	(9)	47, 48, *61*, 128, 160, *219*, 224, 227, 244.
3	(12)	64, 73, 89, 96, 129, 148, 153, 157, 172, *228*,† 230, *232*.
2	(20)	25, 46, 51, 62, 79, 82, 88, 101, 110, 127, 158, 161, 162, 165, 184, *190*, 202, 221, *223*, 242.
1	(11)	*6*, *24*, 27, *52*, 94, 107, 132, *135*, 142, 192, *229*.
0	(11)	*P.Oxy.*^{1230}, *F*, 9, 10, 34, 70, 74, 97, 163, *222*^{sup}, *238*.

Excluded (non-extant within sample base): *P.Oxy.*^{848}.

Within section (*c*), the *average* number of singular readings per MS has now risen to 24.96. However, the *mean* number of singular readings per MS has only risen to 10.5—testifying to the general care taken by the average scribe as he copied the Scriptures. It need barely be mentioned that readings of those MSS above the mean be closely and carefully examined even when shared with other MSS, for it may well be the case that a reading thus shared may only be the result of an accidental agreement, and not due to correct copying of an exemplar.

† (Category 3): MS *228*'s number of singulars again does not include the three cases of omitted rubrication mentioned earlier.

TABLE 6

SINGULAR READINGS BY MANUSCRIPT WITHIN THE CHAPTERS EXAMINED

In the following table, each manuscript is listed according to and in the order of Hoskier's enumeration. The singular readings of each MS follow the MS number and are listed by chapter and verse. It should be noted that only chapters 1, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12, 15, 17, 20 and 22 of the Apocalypse were examined in the present study.

Standard text-critical collation symbols are used herein, including but not limited to the following:

+	=	addition of a word or words to the text
—	=	omission of a word or words from the text
∿	=	transposition of one or more words, the words so transposed often indicated merely by their original numerical position.

Words substituted are given in full; where only a portion of a word is changed, the new reading of that portion may simply appear attached to a hyphen (-).

Some readings are prefaced (MT): this indicates that the base reading which follows represents the Majority/Consensus Text rather than the *Textus Receptus* (TR); also that the variant which follows pertains more directly to the MT reading than to any other. The reader is advised to consult Hoskier's collations in such cases to ascertain the differences between the MT and TR readings at these points.

Similarly, some readings are marked (TR): this indicates that the variant which follows is predicated upon the base text of the TR rather than the MT. In some cases (MT) also encompasses (TR): here the (MT) symbol indicates that there is at least one other reading which possesses a good deal of support among the MSS, though appearing neither in the MT nor the TR traditions. Consultation of Hoskier is again urged in each of these cases.

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
ℵ	1.1 δουλοις) αγιοις*
	Ιωαννη) Ιωανει*
	4 Ιωαννης) -ανης
	5 βασιλεων) βασειλειων*
	τω[1]) — *
	7 πας) παρ'*
	αυτον[2]) —*
	8 (MT) Αλφα και το Ω) Αλφα και εγω και το Ω*
	9 Ιωαννῆς) Ιανης* (corr. by *)
	θλιψει) -ψι
	(MT) εν $\overline{\text{Χω}}$ $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$) } εν $\overline{\text{ΙΙΥ}}$ (9 MSS = εν $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$)
	(TR) — Ιυ Χυ)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(ℵ)	1.11 λεγουσης) -σαν ℵ^{c}
	ο βλεπεις) — *
	και εις Σμυρναν) 1-2-Ζμυρναν, ∿*post* Θυατειρα Λαοδικειαν) + και εις Σαρδις ℵ^{a} (N.B. ℵ* 97 —και εις Σ. in the regular position)
	12 βλεπειν) -πιν ℵ*,^{a}
	13 εν μεσω) μεσον (—εν)
	16 ως ο ηλιος φαινει) ∿4-1-2-3
	17 ως) ωσι* (N.B. 5 MSS + ℵ^{a} = ωσει)
	18 και^{1}) — *
	20 εισι^{1}) — *
	3.2 γρηγορων) εγρηγ-*
	(TR) αποθανειν) -νιν
	3 γρηγορησης) μετανοησης* (cf.143 in loc.)
	4 εχεις) εχις
	7 εκκλησιας) -σιαις*
	την (*ante* κλειν)] — *
	ο ανοιγων^{1}) και ανυγων (cf.106, 140)
	(other) και κλειων) } καὶ κλείων *sic* (cf.17*)
	(MT) αυτην ει μη ο ανοιγων)
	8 σου τα εργα) ∿2-3-1 (cf.113)
	9 διδωμι) δεδωκα
	10 τηρησω) —
	11 κρατει) -τι
	εχεις) εχις
	μηδεις) -δις
	12 εν) — *
	13 λεγει) -γι
	14 αμην) + και*
	αληθινος) + και
	κτισεως) εκκλησιας*
	16 ουτως οτι) ∿2-1
	(MT) ου ζεστος ουτε ψυχρος) ζεστρος [*sic*] ουτε ψυχρος ει*; ζεστος ει ουτε ψυχρος ℵ^{a} (cf.143)
	μελλω σε εμεσαι εκ) παυσε*; 1-2-εμιν-4, ℵ^{a}
	μου) σου*
	17 συ ει ο ταλαιπωρος) ∿ ταλειπωρος [*sic*] ει (—1,3)
	5.1 βιβλιον γεγραμμενον) —*
	εσωθεν) εμπροσθεν (followed by TR και οπισθεν and not MT και εξωθεν. N.B. 5 MSS read εμπροσθεν *added* to the basic text in various locales)
	2 ισχυρον κηρυσσοντα) ∿2-1
	4 εκλαιον) -λαων* (ℵ^{a} = -λεον cum 3 MSS)
	ευρεθη) -θησεται*
	7 του καθημενου) της-2*
	8 εχοντες εκαστος) ∿2-1
	χρυσας) -σεας
	9 λαβειν) -βιν
	10 βασιλεις και ιερεις) βασιλιαν και ιερατειαν (N.B. 9 MSS = βασιλειαν)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(ℵ)	5.12 λαβειν) -βιν
	13 (MT) ὅ —) } το εστιν
	(TR) ὅ εστιν)
	και επι της θαλασσης) και τα εν τη θαλασσῃ
	και το κρατος) παντοκρατορος*
	7.2 τεσσαρσιν) τεσσαρες*
	4 ηκουσα) -σαν
	6 Νεφθαλειμ) -λι
	7 χιλιαδες[2]) χειλ- (cf. 200)
	9 ὂν) ὃς*
	ουδεις) -δις
	10 τω αρνιω (*fin.vers.*)) του αρνιου ℵ[a] (3 MSS = το αρνιον)
	ibid.) + εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων αμην*
	11 (MT) ειστηκεισαν) } ιστηκισαν
	(TR) εστηκεσαν)
	(other) ειστηκησαν)
	13 εἷς εκ των πρεσβυτερων λεγων μοι) written twice, but — εκ both times
	15 σκηνωσει) γινωσκει*
	επ᾽) — *
	17 δακρυον) δρακυον* (cf.ℵ in 21:4, δρακυ)
	10.1 ιρις) θριξ* (ℵ[a] = MT, but —ἡ preceding)
	3 εκραξεν[2]) + ως*
	βρονται) φωναι*
	7 του εβδομου αγγελου) του αγγ. του εβδ.
	9 και καταφαγε αυτο) ∿3-1-2*; ∿3-1-2-3 ℵ[a]
	11 δει) δι
	12.1 η σεληνη) την σεληνην*
	4 αστερων) + το τριτον* (along with MT το τριτον preceding; cf.104)
	5 ποιμαινειν) -μενιν
	6 (MT) εχει εκει) εχι-2
	αυτην) αυτον*
	εξηκοντα) + πεντε ℵ[c]
	8 (TR) ισχυσαν) + προς αυτον
	τοπος) τοτε*
	10 βασιλεια) -λια
	11 αυτοι) ουτοι
	αυτων[2]) εαυτων ℵ[a]
	12 σκηνουντες) κατοικουντες [cum 22 MSS] + εν αυτοις [sing.]
	ουαι) + εις
	μεγαν) —
	13 ο δρακων) ∿ *post* εβληθη ℵ[a]
	εδιωξεν) εδωκεν* (4 MSS = εδιωκεν); εξεδιωξεν ℵ[a]
	14 τον (*ante* τοπον)] —
	καιρον) και καιρον ℵ[a] (N.B. ℵ* 8I —καιρον)
	ημισυ) -σου*

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS — Singular readings within the sample chapters

(א)

12.17 των λοιπων) των επιλοιπων
(MT) Ιησου) του Θεου (cf.98, without the article; also, 22 MSS read του Ιησου)

15.2 κιθαρας) + κυριου
4 τα[2]) —
δικαιωματα) + ενωπιον
6 (MT) λινον καθαρον λαμπρον) ∿ καθαρους λινους λαμπρους
8 ουδεις) -δις
εισελθειν εις τον ναον) ∿2-3-4-1

17.2 επορνευσαν) εποιησαν πορνιον (2 MSS read εποιησαν πορνειαν)
οινου) οικου*
4 (MT) αυτης) } αυτης και της γης
(other) της γης)
6 ειδον) ειδα (2 MSS = ιδα)
8 αναβαινειν) -νιν
(MT) και παρεσται) } και παλιν παρεστε*
(other) και παρεστιν)
9 βασιλεις επτα εισιν) ∿2-1-3
10 (MT) δει αυτον μειναι) ∿2-μινε ζει*; ∿2-μινε δει $א^a$
11 και[3] (*ante* αυτος)) —
απωλειαν) -λιαν
12 κερατα) καιρ-
βασιλειαν) -λιαν
14 νικησει) -σι
15 τα υδατα) ταυτα τα υδατα $א^a$ (א*+ 2 MSS read ταυτα *solus*)
η (*ante* πορνη)) —*
καθηται) + και
17 ποιησαι[2]) -σε (cf.113 re: ποιησαι[1])
βασιλειαν) -λιαν

20.1 αγγελον) αγγε*
εκ του ουρανου) —*
αλυσιν) -σεσιν*
2/3 [2]χιλια ετη. [3]και εβαλεν αυτον) —
3 δει) δι*
4 και[6] (*post* Θεου)) —
ου) ουν* (corrected by *)
6 ιερεις) + και
7 τελεσθη) + σε* (Hoskier reads *vid.* + σε also by *)
8 τεσσαρσι) τετρασι
της γης) —*
τον[1] (*ante* Γωγ)) —*
9/10 [9]πυρ απο του Θυ . . . [10]εβληθη εις την) —*
10 θηριον και) + οπου
12 (MT) τους μεγαλους και τους μικρους) και-2-3-4-5*
ενωπιον) επι*; ενωπιον επι $א^a$

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(א)	20.12 ηνεωχθησαν) -θη (also omits και βιβλιον ἄλλα ηνεωχθη cum 2 other MSS)
	13 ο θανατος) ο τὰ θανάτος* [*sic*]
	εκριθησαν) κατεκρι-
	14 ουτος) και ουτος
	15 ευρεθη) -θησεται*
	22.1 του[1]) ——
	2 εντευθεν και εντευθεν ξυλον ζωης) ενθεν και* (—3-4-5); ενθεν και ενθεν (—4-5) $\aleph^a$
	του ξυλου) των ξυλων
	3 (MT) καταθεμα) καταγμα*
	ετι) ——*
	ὁ) ——
	4 αυτου[2]) + καὶ
	6 απεστειλεν) -τιλεν
	δειξαι) διξαι (13 MSS = διδαξαι)
	7 ερχομαι) ερχονται $\aleph^a$
	προφητειας) -τας*
	8 (MT) δεικνυοντος) } δικνυντος
	(other) δεικνυντος)
	10 λογους) + τουτους* (cf.146 comm.)
	εγγυς) ενγυς
	14 αυτων) + ως δε η εξουσια*
	17 το[1]) ——. (N.B. $\aleph$+194^a also omit ἡ following)
	πνευμα) $\overline{\pi\pi\nu\alpha}$ [*sic*]
	18 (MT) μαρτυρω) η μαρτυρω
	19 αφελοι) -λι
	20 λεγει) -γι
	Ιησου) $\overline{\tau\eta\upsilon}$ (usual nom.sac. = $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$)
	Q ÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
A	1.1 τω δουλω) του δουλου (cf.99)
	9 (MT) εν $\overline{\chi\omega}$ $\overline{\iota\upsilon}$) εν $\overline{\chi\omega}$
	10 εγενομην) εγω εγενομην
	(MT) φωνην οπισω μου μεγαλην) ∿1-4-οπισθεν-3
	12 (MT) ελαλει) λαλει
	13 ομοιον) ομοιωμα
	17 πρωτος) πρωτοτοκος
	3.4 περιπατησουσι) -τησου
	10 οτι) και (4 MSS = και οτι)
	16 χλιαρος) χλειαρος (cf.201)
	21 εκαθισα) -θεισα
	5.6 (TR) και ιδου) + και
	9 αδουσιν) αδωσιν
	ημας) ——
	10 τω Θεω ημων) ——

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(A)	7.1 τεσσαρας[1,3]) -ρες επι της γης)* — (MT) επι τι δενδρον) (TR) επι παν δενδρον) } επι δενδρου (4 MSS —τι/παν) 4 και ηκουσα . . . εσφραγισμενων) — εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες) omit τεσσαρες, but insert δ΄ supr.lin. (4 MSS omit τεσσαρες without correction) 9 και ιδου) — οχλος πολυς) οχλον πολυν ενωπιον[1]) επι 14 της[1,2]) — (11 MSS omit της[1]) 10.1 ιρις) ιρεις 2 ανεωγμενον) — 6 εκτισεν) -τεισ- 12.1 περιβεβλημενη) περιβλεπομε[νη] 2 (TR) κραζει) + και 7 ὁ[1] *(ante* Μιχαηλ*)*) ὁ τε (or ὅτε) 10 κατηγορος) -γωρ 11 ουκ) ουχ 12 (MT) γη) } αγαπην (TR) γην) 13 αρρενα) αρσεναν (25 MSS = αρσενα) 16 τον ποταμον) το υδωρ 17.3 ειδον) ιδα 8 ην[1]) η 12 οιτινες) -τειν- 15 λεγει) ειπεν 16 μισησουσι) μεισ- 20.3 επανω αυτου) εμμενως αυτον 4 εκαθισαν) -θεισ- πεπελεκισμενων) πεπολεμημενων 22.6 αληθινοι) -θειν- 8 εμπροσθεν) προ των) — δεικνυοντος) διγνυοντος 13 (MT) ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος, η αρχη και το τελος) πρ. και εσχ., 6-7-8-9-10 16 ο πρωινος) και ο προινος [*sic*] 18 επ΄ αυτον) — 21 (MT) των αγιων) } — (TR) υμων)
C	1.3 τους λογους) + τουτους 9 νησω) σω δια[1]) — (22% omit δια[2]; including C)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(C)	1.16	χειρι) χιρει
	3.4	αυτων) εαυτων
	7	ουδεις[2]) ουδε εις
	8	ουδεις) ουδε εἷς
		κλεισαι) κλισαι (4 MSS = κλησαι)
		ετηρησας) τηρησας
	12	καινον) κενον
	7.1	μητε[2]) μη
	4	τεσσαρακοντα) τεσσερ-
	6	Νεφθαλειμ) -λιν (26 MSS = -λιμ)
		Μανασση) -ην
	11	(MT) εισιτηκεισαν)
		(TR) εστηκεσαν) } εστηκισαν
		(other) εισιτηκησαν)
	17	δακρυον) εδακ-
	10.1	ως στυλοι) ως τυλοι [*sic*]
	2	τη χειρι) η χιρει
		τον δεξιον) ——
	3	μυκαται) μοικ-
	4	επτα[2]) ——
	8	εν τη χειρι) ——
	12.4	εστηκεν) -κει
	10	Χριστου) Κυριου
	11	τον λογον της μαρτυριας) την μαρτυριαν (—τον λογ.)
	12	σκηνουντες) κατασκην-
	14	εκει) εκαι
		και ημισυ καιρου) —— (cf.170 in 11:11)
	15	(MT) ινα αυτην ποταμοφορητον ποιηση) ∿1-4-2-3
	17	επι) ——
	15.2	νικωντας) -κουν-
	3	και αδουσι) —— (but also omits την ωδην...Θεου immediately following, cum MSS 8, 84*; yet due to the omission of και αδουσι singularly, the omission in C must have been by homoioteleuton, και^και)
	4	εφανερωθησαν) -ναιρ-
	6	εξηλθον) -θαν
	8	αχρι) αχρις οὗ (or αχρι σου?)
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷	
P	3.3	γρηγορησης) γρειγ-
	4	εμολυναν) εμωλ-
	12	(TR) καταβαινουσα) -βεννουσα (3 MSS = -βενουσα)
	7.9	(TR) εστωτες) -τοτ-
	12	δυναμις) -μεις (2 MSS = -μης)

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(P)	12.12 ευφραινεσθε) ευφρενεσθαι (4 MSS = -φρεν-; 32 MSS = -θαι)
	15 ποταμοφορητον) -μωφορι̲τ-
	17.1 τας (*post* εχοντων)) τας τας
	3 κοκκινον) κογκινον
	4 (MT) κοκκινον) κογκινον
	(MT) εχουσα ποτηριον. . . πορνειας αυτης) ——
	22.4 οψονται) -ψων-
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
B	1.1 αυτω) αυτη
	5/6 [5]απο των αμαρτιων...[6]και εποιησεν ημας) ——*
	15 πεπυρωμενοι) περπερωμ-*
	3.1 της) τω
	2 ευρηκα) -καν
	4 αξιοι εισιν) 1-ησιν (cf.15)
	18 πυρος) -ρας
	5.3 (MT) εδυνατο) } ηδυνατω
	(TR) ηδυνατο) }
	5 (other) ο ανοιγων) + και
	7 (MT) ειληφεν) + την (cf.206)
	13 παντα ηκουσα) παντα· και παντας ηκουσα
	7.11 (MT) επεσον) ——*
	12.2 εν γαστρι) εγγαστρι
	6 ητοιμασμενον) ητυμ-
	χιλιας διακοσιας εξηκοντα [= $\overline{\alpha\sigma\xi}$]) 1-2-$\overline{\xi}$
	11 αχρι) αρχη
	15.8 εισελθειν) ειελθ-
	20.5 λοιποι) λυποι
	τελεσθη) -θει
	22.2 μηνα) μινα
	εκαστον) -τω (N.B. Nestle[26] says 046 [= *B] *pc* read thus; yet Hosk. in loc. states "*non al. Non* 39 40, *Corrige Tisch. Charles.*" It is thus likely that N[26] here is in error, especially if based upon earlier printed editions).
	εθνων) εθων
	7 προφητειας) -τιας
	10 προφητειας) -τιας (cf.113)
	14 εισελθωσιν) written twice
	16 ριζα) ρηζα
	17 διψων) -ψω*
	19 (MT) αφελη) αφελει̲ται (9 MSS = -ληται)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(P)	12.12 ευφραινεσθε) ευφρενεσθαι (4 MSS = -φρεν-; 32 MSS = -θαι)
	15 ποταμοφορητον) -μωφορι̲τ-
	17.1 τας *(post* εχοντων*))* τας τας
	3 κοκκινον) κογκινον
	4 (MT) κοκκινον) κογκινον
	(MT) εχουσα ποτηριον. . . πορνειας αυτης) ——
	22.4 οψονται) -ψων-
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
B	1.1 αυτω) αυτη
	5/6 [5]απο των αμαρτιων...[6]και εποιησεν ημας) ——*
	15 πεπυρωμενοι) περπερωμ-*
	3.1 της) τω
	2 ευρηκα) -καν
	4 αξιοι εισιν) 1-ησιν (cf.15)
	18 πυρος) -ρας
	5.3 (MT) εδυνατο) } ηδυνατω̲
	(TR) ηδυνατο)
	5 (other) ο ανοιγων) + και
	7 (MT) ειληφεν) + την (cf.206)
	13 παντα ηκουσα) παντα· και παντας ηκουσα
	7.11 (MT) επεσον) ——*
	12.2 εν γαστρι) εγγαστρι
	6 ητοιμασμενον) ητυμ-
	χιλιας διακοσιας εξηκοντα [= $\overline{\text{ασξ}}$]) 1-2-$\bar{\xi}$
	11 αχρι) αρχη
	15.8 εισελθειν) ειελθ-
	20.5 λοιποι) λυποι
	τελεσθη) -θει
	22.2 μηνα) μινα
	εκαστον) -τω (N.B. Nestle[26] says 046 [= B] *pc* read thus; yet Hosk. in loc. states "*non al. Non* 39 40, *Corrige Tisch. Charles.*" It is thus likely that N[26] here is in error, especially if based upon earlier printed editions).
	εθνων) εθων
	7 προφητειας) -τιας
	10 προφητειας) -τιας (cf.113)
	14 εισελθωσιν) written twice
	16 ριζα) ρηζα
	17 διψων) -ψω*
	19 (MT) αφελη) αφελεται· (9 MSS = -ληται)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
E	17.6 μαρτυρων) μων [*sic*] pp 7 αγγελος) αγε- του^2 (*ante* βασταζ.)) — 12 ουπω) οπω*$_\alpha$ 15 ειδες) οιδες [*sic*] (4 MSS = οιδας)
	20.4 ουκ ελαβον) ουκ κελαβον 6 μετ' αυτου) μετα τουτο* *vid.*
	22.2 και τα φυλλα . . . εθνων (*fin.vers.*) —
F	Contains no singular readings in the very small portion extant within the sample base chapters utilized for this study (F in its entirety only covers 7:16-8:12).
P.Oxy.848	Not extant within the sample base of this study (Contains only 16:17-20).
P.Oxy.1079	
	1.4 υμιν) υμειν 6 η δοξα και το κρατος) ∿4-5-3-1-2
P.Oxy.1080	
	3.21 νικων) νεικων μου^1) — ενικησα και εκαθισα) νενεικηκα και κεκαθικα*
P.Oxy.1230	Contains no singular readings within the small portion (5:5-8) covered in the sample base.
1	1.1 αποστειλας) -στηλ-
	3.2 (MT) εμελλες) εμελλε [*sic*] 1^{mg} (1* + 3 MSS omit the clause) (TR) αποθανειν) -θανην 1^{mg} (1* as above)
	7 (TR) ανοιγει) ανειγει
	5.9 λαβειν) -βων
	7.1 ανεμους) αγγελους 14 (other) επλατυναν) -τειναν

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(1)	10.2	ανεωγμενον) ηνεωγμενων (22% have ηνεωγμενον)
	11	βασιλευσι) -σει
	12.6	χιλιας) χιλιαδες*
	12	ουαι) + δε (superscript, followed by τοις κατοικ-ουσιν cum 17 MSS)
	17.2	την γην) της γης
	3	θηριον) -ου
	8	και[4] (*ante* θαυμασονται)) —*
	13	(MT) διδοασιν) διασιν*
	20.4	εκαθισαν) ακαθησαν
		οιτινες) οιτοινες
	6	εχει) εχι
	22.5	τους) αυτους
	8	και[2]) —
	10	και) —
	11	και ο ρυπων . . . δικαιωθητω ετι) —
	16	το γενος) —*
2	1.14	φλοξ) φλωξ
	20	μυστηριον) -ριαν*
	3.10	οτι) οτη
		υπομονης) -μωνης
	5.2	αγγελον) -λων*
	9	εσφαγης) εσφραγησας (cf.89)
	12.10	δυναμις) δυμις
3	No MS appertains to this number.	
4	1.16	χειρι) χερι
	7.4	(MT) εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες) (TR) $\overline{\rho\mu\delta}$ } εκ. $\overline{\mu}$ τεσσ.
	10.6	(MT) ουκετι εσται) (TR) ουκ εσται ετι) } ουκεστι εσται
	12.5	εθνη) ενθην
	15.1	μεγα και θαυμαστον) —
5	No MS appertains to this number.	

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
6	3.9 λεγοντων) λεγομενων
7	3.2 (MT) στηρισον) στηριζων (7 MSS = στηριζων) (TR) στηριξον) 15 οφελον) -λος 10.4 εμελλον) εμελλων 15.6 στηθη) -θι 17.6 ειδον) ιδων (15 MSS = ιδον) 20.3 δει) — 4 ελαβον) -βων 6 εχει) εχη 22.1 ποταμον) -μων
8	12.10 και^2 (*post* σωτηρια)) — 15.3 και^2 (*ante* την ωδην)) — 17.14 μληтοι και) — 22.13 (MT) ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος, η αρχη και το τελος) αρχ. και τελ., πρ. και εσχ.
9	Contains no singular readings, though fully extant within the sample base chapters.
10	Contains no singular readings, though fully extant within the sample base chapters.
11	No MS appertains to this number.
12	1.1 αυτω) αυτου εσημανεν) εσημαν 5 των^1) των των (TR) τω αγαπησαντι) του αγαπησαντος (other) λυσαντι) λυσαντως 12^2 9 θλιψει) -ψη 11 λεγουσης) ηχουσης 20 (TR) ας ειδες) ας ιδες

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(12)	3.1 αστερας) αστε*; αστερες 12^2
	3 γρηγορησης) -ρησις
	5 (MT) και ομολογησω το ονομα αυτου) —— των *(ante* αγγελων*))* ——
	7 και^2 *(ante* ουδεις^1*))* —— (other) και κλειων) και κλειον
	10 τηρησω) -ρισω
	12 ονομα^1) ονα το^3 *(penult))* ——
	15 οφελον ψυχρος ης η ζεστος) οφελε ει ψ. ἤ ζ.
	5.4 ευρεθη) ηυρεθει (cf.36)
	5 τας) τα
	6 εσφαγμενον) -νων
	8 οι εικοσιτεσσαρες) οι εικοσι* εχοντες) -τας
	9 ηγορασας) ηγορας
	12 δυναμιν) -μειν
	13 τω αρνιω) του αρνιου και η δοξα) ——
	7.1 τεσσαρας^{2,3}) -ρεις (cf.113; 4 MSS = -ρεις for ^{1} only) πνεη) + και (39 MSS + ὁ)
	2 ειδον) ιδου (21 MSS = ιδον) αλλον) αγιον εκραξε) -ξαι
	4 εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες) εκατονσερακοντα
	9 πολυς) —— (MT) ουδεις εδυνατο) (TR) ουδεις ηδυνατο) } ουδυνατο
	11/12 ^{11}επι προσωπον . . . ^{12}αμην *(fin.vers.)* ——
	13 λευκας) + και
	15 και^1) ——
	16 διψησουσιν) διψεισωσιν πεση) πεισει
	17 (MT) οδηγησει) οδιγ-
	10.1 περιβεβλημενον) περιβλη-
	6 εις τους) written twice*
	8 ουρανου) ——
	9 omit entire verse
	10 αυτο^1) αυτου (5 MSS = αυτω) αυτο^2) αυτον
	12.1 σημειον) σιμ- σεληνη) -λεινη
	2 omit entire verse
	3 σημειον) σιμ-
	4 και η ουρα . . . εις την γην) ——
	5 ηρπασθη) -θει
	10 κατηγορων) κατειγ-
	12 σκηνουντες) σηνοντες

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(12)	12.13 εδιωξεν) εδιοξεν
	15 και) ——
	15.1 εσχατας) εσχαστας
	2 ονοματος αυτου) omit αυτου
	6 εχοντες τας) εχοντας [*sic*]
	7 φιαλας) -λαις
	των αιωνων) ——.
	17.1 των[2] (*ante* εχοντων)) τω
	2 της γης) ——
	4 και[2]) και και
	κεχρυσωμενη) χρυσομενη
	μαργαριταις) + το λιθω τιμιω και μαργαριταις κεκοσμηται (= dittography down to μαργ.; the κεκοσμ. reflects ~~the exemplar of 12, cum~~ 3 MSS [*f.*114])
	7 σοι) συ
	16 κατακαυσουσιν) καυσωσιν (9 MSS = κατακαυσωσιν; 24 MSS = καυσουσιν)
	20.2 εκρατησε) + την χειρα*
	3 μικρον χρονον) μικρου χρονου
	4 πεπελεκισμενων) -κησμ-
	το μετωπον) τοπων
	6 βασιλευσουσιν) -σωσι
	7 λυθησεται) λυθη
	8 Μαγωγ) Μαγογ 12[2] (12* illegible)
	συναγαγειν αυτους) συναγαγει αυτου
	9 απο του Θεου εκ του ουρανου) 1-3-4-5-6 (—2)
	11 ουχ) ουκ
	ευρεθη) ηυρεθη
	12 ὃ) οὗ
	13 νεκρους[1]) -ροις
	22.1 κρυσταλλον) + και
	2/3 [2]και τα φυλλα . . . [3](MT) εκει/(TR) ετι) ——
	5 λυχνου) --νυς
	6 πιστοι και αληθινοι) ∿3-2-1+ εισιν (cf.113)
	αγιων προφητων) written twice
	7 ταχυ) εν ταχει
	τουτου) αυτου
	10 σφραγισης) -γησις
	12 ερχομαι) -χουμ-
	15 ψευδος) -δως
	16 εγω ειμι . . . (MT) πρωινος (*fin.vers.*)) ——
	18/19 omit both verses

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
13	1.2	(other) ειδε και ατινα) 1-2-ανα*
	7.1	κρατουντας) -τες
	9	(MT) περιβεβλημενους) -λημεμενους
	11	δυναμεις) δυνας*
	22.2	ποιουν) πυουν
14	1.3	μακαριος) -ιον*
	13	ποδηρη) -δυρη
	3.2	ἄ) ——
	8	ιδου) οδου*
	9	ενωπιον) written twice
	11	ταχυ) ταχει*
	12	Θεου^3) $\overline{\Theta\nu}$*[*sic*]
	5.13	και^1) και και
	7.10	σωτηρια) $\overline{\sigma\rho\iota}$ [*sic*]
	12.2	γαστρι) γαγαστρι
	6	αυτην) ——
	8	και) και και
	17	γυναικι) +*(ex vers.16)* και ηνοιξεν ... ανεβαλεν (the ανεβαλεν in both cases cum 1 other MS; the MT there reads εβαλεν)
	17.12	τα) δα*
	18	η εχουσα) μη εχουσαν (2 MSS = η εχουσαν; cf.187)
	20.11	και τον καθημενον επ΄) ——
	12	εν) ——
	13	εκριθησαν) -σεν
	14	εβληθησαν) εβληθη
15	3.3	ωραν) οραν
		ηξω^2) ηξι
	4	ουκ) ου
		ιματια) ηματεια
		λευκοις) -κεις
		αξιοι εισιν) αξιησιν (cf. B, 122)
	5	νικων) νηκον (2 MSS = νικον)
		περιβαλειται) περιπατισι (cf.156)
		ιματιοις) ιμιτιεις
		ου μη) ουμι
		εξαλειψω) -ληψο (cf.72)
		το ονομα αυτου^1) αυτους *vid.*
		ζωης) ζοης
		των αγγελων) τον αγγελον

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(15)	3.6	εχων) εχον
		ακουσατω) -το
		λεγει) ελεις
		εκκλησιαις) εκλισεις
	7	τω αγγελω) το ανκελω
		(MT) Φιλαδελφεια) } Φυλαδελφιαν (cf.150)
		(other) -φια)
		εκκλησιας) εκλισ-
		αληθινος) αλιθηνος
		(TR) κλειδα) -δαν
		ανοιγων[1]) ανύγον
		(TR) κλειει) κλειη
		(TR) ανοιγει) ονιγει
	8	οιδα) ηδα
		ιδου) ηδου
		δεδωκα) δεδοκα
		ενωπιον) ενοπειον
		θυραν) -ρον
		(MT) ανεωγμενην) ανεογμενιν (2 MSS = ανεογμενηη)
		ουδεις) -δις
		δυναται) -τει (2 MSS = -τε)
		κλεισαι) -σει
		μικραν) -ρον
		ετηρησας) ετιρισας (4 MSS = ετηρισας)
		ηρνησω) ιρνισο (cf.200)
	9	ιδου) ηδου
		διδωμι) διδουμι (5 MSS = διδομι)
		συναγωγης) σηναγογης
		των) τον
		Ιουδαιους) -δειους
		ειναι) ενε
		αλλα) αλα
		ποιησω) πιησο
		ινα) ια
		(MT) προσκυνησωσιν) } -σοσιν
		(other) -σουσιν)
		ενωπιον) ενιπ-
		των ποδων) τον ποδον
		γνωσιν) γνοσιν
		(TR) οτι εγω) } τε ωτι
		(MT) οτι —)
		ηγαπησα) εγαπισα
	10	ετηρησας) ετιρισας (5 MSS = ετηρισας)
		καγω) καγο
		τηρησω) τιρισο
		της ωρας) τις ορας
		οικουμενης) ηκουμενεις
		ολης) ολεις
		πειρασαι) πιρασει
		κατοικουντας) κατεικ-

TABLE 8—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(15)	3.12	τω ναω) το ναον και το ονομα μου το καινον) ——
	14	και[1]) ——
	15	ης) —— (cf. 179[2])
	16	οτι) + ου
	18	(MT) κολλυριον) (TR) κολλουριον) } κολιριον (+ 72 comm.) (MT) εγχριση) ενχρισι
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
16	1.4	ο ων και ο ην και ο ερχομενος) erased by 16[2]
	5	λουσαντι) + και μισησαντι (this within an additional phrase read in 8 MSS)
	7	ιδου) και ιδου 16[2]
	3.9	(MT) ηξωσι) ιξ-
	18	(MT) χρυσιον παρ' εμου πεπυρωμενον) (TR) παρ' εμου χρυσιον πεπυρωμενον) } ∿χρ.πεπ.παρ' εμου
	5.13	της[2] *(ante* θαλασσης*))* —— τω καθημενω) των καθημενων
	7.2	τοις τεσσαρσιν αγγελοις) τους τεσσαρας αγγελους
	3	δενδρα) +*(ex vers. 5)* εκ φυλης Ρουβιμ ιβ χιλιαδες
	5	εκ φυλης Ιουδα ιβ χιλιαδες εσφραγισμενοι) —— 16[3]
	12.6	(MT) εχει εκει) εχει το εκει
	18	την) τον
	15.4	ου μη φοβηθη σε) ου φοβηθηση (26% omit σε)
	17.9	ορη) ορκοι
	18	βασιλεων) -λετων (2 MSS = -λειων)
	20.1	κλειδα) -δαν (2 MSS = κλιδαν)
	4	του Θεου) Ιησου του Θεου* προσεκυνησαν) -κιν-
	11	τοπος) ο τοπος
	12	(MT) τους μεγαλους και τους μικρους) 1-2-3-4-5-4-5
	22.2	ενα) και
	4	το[2]) οτι
	13	(MT) εγω) + δε
	18	του βιβλιου) ——
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
17	1.4	αυτου) + εστι (43% have εστι after ἁ)
	13	επτα) ζ
	3.4	εισιν*(fin. vers.)*) +*(ex 4:8)* και αναπαυσιν . . . ερχομενος*, differing from MT but consistent with 17 itself in the following particulars: ο Θεος) σαβαωθ ο ων και ο ην) ∿4-5-3-1-2

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(17)	3.7 (MT) αυτην ει μη ο ανοιγων) } —* (cf.ℵ) (TR) και κλειει)
	14 (MT) εκκλησιας γραψον) ∿2-1*
	5.1 εσωθεν και εξωθεν) + και οπισθεν[β] και εμπροσθεν[α] [*sic*] (3 MSS + και εμπρ. και οπισθ.)
	11 ως) και 17^2
	7.17 εξαλειψει) εξελθει
	10.7 (TR) τελεσθη) τελεσθηναι*
	20.3 (MT) ετι τα εθνη) ετι εθνη (—τα) 17^2
	22.3 αυτου) αυτω
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
18	3.21 καθισαι) καθιτο
	5.1 εσωθεν και εξωθεν) ∿3-2-1
	10.2 εθηκε) επεθηκε
	15.2 εκ^3 (*ante* του αριθμου)) ——
	4 οτι^3 (*final*)) + παντα
	17.4 (other) πορφυραν και κοκκινον) ∿3-2-1
	12 του θηριου) το θηριον
	20.8 ως η αμμος) 1-3 (—2)
	22.1 καθαρον ποταμον υδατος ζωης) ∿2-3-4-1
	2 εν μεσω) + της πολεως (cf.59)
	δωδεκα) δυο και δεκα
	8 (MT) ο ακουων και βλεπων ταυτα) ∿1-2-3+ὸ-4-5
	εβλεψα) επεβλ-
	15 και πας ο φιλων και ποιων ψευδος) και οι ποιουντες το ψευδος (—πας ο φιλων και)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
19	3.15 οφελον) -φειλ-
	7.1 τεσσαρας^3) -ρις (so also in ^{1,2}, but there with support from other MSS.)
	(MT) επι τι δενδρον) } επι τινι δενδρω
	(TR) επι παν δενδρον)
	10.3 μυκαται) μυκομενος (cf.200)
	22.18 εαν) αν
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
20	1.15 χαλκολιβανω) χαλκωιλ- (18 MSS = χαλκωλ-)
	5.13 κτισμα) σκτισμα

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(20)	7.4	τεσσαρακοντα) τεσσαρακον
	20.4	πεπελεκισμενων) -κιμ- (11 MSS = -κημ-)
	22.6	(TR) των αγιων) + των* (N.B. MT = των πνευματων των *pro* των αγιων)
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
21	1.7	και οιτινες) ——
	16	αυτου[4] *(fin.vers.)*) ——
	3.5	εξαλειψω) -ψωσι (cf.104)
	7	(MT) κλεισει αυτην ει μη ο ανοιγων) } κλειων
		(TR) κλειει και κλειει)
		(MT) ανοιξει) } ανοιγων
		(TR) ανοιγει)
	16	μελλω) θελω (cf.120,138)
	19	εγω) + δε
	20	εαν) + ους (10 MSS + ουν)
	7.3	αυτων) αυτου
	10.1	νεφελην) -λη-
	4	οτε) ——
	7	(TR) τοις εαυτου δουλοις) 1-αυτοις-3
	10	αγγελου) ουρανου*
	15.1	πληγας . . . Θεου *(fin.vers.)*) ——
	8	καπνου) -νος
	17.2	εμεθυσθησαν) -θισθ-
	4	εχουσα) χουσα
	5	μυστηριον) + ἡ 21[2] (2 MSS + και)
	22.1	θρονου) -νιου
	5	νυξ) η νυξ
		και χρειαν ουκ εχουσιν λυχνου και φωτος ηλιου) ∿1-ου-2-4-φως-5 (—6-7-8) (cf.113)
	19	(MT) αφελη) εφ-
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
22	1.3	ακουοντες) ακου*
	20	(TR) αι επτα λυχνιαι) αι $\overline{\zeta}$ $\overline{\zeta}$ λυχνιαι
	3.1	(MT) οτι[2]) } και οτι
		(other) και)
	5.9	εν τω αιματι σου) ——*
	22.5	φωτος) ——
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
23	12.9	καλουμενος) + δρακων και
	18	εσταθην) εστη (20 MSS = εσταθη)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(23)	12.18 επι την αμμον της θαλασσης) ∿ επι το χειλος-4-5-1-2-3 (cf. Heb.11:12)
	15.4 οσιος) αγιος συ ει (only the συ is singular, though 1 MS adds συ *ante* μονος, and another MS adds συ *post* μονος)
	22.19 των λογων) τους λογους
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
24	12.4 καταφαγη) κατακαταφαγη*
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
25	3.8 δυναται) -τα
	20.10 βασανισθησονται) -θησεται* (corrected by * also)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
26	3.17 εχω) εχων*
	18 (MT) εγχριση) εγχρησης* (cf.113)
	5.1 γεγραμμενον) -νων
	6 (MT) αποστελλομενα) -λλωμ-
	7.6 φυλης[1]) φυλην*
	12.16 η γη[1]) η γυναικη* (6 MSS have τη γυναικη *post* η γη[1])
	τον) ὁ*
	ὄν) ο δρα* (= ο δρα[κων]? Or, possibly υδωρ [cf.A]?)
	17 ὁ (*ante* δρακων)) λ [*sic*]
	15.7 των) τω
	22.19 του βιβλιου) των βιβλιων*
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
27	3.12 εκ του ουρανου απο του Θεου) ∿4-2-3-1-5-6 (cf.226*)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
28	1.10 εν[2]) —— (MT) φωνην οπισω μου μεγαλην ως σαλπιγγος) ∿2-3-1-6-4 (—5) (25% of MSS = ∿2-3-1-4-5-6)
	3.4 τα ιματια αυτων) αυτων-1-2-3
	8 ενωπιον σου) ∿2-1
	13 εκκλησιαις) + του Θεου
	18 βλεπης) κλεπτης

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(28)	5.1	επι[1]) —	28^2
	4	αξιος ευρεθη) ∿2-1	28^2
	7	θρονου) + του Θεου	
	8	και[2]) ἡ	
		χρυσας) χριστας	
	7.4	Ισραηλ *(fin.vers.)*) + χιλιαδων $\overline{\rho\mu\delta}$	
	6	(MT) εκ φυλης Νεφθαλειμ $\overline{\iota\beta}$ χιλιαδες) written twice	
	14	κυριε) + συ (reading $\overline{\kappa\varepsilon}$ συ μου συ οιδας)	
		(TR) ελευκαναν στολας αυτων) } ελ. τας στ. αυτων και ελ. αυτας	
		(other) ελευκαναν αυτας)	
	17	αυτους[2]) αυτο	
		παν) —	
	10.1	ιρις) ερινν (a number of MSS = ιριν)	
	10	εν) επι	
		ως) —	
	11	και[3] *(ante* γλωσσαις*)*) —	
	12.4	γυναικος) + αυτων	
	5	σιδηρα) -ρω	
	15.4	κυριε) $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ [*sic*]	
	7	επτα αγγελοις) ξυλοις (—επτα)	
	17.3	ερημον) ερρ-	
		γυναικα) γυναιον	
	4	εχουσα) -σαι	
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷	
29	1.2	ειδε) οιδα	
	13	ζωνην) ζωννην	
	3.4	λευκοις) -καις	
	7.1	επι[1]) υπο	
	9	ενωπιον[2]) —	
	14	ειπεν μοι) + οτι	
	10.11	δει σε) δευτε	
	12.6	χιλιας διακοσιας) —	
	12	ουαι) υαι (Rubric?)	
	13	αρρενα) $\overline{\alpha\rho\nu\alpha}$	
	17	αυτης) αυτου	
	15.3	και την ωδην) και ωδην (—την)	
	6	ζωνας) ζωννας	
	17.2	οι[1]) αι	
	4	(MT) ποτηριον χρυσουν) ποτερον (—χρυσ.)(2 other MSS omit χρ.)	
	5	μητηρ) πορνη μητηρ (πορνη erased)	

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(29)	20.8 Μαγωγ) -γως
	10 των αιωνων) αιωνων (—των)
	22.2 ξυλον) -λα
	ποιουν) ποιουντα
	εκαστον αποδιδουν) αποδιδοντα εκαστου (both forms are read in other MSS; it is only the precise combination shown here which is singular)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
30	1.5 ημων) υμων*
	3.11 εχεις) εχ$^{\varsigma\varsigma}$ [*sic*]
	7.2 απο) απ'*
	13 ποθεν) ποτεν 30^2 (30* = ποτε, cum 2 other MSS)
	10.7 ως) φ' [*sic*]
	10 μελι) μελλι (ℵC = μελλει)
	12.6 γυνη) γη
	12 ευφραινεσθε) ευφραινθαι [*sic*]
	15.8 εγεμισθη) εγενηθη (cf.98)
	17.1 αγγελων) αγε-*
	3 κερατα) κερα*
	17 τω θηριω) το-2* (3 MSS = το θηριον)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
31	1.4 (MT) Θεου) $\overline{\text{κυ}}$
	3.11 ερχομαι) + σοι
	15 ουτε[1]) —*
	5.5 φυλης Ιουδα) ∿2-1
	7.3 μη αδικησητε την γην μηδε την θαλασσαν) — (cf.146)
	15 αυτου) τουτω
	16 επ' αυτους ο ηλιος) ∿3-4-1-2
	10.9 εσται) —
	20.12 ηνεωχθησαν και αλλο βιβλιον ηνεωχθη (MT)) ηνοιχθησαν-2-3-4+ὸ εστι της ζωης-5 (all but the change of ηνεωχ. is singular)
	22.2 θεραπειαν) + των ψυχων* (31^2 erases)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
32	1.15 ομοιοι) ομοια (2 MSS. = ομια; cf.218)
	πεπυρωμενοι) περω-*

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(32)	3.3 (MT) γνως) γνους
	12 της πολεως . . . και το ονομα μου) —
	5.7 του[2] *(ante* θρονου*))*. —
	7.7 Ισαχαρ) Ιδσαχαρ (23 MSS = Ισσ-)
	10.8 του *(ante* εστωτος*))* —
	9 (MT) δουναι) το δουναι
	12.1 περιβεβλημενη) -λημμενη
	10 (MT) εβληθη) —
	12 κατεβη) καταη
	14 πετηται) πεττ-
	15.2 εκ του θηριου και εκ της εικονος αυτου) ∿5-6-7-θεου-1-3-8 (—2,4)
	7 ἔν) ενι
	20.10 πυρος) + την καιομενην (cf.113,143) —
	22.4 αυτων) —
33	1.10 ως) ως ως
	14 τριχες) + της κεφαλης
	18 και[4] *(ante* εχω*))* αι (Rubric?)
	3.1 εκκλησιας) εκλ-
	5.5 φυλης) φιλ-
	6 εν μεσω[1]) εν μεσου
	εχον) + τα (cf.203, εχοντα)
	12.3 κεφαλας επτα και κερατα δεκα και επι τας) —
	17 εχοντων) -τες
	15.3 αι οδοι) αι αι ωδοι (ωδ- not singular; for the dittography, cf. the αληθιναι preceding as well)
	17.3 θηριον) + την (28% of MSS + το)
34	Contains no singular readings, though fully extant within the sample base chapters.
35	1.3 μακαριος ο αναγινωσκων και) —
	7 μετα) μεμετα
	19/20 [19] και ἃ εισι . . . [20] ων ειδες) —
	3.18 γυμνοτητος) γνμ-
	19 παιδευω) πιδ-

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(35)	7.3 αυτων) ——
	14 (MT) επλυναν) -νας
	17 (MT) ποιμανει) -μεναι (other MSS have -μαινει and -μενετ)
	10.3 εκραξε[1]) εξεκραξε
	6 θαλασσαν) θαλλα
	12.3 δεκα) ——
	14 τοπον) το
	17.3 και[3] *(final)*) ——
	10 επεσον) -σων (46% = -σον; 44% = -σαν)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
36	1.2 (MT) ειδε) + additional phrase in 41% of the MSS in which MS 36 differs singularly thus: εισιν) εστι
	3 τους λογους) του λογου 36[2] (36* = τον λογον cum 10 MSS)
	4 ειρηνη) -νει*
	10 (MT) φωνην οπισω μου μεγαλην ως σαλπιγγος) ∿5-1-4-5-1-6 (—2,3) (25% = ∿2-3-1-4-5-6)
	13 ζωνην) ζωνη
	15 εν) εκ (cf.144)
	3.1 τω) το
	2 (other) αποθνησκειν) -θνεισ-*
	7 (TR) ηλειει) ηλιει
	8 εχεις δυναμιν) ∿2-1
	10 τηρησω) εξηγαγον
	τον στεφανον) τους στεφανους
	15 ζεστος[2]) ξεστος
	16 ζεστος) ξεστος
	17 και τυφλος) ——
	5.2 τας) + επτα
	3 επι της γης) εν τη γη
	ανοιξαι) του ανοιξαι
	4 ευρεθη) ηυρ-
	8 επεσον) ——
	εχοντες) ——* (supplied[mg])
	γεμουσας θυμιαματων) θυμιαματα (—γεμ.)
	9 ηγορασας) ——
	και γλωσσης) ∿ *post* εθνους
	12 λεγοντες) -γων-
	την *(ante* δυναμιν*)*) ——
	13 και τα) —— (N.B. 36 reads ἃ εστιν preceding)
	7.2 ανατολης ηλιου) του ηλιου (—ανατολης)
	εκραξεν) + εν
	4 εσφραγισμενοι) ∿ *post* Ισραηλ *ad fin.vers.*

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(36)	7.9	(MT) φοινικας) } φοινοικες (TR) φοινικες)
	11	και^2) ——
		θρονου^2) +*(ex vv. 9, 10)* και ενωπιον του αρνιου
	17	(MT) ποιμανει) πειμ-
	10.8	λεγουσα) + μοι
	9	πικρανει) -νηι (2 MSS = -νη)
		γλυκυ) -κι
	12.4	εβαλεν) βαλλει
		ινα) ιν'
	11	ενικησαν) -κισ-
	14	του αετου) του υετου
	17	ωργισθη) + φησιν
		του^1*(ante* σπερματος*)*) ——
	15.4	τις) και τις
		οτι^2) και
		προσκυνησουσιν) -κυνησου
	6	λινον) ληνου (cf.200)
	17.3	απηνεγκε) -νεγεκε
	9	καθηται) -θιτ-
	10	(MT) δει αυτον) δη-2 (cf.144)
		μειναι) μηναι
	11	αυτος ογδοος) αυτον ογδοον
	15	λεγει) -γοι
	16	την πορνην) αυτην
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
37	1.7	αυτον^1) αυτω (34 MSS = αυτων)
	5.6	αρνιον) αρνειον
	7.11	αυτων) εαυτων
	12.12	κατεβη) κατεβληθη
	17.4	(MT) κοκκινον) κ̄νην
		κεχρυσωμενη) -νη [*sic*] (9 MSS = -νον)
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
38	3.18	αγορασαι) -σον
	7.4	εκατον) written twice
	16	πεση) πεσηται (15 MSS = πεσειται)
	17	(MT) οδηγησει) -ση
	10.8	λαλουσα) λαβουσα* (cf.210)
	12.5	τεκνον) παιδιον
	17.7	του^3*(ante* εχοντος*)*) και (15 MSS = και του)

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(38)	22.10 τουτου) ταυτης
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
39	3.18 περιβαλη) -λι (cf.180) (MT) εγχριση) -συ
	5.5 μοι μη) μοι μοι 6 των πρεσβυτερων) τον-2 11 ειδον) ηδων (4 MSS = ιδων) 12 (MT) τον (*ante* πλουτον)) των 13 τω καθημενω) τον καθημενον του θρονου) τον θρονω [*sic*] (36% = τω θρονω) 14 (MT) λεγοντα το) (TR) ελεγον —) } ελεγων το (21 MSS = ελεγον το)
	15.3 λεγοντες) λεγωνται ς 4 οτι[1]) ὅ 5 ηνοιγη) οιν- 7 φιαλας) φυαλας*; φηαλας corr. by * 8 του Θεου) αυτου και εκ της δυναμεως αυτου) —
	17.3 με) —
	20.1 αλυσιν) αλησιν 3 αυτον λυθηναι) ∿ λυθην ε̄-1 (45% = ∿2-1) 6 αγιος) αιος
	22.2 των) τον 10 εγγυς) εγγεις 12 ερχομαι) -με 16 υμιν) υμην 19 των λογων) των λογον [*sic*] των[2]) των των
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
39[sup]	7.3 αδικησητε την γην) -σητη ην γην* (MT) σφραγισωμεν) φρ- 5 εκ φυλης Ρουβιμ ιβ̄ χιλιαδες) written twice, but with Ρουβημ the first time (cum 12 MSS) and Ρουβιμ the second (cum MT) 9 και[1]) αι (Rubric?) 11 προσεκυνησαν) -νισαν 14 (MT) ειπον) ηπον ειπεν) οιπεν ερχομενοι) -νη αυτων[1]) αυτον 15 τω ναω) το-2 16 πεινασουσιν) -σωσην 17 δακρυον) -ριον αυτων (*fin.vers.*)) αυτον

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(39^{sup})	10.7	σαλπιζειν) -πηζ- [*sic*]
	9	λεγει) -γοι *vid.*
	11	(MT) επι^{2} (*ante* εθνεσιν)) εποι *vid.*
		πολλοις) πολης
	12.3	διαδηματα) διαδηματατα
	4	τριτον) τριτο
	9	δρακων) -κον
		αρχαιος) -ως
	10	ενωπιον) -ποιον
	11	ηγαπησαν) -ποισ-
	14	ερημον) εριμον
		εκει) εκη
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
40	1.1	αυτου^{1}) αυτω
	9	καλουμενη) λεγομενη
	13	περιεζωσμενον) -νω
	20	ων) ἃ
	5.12	και ισχυν και τιμην) ∿3-4-1-2
	12.4	δ) —
	6	χιλιας διακοσιας εξηκοντα [= $\overline{\text{ασξ}}$]) $\overline{\text{αχ}}$ (= 1600)
	15.3	κυριε) + λεγοντες
	6	εχοντες τας) εχοντας τας (cf.12)
	17.11	αυτος) τουτο (41% read ουτος)
	15	αυτου) αυτω
	16	ουδε^{1}) ου
	22.3	αυτη) αυτω
	15	οι φαρμακοι και οι πορνοι) ∿4-5-3-1-2
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
41	1.1	εδωκεν) εδετο
	4	ειρηνη) ει
	13	ενδεδυμενον ποδηρη) ενδεδυρη [*sic*]
	3.8	ηρνησω) -σατω
	14	(MT) και τω αγγελω της εν Λαοδικεια εκκλησιας) —
	20	εστηκα) εστη και (2 MSS = εστικαι)
	7.14	αυτω) αυαυτω
	10.2	ανεωγμενον) αωγμενον
	12.7	δρακων) -κω
	17.2	μεθ') εφ'
	16	αυτην κατακαυσουσιν) ∿2-1*
	17	γαρ) γαρ γαρ

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(41)	22.3 και του αρνιου) —*
	14 ινα) και
	20 ναι[1]) ετι
42	1.13 μαστοις) —* (inserted in mg by *)
	3.4 αξιοι) αξιοιοι
	5.11 (MT) κυκλω) -λο*
	14 (MT) λεγοντα το) 1-τω*
	7.9 ενωπιον[1]) ενωπι*
	12.5 τον Θεον και) —* (from TR base, but even more likely to be an omission from the MT base, i.e. —τον Θεον και προς, though such cannot be determined with certainty)
43	15.2 υαλινην[1]) γαληνην
	17.1 εκ) ε [*sic*]
	8 ην[1]) —
	13 γνωμην) -μιν
	16 αυτην[3] (*final*)) αυτη
	20.4 το μετωπον) τον μετοπον (11 MSS = το μετοπον)
44	1.1 αυτου[3] (*final*)) —
	3.12 (MT) το ονομα[3] (*fin.vers.*)) το ονομα το ονομα το
	20 εισελευσομαι) -σο
	7.9 ενωπιον[1,2]) ενωποιον
	12.3 διαδηματα) δηματα
	14 πετηται) πετητηται
	15.3 ωδην[1]) —
	22.9 μη) πιστευς ~~44[2]~~
	11 αδικων) + μη *supr.lin.* 44[2]
	ρυπαρος) + μη *supr.lin.* 44[2]
	20/21 [20] ναι ερχομαι . . . [21] αμην) ναι, αμην.
45	1.12 ητις) ητι
	3.9 διδωμι) διδο *vid.* (2 MSS = διδω)
	7.1 τεσσαρας[1,2]) -ρις[1], τεσσαρ'[2]
	4 τεσσαρες) -ρις (3 MSS = -ρεις)
	12.10 βασιλεια) -α [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(45)	17.16	ἄ) αἳ
	20.3	αυτον λυθηναι) ∿ λυθειναι-1 (45% = ∿2-1)
	22.2	τα φυλλα) το φυλλον (cf.104)
46	3.3	ηξω[1]) ηξως
	15.6	λινον) λιν̃ [*sic*]
47	7.9	(MT) αριθμησαι ουδεις) ∿2-1 (cf.59)
	12.17	αυτης) αυτους*
	17.12	οιτινες) αιτ- (3 MSS = ειτ-)
	22.19	(MT) αφελη) -λοι (cf.MT of next clause)
48	1.4	Ιωαννης) -αννη
	12.14	πετηται) πεηται
	17.10	εστιν) -τῖν* [*sic*] (3 MSS = εστην)
	22.2	ποταμου) αρνιου (cf. verse 1 *fin.*)
49	1.11	βλεπεις) -πων
	3.9	γνωσιν) γνωσωνται (9 MSS = -σονται)
	7.9	(MT) εδυνατο) / (TR) ηδυνατο) } η εδ- [*sic*] (cf.152)
	17	(MT) ποιμανει) / (other) ποιμαινει) } α ει -μαινει [*sic*]
	15.1	επτα τας εσχατας) εσχατας β επτα α [*sic*]
	3	τα εργα) εργα (—τα)
50	1.9	(MT) και βασιλεια) / (TR) και εν τη βασιλεια) } τη βασιλεια
	3.18	χρυσιον) -ων
	7.8	Βενιαμιν) Βεν- [*sic*] (2 MSS = βαινιαμην)
	11	(MT) εισηκεισαν) / (other) -κησαν) } ει -κησαν* [*sic*]
	17	(other) οδηγη) / (other) οδηγει) } ει -γη [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(50)	17.7 επτα) εζ̄ [*sic*]
	11 επτα) εζ [*sic*]
51	3.14 της) τη
	7.4/5 [4]υιων Ισραηλ. [5]εκ φυλης) ——
52	5.10 (MT) βασιλευσουσιν) -ευσου
53	1.15 χαλκολιβανω) χακολ-* (corr. by *)
	3.13 ακουσατω) ακουειν (cf.193)
	21 ο νικων δωσω αυτω καθισαι μετ'εμου) ——*
	5.5 (MT) Δαδ̄) Δαβιδ (= TR)
	11 μυριαδων) —— (2 MSS omit μυριαδες preceding)
	7.4 εσφραγισμενων) -γιμ-
	9 του θρονου) ——*
	12.10 αυτου) ημων*
	17.11 ὃ ην) ουκ ην
	20.4 πεπελεκισμενων) πεπελεκις*
	12 κατα) και κατα (3 MSS = και *solus*)
	22.2 ποιουν καρπους) ——
	3 εν) εν εν
	11 ο αδικων . . . ετι[2]) ——*
	14 ινα) τουτω
	15 φονεις) φθν- [*sic*] (17 MSS = φων-)
54	No MS appertains to this number.
55	5.5 σφραγιδας) φρ-*
	7.9 γλωσσων) λωσσων* (Rubric?)
	11 των[2] (*ante* τεσσαρων)) ——*
	14 εν) ——* (N.B. reads αυτας preceding)
	17 αυτους[2]) ——*
	12.14 δυο πτερυγες) ~2-1

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(55)	15.4	οτι[1]) + συ ει (2 MSS + συ; 5 MSS + ει *ante* οσιος; 46 MSS + ει *post* οσιος)
56	1.1	εσημανεν) + ταυτα
	2	Ιησου) του
	3	μακαριος ο αναγινωσκων) μακαριοι οι αναγινωσκοντες οτι) ——
	4	Ασια) Ασσια
	3.8	δυναται κλεισαι) δυναται κλεισαι (β α) (N.B. *no* MS reads ∿2-1 here, yet such is the substance of 56[2]!)
	16	εἱ) εἷς
	19	φιλω) + και
	5.1	σφραγισιν επτα) ∿2-1
	7.2	εχοντα σφραγιδα) -τας -δας (or, εχον τας -δας)
	4*	εκ πασης φυλης υιων Ισραηλ) ∿ *ante* ρμδ
	8	χιλιαδες[1]) + εκ φυλης Δαν δωδεκα χιλιαδες
	9	(TR) αυτον ουδεις ηδυνατο) ∿2-3-1
	10.5	ειδον) οιδα
		της *(ante* θαλασσης*)*) τη
	12.6	(MT) εχει εκει) εκει (—εχ.)
	11	αυτων[1]) + addition in 5 MSS, within which occurs δια του αιματος) omit δια
	12	μεγαν) + ως (5 MSS + και)
	17.3	εν) + τω (8 MSS read τω *pro* εν)
	10	ο αλλος) ο δε αλλος (cf.155; 11 MSS = και ο αλλος)
		(MT) δει αυτον) (TR) αυτον δει) } δει αυτον [*sic*] (β α)
	18	η[3] *(ante* μεγαλη*)*) ——
	22.11	αγιασθητω) -θειτω
57	3.12	αυτον[2]) αυτου
	14	δ[1] *(ante* αμην*)*) ——
	18	τους) ——
	5.6	(MT) αποστελλομενα) απογελλ-
	7.13	απεκριθη) αποκ-
	17	αυτων *(fin.vers.)*) ——
	10.9	τω *(ante* στοματι*)*) ——
	11	γλωσσαις) γλωταις (7 MSS = γλωτταις)
	12.14	τοπον) ——
	17.2	κατοικουντες) κατηκ-
	14	κλητοι) κλοιτοι (3 MSS = κλειτοι)
	17	γνωμην[2]) -μιν

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(57)	20.4	και[1]) και και πεπελεκισμενων) πεπλεκ- θηριω) Θεω
	5	ετη) + αχρι (6 MSS + οτι)
	22.16	η) —
	18	εαν τις) ει τις
	19	της[2] *(ante* ζωης*)*) — εκ της) — βιβλιω) -λω

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

58	1.1	Ιωαννη) -ννου
	20	αι επτα λυχνιαι) ∿3-1-2 (MT) αι[2]) —
	3.1	οτι[1]) — (2 MSS read και *pro* οτι)
	10.9*	λεγει) -γων
	12.12	οτι[2]) —
	15.8	εκ της δοξης του Θεου και) —
	17.1	της[3] *(ante* καθημενης*)*) —
	4	κεχρυσωμενη) -σαμενη
	7	ὁ *(ante* αγγελος*)*) —
	8	(other) του βιβλιου) omit του (cf.121, which omits the article from MT το βιβλιον)
	22.9	των[3]) των των

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

59	1.9	(TR) και εν τη βασιλεια) 1-2-3-μαρτυρια και υπομονη) και εν τη υπομονη
	12	(MT) και εκει επιστρεψα) ∿1-3-2
	16	διστομος) + και
	20	των επτα αστερων) — ων) ὅ αγγελοι) + επτα
	3.5	ενωπιον[1,2]) ενοποιον
	7	ανοιγων[1]) ανειγων
	9	εαυτους) —
	17	ο ταλαιπωρος και ο ελεεινος) ∿4-5-3-1-2(-πορος, cum 14 MSS)
	18	γυμνοτητος) -τηστος
	20	δειπνησω) -νισω
	21	μετα του πατρος μου εν τω θρονω αυτου) ∿5-6-7-2-3-4 (—1,8)
	5.1	γεγραμμενον) —
	4	(TR) και αναγνωναι το βιβλιον) ∿3-4-1-2

TABLE 6—*continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(59)	5.4 ουτε) ἤ
	8 εκαστος κιθαρας) ∿2-1+αυτων
	7.9 (TR) αριθμησαι αυτον ουδεις) ∿3-1-2
	15 αὐτῷ) + δια παντος
	10.5 εστωτα) ∿ *post* γης (12 MSS omit entirely)
	6 ωμοσεν εν) + τω Θεω (7 MSS + Θεω *post* ζωντι)
	8 το ανεωγμενον εν τη χειρι του αγγελου) ∿ εκ χειρος -6-7-1-2
	επι της θαλασσης και επι της γης) ∿5-6-7-4-1-2-3
	9 λεγων) και ειπον
	11 και βασιλευσι πολλοις) και βασιλειαις της γης (cf.121)
	12.4 ινα) ωστε
	(TR) τρεφωσιν) τρεφει
	13 γυναικα) γυνην
	17.4 κεχρυσωμενη) -σομενου
	8 εστιν[1]) εσται
	11 ὃ) + ειδες
	ογδοος εστι και) —
	15 και οχλοι εισι) —
	εθνη) + εισιν (N.B. that εισι is omitted above)
	20.3 και εκλεισεν αυτον) →
	(TR) πλανηση) -νιση
	4 και δια τον λογον του Θεου) —
	χαραγμα) + αυτου (11 MSS + του Θηριου)
	6 εξουσιαν) —
	ιερεις) -ροις
	9 (MT) εκ του ουρανου απο του Θεου) } εκ του Θεου απο
	(TR) απο του Θεου εκ του ουρανου) } ουρανου (9 MSS = εκ του Θ. απο <u>του</u> ουρ.)
	22.2 αυτης) της πολεως εκαινης (cf.18)
	14 ποιουντες) φυλασσοντες
	16 ειμι) —
	Δαδ) διὰ Δ [*sic*]
60	No MS appertains to this number.
61	1.17 νεκρος) -ροι *vid.*
	3.4/5 [4]οτι αξιοι . . . [5]λευκοις) —
	7.17 Θεός) + πηγας υδατων και εξαλειψει ο Θεος (from earlier in same verse)
	12.18 εσταθην) -θη [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
62	7.3 του Θεου) τους-2
	20.13 τους εν αυτη) ——
63	1.1 αυτου[3] *(final)*) αυτω
	4 ταις[2]) ——
	χαρις) -ιν
	7 πασαι) πάντες
	8 και ο ην) ——
	3.5 ονομα[1]) ——
	πατρος μου) + και ενωπιον του πατρος μου
	10 λογον) + σου
	12 μου[2]) ——
	το[2]) ——
	μου[3]) + και
	καινης) κοινης
	20 δειπνησω) -νωσω
	5.6 ειδον) -δεν
	12 και[4] *(ante* τιμην*)*) ——
	14 οι) ——
	12.4 της *(ante* μελλουσης*)*) ——
	8 ετι) οτι
	17 αυτης) + και (cf.98)
	17.9 οπου) ——
	12 και τα δεκα) ∿2-3-δε* (cf.166)
	17 ποιησαι[1]. . . αυτων[2]) ——
	20.4 ειδον) + *(ex 20:1)* αγγελον καταβαινοντα εκ του ουρανου*
	Ιησου) του Θεου (12 MSS = του Ιησου)
	τον λογον) των λογων (2 MSS = των λογον *sic*)
	8 τον[1] *(ante* Γωγ*)*) του
	11 αυτοις) -εαυτοις
	12 εκ των γεγραμμενων) επι των λεγομενων*
	22.1 ποταμον) ——*
	2 φυλλα του) ——*
	3/4 [3]λατρευσουσιν αυτω. [4]και οψονται το προσωπον αυτου) ——
	5 νυξ) νυν
	15 ψευδος) τελος
64	7.15 αυτω) αυ
	15.8 ὁ) ——
	22.11 ετι[1]) ετη

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
65	20.9	πυρ) —— *
	22.6	πιστοι και) ——
	11	αδικησατω) αδικειτω
	13	(MT) ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος, η αρχη και το τελος) ∿6-7-8-9-10-1-2-3-4-5
	18	επ' αυτα) επι ταυτα
	20	ναι[1]) ιδου
	21	αγιων) + αυτου
66	No MS appertains to this number.	
67	1.3	τα) ——
	6	omit entire verse
	11	Θυατειρα) -τειρης*; -τειροις[2]
		Σαρδεις) -δες
	13	ενδεδυμενον) -νων (2 MSS = -νω)
	14	τριχες) τρυχαις (14 MSS = τριχαις)
	3.1	ονομα) ονο
	2	πεπληρωμενα) πληρωμενα
	7	(TR) ηλειει) ηλυει
	12	το[4] *(final)*) —— αι
	18	παιδευω) πεδ-*; πεδ-[2] [*sic*] (4 MSS = πεδ- uncorrected)
	5.1	εσωθεν και εξωθεν) 1-2-εμπροσθεν και οπισθεν
	3	(TR) ουδε[1]) ουδεις
	8	τεσσαρα [= δ]) ζ (= επτα)
		εχοντες) -τα
	14	τεσσαρα) τεσα-
	7.6	Μανασση) -ηι
	15	εισιν) ——
	10.4	επτα[1,2]) εζ̄ [*sic*]
	5	ον) ——
	7	ευηγγελισε) -λησατο (24% = -λισατο)
	12.6	εις την) ——
		ητοιμασμενον) -νων
		διακοσιας εξηκοντα) δκοσξ[τ] [*sic*] ς
	12	(other) ευφραινεσθαι) + και (cf. 20)
	14	ημισυ) -σοι (3 MSS = -σι)
	15.1	ετελεσθη) ετελειωθη
	8	πληγαι) πηγαι
	17.3	απηνεγκε) -και
	8	θαυμασονται) θαυμασον
	9	κεφαλαι) -λας

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(67)	17.11 απωλειαν) απωλει
	13 τω θηριω) των θηριων (cf.81; 4 MSS = το θηριον)
	20.4 το μετωπον) το μετοπων (10 MSS = των μετοπων)
	10 ο^{3} (*ante* ψευδ.)) ——
	22.4 αυτου^{2}) ——
	μετωπων) μετων μετοπων (Hoskier is unclear as to whether MT αυτων still follows or whether 67's μετων is a corrupted transposition of such.)
	13 αρχη) -ην (cf.114 in 1:8)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
68	5.6 εν μεσω . . . ζωων) written twice
	22.3 οι δουλοι) ο δουλοι [*sic*]
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
69*	1.2 μαρτυριαν) -ρειαν
	4 ταις^{2}) τες
	ενωπιον) εννω=
	14 λευκον) -κων*
	17 ειδον) ειδη
	19 ειδες) ηδες* *vid.* (18 MSS = ιδες)
	3.2 λοιπα) λυπα
	7 αληθινος) αληθηνος
	(MT) ανοιξει) ανηξει
	11 μηδεις λαβη) μη λαβη τις (7 MSS = μη λαβη τις ταχυ)
	14 αληθινος) -θυνος
	17 πλουσιος) -ιως
	εχω) εχης (3 MSS = εχεις)
	18 πεπυρωμενον) -νων
	(MT) εγχριση) εχρησε
	5.4 βλεπειν) -πην
	9 αιματι) ἑματι*
	11 (MT) μυριαδες) -δαις
	13 ευλογια) -γεια
	7.2 ζωντος) ζωντως
	αυτοις) αυτεις
	9 (MT) εδυνατο) -τω
	(TR) εστωτες) -τεις
	13 οι) ἡ
	εισιν) οισιν
	15 σκηνωσει) σκεινωσει
	10.1 ειδον) οιδον
	προσωπον) πρωσωπον
	3 μυκηται) μηκ-
	τας εαυτων φωνας) ∿1-3-αυτων 69^{2} (69* omits clause along with other MSS)

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(69)	10.7 το μυστηριον) τω-2
	10 γλυκυ) -κη (cf.154)
	12.1 αυτης[1]) αυτοις
	2 τεκειν) τεκην
	4 των[1]) τον
	ενωπιον) εννω-
	5 ποιμαινειν) ποιμενην
	7 εγενετο) -τω
	9 αρχαιος) αρχεος
	10 εγενετο) -τω
	12 (MT) θαλασση) -σσει (cf.113)
	13 ειδεν) ηδεν (17.MSS = ιδεν)
	14 (MT) τρεφηται) στρεφεται (N.B. οπως precedes; cf.108)
	οφεως) ωφ-
	15.1 του Θεου) αυτου
	2 υαλινην[2]) -λυνην
	3 αληθινάι) -θινε
	8 εισελθειν) ελθην*
	17.1 ηλθεν) ειλθεν
	7 διατι) -τη
	το) τω
	8 μελλει) -ειν
	9 καθηται) -τε
	11 αυτος) ουτως (41% = ουτος)
	12 βασιλειαν) -λειας
	αλλ᾽) αλ᾽
	15 πορνη) -νει

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

70 Contains no singular readings, though fully extant within the sample base chapters.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

71 No MS appertains to this number.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

72	1.5	(TR) αγαπησαντι) -πισ-
	10	ηκουσα) -σαν
		(MT) φωνην οπισω μου μεγαλην) ∿2-3-φωνη-4 (25% = ∿2-3-1-4)
	11	(MT) Φιλαδελφειαν) } Φυλαδελφιαν
		(other) -φιαν)
	13	ενδεδυμενον) -δεδιμ-
	15	ποδες) ποδαις [*sic*]
		ομοιοι) ομοιη

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(72)	1.17 πρωτος) προτος (cf.159)
	18 και εγενομην νεκρος και ιδου ζων) —
	19 μελλει) μελη (2 MSS = μελλη)
	20 εκκλησιαι) -αις
	3.2 λοιπα) μυκρα (5 MSS = μακρα; 2 MSS = μικρα)
	3 ειληφας) -λιφ-
	5 λευκοις) -κης
	εξαλειψω) -ψο (cf.15)
	7 αληθινος) αλυθ-
	8 μικραν) μυκ-
	ετηρησας) -τυρ- (4 MSS = -ρισ-)
	9 διδωμι) -μαι (12 MSS = -μοι)
	ενωπιον) ενοπ-
	ηγαπησα) -πιησα
	10 πειρασμου) πυρ-
	κατοικουντας) κατικ-
	14 λεγει) -ειν
	15 ζεστος[2]) + ουτε ψυχρος
	18 χρυσιον) χρισ-
	20 ακουσῃ) -σι (8 MSS = -σει)
	21 καθισαι) -θυσ- (18 MSS = -θησ-)
	5.2 κηρυσσοντα) κυρισσ- (cf.84,113)
	5 πρεσβυτερων) -βητ-
	κλαιε) κλεαι
	ενικησεν) ενηκισεν (12 MSS = ενηκησεν)
	η ριζα) η ρηζα
	6 (TR) οι ἑπτα οισι
	8 φιαλας) φυαλλας (9 MSS = φυαλας)
	10 εποιησας) ποιησας
	11 χιλιαδες) χυλ-
	13 καθημενω) -θυμ-
	14 (MT) λεγοντα το) } λεγον (cf.233)
	(TR) ελεγον —)
	7.6 χιλιαδες[1,3]) -δαις
	7 χιλιαδες[1]) -δαις
	9 ενωπιον[2]) ενοπιον (cf.200)
	(MT) περιβεβλημενους) -λιμ-
	10 καθημενω) -θυμ-
	11 (MT) εστηκεισαν) ειστικησαν (8% = ειστηκησαν)
	πρεσβυτερων) -βειτ-
	12 ισχυς) ισχης
	14 θλιψεως) -λυψ-
	15 νυκτος) -τας
	10.1 καταβαινοντα) -βεν-
	νεφελην) -λιν
	2 εθηκε) -θυκ-
	4 λεγουσαν) -σα
	6 χρονος) -νους
	8 (MT) ανεωγμενον) ανεογ-

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(72)	10.9 απηλθον) -πιλ- πικρανει) πυκ- 11 γλωσσαις) ωσαις (cf.154)
	12.2 βασανιζομενη) -νοι 4 εστηκεν) -τικ- 6 χιλιας διακοσιας εξηκοντα) χιλια διακοσια εξικοντα (1 MS = 1-2-εξικοντα) 9 δρακων) αρχον (7 MSS = αρχων) 10 νυκτος) + addition in 8 MSS, within which 72 thus differs: κατηγορια) κατιγ- διαβολη) -λικη 11 ηγαπησαν) -πισ- 13 δρακων) -κον (cf.154) 14 εδοθησαν) -θισ- πετηται) πετατε (36 MSS = πεταται) 15 ποταμοφορητον) -φωριτ- 16 εβοηθησεν) -θισ- ηνοιξε) ηνηξε 17 γυναικι) γυνεκη (3 MSS = -ναικη) απηλθε) -πιλ-
	15.2 μεμιγμενην) μεμυγμενης χαραγματος) χαραματος κιθαρας) κυθ- 3 ωδην[1]) ωδη Μωσεως) Μωησεως του αρνιου) omit του αληθιναι) αλυθυναι 4 εθνη) εθνοι 5 εν) — 6 εξηλθον) εξυλθων πληγας) πλυγας 8 πληγαι) — 8/16.1 [8]των επτα αγγελων. [1]και ηκουσα φωνης μεγαλης εκ) των αγγελων *solus*
	17.1 δευρο) -ρου (12 MSS = -ρω) καθημενης) -θυμ- επι) υπο 2 κατοικουντες) κατικ- 3 απηνεγκε) απιγεγγε εν) το (8 MSS read τω *pro* εν) ειδον) ηδον (16 MSS = ιδον) 4 και[1]) + (cum 25 MSS) 17.18, within which here 72 reads singularly thus: εχουσα) -σαν περιβεβλημενη) -λιμ- χρυσουν) χρισ- εχουσα) -σαν 8 (MT) το βιβλιον) το βιβλιο

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(72)	17.9 αι επτα) αιπτα (not so in anarthrous επτα^{2,3}, yet cf.218, which renders αι επτα here correctly, but reads αιπτα^{2,3}!)
	καθηται) -θυτ-
	12 του θηριου) 1-θυριου
	13 τω θηριω) τω θυριω
	16 και χωμνη . . . και αυτην) —
	20.1 κλειδα) κλυδα
	3 εκλεισεν) εκλυσαι
	εσφραγισεν) -σαιν [*sic*]
	4 εκαθισαν) -θυσ-
	χαραγμα) -ραμα
	(TR) αυτων^{1}) αυτου* (MT omits)
	7 λυθησεται) ληθυσετε
	8 αμμος) ἁμος [*sic*] (3 MSS have αμος uncorrected)
	9 ηγαπημενην) -πιμ-
	10 θηριον) θυρ-
	νυκτος) νικ-
	11 καθημενον) -θυμ-
	εφυγεν) εφηγεν
	12 ηνεωχθη) ηνοιχθοι
	γεγραμμενων) -αμε-
	14 αδης) αδις
	λιμνην) λιμηνην [*sic*]
	22.1 κρυσταλλον) κριστάλων [*sic*] (cf.104)
	2 δωδεκα) δυοδεκα
	φυλλα) φῦ [*sic*]
	3 εσται^{2}) εσθαι
	5 νυξ) νηξ
	(MT) φωτιει αυτους) } φωτι εις αυτους (15 MSS read
	(TR) φωτιζει αυτους) φωτιει/φωτιζει επ' αυτους)
	και βασιλευσουσιν εις τους) —
	6 αληθινοι) αλυθηνοι
	8 εβλεψα) -αν
	προσκυνησαι) -σε
	εμπροσθεν) -θαι
	δεικνυοντος) δικνιοντος
	9 προσκυνησον) -νησω
	10 σφραγιδης) -γισις
	11 (MT) δικαιοσυνην ποιησατω) -συνη-2
	12 μισθος) μυσ-
	εργον) εργω
	13 πρωτος) προτος
	14 ποιουντες) πιουντες
	15 ειδωλολατραι) ει οιδολολατραι (cf.104,155)
	16 επεμψα) επεψαν
	ο λαμπρος ο πρωινος) ν3-4-1-2+ ο αυτος (10 MSS + ο αυτος to MT)
	17 θελων) -ον

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(72)	22.18	λογους) λογον *vid.*
		επιθη . . . επιθησαι) επιθησι . . . επιθησι
	19	των λογων) τον λογον (cf.39)

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

73	12.4	καταφαγη) κατεφ-
	15.1	εσχατας . . . Θεου *(fin.vers.)*) ——
	20.7	τελεσθη) παντελ-

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

74 Contains no singular readings, though fully extant within the sample base chapters.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

75	1.9	τη θλιψει) omit τη
	3.7	εκκλησιας) εκκλ^{η} [*sic*]
	5.13	ηκουσα) written twice
	7.14	και^{1}) και και
	15.1	σημειον) σημειων
	17.7	κεφαλας) φιαλας
	22.17	ο^{2} *(ante* διψων*)*) ——

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

76 No MS appertains to this number.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

77	1.2	ειδε) + και ατινα εισι. (41% have this addition, but continue with + και ατινα χρη γενεσθαι μετα ταυτα; MS 77 does *not* so continue)
	7.8	(MT) εσφραγισμενοι) -γισμ [*sic*]
	12.10	Χριστου) χρηστου
	17.8	θηριον^{1}) -ιων
	12	ειδες) -δης
	22.12	(TR) εργον αυτου εσται) εργ^{β}ον αυτου εστ^{α}αι [*sic*] (correction thus = ∿3-2-1; perhaps an error of the διορθωτης for a correction to MT ∿1-3-2?)
	17	το πνευμα) ο νυμφιος*, with το $\overline{\text{πνα}}$ superscript by *.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
78	1.13 και[1]) κάι και
	3.2 γρηγορων) γρι$^{\eta}$γ- [*sic*]
	5.10 (MT) βασιλευσουσιν) } -ευσυσιν (= error from MT? Yet Hoskier notes that the (other) -ευουσιν) remaining four MSS of 78's family all read -ευου-; thus, it seems likely that the reading of 78 here resulted from misreading -ευου- as -ευσυ-.)
	12.12 (MT) ουρανοι) ουρανον*
	15.2 υαλινην[1]) υιαλινην *vid.*
	3 του Θεου) omit του (N.B. 78 also reads του *ante* δουλου preceding, along with MT)
	20.4 προσεκυνησαν) -κυνον (5 MSS = -κυνουν)
	8 τον[1] (*ante* Γωγ)) τω (2 MSS = το)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
79	10.6 ωμοσεν) -μυσ-
	17.9 αι) οι$^{\alpha\iota}$ [*sic*] (2 MSS = οι uncorrected)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
80	5.8 (TR) κιθαρας) } -ρα$^{\nu}$ς [*sic*] (MT) κιθαραν)
	13 εν (*ante* αυτοις)) —*
	17 αυτης) —*
	7.1 κρατουντας) ĵ κρατουντας [*sic*] (perhaps = και κρ;?)
	17.10 ελθη) -θοι$^{\eta}$ [*sic*] (cf.187) (2 MSS = -θει)
	16 μισησουσι) μυσησ-
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
81	1.4 ειρηνη) -νης
	9 υμων και) —
	10 (MT) φωνην οπισω μου μεγαλην) ∿2-3-φωνη μεγαλη (25% read ∿2-3-1-4)
	3.7 (MT) εν Φιλαδελφεια) εφιλ-
	18 χρυσιον) — (with παρ' εμοι preceding)
	19 εγω) εγνων *vid.*
	5.1 εσωθεν και εξωθεν) + ~~και οπισθεν~~ και οπισθεν, with the first two words crossed out by a horizontal line)
	4 αξιος) αξιος ~~αξιος~~ [*sic*]
	7.3 την[2] (*ante* θαλασσαν)) την την
	5 (MT) Ρουβιμ) Ρουφιμ*
	6 Ασηρ) ~~Ασυρ~~ Ασηρ* [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(81)	7.7 χιλιαδες^2) λιλιαδες
	11 προσεκυνησαν) -κισαν* (cf.204)
	14 εκ) ~~εκ~~ [*sic*] (N.B. *no* MS omits εκ)
	16 διψησουσιν) + addition in 5 MSS, within which 81 differs thus: τον^2) ——
	10.3 μυκαται) -τε [*sic*] (7 MSS = -τε uncorrected)
	7 του εβδομου αγγελου) του ~~επτα αγγελου~~ $\overline{\zeta}$ αγγελου [*sic*]
	10 κοιλια) υοχυια
	12.1 υποκατω) -τως*
	3 δεκα) $\overline{\iota\beta}$ [*sic*] (2 MSS = δωδεκα; 1 MS [204] reads $\overline{\iota\beta}$ uncorrected)
	4 εβαλεν) ελαβεν*
	οταν) ——
	τεκη) + και* (*supra linea*)
	9 ὁ^2 (*ante* μεγας)) —— (also omits ὁ^3 cum 8 MSS)
	εβληθησαν) + και εικοτως (cf.189,208)
	11 μαρτυριας) μακαριας*
	12 σκηνουντες) κηρνουντες* *vid.*
	17.4 μαργαριταις) μαριταις*
	6 ιδων) ιδὼν [*sic*] (2 MSS = ιδον uncorrected)
	12 και τα δεκα . . . ελαβον) ——*
	13 τω θηριω) τω θηριων (cf.67; 4 MSS = το θηριον)
	15 γλωσσαι) γνωσσαι
	20.3 (MT) ετι τα εθνη) τα ετη* [*sic*] (N.B. 21 MSS omit ετι; also note that ετη appears in the MT only 5 words later)
	8 και τον ~~Μαγωγ~~) —— (inserted in mg)
	15 εβληθη) + γεγραμμενος
	22.1 εκπορευομενον) εκεκπορ-
	4 και^2) και και
	αυτου^2) αυτου$ [*sic*]
	15 πορνοι) πονοι [*sic*]
	17 ειπατω) ευπ-
82	7.4 τεσσαρακοντα) σαρακοντα
	22.20/21 ^{20}ναι ερχομαι . . . ^{21}αμην) ναι ∴ [*sic*]
83	No MS appertains to this number.

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
84	1.8	κυριος ο Θεος) ο κυριος ο Θεος
	13	των επτα λυχνιων) ∿2-1-3
	16	δεξια) -ξεια
	3.2	(MT) εμελλες) ημελες (21% = ημελλες; cf.113,122)
	3	(MT) γνως) } -σης [*sic*]
		(other) γνωση)
	7	εν) + τη
	8	τον (*ante* λογον)) το*
		μου²) σου*
	10	ετηρησας) -σαν
	18	αισχυνη) -νης
	5.2	κηρυσσοντα) κυρυσσοντα [*sic*] (3 MSS = κυρυσσ-)
	9	γλωσσης) -ωσης*
	12	εσφαγμενον) -μενων [*sic*] (2 MSS = -μενων uncorrected)
	14	προσεκυνησαν) προσκυν-*
	7.1	(MT) τουτο) τουτον
	7	Συμεων) -μιων*; -μιων 84²
	8	(other) εσφραγισμεναι) -γιμ-
	13	λεγων) λεγω*
	15	σκηνωσει) -σι
	16	διψησουσιν) διψουσιν
	10.7	σαλπιζειν) -πισ-
	12.1	τον ηλιον) τον η σεληνη ηλιον [*sic*] (the clause και η σεληνη ... still follows)
	10	κατηγορος) καπη-
	14	του αετου) written twice
	15.2	υαλινην¹) υλινην [*sic*]
	7	γεμουσας) γεμους*
	17.3	πνευματι) νπι [*sic*]
	4	ακαθαρτα) ακαρθαρτα [*sic*]
	9	(MT) επτα ορη εισιν) 1-2-3-επτα [*sic*]
	14	εκλεκτοι) -λεπτοι
	16	μισησουσι) μεση-
		και³ (*ante* γυμνη)) και και
	17	εδωκεν) εδοκεν*
		εις) εις εις
	20.1	αλυσιν) αλλ-
	2	τον) το*
	4	μαρτυριαν) -ρειαν
	9	ανεβησαν) ανφεβ- [*sic*]
	22.8	προσκυνησαι) προκ-*
	9	σου²) —— (cf.120)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
85	No MS appertains to this number.
86	No MS appertains to this number.
87	1.20 επτα[6] *(final)*) α επτα (11 MSS = αι επτα)
	7.1 γης[1]) κεφαλης
	10.6 ὅς) ο
	10 ην) εγενετο
	12.7 αυτου[2] *(fin.vers.)*) ——
	15.6 ζωνας) ζωγας
88	12.2 το τεκνον) l-τεκνων
	17.2 πορνειας) -νης
89	3.5 (TR) εξομολογησομαι) (MT) ομολογησω) } εξομολογησω
	5.9 εσφαγης) εσφραγισας (cf.2)
	15.4 φοβηθη σε) ∿2-1
90	3.18 και ιματια λευκα ινα περιβαλη και) ——* (supplied in mg by *)
	7.3 αδικησητε) -κηση*
	12.16 δρακων) διαβολος
	17.4 ακαθαρτα) -θαρματα
	13 ουτοι) ητοι
	17 (MT) οι *(ante* λογοι*)*) ὁ*
91	1.18 τας κλεις) ∿ *post* αδου
	3.5 εκ της βιβλου) εν τη βιβλω (cf.95)
	17 και[4] *(ante* ο ελεεινος*)*) ——
	18 μη) ——
	19 (MT) ζηλωσον) ζητησον

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(91)	7.3	τους δουλους) 1-δουλου
	5	ιβ[1]/δωδεκα[1]) δυο και δεκα
	8	*omit* the "Zebulun" clause; then, *post* the "Joseph" clause, *add* the following clauses in order: "Reuben," "Asher," "Manasseh," "Levi," and "Zebulun." (Earlier, though *not* singularly, MS 91 had omitted these clauses, having read a double-column arrangement *across* and not *down* in his exemplar.)
	12.4	των αστερων του ουρανου) ∿3[β]-4-1[α]-2 [*sic*] (cf. 149)
	15	εβαλεν) εβελεν
	17.7	βασταζοντος) βασανιζ-
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
92	1.7	αυτον) αὐτη 92[mg2]
		πασαι) —
	9	τον λογον) του λογου (2 MSS = των λογον)
	12	(MT)* ελαλει) } ελαλει[ησε] [*sic*]
		(TR) ελαλησε)
	14	(MT) ως[3] (*ante* φλοξ)) ως ως*
	3.3	ουν) ϕϕϕ ουν [*sic*]
	5	περιβαλειται) -ληιται *vid.*
	15	ουτε[1]) ου*
	17	ταλαιπωρος) -πορος[ω] [*sic*] (14 MSS = -πορος uncorrected)
	5.6	καρατα) written twice
	7.9	μετα) μετα τα (N.B. ταυτα follows.)
	10.2	επι[1]) —
	12.16	εβαλεν) ϕανεβαλεν [*sic*] (1 MS = ανεβαλεν)
	18	θαλασσης) γης
	15.1	ειδον) ιδον (cum 18 MSS) + και ιδου (this addition erased by *)
	2	του ονοματος) omit του
	17.16	ουτοι) ουτω
	20.3	επανω αυτου) επανω ϕϕϕϕ αυτου [*sic*]
	4	προσεκυνησαν) -κυνησ[τ] [*sic*]
	8	Γωγ) Γογ* (2 MSS = Γογ uncorrected)
		Μαγωγ) Μϕγϕγ Μαγωγ [*sic*]
	9	εκυκλωσαν) -λευσε (41% = -λευσαν)
	22.19	απο του ξυλου (MT)) απο του ~~περος~~ βιβλιου [*sic*] (N.B. βιβλου = TR reading, with little MS support; *no* other MS reads with 92 here.)
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
93	3.2 (MT) εμελλες) εμελλε (cf. 1^{mg})
	5.2 σφραγιδας) φραγ-
	12.15 ποταμοφορητον) -μωφ-*
	17.18 εστιν) ——
94	1.20 χρυσας) + ταυτα εστιν (9 MSS + ταυτα εισιν)
95	1.2 (MT) τε) } ——
	(TR) οσα τε)
	3 τους) τους τους*
	11 και^{5} (*ante* Σαρδ.)) και και
	και εις^{5} (*ante* Φιλαδ.)) written twice
	14 κεφαλη) -λητ
	3.3 ηξω^{2}) ηξα
	5 εκ της βιβλου) εν βιβλω *vid.* (cf.91; 3 MSS omit της from MT reading)
	ζωης) + ταυτης *vid.*
	18 αισχυνη) -νητ
	5.5 σφραγιδας) + δι'
	12 σοφιαν) σοφι
	7.1 πνευη) πεσητ (5 MSS = πεση)
	11 ζωων) ζωιων
	15 του θρονου^{1}) 1-θρωνου
	10.1 οι ποδες) υποδες (cf.180 in 2:15 and 151 in 1:15)
	7 μελλη) μελητ [*sic*]
	9 γλυκυ) -κω*
	20.2 εκρατησε) εκρατη*
	4 επι^{2}) ——
96	3.5 ενωπιον^{2}) -πηον*
	10 της γης) της της γης
	15.6 επτα^{2}) ——
97	Contains no singular readings, though fully extant within the sample base chapters.

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
98	1.3 μακαριος) και μακαριος
	3/4 [3]εγγυς· [4]Ιωαννης ταις) εγγυς εστι ταις
	4 ταις εν τη Ασια) —
	12 χρυσας) -σους
	13 και[1]) ὁ
	14 ὡς χιων) ο χιων
	18 τας) —
	19 γινεσθαι) —
	20 και[2] *(ante* αι επτα*)*) —
	3.9 (MT) ηξωσι) αξ-
	των ποδων) αυτων ποδων*
	10 μου) σου
	18 αγορασαι) -σω
	5.8 εκαστος κιθαρας και φιαλας) εκ της κιθαρας φιαλας
	11 (MT) κυκλω) -λου
	7.2 απο) + της
	αδικησαι) + τε
	5 (MT) Ρουβιμ) Ρουβεν (11% = -βην; 10% = -βιν)
	8 Ζαβουλων) -λον
	9 ειδον) —
	15 του Θεου) — (cf.139)
	10.1 νεφελην) κεφαλην
	οι *(ante* ποδες*)*) —
	7 ευηγγελισε) ευαγγ- (2 MSS = ευαγγελισαι)
	δουλους αυτου) omit αυτου
	8 της[2] *(ante* γης*)*) —
	12.1 ωφθη) ωθη*
	9 εβληθη[2]) -θη
	14 του αετου του) του αυτου
	πετηται) πετησαι (8 MSS = πεσηται)
	17 αυτης) και της (cf.63)
	(MT) Ιησου) Θεου (cf. א)
	15.2 εκ του θηριου και εκ της εικονος αυτου) ~ της (—εκ)
	εικονος και εκ του θηριου αυτου
	4 ηξουσιν και) omit και
	8 εγεμισθη) εγενετος (cf.30)
	17.3 απηνεγκε με) απονεγκεμενοι
	4 μαργαριταις) -τοις
	5 η μητηρ) ημων (*ex* η μηρ?)
	12 θυπω) —
	13 γνωμην) —
	και *(ante* δυναμιν*)*) —
	14 αρνιου) αρκιου
	βασιλευς) -λεις (cf.119)
	16 σαρκας) —
	20.3 (MT) και μετα ταυτα) κατα δε ταυτα (4 MSS = μετα δε ταυτα)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(98)	20.14 ουτος εστιν ο δευτερος θανατος) ουτος ο δευτερος εν τη λιμνη του πυρος (—εστιν, —θανατος). (N.B. 72% of all MSS have η λιμνη του πυρος at end of verse; MS 136 *there* reads εν τη λιμνη του πυρος)
	22.4 αυτου[1]) ——
	6 δειξαι τοις δουλοις αυτου) ∿ *ad fin.vers.*
	7 ιδου ερχομαι ταχυ) ——
	14 αυτου) + του Θεου (N.B. αυτου follows MT εντολας; also, MS 154 reads του Θεου *pro* αυτου here.)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
99	1.1 τω δουλω) τω δουλου (cf.A)
	16 εχων) ειχων (11 MSS = ειχεν)
	20 επτα[6] *(final)*) —— (N.B. otherwise reads with TR/41% thus: αι επτα λυχνιαι ας ειδες.)
	3.5 περιβαλειται) περιβαλιβαληται [*sic*]
	7 (TR) κλειει και κλειει) κλει και κλει
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
100	5.1 κατεσφραγισμενον) + εσφραγισμένον (3 MSS = και εσφρ. *pro* κατεσφρ.)
	7.5 (MT) Ρουβιμ) Ροβιμ
	Γαδ) Ναδ [*sic* Γ *upon* Δ] (2 MSS = $\overline{\Delta\alpha\delta}$ uncorrected; 9 MSS = Δαν; also, the "Gad" and "Asher" clauses are transposed in MS 100, along with one other MS.)
	7 $\overline{\iota\beta}$ χιλιαδες) ∿2-δωδεκα (cf.164)
	10.4 φωνην εκ του ουρανου) ∿2-3-4-1
	5 εστωτα) ∿ *post* θαλασσης (12 MSS omit entirely)
	11 και γλωσσαις) —— (cum 146 comm., *non* txt)
	12.1 δωδεκα/$\overline{\iota\beta}$) εξ και δεκα (= $\overline{\iota\varsigma}$)
	5 ος) ον
	6 ερημον) + οπου εχει εκει τοπον εις την ερημον (= double dittography)
	16 εκ) απο
	15.3 του Θεου) αυτου
	17.3 πνευματι) + κυριου
	κεφαλας) κερατα
	10 και) και και (N.B. και[1] is at end of one page; και[2] begins the next page)
	17 Θεου) κυριου
	20.2 δρακοντα) [ ]κοντα (letters having been erased, among which a φ seems visible, and Hoskier suggests originally οφιν δρακοντα may have been intended, or perhaps οφιν *pro* δρακοντα)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(100)	20.2/3 ^{2}και εδησεν αυτον . . . ^{3}αβυσσον) ——
	7 Σατανας) σανᾶς [*sic*]
	9 ηγαπημενην) μεγαλην αυτους) αυτην
	11 και τοπος ουχ ευρεθη αυτοις) ∿1-3-4-2-5
	22.8 εβλεψα) + και
	18 (MT) επιθη) } απειθηση (TR) επιτιθη)
	19 αυτου) τουτου
	21 αγιων) + εις τους αιωνας
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
101	3.14 ὁ μαρτυς) written twice
	15.2 υαλινην^{2}) υλινην
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
102	1.3 ο γαρ καιρος εγγυς) ——
	4 χαρις) χαιρειν
	5 λουσαντι) + addition in 8 MSS, within which MS 102 reads thus: κιλιδων) κηλ-
	12 επιστρεψα) -ψαι
	3.1 σου τα εργα) + σου (3 MSS = ∿2-3-1)
	7 Δαδ) written twice
	13 ους) ωτα
	14 ο πιστος και αληθινος) ∿1-4-1-2 (—3) (cf.136; note also that 24 MSS omit και in the MT reading)
	5.4 βλεπειν) ιδειν 102^{2}
	12 σοφιαν) σοφην
	13 και τα) κἀι τους
	14 καιρου) -ρους *vid.*
	7.5 (TR) ιβ χιλιαδες εσφραγισμενοι^{1,2,3}) ∿3-2-1^{1,2,3}
	15.6 τας επτα πληγας) ∿1-3-1-2 περιεζωσμενοι) -μεναν *vid.*
	20.1 εχοντα) εχων (3 MSS = εχον)
	5/6 omit both verses* (partly supplied in mg by ^{2})
	6 μακαριος) -ροιος 102^{2} αγιος) αγοιος 102^{2} μερος) -ρως 102^{2} τη^{1,2}) τι 102^{2} τουτων) τουτο 102^{2} (2 MSS = τουτω) εσονται) -τε 102^{2} μετ' αυτου) —— 102^{2}
	12 τους νεκρους τους μεγαλους και τους μικρους) 1-2-5-6-7-1-2 (—3,4) [*sic*]
	15 γεγραμμενος) -αμε- (so too 3 other MSS, but later corrected; 102 here never corrected)

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(102)	22.6	(MT) των πνευματων των) 1-2-και (3 MSS = 1-2-και-3)
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
103	1.10	οπισω) -σω° [*sic vid.*]
	20	λυχνιας) λιχ- αγγελοι) -λι
	5.9	γλωσσης) γλω [*sic*; "mutilated" according to Hoskier]
	14	πρεσβυτεροι) -ρι
	7.3	αδικησητε) -κηται των μετωπων) τω-2 (2 MSS = τω μετωπω)
	4	(other) εσφραγισμενων) -νον
	15	αυτω) αυτων
	10.2	ευωνυμον) -μων
	8	(MT) ανεωγμενον) -νων (cf.159) εστωτος) εστοτος
	15.1	αυταις) ταυται
	17.13	τω θηριω) 1-θηριον (4 MSS = το θηριον; 4 MSS = το θηριω)
	20.10	των αιωνων) τον-2
	22.8	Ιωαννης) -ννη
	16	τον) των
	17	ακουων) -ον
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
104	1.5	λουσαντι) + addition in 8 MSS, within which 104 differs thus: λουσαντι) νουσαντι ποιησαντι ημας) + απο των αμαρτιων (cf.181 = at fin.vers.) βασιλειον) -λευον ιερατευμα) ερατευμα
	10	ως σαλπιγγος) ωσαλπιγγος
	14	αι) —
	3.1	εχεις) εχης (MT) οτι^2) } ὅ (cf.124) (other) και)
	2	τα λοιπα) των λοιπων
	4	εμολυναν) αιμ-
	5	εξαλειψω) -ληψωσι (cf.21)
	7	ανοιγων^2) + και κληων (9 MSS + και κλειων; = a conflation with a TR-type reading)
	8	μικραν) μηκ- εχεις) εχης

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(104)	3.9 ηγαπησα σε) ηγαποισασαι
	10 τηρησω) τυρισω
	πειρασαι) ποιρ-
	12 νικων) -κον (cf.154)
	(MT) ονομα[3] *(fin.vers.)*) ονονομα
	17 χρειαν) χριαν* (2 MSS read χριαν uncorrected)
	ταλαιπωρος) -λειπορ-
	5.2 το βιβλιον) το βυβ-
	3 ανοιξαι) ανηξαι
	3/4 [3]ουτε βλεπειν . . . [4]το βιβλιον) ——* (104[2] supplies only the missing portion of verse 4)
	4 αυτο) αυτω (cum 8 MSS) + ο εκ της φυλης
	5 Ιουδα) Ηουδα
	8 οι) ἡ
	γεμουσας) μετα (8 MSS = μεστας)
	11 πρεσβυτερων) πρπρεσβ-
	13 και[8] *(final, ante* το κρατος*)*) ——
	7.1 γωνιας) γονειας (cf.114)
	2 φωνη μεγαλη) φωνην μεγαλει (4 MSS = φωνην-2)
	3 αδικησητε) αδηκ-
	μητε την θαλασσαν) ——
	τους δουλους) written twice
	6 Μανασση) -ης
	9 αριθμησαι) αναριθ-
	12 ισχυς) ισχις
	εις) ——
	16 πεινασουσιν) πινασωσιν (8 MSS = πινασουσιν; 6 MSS = πεινασωσιν)
	17 (other) οδηγει) οδιγει
	10.1 καταβαινοντα) -βαινον
	περιβεβλημενον) -μεννον
	2 τον ποδα) το·ποδα [*sic*]
	ευωνυμον) ευονσιG [*sic vid. teste Hoskier*]
	3 εκραξεν[1]) -ραιξ-
	αι επτα) αιπτα [*sic*]
	4 αι επτα[2]) αιπτα [*sic*]
	(MT) μη αυτα)
	(TR) μη ταυτα)} ταυτα *solus*
	(other) μετα ταυτα)
	6 (TR) ουκ εσται ετι) 1-εστιν-3
	9 (MT) βιβλιδαριον) -ληδ-
	πικρανει) πεικ-
	γλυκυ) γληκη (2 MSS = γλυκη)
	11 λεγει) -γη
	επι[1] *(ante* λαοις*)*) εν τοις (cf.121)
	12.4 το τριτον των αστερων του ουρανου) ∿3-4-5-6-1-2 (cf. κ)
	10 ουρανω) ουρουνω [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(104)	12.10 αρτι) + ως
	14 πτερυγες) -γαις
	προσωπου) πρωσοπου
	15 ποταμοφορητον) -ρησει
	(MT) ποιηση) ——
	16/17 [16]εκ του στοματος . . . [17]δρακων) ——
	17 πολεμον) -λαιμ-
	15.1 εχοντας) εχωντας
	2 υαλινην[1]) αλινην *or* οελινην *vid.*
	υαλινην[2]) ηεληνην
	εικονος) ηκονος
	του αριθμου) των αριθμων
	4 παντα τα εθνη) παντας (—τα εθνη) (3 MSS omit τα εθνη; 43% read παντες *pro* παντα)
	5 ηνοιγη) -γην
	6 (MT) ναου οι ησαν ενδεδυμενοι) 1-2-ενδεδυμενη (—3)
	περιεζωσμενοι) -μενη
	8 εγεμισθη) -θι
	αι επτα) αι αιπτα
	17.1 επτα[1]) αιπτα
	2 του οινου) ——
	4 κεχρυσωμενη) -ρησ-
	5 το μετωπον) των μετοπων
	7 βασταζοντος) -ταιζ-
	14 νικησει) νηκεισει (3 MSS = νηκησει)
	16 (MT) ηρημωμενην) ειρημομ- (4 MSS = ειρημωμ-; 21% = ερημωμ-)
	17 γνωμην[1 *or* 2] *(uncertain due to haplography)*) γυμνωσιν
	20.1 κλειδα) μλειδα *vid.*
	2 τον) τους
	εδησεν) -δισ- (6 MSS = -δυσ-)
	3 (other) λυθηναι αυτον) ληθηναι-2
	4 εκαθισαν) -σα
	και κριμα . . . πεπελεκισμενων) ——
	μαρτυριαν) -τιρ-
	την εικονα αυτου) τη οικονι αυτων (63 MSS = τη εικονι αυτου)
	6 εσονται) εσσ-
	7 ετη) ετι
	8 εξελευσεται) -τε
	Γωγ) Γοϒ [*sic*] (3 MSS = Γογ)
	πολεμον) -λαιμ-
	10 λιμνην) λημ-
	11 προσωπου) πρωσωπου
	13 τους εν αυτοις νεκρους) τους εαυτην εκρους [*sic*]
	15 εν τη βιβλω) εις την βιβλω (N.B. neither εις την nor βιβλω is singular in itself; it is the particular *combination* here present which is unique).

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(104)	20.15 γεγραμμενος) γεγραμμαμενος
	22.1 ζωης) ζωντος
	θρονου) θρωνου
	2 (MT) αποδιδους) αποδους
	τα φυλλα) το φυλον (cf.45)
	4 προσωπον) πρωσωπον
	6 αληθινοι) αλιθινοι
	7 προφητειας) -φιτ-
	10 προφητειας) -φειτιας
	12 ταχυ) + addition in 4 MSS, within which 104 differs thus: προφητειας) -φειτιας
	15 κυνες) κινες
	και οι φονεις) —
	ειδωλολατραι) οι οιδωλωλατραι (cf.72,155)
	16 εκκλησιαις) -λισ-
	ειμι) ημι
	17 το[1]) τω
	19 γεγραμμενων) γεγραμμαμενων
	20 ταχυ) ταχει
105	No MS appertains to this number.
106	1.2 μαρτυριαν) -ρι
	11 εις βιβλιον και πεμψον) —
	3.2 (TR) μελλει) μελλεις
	(MT) εμελλες)
	7 ο ανοιγων[1]) και-1-2 (cf. ℵ)
	(MT) κλεισει) + και κλειων· και ουδεις κλεισει και κλειων (conflation of MT and TR, coupled with dittography of same; omits entirely the MT αυτην ει μη ο ανοιγων in the process.)
	9 αυτους) —
	12 και[4] *(final)*) —
	20 και αυτος μετ' εμου) 1-2-3-αυτου-1-2-3-4 [*sic*]
	5.9 καιγην) + και
	γλωσσης) -σσων
	11 του θρονου και) —
	7.10 ἡ) —
	10.3 αι επτα) οι-2
	4 βρονται[1]) + τας εαυτων φωνας (cum 4 MSS; cf.TR), + και οτε ελαλησαν αι επτα βρονται (dittog.)
	9 σου την κοιλιαν) 2-3-1 (cf.203)
	10 κατεφαγον) κατεφον

TABLE 6 — *Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
-(106)	12.2 βασανιζομενη) βιαζομενη
	15.1 και[2]) —
	8 εγεμισθη) -σκη *vid.*
	ο ναος) —
	17.2 επορνευσαν) επολεμησαν
	4 (MT) κοκκινον) κοκκιον
	8 (MT) επι της γης) } της γης (—επι)
	(other) — την γην)
	12 βασιλειαν) -λει
	15 οχλοι) οι οχλοι
	20.7 φυλακης) φυλης (cf.154)
	12 γεγραμμενων) καταγεγρ-
	22.14 πυλωσιν) πειλ-
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
107	7.4 εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες [= ρμδ]) ρμδ ς
	[*sic*, reflecting the presence of the και (= ς)]
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
108	1.1 Ιησου Χριστου) Ιωανου
	14 τριχες) τρυχες (cf.67)
	5.1 σφραγισιν) -γισεις
	3 ουδεις) -δης
	βιβλιον) + και λυσαι τας σφραγιδας αυτου (cf.113; here MS 108 conflates the MT and the singular reading of 113).
	7.4 εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες [= ρμδ]) 1-2-μδ
	10.1 τρις) ερις
	και το προσωπον αυτου) —
	10 γλυκυ) -κυν
	12.14 (MT) οπως τρεφηται) 1-στρεφηται (cf.69)
	καιρους) -ρονς [*sic*]
	15.2 μεμιγμενην) —
	εκ του θηριου και εκ της εικονος αυτου) ∿5-6-7-4-2-3 (—1,8)
	17.1 πολλων) πολων
	15 λαοι) λαος
	20.2 εκρατησε) επατησεν
	3 δει) ει
	4 πεπελεκισμενων) πελε-
	5 αὐτῃ) υτη
	22.2 ξυλον) -λων 108[2]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(108)	22.3 παν . . . αρνιου) —— 108^2
	5 (MT) φωτιει) } φωτισι 108^2 (12 MSS = φωτισει)
	(TR) φωτιζει)
	6 οι) —— 108^2
	(MT) των πνευματων των) } των $\overline{\text{πρων}}$ [= πατερων]
	(TR) των αγιων) και των 108^2
	(3 MSS = των πνευματων και των)
	11 (MT) ρυπαρευθητω) -θειτω 108^2
	17 ειπατω) εσπατω 108^2
	18 επ΄) ηπ΄ 108^2
109	3.9 ειναι) —— (cum 146 comm.)
	15.2 εκ του θηριου και εκ της εικονος αυτου) ∿5-6-7-4-1-2-3-αυτης
	17.16 τα) ——
	18 πολις) -λεις (2 MSS = -λης)
110	5.8 βιβλιον) ββλιον
	17.4 (other) πορφυραν) πορφυρ$^{\omega\nu}$ [*sic*]
111	1.12 επιστρεψας) -ρεφων
	14 κεφαλη) + ην
	3.18 (MT) αγορασαι χρυσιον παρ΄εμου) } παρ΄εμου αγ.χρ.
	(TR) αγορασαι παρ΄εμου χρυσιον)
	εγχριση) -σηι
	βλεπης) εμβλεπηις (3 MSS = εμβλεπης)
	5.11 χιλιαδες) χιαδες* *vid.* (N.B. for χιλιαδων which follows, 2 MSS read χιαδων, but *not* 111!)
	12 και^{5}(*ante* δοξαν)) + την (N.B. 111 also adds την before σοφιαν, ισχυν, and τιμην, but there along with ~~13~~ MSS, 1 MS, and 1 MS respectively).
	και^{6}(*ante* ευλογιαν)) + την
	13 λεγοντας) λεγοντος, *and* ∿ *post* θρονου
	τω καθημενω) του καθημενου
	αρνιω) + δοθησεται
	7.1 (MT) επι τι δενδρον) } επι δενδρων (cf.226; 4 MSS omit τι/παν)
	(TR) επι παν δενδρον)
	4 Ισραηλ) των Ιαραηλιτων
	6 Μανεσση) Μανασσ˜ [*sic fin.lin.*]
	9 (TR) αυτον) αυτων

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(111)	7.11 κυκλω) -λωι
	12 αμην[1]) + και
	10.6 και την θαλασσαν) ——
	12.5 παντα τα εθνη) ν2-3-1
	15.1 εχοντας) -τα
	3 ωδην[1]) ωιδην
	8 αχρι) αχρις
	17.6 αυτην) + μεθυουσαν
	12 αλλ᾽) ——
	15 εισι) εκει
	20.3 εβαλεν) ενεβ-
	(MT) και μετα ταυτα) μετα ταυτα δε (4 MSS = μετα δε ταυτα; note also the δει following).
	4 και ουκ) ουδε
	6 χριστου) + αυτου (cf.113)
	8 αριθμος) + αυτου (45% + αυτων)
	15 ευρεθη) ηυρ-
	22.2 αυτης) ταυτης
	ξυλου) ξηλου
	14 εις την πολιν) εν τη πολει
	16 ο λαμπρος) ο λαμπρων
	18 ακουοντι) ακουσαντι
112	1.5 μαρτυς) + του $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ (but crossed out)
	αμαρτιων) -τηματων
	14 εριον) ερεῖον [*sic*] (9 MSS = ερειον uncorrected)
	16 εκπορευομενη) -ρεσομ- *vid.*
	20 το) ο
	5.10 (TR) ημας . . . βασιλευσομεν) ημας ... βασιλευουσιν (neither reading in itself is singular, but the particular combination here is such.)
	7.3 αδικησητε) -κειται [*sic*] (both * and [2] singular!)
	5 $\overline{\iota\beta}$ χιλιαδες[1,2]) ν2-1[1,2]
	10 (other) θρονου) + και των πρεσβυτερων (*sic, ex v.11*) (cf.187 for a non-corrected version of this reading).
	10.2 (other) βιβλιδαριον) βεβλ-
	12.10 φωνην) written twice
	15.1 αυταις) ταυτας
	4 σου[3] (*final*)) ——
	5 σκηνης) σηκυης *vid.*
	17.3 ειδον) + εν $\overline{\pi\nu\iota}$, but erased by *

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(112)	17.4	μαργαριταις) μαρχγαρ-
	8	(MT) οτι) ‘σ¨ [*sic*]
	17	τω θηριω) του θηριου
	20.9	εκυκλωσαν) -λοσαν 112^2
	10	τους αιωνας των αιωνων) αιωνα αιωνος
	14	πυρος) +*(ex 20:15)* και ειτις ουχ ευεθη*
	15	εβληθη) -θει
	22.1	κρυσταλλον) -ταλ$^{\lambda}$ου [*sic*]
		και^2 *(final)*) ——
	6	πιστοι και αληθινοι) ∿3-2-1+ addition in 9 MSS, within which 112 reads singularly: προφερομενοι) προσφ-
113	1.1	δειξαι) -ξε
		γενεσθαι) -θε
		ταχει) ταχυ
		εσημανεν) -μαινεν *vid.*
	2	ειδε) οιδεν (16 MSS = ιδεν; 7 MSS = ειδον)
	5	απο^1) του
	6	(MT) βασιλειαν) } βασι$^{\lambda}$ [*sic*]
		(TR) βασιλεις)
		δοξα) δχ [*sic*]
	7	ιδου ερχεται μετα των νεφελων και) ——
		οψεται) -τε
		και^3 *(ante* κοψονται*)*) ——
		κοψονται) οψοντε (4 MSS = οψονται)
	10	πνευματι) $\overline{\text{πνι}}$κος (??—Hoskier I:377 says $\overline{\text{πνι}}$κ$\underline{\omega}$ς *vid.*)
	11	λεγουσης) -σα
		πεμψον) + αυτα
		(MT) ταις επτα εκκλησιαις) ——
		εις Σμυρναν) εισμυρνα
	12	ητις) ειτις
	13	λυχνιων) -νηων
		τοις μαστοις) τους μαστους + αυτου
	14	και^2 *(ante* οι οφθαλ.*)*) ——
	14/15	^{14}ως φλοξ πυρος ^{15}και οι ποδες αυτου) —— (supplied illegibly on top of page?)
	15	χαλκολιβανω) -λιμβανω
	17	αυτον) ——
		προς) παρα (8 MSS = επι; 10 MSS = εις)
		(MT) εθηκε) + επ’ εμε
		επ’ εμε) —— (cf. preceding entry)
		ο^1) —— (5 MSS omit ο^2, but *not* 113)
	18	ιδου) + εγω
	20	(TR) και αι επτα λυχνιαι ας ειδες επτα εκκλησιαι εισι) 1-οι-3-4-αγγελων των-7-8-9

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(113)	3.2 λοιπα) λιπα (MT) εμελλες) } μελης (cf.122,84) (TR) μελλει)
	3 επι σε^{2}) —— (113 retains επι σε^{1} cum MT)
	4 εμολυναν) -λιναν
	5 ιματιοις λευκοις) λευκεις (—ιματιοις) αυτου^{3} (*fin.vers.*)) του Θεου
	7 εκκλησιας) εκλ- (MT) και ουδεις ανοιξει) ——
	8 σου τα εργα) ∿2-3-σα *vid.* (cf. ℵ)
	10 της ωρας) της ημερας της οικουμενης ολης) ∿3-1-2 (cf.226)
	12 ἐκ του ουρανου) —— (N.B. 38% read απο-2-3)
	13 εκκλησιαις) εκλ-
	14 ταδε) αδε (Rubric?)
	15 ἤ) και ου (cf.119)
	16 ουτως) αλ' [*sic*] (no other MS reads αλλ'/αλλα) εμεσαι) -σε
	17 (MT) και ο ελεεινος και πτωχος) ∿4-5-1-3 (—2) (35% = omit 2 within MT)
	18 συμβουλευω) -ευομαι σοι) σε περιβαλη) -λεις (3 MSS = -λης) (MT) κολλυριον) κωλυριον (MT) εγχριση) } χρησης (cf.26*) (TR) εγχρισον)
	20 την θυραν) της θυρας προς αυτον) επ' αυτω και αυτος μετ' εμου) ——
	21 εν τω θρονω^{1}) επι του θρονου (so also in ^{2}, but there cum 1 other MS; note that here 113 omits the preceding μετ' εμου, cum 5 MSS)
	5.1 επι την δεξιαν) εν τη δεξια
	2 κηρυσσοντα) κυρησοντα (cf.72,84) μεγαλη) + λεγων (MT) εστιν (*ante* ανοιξαι)) + λαβειν και το βιβλιον) τω-2
	3 (MT) εδυνατο) -τω (cf. B) της γης^{2}) + λαβειν και ουτε βλεπειν αυτο) και λυσε [*sic pro* λυσαι] τας σφραγιδας αυτου (cf. 108's conflation of this reading + MT; note also 2 MSS omit ουδε βλ. αυτο)
	4 (MT) ανοιξαι) λαβειν
	6 (MT) αποστελλομενα) -στελομ- γην) + κυριου
	8 επεσον) + και προσεκυνησαν ενωπιον) + του θρονου (TR) κιθαρας) χιθαρας*
	9 λεγοντες) λεγουσαι (cf.144) λαβειν) + και ανοιξε

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(113)	5.9 το βιβλιον) τω-2+ και λυσε εθνους *(fin.vers.)* + και λαων και γλωσσ [*sic*] και εθνους
	13 και[2]) ——
	αυτοις) αυτη
	παντα . . . λεγοντας) παν . . . λεγον [*sic*] (cf.120)
	7.1 τεσσαρας[1,2,3]) τεσαρεις (cf.12)
	θαλασσης) -ασης
	2 μεγαλην) + λεγων
	τεσσαρσιν) τεσα- (cf.201)
	και την θαλασσαν) ——
	9 εκ παντος) εκτος
	10 τω καθημενω) του -νου (N.B. in the entire phrase within which these words occur, *every* word is in the genitive, though with other MS support.)
	11 και των πρεσβυτερων και των τεσσαρων ζωων) ∿4-5-6-7-1-2-3
	τω Θεω) αυτω
	13 και[1]) ς' και [*sic*; = dittography]
	λεγων) -γον
	15 αυτω) αυτον
	10.1 του) ——
	περιβεβλημενον) -λυμ-
	στυλοι) στειλοι
	2 (MT) εχων) εχον
	τη χειρι) τη δεξια
	ανεωγμενον) γεγραμενον [*sic*]
	(MT) της γης) της θαλασσης (N.B. 113 reads της θαλασσης cum MT earlier in verse).
	3 μεγαλη) + λεγων
	μυκαται) κυμαται
	ελαλησαν) ——
	4 (MT) αι επτα βρονται[1]) ——
	5 θαλασσης) -ασης
	6 αυτω) αυτη
	θαλασσαν) -ασαν
	(MT) ουκετι εσται) 1-εστε
	7 μελλη) μελει (40 MSS = μελλει)
	σαλπιζειν) -ζην
	8 λεγουσα) λεγων
	το[2] *(ante* ηνεωγ.*)*) —— (note that 113 also omits ηνεωγ. cum 2 MSS)
	εν τη χειρι) εκ της χειρος (2 MSS = εκ χειρος)
	9 αυτω) αυτον (cf.233)
	γλυκυ ως μελι) ∿ ως μελη γλυκαζων (cf. 3 MSS which read in 10:10 γλυκαζων *pro* γλυκυ, apparently due to Ezek.3:3)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS Singular readings within the sample chapters

(113) 10.10 και^{2}) και και
αυτο^{1}) —
11 εθνεσι) εθνη
12.3 αλλο) αλον (9 MSS = αλλον)
επτα^{2}) δεκα
4 αυτους) —
της μελλουσης τεκειν) —
5 αρρενα) αρεν [*sic*] (9 MSS = αρενα; no MS = αρεν)
μελλει) μελη
ποιμαινειν) ποιμανε
9 εβληθη^{1,2}) εβλυθη
εβληθησαν) -βλυθ-
10 σωτηρια) βασιλεια (cf.130)
βασιλεια) εξουσια (cf.130)
εξουσια) βασιλεια
(MT) εβληθη) εβλυθη
12 (MT) θαλασση) -ασει (cf.69)
προς) εφ'
εχων θυμον μεγαν) —
13 ειδεν) οιδεν
εβληθη) εβλυθη
14 εδοθησαν) εδωθη (6 MSS = εδόθη)
πετηται) πετετε (13 MSS = πετεταὶ; 6 MSS = πετητε)
απο) εκ
προσωπου του) προσωτου [*sic*]
18 θαλασσης) -ασης
15.2 θαλασσαν) -ασαν
θηριου) -ρηου
4 σε) συ
5 ο ναος της σκηνης) η σκηνη
6 (TR) καθαρον και λαμπρον) ∿3-2-1
7 του ζωντος) τους-2 (2 MSS = του σωζοντος)
8 (other) ναος εκ του καπνου) 1-και-2-3-4
17.1 δειξω) -ξο
2 εμεθυσθησαν) εμαγευσαν (cf.9:21; 18:23)
4 περιβεβλημενη) -λυμ-
(MT) κοκκινον) κοκηνον
βδελυγματων) -ματα
5 μετωπον) μετοπον
8 απωλειαν) απολιαν (16 MSS = απολειαν)
θαυμασονται) -σουσιν
(MT) ων ου γεγραπται τα ονοματα) } 1-ουκ εστε το ονομα
(other) ων ου γεγρ. το ονομα) αὐτων γεγραμενον
[*sic*]
(MT) το βιβλιον) το βιβλιω (6 MSS = τω βιβλιω)
ζωης) + του αρνιου
9 οπου η γυνη . . . επτα εισιν) — (N.B. 113 reads MT επτα ορη εισιν just preceding).

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(113)	17.10	και οταν ελθη) ——
		μειναι) -νε
	12	ειδες) οιδες $^{\lambda^{1}}$
		βασιλειαν) βασι [*sic*]
	14	κυριων) μυριων
	15	οὗ η πορνη) και η γυνη η πορνη οὗ (14 MSS = και η γυνη οὗ η πορνη)
		καθηται) -τε
		λαοι και οχλοι εισι, και εθνη και γλωσσαι) ∿1-5-6-7-γλωσαι-4 (—2,3) (3 MSS read γλωσαι)
	16	ποιησουσιν^{1}) -σοσιν (12 MSS = -σωσιν)
	17	ποιησαι^{1}) -σε (cf. ℵ re: ποιησαι^{2})
		δουναι) -νε
——	20.1	εκ του ουρανου) απο-3 (—2)
	3	επανω αυτου) ——
	4	πεπελεκισμενων) -κυμενον (11 MSS = -κημενων)
	5	η^{1}) —— (2 MSS omit *both* η^{1,2}; 2 MSS omit η^{2} only)
	6	Χριστου) χριστῳ (cum 2 MSS) + αυτου (cf.111)
		μετ' αυτου) μετα του Χριστου (cf.218)
	7	τελεσθη) -θωσιν
		λυθησεται) -τε (cf.72)
	8	πλανησαι) -σε
		ως η αμμος) ος ι' αμος [*sic*] (3 MSS = 1-2-αμος)
		θαλασσης) -ασης
	9	παρεμβοληην) παραβοληην ταυτην (3 MSS have παραβ-)
	10	και θειου) την καιομενην εν τω θειω (cf.32,143)
		θηριον) + εβλυθησαν (2 MSS + εβληθησαν; cf. also 130)
		βασανισθησονται) βανισθ-
	12	(MT) τους μεγαλους και τους μικρους) ∿4-5-3-1-2, but then ∿ *post* MT θρονου later in verse (5% read ∿4-5-1-2-3 in original location).
		ηνεωχθησαν και βιβλιον αλλο ηνεωχθη) ∿1-αλλον-3-ηνεωχθην (—2) (neither αλλον nor ηνεωχθην are singular, but this particular combination of readings is such).
		και^{4} (*ante* βιβλιον) ——
		ὃ) εν ᾧ
	13	και ο θανατος και ο αδης εδωκαν <u>τους νεκρους αυτων</u>) ∿ *ante* και εδωκεν η <u>θαλασα</u> [*sic*] τους νεκρους <u>τους τους</u> [*sic*] εν αυτη (underlined portions absolutely singular)
	14	εβληθησαν) εβλυθ-
	22.1	υδατος ζωης) ——
		εκ) + μεσω (cf.164)
	2	εν μεσω) εμεσω
		ποιουν) εχων
		ξυλου) + καταγγελετε (14 MSS + καταγγε<u>λλεται</u>)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(113)	22.2 των εθνων) τοις πιστοις (cf.164)
	3 (MT) καταθεμα) καταθαιμα (cf.136,217)
	αυτω) αυτον
	5 εσται) εστε
	και χρειαν ουκ εχουσιν λυχνου και φωτος ηλιου) ∿1-ου-2-4-φως-8-6-φως-5 (∿1-ου-2-4 cum MS 21; 36 MSS read φως *ante* ηλιου)
	6 αληθινοι) + εισιν του Θεου (cf.12, + εισιν only)
	γενεσθαι) -θε
	ταχει) ταχυ
	7 προφητειας) + και
	8 και[1]) —
	εμπροσθεν) ενωπιον
	10 της προφητειας) τη επροφητιας *vid. Sic, teste Hoskier; but cf. B in loc.*
	11 ο δικαιος) ο δικαιωσας
	ετι[4] *(final)*) —
	14 εσται) εστε
	16 Ιησους/ΙC) ως
	Δαδ) + ο λογος (3 MSS + και ο λογος)
	17 (MT) ερχου και[1]) — (has MT ερχου και[2])
	δωρεαν) -ραιαν
	18 τω ακουοντι) το ακουων
	προφητειας) + ταυτης (cf.233)
	εαν τις) ος αν (cf.19)
	19 (MT) αφελη) ωφειλη
	ο Θεος το μερος αυτου) αυτον ο Θεος απο
	21 ημων Ιησου Χριστου) —
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
114	3.2 γινου γρηγορων) —
	7 (TR) ανοιγει) ανυγει
	12 *fin.vers.*) + addition in 3 MSS, within which 114 reads singularly:
	καρδιαν) + φησι
	19 ελεγχω) ελλ-
	5.9 εἰ) ἤ
	7.1 γωνιας) -νειας (cf.104)
	10.2 (other) βιβλιδαριον) το βιβ.
	9 σου[1]) ου
	17.8 (other) παρεστιν) + θαυμασοντα . . . βλεποντων from earlier in verse.
	20.4 ειδον) -δων
	το μετωπον) του-2
	13 θαλασσα) θαλλ-
	τους εν αυτοις νεκρους) 1-εαυτον-4
	εκριθησαν) εκρηθησαν

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(114)	22.2/3 [2]και του ποταμου . . . [3]ουκ εσται ετι) ——
	6 απεστειλεν) -τηλεν
	9 προσκυνησον) -νησην
	17 (MT) λαβετω) -το
	18 επιθησει) -θεισι
	20 ναι ερχομαι) ανερχομε (cf.121,241)
115	No MS appertains to this number.
116	No MS appertains to this number.
117	No MS appertains to this number.
118	No MS appertains to this number.
119	1.8 παντοκρατωρ) -τ$\overset{o}{\omega}$κ- [*sic*] (6 MSS = -τοκρατορ; 2 MSS = -τωκρατωρ)
	9 Ιωαννης) -ννης$^{\varsigma}$ [*sic*]
	3.3 ποιαν) written twice
	10 υπομονης) υπα $\overset{ομ}{\text{κ}}$ης* [*sic*]
	15 ζεστος) ζεγος*
	ἡ) ου
	18 πλουτησης) -τησας*
	20 την θυραν) 1-θυρα (4 MSS = τη θυρα)
	5.6 οφθαλμους) -λ$\overset{μ}{\text{φ}}$ους [*sic*]
	9 εσφαγης) -φραγης
	7.8 χιλιαδες[3]) χιλιευδες *vid.*
	12.5 ποιμαινειν) ποι$\overset{\prime\prime\prime}{\mu}$] [*sic, fin.lin.*]
	10 του Θεου ηνων και η εξουσια) ——* (reading του $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ αυτου, corrected to του $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ ημων by *; hand[2] adds in και η εξουσια του $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ αυτου.)
	17.8 $\overline{\text{το}}$ θηριον[2]) το θηριω* (none other read even τω θηριω; this despite ample opportunity for attraction from τω βιβλιω in some MSS later in verse).
	14 βασιλευς) -λες (cf.98)
	20.6 βασιλευσουσιν) -ευσου [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(119)	22.19 (MT) ξυλου) } βιβλιου $119^{mg\,3}$ (TR) βιβλου)
120	1.2 (MT) οσα ειδε) οσα δε (cf. TR οσα τε ειδε, though here ειδε is omitted in either case).
	15 πολλων) πολων (cf.174)
	3.3 (MT) γνως) } γνωσας (cf.84) (other) γνωση)
	14 εκκλησιας) —
	16 μελλω) μθελλω [*sic*] (cf.21,138)
	5.7 θρονου (*fin.vers.*)) + το βιβλιον (cum 11%) + τα δ̄ ζωα, but then crossed out.
	11 πολλων) πολων
	13 ηκουσα λεγοντας) και ηκ. παλιν λεγοντων (each of the new readings has other MS support; it is the particular combination of these which is singular here.
	14 προσεκυνησαν) -κην-* *vid.*
	7.2 (MT) αναβαινοντα) + και
	3 αδικησητε) -τι
	17 οφθαλμων) οφθλαμων [*sic*]
	10.4 εμελλον) εμελον
	7 μελλη) -μελλη [*sic*] (4 MSS = μελη uncorrected)
	12.12 ευφραινεσθε) -θαι + τε και (32 MSS read -θαι without the addition; also, cf.67).
	15.3 δικαιαι και) δικαιε και δικαιαι και [*sic*]
	5 ηνοιγη) ηνοι
	20.4 το μετωπον) τω μετοπον (11 MSS = το μετοπον)
	8 τεσσαρσι) τερσασι (8 MSS = τεσαρσι)
	θαλασσης) θαλλ-
	9 και^{3} (*ante* την πολιν)) και και
	11 αυτοις) εν αυτοις
	22.4 το^{2}) τω
	8 δεικνυοντος) δεκνυντος (43% = δεικνυντος; cf.ℵ)
	15 πορνοι) πορ [*sic*]
	16 (MT) ο πρωινος) ο προιων
	17 (MT) ερχου^{1,2}) ερχου . . . ερχη
	λαβετω) λαβε*, with $\overset{\omega}{\tau}$ *sic* inserted above the ε.
121	1.3 γαρ) —
	4 εκκλησιαις) -σιας
	6 αυτω) φ̄
	9 εγενομην) -μη

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(121)	1.11 εις Σμυρναν) εις μυρναν [*sic*]
	12 επιστρεψα) υπεσ-
	βλεπειν) βλεψαι
	επιστρεψας) υποστ-
	18 νεκρος) νοκ-
	3.12 εξω) ——
	14 αληθινος) αληθης
	7.1 κρατουντας) + ινα μη πνεη*, but erased by *
	τους (*ante* τεσσαρας[3]) τας
	9 (TR) περιβεβλημενοι) -βιβλιμ-
	13 περιβεβλημενοι) -βεβλιμ-
	10.11 επι[1] (*ante* λαοις)) + τοις (cf.104)
	και βασιλευσι πολλοις) και βασιλευς της γης (cf.59)
	12.8 και) ——
	9 omit verse
	15 οπισω) εν μεσω
	16 η γη[1]) η γη η γη [*sic*] (cf.159)
	15.5 ουρανω) ναω
	17.3 καθημενην) ἑθιμ-
	8 (MT) το βιβλιον) omit το (cf.58)
	15 τα) τα τα*
	20.3 και εβαλεν . . . χιλια ετη) ——
	αυτον λυθηναι) ∿ κλυθηναι-1 (45% = ∿2-1)
	4 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	10 θειου) θυιου *vid.*
	11 ἡ γη) και γη
	22.2 πλατειας) πολιτειας (5 MSS = πολεως)
	6 και[3] (*ante* κυριος)) ——
	11 (MT) δικαιοσυνην ποιησατω) 1-ποιειτω (2 MSS = ποιητω)
	15 και ποιων ψευδος) το ψευδος (—και ποιων)
	19 απο των λογων τον βιβλιον της προφητειας ταυτης) ——
	20 ναι ερχομαι) ανερχομαι* (cf.114,241)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
122	1.7 οψεται) οψε*
	11 εις Σμυρναν) εις μυρναν* [*sic*]
	εις Σαρδεις) εισαρδϛϛ [*sic*] (3 MSS = εις Αρδεις; 3 MSS = εισαρδεις)
	20 (MT) αι λυχνιαι) omit αι
	3.2 (MT) εμελλες) ημελες [*sic*] (cf.84,113; 21% = ημελλες)
	4 αξιοι εισιν) αξιοισιν (cf.15)
	18 πεπυρωμενον εκ πυρος) πεπυρωμενος κπυρος [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(122)	5.8 θυμιαματων) θυματων [*sic*] (2 MSS = θυματων uncorrected)
	12 και ισχυν) ——
	7.1 ανεμους) ανενεμους
	5/6 ^{5}εκ φυλης Γαδ . . . ^{6}Νεφθαλειμ ιβ χιλιαδες) ——*
	6 Νεφθαλειμ) -λαι 122mg
	7/8 ^{7}εκ φυλης Συμεων ιβ χιλιαδες) ∿ from verse 7 to verse 8 *post* the "Zebulun" clause. (5 MSS omit this clause without re-insertion!)
	9 αριθμησαι) αρηθ-
	16 αυτους) αυτοις
	10.3 οτε) ——
	4 βρονται^{2}) βροται
	7 (MT) ετελεσθη) ετεσθη*
	11 και επι εθνεσιν . . . πολλοις) ——
	12.1 ποδων) πονδων
	3 κεφαλας^{1}) -αλλας
	6 οπου) + ουκ
	7 και εγενετο πολεμος εν τω ουρανω) ——
	10 νυκτος) -τας
	14 εδοθησαν) $^{\varepsilon}$δοθησαν [*sic*]
	15.1 αυταις) $^{\alpha\upsilon}$ταις [*sic*]
	6 ενδεδυμενοι) εδεδυ- [*sic*]
	17.2 εμεθυσθησαν) + και
	7 εγω) ——* }(both inserted supr.lin. by *)
	της) ——*
	8 (MT) το θηριον οτι ην και ουκ εστιν) ∿3-1-2-6-7 (—4,5) (45% = ∿3-4-1-2-5-6-7)
	17 Θεου (*fin.vers.*)) + και η γυνη ην ειδες (N.B. the dittography here was likely unintentional, though a scholia intervenes between verses 17 and 18).
	20.12 (MT) τους νεκρους τους μεγαλους και τους μικρους) ∿6-7-5-3-4-2 (—1)
	(MT) ηνοιξαν και αλλο βιβλιον ηνεωχθη) ηνεωξαν και βιβλιον ηνεωχθη (—αλλο)
	22.14/15 ^{14}ινα εσται . . . ^{15}ψευδος (*fin.vers.*)) ——
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
123	3.5 (MT) ομολογησω) -γισω
	8 μου^{1}) ——
	15 ψυχρος^{2}) ——
	10.8 ην) ης
	λαλουσα) -σης
	λεγουσα) -σης

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(123)	17.4	(MT) τα ακαθαρτα της) των ακαθαρτων των (2 MSS = ακαθαρτων της; cf.148)
	8	ων ου γεγραπται) ω 8 ουγεγραπται *vid. sic* (2 MSS = ων ουκ εγεγραται)
		(MT) και παρεσται) } και παρεστιν [*sic*]
		(other) και παρεστιν)
	16	φαγονται) -γωσοι (4 MSS = -γωσι)
124	1.11	εις[2] (*ante* Εφεσον)) ει
	20	ων) —* (inserted in mg by *)
	3.1	(MT) οτι[2]) } ὃ και (cf.104)
		(other) και)
	3	πως ειληφας και ηκουσας και τηρει) ∿5-6-1-2-3-4
	5	βιβλου) -λιου *vid.*
	18	αγορασαι) —
	5.6	του Θεου) · τα προς Θυ [*sic*]
	10.3	ελαλησαν) -σεν
	4	ουρανου) εβδομου αγγελου (*ex.* 10:7? Cf.130)
	10	αυτο[2]) + και ην εν τω στοματι μου ως μελι γλυκυ (N.B. και immediately follows this dittography, but cum 2 other MSS).
	11	παλιν προφητευσαι) written twice
	12.9	ολην . . . εβληθησαν (*fin.vers.*)) ολην εβληθησαν, with no intervening words.
	10	σωτηρια) σρ̄ [*sic*]
	15	ως ποταμον) 1-ποταμος* *vid.*
	15.4	προσκυνησουσιν) -σ̈σιν* [*sic*]
	5	της σκηνης) τος-2
	17.9	επ' αυτων) απανω (2 MSS [14-92] = επανω αυτων; MS 124 is *not* part of that family).
	16	ποιησουσιν[1]) -σ̈σιν* [*sic*] (12 MSS = -σωσιν uncorrected).
125	1.11	και εις Θυατ. και εις Σαρδ.) —* (in mg by *)
	20	τας[2]) —
	3.17	ταλαιπωρος) -πος*
	5.13	η[1] (*ante* ευλογια)) ἡ ἡ
	7.1	μητε επι της θαλασσης) —*
	10.2	ευωνυμον) το δε ευ. [*sic*] (4 MSS = το δε ευ. uncorrected)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(125)	17.1	υδατων των) 1-των των
	9	εισιν[1]) εστιν
	10	μειναι) ειναι (Rubric? But cf. Vict.: *brevi tempore erit*!)
126	1.15	ομοιοι) ομιως
	5.1	εσωθεν) -θε
	17.8	καταβολης) -λεις
	20.4	και εζησαν) και εζητησαν
127	1.16	δυναμει) ισχυρι*
	20.3	(MT) ετι τα εθνη) επι-2-3
128	3.5	ιματιοις λευκοις) ∿2=1
	10.4	του ουρανου) τον ουρανον (εκ precedes)
		(MT) μη αυτα) 1-αυτας
	22.7	προφητειας) + ταυτης* (N.B. 4 MSS read ταυτης *pro* του βιβλιου τουτου; MS 128 conflates)
129	5.8	των αγιων) omit των
	7.3	αυτων) ημων
	5	(TR) εσφραγισμενοι[1,2]) -ναι (in the remaining cases MS 129 omits εσφρ. cum MT).
130	1.9	(MT) εν $\overline{\text{Χω}}$ $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$) } εν $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ $\overline{\text{Χυ}}$
		(TR) — $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ $\overline{\text{Χυ}}$)
		εγενομην . . . $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ $\overline{\text{Χυ}}$ (*fin.vers.*) —
	12	βλεπειν) επι
	13	ομοιον) -ος
		ενδεδυμενον) -ος
		περιεζωσμενον) -ος
	17	(MT) την δεξιαν αυτου . .) } την χειρα αυτου
		(TR) την δεξιαν αυτου χειρα)
	3.2	(MT) στηρισον) στησον
	3	μνημονευε) -ευσον (cf. in 2:5; same, but cum 7 MSS)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS.	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(130)	3.5 περιβαλειται) -λειτω
	10 ετηρησας) ηγαπησας
	ολης) ——
	πειρασαι τους κατοικουντας) κατωικουν πειρασαι τους ληστας
	11 ὃ) οσα
	16 οτι) ——
	εμεσαι) -σειν
	17 ουδενος) ουδε (12 MSS = ουδεν)
	ελεεινος) αληθινος (*ex* verse 14?)
	18 (TR) κολλουριον) κολουριον (cf.150)
	5.2 ισχυρον κηρυσσοντα) ∿2-ισχυρα (cf. ℵ)
	μεγαλη) ——
	6 εν μεσω[1]) εμμεσω (2 MSS = εμμεσω in case [1] *and* [2])
	κερατα) κερα*
	8 ελαβεν) ειληφεν
	9 εσφαγης και ηγορασας) ηγιασας *solus*
	9/10 [9]ημας εν τω αιματι . . . [10](MT) εποιησας αυτους τω Θεω) —— (cf.200)
	13 λεγοντας) -τος
	14 (MT) και προσεκυνησαν) ——
	7.1 επι τας) εις (—τας)
	ινα) Ισραηλ (Ιηλ)
	12 η ευλογια και η δοξα) ∿4-5-3-1-2
	10.4 γραφειν) + αυτα
	ουρανου) εβδομου ουρανου (cf.124)
	5 ειδον) ιδες
	8 η φωνη ην ηκουσα εκ του ουρανου, παλιν λαλουσα μετ' εμου, και λεγουσα) ∿ την φωνην-4-8-του λαλουντος-10-11-5-6-7-λεγουσαν
	12.2 και[2]) ——
	6 διακοσιας) οκτακοσιας (making the total = 1860; cf. 2 MSS which read 1860 thus: αωξ)
	10 η[2] (*ante* δυναμις)) ——
	βασιλεια) σωτηρια (cf.113 earlier)
	12 δια τουτο) ——
	14 εις[1]) ——
	(MT) οπως) } ινα (cf.201)
	(TR) οπου)
	17 των λοιπων) ——
	15.2 εχοντας) εχουσαν
	κιθαρας) -ραν
	3 Μωσεως) Μωϋση
	την ωδην[2]) ——
	4 ου μη φοβηθη σε) ∿4-2-3 (—1) (7 MSS = ∿4-1-2-3)
	δοξαση) θαυμαση
	6/7 [6]εκ του ναου . . . [7]τεσσαρων ζωων) omit, replacing lack with ἃς between [6]πληγας and [7]εδωκεν.

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(130)	17.4 (other) πορνειας της γης) πονηριας-2-3 (2 MSS read πονηριας followed by MT αυτης)
	5 αυτης ονομα) 1-2-1 [*sic*]
	8 (MT) και παρεσται) } και οτι παρεστιν (other) και παρεστιν)
	12 βασιλεις[1]) -λειαι ουπω) ουπω ουπω
	17 τας καρδιας) την καρδιαν
	18 η[2] (*ante* πολις)) — της γης) αυτης
	20.4 του Θεου) αυτου χιλια ετη) χιλιοις ετεσι
	6 εσονται) λεγονται
	9 παρεμβολην) πολιν και την περεμβολην εκ του ουρανου) —
	10 λιμνην) καμινον (so too in 19:20, but there cum 2 other MSS). θηριον) + εβληθη (2 MSS + εβληθησαν)
	11 επ' αυτον) επ' αυτο (11 MSS = επ' αυτῳ; TR επ' αυτου has only 10% support).
	22.17 λεγουσιν) -σαι (3 MSS = -σα)
131	No MS appertains to this number.
132	12.9 εβληθη ο δρακων) ∿2-3-1
133	No MS appertains to this number.
134	No MS appertains to this number.
135	7.5-8 $\overline{\iota\beta}^{1-12}$) reads δωδεκα *plene* in cases ^{1,2,7} only.
136	3.3 μνημονευε) -μονσιε 14 ο πιστος και αληθινος) ∿1-4-3-1-2* (cf.102; also, 8 MSS read και ο αληθινος in MT).
	12.10 Θεου[2]) $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ *vid.*

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(136)	15.2 μεμιγμενην) και μεμ.
	17.3 ερημον) ——
	4 (MT) χρυσιω και) ——
	μαργαριταις) -τας*
	13 (MT) διδοασιν) δεδοκασιν (7 MSS = δεδωκασιν)
	18 εχουσα) εγουσα
	20.13 και ο θανατος) written twice (end of one page and beginning of another)
	14 (MT) η λιμνη του πυρος) εν λιμνη του πυρος
	22.3 (MT) καταθεμα) -θημα (cf.113,217)
	12 εργον) ερχον (cf.17:18 in MS 136 above)
	18 (MT) επιθη επ' αυτα επιθησει ο θεος επ' αυτον) ∿1-2-αυτων* (—4-5-6-7-8); ∿επιθης-2-αυτων 136^2.
137	3.6 ους) νουν (cf.72 and 210* in 2:7)
	12 εξελθη) -θωσιν 137^2 (137* = -θω cum 6 MSS)
	5.14 omit verse* (N.B. at end of v.13 MS 137* reads αμην cum MT).
	10.4 του ουρανου) του τοῦ ουρανου
	12.4 αυτους) αυτον (another hand recopies all of verse 4, reading αυτους)
	7 (MT) πολεμησαι . . . αυτου^2 *(fin.vers.)*) ——* (supplied in mg by *)
	20.5 και οι λοιποι . . . τα χιλια ετη) omit entire clause, then + τι εστιν η πρωτη αναστασις και τι ο δευτερος θανατος;
	6 ο δευτερος) ——* (cf. the v.5 clause omitted above; 137^2 reinserts ο δευτερος *ante* ο θανατος, cum 1 other MS and 1 commentary MS; note the MT here reads ο δευτ.θαν.)
	ετη) + δυο ζωας και δυο νεκρωσεις ἥ γουν θανατος εκ της θειας γραφης (gloss)
	22.2 αποδιδουν) -διδουντα (5 MSS = -διδοντα)
	10 σφραγισης) -γεισης*
138	3.5 ο νικων) ενικων
	16 μελλω) θελλω (cf.21,120)
	7.15 εν) εν εν
	16 πεινασουσιν) πην-
	πεση) πεσειται *vid.* (15 MSS = πεσειται)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(138)	12.1 δωδεκα) δυο και δεκα (20 MSS = δεκαδυο)
	17.7 της γυναικος) ——
	22.9 τουτου) του [*sic*]
	15 φιλων) φειλ-
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
139	1.11 (MT) θυατειρα) θυγα-
	3.12 ονομα της πολεως του θεου μου) ——*
	17 οτι λεγεις) written twice
	7.5 Γαδ) Γαδη *vid.*
	15 του θρονου[1]) του θρονου του θρονου [*sic*] (Hoskier leaves it uncertain whether MT του θεου still follows; if not, then MS 139 = MS 98 at that point).
	10.6 εκτισε) -τισι
	10 επικρανθη) επεκ-
	12.2 ωδινουσα) -δῦν- (cf.164; 3 MSS = ωδυν-; 2 MSS = οδυν-)
	22.2 καρπους) + τους
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
140	1.4 Θεου) + απο
	6 αμην) αμιν
	7 νεφελων) + αμιν (2 MSS + αμην)
	8 Ω) + (cum 28%) αρχη και τελος, within which 140 differs singularly thus: αρχη) αρχυ
	9 Ιωαννης) -ννου
	10 κυριακη ημερα) -κυ ὑμ-
	ηκουσα) υκ-
	11 Λαοδικειαν) -δεικιαν
	13 ποδηρη) --δυρι
	14 η δε κεφαλη) υ δε κεφαλυ
	15 φωνη[1,2]) -νυ
	16 ρομφαια) -φαιου
	17 αυτον) -των
	επεσα) επασα
	3.7 αληθινος) -θειν- (cf.201)
	(MT) κλειν) κληνην (2 MSS = κλην)
	ανοιγων[1]) ανυγων (cf. κ)
	ανοιγων[2]) ανυγον
	18 πλουτησης) -τιισις (19 MSS = -τισης)
	φανερωθη) -ροθη
	γυμνοτητος) -τιτος

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS — Singular readings within the sample chapters

(140)
5.5 τας επτα σφραγιδας) οι-2-σφραγιδες
11 (TR) κυκλοθεν) -λωθ- (cf.177)

7.9 (MT) φοινικας) } φυνηκας
(TR) φοινικες)

10.5 ηρε) ηραν (39 MSS = ηρεν)
8 (MT) βιβλιδαριον) } βιβλιονδαριον
(other) βιβλιον)
9 (MT) βιβλιδαριον) } βιβλιονδαριον
(other) βιβλιον)
10 (MT) βιβλιον) } βιβλιονδαριον
(other) βιβλιδαριον)
10/11 [10]εφαγον . . . [11]μοι) —
11 δει σε) εδειτε

12.1 μεγα) -αι
7 πολεμος) + μεγας
16 αυτου) αυτων

15.3 αι οδοι) αι οδυ

17.2 αυτης) αυτῶν [*sic*]
8 αναβαινειν) -βεν-
16 φαγονται) -τε

20.4 πεπελεκισμενων) -λικ-
8 πλανησαι) και πλανησι
10 βασανισθησονται) -σων-

22.15 φονεις) φωνης (17 MSS = φωνεις)
18 βιβλιου) βασιλειου

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

141
1.5 (MT) λουσαντι) } καλεσαντι 141[mg]
(other) λυσαντι)

3.4 ἃ) ὃ (26% = οἳ)
15 οιδα) ἰδα (Rubric?)

5.11 και[2]) + ιδου

7.9 (TR) φοινικες) φοινικες [*sic*]
11 τω Θεω) του Θεου

10.3/4 (TR) [3]τας εαυτων φωνας . . . [4]βρονται τας φωνας) —
6 τον ουρανον και τα εν αυτω και την γην και τα εν αὐτη) ∿1-2-7-8-9-10-11-12-13-3-4-5-6
(4 MSS = ∿1-2-7-8-9-3-4-5-6-10-11-12-13)

12.12/13 [12]ολιγον καιρον . . . [13]δρακων οτι) —

17.8 (MT) και παρεσται) } καιπερ εστιν
(other) και παρεστιν)
11 και εκ των επτα . . . υπαγει (*fin.vers.*)) —
(N.B. 6 MSS have haplography between και[4] and και[5]; the present case extends such by one και).

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(141)	17.16 μισησουσι) μῆσουσι [*sic*] (6 MSS = μησισ-; 12 MSS = μισουσι)
	20.8 γωνιαις) -νιας (3 MSS = γονιας)
	22.12 εσται) εσθαι [*sic*]
	18 εαν τις) εαν ει τις
	19 εαν τις) εαν ει τις
142	1.20 (MT) αι λυχνιαι αι επτα) αι αι-2-3-4
143	1.1 ην εδωκεν . . . Ιωαννη (*fin.vers.*)) της γεναμενης εις εμε Ιωαννην την αποστολον
	2 ος εμαρτυρησε) του κηρυξαι
	ειδε) ιδων (4 MSS = ιδε; 16 MSS = ιδεν)
	3 μακαριος) + εἶ
	εν αυτη) επ' αυτης
	3/4 [3]ο γαρ καιρος εγγυς. [4]Ιωαννης ταις) 1-2-5-6 (—3,4)
	4 ο[3]) —— (2 MSS omit ο[2])
	5 αρχων) μαρτυς
	8 (MT) λεγει κυριος ὁ Θεος) ——
	9 καλουμενη) επικαλ-
	10 εν τη) —— (7 MSS omit only τη)
	(MT) φωνην οπισω μου μεγαλην) φωνης-2-λεγουσης μοι (25% = ∿2-3-1-4)
	11 λεγουσης) ——
	Περγαμον) Περκα-
	12 την φωνη ητις ελαλει μετ' εμου) τον λαλουντα μοι
	επιστρεψας) ——
	15 υδατων πολλων) πληθους λαου
	16 εν) —— (so too 153*, but added supr. lin. by *)
	19 μελλει) δει (4 MSS = δει μελλει; 1 MS = δη μελλ.)
	3.2 (MT) εμελλες) (other) εμελλον) } εμελλων
	3 γρηγορησης) μετανοησης μηδε γρηγορισις (cf. ℵ: 143 here conflates ℵ and MT
	5 ουτος) αυτος
	περιβαλειται) περιβεβληται
	7 ο αληθινος) ——
	9 εαυτους Ιουδαιους ειναι) ∿1-3-2
	10 καγω) και εγω
	της ωρας του πειρασμου) ——
	12 Λαοδικεια) Λαωδικια (2 MSS = λαω-; 12% = -κια)
	16 (MT) ου ζεστας ουτε ψυχρος) ψυχος [*sic*] ει ουτε ζεστος (cf. ℵ[a])
	20 ακουση) ανοιξει (N.B. later in verse 143 along with 28 MSS reads ανοιξει *pro* MT ανοιξη).

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(143)	5.5	και[1]) + απεκριθη (yet λεγει still follows rather than λεγων!)
	8	οι εικοσιτεσσαρες) οι εικοσι τεσσαρις [*sic*]
	9	γλωσσης) γλωττης
	14	*fin.vers.*) the next verse is 20:1 "without the slightest sign of an omission" (I:480).
	20.2	και Σατανας) —
	3	(MT) πλανα) } πλανη (TR) πλανηση)
		αχρι) αχρις αν (4 MSS = αχρις ου)
	4	επ' αυτους) επ' αυτοις (6 MSS = επ' αυτων)
		και κριμα εδοθη αυτοις) —
		και[4]) + ιδων (9 MSS + ειδον)
		και εζησαν) —
		εβασιλευσαν) οϋς ιλευσαν (2 MSS = ευασιλευσαν; 1 MS = ευβασιλευσαν)
	5	(MT) αχρι) αχρει
	10	και θειου) την καιομενην πυρι (cf. 32,113)
		βασανισθησονται) + εκει
	11	(MT) μεγαν λευκον) μεγα και λευκον (6 MSS = μεγα λευκον)
	22.1	λαμπρον) -ος
		κρυσταλλον) -ος
	2	αυτου) αυτων
	3	(MT) καταθεμα) } αναθεμα (TR) καταναθεμα)
	7	ταχυ) + λεγει Κυριος
	8	και οτε) μαρτυρω και οτε
	9	του βιβλιου τουτου) τουτους (—του βιβ.)
	13	ο πρωτος και ο εσχατος) —
	14	πυλωσιν) + ου μη
	15	ειδωλολατραι) -λωλ-
	16	ταυτα) —
	17	διψων) δειψ-
		υδωρ) + της
	18	εγω) + Ιωαννης
	19	απο) —
		πολεως) + αυτου
		εν) —
	20	λεγει) + ο Θεος
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
144	1.7	αυτον[2]) + πας οφθαλμος . . . αυτον from earlier in same verse.
	15	εν καμινω) εκαμινω [*sic*] (cf.36)
		η φωνη) αι φωνοι (3 MSS = οι φωνη *sic*)
	16	αυτου[4] (*fin.vers.*)) + ως νεκρος, crossed out by *.
	17	και[1]) —

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(144)	1.17 δεξιαν) δεξιᾶ
	18 εχω) εχων
	3.7 (other) και κλειων) 1-κλειω
	10 υπομονης) υπακοης* (MT in mg by *) (cf.119)
	12 στυλον) -λω*
	5.9 λεγοντες) λεγουσι (cf.113)
	7.5 (MT) Ρουβιμ) Ρουβιιμ [*sic*; corr.= Ρουβιιμ]
	10 σωτηρια) σια* [*sic* without contraction bar] (144mg = σρια)
	10.2 ευωνυμον) -νιμ-
	12.6 εφυγεν) εφηγεν
	7 (MT) επολεμησε) -μησᾰ [*sic*]
	15.8 Θεου) ——* (inserted in mg)
	17.5 η μητηρ) και-1-2
	10 (MT) δει αυτον) δηι-2 (cf.36)
	18 της γης) ——
	20.4 χαραγμα) -ρασμα
	12 γεγραμμενων) -νον
	16 μαρτυρησαι υμιν ταυτα) 1-αυτ ημιν-4 [*sic*]
	19 αφελοι) -λοῖ [*sic*]
145	1.7 οιτινες) οιτοινες
	10 σαλπιγγος) -πιγκος
	11 εις Σμυρναν) εις μυρ[MSS] [*sic*; = εις μυρνους?]
	13 περιεζωσμενον) περιεσζ-
	15 καμινω) -μεινω (cf.200)
	16 ως) ος
	17 (TR) μοι) μι
	3.7 και[3] (*final*)) ——
	8 ουδεις) -δης
	16 μελλω) μελω
	20 εστηκα) -τικα
	21 θρονω[2]) -νο (so also in case [1], but there in conjunction with 1 other MS).
	5.1-5 omit these verses entirely.
	6 (MT) ἃ εισιν) } εισοι *solus*
	(TR) οἳ εισιν)
	8 εχοντες) -τος (2 MSS = εχοντος εσχᾰτου)
	των αγιων) των δικαιων

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
146	1.18 κλεις) κλχ^{ςς} [*sic*]
	3.8 το ονομα) τον νομον
	9 ινα) και
	17 και πτωχος και τυφλος και γυμνος) ∿3-4-5-6-1-2
	18 ιματια) + καινα
	5.2/3 [2]και λυσαι . . . [3]το βιβλιον) ——
	4 βλεπειν) βλεψαι
	5 (MT) το βιβλιον και) ——
	12 και πλουτον και σοφιαν) ∿3-4-1-2
	13 θαλασσης) + σα (TR/36% + ἃ; 5% + ὅσα)
	επι του θρονου) omit επι
	14 (MT) λεγοντα το) } λεγουσιν (—το)
	(TR) ελεγον —)
	7.1 (MT) τουτο) + φησιν
	2 θαλασσαν) + και τα δενδρα
	3 μη αδικησητε την γην) ——
	5-8 omit these verses, and replace with a summary statement as follows: και λεγει λοιπον απο εκαστης φυλης δωδεκαχιλιαδες τους σφραγισθεντος.
	9 (TR) αυτον ουδεις) ∿2-1
	(TR) ηδυνατο) -το˜ [*sic*; = -τον].
	11 παντες οι αγγελοι) των πρεσβυτερων οι αγιοι
	(MT) ειστηκεισαν) } εστηκασι
	(TR) εστηκεσαν)
	12 λεγοντες . . . τω Θεω) —— (cf.200)
	16 ουδε[1]) ουτε μην (7 MSS = ουδε μη)
	10.7 (MT) ετελεσθη) ου γενομενου τελος ληψεται φησιν
	του Θεου) τω Θεω (N.B. the collation *in loc.* attributes this reading to the commentary of MS 146; yet in I:503 this reading is expressly stated as *text*, with commentary omitting. It must be the case that it likely cannot be determined with certainty, since the commentary is "interwoven with the text," and it is often "difficult to separate text from commentary"[I:494]).
	12.3 αυτου) ——
	4 του ουρανου) εν τω ουνωι [*sic*]
	9 αυτου[1]) ——
	14 καιρους) -ρου* (corrected by *)
	18 επι) παρα
	15.3 Θαυμαστα) -μασια
	20.3 χρονον) + ινα παλιν πλανηση τα εθνη
	9 παρεμβολην) -ρεβ- [*sic*] (2 MSS = -ρεβ- uncorrected)
	22.1 εκπορευομενον) ∿ *post* αρνιου (so too 155 comm.)
	6 ο Θεος) ——

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
147	5.5 ενικησεν) ενισεν [*sic*; corr. = ενικαισεν]
	12.6 (TR) τρεφωσιν) τερφ-
	12 (TR) οι ουρανοι) ο ουρανος (MT = ουρανοι *solus*)
	15.6 οι επτα) οιπτα [*sic*]
	22.14 εισελθωσιν) ——
	16 o^1 (*ante* αστηρ)) —— (cf.51,57, which —o^2)
148	3.2 γινου) γένου [*sic*] (5 MSS = γενου uncorrected)
	17.4 (MT) τα ακαθαρτα της) των ακαθαρτων [*sic*] (2 MSS = ακαθαρτων της; cf.123)
	20.15 εβληθη) εμβλ-
149	1.14 τριχες) τριχες [*sic*] (14 MSS = τριχαις)
	15 ομοιοι) ——
	χαλκολιβανω) -κωκλ-
	16 εκπορευομενη) εισπορ-
	δυναμει) δυναστεια
	18 εγενομην) -ναμ-*
	3.7 εν) ——* (inserted supr.lin. by*; cf.164, which also omits, but does not correct).
	9 και[1]) ——
	14 Λαοδικεια) -ας, but ς has been erased (5 MSS = -ας uncorrected)
	5.13 (MT) ὅ —) (TR) ὅ εστιν) } ων *solus*
	10.9 προς) επι
	λεγων αυτω δουναι μοι) ∿3-4-1-2
	12.4 των αστερων του ουρανου) ∿3-4-1-2 (cf.91*)
	10 ο κατηγορων) και κατηγορος
	15.5 ηνοιγη ο ναος της σκηνης) εφανε[ρ]ωθησαν (ρ not rubricated) (—2-3-4-5)
	17.8 επι το βιβλιον της ζωης απο καταβολης κοσμου) ∿6-7-8-1-2-3-4-5
	11 αυτος) τουτος* (41% = ουτος)
	ογδοος) ογγδοος
	13 ουτοι μιαν) ∿2-1
	20.6 και βασιλευσουσιν μετ' αυτου) ∿1-μετα ταυτα-2 (N.B. 54 MSS read μετα ταυτα, but the specific word order of MS 149 here is singular).
	10 ψευδοπροφητης) -τις
	11 και[3] (*ante* εις Περγ.)) —— (9 MSS omit this και along with all but the last και of the verse).

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
150	3.7 (MT) Φιλαδελφεια) Φυλ- (cf.15)
	18 (TR) κολλουριον) κολου- [*sic*] (cf.130)
	5.3 υποκατω) απ-
	17.17 αχρι) αχρη
	22.3 αρνιου) αρνινου 150^{sup} (N.B. 150^{sup} in ch.22 is by a later hand).
	12 μου) μος 150^{sup} (Note μισθος precedes).
	16 αστηρ) ανηρ 150^{sup}
151	1.1 αποκαλυψις) -ψης
	15 οι ποδες) υποδες (so also MS 180 in 2:18 and MS 95 in 10:1)
	16 ρομφαια) -φεα
	3.7 (MT) ο ανοιγων και ουδεις κλεισει) —— (MT is inserted in mg by *)
	ανοιγων^2) + και κλιων (9 MSS + και κλειων)
	12 γραψω) -ψο (7 MSS = -ψον)
	5.5 λεων) λεωον
	9 αδουσιν) αιδ-
	ωδην) σδην
	7.5 εκ φυλης Γαδ) και-1-2-3
	9 (TR) φοινικες) φυν- (cf.201)
	15 σκηνωσει) σκι<u>νωση</u>
	10.9 λεγων) -γον
	πικρανει) πημ-
	10 επικρανθη) επηκ-
	15.2 υαλινην^2) υελην
	20.1 καταβαινοντα) -βενοντα
	2 δρακοντα) -κωντα
	12 μικρους) μηκ-
	22.2 εν μεσω) εν μεσο
	5 χρειαν) χρια (this within a ∿ having 29% support)
	7 τηρων) τειρων
	14 εισελθωσιν) ειελ-*
	18 τουτω) τουτο *vid.*
	19 τουτω) τουτο
152	1.4 εκκλησιαις) -λισ-
	(MT) Θεου) + $\overline{\text{πρς}}$ $\overline{\text{κ}}$ $\overline{\text{κς}}$ $\overline{\text{ις}}$ $\overline{\text{χς}}$ [*sic*] 152^2
	και^3 (*ante* ο ερχ.)) ——*

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(152)	1.6 αυτω) και αυτω*
	8 Ω) + (cum 28%) αρχη και τελος, within which MS 152 reads singularly: η αρχη και τελος (18 MSS add the article before *both* nouns; 2 MSS add article before τελος only).
	9 τη καλουμενη Πατμω) και εν τη Πατμωι
	11 Σαρδεις) -δης*
	16 εχων) κρατων 152^2 (superscript)
	3.2 γρηγορων) -γωρων
	(MT) στηρισον) } -ξων
	(TR) στηριξον)
	4 (MT) αλλ' ολιγα εχεις) και εχεις ολιγα (24% = αλλ' εχεις ολιγα)
	8 (MT) ανεωγμενην) } ηνεογ- (2 MSS = ανεογ-)
	(other) ηνεωγμενην)
	12 αυτον^2) αυτων*
	18 και^2 (*ante* μη)) ——
	οφθαλμος σου) -μου-2
	5.1 ειδον) -ων (but not thus in verse 2)
	2 τις) της*
	4 (MT) πολυ) πολοι* (9 MSS and 152^2 = πολλοι)
	6 εν^2 (*ante* μεσω^2)) ——
	7.1 τεσσαρας^1) $\overline{\delta}^{\alpha\varsigma}$ [*sic*] 152^2 (152* = $\overline{\delta}$ cum 4 MSS)
	3 θαλασσαν) -σσα*
	6 εκ^1) και εκ
	8 *init.*) + και
	εκ φυλης^2) $\overset{\kappa}{\varepsilon}$φυλης [*sic*]
	9 (MT) εδυνατο) } $\overset{\xi}{\eta}$δ- (cf. 49)
	(TR) ηδυνατο)
	παντος) -τως*
	θρονου) θρωνου*
	10 ημων) ημῶνν
	11 θρονου^{1,2}) θρωνου
	προσεκυνησαν) προεκ-*
	16 διψησουσιν) + an addition *ex comm.* in 5 MSS, within which MS 152 reads singularly thus: ζωης) ζωεις*
	10.1 και το προσωπον . . . ποδες αυτου) ——*
	3 φωνη μεγαλη . . . και οτε εκραξεν) ——*
	9 απηλθον) -θων
	12.2 εχουσα) -σαι
	5 θρονον) -νων
	8 (MT) ουκ ισχυσεν) ου $\overset{\kappa}{\iota}$σχ- [*sic*]
	9 ὁ οφις) ὁ φις* (9 MSS omit ὁ)
	10 και^1) αι (Rubric?)
	ηκουσα) εικ-*
	11 την (*ante* ψυχην)) την την*

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(152)	12.12	ευφραινεσθε) ευφραθαι*; ευφραισθε 152^{2}
	17	δρακων) -κον* (cf.154); -κου 152^{3}
	15.2	υαλινην^{2}) υαληνην*
	4	παντα τα εθνη) omit τα*
	6	επτα^{1}) + αγιοι *supr.lin.* 152^{3}
	8	εγεμισθη) -μεισ-
	17.3	γυναικα) γυναι*
	6	μεθυουσαν) -θωουσ-*
	16	ποιησουσιν^{1}) ποιουσουσην*
	20.2	τον οφιν) τον τον οφιν
	4	δια^{1}) δαι*
	5	αναστασις) -σι*
	10	εβληθη) -θει
	22.5	Θεος) + αυτος
	7	τηρων) -ρον*
	8	εγω) εγωι
	14	πολιν) -ληην*
	15	ποιων) ποιον*
153	10.1	στυλοι) στυλλοι
	6	τα^{1}) —
	12.4	καταφαγη) καφαγη*
154	1.2	εμαρτυρησε) -τηρ-
	6	των αιωνιων) του αιωνος
	9	καλουμενη Πατμῳ) -μενῳ Πατνῳ
	15	χαλκολιβανω) -λυβ-
	3.2	(MT) εμελλες) εμελες [*sic*] (cf.84,122)
	9	(MT) ηξωσι) -σοι
	12	νικων) -κον [*sic*] (cf.104)
		εξελθη) εισελθη
	5.1	(MT) εσωθεν και εξωθεν κατεσφραγισμενον) —
	6	των τεσσαρων) τον-2
	11	αριθμος) -μῶς [*sic*]
	13	ευλογια) εκλογια
	7.2	απο) επι
		φωνη μεγαλη) -νην -λην (4 MSS = -νην -λη)
	4	τον αριθμον) 1-αριθμῶν [*sic*] (6 MSS = των-2; 13 MSS = των -μων; no other MS = τον -μων).
	7	*init.*) + εκ φυλης Νεφθαλειμ ιβ χιλιαδες (also remains in verse 6).
	9	και λαων) καλων
	15	τουτο) τουτω

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(154)	10.4	φωνηὐ) + ~~μεγαλην~~
	8	λαβε) βαλε (but λαβε in verse 9)
		(MT) βιβλι̲δαριον) βιβλι̲αριον
	10	γλυκυ) -κῆ [*sic*] (so also 69, but uncorrected).
	11	γλωσσαις) -ωσ̊αις [*sic*] (cf.72)
	12.5	αρρενα) -ναν (cf. 5:13 κτισμαν cum 1 MS)
	8	ετι) εστι
	13	δρακων) -κ̊ων [*sic*] (cf.72)
	17	δρακων) -κ̊ων [*sic*] (cf.152*)
	17.3	γυναικα) -καν (cf. MS 154 in 5:13 and 12:5 above)
	12	ελαβον) εβον*
	15	καθηται) -θιτ-
		γλωσσαι) -ωσ̊αι [*sic*] (4 MSS = -ωσαι uncorrected)
	20.7	φυλακης) φ̲υ̲λ̲ᾳ̲κ̲ης [*sic*] (cf.106)
	8	γωνιαις) γ̊ων- [*sic*] (7 MSS = γον- uncorrected)
	10	ο ψευδοπροφητης) ο ~~π~~ψευδ- [*sic*] (4 MSS here read οπου ο ψευδ.)
	22.11	ετι[3]) ετει *vid.*
	14	αυτου) του Θεου (cf.98; also note that του Θεου follows MT εντολας rather than στολας)
	15	ψευδος) ~~εφ~~ ψευδος [*sic*]
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
155	1.4	απο Θεου ο ων και ο ην και ο ερχομενος) απο του παντων ημων Θεου
	5	πρωτοτοκος) -κως
	15.7	του θυμου) τον θυμον
	8	του Θεου) +(*ex verse 7*) [7]του ζωντος . . . [8]δοξης του Θεου
	17.1	μετ' εμου) μετ' αιμου
	3	κεφαλας) καιφ-
	4	και[1]) + κοκκινον κακεβε (later erased)
		περιβεβλημενη) + χρυσιω και λιθω τιμιω (also erased later)
	6	και[1]) αι (Rubric?)
		αυτην) αυτη
	7	γυναικος) -κ̊ως [*sic*]
	8	καταβολης) -βοσλης
	10	(TR) επεσαν) επ̄σαν
		ο αλλος) ο δ' αλλος (cf.56; 11 MSS = και ο αλ.)
	13	ουτοι) και ουτοι
		(MT) αυτων) αυτ̲ων αυτ̲ω [*sic*]
	20.2	αυτον) αυτων
	3	χρονον) + ινα μη παλιν πλανηση τα εθνη· τουτο γαρ· πρ̄οιων φησιν. (cf.146)
	4	εβασιλευσαν) ευβ- (2 MSS = ευασ-)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(155)	20.7 χιλια) χια
	8 τον Γωγ) το Γωγ φησι
	9 παρεμβολην) παραβολη [*sic*] (2 MSS have παραβ- uncorrected)
	12 ηνεώχθη) ηνηχθη
	13 εργα) ερ
	22.2 εντευθεν^2) εκει (45% = εκειθεν)
	ξυλον) -λω
	4 προσωπον) -ωπων
	5 βασιλευσουσιν) -σασιν
	8 δεικνυοντος) -νουντος (43% = -νυντος)
	9 λογους) λόγους [*sic*]
	14 τοις) ταις
	15 φονεις) φονεῖς [*sic*]
	ειδωλολατραι) οι εἰδωλολατραι [*sic*] (cf.72,104)
	17 ειπατω) -παστω*
	20 ταυτα) αυτα
	++++++++++++++++++++++++++
156	1.12 βλεπειν) -πων
	20 (MT) αι^1) οι
	3.4 αξιοι) αξια
	5 περιβαλειται) περιπατει τα (cf.15)
	14 Λαοδικεια) -δηκυια
	18 ινα^4 *(final)*) εαν
	20 αυτον) εμαυτον
	5.6 ζωων) ζοων (6 MSS = ζωον)
	7 και ηλθε) ——
	7.1 γωνιας) -νυιας (cf.114)
	4 τεσσαρες) τεσα-
	11 ζωων) ζοων
	θρονου^2) + αυτων (43% + αυτου)
	17 εξαλειψει) -ψη
	10.9 γλυκυ) -κην
	10 γλυκυ) -κην
	12.4 αυτου) αυτων
	6 εξηκοντα) εξηντα
	15.3 αι οδοι σου) αι οδοις σου
	7 ζωων) ζοων (3 MSS = ζωον)
	17.3 θηριον) θυριων
	4 τιμιω) ——
	7 θηριου) + του βασιλεως
	8 (MT) τα ονοματα) ——
	(other) το ονομα)
	15 ἀ) σια
	οχλοι) -λη

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(156)	20.9 ανεβησαν) ανεὗησαν
	14 και ο αδης) —
	22.19 μερος) μετρος
157	3.7 (MT) ηλεισει) } ηλειˢει [*sic*]
	(TR) ηλειει)
	5.12 και τιμην και δοξαν) ᵛηαι δοξαν και τιμην [*sic*] (so too MS 226, but uncorrected).
	17.16 (MT) ηρημωμενην) } ηρημωμ- [*sic*]
	(other) ερημωμ-)
158	15.6 λινον) λινᵛ [*sic fin.lin.*]
	17.3 ερημον) εερ-
159	1.4 Ασια) Ασηα *vid.*
	6 το) —
	8 ειμι) ειμη
	9 Πατμω) -μο
	17 εγω) + γαρ
	πρωτος) πρῶτος [*sic*] (MS 72 = προτος uncorrected)
	19 ειδης) + και α ακουσας (*vid.*, or ηκουσας)
	3.1 οτι[1]) οτι οτι
	7 αληθινος) αλειθ-*
	8 οιδα) ιδα (Rubric)
	12 ονομα[3] *(final)*) ονμα
	14 η *(ante* αρχη*)*) —
	16 χλιαρος) χριαρος
	μελλω σε) ελλῶσε [*sic*, including rubric omission]
	18 (TR) κολλουριον) + δος φαρμακων *supr.lin.* 159[2]
	19 εγω) εγογω [ογ *sic*]
	20 ιδου) δου (Rubric)
	21 ο νικων) ἰνικων (Rubric omitted on οἱ ?)
	θρονω[1]) πραδι* [*sic*] (= Παραδεισω?)
	εκαθισα) -θησα [*sic*] (17 MSS = -θησα uncorrected)
	αυτου *(fin.vers.)*) μουτου (8 MSS = μου *pro* αυτου)
	5.1 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	2 και[1]) —
	4 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	ελαιον) -λελον*[2] (ελελον*[1], but erased)
	5 ενικησεν) -κῖσ- [*sic*]
	αυτου) αυτων
	6 και[1]) αι (Rubric)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(159)	5.6 του θρονου) των ρονου [*sic*] (part rubric?)
	πνευματα) πνα πνατα [*sic*] (7 MSS = πνα; 2 MSS = πνατα)
	7 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	8 οι εικοσιτεσσαρες) οικοσιτεσσαρες (7 MSS omit οι)
	αρνιου) αρνηου
	9 και[1,2]) αι (Rubric)
	11 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	13 το κρατος) τω κρατ [*sic*]
	14 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	7.2 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	(MT) αναβαινοντα) + ατω (??—Hoskier suggests either ατε or ανω was intended; this writer suggests either (a) an error for απο which follows, immediately corrected by *, though without obelizing the error; or (b) a non-rubricated κατω).
	3 μη) η (Rubric)
	4 και) αι (Rubric)
	εσφραγισμενων) εσφαγ- [*sic*]
	τεσσαρες) τεσσαρων [*sic*]
	5 εκ[3] (*ante* Γαδ)) κ (Rubric?)
	6 εκ[2]) κ (Rubric?)
	8 δωδεκα[10-12]) δωδε
	φυλης[3]) λφυλης [*sic*]
	9 (TR) περιβεβλημενοι) -λιμενοι
	14 αρνιου) αριου
	16 ου) υ (Rubric)
	ουδε[2]) υδε (Rubric)
	17 οτι) τι (Rubric)
	εξαλειψει) εξαλει* (11 MSS = εξελει; so too 159[2])
	10.2 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	χειρι) χιειρι
	τον ποδα) τδα [*sic*]
	δεξιον) + αυτου
	3 λεων) λελων*
	4 βρονται[1]) -τον
	σφραγισον) σφργισον [*sic*]
	5 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	7 (MT) αλλ') λλ' (Rubric)
	8 ην) —
	(TR) ηνεωγμενον) -νων
	9 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	10 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	(TR) βιβλαριδιον) } βιβλιδιον
	(other) βιβλιδαριον)
	κοιλια) κοικηα
	11 και[1]) αι (Rubric)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(159)	12.1 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	2 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	βασανιζομενη τεκειν) βασ̄νιζουσα δινειν [*sic*]
	3 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	4 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	και[3]) αι (Rubric)
	5 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	7 (MT) μετα του δρακοντος και ο δρακων επολεμησε) ——
	8 (TR) ουτε τοπος) ουτε ͦπος [*sic*]
	9 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	αρχαιος) αρχεμος
	καλουμενος) + ὁ (N.B. MS 159 also adds ὁ *ante* Σατανας cum 29%).
	Σατανας) Σαπανας
	10 κατηγορων) κατοιγ-
	11 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	ηγαπησαν) -σας
	12 καιρον) ͨρ̄ [*sic*]
	13 και) αι (Rubric)
	ετεκεν τον) ετεκεν ον (Rubric?)
	15 και) αι (Rubric)
	γυναικος) γυνν-
	16 η γη[1]) η γῆ [*sic*] (cf.121)
	17 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	και[2]) ——
	18 και) αι (Rubric)
	15.1 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	του Θεου) ——*
	2 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	θηριου) θῦριου [*sic*]
	3 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	παντοκρατωρ)κ -τρωρ
	5 και) αι (Rubric)
	7 και) αι (Rubric)
	8 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	17.4 (MT) ποτηριον χρυσουν) ∿2-ποτ̄ριον [*sic*] (39% = ∿2-1)
	5 ονομα) ονο
	9 ωδε) δε (Rubric)
	αι επτα) αι[αι] επτα [*sic*] (originally correct, but thought by a later corrector to be a rubrication error for και επτα, which reading then "lacked" the article, and such was duly inserted! N.B. that 3 MSS in fact do read και-*pro* αι).
	και) αι (Rubric)
	.11 και[1]) αι (Rubric)
	ὃ ην) ονον *vid.*
	.12 και) αι (Rubric)
	ελαβον) ελαλον* (corrected by *)
	λαμβανουσι) λαβαννουσι [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
160	5.6 εσφαγμενον) εσφαγισμενον* *vid.* (16 MSS = εσφραγισμενον)
	10.9 κοιλιαν) κουλ-
	12.16 και^{3} *(final)*) ——
	20.8 και^{2} *(ante* τον Μαγωγ*)*) ——*
161	3.7 ο ανοιγων^{1}) ——
	17.18 πολις) -λες (2 MSS = -λης)
162	1.11 Σαρδεις) -δους
	20 λυχνιαι) -νιας (cf. MT earlier in verse)
163	Contains no singular readings, though fully extant within the sample base chapters.
164	1.14 αυτου^{1}) ——
	16 (MT) τη δεξια χειρι αυτου) (TR) τη δεξια αυτου χειρι) } τη χειρι αυτου
	19 ειδης) + επι τη δεξια μου
	3.7 εν Φιλαδελφεια εκκλησιας) Φιλαδελφειας *solus* (1 MS omits εν; 2 MSS omit εκκλ.; 3 MSS read Φιλαδελφέιας; the combination of these in MS 164 is singular).
	20 θυραν) + μου
	5.5 (MT) ὁ —) (TR) ὁ ων) } οτι
	6 (MT) ἃ εισιν) ἅπερ εισιν (2 MSS = ἅτινα εισιν)
	11 και^{3} *(ante* των ζωων*)*) ——
	7.6 ιβ χιλιαδες^{1,3}) ∿2-1 (χιλ. δωδεκα^{1}; χιλ. ιβ^{3})
	7 ιβ χιλιαδες^{1,2,3}) ∿2-1
	8 ιβ χιλιαδες^{1,3}) ∿2-1 (so too in case ^{2}, but there not singular).
	11 (MT) ειστηκεισαν) ηιστ-
	12 τιμη) τημη
	12.2 ωδινουσα) οδυν- [*sic*] (cf.139; 2 MSS = οδυν- uncorrected).
	4 συρει) -ρρ-
	12 σκηνουντες) οικουντες

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(164)	20.12 βιβλιοις) + *(ex verse 13^{b}?)* και ο θανατος και ο αδης εδωκαν τους νεκρους αυτων και ενρι-θησαν* (N.B. MS 164 *omits* verse 13^{b} cum 2 other MSS; also, the above addition, though by *, is at the foot of the page).
	13 και εδωκεν η θαλασσα τους εν αυτη νεκρους) —— τους εν αυτοις νεκρους) τους νεκρους αυτων
	22.1 εκ) + μεσου (cf.113)
	και του αρνιου) ——
	2 εν) και το αρνιον εν (cf. previous entry)
	των εθνων) των πιστων (cf.113)
165	15.3 Μωσεως) Μωυσεῶς [*sic*]
	22.18 επιθησει) written twice
166	1.12 λυχνιας) -νειας
	13 ποδηρη) + κατα την ταξιν Μελχισεδεκ
	3.4 αυτων) αυτης
	5.9 λεγοντες) + ἣν εδιδαξε το πνα το αγιον
	13 (MT) εστιν *(post* θαλασσης*)*) (TR) ἃ εστιν) } ἃ *solus* (25 MSS have neither ἃ nor εστιν).
	7.3 αδικησητε) -κησης
	5 εκ^{1}) ἡ [*sic*]
	16 πεινασουσιν) -νησ-
	12.10 ενωπιον) -πίου
	15.1 εν τω ουρανω) ——
	7 αιωνας των) ——
	17.12 και τα δεκα) τα δε τ̄ [*sic*] (cf.63)
	22.1 ζωης) —— (cf.113: —— υδατος ζωης)
	και του αρνιου) και το αρνιον
	2 τα) ——
	6 ἃ δει) τα μελλοντα γινεσθαι ἃ δει (3 MSS read τα μελλ. γιν. *pro* ἃ δει γενεσθαι εν ταχει; 4 MSS read τα μελλ. τα γιν. in place of the same).
	14 τοις πυλωσιν) της-2 (cf.217)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
167	1.2 ειδε) + και ηκουσε (followed by the 41% addition, και ατινα . . . μετα ταυτα) (cf.174)
	12 επιστρεψας) επεσ-
	λυχνιας) λυγχ-
	χρυσας) ——
	15 ομοιοι) ομοι*
	ως φωνη) 1-φωνην
	3.4 (MT) αλλα ολιγα εχεις) omit αλλα (19 MSS read ~ εχεις ολιγα without αλλα).
	18 (MT) εγχριση) εγχρυση
	5.4 εκλαιον) + φησιν
	8 (MT) οι κδ) οι οι κδ
	9 αδουσιν) + ευχην
	7.2 ανατολης) -λας
	3 λεγων) ——
	7 Συμεων) Συμων
	9 γλωσσωσ -ωσων [*sic*] (9 MSS = -σ- uncorrected)
	10 φωνη μεγαλη) φωνην-2
	12 η[1]) ——
	15 (MT) επι τω θρονω) εν-2-3
	σκηνωσει) εσκηνωσεν
	10.8 (MT) ανεωγμενον) ανεγνωσμενον
	8/9 [8]του εστωτος . . . [9]αγγελον) ——
	11 δει σε) δεις[αι] [*sic*] (15 MSS = δει σαι)
	12.1 υποκατω) -τφ [*sic*]
	11 το (*ante* αιμα)) ——
	12 αυτοις) αυτοι
	14 ημισυ καιρου) ημισυρου [*sic*]
	16 κατεπιεν) απεποιεν
	15.2 υαλινην[2]) υαλιανην
	και τους νικωντας) και και-2-3
	εστωτας) εστωστας
	17.3 εν) ——* (inserted supr.lin. by *; 25% omit without correcting).
	8 θαυμασονται) + φησι την του θηριου παρουσιαν
	(other) του βιβλιου) του βιβλου [*sic*]
	9 ο νους) ογνους *or* αγνους *vid. teste Hoskier*
	16 (MT) ηρημωμενην) -μωμενην (9 MSS = ηρημομενην)
	ποιησουσιν αυτην[2]) ποιησονται-2
	20.3 εκλεισεν) -λυσ-*
	4 δια[2]) απο
	5 (MT) αχρι) αχρη
	7 τα) τα τα
	9 την[2] (*ante* πολιν)) ——
	12 τα) τα τα

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS — Singular readings within the sample chapters

(167) 22.5 εκει) + ετι (N.B. 46% read ετι *pro* εκει; MS 167 conflates).
εις) ει
6 κυριος) —

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

168 No MS appertains to this number.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

169 1.5 και[1]) διο κάνταυθα φησιν και (cf.216)
18 *fin.verse*) + addition in 3 MSS, within which MS 169 reads singularly as follows:
αυτι [= αυτοι]) αντι
3.7 (MT) ανοιξει) } ανοιχει [*sic*]
(TR) ανοιγει)
15.2 υαλινην[2]) υαλινην [*sic*]
20.9 εκυκλωσαν) -λεύσαν [*sic*] (41% = -λευσαν)

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

170 1.5 εν τω αιματι) *either omit* εν *or omit* εν τω *(Hoskier unclear)*
3.7 (other) ὁ κλειων) omit ὁ (9 MSS read the variant reading cited as text from which 170 differs).
19 *fin.*) + gloss ex comm. in 9 MSS, within which MS 170 reads singularly as follows:
ποση) ποσηι
7.2 ηλιου) ☉ [*sic*]
8 Βενιαμιν) Βενιαμ [*sic*]
11 (MT) επεσον) μεσον
16 ηλιος) ☉ [*sic*]
10.1 ηλιος) ☉ [*sic*]
2 τη χειρι) τηι χ [*sic*]
5 ειδον) -δεν
12.1 ηλιον) ☉ [*sic*]
σεληνη) ☾ [*sic*]
5 ποιμαινειν) ποιμὼ" [*sic*]
17.15 οὗ) εφ' οις 170[mg]
20.2/3 [2]αυτον χιλια . . . [3]εκλεισεν αυτον) —, but after εδησεν begin immediately with [3]και εσφραγισεν. (N.B. in verse 3, 22 MSS read εδησεν *pro* εκλεισεν).
5 τελεσθη) συντελεσθωσι (15 MSS = τελεσθωσι)
22.5 ηλιου) ☉ [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
171	3.15 ης) ις
	15.3 δικαιαι) δικαια
	4 δοξαση) -σδι [*sic*]
	22.6 και[1]) και εξηλθεν και 171^{sup}
	17 λεγουσιν) ~~ελεγον~~ λεγουσιν [*sic*] (4 MSS = ελεγον uncorrected) 171^{sup}
	18 (MT) μαρτυρω) συμμαρτυρω γαρ 171^{sup} (cf.TR!)
	19 ταυτης) ταστης 171^{sup}
172	1.9 (MT) και[1] *(ante* κοινωνος*)*) ——*
	7.4 των εσφραγισμενων ρμδ χι[...) omit *sic!**(text resumes thus: ...]λιαδες).
	5 φυλης[1]) -λλ-
173	No MS appertains to this number.
174	1.1 εσημανεν) -μαναι*
	2 ειδε) + και οσα ηκουσε (followed by + και ατινα . . . μετα ταυτα found in 41%; cf.168).
	15 φωνη υδατων πολλων) φωη ηδατων πολων [*sic*]
	17 εμε) εμαι*
	5.8 ελαβε) ελεβε
	7.4 ηκουσα) οικ- [*sic*]
	8 χιλιαδες[1]) χιδλ-
	Ιωσηφ) Ιωφσηφ
	9 μετα) και μετα
	14 εισιν) οισιν
	12.1 γυνη) γηνη
	12 εχων θυμον μεγαν) ∿1-3-2
	15.4 ονομα) ομα
	8 αι) ἡ
	22.8 εγω) εγο
	13 Ω) Ωμεγα (N.B. with Alpha 42% read A; 58% read Αλφα; yet with regard to Omega, 174 stands alone!)
175	No MS appertains to this number.

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
176	1.5	(MT) αγαπωντι) —ποοντι
	7.11	ενωπιον) -ποιον
	12.2 6	(MT) ενραζεν ωδινουσα) — εξηκοντα) εβδομηκοντα (cf. 206, which reads ευδομηκοντα; also, both 176 and 206 continue by adding 7½ to the total).
	15.2	και εκ της εικονος αυτου) —
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
177	1.16	διστομος) διστομος [*sic*]
	5.11	ηκουσα) οἰκουσα [*sic*] (MT) κυκλω) } κυκλωθεν [*sic*; corr. = κυκλων (TR) κυκλοθεν) with no other MS; cf. MS 140 for κυκλωθεν)
	12.17	ωργισθη) ὤρ- [*sic*] (34 MSS = ορ- uncorrected)
	15.6	λινον) λι__νον [two letters erased *sic*]
	20.8	θαλασσης) -ᾶση [*sic*]
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
178	3.14	(MT) Λαοδικεια) } -κειων (3 MSS = -καιων) (TR) -κεων)
	12.2	(MT) ενραζεν) } εαραξεν (other) ενραξεν)
	10	ηκουσα) εγενετο (cf. 203)
	17.17	γνωμην²) MT written over erasure by 178²; as for what 178* wrote, Hoskier guesses thus: βουλην? δοξιν? ευδοξιαν?
	22.11	(MT) ρυπαρος ρυπαρευθητω) } ρυπαρον ρυπωτατο 178² (TR) ρυπων ρυπωσατω) (2 MSS = ρυπαρων)
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
179	1.8 9	και ο ην) και ην (—ὁ) καλουμενη) written twice
	3.9	των (*ante* ποδων)) —
	12	(TR) καταβαινουσα) -ση* (-σης², cum 2 MSS)
	13	*fin.vers.*) + τουτου του ωτιου· και ημεις τυχειν. ευξωμεθα.
	15	ψυχρος ης ἢ ζεστος) —* (179² inserts thus: ψυχρος η ζεστος [—ης], cum MS 15: also, note that 14 MSS omit οφελον . . . ζεστος²)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(179)	7.5	χιλιαδες^3) χιαδες
	17.8	υπαγειν) +(cum 12 MSS) αει ζητουν τινα καταπιη +(*solus*) το θηριον ο διαβολος 179^2
	22.14	μακαριοι) μακαροι
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
180	1.5	λουσαντι) + an addition shared by 8 MSS, within which MS 180 reads singularly thus: ζωοποιου) -πιου
	13	τοις μαστοις) της μασθοις (14% = τοις μασθοις)
	14	και αι τριχες) και ετχύ [*sic*]
	15	πεπυρωμενοι) -ρομενω (13 MSS = -ρωμενω)
	20	το) τω
	3.3	(MT) γνως) (other) γνωση) } γν$\ddot{\alpha}$σει [*sic*] (7 MSS = γνωσει; no other MS reads γνασει)
	4	περιπατησουσιν) -πατουσισιν
	7	(TR) κλειδα) κλιδα
		ανοιγων^2) + και κλειον (9 MSS + και κλειων = conflation from a TR-type reading)
	9	λεγοντων) λεγων τ̂ [*sic*]
		εαυτους) ε αυτους [*sic*] (cf.217, which reads εν αυτους)
		ενωπιον) -ποιον
	10	ερχεσθαι) ερχεται
	11	ὃ) ἃ *vid.*
	18	περιβαλη) -βα$^{\lambda\iota}$ [*sic*] (cf.39)
		βλεπης) βλεψεις (3 MSS = -ψης)
	5.8	οι εικοσιτεσσαρες) οικοσητεσσαρεις (7 MSS —οι)
	7.9	περιβεβλημενους (MT)) περιβλημενους
	10	(MT) θρον̄ω) θρωνω
	17	(MT) ποιμανει) (other) ποιμαινει) } ποιμ$\ddot{\alpha}$νει [*sic*]
		(TR) απο) ααπο
	10.8	(MT) το ανεωγμενον) written twice (once at end of one page, the next at the head of the following page).
		÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
181	1.5	*fin.vers.*) + και εποιησεν ημας απο των αμαρτιων ημων εν τω αιματι αυτου 181*, but erased (cf. the addition found in 8 MSS following λουσαντι)
	7.4	των εσφραγισμενων) τον-2
	12.5	παντα τα) παντα τα τα

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(181)	12.8 ευρεθη) ευρε____θη (erasure of 4 letters *sic*; cf. 2 MSS which read ευρηευρεθη *sic*).
	14 (MT) τρεφηται) -φεται
	17.14 ουτοι) ουτο
	κυριος) -ριως
	22.6 (MT) των πνευματων των) (TR) των αγιων) } των $\overline{\pi\nu\omega}$ των αγιων [*sic*] (13 MSS = των πνευματων των αγιων)
182	3.12 στυλον) -λλ-
	21 καθισαι)-σοι *vid.*
	5.2 τας σφραγιδας) —— (??—Hoskier unclear)
	12.12 εχων) εχω
	14 καιρου) ——
	15 αυτου) ——
	15.3 κυριε) δεσποτα κυριε
	6 επτα[1]) ——
	17.9 ωδε) ᾧ
	22.3 εσται[1]) εστιν (2 MSS read εστιν for both εσται[1,2])
	αυτου) αυτων
	6 εν ταχει) μετα ταυτα
	16 μαρτυρησαι) μαρτυρηΚαι [*sic*; error of rubrication]
183	No MS appertains to this number.
184	1.7 πασαι αι φυλαι της γης) ν1-2-4-5-3
	12.12 ευφραινεσθε) -θαῖ [*sic*] (32 MSS = -θαι uncorrected)
185	No MS appertains to this number.
186	3.7 εν) εν εν
	9 (MT) προσκυνησωσιν) (other) -σουσιν) } -σοῦσιν [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(186)	5.13 (TR) ὃ εστιν) (MT) ὃ —) } ὃν *solus* (cf.200)
	7.16 πεση) παιση
	15.1 σημειον) σαμ-
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
187	1.3 ακουοντες) -σαντες
	9 κοινωνος) ο κοινωνος
	11 λεγουσης) + addition cum 27%, within which MS 187 reads singularly thus: εσχατος) αισχ-
	17 εσχατος) αισχ-
	20 επτα[5] *(ante* TR λυχνιαι*)* ~~αι~~πτα (cf.218 re επτα[6])
	3.5 (TR) εξομολογησομαι) -σωμ-
	ενώπιον[1]) -πιων
	21 ο) και ο
	5.1 εσωθεν) εσοθεν
	3 και) —
	5 ενικησεν) ενοκ-
	7 εκ της δεξιας) εν τη δεξια
	9 οτι) ὃ
	7.8 Βενιαμιν) -μὴν [*sic*] (27 MSS = -μην uncorrected)
	10/11 [10] και τω αρνιω . . . [11] κυκλω του θρονου[1]) — (N.B. 187 reads cum 26% θρονου just preceding this omission; cf. MS 112 for the same error caught and corrected).
	10.6 και ωμοσεν ἐ . . τον ουρανον) —
	7 ευηγγελισε) ευαγγελισατο (24% = ευηγγελισατο)
	9 το) τω
	10 (other) βιβλιδαριον) βον το βιβλιδαριὸν [*sic*]
	12.3 δρακων) -κὸν [*sic*] (4 MSS = -κον uncorrected)
	διαδηματα) διαστηματα
	9 εβληθη[2]) εκληθη
	10 ενωπιον) ενωπι
	15 στοματος αυτου) written twice
	16/17 [16] ηνοιξεν . . . [17] επι τη γυναικι και) —
	15.4 ονομα) ονονομα
	6 ναου) + και ησαν (MT = + οι ησαν)
	7 φιλας) -λλ-
	17.9 επτα εισιν) επτα και εισιν *vid.*, *or* επτάκις: *sic:* επτάεις
	10 ελθη) ελθο-ι [*sic*] (cf.80; 2 MSS = ελθει)
	14 κλητοι και εκλεκτοι και πιστοι) ∿1-4-5-2-3-4-5 (13 MSS = ∿1-4-5-2-3)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(187)	17.18 η εχουσα) ~~και εχουσαν~~ (2 MSS = η εχουσαν; cf.14)
	20.2 δρακοντα) + και
	4 ελαβον) εβαλον
	13 entire verse written twice, differing in each case from the MT thus: τους νεκρους τους εν αυτοις) τους εαυτοις νεκρους (cum MS 136).
	22.8 των ποδων του αγγελου) ∿3-4-1-2
	14 εντολας) -τωλ-
	16 υμιν ταυτα) ∿2-1
	17 και[3]) και και
	18 (MT) επιθη) } επιθη [*sic*]
	(TR) επιτιθη)
188	3.17 πτωχος) πωχος
	7.1 πνεη) πνευσει (18 MSS = πνευση)
	12.8 (MT) ισχυσεν) } -σαν [*sic*]
	(TR) ισχυσαν)
	17.1 καθημενης) -θιμ-
	20.4 ουτε) και
	22.8 προσκυνησαι) -νεισαι
	17 (MT) λαβετω) λαβειν λαβετω (12 MSS read λαβειν *pro* λαβετω; MS 188 here conflates).
	19 αφελη) ∿ *post* ταυτης
189	10.8 και επι της γης) —
	10 ως μελι) —
	επικρανθη η κοιλια μου) ∿εν τη-3-4-πικρον
	11 πολλοις) —
	12.1 αστερων) φερων
	2 (MT) εκραζεν) } βοαζει
	(TR) κραζει)
	9 μετ' αυτου εβληθησαν) εικοτως *solus* (cf.81,208; 19% omit μετ' αυτου, and 10 MSS of that group also omit εβληθησαν, but without substitution).
	12 κατεβη) κατευη
	17 (MT) Ιησου) Κυριου
	15.2 την θαλασσαν την υαλινην) ∿3-4-2 (—1)
	εχοντας κιθαρας του Θεου) —
	3 την ωδην[1]) —

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(189)	15.4 μονος) + συ (1 MS adds συ *ante* μονος; 1 MS adds συ ει *post* οσιος)
	17.1 ηλθεν) ∿ *post* αγγελων
	ελαλησε) -σαι
	7 σοι) —
	9 ο[1]) —
	11 εστι[1]) + και μελλει ελθειν
	υπαγει) -γη *vid.*
	15 καθηται) εκαθητο
	εισι) —
	γλωσσαι) + εισιν (cf.113; note also previous entry)
	16 και τα) τα δε
	20.1-3 omit these verses without a break; the remaining verses 4-11 then appear in the following order: 7-8-9-10-4-5-11, though in the apparatus below they are treated in their "standard" order.
	4 και κριμα εδοθη αὐτοις) ∿1-3-4-2 (7 MSS = ∿1-3-2-4
	(TR) το χαραγμα επι το μετωπον αυτων) σημειον-3-των μετωπων-6-ἡ-2 (MT = 1-2-3-4-5 [—6])
	τα χιλια ετη) εισατελευτη τους αιωνας (—τα χ.ε.)
	5 (MT) εζησαν) + αλλ' ενεκρωθησαν και απεθανον τον εκ Θεου χωρισμον και εβληθησαν εις αιωνιον κολασιν (omitting MT εως . . . πρωτη cum 34%). (Note that the phrase αιωνιον κολασιν occurs otherwise only in Mt.25:46).
	6 omit entire verse
	7 τα χιλια ετη) ταυτα (cf.214)
	8 θαλασσης) γης
	9 αγιων) + η γουν την εκκλησιαν την απο περατων εως περατων της οικουμενης απλωθησαν ηγαπημενην) + οἶμαι την ιλημ και εξολοθρευσαν παντα
	10 θειου) του θοιου (29% = του θειου)
	εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων) εις ατελευτη τους αιωνας (13 MSS omit εις . . . αιωνων).
	12 (TR) μικρους και μεγαλους) ∿3-2-1 (N.B. MT places μεγαλους before μικρους as well, but adds τους before each term).
	ηνεωχθησαν και αλλο βιβλιον ηνεωχθη (MT)) ∿1-2-3 +ζωης-4-5 (MS 189 also omits ο εστι της ζωη later as part of one great transposition).
	κατα) εκαστος κατα
	αυτων) αυτου
	14 εβληθησαν . . . θανατος (*fin.vers.*)) —
	15 εν τη βιβλω της ζωης) ∿1-2-4-5-3
	εβληθη) -θησαν
	πυρος) + της καιομενης

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
190	15.6	λαμπρον) λεπτον
	22.7	τουτου) ——
191	3.7	(MT) αυτην ει μη ο ανοιγων) } αυτην· και ο κλειων
		(other) και κλειων)
	9	(MT) ηξωσι) ηκωσι (so too 220^{mg*})
	17.4	και^{1}) + (cum 25 MSS) 17:18, within which MS 191 reads singularly thus: βασιλειαν) βλασφημιαν*
	20.1	επι) υπο (6 MSS = εν)
	4	πεπελεκισμενων) -κυσμ-
	22.6	των αγιων) + και [*sic*] (MT = των πνευματων των; 3 MSS within MT tradition read των πν. και των)
192	1.16	ως) —— (inserted supr.lin. by *)
193	3.13	ους) + ακουειν (cf.53)
		ακουσατω) ακουετω (cf.53)
	5.5	(MT) ανοιξαι) } ανοιξον
		(other) ο ανοιγων)
	8	γεμουσας) -σα
	9	τας σφραγιδας αυτου) αυτο *solus*
	7.15	αυτω) αυτα
	12.10	μεγαλην) ——
	17.4	γεμον) χεμουσα (5 MSS = γεμουσα)
	8	(MT) και παρεσται) } και πρεστι [*sic*]
		(other) και παρεστιν)
194	3.1	πνευματα) -μτα (Scribe 1: chs.3,5,7)
	4	ονοματα) -μτα
	5.6	πνευματα) -μτα
	8	θυμιαματων) θυμιαμτων [*sic*]
	9	αιματι) αιμτι
	7.4	υιων) ηων
	7	Συμεων) Σιμ-
	14	αιματι) αιμτι
	10.1	ισχυρον) ισχυτον (Scribe 2: chs.10,12,15,17,20,22)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(194)	12.6 χιλιας) χειλ- 12 ευφραινεσθε) ευφρανθησεσθε (5 MSS = ευφρανεσθε) 17.4 η (*ante* γυνη)) ——*; replace with μοι supr.lin.[2] 16 την πορνην) την γην πορνην 20.15 ειτις) ουτις 22.11 ο αδικων . . . ετι[1]) —— (N.B. 10 MSS read και *ante* ο αδικων) 14 ινα) ια 15 φαρμακοι) φαρμα 16 ο λαμπρος) + ο φαεινος
195	No MS appertains to this number.
196	No MS appertains to this number.
197	No MS appertains to this number.
198	No MS appertains to this number.
199	No MS appertains to this number.
200	1.2 Ιησου Χριστου) αυτου 3 τηρουντες) τιρ- 7 ναι) —— 8 κυριος ο Θεος) omit κυριος 9 νησω) ωισσω (5 MSS = νησσω) 11 εις[1]) —— 12 χρυσας) + και θυσιαστηριον 15 καμινω) —μεινου 16 και εχων) κατεχων 17 φοβου) φωβου 19 μελλει) δη μελλει (4 MSS = δει μελλει) 19/20 [19] μετα ταυτα· [20] το μυστηριον) μετα το μυστηριον 20 των επτα αστερων) τους επτα αστερας δεξιας) λυχνιας μου) ——

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(200)	1.20 και τας επτα λυχνιας τας χρυσας οι επτα αστερες) και των επτα αστερων λυχνιων (partly erased). (2 MSS have και των επτα λυχνιων, but including οι επτα αστερες).
	3.1 πνευματα) $\overline{\text{πνατα}}$ (interesting to note that no other MS uses this *nomina sacra* here, though 5 MSS have $\overline{\text{πνα}}$).
	2 (MT) στηρισον) / (TR) στηριξον) } στειριζων (7 MSS = στηριζων)
	3 μνημονευε) και μν.
	τηρει) τιρει
	γρηγορησης) -ριῦις (cf.12,143,241)
	(other) γνωση) -σηι (8 MSS = -σει)
	4 εχεις) εχω
	Σαρδεσιν) -δαις
	ἃ) οτι (26% = οἳ)
	εν λευκοις) ——
	8 ηρνησω) -νισω
	10 υπομονης) υπω-
	16 μελλω σε εμεσαι) ελεγχω σε (—εμεσαι) (7 MSS = 1-2-3+και ελεγχω σε)
	17 πεπλουτηκα) πεπτωκα
	18 (MT) εγχριση) / (other) -σαι) } ενχριϸαι
	19 φιλω) φηλησω
	20 προς αυτον) μετ'-2
	δειπνησω) δηπνισω
	21 αυτω) αυτον
	5.1 κατεσφραγισμενον) -γησ-
	2 ειδον) ——
	3 υποκατω) -τῷ
	της γης^2) της αβυσσου
	6 επτα^1) ——
	(MT) ἃ εισιν) εισιν δε
	8 γεμουσας θυμιαματων) ——
	9 σφραγιδας) -γηδ-
	ηγορασας) ἠγειρας [*sic*]
	9/10 ^{9}εν τω αιματι . . . ^{10}εποιησας αυτους τω Θεω ημων) —— (cf.130)
	12 και σοφιαν και ισχυν και τιμην) ——
	13 (TR) ὃ εστιν) ὃν εστιν (cf.186)
	ηκουσα) + δε
	επι του θρονου) ——
	13/14 ^{13}και το κρατος . . . ^{14}αμην) ——
	7.1 πνεη) γενηται
	2 εχοντα) και ην εχων
	αγγελοις) ανεμοις
	3 την γην μητε) ——
	(MT) σφραγισωμεν) -γησ-

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(200)	7.4 (other) ρμδ) ρκδ (N.B. MT reads *plene*: εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες; 200's reading may have developed from ρμδ);
	5 χιλιαδες[1,2,3]) χειλ-
	6 χιλιαδες[1,2,3]) χειλ-
	7 χιλιαδες[1,3]) χειλ- (case [2] omitted)
	8 χιλιαδες[1]) χειλ- (so also [2,3], but cum ℵ)
	9 γλωσσων) + πολλων
	ενωπιον[1]) ενοπιον (cf.72)
	(TR) περιβεβλημενοι) -μμενοι
	10 (MT) κραζουσι) εκραξαν
	11 (MT) ειστηκεισαν)
	(TR) εστηκεσαν) } ιστικησαν
	(other) ειστηκησαν)
	11/12 [11] τω Θεω (*fin.vers.*)) + ημων τω καθημενω επι τω θρονω και τω αρνιω. (*ex verse 10*) [12] omit λεγοντες αμην, and resume with η ευλογια etc.
	13 ηλθον) -θαν
	14 εν) επι (N.B. reads αυτας preceding)
	17 (MT) οδηγησει) ωδ-
	10.1 ιρις) ειρις
	επι) επι επι
	στυλοι) ευστοιλοι (Note ως preceding)
	2 (TR) βιβλαριδιον)
	(other) βιβλιδαριον) } βιβλαριον
	3 μυκαται) μοικωμενος (cf.19: μυκομενος)
	8 η φωνη ἣν ηκουσα) φωνην ηκουσα παλιν (4 MSS have φωνην ηκουσα without παλιν)
	9 (TR) δος) δως
	10 (TR) βιβλαριδιον)
	(other) βιβλιδαριον) } βυβλαριον [*sic*] (cf.208)
	χειρος) + αυτου
	12.1 υποκατω) -το
	στεφανος) ——
	4 καταφαγη) + αυτω (11 MSS + αυτο)
	6 ερημον) -μων
	(MT) εχει εκει) ἦχεν (—εκει) (only ηχεν is singular)
	εξηκοντα) εξικ-
	7 Μιχαηλ) Μηχ-
	14 ερημον) -μων
	18 αμμον) -ων
	15.2 υαλινην[1]) -ληνην
	3 την ωδην[1]) + του Θεου ανειλήφοτως· διαψιλαφουντος
	4 οσιος) + και δικαιος
	6 λινον) -νου
	στηθη) + αυτων

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(200)	15.7 επτα[1]) ——
	αγγελοις) + τοις
	χρυσας) + $\overline{\zeta}$ (= επτα)
	8 εγεμισθη) -θεΐ
	17.1 επτα[1]) $\overline{\zeta}$ επτα [*sic*] (16 MSS = $\overline{\zeta}$ *solus*)
	και ελαλησε μετ' εμου) ——
	πορνης) + ταυτης
	2 την γην) αυτην
	3 (MT) γεμον ονοματα) γεμωντα *or* γεμων τα-2 (21 MSS = γεμων-2; 5 MSS = γεμοντα/γεμον τα-2)
	βλασφημιας) -μα
	7 διατι) τι οτι (cf.146 comm.: τι εστι)
	9 αι επτα κεφαλαι) ——
	11 ο ην και ουκ εστι) ——
	13 εξουσιαν) + και την εξουσιαν (cf.200's entire text in this portion: και δυναμιν και εξουσιαν· και την εξουσιαν αυτων το θηριον διδοασιν);
	14 κλητοι) κλιτοι
	17 εδωκεν) + βουλην
	20.2 χιλια) χειλια
	3 χιλια) χειλια
	4 Ιησου) + $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$
	χριστου) + αυτων (N.B. omits τα following, cum 48%)
	χιλια) χειλια
	5 χιλια) χειλια
	6 ο[1]) ——
	μετ' αυτου) μετ' αυτα
	χιλια) χειλια
	7 χιλια) χειλια
	8 πλανησαι) -νισαι
	ως η αμμος) ωσημμος [*sic*]
	9 ηγαπημενην) αγιαν
	10 αυτους) τους ανθρωπους
	12 ηνεωχθη) ηνοιγει (3% = ηνοιγη)
	14 λιμνην) + την καιομενην
	22.5 φωτιζει) φωτησει (MT = φωτιει; 12 MSS = φωτισει)
	8 εβλεψα) εβλεπων και ηκουων ταυτα
	10 σφραγισης) -γησεις
	17 (MT) και ο διψων ερχεσθω· ο θελων λαβετω) ∿1-2-3 +και-6-4·-7 (—5)
	18 μαρτυρω) -ωμαι (8% = -ομαι)
	21 η χαρις του κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου) ——
	παντων των αγιων) των αγιων σου
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
201	1.4 θρονου) θρωνου
	6 Θεω) + ημων

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(201)	1.6 αιωνων) αιονων
	11 γραψον) -ων
	(MT) Φιλαδελφειαν) }-φειαν [*sic*]
	(other) -φιαν)
	13 μεσω) -σωι
	16 φαινει) φαιν__ει (2 letters erased *sic*)
	3.1/2 [1]νεκρος ει· [2]γινου) νεκρος εγηνου (cf.226; cf. Isa.25:4 LXX) (In verse 2, γενου is read by 5 MSS)
	2 γρηγορων) -γορον
	(MT) εμελλες αποβαλλειν) } ημελλον αποθανειν (only the particular combination here is singular).
	(TR) μελλει αποθανειν)
	πεπληρωμενα) -ρωμενω (N.B. next word is ενωπιον)
	7 ο αγιος ο αληθινος) ο αγγε *(fin.lin.)*/οσα ληθεινος [*sic*] (cf.140)
	(MT) αυτην ει μη ο ανοιγων) } αυτην και ηλειων και ουδεις ανοιγη ει μη ο ανοιγων
	(other) και ηλειων)
	8 μικραν) -ρα¨ [*sic fin.lin.*]
	9 ενωπιον) -πιων
	10 κατοικουντας) κατουκ-
	12 (MT) καταβαινει) -νη
	14 εκκλησιας) -σιαις
	16 χλιαρος) χλεαρος (cf. A)
	18 περιβαλη) -ληι
	φανερωθη) φανει (6 MSS = φανη)
	5.1 δεξιαν) + και εμμεσω
	2 αγγελον) written twice
	8 προσευχαι) -χαιων (34 MSS = -χων)
	7.2 τεσσαρσιν) τεσσα- [*sic*] (cf.113)
	4 εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες) ραραντατεσσαρες
	8 (MT) εσφραγισμενοι) } εσφ [*sic*]
	(other) -να¸)
	9 (MT) φοινικας) φυν- (cf.151)
	11 (MT) ειστηκαισαν)
	(TR) εστηκεσαν) } ιστεικησαν
	(other) ειστηκησαν)
	17 εξαλειψει) -ληψη
	10.1 ειδον) ιδων (22 MSS = ιδον)
	ιρις) ηρεις [*sic*] (2 MSS = ηρις; MS A = ιρεις)
	2 (TR) βιβλαριδιον) βυβλ-
	8 (TR) βιβλαριδιον) βρβλαριδιον *vid.sic*
	9 (TR) βιβλαριδιον) βυβλ-
	10 (TR) βιβλαριδιον) βυβλαρυδιον [*sic*]
	12.7 (MT) πολεμησαι) ——

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(201)	12.14 (TR) οπου) ινα οπου (cf.130, which reads ινα *solus*)
	17 επι) εν
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
202	10.10 γλυκυ) -κυι (2 MSS = -κι)
	15.6 ενδεδυμενοι) -δυμεν
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
203	3.15 οφελον ψυχρος ης η ζεστος) written once, followed by scholia, then written again before verse 16 begins.
	5.6 εχον) εχοντα (cf.33)
	7.11 οι) αγιοι (3 MSS = οι αγιοι)
	10.3 εκραξεν^2) -ξαν
	9 σου την κοιλιαν) ∿2-καρδιαν-1 (cf.106 for word order; 5 MSS = καρδιαν within MT order).
	12.2 (MT) εκραζεν)
	(TR) κραζει) } κεκραξαται (cf.240)
	(other) εκραξεν)
	7 Μιχαηλ) μι$^{+\lambda}$ [*sic*]
	9 ο^5 (*ante* καλουμενος)) ——
	εβληθη^2) + κατω (so too 2 MSS in comm., but not in text).
	10 και ηκουσα) και ηκουσα φωνην· και εγενετο (cf.178)(N.B. followed by φωνη μεγαλη, cum 2 MSS, and λεγουσα, cum 4 MSS).
	20.7 omit verse (due to confusion from commentary)
	8 verse present, but concealed in scholia.
	9 εκυκλωσαν) -σε
	10 τους αιωνας των αιωνων) τον αιωνα (—3,4)
	22.8 Ιωαννης) ιω$^{\pi}$ [*sic*]
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
204	1.2 ειδε) + addition in 41%, within which MS 204 reads singularly thus: χρη) χρι / ιων$^{\varsigma}$ [*sic*]
	9 Ιωαννης) ιων$^{\varsigma}$ [*sic*]
	3.9 (MT) προσκυνησωσιν) -νισ-
	16 ψυχρος) -ριος
	17 τάλαιπωρας) -πορος
	5.1 εσωθεν και εξωθεν) + και οπισθεν (cf.81)
	11 χιλιαδες) -δας

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(204)	5.14 προσεκυνησαν) -κειν-
	7.11 προσεκυνησαν) -κησαν (cf.81)
	10.1 περιβεβλημενον) -λιμ-
	12.3 δεκα) ιβ [*sic*] (2 MSS = δωδεκα; MS 81 = ιβ *sic*)
	14 ημισυ) ημυσι
	15.3 Μωσεως) Μῶσεως [*sic*]
	17.14 αυτου) αυτον
	20.4 αυτοις) αυτου
	5 αναστασις) ἀν [*sic*]
	22.8 Ιωαννης) ιων [*sic*]
	17 ειπατω) ηπ-
205	No MS appertains to this number.
206	1.15 οι ποδες) ηποδες 206^2
	πεπυρωμενοι) -ομενη 206^2 (cf.226)
	5.7 (TR) το βιβλιον) } αυτο
	(MT) omits)
	10 ημας) —
	7.1 τεσσαρας αγγελους) ∿2-1
	12.6 εξηκοντα) ευδομηκοντα (cf.176: εβδομηκοντα; note also that both 176 and 206 add 7½ to the total figure).
207	7.9 (MT) εδυνατο) } ιδ-
	(TR) ηδυνατο)
	12.4 τεκη) γεννηση
	14 (MT) τρεφηται) εκτρεφηται
	καιρους) κἐρους [*sic*]
	15.6 περι) παρα
	17.4 αυτης[1]) αυτου
	16 αυτης) αυτων
	20.4 πεπελεκισμενων) -κειμ-
	22.6 προφητων) πονηρων
	7 τηρων) τυρων

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
208	1.14 αυτου[1]) + φησιν
	3.2 (MT) Θεου μου) } $\overline{\text{Θυ}}$ φησιν (TR) Θεου —)
	5.9 και[1]) και η καθαρα προσευχη προσερχεται και
	7.6 φυλης[1]) φιλης
	9 (TR) φοινικες) -νηκες
	11 (MT) επεσον) -σων
	10.8 χειρι) χερι
	10 (TR) βιβλαριδιον) } βιβλαριον (other) βιβλιδαριον)
	12.9 εβληθησαν) + εικοτως (cf.81,189)
	15.4 ου) ου ου
	20.1 καταβαινοντα) -βαιοντα
	4 εκαθισαν) -θιταν*
	22.15 ειδωλολατραι) -λοτατραι *vid.*
	16 $\overline{\text{Δαδ}}$) + ο $\overline{\text{χς}}$ ο $\overline{\text{Θς}}$
	20 ταυτα) —
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
209	No MS appertains to this number.
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
210	1.13 χρυσην) χρυσ' [*sic*]
	20 λυχνιας) λυγχ- οι) και οι
	3.10 μελλουσης) -σσης
	11 ερχομαι) ερχεται
	18 αγορασαι) -γῶρ- [*sic*] (9 MSS = -γωρ- uncorrected)
	5.8 αι εισιν) αισι
	προσευχαι) -χε[1] [*sic*]
	9 ωδην καινην) ∿κενην-1 (24 MSS = ∿2-1)
	7.7 Ισαχαρ) Ισσαρχαρ (23 MSS have Ισσαχαρ)
	10.8 λαλουσα) λαβουσα (cf.38*)
	12.4 τεκη) τεξει (2 MSS = τεξη; 15 MSS = τεκει)
	6 χιλιας διακοσιας εξηκοντα [= $\overline{\text{ασξ}}$]) $\overline{\text{ασχ}}$ (= 1800)
	9 ο δρακων) written twice, but dittography? (cf. eth)
	14 οφεως) Σατανα
	15.4 σου[1]) + $\overline{\text{κε}}$* (later erased)
	7 τοις επτα αγγελοις επτα φιαλας) τοις επτα φιαλας
	17.2 εμεθυσθησαν) εμεθησαν (15 MSS = εμεθυσαν)
	6 του αιματος[1]) το αιμα
	9 αι) ι [*sic*] (Rubric?)
	12 λαμβανουσιν) βανουσι

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(210)	20.6 μερος) μετρος
	22.3 εσται^{2}) εστι
	5 λυχνου) λυγχνου
	17 ειπατω) ^{εισ}υπατω [*sic*] (2 MSS = υπατω)
	21 αγιων) -ιω
211	3.8 τον λογον) το εργον (5 MSS = τα εργα)
	17 και πτωχος και τυφλος) ∿3-4-1-2
	(other) οδηγει) } οδηγι
	(other) οδηγη)
	10.9 απηλθον) απηλ$^{\theta}$ [*sic*]
	20.14 εβληθησαν) ενβλ-
212	1.15 πεπυρωμενοι) πεπορ-
	3.9 (MT) προσκυνησωσιν) } -νησιν
	(other) -σουσιν)
	7.5 φυλης^{2}) φιλης
	17 (MT) οδηγησει) -γεισει
	10.4 εμελλον) εμελ$^{\lambda}$ον [*sic*] (cf.120 for εμελον uncorrected)
	17.16 μισησουσι) μισησου
213	No MS appertains to this number.
214	3.3 πως . . . εαν ουν^{2}) ——
	7 (MT) ανοιξει) -ξε> [*sic*]
	9 Ιουδαιους) ι$^{\delta}$αιους [*sic*]
	10.3 εκραξε^{1}) -ξα
	8 υπαγε) ειπαγε *or* απαγε *vid.*
	17.6 μαρτυρων) ⁂ [*sic*] (= μαρτυρων χριστου? Note that Ιησου follows)
	8 μελλει) μελλη
	20.7 τα χιλια ετη) ταυτα χιλια ετη (cf.189)
	8 ως ἡ) ωσει ἡ (34% read ωσει *pro* ως ἡ)
	22.12 και ο μισθος . . . ως το) —— (N.B. just preceding 214 reads εργον εσται αυτου [= MT]+ ο μισθος [cum 2 MSS])

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
215	3.1 και[1]) ——
	9 γνωσιν) γνωσωσιν
	5.11 ζωων) ζωιων
	10.7 μελλη) -λλε͞ι [*sic*] (40 MSS = -λλει)
	12.11 αυτων[2]) αυτου
	15.2 εστωτας) -τες
	4 ενωπιον σου) σε κε *txt*; π^{ρ} ενοπιον σ^{υ} κε *mg*. (2 MSS read ενοπιον; 11 MSS have κε *post* σου).
	7 ζωων) ζωιων
	17.1 της μεγαλης) —— (so too 146 comm.)
	20.1 καταβαινοντα) καταταβ-
	5 ετη) ετι
	12 ηνεωχθησαν) ηνοχ-
	22.6 οι λογοι) ὁ-2
	14 (MT) ποιουντες) πλυνυντες (10 MSS = πλυνοντες; 5 MSS = πλυναντες; note that τας στολας αυτου follows cum 15 MSS over against MT τας εντολας αυτου).
	15 οι[2]) ο· [*sic*]
216	1.5 χριστου) + διο κἀνταυθα φησιν (cf. 169)
	3.19 *fin. verse*) + gloss in 9 MSS ex comm., within which MS 216 reads singularly thus: αγαθοτητι) -τει
	21 ακουσατω) ακοσ-
	5.2 και ειδον αγγελον)· ——
	8 και φιαλας) ——
	7.9 μετα) + δε
	παντος εθνους) παντου εθνου
	17 (TR) ζωσας) -αν *vid.*
	εξαλειψει) εξελ-*
	10.7 εβδομου) ευβδομου
	12.4 εστηκεν) εστησεν
	5 και ετεκεν υιον) ——
	σιδηρα) -ρουν
	16 στομα αυτης) στομαυτης (3 MSS = στοματος αυτης)
	εβαλεν) εβαλεν [*sic*] (13 MSS = -λλ-)
	δρακων) -κον

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(216)	15.1 αγγελους) αλλους
	17.3 εν) εν εν
	10 ουπω) ουκ* *vid.*
	22.11 δικαιος) written twice*
217	1.12 επιστρεψας) -ψα
	3.9 εαυτους) εν αυτους (cf.180)
	10 εκ) —
	17 πεπλουτηκα) -τικας (2 MSS = -τηκας; 17% = -τικα)
	21 καγω ενικησα) ∿2-1
	5.2 αξιος) -ον
	12 λεγοντες) -τας
	10.9 καταφαγε) κατεφ-
	12.10 κατηγορος) κατοιγ-
	12 οτε) οτι
	16 κατεπιε) εκατεπιε (3 MSS = επιε)
	15.2 εστωτας) -τα
	17.2 οι κατοικουντες την γην) —
	20.9 (MT) εκ του ουρανου απο του Θεου) εκ Θεου (but this reading should be compared within the larger complex of non-singular variants in the immediate context).
	22.3 (MT) καταθεμα) καταθεμαι (cf.113,136)
	5 λυχνου) + φωτος (18 MSS add φωτος *ante* λυχ.; 13 MSS add φως *ante* λυχ.)
	9 των αδελφων) των δελφων
	14 τοις πυλωσιν) της πυλεωσιν (cf.166; also, 30 MSS read τοις πυλεωσιν)
218	1.1 ο Θεος) —
	δειξαι) γενεσθαι (cf. later in same verse)
	2 την μαρτυριαν) μαρτυρια (—την)
	4 ειρηνη) ηρ-
	5 ιερεις) ιρεις
	8 ειμι) ημι
	9 οινωνος) οινο (= οινος)[*sic*] (cf.154: οινος *sic*)
	11 λεγουσης) λαλουσις (5 MSS = λαλουσης)
	βιβλιον) -λον
	εις Σμυρναν) εις μυρνον (24 MSS elide the second σ; 17 of these then read μυρναν; also, 13 MSS read as one word εισμυρναν).

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(218)	1.11 Λαοδικειαν) Λαωδ- 12 βλεπειν) και βλεψας (και superscript by *) την φωνην . . . επιστρεψας) —— (cf.236) 14 κεφαλη) καιφαλη ερίον) + το προσωπον αυτου 15 ομοιοι) ομοια ον ομοιει *vid.* (2 MSS = ομια; 1 MS = ομοια χαλκολιβανω) εν χαλκολιυανω 16 η οψις) ειοψις 18 δ) —— 20 (MT) και αι λυχνιαι αι επτα επτα εκκλησιαι εισι) 1-2-3-αιπτα-7-8 (cf.187 re: επτα[5]) 5.5 μοι) μει *vid.* λεων) λεον (other) ο ανοιγων) ο ανοιγον 6 τεσσαρων) τεσα- ζωων) + αυτου εσφαγμενον) εσφραγιμενον (16 MSS = -φραγισμ-) εχον) εχωντα (43 MSS = εχων; MS 203 = εχοντα) 7 ειληφεν) ελαβεν 8 τεσσαρα) τεσαρα οι εικοσιτεσσαρες) οι οικοσιτεσαροις (7 MSS —οι) εχοντες) εχωντες αι εισιν) αι ησιν 9 λεγοντες) -γων- τω αιματι) το-2 10 επι της γης) επι την γην 12 λεγοντες) λεγωντων (11 MSS = λεγοντων εσφαγμενον) -φραγιμ- (11 MSS = -φραγισμ-) 13 κτισμα) κτιμαν (3 MSS = κτιμα; 2 MSS = κτισμαν) λεγοντας) -γων- 7.1 τεσσαρας[1,3]) τεσαρας[1], τεσαροις[3] (the phrase containing case [2] is omitted; see next entry) τας τεσσαρας γωνιας της γης κρατουνας) —— πνεη) πεσι (5 MSS = πεση) 2 εχοντα) εχωντα τεσσαρσιν) τεσαροις 2/3 [2]και την θαλασσαν. [3]λεγων μη αδικησητε) —— 3 τα (*ante* δενδρα)) —— 4 και) —— 6 Ασηρ) Ασορ 8 Βενιαμιν) -μῆ [*sic*] (27 MSS = -μην) 9 οχλος) αριθμος ὃν) ἣν φυλων) φιλ- 10 λεγοντες) -γων- τω καθημενω) το-2 11 και[1]) —— (MT) εισταικεισαν) (TR) εισταικησαν) } ηστηκησαν (8% = εισταικησαν)

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(218)	7.11 θρονου[1]) θρωνου αυτου (MS 152 reads θρωνου in cases [1,2], but without addition).
	τεσσαρων) τεσα-
	12 ευχαριστια) -τηα (15 MSS = -τεια)
	15 σκηνωσει) σκυνοσει
	16 διψησουσιν) δηψη-
	17 το[1]) ——
	(MT) ποιμανει) } -μένοι [*sic*] (2% = -μενει)
	(other) -μαινει)
	10.1 κεφαλης) καιφ-
	στυλοι) -λη
	2 ανεωγμενον) ανεογ-
	4 εμελλον) ημελων (31% = ημελλον)
	7 ταις ημεραις) ——
	8 ηκουσα) -σας
	10 και ην εν τω στοματι . . . εφαγον αυτο) ——
	(N.B. text resumes και επικρανθη cum 2 MSS)
	11 και βασιλευσι πολλοις) ——
	12.3/4 [3]διαδηματα . . . [4]τριτον) ——
	4 ινα οταν τεκη) ——
	καταφαγη) -γειν
	5 σιδηρα) σηδειρα
	6 εις) προς
	ημερας) ——* (added in mg by *, but to be placed *post* εξηκοντα at fin.vers., cum versions only).
	εξηκοντα) -κων-
	8 τοπος) τοπως
	9 πλανων) -νον
	εβληθησαν) ——
	10 εξουσια) θυσια
	11 και αυτοι ενικησαν αυτον) ∿1-4-3 (—2)
	12 τουτο) -τω
	14 καιρον και) ——
	ημισυ) -ση (3 MSS = ημισι)
	15 ως ποταμον) ποταμου (—ως)
	(MT) ποιηση) -σι
	16 εβαλεν) εξεβαλεν (2 MSS = ενεβ-; 2 MSS = ανεβ-)
	17 λοιπων) λυπων
	εχοντων) -χων-
	18 την αμμον) τον ποταμον
	15.1 εχοντας) ——
	θυμος) θυμως
	3 λεγοντες) -γων-
	4 φοβηθη σε) φοβηθησεται
	ονομα) ονωμα
	σου[1]) + τω αγιον
	δικαιωματα) -κεω-
	6 λινον) ληυ [*sic*]
	περιεζωσμενοι) -ζοσ-

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(218)	15.6 περι τα στηθη) ——
	8 αι) ἀ [*sic*]
	17.1 εἷς) ος *vid? (Hoskier uncertain)*
	πορνης) πολης
	2 εμεθυσθησαν) εμεθησθησαν
	3 απηνεγκε) ανηνεγκᾶν (4 MSS = ανηνεγκεν)
	4 (MT) ην) ——
	πορφυρα και κοκκινω και κεχρυσωμενη) ——
	(MT) χρυσιω) -σιον
	λιθω τιμιω) -ον -ον
	8 εστιν[1]) εστην
	9 κεφαλαι) φιαλαι
	επτα[2,3]) αιπτα (cf.72 re: αι επτα[1], where 218 reads with MT; in cases [2,3] cited here, 72 reads with MT!)
	και) + οι
	10 (MT) δει αυτον) δι αυτων
	12 ἃ ειδες) ——
	13 εχουσιν) εχωσιν
	(MT) αυτων) ——
	14 και οι μετ' αυτου) ——
	κλητοι) λητοι *vid.* (Rubric?)
	15 τα) —— *vid.*
	20.3 αυτον) εαυτον
	αχρι) αχρη
	αυτον λυθηναι) ∿2-αυτων (45% = ∿2-1)
	4-6 [4]τα χιλια . . . [6]και του χριστου) omit, resuming with [6]και βασιλευσουσιν, followed by μετ' αυτου + του χυ, then returning to verse 5, αυτη η αναστασις η πρωτη, continuing with verse 6, μακαριος etc. (cf.113 for the addition of του χριστου *post* μετ' αυτου).
	8 τον[2]) των (so too τον[1], but there cum 2 MSS).
	αμμος) + της γης ἥ τη
	9 πλατος) -τ-
	την[3] (*post* πολιν)) —— *vid.*
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
219	7.8 εκ φυλης Βενιαμιν ιβ χιλιαδες) —— (N.B. omits εσφραγισμενοι *fin.* as well; so must have 219's exemplar. Cf.245).
	16 (MT) ουδε διψησουσιν ετι, ουδ' ου μη πεση επ' αυτους ο ηλιος) ∿4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-1-2-3*
	22.19 της αγιας) ——
	21 αμην) + ιλεως εσο τοις πασι κε
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
220	7.7 εκ φυλης Λευι ιβ̄ χιλιαδες) —→* (5 MSS omit with no later correction; note also that when inserted in mg by *, the TR εσφραγισμενοι is also added, cum 17%).
	14 (MT) τας στολας[1]) τας λευκας στολας
	16 διψησουσιν) + addition ex comm. in 3 MSS, within which 220 reads singularly thus: εικοτως) ——
	10.3 ωσπερ) ως μυκαται) ωρυεται in mg by *
	12.6 (MT) εχει εκει τποον) ν1-3-2 [*sic*] (4% = ν1-3-2 uncorrected)
	9 την οικουμενην ολην) ν3-1-2
	15.8 αὐτου) + addition cum MS 28, within which 220 reads singularly thus: ενεγκει) -κη
	20.8 εις πολεμον) επολεμον *vid.*
221	1.1 δουλοις) αποστολις 221[2]
	3 αναγινωσκων) -οσκον 221[2] (4 MSS = -ωσκον; 3 MSS = ωσκον*; 2 MSS = -οσκων)
222	3.1 εἶ) ἦς (8 MSS = ἦ)
	5 ενωπιον του Πατρος μου και) ——
	5.8 αι προσευχαι) εκ των προσευχων (34 MSS = αι προσεύχων)
	7.5 (TR) εσφραγισμενοι[1]) -μενε (?—for -μεναι cum 38%? In remainder of cases 222 reads with MT, omitting εσφραγ. altogether).
	10.10 κατεφαγον) εφαγον
	17.14 πολεμησουσ-ι) -μησουσι
	20.1 μεγαλην) + ισχυραν
223	7.6 χιλιαδες[2]) χιχιλιαδες
	17.5 βδελυγματων) ββδ-

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
224	12.7 αυτου[1]) αυαυτου
	15.3 παντοκρατωρ) + και
	17.5 της) της της
	10 (MT) επεσον) (TR) επεσαν) } επεσὸν [*sic*] (9 MSS = -σὰν)
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
225	No MS appertains to this number.
	÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷
226	1.3 τους λογους) των λογων
	4 (TR) ἃ εστιν) (MT) ἃ ——) } ——
	5 (TR) εκ των) (MT) — των) } ——
	13 ενδεδυμενον) ενδεδεμ-
	15 πεπυρωμενοι) -ωμενη *vid.* (2 MSS = -ωμενης; cf.206)
	16 και[2]) ——
	αυτου[2]) ——
	20 οι) + δε
	3.1/2 [1]νεκρος εἶ. [2]γινου) νεκρος εγενου (cf.201; note also that in verse 2, γενου is read by 5 MSS, though not by 226).
	2 (MT) αποβαλλειν) απολαβειν (30 MSS = -βαλειν)
	3 ως κλεπτης . . . επι σε[2]) ——
	9 εαυτους Ιουδαιους ειναι) ∿3-1-2
	10 τον λογον) τους λογους
	επι της οικουμενης ολης) εις ὅλην την οικουμενην (cf.113; also, 11 MSS read επι την οικ. ολην)
	12 ἡ (*ante* Ιερουσαλημ)) ὃ [*sic*]
	εκ του ουρανου απο του Θεου) ∿4-3-1-6 (—2,5)*; ∿4-3-1-5-6 (—2) 226[2] (3 MSS = ∿4-3-4-5-6; 38% = ∿4-2-3-4-5-6)
	15/16 [15]ζεστος[1] . . . [16]ψυχρος) χλιαρος *solus*
	18 βλεπης) -πη *vid.*
	5.5 (TR) και λυσαι) και λυων
	6 εστηκος ως εσφαγμενον) εσφραγισμενον εστηκως (—ως) (N.B. only the word order is singular!)
	7 εκ) απο
	8 οτε) οταν
	11 (MT) ὁ (*ante* αριθμος)) ——
	12 φωνη μεγαλη) ——
	13 και τα εν αυτοις) ——
	14 (MT) και τα τεσσαρα ζωα λεγοντα το αμην) ——* (supplied in mg by [2] in TR form: 1-2-3-4- ελεγον αμην).

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(226)	7.1	επι τας) —— (MT) επι τι δενδρον) (TR) επι παν δενδρον) } επι των δένδρων (4 MSS omit τι/παν; cf. also 111)
	4	εκ) επι
	5	χιλιαδες^{2}) ——
	6	φυλης^{3}) + του *(ante* Μανασση*)*
	9	εθνους) γενους
	13	απεκριθη) αποκριθεις
		λεγων) λεγει
	14	συ οιδας) ουκ οιδα
		(MT) επλυναν) (other) επλατυναν) } επλάτυναν [*sic*] (3 MSS = επληναν; no MS reads επλητυναν).
227	5.12	και σοφιαν και ισχυν) ∿3-4-1-2
	15.5	ουρανω) $\overline{\text{ουνω}}$ $\overline{\text{ουνω}}$*
	22.2	εντευθεν και εντευθεν) 1-2-3-2-3
		ξυλον) ——*
228	7.9	μετα) ετα (Rubric?)
	12.7	ουρανω) + ___ (3 letters, but wholly erased; most likely + και, cum 5 MSS, though none of those MSS has corrected in any way).
	15.5	μετα) ετα (Rubric?)
	17.6	μεθυουσαν) σθ- (Rubric?)
	8	και^{6} *(final)*) ——
	20.4	και ουκ) omit ουκ*
229	22.2	εντευθεν και εντευθεν) 1-2-3-1-2-3
230	1.9	Πατμω) Παττμω
	7.1	επι τας τεσσαρας γωνιας της γης κρατουντας) ——*
	20.6	αναστασει) ααν-

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS — Singular readings within the sample chapters

230[a] No MS appertains to this number.

231 No MS appertains to this number.

232 7.2 εκραξε) εκεκραξε (so too in 6:10, cum 3 MSS)

233
1.1 αυτω) —
9 Ιησου χριστου (*fin.vers.*)) του $\overline{\text{Ιυ}}$ $\overline{\text{Χυ}}$*
17 και[2]) —*

3.1 επτα) —
3 μνημονευε) -νεβε
6 το) τω
9 αλλα ψευδονται. Ιδου ποιησω αυτους ινα ηξωσι) —
12 καινης) + μου
(MT) καταβαινει) -βενει
16 σε) —
18 (TR) εγχρισον) ενχρυσον
19 ελεγχω) ελεχω

5.5 μοι) με *vid.* (note μη following)
8 επεσον) επεσσαν *vid.* (43 MSS = επεσαν)
9 εσφαγης) -γις [*sic*] (4 MSS = -γις uncorrected)
11 του θρονου) των θρονων
12 εσφαγμενον) -φραγ-
13 και τα) και και τα
14 (MT) λεγοντα το) λεγον το (cf.72; note that 3 MSS = λεγοντα *solus*, and 3 MSS = λεγοντας *solus*).
και[3] (*final*)) —*

7.7 Λευι) Λευβι
9 (TR) περιβεβλημενοι) -μενη
11 (other) επεσαν) επεσσαν
13 ουτοι οι περιβεβλημενοι) ουτοι υπεριβεβ-
16 μη) μοι
πεση) —

10.3 φωνη μεγαλη) ∿2-1
ελαλησαν) ελλα- *vid.*
6 χρονος) -νοι
9 αυτω) προς αυτον (cf.113)
γλυκυ) κλυκυν
10 της χειρος) του-2
γλυκυ) κλυκυ
11 εθνεσι) εθνεσεσι
πολλοις) πολοις [*sic*]

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(233)	12.16	εβαλεν) -βελ-
	15.4	και δοξαση) τις ου μη δοξαση (2 MSS = και τις ου δοξαση)
	5	μαρτυριου) + του
	17.2	βασιλεις) βαλεῖς [*sic*]
		γης) ——
	4	(MT) κοκκινον) κκοκινον (= metathesis rather than dittography?)
	8	αβυσσου) -υσου
	17	(MT) μιαν) μιαν μιαν
	20.3	και μετα ταυτα) μεταυτα*; μεταυτα [*sic*][2] (N.B. 44% omit και)
	4	το μετωπον) 1-μετωπων (26 MSS = των μετωπων)
	12	νεκρους) —— (5 MSS omit τους νεκρους)
	15	εν τη βιβλω) 1-2-βιβλιω (only the particular combination of these words is singular).
	22.5	λυχνου) -νον
	6	τον αγγελον) των-2
	8	Ιωαννης) ὁω ῑ̄ω̄ [*sic*]
	9	συνδουλος) συμβουλος
	10	σφραγισης) -γιση
	14	πολιν) ~~ζωην~~ πολιν [*sic*]*
	15	οι πορνοι) πας πορνοι
	18	της) τουτης (= error for ταυτης? Cf. 1.13)
		αυτον) αυταυ
	19	των λογων) των ~~αμαρτιων~~ λογων [*sic*]*
		γεγραμμενων) -ενω (cf. this MS in 18:24, των εσφαγμενω).
	20	ερχομαι) ερχο
234	No MS appertains to this number.	
235	No MS appertains to this number.	
236	1.1	αποστειλας) ——
	2	omit entire verse.
	6	αυτω η δοξα . . . αμην (*fin. vers.*)) ——
	7	ναι αμην) ——
	8	το Ω) ωμεγα (—το)
	9	(MT) και κοινωνος . . . Ιησου Χριστου) ——
	10	φωνην οπισω μου μεγαλην) φωνης *solus*
		ως σαλπιγγος) ——
	11	εις Εφεσον . . . Λαοδικειαν (*fin. vers.*)) ——

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS — Singular readings within the sample chapters

(236) 1.12 ητις ελαλησε μετ' εμου και επιστρεψας) —
ειδον) και ειδον

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

237 No MS appertains to this number.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

238 Contains no singular readings in the very small portion extant within the sample base chapters utilized for this study (238 in its entirety only contains 1:1-3; 10:7-11).

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

239 No MS appertains to this number.

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

240 1.2 ειδε) + και οτι δι' αγγελου δεδοται

3.8 (MT) ανεωγμενην) -νον *vid.*
19 φιλω) αγαπω

5.9 λεγοντες) -τας
11 φωνην) φων

7.4 εκατον και τεσσαρακοντα τεσσαρες) } ρ κ μδ^ες [*sic*]
ρμδ)

10.7 εβδομου) ζ̄^ω [*sic*]

12.2 (MT) εκραζεν) } κεκραζεται (cf.203)
(TR) κραζει)
15 ως) ως εις (3 MSS read ως *pro* εις)
18 επι) επι επι

15.8 εισελθειν) —*

17.11 απωλειαν) απω [*sic*]

20.2 τον δρακοντα) του δρακοντος
4 χιλια) ᾱ^α [*sic*]
6 πρωτη) ᾱ" [*sic*]
12 ηνεωχθησαν) ανεωξαν

22.3 αυτου) αυτο [*sic*]
7 ιδου) ιδε*

÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷÷

241 1.7 εξεκεντησαν) εξεκενσαν [*sic*]
11 λεγουσης) -ση
12 ητις) ητης
15 εν) εγ
20 (TR) ας ειδες) ας οιδες

3.3 γρηγορησης) -ρισης

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS		Singular readings within the sample chapters
(241)	7.14	ειπεν μοι) ειπεν [*sic*]
	10.3	μυκαται) κοιμαται (cf.113: κυματα)
	12.14	(TR) τρεφεται) + αυτη
	17.6	ιδων) ειδον (4 MSS = ειδων)
	12	κερατα) + ταυτα
	20.11	καθημενον) -θιμ-
	15	ειτις) -της
	22.2	εντευθεν και εντευθεν ξυλον ζωης) ∿4-5-1-2-3-4-5
	20	ναι ερχομαι) ανερχομαι [*sic*] (cf.114,121)
242	1.8	αλφα) αλ$^{\phi\alpha}$ [*sic*]
	15.6	τας επτα πληγας) τας$^{\overline{\zeta}}$πληγας [*sic*]
243	1.13	χρυσην) -σουν
	3.4	μετ' εμου) μετ' αυτου
	5.3	επι της γης) omit της
	7.3	αδικησητε) -σετε
	20.8	τον Γωγ και τον Μαγωγ) την Γ. και την Μ.
		Note: the above readings are listed in I:737 since this MS is officially "deleted" from the collation.
244	3.4	ἀ) $^{o\iota}\alpha$ [*sic*] (26% = οι)
	18	περιβαλη) -λ$^{\lambda}$η [*sic*] (17% = -λλη)
	7.9	(MT) φοινικας) } -κ$^{\varepsilon}$ας [*sic*]
		(TR) -κες)
	11	τεσσαρων) $\overline{\delta}^{\omega\nu}$ [*sic*] (14 MSS = $\overline{\delta}$)
245	1.7	και^{1}) —— (N.B. reads αμην just preceding, cum 2 MSS)
	11	βλεπεις) βλεψεις
	3.18	(MT) εγχριση) εχρ-
	5.11	αυτων) αυτω
	7.8	εκ φυλης Βενιαμιν $\overline{\iota\beta}$ χιλιαδες) —— (cf. 219; also note that in the present case, εσφραγισμενοι remains at fin.vers.!).
	10.8	και^{1}) και και

TABLE 6—*Continued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters	
(245)	10.9	ως μελι) ὡσ___μελι* (3 letters erased *sic*; perhaps ωσπερ μελι?)
	10	οτε) —
	12.3	και[4] *(final)*) —
	9	την γην) omit την* (inserted sup.lin. by *)
	15.2	ονοματος αυτου) 1-του θηριου
	17.2	οι βασιλεις της γης και εμεθυσθησαν) —
	20.12	ηνεῳχθη) -θει
		ὃ) —*
	13	και ο θανατος . . . τα εργα αυτων) —
246	1.20	(MT) και αι λυχνιαι αι επτα επτα εκκλησιαι εισι) 1-αι αι-3-5-6-7-8 (—4)
	3.1	ὁ *(ante* εχων*)*) —
	4	λευκοις) λευκ^ [*sic*]
	13	ακουσατω) -τωι
	22	ακουσατω) -τωι
	12.3	ωφθη) φθη (Rubric?)
	14	ημισυ) _μισυ (2 letters erased, *vid.* either η or ει)
247	No MS appertains to this number.	
248	No MS appertains to this number.	
249	No MS appertains to this number.	
250	5.8	οι εικοσιτεσσαρες [= $\overline{\text{κδ}}$]) οι ει $\overline{\text{κδ}}$ [*sic*]
	7.2	εχοντα) εχοντα· εχοντα [*sic*]
	10.5	εστωτα) written twice
	12.10	χριστου) αντιχριστου *vid.*
	15.6	λινον) λειvον* *vid.*
	17.1	δευρο) -ρῶ [*sic*] (12 MSS = -ρω uncorrected)

TABLE 6—*COntinued*

MS	Singular readings within the sample chapters
(250)	20.11 τον) ——
	22.19 το) —— της^{3} *(ante* πολεως*)*) ——* (inserted supr.lin.^{2})
251	1.3 τους λογους) 1-λογούς [*sic*] (10 MSS read τον λογον without correction).
	3.2 (MT) εμελλες αποβαλλειν) (TR) μελλει αποθανειν) } εμελλες αποθανειν
	18 (TR) εγχρισον) εγχρησον
	5.3 υποκατω) οι υποκατω (this also ∿ *post* αυτο at fin.vers. cum 4 MSS).
	10.8 χειρι) + του αγιου
	12.6 χιλιας) ——*
	15.2 και εκ του χαραγματος αυτου) ∿ *post* ονοματος αυτου οσιος) και οσιος ει (46 MSS read οσιος ει)
	22.15 (MT) και πας φιλων) 1-2-υπερηφανιαν-3 17 (MT) μαρτυρω) μαρτυρω δε
252	No MS appertains to this number.

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

Aland, Kurt. *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. I. Gesamtübersicht.* Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Band 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.

———. *Materialien zur Neutestamentlichen Handschriftenkunde, I.* Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung, Band 3. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1969.

———, gen.ed. *Nestle-Aland Novum Testamentum Graece.* 26th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1979.

Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M.; and Wikgren, Allen, eds. *The Greek New Testament.* 3rd ed. London: United Bible Societies, 1975.

Anderson, Hugh; and Barclay, William, eds. *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G. H. C. Macgregor.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Best, Ernest; and Wilson, R. McL., eds. *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Brown, Raymond E.; Donfried, Karl P.; Fitzmyer, Joseph A.; and Reumann, John, eds. *Mary in the New Testament.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978.

Burgon, John William. *The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels.* Arranged, completed, and edited by Edward Miller. London: George Bell & Sons, 1896.

———. *The Revision Revised.* London: John Murray, 1883.

———. *The Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels Vindicated and Established.* Arranged, completed, and edited by Edward Miller. London: George Bell & Sons, 1896.

Carson, Donald A. *The King James Version Debate: A Plea for Realism.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1979.

Case, Shirley Jackson, ed. *Studies in Early Christianity: Presented to Frank C. Porter and Benjamin W. Bacon.* New York: The Century Co., 1928.

Charles, Robert Henry. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Revelation of St. John.* 2 vols. International Critical Commentary Series. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1920; rep. ed., 1963.

Colwell, Ernest Cadman. *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.9; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968.

Elliott, J. Keith, ed. *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick.* Supplements to *Novum Testamentum,* Vol.44. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.

Fee, Gordon Donald. *Papyrus Bodmer II (P^{66}): Its Textual Relationships and Scribal Characteristics.* Studies and Documents, Vol.34; Jacob Geerlings, ed. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

Fuller, David Otis, ed. *True or False? The Westcott-Hort Textual Theory Examined.* Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1973.

Greenlee, Jacob Harold. *Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism.* Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1964.

Hatch, William Henry Payne, ed. *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament at Mount Sinai: Facsimiles and Descriptions.* Paris: Geuthner, 1932.

Havet, L. *Manuel de critique verbale appliqueé aux texts latins.* Paris: n.p., 1911.

Hoskier, Herman Charles. *Codex B and Its Allies: A Study and an Indictment.* 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1914.

———. *A Commentary on the Various Readings in the Text of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Chester Beatty Papyrus P^{46} (circa 200 A.D.).* London: Bernard Quaritch, 1938.

———. *Concerning the Genesis of the Versions of the New Testament (Gospels).* 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1910-11.

———. *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse.* 2 vols. London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.

Huff, Darrell. *How to Lie With Statistics.* New York: W.W. Norton, 1954.

Hyatt, J. Philip, ed. *The Bible in Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964.* Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965.

Kenyon, Frederic G., ed. *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts in Papyrus of the Greek Bible.* Fasciculus III: Revelation. London: Emery Walker, 1934(Text), 1936 (Plates).

Longenecker, Richard N.; and Tenney, Merrill C., eds. *New Dimensions in New Testament Study.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974.

McGinn, Bernard. *Visions of the End: Apocalyptic Traditions in the Middle Ages.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1979.

McNeile, Alan Hugh. *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament.* 2nd ed. Revised by C.S.C. Williams. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1953.

Metzger, Bruce Manning. *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.

———. *Historical and Literary Studies: Pagan, Jewish, and Christian.* New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.8; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1968.

———. *The Text of the New Testament.* 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1968.

———. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament.* London: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Miller, Edward. *A Guide to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament.* London: George Bell & Sons, 1886.

———, ed. *The Oxford Debate on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament: Held at New College on May 6, 1897.* London: George Bell & Sons, 1897.

———. *The Present State of the Textual Controversy Respecting the Holy Gospels.* Privately printed by the author, 1898.

Milne, H. J. M.; and Skeat, Theodore Cressy. *Scribes and Correctors of the Codex Sinaiticus.* London: The British Museum, 1938.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine.* Vol.I: "The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)." Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Peter, Laurence J.; and Hull, Raymond. *The Peter Principle.* New York: Bantam Books, 1969.

Pickering, Wilbur Norman. *The Identity of the New Testament Text.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1977.

———. *The Identity of the New Testament Text: Revised Edition.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1980.

Rahlfs, A. *Septuaginta.* 2 vols. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935; 1971 rep.ed.

Roberts, Colin H. *Manuscript, Society and Belief in Early Christian Egypt.* The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1977. London: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Robertson, Archibald Thomas. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research.* Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.

Rylaarsdam, J. Coert, ed. *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship.* Essays in Divinity, Vol.6; gen.ed. Jerald C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Schmid, Josef. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Texts.* 3 vols. Munich: Karl Zink Verlag, 1955-56.

Scrivener, Frederick Henry Ambrose, ed. *Bezae Codex Cantabrigiensis: Being an Exact Copy in Ordinary Type, of the Celebrated Uncial Graeco-Latin Manuscript of the Four Gospels and Acts of the Apostles.* Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1978 rep.ed. [Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co., 1864].

———. *A Plain Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament.* 4th ed. Edited by Edward Miller. 2 vols. London: George Bell & Sons, 1894.

Sevenster, J. N.; and van Unnik, W. C., eds. *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii.* Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953.

Soden, Hermann Freiherr von. *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt.* 2 vols. in 4 parts. Vol.2: "Text mit Apparat." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1911.

Sturz, Harry A. *The Byzantine Text-Type And New Testament Textual Criticism.* 3rd syllabus ed. La Mirada, CA: Biola College, 1976.

Tischendorf, Constantine von. *Novum Testamentum Graece.* Editio Octava Critica Maior. 2 vols. Leipzig: Giesecke und Devrient, 1869-72.

Vincent, L.-H., ed. *Mémorial Lagrange.* Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1940.

Westcott, Brooke Foss; and Hort, Fenton John Anthony. *The New Testament in the Original Greek.* One-volume edition. New York: Macmillan, 1953 rep. ed.

———. *The New Testament in the Original Greek.* 2 vols. Vol.2: "Introduction and Appendix." New York: Harper & Brothers, 1882.

II. ARTICLES IN BOOKS

Clark, Kenneth Willis. "Textual Criticism and Doctrine." In *Studia Paulina in honorem Johannis de Zwaan, Septuagenarii*. Edited by J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik. Haarlem: De Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953, pp.52-65.

———. "Today's Problems with the Critical Text of the New Testament." In *Transitions in Biblical Scholarship*. Edited by J. Coert Rylaarsdam. Essays in Divinity, Vol.6; gen. ed. Jerald C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp.157-169.

Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Limitations." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.9; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp.63-83.

———. "Hort Redivivus: A Plea and a Program." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.9; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp.148-171.

———. "Method in Classifying and Evaluating Variant Readings." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.9; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp.84-105.

———. "Method in Establishing Quantitative Relationships between Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.9; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp.56-62.

———. "Method in Establishing the Nature of Text-Types of New Testament Manuscripts." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.9; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp.45-55.

———. "Method in Evaluating Scribal Habits." In *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. New Testament Tools and Studies, Vol.9; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp.106-124.

———. "Scribal Habits in Early Papyri: A Study in the Corruption of the Text." In *The Bible In Modern Scholarship: Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1965., pp.370-389.

Elliott, W. J. "The Need for an Accurate and Comprehensive Collation of All Known Greek NT Manuscripts With Their Individual Variants Noted *in pleno*." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, Vol.44. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976, pp.137-143.

Fee, Gordon Donald. "P^{66} P^{75} and Origen: The Myth of Early Textual Recension in Alexandria." In *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*. Edited by Richard N. Longenecker and Merrill C. Tenney. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974, pp.19-45.

———. "Rigorous or Reasoned Eclecticism——Which?" In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, Vol.44. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976, pp.174-197.

Kilpatrick, George Dunbar. "The Greek New Testament Text of Today and the *Textus Receptus*." In *The New Testament in Historical and Contemporary Perspective: Essays in Memory of G. H. C. Macgregor*. Edited by Hugh Anderson and William Barclay. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965, pp.189-208.

Lake, Kirsopp. "The Byzantine Text of the Gospels." In *Mémorial Lagrange*. Edited by L.-H. Vincent. Paris: J. Gabalda et Cie, 1940, pp.251-258.

———. "The Text of the Gospels." In *Studies in Early Christianity Presented to Frank C. Porter and Benjamin W. Bacon*. Edited by Shirley Jackson Case. New York: The Century Co., 1928, pp.21-47.

Metzger, Bruce Manning. "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, Vol.8; Bruce M. Metzger, ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1968, pp.88-103.

———. "St. Jerome's Explicit References to Variant Readings in Manuscripts of the New Testament." In *Text and Interpretation: Studies in the New Testament Presented to Matthew Black*. Edited by Ernest Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979, pp.179-190.

Pickering, Wilbur Norman. "Contribution of John William Burgon to New Testament Criticism." In *True or False? The Westcott-Hort Textual Theory Examined*. Edited by David Otis Fuller. Grand Rapids: Grand Rapids International Publications, 1973, pp.216-295.

Plumley, J. Martin. "Limitations of Coptic (Sahidic) in Representing Greek." In Bruce M. Metzger, *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977, pp.141-152.

Ross, J. M. "The Ending of the Apocalypse." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick*. Edited by J. K. Elliott. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum*, Vol.44. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976, pp.338-344.

III. PERIODICAL ARTICLES

Aland, Kurt. "The Greek New Testament: Its Present and Future Editions." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 179-186.

_____. "Novi Testamenti Graeci Editio Maior Critica: Der gegenwärtige Stand der Arbeit an einer neuen grossen kritischen Ausgabe des Neuen Testament." *New Testament Studies* 16 (1969/70): 174-177.

Birdsall, J. Neville. "The Text of the Revelation of Saint John: A Review of its Materials and Problems, with Especial Reference to the Work of Josef Schmid." *Evangelical Quarterly* 33 (1961): 228-237.

Chapman, John. "St. Jerome and the Vulgate New Testament." 3 parts. *Journal of Theological Studies* 24 (1923): 33-51, 113-125, 282-299.

Clark, Kenneth Willis. "The Text of the Gospel of John in Third-Century Egypt." *Novum Testamentum* 5 (1962): 17-24.

Colwell, Ernest Cadman. "The Complex Character of the Late Byzantine Text of the Gospels." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 54 (1935): 211-221.

Duplacy, Jean. "Histoire des Manuscrits et Histoire du Texte du N.T." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1965/66): 124-139.

Epp, Eldon J. "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?" *Harvard Theological Review* 69 (1976): 211-257.

_____. "The Twentieth-Century Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 93 (1974): 386-414.

Fee, Gordon Donald. "The Corrections of Papyrus Bodmer II and Early Textual Transmission." *Novum Testamentum* 7 (1964/65): 247-257.

_____. "A Critique of W. N. Pickering's *The Identity of the New Testament Text:* A Review Article." *Westminster Theological Journal* 41 (1979): 397-423.

Hatch, William Henry Payne. "The Provenance of Codex Vaticanus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 72 (1953): xviii-xix [SBL Proceedings].

Hedley, P. L. "The Egyptian Texts of the Gospels and Acts." 2 parts. *Church Quarterly Review* 118 (1934): 23-39, 188-230.

Hills, Edward F. "The Inter-Relationship of the Caesarean Manuscripts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 68 (1949): 141-159.

_____. "A New Approach to the Old Egyptian Text." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 345-362.

Hodges, Zane Clark. "The Critical Text and the Alexandrian Family of Revelation." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 119 (1962): 129-138.

———. "The Ecclesiastical Text of Revelation—Does It Exist?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 118 (1961): 113-122.

———. "The Greek Text of the King James Version." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 125 (1968): 334-345.

———. "Rationalism and Contemporary New Testament Textual Criticism." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 128 (1971): 27-35.

Hoskier, Herman Charles. "Manuscripts of the Apocalypse—Recent Investigations." 5 parts, with plates. *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester* 7 (1922/23): 118-137, 256-268, 507-525; 8 (1924/25): 236-275, 412-443.

Howard, Wilbert F. "The Influence of Doctrine upon the Text of the New Testament." *London Quarterly and Holborn Review* 166 (1941): 1-16.

Jellicoe, Sidney. "The Hesychian Recension Reconsidered." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 82 (1963): 409-418.

King, Marchant A. "Should Conservatives Abandon Textual Criticism?" *Bibliotheca Sacra* 130 (1973): 35-40.

Lunde, Paul. "A Missing Link." *Aramco World* 32 (Mar.-Apr. 1981): 26-27.

Manson, T. W. Review of *Novum Testamentum Graece: Evangelium Secundum Matthaeum*, by S. C. E. Legg. *Journal of Theological Studies* 43 (1942): 83-92.

Martin, Alfred. "John William Burgon—A Memorial." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 123 (1966): 150-157.

O'Callaghan, José. "El cambio δ > τ en los papiros bíblicos." *Biblica* 54 (1973): 411-420.

Riddle, Donald Wayne. "Textual Criticism as a Historical Discipline." *Anglican Theological Review* 18 (1936): 220-233.

Sanders, Henry Arthur. "The Egyptian Text of the Four Gospels and Acts." *Harvard Theological Review* 26 (1933): 77-98.

Saunders, Ernest W. "Studies in Doctrinal Influences in the Byzantine Text of the Gospels." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 71 (1952): 85-92.

Schmid, Josef. "Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-textes: Der *K*-Text." 4 parts. *Biblica* 17 (1936): 11-44, 167-201, 273-293, 429-460.

Skeat, Theodore Cressy. "The Provenance of Codex Alexandrinus." *Journal of Theological Studies, n.s.* 6 (1955): 233-235.

Tarelli, C. C. "The Byzantine Text and the Lectionaries." *Journal of Theological Studies* 43 (1942): 181-183.

Yamauchi, Edwin. "Do the Bible's Critics Use A Double Standard?" *Christianity Today* 10 (1965): 179-182.

Zuntz, Günther. "The Byzantine Text in New Testament Criticism." *Journal of Theological Studies* 43 (1942): 25-30.

IV. DICTIONARIES AND ENCYCLOPAEDIAS

Encyclopædia Britannica. 11th edition.

Encyclopædia Britannica. 14th edition (1963).

A Greek-English Lexicon. Edited by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott. Revised and Augmented by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. 4 vols. Edited by George Arthur Buttrick. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962.

The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church. Edited by Frank L. Cross. London: Oxford University Press, 1957.

The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources. Edited by James Hope Moulton and George Milligan. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1972 rep.ed.

V. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Martin, Alfred. "A Critical Examination of the Westcott-Hort Textual Theory." Th.D. dissertation, Dallas Theological Seminary, 1951.

Porter, Calvin L. "A Textual Analysis of the Earliest Manuscripts of the Gospel of John." Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1961.

Robinson, Maurice Arthur. "Textual Interrelationships among Selected Ancient Witnesses to the Book of Acts." Th.M. thesis, Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975.

———. "Von Soden's Folly: The Greek New Testament That Failed?" Ph.D. seminar paper, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1977.

Stewart, John William. "Doctrinal Influence Upon the New Testament Text of Clement of Alexandria." Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1967.