

How to read the commentary

Abbreviations:

BYZ	Byzantine (Majority) text (Maurice Robinson's version)
Bal	NT by J.M.S Baljon, 1898
Bois	Boismard Synopsis (Leuven 1986)
Gre	Huck-Greeven Synopsis (13 th edition 1981)
IQP	International Q Project
IGNTP	International Greek NT Project
mg	Margin
NA	Nestle - Aland
S	Supplement (as superscript with a manuscript number)
SBL	SBL GNT by Mike Holmes, 2010
SQE	Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum (15 th ed.)
T&T	Text und Textwert, Muenster
Tis	Tischendorf, 8th edition
TR	Textus Receptus
Trg	Tregelles, Greek NT, 1857ff.
TVU	Textual Variation Unit
Weiss	Bernhard Weiss ("Die vier Evangelien", 2 nd ed. 1905)
WH	Westcott - Hort

Basic presentation of the data:

We distinguish "Majority" and "Minority" variants. A Majority variant is one where the accepted (= txt) reading is not that of the majority of manuscripts (= Byz). A Minority reading is a variant where txt and the majority (Byz) agree against a small number of other manuscripts. The txt reading is always the Nestle-Aland reading.

First the reading of the verse is given as it is in NA²⁷. Then, for Majority variants the reading of the Robinson Majority text is given. I use the texts given in Bibleworks 6, which has currently the best proofread texts. BYZ is the Byzantine (Majority) text by Maurice Robinson.

After that the evidence for both cases is presented. In case of Minority variants only the varied passage is given after the txt reading, because the Byz reading is the same as the txt reading.

The varied words are given in **green** in the text.

Also the evidence of the most important printed editions is given ([NA²⁵](#), [WH](#), [Gre](#), [Bois](#), [Weiss](#), [Trg](#)). This evidence is only given when these editions deviate from txt. Whenever there is no label, these editions read txt. In a few special cases I have added additionally the editions for txt, to make clear that they really read txt. So, whenever one of these five editions is not noted, it reads txt.

In a few cases I have also added the evidence of [Tis](#) or some other editions (e.g. Lachmann or Von Soden).

The notation of the correctors:

I basically have followed the notation used by NA, with the minor distinction that NA writes e.g. B¹, B², in this commentary I write B^{C1}, B^{C2}. In B the enhancer is B^{C2}. It is sometimes difficult to evaluate if the enhancer simply enhanced a correction written by B^{C1}, or if he himself did the correction.

If an Umlaut occurs in B, it is noted in [blue](#). Also other noteworthy stuff in B has been noted.

After that the text of possible parallels is given, followed by the discussion of the evidence.

Coherence: The term "coherence" has been introduced into textual criticism by Gerd Mink from Muenster. I use it in a rather free way sometimes in saying, "the support is not coherent". What does this mean? It means that the supporting witnesses are not related. As an example a reading may be supported by B, E, 2. Since B and E, 2 are so far removed from each other in the global stemma, there are only two possibilities: Either both B and E, 2 go back directly to the autographs, which is extremely unlikely, or the reading arose independently twice. In that case it is still possible that part of the witnesses are connected with the autograph, but not all. Therefore saying "the support is not coherent" weakens the weight of the support.

In several cases the text of the International Q Project is given. This is just a presentation of their choice and does not affect the evaluation.

Also in certain cases it is noted that the words in a verse are part of a so called Minor Agreement of Mt and Lk against Mk.

Both these notations do not affect the judgment and do not mean that one has to accept a certain source theory. It is just noted for your own judgment.

At the end of the discussion we give a rough judgment of the certainty of the decision:

- 2 = The non-txt reading is clearly secondary
- 2? = The non-txt reading is probably secondary
- = the evidence is indecisive
- 1? = it is possible that the txt reading is wrong
- 1 = the txt reading is clearly wrong

These numbers should not be taken too serious. Especially they have nothing to do with the rating system of the UBS GNT. They are meant simply to keep track of the decisions and the easy analysis of the external evidence.

After analyzing the clearly secondary readings, the witnesses have been weighted and tabulated. Then, in a second round, the problematic cases, the "2?" and the "-" readings have been reconsidered accordingly:

Readings which at first have been rated as "2?", but which are supported by the majority of the best manuscripts are now being labeled as "2" readings. The same is applied to the "-" (= open) readings, which are rated up to "2?", except there are serious internal reasons against it. If the overall rating is changed, it is displayed like this, e.g.:

External rating: 2
(after weighting the witnesses)

or (for the "1" and "1?" readings):

External rating: 1
(after weighting the witnesses)

These ratings are my own. If you want to have them changed, you have to convince me. ☺ The main goal of this commentary is not to create those ratings, but to present the arguments. I hope that my presentation is fair and concise, so that everybody can judge on his own. Comments are welcome!

Used sources

Most of the external evidence has been collected from the following materials: NA, UBS, Swanson, IGNTP (also Legg), Text & Textwert, Lake and Geerlings collations of f1 and f13 and various other collations of manuscripts (e.g. POxy volumes, Tischendorf's editions etc.). Whenever possible I have checked the facsimile editions or photos of the manuscripts (e.g. all papyri, 01, 02, 03, 04, 05, 029, 032, 033, 037). I have also tried to verify difficult readings, especially of the papyri, from the facsimiles or photos. Some reconstructions are [included](#).

In some cases discrepancies appeared, which I noted. Some of these have already been checked by Klaus Witte in Muenster and the results are also noted.

f13 has been checked against the Geerlings volumes and the following subgroup designations have been used:

f13: a: 13, 346, 543, 826, 828
b: 69, 124, 788
c: 983, 1689

f1: 131 belongs to f1 in Mk 1-5 according to Lake ("f1"), being Byzantine in the remaining part. 131 is also f1 in Lk. 22 is f1 in Mt and 565 is f1 in Jo. Readings of f1 have been checked and corrected from the new book from Amy Anderson on 1582 in Mt ("The Textual Tradition of the Gospels - Family 1 in Matthew" Brill, 2004).

892, which is cited only partially in NA and SQE, has been checked from Harris' collation in JBL (1890).

1342, which is cited also only partially in NA and SQE has been added from Lake's collation (Six Collations, 1932) in Mt, Mk and Jo and from IGNTP for Lk.

Versions:

- the Latin has been carefully checked in Jülicher's "Itala" edition (1963-76). The Gospel of John was additionally verified against the new online edition of the Vetus Latina Iohannes from Birmingham.
- the Coptic has been checked in Horner's edition (1898-1905).
- the Subakhmimic (ac²) has been checked from the edition of Herbert Thompson
- the Syriac has been checked only sporadically in the (unreliable) E.J. Wilson edition, with some help of Pete Williams (Cambridge).
- The Gothic has been added from the online Wulfila project.

Church fathers:

- Justin Martyr has been checked from Bellinzoni.
- Marcion has been checked from Harnack.
- Tatian has been checked from W. Petersen.
- Clement of Alexandria has been checked from Swanson, M. Mees and M. Barnard. Recently again from the new edition by Carl. P. Cosaert "The text of the gospels in Clement of Alexandria" SBL 2008.
- The quotations of the Gospel of John by Origen have been incorporated using Ehrman's edition ("The text of the fourth Gospel in the writings of Origen", 1992).