

Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments

Arbeiten zur
Neutestamentlichen Textforschung

Herausgegeben vom
Institut für Neutestamentliche Textforschung der Westfälischen
Wilhelms-Universität Münster/Westfalen

Band 49

De Gruyter

Text und Textwert der griechischen
Handschriften des Neuen Testaments

VI.
Die Apokalypse

Teststellenkollation und Auswertungen

In Verbindung mit
Martin Karrer

Herausgegeben von
Markus Lembke
Darius Müller
Ulrich B. Schmid

De Gruyter

ISBN 978-3-11-054728-3
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-054843-3
ISSN 0570-5509

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2017 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/Boston

Druck und Bindung: CPI books GmbH, Leck

⊗ Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Preface

The first volume in the series *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments (TuT)* was published in 1987 by the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung (INTF) in Münster. It consisted of collation material relating to all accessible Greek manuscripts of the Catholic Epistles. This extensive and unparalleled collection is now, almost thirty years later, nearly completed by the present volume on the Apocalypse of John (Rev), undertaken under the auspices of the Wuppertal research project *Erstellung einer kritischen Edition der Johannesapokalypse (ECM-Apk)*. In comparison with the other volumes of the series, several special features should be noted.

The 123 test passages presented in this volume do not belong to the original set that Aland chose for the evaluation of New Testament manuscripts. He did not select any test passage for Revelation because of the researches of Herman C. Hoskier¹ and, above all, Josef Schmid, who worked extensively on the Greek text of the Apocalypse in the 1920s and 1950s.² Aland's preparatory work on *TuT* included the following statement that appeared in the 1987 preface: "[...] alle Schriftengruppen des Neuen Testaments mit Ausnahme der Offenbarung des Johannes, die bei den Kollationen von vornherein mit Rücksicht auf das dreibändige Werk von Josef Schmid, dessen Arbeit nicht unnötig wiederholt werden sollte, ausgelassen worden war."³

-
- 1 H.C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. Collations of all existing available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen's third Edition together with testimony of Versions, Commentaries, and Fathers. A complete Conspectus of all Authorities*, vol. I-II, London: Bernard Quaritch, 1929.
 - 2 J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*, 3 vols., MThS.HE 1/a-c, München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1955-1956.
 - 3 K. Aland, B. Aland, and K. Wachtel, *Text und Textwert der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments. I. Die Katholischen Briefe*, vol. 1: *Das Material*, ANTF 9, Berlin: De Gruyter, 1987, S. V. English Translation of the cited German text: "[...]

At the end of the twentieth century, however, as the distance increased from the work of Hoskier and Schmid, text critical interest in the Apocalypse, a trend found primarily in important commentaries which considered textual research to be an essential critical task.⁴ The exclusion of the Apocalypse from the *TuT* series proved to be untenable, especially since it is a preparatory tool for the *Editio Critica Maior* (*ECM*) now planned for publication at the beginning of the 2020s.

The preparations for this work reach back some years. To understand the textual forms of the Apocalypse better, in 2008 Markus Lembke (Hamburg) began to select test passages and to collate all manuscripts, beginning with those that were not documented by Hoskier. He did this using the microfilm resources of the INTF. This work commenced independently of any overarching institution.

Separately from Lembke, the Institut für Septuaginta- und biblische Textforschung (ISBTF) of the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel, under the leadership of Martin Karrer with the partnership of Ulrich Schmid, began important preparatory work in 2010, and at the end of 2011 work on the *ECM* of the Apocalypse began.⁵ A test passage set was designed that adapted the methodology of the previous *TuT* volumes.

During 2011, both Lembke and the Wuppertal team developed a cooperative partnership, in which it was discovered that many test passages overlapped. Lembke kindly provided his test passage data, which

all book groups of the New Testament except the Revelation of John which was excluded from the beginning with regard to Josef Schmid's three-volume work; his work should not have been repeated unnecessarily."

- 4 Above all, D.E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, WBC 52a, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997, CLVIII–CLX; G.K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids/MI: Eerdmans, 1999, 70–75.
- 5 The development of the project is described in M. Karrer, "Der Text der Johannesapokalypse", in *Die Johannesapokalypse: Kontexte – Konzepte – Rezeption*, ed. J. Frey, J.A. Kelhoffer, and F. Tóth, WUNT 287, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 43–78; U.B. Schmid and M. Karrer, "Die neue Edition der Johannesapokalypse. Ein Arbeitsbericht", in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund, U.B. Schmid, and M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 3–15; M. Karrer, "Der Text der Apokalypse – Textkritik und Theologiegeschichte", in *Veröffentlichungsband zum Apokalypse-Kongress, Leuven 2015*, ed. A. Yarbro Collins, BETL, Leuven: Peeters 2016/17 (forthcoming).

was carefully considered by the Wuppertal research project. This collaboration led to the establishment of common test passages. As planned, all accessible test passages in the Greek manuscripts of Revelation were collated in the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room (NT.VMR) by project researchers, and the results of this process placed in an online database.

Parallel to this work, Lembke continued his own work in coordination with the Wuppertal project, completing his own collation of the test passages and including information from Hoskier's edition. In this way, two complete and independent collation datasets of identical test passages were created. These databases were electronically compared and reconciled by recourse to the manuscripts. This achieved another important aspect of the volume: that the material for *TuT* was doubly checked.

This effort was necessary for a significant reason (and here we arrive at the third special aspect of the volume): the textual tradition of the Apocalypse differs significantly from other New Testament works. Its textual transmission does not attest a uniform majority, which is why the category "Majority Text" (in the previous volumes of *TuT reading 1*) cannot be deployed in its usual fashion. Instead, numerous divergent manuscript groups occur in the tradition, which need to be distinguished by evaluating the witnesses. The peculiarities of the Greek textual tradition of Revelation required both the modification of Aland's selection criteria and further methodological reflection on the analysis of the collected material.⁶ Readers can find more about this in the introduction.

The new collation in Wuppertal, and the comparison with Lembke's data, provided the opportunity for a fresh evaluation of the quality of Hoskier's collations.⁷ It is now confirmed that his collations are quite

6 M. Lembke, "Beobachtungen zu den Handschriften der Apokalypse des Johannes", in *Die Johannesoffenbarung. Ihr Text und ihre Auslegung*, ed. M. Labahn and M. Karrer, ABIG 38, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2012, 19–69.

7 Hoskier's work was called into question because of some faults in the recording of versional attestation: R. Gryson, *Vetus Latina. Die Reste der attilateinischen Bibel*, vol. 26: *Apocalypsis Johannis*, Freiburg: Herder 2000–2003, 93: „Si l'auteur a traité

reliable.⁸ In general, the findings of previous research are to be appreciated, because through the work of Hoskier and J. Schmid we are already well-informed regarding the textual tradition of Revelation.

Furthermore, a re-examination of research on the text of the Apocalypse allowed comprehensive reassessment of the material. The groupings of previous research (cf. B. Weiss, W. Bousset, H.C. Hoskier, J. Schmid, W.N. Pickering) were at variance with one another and required review. Moreover, the number of Greek manuscripts has increased by a quarter since Hoskier (71 more manuscripts since Hoskier and 26 since Schmid, for a total of 310 registered objects).⁹ Third, the high textual value of some manuscripts has only been discovered in recent research. By way of example 2846 should be noted, whose exceptional text was already noticed in the first collations.¹⁰ It was to be expected that previously unknown or little studied material would have a significant effect on the reconstruction of the initial text. This suspicion has been confirmed in many ways, leading to beneficial findings for the forthcoming ECM. Here, manuscripts such as 2582 or 2625 deserve mention, whose value exceeds that of manuscripts like 2351 belonging to the so-called “consistently cited witnesses” in the recent editions of Nestle-Aland.¹¹

Special remark merits Markus Lembke’s programming and work on numerous technical problems. Following Ulrich Schmid’s departure from the ISBTF at the end of 2014, Darius Müller, who was already familiar with the material from his participation in the collation of test passages, took over essential tasks, including the formulation of the introduction. Through this circumstance, the editorship of this project expanded, empowering several people to make fundamental decisions

les témoins grecs avec la même légèreté que les latins, sans parler des versions orientales, y a vraiment quoi de s’inquiéter”.

8 Also D.C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 230, praises Hoskier for his considerable achievement in this area.

9 Cf. the manuscript list and appendix A in this volume.

10 M. Lembke, “Die Apokalypse-Handschrift 2846. Beschreibung, Kollation und Textwertbestimmung eines wichtigen neuen Zeugen” *NT* 54 (2012), 369–395.

11 Cf. NA²⁸, 66–67*.

on design and content in conversation with one another. The work in this volume is the result of mutual agreement.

Now that the work has concluded, it remains to express gratitude. The editors would first like to thank the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, which has generously funded the ECM project since 2011 and the INTF in Münster, especially Klaus Wachtel and Holger Strutwolf for their helpful cooperation. Our thanks go also to Holger Strutwolf and David Parker for accepting this volume into the ANTF series. Additionally, we recognise the tireless work of the team members who collated with us the manuscripts, including current and former project colleagues Marcus Sigismund, Alexander Stokowski, and Johannes de Vries, as well as student assistants Simone Keller, Mathea Dieker, and Kerstin Heider. Thanks also to Benjamin L. Blum and Rebekka Gottwald who carefully read and corrected the entire manuscript, and to Garrick Allen for the translation of the preface and the English introduction.

We are confident that the material in this volume provides a sufficiently detailed portrait of the Greek transmission of the Apocalypse. With the help of this data the selection of the manuscript witnesses for apparatus and reconstruction of the initial text of the *Editio Critica Maior* stands on solid principles. Finally, the material in this volume provides further services to the field, stimulating academic discourse interested in manuscripts, text grouping, and textual history in diverse and sustaining ways.

Wuppertal, 15/10/2016

Markus Lembke
Darius Müller
Ulrich B. Schmid
Martin Karrer

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Vorwort.....	V
Preface.....	XI
Einführung.....	1*
1. Verzeichnis der griechischen Apk-Hss.....	4*
1.1 Allgemeine Hinweise zur Handschriftenliste.....	4*
1.2 Einschränkungen für die Auswertung von Apk-Hss.....	6*
1.3 Neubenennungen einzelner Apk-Hss.....	9*
2. Lesartenbezifferung, Textformen und Teststellenauswahl.....	12*
2.1 Die „relative Mehrheit“ (rM) der Apk-Hss.....	12*
2.2 Die Bezifferung der Lesarten.....	13*
2.3 Repräsentanten der die Mehrheit konstituierenden Textformen.....	15*
2.4 Kriterien und Durchführung der Teststellenauswahl.....	18*
3. Resultate der Kollation.....	25*
3.1 Die Bezeichnung der Lesarten für die Apokalypse.....	25*
3.2 Die variable Zusammensetzung von rM	27*
3.3 Hinweise zur Benutzung der Kollationsresultate.....	29*
3.4 Besonderheiten bei der Verzeichnung einzelner Lesarten und Hss.....	31*
4. Verzeichnende Beschreibung.....	35*
5. Sortierungen nach Anteilen.....	38*
5.1 Vorbemerkungen zu den Auswertungslisten der Kapitel 5–7.....	38*
5.2 Zu den Sortierungslisten 5.1–8.....	39*
5.3 Zu den Sortierungen in den Listen 5.9–14.....	44*
6. Vergleichsliste.....	53*
6.1 Bezug zur früheren Haupt- und Ergänzungsliste.....	53*
6.2 Die wesentlichen Daten der Vergleichsliste.....	54*
6.3 Zum Inhalt der Leitzeile.....	55*
7. Gruppierung nach Übereinstimmungsquoten.....	58*
7.1 Zum Gruppierungsvorgang der Apk-Handschriften.....	58*

7.2 Benutzungshinweise zur Darstellung der Gruppierung nach Übereinstimmungsquoten.....	60*
7.3 Kriterien zur Auswahl der aufgeführten Vergleichshandschriften.....	63*
7.4 Beispiele zur Auswertung der vorgelegten Gruppenlisten	66*
8. Schlussbemerkungen.....	72*
Literatur.....	75*
Introduction.....	83*
1. List of Greek Manuscripts of Rev.....	85*
1.1 General Information about the List of Manuscripts.....	85*
1.2 Restrictions concerning the Evaluation of Manuscripts.....	87*
1.3 Renaming of Individual Manuscripts.....	90*
2. The Designation of Readings, Text Forms, and the Selection of Test Passages.....	92*
2.1 The Relative Majority (<i>rM</i>) of the Manuscripts of Rev.....	93*
2.2. The Numbering of Readings.....	94*
2.3 Representatives of the Text Forms Constituting the Majority.....	95*
2.4 The Test Passage Selection: Criteria and Execution.....	98*
3. Collation Results.....	103*
3.1 Designations of the Readings in Revelation.....	104*
3.2 The Variable Composition of <i>rM</i>	106*
3.3 Directions for Using the Collation Results.....	107*
3.4 Special Features of Specific Readings and Manuscripts.....	109*
4. Descriptive List.....	112*
5. Sorting by Percentages	114*
5.1 Preliminary Comments on the Evaluation Lists in Chapters 5–7.....	114*
5.2 On the Sorting by Percentages Lists 5.1–8.....	115*
5.3 On the Sorting by Percentages Lists 5.9–14.....	120*
6. Comparative List.....	126*
6.1 Connection to the previous Main and Supplementary Lists.....	126*
6.2 Data Given in the Comparative List.....	127*
6.3 Concerning the Content of the First Line.....	128*
7. Grouping by Percentages of Agreement.....	130*
7.1 Difficulties in the Grouping Process	131*
7.2 Using the Grouping Lists.....	132*
7.3 Criteria for Selecting Comparison Manuscripts.....	134*
7.4 Examples for Evaluating the Grouping Lists	136*

8. Concluding Comments.....	141*
Literature.....	144*
1. Handschriftenliste / List of Manuscripts.....	1
2. Repräsentanten der mehrheitsbildenden Textformen / Representatives of the Text Forms Constituting the Majority.....	23
3. Resultate der Kollation / Collation Results.....	25
4. Verzeichnende Beschreibung / Descriptive List.....	229
5. Sortierungen nach Anteilen / Sorting by Percentages.....	421
5.1 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 2 (= A.).....	422
5.2 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 2/ (= A. E. F. G. K. L. M. O.).....	429
5.3 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 3 (= B.).....	435
5.4 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 3/ (= B. E. H. I. K. L. N. O.).....	442
5.5 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 4 (= C.).....	449
5.6 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 4/ (= C. F. H. J. K. M. N. O.).....	455
5.7 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 5 (= D.).....	462
5.8 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 5/ (= D. G. I. J. L. M. N. O.).....	469
5.9 Sortierung nach Anteil an Sonderlesarten: Lesart 6 und höher (= P.).....	475
5.10 Sortierung nach Anteil an Singulärlesarten (= Q.).....	482
5.11 Sortierung nach Anteil an mehrheitlich bezeugten Lesarten (Nebenspalten mit Schnittmengen).....	489
5.12 Sortierung nach Anteil an mehrheitlich bezeugten Lesarten (Nebenspalten ohne Schnittmengen).....	495
5.13 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 2 gegen relative Mehrheit.....	502
5.14 Sortierung nach Anteil an Lesart 2 mit Minderheitsbezeugung.....	509
6. Vergleichsliste / Comparative List.....	517
7. Gruppierung nach Übereinstimmungsquoten / Grouping by Percentages of Agreement.....	601
8. Appendizes / Appendices.....	725
A: Sigelkonkordanz und Erwähnung der Apk-Hss. bei J. Schmid.....	727
B: Entfallene Teststellen der Wuppertaler Datenbank.....	741
C: Differenzen zwischen Lesart 4 und <i>A_v</i> nach J. Schmid.....	747
D: Auflistung der Mehrheitslesarten und großen Textformen an den Teststellen.....	751
E: Verzeichnis der Handschriften und ihrer Beteiligung an <i>rM</i>	755

F: Teststellen mit hoher relativer Mehrheit und Sortierung der Handschriften nach Anteilen an hoher relativer Mehrheit.....	783
--	-----

Introduction

The tradition of the Apocalypse (Rev) is markedly different from other New Testament (NT) writings. The clearest of these features is the fact that Rev does not preserve a uniform “Byzantine Majority Text.” The bulk of its manuscripts is divided into two well-attested, but differing text forms called the Koine text (*K*) and Andreas text (*A*_v). This circumstance, examined by J. Schmid et al., is sufficiently well-known and cited in NA²⁸ with the sigla \mathfrak{M}^K and \mathfrak{M}^A .¹ The lack of a uniform Majority Text has important consequences for this volume, both for its presentation of the collation results, about which much more will be said (§ 2.1–2 and 3.1), and for its evaluation of them.

Although B. Weiss, W. Bousset, H. von Soden, H. C. Hoskier, and J. Schmid have previously undertaken thorough studies of the textual history of Rev,² there remain many unresolved text-critical and text-historical problems. Recent research, too, has shown that problems in understanding the textual history of Rev still exist.³ As Martin Karrer has

1 See NA²⁸, 66*–67* and fn. 2.

2 Following B. F. Westcott/F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek. Introduction Appendix*, London: Macmillan, 1882, 260–263 a meaningful step in research occurred: e.g. B. Weiss, *Die Johannes-Apokalypse: Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung*, TU 7.1, Leipzig: Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1891; W. Bousset, “Zur Textkritik der Apokalypse”, in *Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament*, ed. W. Bousset, TU 11.4, Leipzig: Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1894, 1–44; H. v. Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte*. I. Teil: Untersuchungen, III. Abteilung: Die Textformen, B. Der Apostolos mit Apokalypse, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911, 2042–2097; H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse. Collations of all existing available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen’s third Edition together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers. A Complete Conspectus of all Authorities*. Vol. 1, London: Bernard Quaritch 1929; J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes*. 2. Teil: Die alten Stämme, MThS.HE 1c, München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1955.

3 Selected studies on the textual tradition include: M. Karrer, “Der Text der Johannesoffenbarung. Varianten und Theologie” *Neotest.* 43 (2009), 373–398; M. Karrer, DOI: 10.1515/9783110548433-002

formulated it, the text of Rev in NA²⁸ is “nicht konsequent erstellt”⁴ and, therefore, in need of revision.

Moreover, the textual criticism of Rev is burdened by the state of its preservation in the manuscript tradition. Although Rev is relatively well-attested in the third century by means of \mathfrak{P}^{18} , \mathfrak{P}^{47} , \mathfrak{P}^{98} and \mathfrak{P}^{115} these witnesses are mostly fragmentary. Weighing heavily also on this problem is the fact that Rev in Codex Vaticanus (03) is a fifteenth century

“The Angels of the Congregations in Revelation – Textual History and Interpretation” *Journal of Early Christian History* 1 (2011), 57–84; M. Karrer, “Textgeschichte und Demarkationsprozesse der Johannesoffenbarung”, in *Poetik und Intertextualität der Johannesapokalypse*, ed. S. Alkier/T. Hieke/T. Nicklas, WUNT 346, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2015, 45–70; T. Nicklas, “The Early Text of Revelation”, in *The Early Text of the New Testament*, ed. C. E. Hill/M. J. Kruger, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 225–238; M. Lembke, “Besonderheiten der griechischen Überlieferung der Offenbarung und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Textkritik”, in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 201–230; J. Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse. The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT II 218, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2006; J. Hernández, *The Apocalypse in Codex Alexandrinus: Its Singular Readings and Scribal Habits*, in: *Scripture and Traditions* (FS C.R. Holladay), ed. P. Gray/G.R. O’Day, NTS 129, Leiden/Boston 2008, 341–355; J. Hernández, “The Creation of a Fourth-Century Witness to the Andreas Text Type: A Misreading in the Apocalypse’s Textual History” *NTS* 60 (2014), 106–120; J. Hernández, “Codex Sinaiticus: An Early Christian Commentary on the Apocalypse?” in *Codex Sinaiticus: New Perspectives on the Ancient Biblical Manuscript*, ed. S. McKendrick/D. C. Parker/A. Myshrahl/C. O’Hogan, London: Hendrickson, 2015, 107–126; J. Hernández, “NA 28 and the Revision of the Apocalypse’s Textual History”, in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*, ed. D.M. Gurtner/J. Hernández/P. Foster, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015, 71–81; P. Malik, “The Corrections of Codex Sinaiticus and the Textual Transmission of Revelation: Josef Schmid Revisited” *NTS* 61 (2015), 595–614; P. Malik, “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus. Further Evidence from the Apocalypse” *TC* 20 (2015).

- 4 “not consistently edited”; M. Karrer, “Der Text der Johannesapokalypse”, in *Die Johannesapokalypse. Kontexte – Konzepte Rezeption*, ed. J. Frey/J. A. Kelhoffer/F. Tóth, WUNT 287, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 43–78, here 71. Further critical comments are directed toward the reconstruction by J. K. Elliott, “A Short Textual Commentary on the Book of Revelation and the ‘New’ Nestle” *NT* 56 (2014), 68–100.

supplement with little text-critical value (GA 1957). Therefore, from the second or rather third to the eighth centuries, Rev is only fully witnessed in the well-known Codices Sinaiticus (01) and Alexandrinus (02). And of these, the first one often preserves a peculiar text, which leaves a poor impression in terms of copying over large tracts of its material.⁵ Codex Ephraemi rescriptus (04) has received little scholarly attention despite its high textual value. Recently, new high-resolution digital photos made by the Bibliothèque nationale de France should reinvigorate research. These new images are used to record the text of 04 in this volume.

Because of the numerous unique features of the tradition of Rev that affect every section of this volume, it is necessary here to offer a full introduction to the material and method used in *TuT* of Rev. The problems associated with undertaking this kind of examination of the text of Rev are clearly articulated and the development of the results made comprehensible to all users. Finally, an extended introduction is necessary because the data in this volume is the basis for selection of relevant manuscripts used to produce the ECM of the Apocalypse.

To aid orientation, the sections of this introduction (§ 1–7) run parallel to the seven main chapters of the volume (Chap. 1–7).

1. List of Greek Manuscripts of Rev

1.1 General Information about the List of Manuscripts

The list of Greek manuscripts of Rev is organized similarly to the “Kurzgefaßte Liste” (KGFL II),⁶ but offers further clarification and precision. The list includes all material marked with content note *r* (*revelatio*) in KGFL II and newly discovered manuscripts (as of April 2016). The

5 D.C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008, 235.

6 K. Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2., neubearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, ANTF 1, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1994.

current number of Greek manuscripts comprises 7 papyri, 12 majuscules, and 291 minuscules, in total 310 documents⁷ of which the text is currently available for 293.⁸ In comparison to Hoskier's edition, this volume includes readings from 71 additional manuscripts; and, in comparison to Schmid's last publications, another 26 manuscripts have been examined. Manuscripts in the conspectus that are now lost or inaccessible for collation are marked with {braces}.

The most important additional information vis-à-vis KFGL II is that the list in this volume now also includes the extent of the text of each manuscript.⁹ This information is recorded in the "Apk-Inhalt" column. This new data is of considerable importance for research, since Rev is considerably worse attested than the rest of the NT writings. Additionally, the records of the extent of the text in each manuscript as recorded

-
- 7 Regarding the number of manuscripts of Rev, a few new observations should be noted: Aland's printed KGFL II of 1994 registers 304 manuscripts containing Rev. ("r"), a number that has increased with the recent discovery of \mathfrak{B}^{115} 0308 2864 2931. Also 1768 was not recorded as a Rev witness, although it contains the complete text of Rev. Supplement 2004-S has now received its own GA number because its textual character differs from the other works in 2004: 2924. Overall, six additional manuscripts have been discovered since the printing of KGFL II.
- 8 Further information on the manuscripts of Rev can be found in J. K. Elliott, "Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation collated by H. C. Hoskier" in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NT.S 137, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010, 133–144; J. K. Elliott, "The Distinctiveness of the Greek Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation" in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NT.S 137, Leiden/Boston: Brill 2010, 145–155; J. K. Elliott, "Recent Work on the Greek Manuscripts of Revelation and the Consequences for the Kurzgefasste Liste" *JThS* 66 (2015), 574–584; M. Lembke, "Beobachtungen zu den Handschriften der Apokalypse des Johannes" in *Die Johannesoffenbarung. Ihr Text und ihre Auslegung*, ed. M. Labahn/M. Karrer, ABIG 38, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2012, 19–69; M. Sommer, "What do Revelation's handwritings tell us about its post-canonical role and function in the Bible? 'Work in progress'" in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 175–197.
- 9 A verse is considered to exist in a manuscript if at least one letter is preserved.

by Hoskier and J. Schmid are not always accurate. Information regarding physical lacunae¹⁰ or obvious textual omissions are also noted (e.g. 1824 2062 2350 2403). Omissions of a single verse are not recorded. Larger leaps, deriving either from a damaged *Vorlage* or through scribal accident are noted in the corresponding footnotes as far as they are known.

It is helpful to know the meaning of the following sigla:

e	Text of the Gospels
a	Text of the Acts of the Apostles including the Catholic Letters
p	Text of Pauline letters, include Hebrew and the Pastorals
r	Text of Revelation
K	The manuscript contains a commentary of Rev

Manuscripts that contain commentary (e.g. Andreas) or glosses (e.g. GA 35) are an important feature of the tradition of Rev. This inevitably raises the question of the social contexts in which Rev was read, suggesting that it was viewed often as a study book that required explanation.¹¹

1.2 Restrictions concerning the Evaluation of Manuscripts

Several fragmentary manuscripts are either not included in the collation or only cited sparingly. \mathfrak{P}^{43} \mathfrak{P}^{85} \mathfrak{P}^{98} 052 0163 0207 0308 886 1652 are not preserved at any of the test passages (*Teststellen* or TST). In rare cases \mathfrak{P}^{18} \mathfrak{P}^{24} \mathfrak{P}^{115} 0169 0229 1769 2087 2361 2408 2419 2855 2924 are cited, but appear in less than 10 test passages (§ 5.1), which prevents a meaningful evaluation of their textual significance and place in the tradition.

Manuscripts 2063 2433 are recorded in the list, but merely contain the commentaries without lemmatic text. In contrast to J. Schmid's

10 Lacunae that resulted from technical error (e.g. poor photographic reproduction), have not been noted. If the technical error affected the evaluation of a text, it appears in the collation under the siglum "Y" (see below).

11 Cf. M. Karrer, "Der Text der Apokalypse – Textkritik und Theologiegeschichte" in *Revelation, Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense 2015*, ed. A. Yarbro Collins, BETL, Leuven: Peeters, 2016/2017, § 2 (forthcoming).

claim,¹² 2433 contains no lemma text of Rev, but only sequential citations in the commentary that function as witnesses to the citations of Church Fathers. As M. Sigismund, has recently outlined, 2114 2402 2449 are witnesses to the vernacular Greek (*neugriechisch*) text of the Apocalypse and should be considered as versional attestation.¹³ These five manuscripts are not collated here.

The following witnesses could not be documented due to lack of photographs. The text of Rev in 339 is burned. 1757 1785 1806 2116 are lost, and 2136 2435 2663 2664 2776 2849 are not available via photographs or microfilm. The text of 2648 is illegible due to photographic error. The manuscript 1824 consists of two volumes (Vat. Ottob. Gr. 126/127). Of these, only the second one is photographed containing Rev 19,17–22,21. The missing part of the text of Rev is located in the first volume which has not yet been photographed.¹⁴

Some manuscripts not available in photographs were included in the volume with the help of other sources. The text of 025 was accessed through Tischendorf's transcription¹⁵ and 0229—a barely legible manuscript—was recorded using Mercati's transcription.¹⁶ Finally, 241 242 1678 2039 were, for different reasons, recorded using Hoskier's colla-

-
- 12 J. Schmid, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes, 1. Teil: Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia – Einleitung*, MThS.HE 1b, München: Karl Zink Verlag 1956, 66.
- 13 M. Sigismund, "Neue Freunde. Annäherung an die 'Early Modern Greek' Apk-Hss. der Kurzgefassten Liste" in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 397–407.
- 14 An evaluation of the first part (gr. 126) by Ulrich Schmid in 2014 confirmed that the entirety of 1824 is a copy of 2062
- 15 K. von Tischendorf (ed.), *Monumenta sacra inedita. Nova Collectio VI. Apocalypsis et Actus Apostolorum cum quarti Maccabaeorum libri fragmento item quattuor Evangeliorum reliquiae: ex duobus codicibus palimpsestis octavi fere et sexti saeculi altero Porphyrii episcopi, altero Guelferbyitano*, Leipzig: Giesecke and Deverient, 1869.
- 16 A reproduction of PSIRP XIII 1296 was accessed through <http://www.psi-online.it/documents/psi;13;1296>. G. Mercati, *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto XIII*, Firenze: Tipografia Enrico Aiani, 1953, 1.8–11.

tions: 241 and 2039 were destroyed by fire; 242 is in Moscow, but remained inaccessible; and the INTF reproduction of 1678 ends with Rev 1:2.

The following manuscripts are collated, but are without text-critical value since they are copies of the printed *Textus Receptus* (TR): 296 1776 1777 2049 2066 2072 2619 2909.¹⁷ 1064 and a large portion of 2656 are copies of a revised text of the Complutensian Polyglot.¹⁸ Moreover, the texts of 1775 1903 2656 2669 2926 are either partially copied from the TR or heavily influenced by it.¹⁹

In addition, Marcus Sigismund has observed that 2408 is not a copy of Rev, but contains a citation of Rev embedded in the *Philocalia* tradition

-
- 17 D. Müller, "Abschriften des Erasmischen Textes im Handschriften-Material der Johannesapokalypse. Nebst einigen editionsgeschichtlichen Beobachtungen" in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 165–268.
- 18 M. Lembke, "Der Apokalypsetext der Complutensischen Polyglotte und sein Verhältnis zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung" in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 33–133, here 88–91.
- 19 1903 from 1:1 to 5:11–12; 2656 from 1:1 to 2:12–13; 2669 from 22:11 to 22:21; 2926 from 1:1 to 3:11. The problem is more complicated for 1775, because it is an abbreviated version of Rev. This situation makes the evaluation of this manuscript difficult, especially because readings from the TR occur more frequently in the second half of its text. On the special readings of the TR in Rev see F. Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde, 1. Heft, Die Erasmischen Entstellungen des Textes der Apokalypse, nachgewiesen aus dem verloren geglaubten Codex Reuchlins*, Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1861; M. Heide, *Der einzig wahre Bibeltext? Erasmus und die Frage nach dem Urtext*, Nürnberg: Verlag für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, 2006, 86–111; D. Müller, "Erasmus und die Sonderlesarten des Textus Receptus der Apokalypse" in *Worte der Weissagung. Studien zu Septuaginta und Johannesoffenbarung*, ed. J. Elschenbroich/J. de Vries, ABIG 47, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2014, 159–187. A critical edition of the five editions of Erasmus can be found in A. J. Brown (ed.), *Novum Testamentum ab Erasmo recognitum IV: Epistolae Apostolicae (secunda pars) et Apocalypsis Iohannis*, ASD 6.4, Leiden/Boston: Elsevier, 2013.

of Origen.²⁰ Consequently, this witness belongs in the category of patristic citations. In order to compare 2408 with the manuscript tradition it is recorded in 5:1–5, i.e. test passages 32 and 33 in the Collation Results.

In summary: subtracted from the 310 exemplars of the Apocalypse are five that do not offer an adequate text, twelve that are inaccessible, eight that are fragmentary and not preserved at any test passage, and eleven that occur at fewer than ten test passages. Therefore, 285 manuscripts are included in the collation results (Chapters 3–4) and 274 (of which fourteen are partially or entirely copies of printed texts) are included in the analytic chapters (Chapters 5–7).

1.3 Renaming of Individual Manuscripts

At the end of the manuscript list, one finds several manuscripts with high GA numbers. These are not new, but are long-known exemplars that have been renumbered. Usually these represent documents that have been completed as later supplements, designed to add Rev to codices of preserving other parts of the New Testament. These supplements have now been assigned their own GA numbers.²¹

Table 1: A list of recently renumbered manuscripts of Rev

Previous GA number	Current GA number for Rev
205abs	2886
2036abs	2891
1668 (ePpPr Supplement)	2909
180 (apr) ²²	2918

- 20 M. Sigismund, “Das sog. Apk-Fragment GA 2408”, in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston 2015, 135–146.
- 21 For information on the motivations of renaming see U. B. Schmid, “Die Apokalypse, überliefert mit anderen neutestamentlichen Schriften – eapr-Handschriften” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 421–441.
- 22 It is not certain whether the apr-part was a supplement to the gospels or if both parts were put together after being produced independently. (Schmid, *eapr-Handschriften*, 425–426).

Previous GA number	Current GA number for Rev
181 (r Supplement)	2919
209 (r Supplement)	2920
429 (r Supplement)	2921
1140 (r Supplement)	2922
1857 (r Supplement)	2923
1835-S / 2004-S ²³ (rP Supplement)	2924
1894 (aPpPr Supplement)	2926

GA 2391 (Paris, Bib. Nat. Suppl. Gr. 475) is an exception. It was briefly mentioned by J. Schmid,²⁴ but has not received a GA number until recently. A new photographic reproduction was made in 2015. The following table shows some other manuscripts, which were also renumbered in the past:

Table 2: Further renumbered manuscripts of Rev

Old GA number	Current GA number
1	2814
60	2821
598	2595
1352	2824
2040	911
2349	1795

Both tables illustrate that the presence of Rev in some NT codices is the result of later attempts to complete the collection. Since the inclusion of Rev among the writings of the NT canon in the Greek Church was controversial from the time of Dionysius, it is not surprising that the tradition is exceptional.²⁵ The lack of lectionary manuscripts for Rev is also

23 The Rev portion originated as GA 1835, but was recorded as GA 2004 by J. Schmid and the printed KGFL II. In the NT.VMR it is recorded as 1835. In accordance with previous research it will be referred to as 2004 in this volume. The supplement to this manuscript, which covers Rev 14,10–15,2, is recorded as GA 2924 (Schmid, *capr-Handschriften*, 431–432.439).

24 Schmid, *Studien I (Einleitung)*, 77.

25 Euseb, HE VII 24:1–25:27. Cf. G. Kretschmar, “Die Offenbarung des Johannes. Die Geschichte ihrer Auslegung im 1. Jahrtausend”, CThM.ST 9, Stuttgart: Calwer

unique. Unlike the Latin West or in the Coptic tradition, Rev was never part of the normal liturgy of the Greek East.²⁶

During the collation process, the numerous paratextual features of the tradition attracted much attention, including glosses, colophons, images, ornamentation, and initial letters. An aim of the ECMApK project is to record these features of the manuscripts of Rev in the New Testament Virtual Manuscript Room (NT.VMR) since they provide remarkable insight into the cultural and historical setting of the transmission of Rev.²⁷ The consideration of these features allows for the examination of the extent to which social factors influenced textual transmission. These features may also potentially clarify the text-historical and text-critical problems of certain manuscript groups. Additionally, images or illuminations typical of a specific region or period may aid in the identification of the origin of some of these objects.

2. The Designation of Readings, Text Forms, and the Selection of Test Passages

As is generally known, the designation of the readings (or *Lesarten*, LA) in *TuT*, at the beginning of every test passage (in previous volumes LA 1–2), offers a basic text-historical orientation. The designation of readings also lays the foundation for the evaluation of the data. With this aim

Verlag, 1985, 80–90; C. R. Koester, *Revelation. A new Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 38A, New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2014, 33–39; M. J. Kruger, “The Reception of the Book of Revelation in the Early Church” in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 159–174; M. Meiser, “Before Canonisation. Early Attestation of Revelation” in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 137–158.

- 26 H. Buchinger, “Die Johannes-Apokalypse im christlichen Gottesdienst: Sondierungen in Liturgie und Ikonographie” in *Ancient Christian Interpretations of ‘Violent Texts’ in the Apocalypse*, ed. J. Verheyden/S. Alkier, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, 216–266.
- 27 Cf. M. Karrer, “Der Text der Apokalypse – Textkritik und Theologiegeschichte” (cf. note 11 above). See also G. V. Allen, “Image, Memory, and Allusion, in the Textual History of the Apocalypse: GA 2028 and Visual Exegesis”, in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ed. M. Sigismund/D. Müller, ANTF, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter (forthcoming).

in mind, the numbering of readings corresponds to the text form of a given reading.²⁸ In contrast to previous editions of *TuT*, the numbering of the readings of Rev has been significantly expanded (cf. § 2.2 and 3.1).

2.1 The Relative Majority (*rM*) of the Manuscripts of Rev

The majority of manuscripts is divided by different readings at several passages. The attestation of these readings occurs in regularly recurrent constellations, of which *K* and *Av* are the largest groups – but not the only ones. The majority attestation is defined statistically as the reading which is attested by the largest number of manuscripts (the attestation of sub-readings is regarded as attestation of the main reading). This corresponds to Klaus Wachtel's definition of "Majority."²⁹ Nonetheless, when it comes to the textual tradition of Rev it is inadequate to speak of "Majority Text" in this sense; instead, we utilize the term "relative Majority (*rM*)". On the one hand, by adding the qualifier "relative" the editors intend to show that the majority of manuscripts consists at each varied passage of variable relations. On the other hand, the numerical majority of witnesses for a reading defined as *rM* is often quite narrow due to the division into *K* and *Av*. In test passage 119 we even have the phenomenon that two main readings (including sub-readings) are attested by exactly the same number of manuscripts. Consequently, at this passage no clear majority reading is forthcoming. In some cases where the tradition is largely divided the majority reading is attested by fewer than 50% of all manuscripts, which underlines the "relativity" of majority attestation in Rev (this is the case at twenty-one test passages and fewer than 40% at TST 64, 100, 108, 114; cf. Appendix D). In sum, out of 123 test passages only thirteen show a majority reading which is attested by over 90% of all manuscripts (11% of all test passages); at a further fifty-three test passages the majority reading is attested by 70% of all manuscripts (43% of all test passages). Comparing these facts with other NT writings, we observe the following situation: in the twenty-five test

28 Cf. *TuT* I/1, xiii etc.

29 See K. Wachtel, *Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe, Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der Koine des Neuen Testaments*, ANTF 24, Berlin/New York 1995, 7.

passages selected for James, the majority readings are attested on average by 89% of all manuscripts whereas Rev's test passages one to twenty-five involve majority readings which are attested on average by only 73% of all manuscripts.³⁰

From this it follows that the reading attested by the relative Majority should not be numbered with "1" (sign the Majority text in previous *TuT* volumes). The proportion of LA 1 of a given manuscript provides little information about its textual character, because at each test passage the relative Majority consists of different combinations of text-types (cf. § 3.2 and Appendix D). Therefore, each majority reading must be considered independently with regard to its text-critical and text-historical value. After weighing these problems, the present volume (in agreement with the INTF, Münster) dispenses with the use of LA 1 as the definition of a reading.

2.2 The Numbering of Readings

The numbering of readings had to be modified to measure the *rM* of a given test passage while still distinguishing between families. Due to this alteration, different numbers were assigned to the particular families: the Koine text (*K*) is found under LA 3 and the Andreas text (*Av*) under LA 4. A third text form is also consistently consulted: the Complutensian text (*Com*) is found under LA 5. In various combinations, these three text forms create a clear majority of available manuscripts, forming an acceptable alternative to LA 1 from previous volumes. At the same time, this classification system offers preliminary information on the textual character of a given manuscript.

As in previous volumes, LA 2 stands for the reconstructed text of the Nestle-Aland edition.³¹ Because this text is already critically constructed,

30 The data for James is established by K. Wachtel, *Byzantinische Text*, 208–240; the data for Rev is presented in Appendices D–F.

31 The text of Rev in NA²⁸ is identical with NA²⁶ and NA²⁷. By selecting NA^{26–28} to represent LA 2, the readings of this category are fixed in the context of *TuT*, but not actually established. If a new critical edition rejected the singular reading of 02 in Rev 13,10 (TST 58) and reverted to the reading from NA²⁵, then, for example, the *Av* text would agree more closely with LA 2. Additionally, if a future edition

its definition affects the definition of the “Old Text”. This reconstruction need not obscure the fact that the old codices contain many different text forms, whose background is still in need of elucidation. They attested old texts, but not *the* Old Text. Therefore, it is better to speak of manuscripts with old readings not as having a share in *the* “Old Text”, but rather of *an* Old Text (cf. § 5), meaning a share in one of several old textual traditions. Here LA 2 displays the text reconstructed by the current critical edition.

The numbering of readings begins, therefore, not with 1, but with 2, while the reading with the highest percentage of witnesses at a given test passage is presented first. This maintains the familiar shape of previous volumes. One result of this approach is that the numerical ordering does not cover the best arrangement of collation results (cf. § 3.1). The editors found this structure to be the most reasonable compromise between the tradition of *TuT*, the avoidance of misunderstandings, and the demands of the tradition of Rev. The designations LA 3, 4, and 5 correspond respectively to the Koine, Andreas, and Complutensian texts.

2.3 Representatives of the Text Forms Constituting the Majority

The list of manuscripts (Chapter 2) that belong to the three largest strands of the tradition is a new feature of this volume in comparison to other *TuT* volumes: This section contains the representatives which belong to the three major textual traditions of Rev. In view of what has been said above, a method is needed to define particular readings as LA 3, 4, and 5.

To assist the process of identification, previous research regarding the relationship between particular manuscripts and text forms was examined.³² Initial identifications were based on the list of J. Schmid, who

altered another of the 123 TST, the evaluation of the tradition would be subject to change, especially when it came to borderline relationships.

32 For the electronic data processing, we had to define which types of witnesses have been referred to as *K*, *Av* etc. in previous research.

categorized the manuscripts that belong to *K*, *Av*, and *Com*.³³ His lists were corrected according to our evaluation: the assignments of currently available manuscripts were checked for consistency with the groups of J. Schmid, using the Comparative List (Chapter 6) which is (except for the first line, see below) based solely on the collation results independent from any assignments to text forms. Unsuitable manuscripts were deleted from groups into which they did not fit (e.g. mixed texts) and manuscripts unknown to J. Schmid were added.³⁴ Based on these assignments, provisional LA-numbers were given to the readings in each test passage, and this material was evaluated by a preliminary study of the sorting lists. From this data, a fresh examination and correction of manuscript assignment was undertaken. Thus, Chapter 2 provides an overview of the representatives of the three main text forms (*K*, *Av*, *Com*), which together create the majority of Rev's manuscripts. They are listed before the collation results for the sake of transparency.

Based on this material, LA 3–5 were allocated electronically to the collated readings according to their witnesses. The numbering of readings in Chapter 3 is organized in a purely statistical way. This means that the arrangement of LA 3–5 at any given test passage is defined by the numerical majority of the witnesses listed in Chapter 2 according to their text forms. For example, LA 4 is defined by the reading found in the majority of *Av* manuscripts at a given test passage. This means that LA 3, 4, or 5 cannot be directly equated with the wording of *K*, *Av*, or *Com*, but only with the bulk of the exemplars of these traditions.

This issue applies especially to LA 4, since it sometimes differs from the *Av*-text edited by J. Schmid. The heterogeneity of *Av* manuscripts (LA 4) contributes to this situation, because various potential *Av* witnesses are only related to the core of the *Av* tradition in differing degrees. *Av* subgroups often differ in wording from one another even if they

33 For LA 3 the *K* witnesses in *Studien II*, 27 were selected; for LA 4 the *Av* witnesses in *Studien II*, 26; and for LA 5 the *Com* witnesses in *Studien II*, 28.

34 Whether these major text forms (Koine, Andreas, and Complutenisan) constitute consistent textual families, as researchers have claimed, needs to be confirmed by other means. The procedure described here is not designed to determine the reality of these forms, but to assign LA numbers, without which the evaluations in Chapters 4 and 5 would be impossible.

share a common base. Thus, LA 4 at times disagrees with J. Schmid's reconstruction (cf. Appendix C).

The affiliation of particular objects to the remainder of the manuscripts that constitute LA 4 is not always obvious. Imagine, by way of comparison, how the satellites of the solar system move at different distances from the sun. The unity of the system is not discernible on the basis of their relation to the center, but in the context of the overall image.

An extreme example of this phenomenon is 2429. The manuscript offers LA 4 only in three out of sixteen test passages (TST 47, 51 and 67). Although J. Schmid identified this manuscript as a witness of the *Av* text,³⁵ it only shows significant agreement with a special group of that tradition, and not with other *Av* manuscripts.

Furthermore, groups *f.1678* and *f.2065* are not counted as representatives of LA 4 in the final version of Chapter 2, because of their considerable distance from *Av* manuscripts.

The numbering of readings does not differentiate between sub-groups, like those identified by J. Schmid. This is because the determination of these sub-groups is inconclusive in terms of the number of readings in the collation results and because it is not always possible to discern the sub-groups of the *K* text by means of the collated data. Even text groups like the Oecumenius and Arethas texts, which have been identified in recent research,³⁶ were not as clearly identifiable as the main text forms for two reasons: 1) Because the readings of these smaller groups often overlap with LA 2, LA 3 or LA 4, and the combined reading numbers in the collations would become very long and more confusing if these traditions were included under their own signs. 2) The identification of the text forms and reading numbers of *K*, *Av*, and *Com* serves primarily as a substitute for LA 1 in previous *TuT* volumes. The sum of LA 3–5 (in various combinations) is analogous to LA 1: these readings constitute the majority and provide greater clarity for the internal differences in the

35 Cf. J. Schmid, *Studien II*, 26.

36 J. Schmid, *Untersuchungen I*, 4–51.59–77; J. Schmid, "Der Apokalypse-Text des Oikumenius" *Bib.* 40 (1959), 935–942; J. Schmid, "Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Apokalypse-Kommentars des Arethas von Kaisareia" *BNGJ* 17 (1939–1943), 72–81.

tradition of Rev. Groups and sub-groups are only determined based on the results of the collation and cannot be presumed (cf. Chapter 7).

Finally, when using the survey in Chapter 2, the user should carefully consider the purpose for which lists were constructed. They are not to be understood as the final characterization of the three text forms (even if this claim has been made in secondary literature for some time), but as contingent presentations of the data that require further research. Moreover, many manuscripts at the edges of these text forms blur the hard and fast distinction between traditions, and further study of these copies is necessary. This overview serves, as previously mentioned, only to ground the numbering of LA 3–5 and to illustrate the transparency of the project.

2.4 The Test Passage Selection: Criteria and Execution

Both the difficulties and the principles for the selection of test passages were considered at the preparatory stage of the project.³⁷ It was important to locate representative passages in Rev in which the different traditional branches could be distinguished. Based on the issue mentioned above, the selection could not primarily be based on the divergence of NA²⁸ from the “Majority Text”; serious attention should also be paid to the two main strands of *K* and *Av*. Moreover, the small text groups examined by Hoskier and J. Schmid (or, at least, which they postulated) could not be ignored.

The choice of test passages included many stages of refinement. In 2008, Lembke completed the first collection, including 146 test passages across every chapter of Rev. This data represented a sample of the manuscript groups found in secondary literature (eight families in accordance with Hoskier, in addition to the sub-groups of *K* and *Av* according to J. Schmid). The second phase, beginning in 2009, expanded this selection by including numerous locations in which the apparatus from NA²⁷ differentiated between \mathfrak{M} and *txt* or between \mathfrak{M}^K , \mathfrak{M}^A , and *txt*. By this process the data set grew to 272 test passages. Lembke began to collate

37 Cf. esp. Lembke, “Beobachtungen”, 41–53.

manuscripts in 2008, beginning with those not documented by Hoskier, by means of the microfilms belonging to the INTF.

Independently from Lembke, M. Karrer and U. Schmid — at the Institut für Septuaginta- und biblische Textforschung (ISBTF) of the Kirchliche Hochschule Wuppertal/Bethel — also designed a test passage selection process as part of the planning of the ECM of Rev. They abandoned Hoskier due to the criticism by R. Gryson in his *Vetus Latina* edition³⁸ and because recent research required a review of his text-historical hypothesis.³⁹ Additionally, it became clear that it was important to consider stylistic phenomena, since they play an important role in the tradition of Rev.⁴⁰

In the third phase (in 2011) a fruitful collaboration between Lembke and the ISBTF commenced. The test passages of both databases overlapped to a large degree and corresponded closely in other locations. The combination of material increased the number of test passages to 324. At the same time, Lembke transferred the collation data from Hoskier and his own collations⁴¹ into an electronic database. After this, the number of test passages for *TuT* was reduced. Following discussion with K. Wachtel and H. Strutwolf, it was decided that about 120 test passages should be retained. The process of reduction was facilitated by the realization, brought to light by sample analyses, that the divisions between text traditions are not only recognizable by evaluating the whole Rev, but also found in individual chapters.⁴²

The fourth phase, under the leadership of M. Karrer, lowered the number of test passages to 180 by concentrating on select chapters. These

38 R. Gryson (ed.), *Apocalypsis Johannis, Vetus Latina, Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*, vol. 26, Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 2000–2003, 93f.

39 Cf. fn. 3 and D. E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, WBC 52a, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997, clviii–clx; G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids/MI: Eerdmans, 1999, 70–75.

40 For examples, cf. Karrer, “Text (in: Frey/Kelhoffer/Tóth)”, 48–50; Karrer, “Text (in: Yarbro Collins)”.

41 Lembke also collated the manuscripts not included by Hoskier at the INTF, Münster.

42 The selection of chapters was influenced by the possibility in future of creating a full collation in all witnesses of, first, a portion of Rev and then the whole text. The small number of witnesses makes this aim possible.

test passages were divided among Chapters 1 (introduction), 2 (letters), 4–5 (the throne room vision), 6 (opening of the seals), 13 (vision of the two beasts), 14 (visions and auditions), 18 (the fall of Babylon), and 21 (the heavenly Jerusalem), collecting readings that form an impression of the overall shape of the work. These chapters also include key points for the interpretation of Rev (e.g. Rev 1,4–6; 4,3; 5,9f.).

As a result of the control and preparation of the collation material for the volume, the test passages that highlight the sub-groups of *K* and *A_v* were reduced. These passages proved inadequate or unfruitful in the current context of *TuT*.⁴³ This process brought the number of test passages down to a reasonable number in comparison with previous *TuT* volumes, namely a total of 123 test passages (for the discarded passages, see Appendix B).

The 123 test passages may be divided into seven categories that reflect various features of the textual history of Revelation and the sources used for the selection.⁴⁴ Some test passages fall into more than one of these categories:

Category m: Differences between \mathfrak{M} (= shared reading *K-A_v*) and NA²⁷, in the apparatus of NA²⁷;⁴⁵ see TST 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18,

-
- 43 Due to the chapter selection in the fourth phase, divergent quantities of test passages for the various sub-groups emerged; in addition to this imbalance, we noticed that some of the *K* sub-groups postulated by J. Schmid were not clearly confirmed by our collation material.
- 44 In Phase 1, test passages were selected that included category f and n readings, as well as categories highlighting the presences of *K* and *A_v* sub-groups (not included in the volume). In Phase 2, test passages were selected that represented categories m and d, and in Phase 3 categories s and r, as well as g (from the Wuppertal selection). The readings omitted in Phase 4 are not listed in the table because these test passages were not used in the final form of the volume.
- 45 Up to this point the 27th edition was used because the 28th had not yet been published (this had no influence on the results). The apparatus details of NA²⁷ and NA²⁸ are not always reliable. For example, in TST 1 the *A_v* reading should agree with the main text, and the siglum \mathfrak{M} should not be located here. This situation, however, influences only the categorization of a reading, not its evaluation, because the selection of test passages and the evaluation of their relationships are independent of one another. This is true also of the remaining test passages (cf. Lembke, "Beobachtungen", 47).

	20, 24, 25, 26, 29, 30, 32, 37, 38, 41, 44, 45, 49, 50, 55, 56, 59, 65, 71, 73, 78, 82, 83, 85, 88, 95, 96, 99, 101, 102, 105, 106, 110, 121, 122.
Category d:	Places where <i>K</i> and <i>A_v</i> differ in the apparatus of NA ²⁷ and in which the main text of NA ²⁷ offers a third reading; ⁴⁶ TST 4, 19, 22, 27, 31, 36, 40, 54, 58, 67, 84, 94, 100, 117.
Category s:	Division into two groups by J. Schmid (P ⁴⁷ -01 and 02-04) according to the analysis of the transcriptions made in Münster; TST 68, 70, 71, 72, 76, 81.
Category f:	Differences between the manuscript families identified by Hoskier (<i>Com</i> and other) ⁴⁷ as displayed in the apparatus of W.N. Pickering; ⁴⁸ TST 3, 9, 16, 23, 33, 34, 47, 48, 52, 53, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 69, 74, 75, 79, 80, 86, 93, 98, 102, 103, 115, 117, 119, 120.
Category n:	Same as Category f, but selected to identify the Arethas tradition that differs only slightly from <i>K</i> ; TST 8, 97, 100, 109, 114.
Category g:	Relevant test passages from secondary literature; TST 1, 2, 7, 21, 26, 30, 38, 39, 46, 50, 57, 58, 66, 81, 84, 90, 92, 107, 116, 118, 123.
Category r:	Text-critically problematic locations in accordance with {B} to {D} ratings in GNT ⁴⁹ and in B.M. Metzger's Commentary, ⁵⁰ as well as

-
- 46 The value of this category is for identifying passages where LA 2, LA 3 und LA 4 diverge from one another. An exception is TST 31, where the *A_v* reading is divided and the apparatus of NA²⁷ referred only to a minority of *A_v* manuscripts, resulting in LA 6 agreeing with \mathfrak{M}^A in the apparatus (cf. Appendix C).
- 47 According to Hoskier, *Text II*, 23–24: Erasmusian fam. (*A_v*), Complutensian fam. (*Com*), B fam. (*K*), Arethas, Graeco-Latin (*f.104*), Egyptian (*A_vⁱ*), Coptic (*f.172*), furthermore, Oecumenius (mixed by Hoskier with *f.1678*, and enlarged by Pickering with *f.1006* and other manuscripts, resulting in an incoherent group). But Hoskier's Syriac fam. is ignored by Schmid and Pickering because it does not constitute a verifiable group. Cf. Lembke, "Beobachtungen", 34–41.49–51.
- 48 In the process of test passage selection, the apparatus of Pickering's edition was used, which offers a summary of Hoskier's collation. This edition is available online: <http://www.walkinhiscommandments.com/Pickeing/Greek%20Text/apokalupsis-ff.pdf>. The printed edition is Wilbur N. Pickering, *The Greek New Testament According to Family 35*, Second Edition, n.p. 2015. This volume is also available online: <http://www.cspmt.org/pdf/F35%20GNT.pdf>. The manuscript families are located on pp. 787–788.
- 49 On the basis of the Greek New Testament, Fourth Revised Edition. The fifth edition was published only following the selection process.
- 50 B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 662–691.

passages which are characteristic of printed editions of the TR; TST 2, 3, 7, 21, 28, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 50, 51, 57, 58, 63, 66, 68, 70, 71, 77, 81, 87, 89, 90, 91, 104, 106, 107, 108, 111, 112, 113, 116, 118, 123.

The diversity of sources prevents dependence on potentially problematic models of text family grouping. It also makes possible further critical review of these models by differentiating among these categories.⁵¹ Although steps were taken in the selection of test passages to represent all text forms in a balanced manner, there is no guarantee that this is so.⁵² But the final selection reflects this intended balance by selecting a high number of points where the tradition is divided (e.g. Categories d and partially f). The weighting of these locations is due in large part to the unique tradition of Rev. In sum, the test passages where *K* and *A_v* diverge are not overweighed. Instead, they remain underrepresented, compared to the classical passages where the majority diverges from NA.⁵³

The reason for the relatively high number of Category m test passages is because the differences between NA and the majority of manuscripts has traditionally been afforded a high level of significance. This does not contradict the finding noted above that a manuscript's level of agreement with the *rM* has limited value. Instead, it offers an opportunity to profile texts that retain a high proportion of "old text" readings (LA 2). Moreover, it remains to be examined why LA 3 and 4 (*K* and *A_v*), despite their differences from the text of NA²⁸, share numerous characteristics.

The reason why so many test passages from Category n occur in the last chapters of Rev is because the *K* and Arethas traditions differ more at the end of the work.⁵⁴

51 This principle has already been described by Lembke ("Beobachtungen", 45–47.56). It is intended for use in further studies.

52 It is hardly possible to balance the relationship between text forms and the selection of test passages perfectly. Optimal results can only be achieved through the evaluation of a full collation, as is done in the "Profile Method", though this approach also contains disadvantages (cf. Lembke, "Beobachtungen", 30–34).

53 Cf. M. Lembke, "Besonderheiten", 212–215.

54 On this cf. J. Schmid, *Untersuchungen I*, 9; J. Schmid, *Studien II*, 27. This observation confirms Hoskier's data, which was the basis for Category n.

With regard to Category *f*, some groups could not be considered in the same way as others for the selection of test passages. Readings from the Oecumenius text and *f*.1006 were not satisfactorily documented in the sources.⁵⁵ Additionally, some test passages that identified sub-groups of *K* and *Av* were omitted (as described above).

These imbalances are justifiable due to an important feature in the history of the *Text und Textwert* project: it is not necessary to assume the existence of a group in the process of test passage selection, since the profile of each group is created only through the evaluation of a number of test passages (without knowing specific group readings). In the evaluation of the data a group can be distinguished from other groups, even if the group was not considered in the process of test passage selection.⁵⁶

This principle is effective here because Rev contains numerous test passages where the tradition is very divided. In fact, the data not only witnesses to the major groups considered in the process of selection, but also to the groups not presupposed (e.g. Oecumenius, *f*.1006, and *Av* sub-groups), and groups that were not recognized before collation (e.g. manuscript pairs 469-2716 and 792-2643).

These findings give reason to believe that, in this volume, *all* existing groups can be identified (including those that were previously unknown), if they preserve wording distinct from other known traditions (some weak sub-groups of the *K*-text excluded). It is important to be aware that twentieth-century research reached important insights into the textual history of Rev with which the interpretation of the data presented in this volume must engage.

3. Collation Results

Like the previous *TuT* volumes, the collation results are the basis for determining the textual character of each manuscript. The following issues should be considered when using this data.

55 Cf. fn. 44 and Lembke, "Beobachtungen", 50f.

56 A detailed description of this method is found in Lembke, "Beobachtungen", 44f.

3.1 Designations of the Readings in Revelation

To understand the information described in § 2.1, the numbering of the readings must be carefully considered. In agreement with § 2.2–3, one finds the following readings in the collation results:

- 1 not used (see § 2.1)
- 2 reading from NA²⁸
- 3 reading from the majority of Koine witnesses
- 4 reading from the majority of Andreas witnesses
- 5 reading from the majority of Complutensian witnesses
- ≥6 readings that differ from 2–5 (special readings)
- W indeterminate reading, meaning that it is not clear which reading a manuscript follows at a given test passage. In this volume these occur in examples where the reading is legible, but uncertain into which category it falls, for example in cases of abbreviation (cf. TST 22, 50, 66, 67, 112).
- X illegible in the microfilm (and possibly also the original)
- Y problem with the microfilm (although the manuscript remains intact); the reading is currently unavailable
- Z physical lacuna in the manuscript due to lost material or incomplete transcription

In test passages where the NA²⁸ text is in [brackets] (TST 2, 35, 51, 68, 108, 111, 113, 118, 123), LA 2 is treated as undefined and ignored in calculations for evaluation (Chapters 4–7). Because the text reconstruction in these cases is uncertain (*non liquet*) and allows for multiple interpretations, it is not suitable for statistical analysis. Therefore, these insecure readings are marked in brackets as “[2]” in the collation results, but are not evaluated as LA 2.

Manuscripts are assigned category Z in the event of material loss, damage, and incomplete transcription. An incomplete transcription occurs when the text breaks off prematurely despite the presence of writing material (e.g. GA 1064 1777) or if a larger section of text is missing even though it appears that no leaves are lost. For example, the last case

is true for the manuscripts 1824-2062-2350-2403 (which also belong together textually). The omission of Rev 2:2–14:20 is an inherent element of these four manuscripts.

In 1775 and 2931, Rev is often abbreviated, omitting long passages, because the main text was only copied to orient the reading of the commentary. Although the manuscripts are physically complete, these omissions fall under category Z because they are not omissions in the classic sense.

The arrangement of readings follows this pattern: the first variant of a test passage is the reading that reflects the *rM* of this passage (possibly including sub-readings), as described in § 3.2. This is followed by the readings of the other main text forms, usually in the order LA 2, 3, 4, and 5. But this is modified in cases where several of these forms agree. Practically, this means that various arrangements of readings occur at the first position of a test passage, where combinations of groups share a common reading (e.g. LA 2/4/5). In practice, it is more common to find test passages where major text forms agree than passages where they all witness separate readings (this is a consequence of the structure of the tradition, cf. Appendix D). Overall, the numbering of readings respects the characteristics of a given test passage and provides the opportunity to examine the interrelationships of *K*, *Av*, and *Com*, as well as their connection to older text forms. For every reading, both the total number of witnesses and the number of witnesses that belong to a certain group are given. This was done to show the diversity of the manuscripts (cf. § 2.3).

The LA numbering was organized with the goal of providing a correspondent differentiation of the manuscripts in the evaluation lists (Chapters 4–5), and to make transparent the interrelationships within the collation results. The textual value of the manuscripts of Rev cannot be measured by comparison to the NA text or the *rM*. The findings turn out to be much more complex and require an analysis that brings the groups of manuscripts into focus.

After LA 2–5 come special readings that are identified by numbers 6 and above. These include variants in individual manuscripts and the idiosyncrasies of smaller sub-groups.

3.2 The Variable Composition of *rM*

Table three gives an overview of the character of the “relative majority” (*rM*, § 2.1). This table shows which combinations of readings create the *rM* and how often they occur (a complete listing of all anomalous cases is found in Appendix D). Combinations of several text forms often preserve identical readings at certain test passages. These combinations are marked by the presence of multiple LA numbers (e.g. LA 2/4/5).

Table 3: Readings of the “relative majority” (*rM*), organized by LA number

Frequency	Combination	includes, i.a.		
41x	LA 3/4/5	<i>K</i>	<i>Av</i>	<i>Com</i>
19x	LA 3/5	<i>K</i>		<i>Com</i>
13x	LA 2/4/5		<i>Av</i>	<i>Com</i> NA ²⁸
11x	LA 3	<i>K</i>		
7x	LA 4/5		<i>Av</i>	<i>Com</i>
5x	LA 2/3/5	<i>K</i>		<i>Com</i> NA ²⁸
5x	LA 2/3	<i>K</i>		NA ²⁸
4x	LA 3/4	<i>K</i>	<i>Av</i>	
4x	LA 2/3/4	<i>K</i>	<i>Av</i>	NA ²⁸
3x	LA [2]/3/4/5	<i>K</i>	<i>Av</i>	<i>Com</i>
3x	LA 2/3/4/5	<i>K</i>	<i>Av</i>	<i>Com</i> NA ²⁸
3x	LA 2/4		<i>Av</i>	NA ²⁸
2x	LA [2]/3/5	<i>K</i>		<i>Com</i>
1x	LA 2/5			<i>Com</i> NA ²⁸
1x	LA [2]/3	<i>K</i>		
1x	LA [2]/4/5		<i>Av</i>	<i>Com</i>

As one can see, the *rM* sometimes follows *K* and sometimes *Av* in cases where LA 3 and 4 diverge. The causes of the varying combinations include the convergence of different groups at a particular reading and the fluctuation of the number of witnesses for a certain LA across Rev.

Although the Koine and Andrew groups consist each of a relatively high number of manuscripts (136 in total), in rare cases the reading LA 3/4 is not identical with the reading of *rM*. One example is TST 29, where LA 2/5 comprises the *rM* and not the

combination of most Andrew and Koine manuscripts (LA 3/4). In this case NA²⁸ represents the majority against *K/Av*. Additionally, smaller sub-groups (not represented by LA 2–5) may sometimes tip the scale in favour of a particular *rM* reading.

3.3 Directions for Using the Collation Results

What follows is a list of abbreviations that are necessary for understanding the collation results:

- * first hand (always coordinate with C)
- C correction (always coordinate with *)
- T textual reading if an alternative exists (always connected with L)
- L alternative reading, either in the margin or interlinear (always coordinate with T)
- S supplement
- OM. omission
- HOM. homoioteleuton; this is provided when the omission (at the discretion of the editors) is the result of confusion in the copying process of repeated phrases
- VS verse
-] For textual changes whose presentation requires an extension of the test passage beyond its predetermined limits. First, the wording of NA²⁸ is cited and enclosed in ‘]’, after which the reading of the manuscript(s) is given. In this way, a clear reference point is available
- { } Words enclosed within braces stand within the test passage limits, but actually belong to the preceding or following context. The words in question are documented in the collation results, but ignored in the analysis of the collation by subordinating this reading to the main reading (insofar as a main reading exists; exception: LA 8 in TST 122)
- VEL meaning “or”, this note signifies that the reading of a manuscript offers multiple interpretations of its text. In these cases, both options are recorded in the data.

The editors have decided to include examples of homoioteleuton and distorting omissions in the analysis the better to identify the characteristics of particular sub-groups, text families, or manuscript pairs (e.g. homoioteleuton in TST 45 shows internal characteristics of *f*.2060 and the omission in TST 116 indicates that 1824 is a copy of 2062). As a result, categories U and V, which were utilized in previous *TuT* volumes, are not used here, and these cases are evaluated as “proper” readings. The description of a homoioteleuton would often be complex in Rev, owing to the many stereotyped phrases, particularly when causative phrases diverge from the known text of NA²⁸. Additionally, in commentary manuscripts omissions occur by portions repeated in the commentary. In order not to overuse HOM., its deployment was limited to the most obvious cases. Complex omissions that were influenced by the form of the commentary are recorded in other ways. The denotation of commentary readings (K in previous *TuT* volumes) has also been omitted here because the Andreas commentary is preserved in numerous manuscripts and requires its own detailed examination.

More difficulties arise in cases where it is unclear whether a variant should be considered a main reading or a sub-reading. This choice has consequences for how the data is evaluated. While main readings are evaluated separately, sub-readings are subordinated to a particular main reading and in analysis treated as identical to it. Therefore, a unique sub-reading can only be recovered in its own right if separated from the main reading in the evaluations. To handle these issues as objectively as possible, the structuring of the readings in the collation results follows these rules: if a reading is grammatically possible in its context it is defined as a main reading, even if its content is difficult. If a reading offers, however, a grammatically improper or mistaken form (e.g. incongruence in case, gender, etc.), it is counted as a sub-reading of a related main reading. In cases where a sub-reading is not obviously related to a main reading, it is treated as a main reading. This approach was only abandoned in justifiable cases (cf. § 3.4).

The use of VEL often occurs in cases where the sub-reading is uncertain due to lost material or unclear abbreviations, but in which the main reading is certain (TST 13, 58, 63, 65). This approach was applied

to avoid that the witness falls under category W, X, or Z; since the passage can be used in the analysis, when doubt remains within sub-readings, it is subordinated to the main reading. But when several main readings are possible, the case must be assigned to category W and cannot be evaluated. Of course, the same is true for X and Z readings, but in exceptional cases VEL is utilized with W readings if a part of the reading is legible and of potential interest for interpretation (e.g. TST 66 in GA 110; cf. TST 22, 50, 58, 112).

3.4 Special Features of Specific Readings and Manuscripts

The report of the readings generally follows the exact spelling in the manuscripts, although abbreviations and short hand symbols are given in their long form. Regular abbreviations like *nomina sacra* are resolved according to case and number. Differences in presentation of the “moveable nu” have been smoothed by the use of the -(v) designation. Scribal mistakes are documented as they occur in the manuscript, but subsumed into a main reading (when one is available) for the purposes of evaluation (see above).

Sub-readings are marked by the assigning of a capital letter attached to the number of a main reading (2-A, 2-B, etc.). This allows for the exact documentation of the tradition, but the sub-readings are equated with the main readings in the evaluation (Chapters 4–7). In previous volumes, scribal errors (-f) and orthographic differences (-o) were marked, but these have been abandoned here because the line between them is often blurred.

Where a reading is uncertain or partially reconstructed it is not marked with *ut videtur*, as is the usual custom in *TuT*. If no clear decision is possible for a given reading, the manuscript is categorized under X or Z. Parts of manuscripts that fall under categories W, X, Y, and Z are excluded in the evaluation calculations.

- The corrections in Sinaiticus are marked as follows:
 - C1 4–6th century, in NA²⁸: \aleph^1 on the Sinaiticus homepage:⁵⁷ S1;
 - CA from the 7th century, in NA²⁸ \aleph^2 , on the Sinaiticus homepage: ca;
 - CC also 7th century, in NA²⁸: \aleph^2 , on the Sinaiticus homepage: cc;⁵⁸
 - C not certain, in NA²⁸: \aleph^c , on the Sinaiticus homepage: corr.
- Difference in punctuation and accentuation are, as in previous *TuT* volumes, ignored. In TST 13 (Rev 2:3) the correct word division in some manuscripts is recognizable only through the deployment of the breathing. The following note is a guide for the reader of this test passage: provided that the breathing over the ϵ in *και ουκ εκοπιασας* is missing, the reading has been reported as *και ου κεκοπιασας*. Other contentious cases also exist.⁵⁹ Although *κεκοπιασας* is not a grammatically coherent form (perfect augment with aorist ending), the word division has not been normalized, but documented in accordance with the manuscripts. It seems that the scribes found it hard to transcribe this passage correctly, which is why a broad confusion appears in the tradition (cf. the correction in 02),⁶⁰ because the breathing in question is missing in twenty-seven manuscripts. Both readings are subsumed under the same main reading.
- In TST 22 (Rev 2:20) some manuscripts have the abbreviation $\eta \lambda \epsilon \gamma$ (gamma over $\lambda \epsilon$), which can stand for either of the two main readings: $\eta \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \iota$ or $\eta \lambda \epsilon \gamma \omicron \upsilon \sigma \alpha$. These cases are denoted by option W in the collation results.
- In TST 35 (Rev 5:6) the spelling of the *nomen sacrum* $\overline{\pi \nu \alpha}$ remains ambiguous in some manuscripts. This abbreviation usually stands for the singular *πνευμα*, although in the context ($\epsilon \pi \tau \alpha$) the plural *πνευματα* would be more appropriate. The plural is usually abbreviated as $\overline{\pi \nu \alpha \tau \alpha}$. In this case, both the singular and plural are treated as main readings.
- In TST 58 (Rev 13:10) the manuscripts break down into an especially complex situation in the variant forms of *αποκτενει*. In addition to variable spelling practices

57 The online edition of the Codex Sinaiticus can be found at <http://codexsinaiticus.org/de/>.

58 The differentiation between \aleph^{2a} and \aleph^{2b} in NA²⁸ does not correspond in all cases to the differentiation between \aleph^{ca} and \aleph^{cc} on the Sinaiticus homepage, since the latter are different hands, but NA²⁸ only differentiates between the sequence of corrections (cf. NA²⁸, 59*). As a result, it is possible that ca can be assigned to two readings in TST 113.

59 For example, in 1934, the reading is *και ουκ εκοπιασας*. The *kappa* of *ουκ* is not connected to *εκοπιασας*, indicating a word division. But why then does *ουκ* have a breathing and not *εκοπιασας*?

60 On the corrections in 02 cf. M. Sigismund, "Schreiber und Korrektoren in der Johannes-Apokalypse des Codex Alexandrinus" in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament. Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, ed. M. Karrer/S. Kreuzer/M. Sigismund, ANTF 43, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 2010, 319–338.

- (*αποκτεννει/αποκτενει* etc.), the presence of accents can affect the tense, offering either a present (*αποκτένει*) or a future construction (*αποκτενεῖ*). This nuance cannot be considered here and the placement of readings is based only on the graphemes.
- In TST 58 (Rev 13:10) and 63 (Rev 13:14) the readings *μαχαιρα* and *μαχαιρη* are subsumed under the same main reading in the evaluation chapters, but are divided as different sub-readings in the collation results.
 - In TST 66 (Rev 13:18) it was difficult to present the reading in \mathfrak{F}^{115} . With the reading $\eta \overline{\chi\iota\zeta}$ ([...] or 616), \mathfrak{F}^{115} remains uncertain because it is not clear whether another number was omitted in the lost material ($\overline{\chi\iota\zeta}$ can only be suspected). The presence of η raises another problem, because a horizontal line stands over it, the meaning of which is unclear. In the initial publication of the papyrus it was interpreted in the following way: “Eta is certain and has a horizontal bar above it. If this is a deletion mark, it could explain the short supplement.”⁶¹ The editor is not certain about the meaning of the bar. It could be a deletion mark, which would be supported by 04 in light of the fact that the correction creates the reading $\overline{\chi\iota\zeta}$. D. Parker follows this assessment.⁶² However, this question must remain open since the bar is rather long and may have served as an additional number abbreviation ($\overline{\eta}$ = 8) as Comfort and Barrett have noted.⁶³ In the collation results, \mathfrak{F}^{115} has its own main reading ([...] $\overline{\eta \chi\iota\zeta}$), signaling that the question remains unresolved.
 - In TST 72 (Rev 14:6) some manuscripts witness *ερχομενον*, which is typical of *Av* sub-group *i*. Because other variants are related to *ερχομενον* (-ων) or to the following reading *ευαγγελισαι/ευαγγελισασθαι*, this phenomenon is used to show the relationship of specific manuscripts
 - In TST 90 (Rev 18:3) *πεπωκαν* and *πεπωκασιν* are preserved separately due to discussions of stylistics in Rev, even though they both witness third person plural perfect forms.
 - In TST 94 (Rev 18:11) *εφ αυτους* is subsumed under the main reading *εφ εαυτους*, because the aspirated *εφ αυτους* corresponds closely to the serial arrangement of *εφ εαυτους*.
 - Although *μεγαν ως μυλον* in TST 102 (Rev 18:21) represents a simple transposition and could be subsumed under *μυλον*, it is presented as a main reading because it shows the relationship of specific manuscripts.

-
- 61 J. Chapa e. a. (ed.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXVI*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 86, London: Cook Books, 1999, 34.
- 62 D. C. Parker, “A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Revelation: P115 (P. Oxy. 4499)” in *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology. Collected Papers 1977–2007*, ed. D. C. Parker, ANTF 40, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2009, 73–92, here 75.
- 63 P. W. Comfort/D. P. Barrett (ed.), *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: New and complete Transcriptions with Photographs*, Wheaton/IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001, 645 with fn. a.

- In TST 112 (Rev 21:4) *απηλθαν* and *απηλθον* are both presented as main readings, though being morphologically identical, for the reason mentioned above.
- The same is true for *γεγονασιν* and *γεγοναν* in TST 113 (Rev 21:6).

4. Descriptive List

Like previous volumes in the *TuT* series, this volume offers an overview of the textual characteristics of every manuscript, including the frequency and locations at which a manuscript attests a reading of a specific reading category (Chapter 3). Next to *Summe* (“total”) the number of times a manuscript witnesses a certain category is given and, next to it in brackets, the number of times the category exists with or without the witness of the manuscript. Because there is no reading category existing in all 123 TST, the ratio must be carefully considered. The test passages where the manuscript witnesses each category are also listed. Essentially, this chapter offers the same data as Chapter 3, but organized by manuscript instead of test passage.

The number of LA 2 (=NA²⁸) and of singular readings (*Singulärlersarten*) are given as they appear. This is also valid for the share of special readings that cohere with this definition (§ 3.1). Of great value are the occurrences of LA 3–5, because the quantity of these readings that a manuscript contains is an important factor in determining its textual affiliation. The classification of manuscripts is problematic in some respects: The probability depends on the quantity of readings which a manuscript contains of a specific text-type. To assess the reality of these relationships more clearly, an overview of the various reading types and their combinations with the test passages where they occur follows:

A. LA 2 (NA ²⁸):	4 5 7 10 12 13 14 15 17 18 19 20 22 24 25 26 27 30 32 36 37 38 40 41 45 50 54 55 56 58 59 66 67 70 73 76 78 82 83 84 85 88 90 91 92 94 95 96 99 100 101 102 105 106 110 112 117 121 122 (59 test pas- sages)
B. LA 3 (K):	1 8 19 27 28 33 40 42 48 58 62 63 64 66 74 75 77 84 85 86 90 92 93 97 98 100 108 109 112 114 115 118 120 123 (34 test passages)
C. LA 4 (Av):	3 4 22 36 47 51 52 54 57 67 68 87 94 108 113 117 (16 test passages)
D. LA 5 (Com):	23 64 72 80 103 108 114 (7 test passages)
E. LA 2/3 (NA ²⁸ /K):	9 16 46 79 89 (5 test passages)

F. LA 2/4 (NA ²⁸ /Av):	6 21 31 34 49 53 60 61 64 69 81 107 114 116 119 (15 test passages)
G. LA 2/5 (NA ²⁸ /Com):	11 29 44 65 71 (5 test passages)
H. LA 3/4 (K/Av):	11 29 44 65 71 (5 test passages)
I. LA 3/5 (K/Com):	4 6 21 22 31 34 36 49 51 53 54 60 61 67 68 69 81 94 107 113 116 117 119 (23 test passages)
J. LA 4/5 (Av/Com):	9 16 19 27 40 46 58 66 79 84 85 89 90 92 100 112 118 123 (18 test passages)
K. LA 2/3/4 (NA ²⁸ /K/Av):	23 72 80 103 (4 test passages)
L. LA 2/3/5 (NA ²⁸ /K/Com):	3 47 52 57 87 (5 test passages)
M. LA 2/4/5 (NA ²⁸ /Av/Com):	1 8 28 33 42 48 62 63 74 75 77 86 93 97 98 109 115 120 (18 test passages)
N. LA 3/4/5 (K/Av/Com):	2 5 7 10 12 13 14 15 17 18 20 24 25 26 30 32 35 37 38 41 45 50 55 56 59 70 73 76 78 82 83 88 91 95 96 99 101 102 105 106 110 111 121 122 (44 test passages)
O. LA 2/3/4/5 (NA ²⁸ /K/Av/Com):	39 43 104 (3 test passages)

As one can see, each of the reading types LA 2–5 appears alone and in combination with other types. The total number of occurrence is calculated by adding all categories containing the LA number (123 for LA 3–5, 114 for LA 2 in accordance with § 3.1).

After the listing of the LA numbers in the Descriptive List the additional categories not included in the collation results occur: P (special readings), Q (singular readings), R (corrections), and S (marginal or alternative readings). The use of these letters differs from previous volumes since the letters D to O had to be used for the various reading combinations in Rev (see above). For categories P, Q, R, and S the TST at which they occur are given, as well as LA numbers at these TSTs. If a correction, marginal reading, or alternative reading exists, the TST is found both under the appropriate LA combination (A to O) and the secondary reading under R or S.

Another new feature of this chapter is that the supplements of manuscripts are presented as separate witnesses (93-S, 757-S, 1852-S), because they sometimes belong to different text families than the manuscript which they supplement. They are analysed separately.

The following manuscripts are omitted from the Descriptive List because they do not preserve text at any test passage: \mathfrak{P}^{43} \mathfrak{P}^{85} \mathfrak{P}^{98} 052 0163 0207 0308 886 1652 (cf. § 1.2 and 5.1).

To illustrate the way in which the Descriptive List functions, let us look at \mathfrak{P}^{47} .⁶⁴ On the first line, \mathfrak{P}^{47} contains text in only thirty-four test passages. In seven of fifteen possible test passages, \mathfrak{P}^{47} agrees with LA 2 (NA²⁸). The test passages at which this is so are listed. Following this, the list shows that \mathfrak{P}^{47} follows LA 4 (*Av*) in four passages. Category B (LA 3) is omitted because \mathfrak{P}^{47} does not preserve any of its readings. It does however agree with the *K* text in places where it has E (LA 2/3), H (LA 3/4), I (LA 3/5), K (LA 2/3/4), and N (LA 3/4/5) readings, readings where the *K* text agrees with other traditions. \mathfrak{P}^{47} stands at some distance from the *K* text, but agrees in some places with *Av*. This observation is underlined by M and F readings, where \mathfrak{P}^{47} agrees with *Av* (in combination with other traditions) against *K*.

5. Sorting by Percentages

5.1 Preliminary Comments on the Evaluation Lists in Chapters 5–7

The following manuscripts were omitted in Chapters 5–7 because they occurred in fewer than ten test passages (number of occurrences in parenthesis): \mathfrak{P}^{18} (1), \mathfrak{P}^{24} (1), \mathfrak{P}^{43} (0) \mathfrak{P}^{85} (0), \mathfrak{P}^{98} (0), \mathfrak{P}^{115} (3), 052 (0), 0163 (0), 0169 (1), 0207 (0), 0229 (1), 0308 (0), 757-S (8), 886 (0), 1652 (0), 1769 (5), 1852-S (5), 2087 (6), 2361 (5), 2408 (2), 2419 (6), 2855 (7), 2924 (9). The textual characteristics of manuscripts without text in fewer than ten test passages cannot be determined with certainty. The textual value of these objects should be examined in specific studies.⁶⁵

64 See the new study by P. Malik, *Studies in P. Beatty III (\mathfrak{P}^{47}). The Codex, its Scribe and its Text*, Ph.D. University of Cambridge 2016.

65 Model studies include: D. Hagedorn, "P.IFAO II 31: Johannesapokalypse 1,13–20" *ZPE* 92 (1992), 243–247; D. C. Parker, "A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Revelation: P115 (P. Oxy. 4499)" in *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology. Collected Papers 1977–2007*, ed. D. C. Parker, ANTF 40, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2009, 73–92; M.

Of the remaining manuscripts that are present in at least ten test passages, it should be noted that test passages with categories W–Z were not considered in the evaluation, and that sub-readings were assigned to their respective main readings. Where a manuscript preserved a correction or alternative reading, only the original reading was used in calculations in Chapters 5–7. Supplements are treated (as mentioned in § 4) as separate manuscripts.

5.2 On the Sorting by Percentages Lists 5.1–8

Chapter 5 (Sorting by Percentages) contains lists organized by reading categories. Lists 5.1–8 arrange each manuscript in terms of percentage of agreement with the categories 2, 3, 4, and 5. The slash after a reading category (e.g. 3/) indicates that these columns calculate percentages based not only on instances where a reading occurs alone, but also cases where multiple forms share the same reading (cf. § 4). LA 2/, for example, includes LA 2, LA 2/3, LA 2/4 and all other possible reading combinations that follow NA²⁸ at a given TST. (This is based on the use of LA 1/2 in previous volumes.)⁶⁶ Where the numbers stand-alone without a slash, the lists measure agreement with those locations where this text form preserves its own reading, i.e. without agreement from other text forms.

In addition, each Sorting by Percentages list shows in further columns the quantity of readings of the manuscript that belong to the other major text forms. In doing so, a primary orientation of the textual character of every manuscript is easily accessible. The percentages of agreement that a manuscript maintains to the other main text forms (NA²⁸, *K*, *Av*, *Com*) are offered in columns 3–6. (These percentages are presented

Sigismund, “Das sog. Apk-Fragment GA 2408” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 135–146; P. Malik, “Another Look at P.IFAO II 31 (P98). An Updated Transcription and Textual Analysis” *NT* 57 (2015), 1–14.

66 In the Sorting by Percentages lists of previous volumes, a similar case could be presented as “LA 2+1/2”, but for Rev this would equate to long series of numbers hard to read “LA 2+2/3+2/4+2/5+2/3/4+2/3/5+2/4/5+2/3/4/5”, which is more succinctly presented as LA 2/.

as primary data elsewhere in the Sorting by Percentages lists, but presented in each list for ease of access.) For better comparison, the pure readings (LA 2–5) are presented next to combinations of the readings (e.g. LA 2/, 3/).

The presentation of the data allows for an immediate overview of a manuscript's textual affiliation to a given text form. Those with the highest agreement to the left column are listed first. The latter columns also provide insight into the make-up of a manuscript's text, particularly if it is a mixed text.⁶⁷

Usually, the sum of a manuscript's agreement with the various text forms in the secondary columns exceeds 100%. This is a consequence of including combinations of readings (e.g. LA 2/4). For example, the percentages in columns 3/ and 4/ record LA 3/4 readings twice.

The structure of Sorting by Percentages lists 5.1–8 only differ in that the organizing left column changes, beginning with LA 2, 3, 4, and 5 and moving onto 2/, 3/, 4/, and 5/.

5.2.1 Sorted by Share of LA 2 – List 5.1

In view of the special situation of the transmission of Rev, the sorting of LA 2 and 2/ are of high importance. The narrow definition of LA 2, lacking overlaps with other traditions of Rev, results in the fact that only those manuscripts which often preserve readings in NA²⁸ that are not attested in other text-types show a high rate of agreement with NA²⁸.

It is interesting that, for example, \mathfrak{P}^{47} and 01 stand in the third and fifth positions in LA 2, but that \mathfrak{P}^{47} falls back significantly in LA 2/ readings. This difference requires precise text historical investigation. Moreover, the preference since Bousset⁶⁸ (and in NA) for

⁶⁷ When considering the columns in the Sorting by Percentages lists with slashed numbers (LA 2/, 3/, 4/, 5/), one should keep in mind that every text form has a share of > 0% of the other text forms, even if its text is not mixed, because some variants are common to multiple text forms. Mixed text is only found when a manuscript contains a proportion of a second text form that exceeds the typical level.

⁶⁸ W. Bousset, *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, KEK 16, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1906 (rev. ed. 1966), 155–156, 158.

02 must have artificially increased its high level of LA 2 or 2/ readings. When it comes to LA 2/, it is interesting to note that 04 preserves a somewhat higher percentage than 02.

5.2.2 Sorted by Share of LA 2/ – List 5.2

In contrast to List 5.1, this list organizes manuscripts according to their affiliation to readings witnessed in NA²⁸ alone *and* in combination with other traditions. Categories of LA 3/, 4/, and 5/ provide additional information about the textual character of a given manuscript, but it initially remains unclear on which basis a given manuscript preserves LA 2/ readings.

For example, 025 has a relatively high share of LA 2/ readings, a number that is surpassed by LA 4/ readings. In this case, it is important to consider the details from the *Descriptive List*: in 22 of 56 cases, 025 follows LA 2 and in 6 of 15 it follows LA 4, totalling between 39% and 40% of the respective categories. However, 025 follows LA 2/4 in 12 of 14 possible cases – an 85% agreement. These statistics do not tell us why 025 preserves such a high number of LA 2/4 readings. Does it have a strong relationship to the text reconstructed in NA²⁸ or to the Andreas text? The data does not directly answer this question, but offers a platform from which to make such judgments.

At the end of List 5.1 several manuscripts that witness the reading LA 2 at 0% occur. These manuscripts never agree with a “unique” LA 2, referring to location where LA 2 stands alone against other text forms (not LA 2/). On the other hand, there is no manuscript that shows a 0% agreement with mixed LA 2/ readings, because in many places NA²⁸ agrees in wording with LA 3–5. The same observation could be made for LA 3 and 3/ etc. This fact is important in two ways. First, when a manuscript witnesses a high percentage of pure LA 2–5 readings, it is a good indicator as to which family this text belongs. Second, the textual characteristics of a manuscript cannot be decided based on percentages of readings specific to NA²⁸ or a given text-type. To understand the textual characteristics of a manuscript comprehensively, it is necessary to consider also the intersections and connections between traditions.

For example, with 64% 2846 has the highest share of LA 2/ readings among the minuscules and is only surpassed by 02 (83%) and 04 (85%). In assessing the character of this text, it is important to note its relatively high percentage of LA 4/ readings (48%), especially in the light of the lower percentages of LA 3/ (27%) and 5/ (37%) readings. 2846

is closely connected to the Andreas tradition, a fact made clear by the higher percentage of pure LA 4 (33%) readings compared to LA 3 (8%).

These lists make clear that the transmission of Rev does not allow for a straightforward ranking of manuscripts and their value based on one Sorting by Percentages list. Consequently, the textual character and worth of a manuscript must be deduced through the cross-referencing of different lists. Even when manuscripts preserve a high level of LA 2 readings, every text intersects with other traditions, even in the earliest exemplars.

5.2.3 Sorted by Share of LA 3 (Koine) – List 5.3

Since “unique” LA 3 readings are not shared by other traditions, a high percentage in this category is characteristic of proper *K* manuscripts. Exemplars that stand at the top of this list are good *K* text representatives. The same is generally true of LA 4 (*Av*) and LA 5 (*Com*) readings with certain limitations (see below).

5.2.4 Sorted by Share of LA 3/ (Koine) – List 5.4

In contrast to List 5.3, this list measures also points of contact between the *K* text and other forms, mapping the relationship of *K* to the broader tradition. The value of this list in terms of text history remains open and requires the investigation of individual cases.

5.2.5 Sorted by Share of LA 4 (Andreas) – List 5.5

Due to the strong variances within the Andrew traditions, the list for LA 4 has limited value. A manuscript can belong clearly to *Av* but preserve a proportion of LA 4 readings which lies well below 100%. A relatively high proportion of LA 4 readings, which is never as high as the LA 3 proportion of *K* manuscripts, shows that the manuscript under consideration is situated in the center of the Andreas tradition (cf. § 2.2–3).

5.2.6 Sorted by Share of LA 4/ (*Andreas*) – List 5.6

Although LA 4 readings allow the identification of *Av* exemplars, this sorting has certain disadvantages, because there are only 16 test passages with pure LA 4 readings (compared to 34 test passage with LA 3). In this way, list 5.5 is statistically less representative of *Av* than 5.3 is of *K*. When it comes to the *Av* tradition (and *Com*, cf. § 5.2.7) the sorting by share of LA 4/ (or of LA 5/ for *Com*) is especially important. When searching for quality representative of *Av*, LA 4/ offers a wider and more accurate data set, even if the definition of *Av* is not as strict as in the sorting of “unique” readings.

5.2.7 Sorted by Share of LA 5 (*Complutensian*) – List 5.7

It is even more difficult to identify *Com* manuscripts using this approach because only seven test passages preserve pure *Com* (LA 5) readings. This situation is a result of the fact that *Com* is a mixture of *K* and *Av*, a mixture that rarely deviates from LA 3 or 4 and attests a unique reading.⁶⁹ Therefore, the sorting by share of LA 5/ must be consulted for more precise information.

To illustrate this point, it may be noted that 1064, which is a copy of the printed Complutensian Polyglot (§ 1.2), has a 0% share of LA 5 readings. This occurs because 1064 is fragmentary and only preserved at one of the seven test passages (TST 23) that contains a pure *Com* reading. This test passage is not representative of the textual character of 1064. It is important not only to consider the percentages given in the Sorting by Percentages list, but to pay attention to the number of test passages where a specific LA occurs in the manuscript.

5.2.8 Sorted by Share of LA 5/ (*Complutensian*) – List 5.8

As noted, LA 5/ readings are more reliable for determining a manuscript's affiliation with the *Com* text because they are witnessed at every TST, even if they often intersect with readings from other traditions. The statistical base is broader for LA 5/ than LA 5. The homogeneity of the group also speaks to the ability of the sorting of LA 5/ to properly identify members.

⁶⁹ Lembke, “Apokalypsetext”, 71 offers a complete list of special *Com* readings.

5.3 On the Sorting by Percentages Lists 5.9–14

In addition to the Sorting by Percentages lists described above, the following lists are organized following the precedent of previous *TuT* volumes. They also describe the textual character of a given manuscript.

5.3.1 *Sorted by Share of Special Readings (Sonderlesarten) – List 5.9*

This list identifies the percentage of readings of a manuscript that diverge from LA 2–5. These readings are noted by LA 6 and above.

For example, the related Oecumenius manuscripts 1824 2062 2350 2403 share a high percentage of special readings due to the idiosyncratic and incomplete copying of their scribes (special readings in Oecumenius are mostly present in the second half of Rev and these manuscripts are missing some portions of the first half of the work). Similarly, the special readings of 1777 indicate that it is a copy of the printed TR.

Generally, special readings help to identify representatives of different sub-groups (*f.104*, *f.172*, *f.1006*, Oecumenius) or manuscript pairs, because their characteristic readings are not identified with LA 2–5 (§ 2.2). If a *K*, *Av*, or *Com* manuscript has several special readings it is likely that it is a witness of a sub-group. This is common in the *Av* tradition. When in doubt as to the main category to which a manuscript belongs, the background of the special readings must be further examined.

5.3.2 *Sorted by Share of Singular Readings (Singulärlesarten) – List 5.10*

This list identifies the number of readings that a manuscript reads alone against the rest of the tradition. Normally these are denoted by LA 6 and above, but sometimes also as LA 2 in cases where the critical text is supported by only a single manuscript (TST 37, 58). Following the principles noted above (§ 5.1), only the *prima manus* is counted as a singular reading. Because of this approach, divergences from the Q category in the Descriptive List may occur in cases of corrections (e.g. TST 61, LA 6).

In this list \mathfrak{B}^{47} and 01 have a high percentage of singular readings, as one would expect. 2344 2050 2582 also have a relatively high level of singular readings. These are manuscripts that also have a high level of “Old Text” (LA 2/). It is unexpected to find a high percentage of singular readings in 2843 (8 of 49 TST), a manuscript that is otherwise a

clear exemplar of *K* (cf. LA 3/). This quantity of singular readings remains to be explained.

5.3.3 *Sorted by Share of Readings attested by the Majority of Witnesses (including intersections) – List 5.11*

In previous *TuT* volumes, it has been customary to identify the number of times a manuscript goes with the majority reading by examining LA 1 in “Verzeichnende Beschreibung (LA 1)” and “Sortierung nach Anteil der Mehrheitslesarten (LA 1 und 1/2)”. In this volume, List 5.11 shows the percentage of test passages at which a manuscript follows the “relative majority” (*rM*, cf. § 2.1). In contrast to previous *TuT* volumes, it should be remembered that the *rM* is not represented by a single LA number, but that the textual character of the *rM* differs from TST to TST (cf. Table 3 and Appendix D).

Additionally, it is striking that most manuscripts that are in a high position in this list preserve a percentage that does not approach 100%, in contrast to lists sorted by LA 1 in previous volumes. Unlike other NT works, the majority or “Byzantine tradition” of Rev is not a homogenous textual form. This situation also makes the designation “manuscript with Majority Text” meaningless, since these manuscripts usually belong either to *K*, *Av*, or *Com*. Therefore, manuscripts that frequently preserve the *rM* appear starting with 82% agreement (exception below).

Generally, *K* and *Com* manuscripts have the highest agreement with the *rM*. This is clear from the fact that most manuscripts near the top of the list have nearly 100% in the LA 3/ and 5/ columns.

The reason why *Av* manuscripts are generally lower in this list (meaning that LA 4 follows the *rM* far less often than LA 3 and 5) is not only because *Av* is attested in fewer manuscripts than *K* (cf. Chapter 2), but also because the *Av* tradition is much more fragmented and heterogeneous than *K*.

Manuscripts with a kind of “Old Text” are found mostly at the bottom end of the list, but they retain some significant level of agreement

with the *rM* (28% to 41% for \mathfrak{P}^{47} 01 02 04) and never reach a 0% agreement with *rM*.⁷⁰

This situation regarding the data of individual manuscripts must be considered in connection to the text forms to which they belong. Statistically speaking, LA 3/ (*K*) agrees with the *rM* 98x (79%) and LA 5/ (*Com*) 95x (77%), while LA 4/ (*Av*) only preserves the *rM* in 79 test passages (64%). LA 2/ (*NA*²⁸) agrees with *rM* 34x (34/114 = 29%) (cf. Table 3 in § 3.2).

Conspicuously, supplement 93-S follows the *rM* at every TST at which it preserved (1–14). This situation sets this manuscript apart from other witnesses. The collation results provide insight into this phenomenon: at the 14 TST which this manuscript witnesses, LA 3 is a witness to the *rM* and 93-S is a good witness to the *K* tradition. If e.g. 82 was also only preserved at the first 14 TST (it preserves the entire text), it too would agree with *rM* at 100%. The first TST at which LA 3 is not an *rM* witness is TST 19 (*rM* = LA 4/5). Passages like this that move other *K*-witnesses percentage of agreement with *rM* below 100%. In the *Sorting by Percentages* that measure LA 3 and 3/, 93-S also preserves 100% agreement. Again, the agreement here is coincidental and caused by its partial preservation of the text of Rev.

5.3.4 Sorted by Share of Readings attested by the Majority of Witnesses (intersections excluded) – List 5.12

The *Sorting by Percentages* according to the proportion of majority readings (described above) is also the basis of List 5.12 – the differences occur in columns 3–6. As is stated in the explanations to Lists 5.1–8, the sorting according to readings only attested by *NA*²⁸ or a text-type of Rev as well as the sorting according to readings attested in multiple traditions has its own merits. List 5.12 supplements List 5.11 by presenting the level of agreement with readings only attested in *NA*²⁸ or a given text-type LA 2–5 in the columns 3–6 (i.e. readings without overlap with other traditions). Thus, the representatives of the text-types *K*, *Av*, and *Com* are more visible than in List 5.11 and can be differentiated from manuscripts which transmits a mixed text.

70 The same can be observed in other parts of the New Testament: e.g. 01 has 36.7% and 03 has 34.6% agreement with the majority text in John.

Manuscript 1760 occur at the top of List 5.12, showing 90.4% agreement with LA 3 and 0% with LA 4 – clearly it is a *K* witness. In List 5.11, the same manuscript agrees with LA 4/ at 47.2%. It is therefore hard to decide whether 1760 transmits a mixed text of *K* and *Av*. The reason for this is that LA 4/ contains by definition also readings shared by the *K* type like 3/4. Hence, all *K* manuscripts attest a certain proportion of LA 4/. A comparison of all *K* manuscripts shows that the average of their proportion of LA 4/ readings is between 35% and 48%. Looking at it the other way around, *Av* manuscripts witness an average of 32% to 55% LA3/ readings. List 5.12 clearly shows to which text-type a given manuscript belongs because only the text-type readings are counted. If individual manuscripts transmit a certain amount of various types, it is a sign that these manuscripts deviate from their text-types and go at some places with other traditions. This is the case – for example – in 046. It is defined as a *K* manuscript but attests also 6.2% LA 4 and 28.5% LA 5. A proper *Com* manuscript attests 100% LA 5 and zero percent LA 2, 3, and 4. If the *Com* manuscript 432, for instance, shows an amount of 12.5% LA 4, it seems to indicate that this manuscript attest mixture of *Com* and *Av* (the relevant test passages can be checked in the Descriptive List).

In sum, List 5.12 allows a comparison of the different proportions of *rM* in the text-types of Rev. As an alternative to the sorting by *rM*, a stricter definition of “majority” which explains the different sorting of manuscripts can also be used (cf. Appendix F).

5.3.5 Sorted by Share of LA 2 against *rM* – List 5.13

The evaluation of a manuscript’s agreement with the critical text of NA²⁸ is flexible when it comes to the text of Rev. Depending on the sorting criteria, various rankings occur:

The simplest option is to evaluate the number of LA 2/ readings that a particular manuscript witnesses (List 5.2). In these cases, however, LA 2 often coincides with other text forms and also the *rM*, a situation that limits the text-critical value expected of such readings. An alternative is to examine List 5.1, where LA 2 readings are differentiated from other text forms. In addition, the differences between LA 2 and *rM* are catalogued in List 5.13 (similar to the categorizing of LA 1 and LA 2 in previous *TuT* volumes). Although agreement with NA²⁸ (which can also agree with *rM*) or deviation from *rM* (which can also diverge from NA²⁸) is only one possible measure, it offers a way to map a manuscript’s degree of agreement with NA²⁸ against the mass of manuscripts.

In contrast to Lists 5.11–12 (which preserve all 123 TST), this list examines only the 80 TST in which NA²⁸ differs from the *rM*. The 34 test passages in which NA²⁸ is identical with *rM*, and the 9 in which NA²⁸ is not certain, are omitted. Because of this, the calculations in List 5.13 differ from those in 5.1–2 and 5.11–12. The calculation is achieved by dividing the number of times a manuscript agrees with NA²⁸ against *rM* by the 80 possible test passages.

This raises the question of how to evaluate passages where NA²⁸ and *rM* disagree and a manuscript witnesses a third reading. If one includes third readings (non-NA²⁸ and non-*rM*) in the calculation (“inclusive” calculation), these readings appear in the data like agreements with *rM*. On the other hand, if one excludes these readings (“exclusive” calculation), the proportion of agreements with NA²⁸ does not change (dividend), the quantity of used test passages is altered (divisor), so that the quotient results in other percentage values than in the first option. The value of exemplars with a high proportion of third readings is downgraded in inclusive calculations, and these third readings are ignored in exclusive calculations. “Exclusive” evaluations would appear to have more significance since “doubtful” cases are ignored, although problematic manuscripts with many third readings reach a higher value in this evaluation. Both approaches are valid in their own right.

Accordingly, the tabular arrangement of List 5.13 is divided into two main parts. First, locations with a third reading, diverging from both NA²⁸ and *rM*, are included in the divisor. The outcome of this calculation is recorded in the NA²⁸ vs. *rM*^m column. This column organizes the table. In the next column follows the percentage of third readings. Second, locations are only included in which a manuscript agrees either with NA²⁸ or *rM*; the results of this calculation are mentioned in the column NA²⁸ vs. *rM*. The next three columns show a manuscript’s percentage of agreement with LA 3/, 4/, and 5/ readings.

An example illustrates the ways in which the inclusive and exclusive calculations may differ. Oecumenius manuscript 2062 only preserves 28 TST (instead of 80) where NA²⁸ and *rM* differ.⁷¹ In these places it follows NA²⁸ ten times, *rM* six times, and has a third

71 The level of agreement with *rM* is not explicit in List 5.13, but can easily be accessed. The total number of divergent passages stands as the divisor (28) in the

reading twelve times. Therefore, the inclusive calculation shows a 35.7% agreement with NA²⁸ (10/28). The rest (64.3%) are either *rM* readings or third readings (42.8%). If these third-option readings are omitted, the number of relevant test passages becomes 16. In this case (exclusive calculation), the agreement with NA²⁸ is much higher, coming to 62.5% (10/16).

Of course there are circular aspects to previous approaches and the text of NA²⁸ remains questionable at several passages. But, due to the careful consideration of the divergences between NA²⁸ and *rM*, the proportion of agreements with NA²⁸ represents an approximation to the *textual value* of each manuscript. This percentage also assists in identifying to what extent a manuscript functions as an important source for reconstructing the critical text.⁷²

This approach, however, in no way affirms every editorial decision of NA²⁸ since it also highlights problems in the critical apparatus. As expected, 02 and 04 stand in a high position on this list, but the third manuscript (2846),⁷³ which has a 67.1% share of LA 2 readings (exclusive calculation), has been hitherto neglected in the apparatus.

Other manuscripts that have a high proportion of LA 2 readings against *rM*, but which are absent from the apparatus, including 1678 1778 2080 2259 2350 2403. Some of these manuscripts even exceed those of “consistently cited witnesses” like 1854 2329 and 2351 (cf. NA²⁸, 67*).⁷⁴

first two columns. The divisor is comprised of readings in agreement with NA²⁸ (10x in the first column), third readings (12x in the second column), and agreements with *rM*, of which there are six (10+12+6=28).

- 72 It is important to beware of the hermeneutical circle, because LA 2 represents the reconstructed text.
- 73 M. Lembke, “Die Apokalypse-Handschrift 2846. Beschreibung, Kollation und Textwertbestimmung eines wichtigen neuen Zeugen” *NT* 54 (2012), 369–395.
- 74 Cf. also D. Müller, “Die Apokalypse-Handschriften GA 2329 und 2351. Textkritische und textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu zwei „ständigen Zeugen für die Apokalypse“ in Nestle-Aland²⁸”, in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ed. M. Sigismund/D. Müller, ANTF, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter (forthcoming).

5.3.6 Sorted by Share of LA 2 attested by a Minority of Witnesses – List 5.14

The final list arranges manuscripts according to the extent to which they agree with LA 2 readings that are supported by a minority of manuscripts. The differences between LA 2 and *rM* lose significance in cases where the *rM* has only slightly more quantitative support than LA 2. As a counterweight, this list examines cases where LA 2 is only attested by between 3% and 35% of all manuscripts.

When evaluating this list, it is important to remember that only fifteen test passages offer LA 2 readings that are witnessed by a maximum of 3% of all manuscripts (this is similar to the 90% column in 5.12.) These are TST 7, 13, 20, 22, 27, 36, 37, 58, 66, 82, 90, 92, 102, 106, 112.

Once again 02 and 04 stand at the top of this list, but they diverge when the attestation of minority readings decreases. In one sense, this is a result of the editorial principles of NA²⁸ which occasionally prefers singular readings from 02 (e.g. TST 58 in Rev 13,10). But in another way, this also shows that 02 and 04 diverge at various places – in certain details these manuscripts attest a different text. This observation is an additional occasion to re-evaluate both manuscripts for the ECM of Revelation.

Lists 5.1–2 and 5.13–14 offer the *Textwert* of a given manuscript from several perspectives. These data sets need to be considered in conversation with one another when examining the textual value of a witness.

6. Comparative List

The first step in comparing manuscripts with one another is to calculate their number of agreements divided by the amount of test passages in total. The results of these calculations are recorded for each manuscript in the Comparative List.

6.1 Connection to the previous Main and Supplementary Lists

In previous *TuT* volumes, two different lists were printed in this section: Main List (*Hauptliste*) and Supplementary List (*Ergänzungsliste*). For the

Main List, all test passages were omitted where a manuscript maintained a majority reading or a singular reading, to eliminate less meaningful matches between manuscripts.⁷⁵ In the Supplementary List, all shared test passages between two manuscripts were examined.

This two-step approach is not followed in this volume due to the heterogeneity of the composition of the *rM* in several test passages. Since the wordings of various text forms are easily distinguishable within the tradition of Rev, the divergences of individual manuscripts from one another is clearly visible.⁷⁶ In the view of the editors, a two-step presentation of the manuscript profiles is unnecessary because of the peculiarities of the Apocalypse's textual transmission.

The presentation of the data concentrates on the evaluation of all test passages (but the percentage of agreement captured by the Main List appears in the Grouping by Percentages list, cf. § 7.2). The term Comparative List is used for this evaluation which is provided for *every* manuscript since the omission of certain manuscripts seems inappropriate in view of the tradition of Rev. Because the composition of the *rM* differs from passage to passage (cf. § 2.1 and 3.2), there are no clear criteria for excluding exemplars of *the* Majority Text. This approach was made possible by the relatively few manuscripts of Rev.

6.2 Data Given in the Comparative List

For each manuscript, the Comparative List measures the percentage of its agreement with the seventy manuscripts with which it most closely agrees.⁷⁷ Agreements in minimally witnessed readings typical of subgroups that indicate a close relationship do not create a major difference as in the previous Main Lists because of the fact the all test passages are

75 K. Aland/B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament. An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, Second Edition, translated by E.F. Rhodes, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1989, 325.

76 This is clearly visible in the relatively low percentages of agreement (in comparison to previous Supplementary Lists ["Ergänzungslisten"]), which is caused by the selection of test passages *and* the diversity of the text forms.

77 The number can vary upwards, since all manuscripts have been included that agree at the same percentage level.

taken into account in the Comparative List. The following Grouping by Percentages lists (§ 7) more accurately illuminate textual relationships and represent an adequate compensation for this aspect of the Main List.

Percentages of agreement are rounded (downwards) to the integer for the sake of presentation. This editorial decision is irrelevant since each test passage represents approximately 0.8% of the total number of passages. The fewer test passages a manuscript has, the higher the percentage share of each test passage (e.g. every test passage of \mathfrak{P}^{47} represents 2.9% of its readings).

Although manuscripts with fewer than ten test passages have been omitted in the evaluation chapters,⁷⁸ occasionally the rate of shared test passage between two manuscripts (which attest individually more than ten test passages) drops below ten. Consequently, the relationship between these manuscripts cannot be determined (cf. § 5.1). In these cases, manuscripts with fewer than ten test passages in common with another are listed at the end of a Comparative List under the denotation “Keine oder zu wenig Belegstellen gemeinsam” (no or too few passages in common).

6.3 Concerning the Content of the First Line

The following information is provided in the first line of each Comparative List:

- The number of test passages in which a manuscript is available for evaluation (excluding category W to Z)
- The level of agreement with *rM* readings
- The number of singular readings
- The highest share of one of the four main text forms (LA 2/, 3/, 4/, or 5/).

These four features, in concert with previous data sets, provide a rough image of a manuscript’s textual character.⁷⁹ The first line provides the data of the Sorting by Percentages list without the detail.

78 On the manuscripts used in this evaluation cf. § 1.2 and 5.1.

79 These four features correspond to: Descriptive List, Sorting by Percentages 5.11, Sorting by Percentages 5.10, Sorting by Percentages 5.2, 5.4, 5.6, 5.8.

The higher the percentage of the fourth feature of the first line (text form), the more surely a manuscript's text can be assigned to a specific text type of the tradition of Rev. Many *K* and *Com* exemplars are recognizable by a high proportion of LA 3/ or LA 5/ readings, usually over 80% or 90%. A good *Av* witness will preserve LA 4/ readings in at least 71% of test passages. The classification of *Av* manuscripts is thus less clear, although it is usually apparent when a manuscript preserves a text within the realm of the *Av* tradition. Closely related *Av* manuscripts often are part of recognizable sub-groups (cf. § 6.2).

Lower percentages of the text form indicate that a witness does not belong to a text stratum represented by LA 2–5. In this case, the question arises as to whether the text is a unique witness or whether its character stands closer to a minority tradition outside LA 2–5.⁸⁰ An extreme case is when a manuscript preserves an equal percentage from different text forms. When this happens both forms are given in the first line (e.g. 1732). Because these fourth numbers are composed using LA 2/, 3/, 4/, and 5/, the sum of the percentages can climb above 100% (cf. § 5.2). Further investigation is required to determine the textual character of manuscripts that do not closely align with one of the four text forms. When a manuscript has fewer than 70% agreement with a single text form, care must be exercised in determining its textual character.⁸¹

In a manuscript that has a relatively low percentage of agreement with the text form given in the first line, the textual character of the nearest relative sheds light on the shape of the first manuscript's character. If the percentage of agreement with the nearest relative is very low, then the manuscript resists (at least on the surface) simple classification. An example of this phenomenon is 2436, which has a 63% agreement with LA 5/ given in the first line. However, because most true *Com* witnesses agree with LA 5/ at a minimum of 90% of the test passages, 2436 cannot be considered a *Com* witness. Instead, it is independent of direct *Com* influence, and is a mixed text of LA 3 (*K*) and

80 For example, the largest share of readings in minuscule 104 is LA 3/, but it only agrees at 67%. Although it tends toward this tradition, this low level of agreement does not confirm its belonging to it. 104 creates a special text family with some other witnesses (f.104). According to J. Schmid (*Untersuchungen I*, 59–78), f.104 is a mixture of *Av* and *K*.

81 An example of this can be found in D. Müller's analysis of 2329 and 2351 in ANTF II.

LA 4 (*Av*).⁸² The Comparative List shows 2078 as its nearest relative at a very high percentage of agreement, indicating a manuscript pair that does not belong directly to any of the main text forms.

Finally, an important limitation of the main line must be mentioned: the assigning of a manuscript to LA 2/ occurs only if the share of LA 2/ readings predominates. This results in some peculiarities concerning the so-called “consistently cited witnesses” in NA²⁸. For example, 1006 1854 2030 and 2344 each attest a higher rate of LA 4/ readings than LA 2/ readings, even though they are in no way *Av* witnesses. This triggers an interesting feature of this volume: in many cases, none of the known text forms could be decisively attributed to a particular manuscript.

It remains to be explained how these numerous mixed texts (especially those with high proportions of LA 2/ readings) came into being. Several explanations seem to stand within the realm of possibility, including text historical growth, uncontrolled contamination, and conscious design.

7. Grouping by Percentages of Agreement

Grouping Lists documenting the relationship of every manuscript were first introduced in *TuT* IV (Synoptic Gospels) and have been presented for every manuscript since *TuT* V (John). These lists include data on all collated manuscripts (except for fragmentary papyri) and contain elements that were formerly included in the Main and Supplementary Lists (cf. § 6.1). Like the Comparative List (cf. § 6), only manuscripts that share readings at a minimum of 10 test passages are compared.

The grouping of *K*, *Av*, and *Com* were already established through the Sorting by Percentages 5.3–8. However, this data is not completely objective due to issues with the definition of readings in Chapter 2. The main issue involves the minor text forms that have been identified in recent research. Chapter 7 offers data that is based solely on the collation result independent of the three main text forms that defined sorting of readings in Chapter 5. This allows for a more detailed evaluation of the sub-groups of *Rev* and traditional branches.

82 J. Schmid, “Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypsetextes II: Der *K*-Text” *Bib.* 17 (1936), 11–44, 167–201, 273–293, 429–460, here 438–444.

7.1 Difficulties in the Grouping Process

The grouping of manuscripts of Rev must deal with some difficulties: First, the method of grouping used in previous *TuT* volumes, which was based on the Majority Text, meets with a less distinctive majority. Second, there have been several attempts to group the manuscript tradition of Rev in previous scholarship (Bousset, Hoskier, J. Schmid, W. N. Pickering), which may provide a control to the findings in *TuT*.

For formal reasons, the data of *TuT* can only be partly applied to previous research results. J. Schmid, for example, grouped the manuscripts according to their agreement in *errores conjunctivi* and listed his well-defined groups in series of manuscripts numbers such as 141–1424–1719.⁸³ In contrast to that approach, *TuT* shows a list of manuscripts that contains the closest relatives of given manuscript arranged by their rates of agreement. This is an approximate grouping according to the rate of agreement between a given manuscript and its closest relatives. Therefore, the *TuT* data requires evaluation before it can be compared with J. Schmid's findings.

The Grouping Lists in *TuT* IV–V contain all manuscripts to which a given manuscript shows a higher rate of agreement than it does to the Majority text.⁸⁴ This rule cannot be applied to Rev because the manuscript tradition is strongly divided into different textual traditions. This is caused by the fact that the rate of agreement of a given manuscript with the majority of manuscripts is usually lower than in other NT writings.

The difficulties of applying the grouping process used in *TuT* IV–V to Rev can be illustrated by examining the Oecumenius group. The main witness of this group is 2053, which shares a 42% agreement with *rM* (52 of 123 TST). If we follow the majority grouping method, all manuscripts that agree with 2053 at a rate higher than 42% must be considered part of the Oecumenius text. A brief look at the Comparative List of 2053, however, shows that numerous manuscripts from various text forms agree with 2053 at a percentage higher than 42%. Using the *rM* as a primary criterion creates the appearance of relationships where none exists. Other Oecumenius manuscripts agree with 2053 in the range of 93%–76% (1824 2062 2350 2403), while other manuscripts that agree

83 J. Schmid, *Studien II*, 26f.

84 *TuT* IV, 1/1, 44 etc.

in the range of 75%-43% represent other text forms (Ɱ⁴⁷ 01 02 04 1611 1854 2030 2329 2344 2846, *f.1006*, *f.1678*, *f.2065*). Numerous *Av* witnesses are also included within this range (025 051 205 1685 1773 2019 2026 2031 2038 2056 2057 2060 2073 2074 2091 2254 2259 2595 2886), along with a few *Com* witnesses (1768 1865 2554). Although these manuscripts exceed the percentage limit imposed by the agreement of 2053 with *rM*, they are not Oecumenius exemplars. This observation is not confined to the Oecumenius group, but repeated in various degrees by other text forms. The problem does not lie with a lack of group relationships but with the method, since group boundaries are for the most part clearly defined for Rev. It is unclear, however, whether this phenomenon is unique to Rev or whether it is also relevant (although unrecognized) in the Gospels.

Because of these four difficulties, the group boundaries of Rev are not defined by the majority criterion, but by a combination of other criteria developed for this volume (§ 7.3). If a group does not coincide with the results of previous research, the differences in evaluation should not immediately be understood as a deficiency of previous grouping attempts. Instead, the differences offer an opportunity to evaluate the methodological underpinnings of previous research. If the data confirms the finding of previous examinations, this constitutes a strong validation that these groups actually exist. If, however, new groups appear through this data, further examination of these results is necessary.

7.2 Using the Grouping Lists

To address the aforementioned issues, the presentation of the Grouping Lists (modified compared to previous *TuT* volumes) provides different types of information in columns set side by side.

The tables are organized according to the manuscript number so that the manuscript with which others are being grouped appears in the first column (*Hs.* = *Ausgangshandschrift* / main manuscript). The second column displays the number of the manuscript which is grouped with it (*VHs.* = *Vergleichshandschrift* / comparison manuscript).

The third column gives the percentage of agreement between the two manuscripts at each of the test passages that they share with the exception of categories W to Z (*Ü.ges.* = *Übereinstimmung gesamt* / total agreement). The level of agreement in this column determines the order of comparison manuscripts.

The fourth column (*Ü.o.rM = Übereinstimmung ohne Lesarten rM /* agreement without *rM* readings) presents the level of agreement without the test passages where the main manuscript agrees with *rM* or has a singular reading. In this way columns 3 and 4 correspond to the data presented in previous volumes in the Main and Supplementary Lists. Since the main manuscript determines the test passages used in this column, the percentage of agreement between two manuscripts may differ, depending on which of the two is the main manuscript under consideration. The percentage values are rounded to the nearest whole number for ease of presentation.

Column 5 (*A=*) shows the number of manuscripts with which the comparison manuscript (*VHs.*) agrees at the same percentage as with the main manuscript (*Hs.*). The *Ü.ges.* column determines this percentage. In order to find the manuscripts added up in the *A=* column, one must examine the Grouping List of the desired *VHs.*

Column 6 (*A>*) indicates the number of manuscripts with which the comparison manuscript (*VHs.*) agrees at a higher rate compared to the main manuscript. This information presents data from the Grouping List of the comparison manuscript, contextualizing its relationship to the main manuscript.

Columns *A=* and *A>* summarize information found in fuller form in the Grouping List of a given comparison manuscript, offering a glimpse into the relationship between the two manuscripts from the opposite perspective. Although a given comparison manuscript might be the closest relative of the main manuscript, this does not necessarily mean that the reverse is true. When the data is organized around the comparison manuscript, the main manuscript might be a more distant relative. Usually, *higher* numbers for *A=* and *A>* indicate that the main manuscript is a more distant relative in comparison to the other manuscripts with which the comparison manuscript is related. In comparison, low *A=* and *A>* values confirm the close relationship between two manuscripts. The relationship between manuscripts needs to be examined from all angles.

The importance of columns *A=* and *A>* is illustrated in the Grouping List of 792, whose closest relatives seem to be 2643 and 1626 (excluding 93-S, see above). While 2643 does not agree with another manuscript at a higher rate than with 792, 1626 has 101 manu-

scripts with which its level of agreement is greater than with 792. From this information, it is clear that 792 and 2643 form a manuscript pair and that the relationship between 792 and 1626 is secondary in nature. In reality, 792 has no relatives except 2643, but the remaining manuscripts are included here based on the minimum number of comparison manuscripts set forth in § 7.3. Additionally, 792 only appears at the edges of the Grouping List of 1626, due to an increased proportion of shared *Ü.o.rM* readings.

The seventh and final column (*SoLA*) shows the number of places where the comparison manuscript agrees with special readings of the main manuscript. The data is not presented in the form of percentage rate since the divisor is too low to be meaningful. Special readings are defined as readings assigned LA 6 or higher in the collation results (cf. § 3.1) that are supported by no more than 15 manuscripts. This second restriction should prevent a reading from being regarded as a special reading which statistically misses the LA 3, 4, or 5 categories, but which numerous manuscripts attest. This scenario is especially typical of *Av* readings since this tradition is relatively heterogeneous. Occasionally, these include readings that are characteristic of the *Av* tradition identified by J. Schmid (cf. Appendix C), but which are not LA 4 readings due to our statistical model of representing LA 3–5. It would be inappropriate to classify such readings as special readings (especially since such an approach would artificially swell the number of shared special readings among *Av* exemplars). Also in a few other cases where LA 3, 4 or 5 are defined by a relatively small quantity of witnesses, the deviating variant reading within this tradition should not be considered a special reading. For this reason, the limitation of a maximum of 15 witnesses was introduced to prevent insufficiently supported groupings.

7.3 Criteria for Selecting Comparison Manuscripts

Four criteria determine the manuscripts selected as Comparison Manuscripts for a given main manuscript.

Criterion 1: All manuscripts are listed that agree with the main manuscript in at least 80% of shared test passages. All manuscripts below this threshold are only included if they meet another of the criteria (see below). Normally, manuscripts showing fewer than 80% agreement

with the main manuscript are not considered to be a typical group member or a close relative. If the threshold is lowered to 70%, the number of comparison manuscripts becomes too large to be meaningful.

Criterion 2: If fewer than eight manuscripts show 80% agreement of shared test passages with the main manuscript, its eight closest relatives are listed. This criterion provides further information even if a manuscript has a relatively independent text form (e.g. the list for 02).

Criterion 3: According to K. Aland, a good indication of a close relationship between two manuscripts is that they have a high level of agreement in both Main and Supplementary Lists included in previous *TuT* volumes.⁸⁵ Although the Main List is not presented in this volume in a manner commensurate with previous volumes, its proportion of agreement is sufficiently presented in the *Ü.o.rM* column (cf. § 7.2) and the Supplementary List is adequately presented in the *Ü.ges.* column.

In cases where criteria 1–2 do not include the first eight comparison manuscripts of highest agreement according to *Ü.o.rM*, these witnesses are added to the list. In these cases, the *Ü.o.rM* value is printed in italics to indicate that the particular comparison manuscript did not meet criteria 1–2, but is selected because of criterion 3. Each list includes at least the eight closest relatives in both the *Ü.ges.* and *Ü.o.rM* columns.

Criterion 4: Manuscripts are also included in the list that agree with the main manuscript in at least two of its special readings (as defined in § 7.2), regardless of its other levels of agreement. For example, 1611 appears in the list of 02, even though it is not one of the eight nearest relatives measured by the *Ü.ges.* or *Ü.o.rM* columns. In these cases, the *SoLA* value of these manuscripts is presented in italic script.

The value of using special readings as a selection criterion is exemplified by examining LA 12 in TST 87 (την μεγαλην του θυμου του θεου). This variant occurs in 9 manuscripts, which J. Schmid identified as group *f.172/250*. Although 1828 is a poor exemplar of this group, it belonged to it due to its shared agreement in this reading. This is also borne out in the Grouping List of 1828, whose closest relatives belong to this group, although it only agrees with 250 (a main witness to this group) in 62% of readings. 250 would have been excluded from the list of 1828 based on criteria 1–3. However, 250 shares 5

85 Aland/Aland, Introduction, 325: “if the same manuscripts rank high on both lists for a given control manuscript, it may be assumed that the two are related to each other.”

of 9 special readings of 1828, readings that are typical of *f.172/250*. Criterion 4 ensures that loosely affiliated groups are still represented in the data.

Also notable is the fact that 04 agrees with 025 in both of its special readings, confirming the relatively high level of agreement between the two in the *Ü.o.rM* column (79%). If one focuses the evaluation of 025 on readings which do not follow the *rM*, then variants predominate that also occur in 04. Furthermore 025 agrees at 63% with *Av* as mentioned in the headline of the Comparative List. Criterion 4 also measures the agreements between manuscripts that are, overall, witnesses to different textual forms. The text historical background caused this situation and the relationship between these manuscripts requires further investigation.

Despite these efforts to optimize the presentation of manuscript groups, the information constitutes only a first approximation to the text families of Rev. It is important to know that the listed comparison manuscripts do not necessarily correspond directly to the proper group of a given main manuscript. It is paramount to consider all the presented data of the printed columns from various directions.

7.4 Examples for Evaluating the Grouping Lists

The value of the Grouping Lists can be illustrated by examining 01 and 04, the Arethas group, 2196, and 35. What follows is not an exhaustive evaluation, but examples of how this data can be used in future research.

7.4.1 *Sinaiticus* and \mathfrak{P}^{47}

To begin, we turn our attention to the Grouping List for 01, a data set that will likely draw considerable interest. 01 does not have any relatives with which it agrees at 80% or more. Its nearest relatives are \mathfrak{P}^{47} 1678 1778 2050 2080 04 2846 and 2344, and several other manuscripts are included because they preserve at least 2 special readings of 01. The agreement of 01 with \mathfrak{P}^{47} stands at 58% in *Ü.ges.* and grows to 61% in *Ü.o.rM*. When considered from the Grouping List of \mathfrak{P}^{47} , the numbers do not greatly differ. In its preserved portions, \mathfrak{P}^{47} has a higher level of agreement with *rM* readings than 01, while the level of agreement with LA 4/ exceeds its agreement with LA 3/ and LA 5/ (cf. Sorting by Percentages). If *rM* readings are ignored in the calculation, the agreement of \mathfrak{P}^{47} with 01 grows to 64%.

Due to the minimal level of agreement, J. Schmid's characterization of 01 and \mathfrak{P}^{47} as two representatives of the same text-type (so-called S-text) is brought into question.⁸⁶ The evidence here seems to speak against Schmid's conclusion and requires further investigation. 04 agrees with 01 in the *Ü.o.rM* column (58%) at a similar level to \mathfrak{P}^{47} (61%). According to Schmid 04 and 02 constitute their own opposing text-type to \mathfrak{P}^{47} -01. In fact, against J. Schmid, the data suggests that, even though 01 and \mathfrak{P}^{47} are the closest relatives to each other, they do not constitute an independent text-type.

7.4.2 *Alexandrinus and Ephraemi Rescriptus*

In contrast to the previous example, the relationship between 02 and 04 is much stronger (74% or 75% in *Ü.o.rM*), although their agreements are less pronounced than expected. This problem becomes more complicated when J. Schmid claims that these two manuscripts establish a text-type together with the so-called Oecumenius text (represented by 2053 etc.). When the list of 2053 is examined, its agreement with 02 and 04 stands at only 57% and 59% (*Ü.o.rM*) respectively, and this number drops to 53% in *Ü.ges.* in comparison to 02.⁸⁷ The level of agreement between these witnesses calls J. Schmid's conclusion that 02 04 and Oecumenius are representatives of the same text-type (the so-called A-text) into question.

7.4.3 *The Arethas Tradition*

The Arethas manuscripts pose some problems when it comes to grouping. Unfortunately, the *TuT* data neither fully confirms nor refutes J. Schmid's division of this form into two sub-groups ($A\rho^1$ and $A\rho^2$).⁸⁸ For example, in the Grouping List of 617 ($A\rho^1$), 175 and 2075 agree with it in the highest proportion of *Ü.ges.* Following these two, 91 242 1934 2077 also have similarly high levels of agreement in *Ü.ges.*, even though 2075

86 Schmid, *Studien II*, 109–127.

87 Cf. Lembke, "Besonderheiten", 206f.

88 Schmid, *Untersuchungen I*, 4–26; Schmid, *Studien II*, 27.

and 2077 are witnesses of $A\rho^2$.⁸⁹ In the $\ddot{U}.o.rM$ column, 91 175 242 1934 outweigh the agreement between 617 and 2075 2077. Beginning at the eleventh position, 919 1760 1955 (the first K witnesses) appear as comparison manuscripts; their $\ddot{U}.ges.$ agreement rates exceed those of Arethas exemplars 2016 and 2017. However, in the $\ddot{U}.o.rM$ column, 2016 and 2017 witness a higher level of agreement than 919 etc. with 617. A similar situation occurs if 314 is taken as the main manuscript. In this list, the first two comparison manuscripts are 2075 and 175 (two Arethas manuscripts), but it also follows three further K witnesses (627 1728 82) agreeing with 314 at a high level. The level of agreement between 314 and these K witnesses, in contrast, stands far behind 91 and 617 (Arethas witnesses) in the $\ddot{U}.o.rM$ column. This data indicates that the distinction between $A\rho^1$ and $A\rho^2$, as identified by J. Schmid, is not so clear-cut. This is confirmed again by looking at the list of 664 (an $A\rho^2$ manuscript), whose nearest relative is 175 (an $A\rho^1$ manuscript).

Three observations arise from these key facts, which reappear in the Grouping Lists of each Arethas manuscript denoted by J. Schmid: (1) In the Grouping Lists of each Arethas manuscript other Arethas manuscripts appear with a high amount of agreement in the first positions.⁹⁰ Thus, the proper exemplars of this tradition are readily recognizable. (2) Depending on the main Arethas manuscript, some K witnesses also appear among the listed Arethas manuscripts. The rate of agreement of the K manuscripts with the given Arethas manuscript, however, decreases clearly in the $\ddot{U}.o.rM$ column. The K manuscripts are less related to a given Arethas manuscript than other Arethas witnesses, although it is difficult to delimit the Arethas group from the K text. (3) J. Schmid's identification of Arethas sub-groups cannot be confirmed by the TuT data. Regardless of which Arethas witness is the main manuscript of a Grouping List, the various witnesses of these alleged sub-groups are intermixed. This observation is also true of manuscript pairs that J. Schmid

89 According to J. Schmid (see above) the following witnesses comprise the Arethas sub-groups: $A\rho^1$: 91 175 242 256 617 1934 2017; $A\rho^2$: 314 664 1094 2016 2075 2077 2419.

90 Exception: $A\rho$ manuscript 2017 has its highest level of agreement in both the $\ddot{U}.ges.$ and $\ddot{U}.o.rM$ columns not with an $A\rho$ manuscript, but with a K witness (1760).

identified. For example, he closely linked 256 and 2017,⁹¹ but in the Grouping List of 256, 2017 stands in the nineteenth position and other Arethas manuscripts are much more closely aligned. (This is true also of the *Ü.o.rM* column.) Overall, the grouping of the Arethas traditions is a difficult endeavor.

These observations lead directly to the question of the witnesses for the Arethas traditions that should be used by the ECM. The Arethas text has not been reliably edited,⁹² and previous editions offer little assistance. Normally, it has been assumed that Arethas witnesses hardly offer any access to the reconstruction of the critical text⁹³ because the Arethas tradition is not independent, but an editing of the *K* text toward *Av*, as J. Schmid argued. On the other hand, Arethas is an important witness to the shape of the text in the tenth century and the developments within the *K* and *Av* traditions. In light of the doubts surrounding J. Schmid's evaluation of the Arethas tradition, the editors of the ECM will likely rely on their own evaluation of the tradition in selecting relevant exemplars for the edition.

7.4.4 Minuscule 2196 and the Complutensian Group

In some cases, the *TuT* data illustrates the complex textual character of a given witness. A good example of this phenomenon is 2196. Apart from 93-S, which can be ignored (cf. § 5.11), no witness agrees with 2196 in at least 80% of its test passages. 2323 agrees at a level of 77%, but this sinks drastically to 43% in the *Ü.o.rM* column. All other witnesses, apart from the partially preserved copy of a printed edition (1064), have a lower level of agreement with 2196 than *rM* (77%). With a slightly lower level of agreement 824 1075 1740 1746 2821 – all representatives of the *Com* text – appear as the most closely related manuscripts to 2196 in its Grouping List. This situation is striking since the *Com* group is usually characterized by a very high level of agreement among exemplars,

91 Schmid, *Untersuchungen I*, 10f.

92 The last edition was the work of J. A. Cramer from 1844 (J. A. Cramer [ed.], *Cattena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum. Tomus VIII: In Epistolas Catholicas et Apocalypsin*, Oxford: E Typographeo Academico, 1844). His work relied heavily on 314, but the wording of the edition was based on a contemporary critical text.

93 Except for 792–2643, whose text stands between the Arethas tradition and an older state of the text.

which often agree at 100% of test passages.⁹⁴ Nonetheless, from a specific viewpoint 2196 seems to be related to the *Com* text. Despite its many deviations, it stands closer to this text form than to any other one of the Apocalypse. This explains why *Com* manuscripts appear as remote relatives to 2196, whereas the proper *Com* manuscripts constitute many near relatives among themselves. 2916 never surfaces in the Grouping List of a *Com* manuscript. On the other hand, there is also evidence to assign 2196 to the *Com* tradition. For example, in TST 103 (Rev 18,21), 2196 preserves a unique LA 5 reading (the omission of οὐτως), which does not occur in any other text type. The agreement here cannot be accidental, since 2196 preserves other unique *Com* readings (cf. its Descriptive List). Although the proportion of LA 3/ readings minimizes the overall agreement of 2196 with *Com* the manuscript shows a close relationship with the *Com* tradition because it attests unique *Com* readings. In terms of special readings 2196 shows also an increased rate of agreement with *f*.2028 (a sub-group of the *Av* text). This unique case illustrates the difficulties involved with grouping of manuscripts with independent or mixed textual forms. 2196 can only be considered a questionable representative of the *Com* text because it appears in the Grouping List of *Com* manuscripts only based on criteria 2 and 3 (see above).

7.4.5 Minuscule 35 as a Mixed Text

The data in this chapter also confirms previous examinations. Manuscript 35 is a good example of such a confirmation. This manuscript has a unique textual character and cannot be assigned to any known group. J. Schmid argued that the Rev text of 35 is a mixture of *Com* and *Av*,⁹⁵ and observed an obvious relationship to the *Av* sub-group *f* (051 etc.). This conclusion is further supported by the *TuT* data. The Grouping List of 35 illuminates its complex textual affinities. In the *Ü.ges.* column, it agrees at least 82% with several *Com* witnesses. This information, and

94 Cf. Lembke, "Apokalypsetext", 61, 66, 71.

95 J. Schmid, *Untersuchungen I*, 53; J. Schmid, *Studien II*, 28. Similar cases occur with 1384 and 1732, which are listed twice in Schmid's grouping.

the fact that 35 agrees in 86% of its readings with LA 5,⁹⁶ confirms J. Schmid's assignment of 35 to the *Com* tradition.⁹⁷ However, when the *Ü.o.rM* column is examined, it becomes clear that 35 also is closely related to a number of *Av* manuscripts: 80% with 2056, 77% with 051, 70% with 2031 2045 2073, and 67% with 1773 2254 and 2595. Of these witnesses, 051 2031 2056 2073 and 2254 are closely related (Schmid's *Av* sub-group *f*),⁹⁸ and 35 retains a certain level of agreement with them. J. Schmid's evaluation of 35 is confirmed by *TuT*, even though the question of the textual affinities of 35 remains an open question. Because of its kinship with the Andreas text, the editors decided not to count 35 as one of the *Com* witnesses defining LA 5.

8. Concluding Comments

The introduction to this volume has shown the difficulties involved in collecting and evaluating the textual data from the manuscripts of Rev due to the peculiarities of its textual transmission. Because of this, the presentation of collation results and the evaluation of the manuscripts from multiple angles must be modified compared to previous *TuT* volumes.

Nonetheless, this material represents groundbreaking progress for further research of the Apocalypse textual tradition. The work was successful because the mass of data allows for a re-examination of previous judgments and also offers a number of new insights. Perhaps the most key observation thus far is the questionable relationship between 01 and \mathfrak{B}^{47} , which was forcefully posited by J. Schmid.

96 When assessing the number ratio, it should be remembered that manuscripts that belong to Andrew tradition witness an quantity of LA 4 readings which is regularly lower compared to *K* manuscripts attesting LA 3 or *Com* manuscripts attesting LA 5, because the *Av* traditions is on average more diverse in wording than *K* or *Com*.

97 J. Schmid, *Studien II*, 28.

98 1773 und 2595 are *Av* representatives, but do not belong to any sub-group. 2045 belongs to the *Av* sub-group *g*.

In light of these results, these two manuscripts can no longer be considered the main witnesses of a shared text type. Their differences are so pronounced that their text-critical value and text historical location requires a completely new assessment. This calls into question the broader picture of the tradition of Rev offered by J. Schmid, in which 01 and \mathfrak{P}^{47} constituted a key text-type. A similar observation is also true for 02 04 Oecumenius, whose relationships are also questionable.

The material presented also constitutes a valuable tool for selecting relevant manuscripts for the ECM of Rev.⁹⁹ If the main goal of *TuT*, according to K. Aland, is to identify the text-critically and historically important witnesses among the “mass of manuscripts,”¹⁰⁰ then we are facing a different situation in the Apocalypse due to the reduced number of manuscripts and the peculiarities of its textual transmission. The question then moves away from the reduction of manuscripts for the edition, to the assessment of the textual character of individual witnesses and their affinities to the main text forms. This evaluation can be gained, in part, by using the data collected in this volume.

At this point, the selection of manuscripts for the ECM cannot be fully anticipated, but a number of core witnesses are surely to be included:

The seven papyri and twelve majuscules will be used based on their age and the fact that there are not many of them. Unfortunately, many of these witnesses are too fragmentary to have been included in *TuT*. In order to properly understand the value of these fragmentary witnesses for the reconstruction of the *Ausgangstext* in the ECM, independent studies are required.

Additionally, exemplars with independent text forms, those that preserve a high level of LA 2 or 2/ readings (e.g. 2582 2625), and those which are difficult to group (e.g. 35 2196 etc.) are likely to be included. Also, manuscripts with close relationships to 01 02 or 04 will be selected (e.g. 69 1006 1778 2329).

Witnesses of the text forms that also constitute the majority will also be selected, including exemplars of the homogeneous *K* and *Com* text. The Sorting by Percentages and Grouping Lists provide excellent data on which exemplars stand close to the center of these traditions and which stand at the boundaries – both types of witnesses are likely to be selected for the ECM.

99 Some further thoughts on editing the Apocalypse as a part of the ECM are provided by U.B. Schmid, “Editing the Apocalypse in the twenty-first century” in *Book of Seven Seals. The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T.J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 231–240.

100 K. Aland/B. Aland, *Introduction*, 318.

In terms of the *Av* tradition, which is more diverse than the other main text forms, witnesses are likely to be selected that illustrate the diversity of the sub-groups of *Av*. Smaller text forms like the Arethas text present special problems since they are not defined in the Sorting by Percentages lists and are a mixture of LA 3 (*K*) and LA 4 (*Av*).

Translation of the German *Einführung* by Garrick V. Allen

Literature

- K. Aland, *Kurzgefaßte Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2., neubearbeitete und ergänzte Auflage, ANTF 1, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter 1994.
- K. Aland/B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament. An Introduction to the Critical Editions and to the Theory and Practice of Modern Textual Criticism*, Second Edition, translated by E.F. Rhodes, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1989.
- G.V. Allen, "Image, Memory, and Allusion, in the Textual History of the Apocalypse: GA 2028 and Visual Exegesis" in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ed. M. Sigismund/D. Müller, ANTF, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter (forthcoming).
- D.E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, WBC 52a, Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1997.
- G. K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation. A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC, Grand Rapids/MI: Eerdmans, 1999.
- W. Bousset, "Zur Textkritik der Apokalypse, in: Textkritische Studien zum Neuen Testament", ed. W. Bousset, TU 11.4, Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1894, 1–44.
- , *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, KEK 16, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1906 (Neuaufgabe 1966).
- A. J. Brown, ed., *Novum Testamentum ab Erasmo recognitum IV: Epistolae Apostolicae (secunda pars) et Apocalypsis Iohannis*, ASD 6.4, Leiden/Boston: Elsevier, 2013.
- H. Buchinger, "Die Johannes-Apokalypse im christlichen Gottesdienst: Sondierungen in Liturgie und Ikonographie" in *Ancient Christian Interpretations of 'Violent Texts' in the Apocalypse*, ed. J. Verheyden/S. Alkier, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, 216–266.
- J. Chapa e.a., eds., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri LXVI*, Graeco-Roman Memoirs 86, London: Cook Books, 1999.
- P. W. Comfort/D. P. Barrett, eds., *The Text of the Earliest New Testament Greek Manuscripts: New and complete Transcriptions with Photographs*, Wheaton/IL: Tyndale House Publishers, 2001.
- J. A. Cramer, ed., *Cattena Graecorum Patrum in Novum Testamentum. Tomus VIII: In Epistolas Catholicas et Apocalypsin*, Oxford: E Typographeo Academico, 1844.

- F. Delitzsch, *Handschriftliche Funde, 1. Heft, Die Erasmischen Entstellungen des Textes der Apokalypse, nachgewiesen aus dem verloren geglaubten Codex Reuchlins*, Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke 1861.
- J. K. Elliott, "Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation collated by H. C. Hoskier" in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NT.S 137, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010, 133–144.
- , "The Distinctiveness of the Greek Manuscripts of the Book of Revelation" in *New Testament Textual Criticism: The Application of Thoroughgoing Principles. Essays on Manuscripts and Textual Variation*, ed. J. K. Elliott, NT.S 137, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2010, 145–155.
- , "A Short Textual Commentary on the Book of Revelation and the 'New' Nestle" *NT* 56 (2014), 68–100.
- , "Recent Work on the Greek Manuscripts of Revelation and the Consequences for the Kurzgefasste Liste" *JThS* 66 (2015), 574–584.
- M. de Groote, ed., *Oecumenius Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, TEG 8, Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- R. Gryson, ed., *Apocalypsis Johannis, Vetus Latina, Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*, vol. 26, Freiburg i.Br.: Herder, 2000–2003.
- D. Hagedorn, "P.IFAO II 31: Johannesapokalypse 1,13–20" *ZPE* 92 (1992), 243–247.
- M. Heide, *Der einzig wahre Bibeltext? Erasmus und die Frage nach dem Urtext*, 5., verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage, Nürnberg: Verlag für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, 2006.
- J. Hernández, *Scribal Habits and Theological Influences in the Apocalypse. The Singular Readings of Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, and Ephraemi*, WUNT II 218, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- , "The Apocalypse in Codex Alexandrinus: Its Singular Readings and Scribal Habits" in *Scripture and Traditions (FS C. R. Holladay)*, ed. P. Gray/G. R. O'Day, NT.S 129, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2008, 341–355.
- , "The Creation of a Fourth-Century Witness to the Andreas Text Type: A Misreading in the Apocalypse's Textual History" *NTS* 60 (2014), 106–120.
- , "Codex Sinaiticus: An Early Christian Commentary on the Apocalypse?" in *Codex Sinaiticus: New Perspectives on the Ancient Biblical*

- Manuscript* ed. S. McKendrick/D. C. Parker/A. Myshrall/C. O'Hogan, London: Hendrickson, 2015, 107–126.
- , “NA 28 and the Revision of the Apocalypse’s Textual History” in *Studies on the Text of the New Testament and Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Michael W. Holmes*, ed. D. M. Gurtner/J. Her-nández/P. Foster, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2015, 71–81.
- H. C. Hoskier, *Concerning the Text of the Apocalypse: Collations of all existing available Greek Documents with the Standard Text of Stephen’s third Edition together with the Testimony of Versions, Commentaries and Fathers. A complete Conspectus of all Authorities*, 2 vols., London: Bernard Quaritch 1929.
- M. Karrer, “Der Text der Johannesoffenbarung. Varianten und Theologie” *Neotest.* 43 (2009), 373–398.
- , “The Angels of the Congregations in Revelation – Textual History and Interpretation” *Journal of Early Christian History* 1 (2011), 57–84.
- , “Der Text der Johannesapokalypse” in *Die Johannesapokalypse. Kontexte – Konzepte Rezeption*, ed. J. Frey/J. A. Kelhoffer/F. Tóth, WUNT 287, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012, 43–78.
- , “Textgeschichte und Demarkationsprozesse der Johannesoffenbarung”, in *Poetik und Intertextualität der Johannesapokalypse*, ed. S. Alkier/T. Hieke/T. Nicklas, WUNT 346, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015, 45–70.
- , “Der Text der Apokalypse – Textkritik und Theologiegeschichte” in *Revelation, Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense 2015*, ed. A. Yarbro Collins, BETL, Leuven: Peeters, 2016/2017 (forthcoming).
- C. R. Koester, *Revelation. A new Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 38A, New Haven/London: Yale University Press, 2014.
- G. Kretschmar, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes. Die Geschichte ihrer Auslegung im 1. Jahrtausend*, CThM.ST 9, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1985.
- M. J. Kruger, “The Reception of the Book of Revelation in the Early Church” in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 159–174.
- M. Lembke, “Beobachtungen zu den Handschriften der Apokalypse des Johannes” in *Die Johannesoffenbarung. Ihr Text und ihre Auslegung*, ed. M. Labahn/M. Karrer, ABIG 38, Leipzig 2012, 19–69.

- , “Die Apokalypse-Handschrift 2846. Beschreibung, Kollation und Textwertbestimmung eines wichtigen neuen Zeugen” *NT* 54 (2012), 369–395.
- , “Der Apokalypsetext der Complutensischen Polyglotte und sein Verhältnis zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 33–133.
- , “Besonderheiten der griechischen Überlieferung des Textes der Offenbarung und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Textkritik” in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 201–230.
- P. Malik, “Another Look at P.IFAO II 31 (P98). An Updated Transcription and Textual Analysis” *NT* 57 (2015), 1–14.
- , “The Corrections of Codex Sinaiticus and the Textual Transmission of Revelation: Josef Schmid Revisited” *NTS* 61 (2015), 595–614.
- , “The Earliest Corrections in Codex Sinaiticus. Further Evidence from the Apocalypse” *TC* 20 (2015).
- , *Studies in P.Beatty III (P⁹⁷). The Codex, its Scribe and its Text*, Ph.D. University of Cambridge 2016 (forthcoming).
- M. Meiser, “Before Canonisation” in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, hg. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 137–158.
- G. Mercati, ed., *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto XIII*, Firenze: Tipografia Enrico Aiani, 1953, 1.8–11.
- B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- D. Müller, “Erasmus und die Sonderlesarten des Textus Receptus der Apokalypse” in *Worte der Weissagung. Studien zu Septuaginta und Johannesoffenbarung*, ed. J. Elschenbroich/J. de Vries, ABIG 47, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2014, 159–187.

- , „Abschriften des Erasmischen Textes im Handschriftenmaterial der Johannesapokalypse. Nebst einigen editions-geschichtlichen Beobachtungen“ in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 165–268.
- , „Die Apokalypse-Handschriften GA 2329 und 2351. Textkritische und textgeschichtliche Beobachtungen zu zwei „ständigen Zeugen für die Apokalypse“ in Nestle-Aland²⁸“ in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse II*, ed. M. Sigismund/D. Müller, ANTF, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter (forthcoming).
- T. Nicklas, „The Early Text of Revelation“ in *The Early Text of the New Testament* ed. C. E. Hill/M. J. Kruger, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 225–238.
- D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and their Texts*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- , „A Comparison between the Text und Textwert and the Claremont Profile Method Analyses of Manuscripts in the Gospel of Luke“ in *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology. Collected Papers 1977–2007*, ed. D. C. Parker, ANTF 40, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2009, 217–252.
- , „A New Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Revelation: P115 (P. Oxy. 4499)“ in *Manuscripts, Texts, Theology. Collected Papers 1977–2007*, ed. D. C. Parker, ANTF 40, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2009, 73–92.
- W. N. Pickering, *The Greek New Testament According to Family 35*, Second Edition, n.p. 2015.
- J. Schmid, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypsetextes. I: Der Apokalypsetext des Arethas von Kaisareia und einiger anderer jüngerer Gruppen*, TBNGP 17, Athen: Verlag der „Byzantinisch-Neugriechischen Jahrbücher“, 1936.
- , „Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypsetextes: II: Der K-Text“ *Bib.* 17 (1936), 11–44.167–201.273–93.429–60.
- , „Der Apokalypse-Text des Oikumenius“ *Bib.* 40 (1959), 935–942.
- , „Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Apokalypse-Kommentars des Arethas von Kaisareia“ *BNGJ* 17 (1939–1943), 72–81.
- , *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes, 2. Teil: Die alten Stämme*, MThS.HE 1c, München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1955.

- , *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Apokalypse-Textes, 1. Teil: Der Apokalypse-Kommentar des Andreas von Kaisareia – Einleitung*, MThS.HE 1b, München: Karl Zink Verlag, 1956.
- U. B. Schmid, “Die Apokalypse, überliefert mit anderen neutestamentlichen Schriften – eap-Handschriften” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 421–441.
- , “Editing the Apocalypse in the twenty-first century” in *Book of Seven Seals. The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 231–240.
- M. Sigismund, “Schreiber und Korrektoren in der Johannes-Apokalypse des Codex Alexandrinus” in *Von der Septuaginta zum Neuen Testament. Textgeschichtliche Erörterungen*, ed. M. Karrer/S. Kreuzer/M. Sigismund, ANTF 43, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2010, 319–338.
- , “Das sog. Apk-Fragment GA 2408” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 135–146.
- , “Neue Freunde. Annäherung an die ‘Early Modern Greek’ Apk-Hss. der Kurzgefassten Liste” in *Studien zum Text der Apokalypse*, ed. M. Sigismund/U. B. Schmid/M. Karrer, ANTF 47, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2015, 397–407.
- H. v. Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt, hergestellt auf Grund ihrer Textgeschichte. I. Teil: Untersuchungen, III. Abteilung: Die Textformen, B. Der Apostolos mit Apokalypse*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.
- M. Sommer, “What do Revelation’s handwritings tell us about its post-canonical role and function in the Bible? ‘Work in progress’” in *Book of Seven Seals: The Peculiarity of Revelation, its Manuscripts, Attestation, and Transmission*, ed. T. J. Kraus/M. Sommer, WUNT 363, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016, 175–197.
- K. von Tischendorf, ed., *Monumenta sacra inedita. Nova Collectio VI. Apocalypsis et Actus Apostolorum cum quarti Maccabaeorum libri fragmento item quattuor Evangeliorum reliquiae: ex duobus codicibus palimpsestis octavi fere et sexti saeculi altero Porphyrii episcopi, altero Guelferbyitano*, Leipzig: Giesecke and Deverient, 1869.

- K. Wachtel, *Der Byzantinische Text der Katholischen Briefe, Eine Untersuchung zur Entstehung der Koine des Neuen Testaments*, ANTF 24, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 1995.
- B. Weiss, *Die Johannes-Apokalypse: Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung*, TU 7.1, Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1891.
- B. F. Westcott/F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in the Original Greek. Introduction Appendix*, London: Macmillan, 1882.
- F. Wisse, *The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscripts Evidence*, SD 44, Grand Rapids/MI: Eerdmans, 1982.