

Preliminary Examination of McGill New Testament Manuscripts

Mike Arcieri, *McGill University*

I welcome the opportunity to join in this tribute to Professor Frederik Wisse, whose work with New Testament Greek manuscripts has been a valuable contribution, especially his classification of NT manuscripts (akin to the efforts of Hermann von Soden).¹ It was in collaboration with fellow seminarian Paul McReynolds, under the able direction of Ernest C. Colwell, that Wisse developed the *Claremont Profile Method* (CPM).² The driving force behind CPM was to allow collators (by a collation of three chapters of Luke from any given ms) *first* to identify its text and appropriate it to a distinctive text type (either Alexandrian, Western, or Byzantine),³ and *second* to classify the MS to a particular substratum within that text type. The value of such a method allowed researchers to quickly classify MSS and separate those deemed valuable for further research. Although the *Profile Method* as such cannot be properly applied to all the manuscripts under consideration, it seemed not inappropriate to undertake a preliminary examination of some New Testament manuscripts housed at McGill University.

Manuscripts Housed in Canada

Kenneth W. Clark's book, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Greek New Testament Manuscripts in America*,⁴ was among his very first publications in text criticism. This book served as a inventory of New Testament manuscripts (MSS) found throughout the United States and Canada. In spite of the fact that it was published almost 70 years ago, this unique catalogue of North American Greek New Testament MSS still remains an invaluable tool for research purposes.⁵

It is quite disappointing to discover that of Clark's inventory containing some 256 MSS, a mere nine are housed in Canada. These MSS are located in five separate collections found in two major cities, Toronto and Montreal, the latter having a grand total of eight. The MSS are the following:

University of Toronto:	2321 ⁶	1 MS
McGill University:	2415a, <i>l1644</i>	2 MSS
F. Cleveland Morgan:	2398c, 2401b miniature of John (no text)	3 MSS
Diocesan Theological College:	2415b, 2398b	2 MSS
Art Association of Montreal:	miniature of Mark (no text)	1 MS ⁷

Examination of Select Manuscripts

Certain restrictions prevented the present writer from fully collating all nine MSS, but three of the Montreal MSS were inspected. The following table provides a brief overview of the MSS examined:

MS	McGill MS	Date	Cont	Material	Format	Col
2398	F.C. Morgan, De Ricci 1; McGill MS 9	XIV	e ⁸	parchment	22x15.5 c.20 lines/pg	1
2401	F.C. Morgan, De Ricci 2; McGill MS 10	XII	c	parchment	19.5x15 6 lines txt (υποθεσις της τω επιστολη)	1
2415	De Ricci 2; McGill MS 1	XI/XII	e	parchment	19x14.5 c.22 lines/pg	2

Gregory-Aland 2398; McGill Greek MS 9⁹

Contents: John 12:50 (ζωη) - 13:16 (νμιν)

Collation

The first reading is that of the TR; the second is that of 2398, while any other variant readings listed are presented as of interest for the text transmission.

1] 12:50a	λαλω εγω	E K U Δ Θ Λ Π Μ sa ac ² p bo • TR HF ² /RP
	εγω λαλω	2398 p ⁶⁶ Ν A B L M W Ψ 070 0124 f ^{1.13} al lat bo • NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	εγω	D Γ 1241 pc a bo ^{ms}
2] 12:50b	ειρηκεν	rell? • TR RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	ειρηκε	2398 cum? • HF ²
3] 13:1	αυτου η ωρα	rell? • TR HF ² /RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	η ωρα αυτου	2398 cum?
4] 13:8	αυτω ο ιησους	2398c Ν M U Λ f ¹ f ¹³ Μ • TR HF ² /RP
	ιησους	2398* C ^c D Ψ
	ιησους αυτω	A B C [*] L • NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	αυτω ιησους	E G K S Δ Θ Π Ω
5] 13:9	τους ποδας μου	Ν B Μ • TR HF ² /RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	τους ποδας	2398 p ⁶⁶ D ¹⁰ E G H al e
6] 13:10	εστιν	rell? • TR HF ² /RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	εστι	2398 cum?
7] 13:12	ελαβεν	rell? • TR RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	ελαβε	2398 cum? • HF ²
8] 13:13	ο διδασκαλος και ο κυριος	p ⁶⁶ B Y Μ • TR NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴ HF ² /RP ¹¹
	ο κυριος και ο διδασκαλος	2398 C ² E F G H M Λ f ¹³
9] 13:15	εδωκα	p ^{66c} B C D L U W Δ Θ Λ M ^{pt} • TR HF ² /RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	δεδωκα	2398 p ^{66*} Ν A K M Π f ¹ f ¹³ M ^{pt}

Analysis

Within the short space of 17 verses this MS presents us with numerous variant readings (*vv.ll.*), albeit few actually effect the meaning of the text. First, a number of *vv.ll.* are of orthographic nature and do not affect the sense (ex. *vv.ll.* # 2, 6 and 7).¹² Secondly, transpositions at # 1, 3, and 8 likewise affect little the sense of the passage, although

#3 may reflect a singular reading on the part of 2398,¹³ while #8 (13:13) is interesting for probable harmonization to the immediate context. The texts of vv. 13 and 14 reads as follows:

13. ο διδασκαλος και ο κυριος 14. ο κυριος και ο διδασκαλος
p⁶⁶ B Y Μ • TR NA²⁷/UBS⁴ HF²/RP

13. ο κυριος και ο διδασκαλος 14. ο κυριος και ο διδασκαλος
2398 C² E F G H M Λ f¹³

It is immediately clear that the overwhelming majority of MSS (of all text-types) has preserved the 'disharmony' of the passage, and only a few have 'harmonized' to smooth out the text.

The remaining variants affect the sense of the passage and need to be looked at more carefully. At 13:8 the scribe of 2398 may have accidentally omitted *αυτο* ο, an error which another scribe 'corrected' via marginal addition. The difference in calligraphy of the marginal addition *αυτω* ο clearly shows this to be the correction of another hand (a διορθωτης?) and not that of the original scribe of MS 2398. Since the text *απεκριθη λεγει Ιησους πετρος* makes sense as such, it appears that the marginal correction to *απεκριθη λεγει αυτω ο ιησους πετρος* was probably the result of cross-comparison from another MS to the more commonly known text rather than the correction of a nonsense reading.¹⁴

John 13:9 contains a *v.l.* which can easily be explained on the basis of omission. The contextual word order is as follows:

2398	8. τους ποδας μου...	9. τους ποδας	... 10. η τους ποδας
HF ² /RP (= Μ)	8. τους ποδας μου...	9. τους ποδας μου ...	10. η τους ποδας
NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴	8. μου τους ποδας...	9. τους ποδας μου ...	10. ει μη τους ποδας

MS 2398, along with a few others, omit the pronoun *μου*. Theoretically it can be argued that the shorter reading is original, while the majority of MSS harmonized to the immediate context and added the *μου*. However, it must be remembered that 1) if *τους ποδας* is original, how did the longer reading gain overwhelming support within *all* text types, and 2) analysis of scribal habits, in particular the early papyri, have conclusively demonstrated that the early scribes of the papyri

were more likely to omit (unnecessary) words than add.¹⁵ It appears more likely that *you* was dropped—either accidentally, or judged to be superfluous—rather than added.

Finally, at 13:15 the interchange of aorist-perfect of διδωμι (εδωκ* – δεδωκ*) in John does not appear to be a frequent occurrence. A comparison of the aorist-perfect forms used throughout John in RP and NA²⁷/UBS⁴ reveal the following statistics:

NA27/UBS4		RP (= \mathfrak{M})		NA27/UBS4		RP (= \mathfrak{M})	
	<i>Aorist</i>	<i>Perfect</i>	<i>Aorist</i>	<i>Perfect</i>		<i>Aorist</i>	<i>Perfect</i>
1:12	X		X		17:2 ^b		X
1:17	X		X		17:4		X
3:16	X		X		17:6 ^a	X	
3:35		X		X	17:6 ^b	X	
4:5	X		X		17:7		X
4:10	X		X		17:8 ^a	X	
4:12	X		X		17:8 ^b		X
5:22		X		X	17:9		X
5:26	X		X		17:11		X
5:27	X		X		17:12		X
5:36		X	X		17:14		X
6:11	X		X		17:22 ^a		X
6:31	X		X		17:22 ^b		X
6:32		X		X	17:24 ^a		X
6:39		X		X	17:24 ^b		X
7:19		X		X	18:9		X
7:22		X		X	18:11		X
10:29		X		X	18:22		X
12:5	X		X		18:30		X
12:49		X	X		18:35		X
13:3	X			X	19:9		X
13:15	X		X		19:16		X
17:2 ^a	X		X		19:30		X

<i>Total:</i>	RP	διδωμι, aorist 22x	perfect, 24x
	NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴	διδωμι, aorist 23x	perfect, 23x

There are only seven instances where both texts differ in regards to the verb tense (note the shift in predominance from aorist to perfect beginning at chapter 17). In these cases, the editorial choices reflected in RP vs NA²⁷/UBS⁴ reflects the text type MS base used (i.e., differences between the Alexandrian and Byzantine text types).¹⁶ In regards to 13:15, the possibility of attraction and harmonization to the immediate context should be considered: διδῷ (perf.) occurs in 13:3, whereas the other occurrences of διδῷ (aor.) are in 12:49 and 17:2.

Gregory-Aland 2401; McGill Greek MS 10

Contents: 2 Peter 3:16 (ἀπωλειαν) – 18

Collation

1] 3:18 ^a	χαριτὶ καὶ γνωσεὶ	rell? • TR HF ² /RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	γνωσεὶ καὶ χαριτὶ	2398 <i>cum?</i>
	χαριτὶ καὶ πιστεὶ	P 69 pc
2] 3:18 ^b	ημεραν	rell? • TR HF ² /RP NA ²⁷ /UBS ⁴
	ημερας	2398 pc vg ^{ms} sy sa

Analysis

Neither of the two *vv.ll.* within the space of 3 verses offers any problematic reading. The first is a case of transposition and does not affect the sense of the passage.¹⁷ The second variant involves a change from accusative singular to plural, smoothing out the text (“To him (be) the glory both now and to (the) day forever,” now reads “to (the) days forever”).

Gregory-Aland 2415; McGill Greek MS 01¹⁸

Contents: Gospels

Wisse examined this MS in his *Profile Method*, classifying it as a **K^x** member (not used however, for *IGNTP Luke*). As desirable as a full collation for Luke is, for the present article the collation is limited to

the *pericope de adultera* in the Gospel of John. The HF² sigla of μ will be used to specify Byzantine group forms of the pericope (rather than the NA²⁷ 'pm'). As explained in the HF² *Introduction*,¹⁹ the various μ groups represent different strands (identified by von Soden)²⁰ of *pericope* transmission within the Byzantine tradition (the HF² 'M1' = Soden μ^1 , 'M2' = μ^2 , etc.).²¹

Collation

1] 7:53	$\epsilon\nu\rho\nu\theta\eta$	TR K Π \mathfrak{M} [$\mu^3 5$]
	$\epsilon\nu\rho\nu\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$	2415 D M S Γ Ω f^1 [$\mu^1 2$]
2] 8:1	$\epsilon\nu\rho\nu\theta\eta$	TR <i>rell</i> [$\mu^1 3 5 6 7$]
	$\epsilon\nu\rho\nu\nu\epsilon\tau\eta$	2415 S Ω [$\mu^2 4$]
3] 8:2	$\lambda\alpha\varsigma$	TR <i>rell</i> [$\mu^1 3 5 6 7$]
	$\omega\chi\lambda\varsigma$	2415 Γ Σ Λ Ω [μ^2]
4] 8:3 ^a	$\pi\rho\varsigma\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$	TR K Π \mathfrak{M} [$\mu^1\text{pt} 3\text{pt} 5 6\text{pt} 7$]
	— —	2415 D S M U Γ Λ Ω $f^{1,13}$ [$\mu^1\text{pt} 2 3\text{pt} 4 6\text{pt}$]
5] 8:3 ^b	$\epsilon\nu^1$	TR E G H K Π [μ^5]
	$\epsilon\nu\iota$	2415 M S U Γ Λ Ω $f^{1,13}$ [$\mu^1 2 3 4 6 7$]
6] 8:4 ^a	$\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\phi\theta\eta$	TR <i>cum?</i> ²²
	$\epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\pi\tau\alpha\iota$	2415 S Λ Ω f^{13} [$\mu^2 3 4$]
7] 8:4 ^c	$\alpha\upsilon\tau\phi\omega\rho\omega$	TR D K M S U Λ Π Ω f^1 \mathfrak{M} [$\mu^1 7$]
	$\alpha\upsilon\tau\phi\omega\rho\omega$	2415 [$\mu^2 3 5 6$]

8] 8:5 ^a	μωσης ημιν	TR E G K M Π [μ ^{1pt 5}]
	ημων μωσης	2415 S Ω [μ ^{2 3pt 6 7}] ²³
9] 8:5 ^b	λιθοβολεισθαι	TR E G H K Π [μ ^{1pt 5 7}]
	λιθαζειν	2415 D M S U Λ Ω <i>f</i> ^{1,13} [μ ^{1pt 2 3 4 6}]
10] 8:5 ^c	λεγεις	TR D K Π <i>f</i> ¹ <i>m</i> [μ ^{1pt 5 6pt 7}]
	λεγεις περι αυτης	2415 M S U Λ Ω <i>f</i> ¹³ [μ ^{1pt 2 3 4 6pt}]
11] 8:6 ^a	ελεγον	TR K U Π <i>f</i> ^{1,13} <i>m</i> [μ ^{1 3 4 5 6 7}]
	ειπον	2415 S Ω [μ ²]
12] 8:6 ^b	πειραζοντες	TR K U Λ Π <i>f</i> ^{1,13} <i>m</i> [μ ^{1 3 4 5 6 7}]
	εκπειραζοντες	2415 S Ω [μ ²]
13] 8:6 ^c	εχωσιν	TR <i>rell?</i>
	εχωσι	2415 G K S U
14] 8:6 ^d	κατηγορειν	TR Π <i>f</i> ¹ <i>m</i> [μ ^{1 5}]
	κατηγοριαν κατ	2415 S U Λ Ω <i>f</i> ¹³ [μ ^{2 3 4 6 7}]
15] 8:6 ^e	εγραφεν	TR K U Λ <i>f</i> ^{1,13} <i>m</i> [μ ^{1 2pt 3 4 5 6 7}]
	κατεγραφεν	2415 D M S Ω [μ ^{2pt}]

16] 8:7a ανακυψας TR K \mathfrak{M} [$\mu^{1pt\ 5\ 7}$]
 ανεκυψεν και 2415 D M S Ω f^1 [$\mu^{2\ 3\ 4}$]

17] 8:7b προς αυτους TR K \mathfrak{M} [$\mu^{5\ 7}$]
 αυτοις 2415 D S U Λ Ω f^{13}
 [$\mu^{1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 6}$]

18] 8:7b τον λιθον επ αυτη βαλετω TR [μ^7]
 επ αυτη τον λιθον βαλετω 2415 [μ^5]²⁴

19] 8:9a και υπο της συνειδησεως ελεγχομενοι TR K \mathfrak{M} [$\mu^{5\ 6pt\ 7}$]
 — — — 2415 D M S U Λ Π
 Ω $f^{1,13}$ [$\mu^{1\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 6pt}$]

20] 8:9b εστωσα TR f^1 [μ^{1pt}]
 ουσα 2415 *rell* [$\mu^{1pt\ 2\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6\ 7}$]

21] 8:10a και μηδενα θεασαμενος πλην της γυναικος TR E G H K \mathfrak{M} [$\mu^5\ 7$]
 — — — 2415 D M S Ω f^1 [$\mu^{1\ 2}$]

22] 8:10b η γυναι TR *cum?*
 γυναι 2415 M S U Λ Ω $f^{1,13}$
 [$\mu^{1pt\ 2\ 3pt\ 4\ 6}$]

23] 8:10c εκεινοι TR E F G K [$\mu^{5\ 6pt\ 7}$]
 — 2415 H M S U Λ Ω $f^{1,13}$
 [$\mu^{1\ 2pt\ 3\ 4\ 6pt}$]

24] 8:11 ^a	αυτη	TR U <i>f</i> ¹³ [$\mu^{1pt\ 6\ 7}$]
	—	2415 D K M <i>M</i> [$\mu^{2\ 5}$]
25] 8:11 ^b	και	TR K L <i>M</i> [$\mu^{4pt\ 5}$]
	και απο του νυν	2415 D M S U <i>Ω</i> <i>f</i> ^{1,13} [$\mu^{1\ 2\ 3\ 6\ 7}$]

Analysis

There are a number of interesting variants preserved in 2415. Although there are no singular or subsingular readings, in a few places it contains a minority reading *contra* a rather united tradition (ex. 8:2 οχλος; 8:6^a ειπον; 8:6^b εκπειραζοντες; 8:6^c κατεγραφεν); 2415 also aligns itself with the majority tradition against the minority reading preserved in the TR (8:3^b εν¹; 8:4^a κατειληθη; 8:9^b εστωσα; 8:10^b η γυναι).²⁵ The MSS tradition is divided in three places, viz., 8:3^a προς αυτον—; 8:5^c λεγεις] λεγεις περι αυτης; 8:10^c εκενοι]—. A careful study of other *vv.ll.* will probably shed light not only on the transmission of the text but upon the history of interpretation as well (ex. # 19, 21). The interchange of ο and ω at 8:4^c (αυτοφωρω] αυτοφορω) is a good example of phonetically caused variation.²⁶

A preliminary observation reveals a certain affinity with the uncials S (028, X cent.) and Ω (045, VIII/IX cent.). Both of these uncials were classified as *K¹* by Soden, i.e., the earliest strand of the *K* txt (= Ω cluster in Wisse, *Profile*, 95). It is interesting to observe that although 2415 is classified as a *K^x* by Wisse, within the pericope text itself it probably reflects an earlier strand of the Byzantine text,²⁷ a strand which may have closest affinities with the μ^2 group.

Conclusion

Every MS—regardless of its age—has an inherent value as a witness to the text of the New Testament. From this initial survey, the texts found within the McGill collection present some interesting variant readings. The preliminary collation of these MSS clearly reveals that, far from merely representing the ‘typical’ Byzantine text

of the middle-ages, these MSS actually represent variations from both the (idiosyncratic) TR as well as the HF² and RP texts. A full collation of these will not only shed light upon their own transmissional history, but likewise provide some contribution to understanding the growth and development of the Byzantine text as a whole. There can be little doubt that a thorough collation and analysis of the variant readings should provide further light behind the quality and history of the texts preserved.

Notes

1. Hermann Freiherr von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments in ihrer ältesten erreichbaren Textgestalt*, I. Teil, *Untersuchungen*, i. Abteilung, *Die Textzeugen* (Berlin, 1902); ii. Abteilung, *Die Textformen*, B. *Der Apostolos mit Apokalypse*, 1910 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911–1913). Early reviews of Soden’s work have criticised the needless complexity and collation errors found within the three-fold text apparatus. While subsequent research has indeed demonstrated collation and printing errors within the work, Wisse’s work with the Lukan MSS for CPM has largely *confirmed* many of Soden’s MSS groupings. It is important to remember that not all of Soden’s work was for naught—subsequent scholarship has benefited from the extensive apparatus and MSS classification (cf. A. Merk [*Novum Testamentum*, 8th ed.; 1957], who selectively borrowed Soden’s data (representing more the **H** and **I** strands than the **K** in his apparatus); the Scottish scholar James Moffatt used Soden’s text as the translating base for his English version (*The New Testament* (1913); *The Moffatt Translation of the Bible*, 1926; 1935^r); two critical editions of the Byzantine text were published, largely dependent upon the apparatus of Soden (Zane C. Hodges and Arthur L. Farstad, *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*² [=HF²; Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1982]; Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont, *The Greek New Testament in the Original Greek According to the Byzantine/Majority Textform* [=RP; Atlanta: Original Word Publishers, 1991]).
2. Cf. F. Wisse, “The Claremont Profile Method for the Classification of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts: A Study in Method.” Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968 (published as *The Profile Method for Classifying and Evaluating Manuscript Evidence* [SD 44; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982]); Paul R. McReynolds, “The Claremont Profile Method and the Grouping of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts” Ph.D. diss., Claremont Graduate School, 1968; Roger L. Omanson, “The Claremont Profile Method and the Grouping of Byzantine New Testament Manuscripts in the Gospel of Mark,” Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary,

1975; E. J. Epp, "The Claremont Profile Method for Grouping New Testament Minuscule Manuscripts," *Studies in the History and Text of the New Testament in Honor of Kenneth Willis Clark, Ph. D.*, ed. B. L. Daniels and M. J. Suggs (SD 29; Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1967), 27–38.

The CPM was used to select MSS behind the International Greek New Testament Project, *The New Testament in Greek: The Gospel According to St. Luke, Part 1 & 2* (IGNTP; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984, 1987). Of Greek New Testaments, the IGNTP *Gospel of Luke* is an excellent supplement to Soden, especially in its representation of the Byzantine text and its *K* strands, contra NA²⁷ and UBS⁴. The principal obstacle however in using the apparatus for the NA²⁷/UBS⁴ is in their representation of the Byzantine text under one siglum, *M/Byz* (or *pm/Byz^{pt}* in cases of divided readings). As Wisse pointed out: "Due to the overwhelming numbers, any attempt to represent the Byzantine minuscules by a single siglum *M* will result in the obliteration by *K^x* of all other Byzantine groups" (*Profile Method*, 94). Concerning the UBS⁴ apparatus specifically, Wisse writes: "Furthermore, the selection tool could not make the distinctions among the Byzantine minuscules and select representatives from the different groups. Thus the M and P groups, Grs A, 16, 291, 1519, and *K'*—not to speak of non-*K^x* clusters—were all swallowed up by the siglum 'Byz' which actually represents only Gr *K^x*" (*ibid.*, pp. 137–38).

3. The homogeneity of the so-called 'Caesarean' text type and its constituent witnesses is still an open question, and no 'Caesarean' text has adequately been identified outside the Gospels: "[T]he Caesarean text appears to be the most mixed and the least homogeneous of any of the groups which can be classified as distinct text-types" (Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*, 3rd ed. [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 215). Detailed studies of the Caesarean text can be found in Larry W. Hurtado, *Text-Critical Methodology and the Pre-Caesarean Text: Codex W in the Gospel of Mark*, ed. Irving A. Sparks, (SD 43; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981), 85–89, and Muriel M. Carder, "A Caesarean Text in the Catholic Epistles?" *NTS* 16.3 (1970): 252–70.

4. (Chicago: Chicago Press, 1937) (*vide* largely favourable review by T. C. Skeat in *JHS* 59 [1939]: 179; F. G. Kenyon, *JTS* 39 [1938]: 412–13). For a broader listing of MSS distribution in major collections see K. & B. Aland, *The Text of the New Testament*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 79–83.

5. The official listing of all NT MSS is edited by Kurt Aland, *Kurzgefasste Liste der griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments*, 2d ed. rev. and enlarged (Berlin: de Gruyter 1963, 1994). This *Liste* is a standard reference tool in NTTC, replacing the earlier listing compiled by C. R. Gregory (*Die griechischen Handschriften des Neuen Testaments* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908]). As of 1994, the official tally of NT MSS is as follows: 99 Papyri, 306 Uncials, 2856 Minuscules,

2403 Lectionaries (5664 MSS). That this list is somewhat dated is seen by the occasional publication of newly discovered MSS (cf. J.K. Elliott, *A Bibliography of Greek New Testament Manuscripts* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000], where the updated figures are as follows: 115 Papyri, 309 Uncials, 2862 Minuscules, and 2412 Lectionaries [5698 MSS]). Elliott's *Bibliography* is an indispensable supplement to the *Liste* volume, being a complete guide to published manuscripts, collations, facsimiles and photographic plates.

6. "Purchased from an English dealer *ca.* 1890 by Rev. Canon Henry C. Scadding, D. D., who bequeathed his library to the Univ. of Toronto at his death in 1901" Clark, *Catalogue*, 345. A full collation of the MSS (aptly named 'Codex Torontonensis') was published by E. J. Goodspeed (*The Toronto Gospels* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1911]). Consequently this acquisition became the very *first* NT MS to be housed in Canada.
7. Aland's *Kurzgefasste Liste* lists only 7 MSS in Montreal, as the miniatures of Mark and John are not counted. The MS designations follows Aland's *Liste*.
8. Following conventional abbreviations, e = Gospels; a = Acts; p = Pauline letters (including Hebrews); c = Catholic letters; r = Revelation (Aland, Text, 27).
9. Only one page of MSS 2398c and 2401b are at McGill: the remaining pages are located at the University of Chicago (cf. Clark, *Catalogue*, p. 137).
10. The text of D involves several changes to the commonly accepted text: $\mu\eta$ $\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\delta\alpha\varsigma$ $\mu\eta\omega$ $\mu\eta\omega$ (*rell*) vs. $\mu\eta$ $\mu\eta\omega$ $\tau\omega\varsigma$ $\pi\delta\alpha\varsigma$ D.
11. R. Swanson (*New Testament Greek Manuscripts: Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: John* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995]) attributes the order $\sigma\iota$ $\kappa\mu\tau\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\delta\iota\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\varsigma$ as being \mathfrak{M} (= E F G H S Y Ω). Technically this is correct, but the reader will be misled if he assume that Swanson's \mathfrak{M} equals the H/F² \mathfrak{M} (= Byzantine majority)! The actual Byzantine *-majority* order is 'teacher . . . Lord', whereas only a *minority* of key Byzantine MSS reverse the order to 'Lord . . . teacher'.
12. Often referred to as 'v-movable' ($\epsilon\phi\ell\kappa\mu\sigma\tau\iota\kappa\omega\eta$), this is "added to words ending in $\sigma\iota$, $\xi\iota$, and $\psi\iota$; to third person verb forms ending in ϵ ; and to $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$: always when the following word begins with a vowel, sometimes even when the following word begins with a consonant (the 'irrational' v), and usually at the end of a clause or sentence" (J. A. Brooks, C. L. Winbery, *A Morphology of New Testament Greek* [Lanham: University Press of America, 1994], 16–17; cf. J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1929], 113; F. Blass, A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. R. W. Funk [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961], 12).

13. None of the common critical texts with apparatus (NA²⁷/UBS⁴, HF², Tischendorf, von Soden) cite this variant in their apparatus; only a full collation of all existing MSS will reveal whether this is a true singular reading, or sub-singular at the very least.
14. Cross comparison of MSS is a known factor in both Classical and Biblical texts, usually referred to as *contamination* (cf. L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, 3d ed. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1991), 214–15.
15. Cf. the summary discussion of issues involved by E. J. Epp, “Issues in New Testament Textual Criticism” in *Rethinking New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. D. A. Black (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), 27–30. Epp approvingly cites Michael W. Holmes, who writes “in light of [J. R.] Royse’s study the venerable canon of *lectio brevior potior* is now seen as relatively useless, at least for the early papyri” (29). Significant studies in early scribal habits are E. C. Colwell, “Scribal Habits,” *Studies in Methodology in Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. Bruce M. Metzger (NTTS 9; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 106–24; James R. Royse, “Scribal Tendencies in the Transmission of the Text of the New Testament,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes (SD 46; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 239–52; idem, “Scribal Habits in the Transmission of New Testament Texts,” in *The Critical Study of Sacred Texts* ed. Wendy D. O’Flaherty (Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union, 1979), 139–61; Peter M. Head, “Observations on Early Papyri of the Synoptic Gospels, especially on the ‘Scribal Habits,’ ” *Bib* 71 (1990): 240–43; Maurice A. Robinson, “Scribal Habits among Manuscripts of the Apocalypse” (PhD diss., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1982).
16. The *primary* witnesses of both Alexandrian and Byzantine texts are accurately represented by the text of RP and NA²⁷/UBS⁴, although there is frequent defection from other Alexandrian and Byzantine members.
17. None of the common critical texts with apparatus cite this transposition in their apparatus.
18. Cf. *Catalogue*, 132–34. Ms 2415 preserves the Gospels in the ‘Western’ order, i.e., Matthew, Luke, John and Mark; it has several lacuna (ex. John 1:1–17 (δια) is supplied by a later 13th century hand; John 19 is defective, and chs. 20–21 *in toto* are missing); the text of John 7:53–8:11 is obelized (as is John 5:4).
19. *Majority Text*, xxiii–xxxii.
20. Unfortunately, von Soden nowhere identifies exactly which MSS belong to which μ groups! This information must be painstakingly inferred

(when available) from his discussion of the *pericope* itself, or from sporadic comments made elsewhere (the number of MSS represented within the μ groups exceeds 900).

21. However, not all variants are cited within the HF² apparatus; supplanting HF² are the seven reconstructed μ οχεῖα *pericope* as found in the *Appendix* of the Robinson/Pierpont *New Testament in the Original Greek*, 494–505. Post-Soden work regarding the *pericope* has revealed an eighth form of the pericope in the Lectionary text (J. N. Birdsall, “The New Testament Text” in *The Cambridge History of the Bible*, vol. 1, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. E. Evans [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970], 319). Allen P. Wikgren presented a distinct version of the pericope as found in 37 Lectionaries (“The Lectionary Text of the Pericope, John 8:1–11,” *JBL* 53 (1934): 188–97). Maurice Robinson has collated every Johannine and Lectionary MS containing the pericope, and *tentatively* suggests that there may be as many as 10 different groups – although it seems likely that this number will increase once all the amassed data has been carefully examined (“Preliminary Observations regarding the *Pericope Adulterae* based upon Fresh Collations of nearly all Continuous-Text Manuscripts and all Lectionary Manuscripts Containing the Passage,” *FN* 13 (2000): 35–59).

22. No critical apparatus cites this *v.l.* (although the possibility exists that there are some minuscules that read as such).

23. The MS tradition alternates between μ ωσης and μ ωση.

24. Practically all the μ groups offer some variation at this clause; it may be helpful to present the variants in horizontal-parallel format:

τὸν λιθὸν	επ αὐτῇ	βαλετῷ	TR [μ^7]
	επ αὐτὴν	τὸν λιθὸν	2415 [μ^5]
	επ αὐτὴν	βαλετῷ	[μ^1 pt 2pt 4]
	επ αὐτῇ	τὸν λιθὸν	[μ^1 pt]
	επ αὐτῇ	βαλετῷ τὸν λιθὸν	[μ^2 pt 3]
λιθὸν βαλετῷ	επ αὐτὴν		[μ^6]

25. 8:6C εχωσιν is a case of v-movable and not considered as a true ‘minority’ reading.

26. Occasionally the interchange actually produces a sensible reading, ex. Rom. 5:1 (εχωμεν] εχομεν).

27. It remains to be seen whether the complete collation of the pericope by Robinson will reveal numerous independent **K** strands, or rather many lines of pericope-transmission within a more uniform **K** text.