

THE BYZANTINE
TEXT-TYPE

 &

NEW TESTAMENT
TEXTUAL CRITICISM

HARRY A. STURZ

REPRINT EDITION WITH A NEW
PREFACE BY
DAVID ALAN BLACK

PRAISE FOR *THE BYZANTINE TEXT-TYPE &*
NEW TESTAMENT TEXTUAL CRITICISM

For years I have searched in vain for an affordable copy of Sturz's work on the Byzantine text. It was an important contribution to the field when written and is still referenced. Its arguments need to be taken seriously especially with the renewed appreciation for the Byzantine text in our day. I am delighted to see this reprint and look forward to reading it.

Peter Gurry, PhD

Assistant Professor of New Testament and
Co-Director of the Text & Canon Institute
Phoenix Seminary

When considering how the Byzantine text stream should be analyzed within New Testament textual criticism, Harry Sturz is one of the primary advocates for a more balanced weighing of the textual streams, with his work serving as a great primer on the arguments in favor of a thorough weighing of the Byzantine readings. This work likewise serves as a good introduction to the overall views of those who support the Majority text, although Sturz actually calls more for an equal weighing of the different textual streams versus only picking one of the options, even if that means not picking the Majority text reading. His case is against what is often the practice of NT textual critics, namely the dismissal of Byzantine readings as secondary. Whether one agrees with Sturz's arguments or not, his call for a fairer evaluation of the Byzantine readings is very appropriate. This is the case especially since the application of the Coherence Based Genealogical Method has shown the wisdom of a fairer evaluation of the Byzantine readings as some of those readings are now being accepted into the modern critical text.

Bill Warren, PhD

Pastor, Jacob's Well Baptist Church
Director of the Center for New Testament Textual Studies
Landrum P. Leavell, II, Professor of New Testament and Greek
New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary

The Byzantine text-type has again come to the fore in text-critical discussion, so it is also time to consider again the arguments of Harry Sturz for its independence and early date. Sturz's book provides a clear and methodologically precise argument for the viability of the Byzantine text-type as one of the early text-types of the Greek New Testament. As a result, he threads his way between those who have too quickly dismissed it and those who have heralded it as the earliest or most reliable. Sturz's arguments deserve to be read and considered. I applaud the publishers for bringing this book back into print.

Stanley E. Porter, PhD

President, Dean, and Professor of New Testament, and Roy A.
Hope Chair in Christian Worldview
McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada

Sturz's thesis demonstrated that the Byzantine text-type was as old as the Alexandrian and Western text-type and deserves to be considered. When his work was first published, it was misunderstood by many text critics because they didn't consider Hort's definition of "distinctive Syrian" (Byzantine) readings. According to Hort, a "distinctively" Byzantine reading was one not found in the earliest Greek MSS (at the time Aleph and B), nor in any pre-4th century church father or version. Since then, it has been shown that such readings are present in pre-4th century papyri, unknown to Hort. With this clarification, Sturz's book is definitely relevant to the ongoing quest for the original text of the New Testament.

Abidan Shah, PhD

Pastor, Clearview Church, Henderson, NC

The re-issuing of Harry Sturz's book entitled *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism* comes after its initial publication in 1984. It is timely because it comes shortly after Klaus Wachtel's thesis and his Festschrift (when he was at the Institut für neutestamentliche Textforschung at the University of Münster in Westphalia); both are on the Byzantine text-type (one of the few text-types left standing, especially following his former

institution's decimation of those (often geographical) terms which were found to be wrong.

Earlier, Westcott and Hort's theories undermining that text-type (very successfully in the days following its publication — now nearly 150 years ago) are being examined anew. The continuation of the Byzantine text itself is maintained, thanks largely to Maurice Robinson of the S.E. Baptist Seminary near Wake Forest, North Carolina, where textual studies still have a major role to play.

Sturz's book is made up of one half of introductory remarks and then by a second half that includes indexes and lists. In Sturz's own "day," there was a great feeling for the Anglo-Catholic Anglican Dean, John Burgon and, more recently, albeit far lower on the academic ladder, the acceptance of the alleged musings of Edward Hills and of Wilbur Pickering on these matters by parvenus.

Doubtless, conservative and evangelical scholars readily take those musings, accepting that "if it ain't the King James Version it ain't the Bible" (an instruction which I read to my horror when visiting David Black at S.E. Baptist Seminary and its huge car-parking-lot. (It was there where I read many a transfer [decal] on the automobile's car-bumpers [fenders] proclaiming such a message!)

When I was a student sitting at the feet of the North American textual scholar George Kilpatrick, who by then was the Dean Ireland Professor (the N.T. chair-holder) at the University of Oxford in England, we saw his words greet Sturz's volume on its cover.

I reviewed Sturz's thesis/book in *Novum Testamentum* in 1986 (= volume xxviii, 3 pp. 282-4) and then declared that this volume was most valuable. It has now slipped from view but deserves its re-printing. As with that first hard-back edition of Sturz's book, I am able to say that it is useful, helpful and indeed is revolutionary, despite the many blemishes caused by its poor proof-reading throughout. These mis-typings regrettably are present too in this re-printed version but I do hope that they will not mar what is an interesting and informative volume. I wish it well!

J. K. Elliott

Emeritus Professor of New Testament Textual Criticism
The University of Leeds

THE BYZANTINE
TEXT-TYPE
&
NEW TESTAMENT
TEXTUAL CRITICISM

HARRY A. STURZ

REPRINT EDITION WITH A NEW PREFACE BY
DAVID ALAN BLACK

Energion Publications
Gonzalez, Florida
2022

Copyright © 1984, Harry A. Sturz

Published by arrangement with HarperCollins Christian Publishing, Inc.

Front Matter added for this reprint edition is Copyright © 2022, Energion Publications

Cover Design: Henry E. Neufeld

ISBN: 978-1-63199-806-5

eISBN: 978-1-63199-807-2

Energion Publications

P. O. Box 841

Gonzalez, FL 32560

energion.com

pubs@energion.com

PREFACE

Most people know that my views about New Testament textual criticism have been greatly influenced by my former colleague in the Greek Department at Biola University, Prof. Harry Sturz. Sturz's 1967 dissertation (Th.D., Grace Theological Seminary) was published as *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism*.

It is masterful work. It was written by a scholar for scholars. And it's a reminder of just how unpredictable scholarship can be at times. Just when the coaches thought they had their players set up for an off tackle thrust, someone seizes the ball and carries it on a wide sweep around end. This is precisely what happened when Harry Sturz published his book.

In textual criticism, one enters a discipline that is as much art as it is science, so that what is all too clear to one scholar may be opaque to another. I have known some scholars who also took Harry Sturz's textual criticism class at Biola and who, for a time, were convinced of the correctness of his views, only to leave the Sturzian fold and return to the camp of the Critical Text — much to the joy, I surmise, of the coaching staff.

I have never changed my mind.

Harry Sturz had no personal axe to grind. He neither hoped for nor expected any professional advantages from his work on the Byzantine text. He had been a student of E. C. Colwell when the latter was still teaching at Claremont Graduate School in Southern California. Like Colwell, Sturz always presented his views in a scholarly yet humble way. His work was not a revelation from Mount Sinai but the considered judgment of an intelligent, hard-working scholar. As one reviewer, writing in *Novum Testamentum* (28.3 [1986] 282-83), has put it:

Sturz's book is a carefully documented and painstakingly argued thesis which demonstrates that Westcott and Hort (= WH) were wrong to dismiss the validity of the Byzantine text-type as a legitimate claimant alongside the other text-types to possess the original text.

Much to his credit, Sturz had the temerity to challenge the

status quo and to take up the cudgels of the primary data in search of the truth. His views were (and still are) diametrically opposed to the conception behind the Byzantine Priority view and the Critical Text view alike. With the grim determination of a spawning salmon, he swam up the stream of scholarship. His total sincerity shows through every page of his work. His reputation at Biola was such as to compel respect and attention by all. His conclusion — that the Byzantine text is not edited or secondary in the Westcott-Hort sense — gushed forth from the fountains of his conviction.

I consider *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism* to be extremely fair with the evidence, and whenever I teach textual criticism, I always require it to be read alongside other standard works in the field. Sturz's perspective is, I believe, essential to a correct estimation of the problem. This is all the more important in our day, which is characterized by a burgeoning ambivalence toward all things text-critical. It is the duty of every student of the New Testament to dig up the skeleton of truth, even if only a dozen people in the world care about it.

Harry Sturz was a gentleman to his fingertips. He would never have thought of imposing his ideas upon his students, who held him in awe. He was a beaver for work despite his age. Unlike so many scholars of his day (and ours), he refused to resort to the ark of groupthink, scampering up its gang plank whenever his views were challenged.

Harry Sturz's *The Byzantine Text-Type & New Testament Textual Criticism* is a magnificent *tour de force*. In my opinion, it seriously weakens the arguments of both those who elevate the Byzantine text to a position of unquestioned primacy and those who seek to relegate it to the academic rubbish heap. All in all, it pulls the rug from under a great deal of what passes for scholarship today. It is a dangerous book for a young scholar to read, unless one enjoys coolheaded, impersonal logic. It is a coda to an investigative symphony, and for the symphony I am most grateful, even though it remains unfinished.

David Alan Black
Bradford Hall, Virginia

The Byzantine Text-Type
and
New Testament Textual
Criticism

The Byzantine Text-Type
and
New Testament Textual
Criticism

by Harry A. Sturz



THOMAS NELSON PUBLISHERS
Nashville • Camden • New York

(Title page from the first edition.)

Copyright © 1984 by Harry A. Sturz

All rights reserved. Written permission must be secured from the publisher to use or reproduce any part of this book, except for brief quotations in critical reviews or articles.

Published in the United States in Nashville, Tennessee, by Thomas Nelson, Inc., Publishers and distributed in Canada by Lawson Falle, Ltd., Cambridge, Ontario.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Sturz, Harry A.

The Byzantine text-type and New Testament textual criticism.

Thesis (Th. D)—Grace Theological Seminary, 1967.

Bibliography: p.

Includes indexes.

1. Bible. N.T.—Criticism, Textual. I. Title.

BS2555.2.S78 1984 225.4'8 84-11479

ISBN 978-1-63199-806-5

Contents

Preface.....	9
PART I: CURRENT ATTITUDES TOWARD THE BYZANTINE TEXT	
1. Background	13
2. A Summary of the Argument that the Byzantine Text is Secondary.....	24
3. A Summary of the Argument that the Byzantine Text is Primary.....	32
4. An Examination of the Argument that the Byzantine Text is Primary	37
PART II: REASONS FOR CONSIDERING THAT THE BYZANTINE TEXT IS INDEPENDENT	
Section A: Byzantine Readings Are Old.....	53
5. Distinctively Byzantine Readings Are Found in Early Papyri	55
6. Byzantine-Western Alignments Go Back Into the Second Century Independently and Originate in the East—Not in the West	70
7. The Silence of the Fathers Is Explainable and Therefore Is Not A Proof of Lateness	77
8. The “Conflate” or Longer Readings Are Not A Proof of Lateness.....	82

9. The Composite Nature of the Byzantine Texts Attests the Early Existence of Its Readings Where Its Strands Unite.....	90
10. Summary of Section A.....	95
Section B: The Byzantine Text Is Unedited In The Westcott-Hort Sense	99
11. The Evidence of Section A	101
12. The Significant Provenance of the Byzantine Text- Type	104
13. The Koinē Style of the Byzantine Text-Type.....	107
14. The Conservative Users	115
15. The Silent History	122
16. Summary of Section B	127
Conclusion.....	129
Appendices.....	133
Lists.....	137
1. Papyrus-Byzantine Alignments Opposed by Westerns, Alexandrians, and Westcott-Hort	145
2. Papyrus-Byzantine-Western Alignments Opposed by Alexandrians and Westcott-Hort	160
3. Papyrus-Byzantine-Alexandrian Alignments Followed by Westcott-Hort but Opposed by Westerns.....	175
4. Papyrus-Byzantine Plus Varying Support (Western and/or Alexandrian) but Opposed by Westcott-Hort	188
5. Papyrus-Byzantine Plus Varying Support (Western and/or Alexandrian) Followed Hesitantly by Westcott-Hort	200
Tables	209
1. Papyrus-Byzantine Readings Compared with Alexandrian	211
2. Papyrus-Byzantine Readings Compared with Western.....	212
3. Papyrus-Byzantine Readings Compared with Alexandrian-Western.....	213
4. Papyrus-Byzantine-Western Readings Compared with Alexandrian	217

5. Papyrus-Byzantine-Alexandrian Readings	
Compared with Western	223
Charts	228
1. Number of Occurrences and Relative Percentages	
of Four Basic Alignments	228
2. Numerical and Percentage Summary of Variants	229
3. Additions	229
4. Omissions	230
5. Changes	230
Bibliography	231
Indices To The Bibliography	275
Index To The Text	301

Preface

Widely different views are currently held on the history and usefulness of the type of text represented by the mass of the later manuscripts of the New Testament. Because of this, settling the question of the Byzantine text-type is essential for any student of the New Testament who seeks a means of evaluating external evidence for readings. The crucial nature of the problem is clear from the fact that the “history of the New Testament text” held by the critic largely determines whether he will set aside the testimony of the mass of the MSS or will take it into account in decision-making at places of variation. The “history of the text” he accepts and follows is unavoidably, even if unconsciously, an influential factor in his evaluation of evidence for readings.

His judgment regarding the value and usefulness of the Byzantine text may often make the difference in whether the textual student follows the reading printed in his edited Greek text or prefers a reading the editors have relegated to the critical apparatus. 1) If the critic holds that the Byzantine text represents a late, secondary and corrupt stage of the New Testament and that the Alexandrian text, e.g., best represents the original (Westcott and Hort *et al*), he quite naturally dismisses the Byzantine text from consideration and follows the reading(s) of the Alexandrian text. 2) However, if he holds that the Byzantine represents the “traditional” or original text most accurately, and that other texts are corruptions of it (Burgon *et al*),

he naturally gives the Byzantine supreme authority and the readings of the differing texts are relegated to the apparatus. 3) If, on the other hand, he believes that the "history of the text" is largely untraceable and that none of the text-types or MSS are capable of supplying any real external weight of attestation (Kilpatrick *et al*), his decision-making will rely chiefly upon internal (transcriptional, intrinsic and stylistic) evidence of readings. 4) However, if he believes that each of the main text-types (including the Byzantine) are equally old and relatively independent from each other, he will include the Byzantine testimony along with the others in order to determine external weight and spread of testimony.

The investigation lying behind the original dissertation on which this book is based was to see if there were valid reasons for making use of the Byzantine text-type as an early and independent witness to the text of the New Testament. The investigation having been made and with the conviction that such reasons exist, this treatment seeks to present a case for including the Byzantine text-type in the weighing of external evidence for various readings to the Greek text of the New Testament.

PART I

Current Attitudes Toward the Byzantine Text

CHAPTER I

Background

“Byzantine” refers to that type of text which characterizes the majority of the later Greek uncial, semi-uncial and minuscule manuscripts of the New Testament. It is also the type of text found in the Syriac Peshitta and Gothic versions and in the extant quotations of Church Fathers from Chrysostom on. This text derives its name from the provenance (origin) of most of its manuscripts: the Byzantine Empire. It has, in addition to “Byzantine,” been called: “Antiochian,” after the supposed place of its origin, and the “Lucian Recension,” after its supposed editor. It is Semler’s “Oriental,” Bengel’s “Asiatic,” Griesbach’s “Constantinopolitan,” Westcott and Hort’s “Syrian,” and Burgon’s “Traditional.” Other designations of the same text include: von Soden and Merk’s “K,” standing for “Koine” or “Common” text, Lagrange’s “A,” and Kenyon’s “Alpha.” It is largely the text which lies behind the *Textus Receptus* and the *King James Version*. In this book the Byzantine text will be referred to more or less indiscriminately by the use of several of the above terms, especially those currently being used by writers in this area of study.¹

¹It should be noted that the early and later stages of the Byzantine text are sometimes distinguished by various authors. Westcott and Hort used the term “Constantinopolitan” when they wished to indicate a later “Syrian” text reading where an earlier and later stage might be discerned in the attestation of a passage. In these instances “Syrian” was reserved for the earlier stage. (For an example see Hort’s “Notes on Select Readings,” *The New Testament in the Original Greek*.)

The Byzantine text has had its ups and downs. Especially is this true with regard to what is generally thought of as its chief representative: the *Textus Receptus* (TR). Most textual students of the New Testament would agree that the TR was made from a few medieval Greek manuscripts, mostly Byzantine, of Von Soden's K^x strand. They would further concur that the TR, though it brought the students and translators of the New Testament infinitely closer to the originals than the Latin Vulgate, was far from the pure text of the original autographs. Indeed, it was "the text received by all" and therefore the text used by all.² However, the principal reason for this was probably the fact that it was the only text available to all.

Though voices began to be raised for revision of the TR early in the eighteenth century, its sway was not broken until the nineteenth century. Beginning with Karl Lachmann's bold exclusion of the late manuscripts in publishing his reconstruction of a fourth-century text, efforts continued through the collating and editing labors of Constantine Tischendorf. The climax came with the use of the genealogical argument, which, as applied by Westcott and Hort (WH) gave the *coup de grace* to the Received Text.³ The text of WH then replaced that of the TR, and the reign of the Byzantine text came to an end. From a position of exclusive use, it fell to a place of almost complete disuse. To this day, at least as far as the West is concerned, it has become the least-used text.⁴

Though the scholarly world for the most part accepted the overthrow of the TR and along with it the rejection of the Byzantine text-type, nevertheless the agreement was not unanimous. From the

²Bruce M. Metzger, *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1963). See his chapter on "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible," and especially pages 27:30 for a concise summary of the influence of the Antiochian Text outside the Greek Church.

³For a lucid summary of this transition period and the supplanting of the TR, see Ernest Cadman Colwell, *What is the Best New Testament?* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1952), pp. 16-39; or Kirsopp Lake, *The Text of the New Testament* (6th ed. rev. by Silva New), 13th impression; London: Rivingtons, 1959, pp. 62-73. For a fuller treatment see M. R. Vincent, *A History of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1899), pp. 53-109.

⁴The Eastern Church has consistently resisted attempts to revise its text and versions away from the Byzantine norm. Cf. Robert P. Casey, "A Russian Orthodox View of New Testament Textual Criticism," *Theology*, LX. No. 440 (1957), 50-54.

first there was a reaction on the part of some Biblical scholars led by John William Burgon, Dean of Chichester. He sought to refute the theory of WH and to support the text which lay behind the TR, which he called the "Traditional" text.

Two clear-cut attitudes toward the Byzantine text have persisted since the days of WH and Burgon and are still current today. There are those who follow the theory of WH, and there are some who adopt John Burgon's defense of the Traditional text. These two theories espouse diametrically opposed methods when it comes to the use of the Byzantine text-type in the textual criticism of the New Testament. There seems to be no possibility of harmonizing or reconciling the two viewpoints. Not only are they mutually exclusive, but the adherents of each claim to base their theory on "the facts." For example, Kirsopp Lake concludes his remarks on the theory of WH by saying:

The fact of the "Syrian" revision is merely the deduction which W.H. drew from the facts. If any one can draw any other deduction, well and good. But the facts will not be altered, and they prove that the later text is definitely an eclectic one, posterior in date, as shown by Patristic evidence, both to the Neutral and Western texts.⁵

If anyone thinks that the unyielding stand of Lake (1st edition, 1900, and the 6th edition, 1928) would have no adherents in more recent time, the following statement by Charles Stephens Conway Williams will indicate that the view is still strongly held:

But whether we adopt the hypothesis of a definite revision or that of a gradual process of change in order to account for the existence of the α [i.e. alpha or Byzantine] text, the *fact* of the existence of such a text remains, and its character as a secondary text of relatively late origin must be taken to be one of the established results of criticism [*italics by Williams*].⁶

⁵Lake, p. 72.

⁶"Text of the New Testament," *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings (rev. ed., ed. F. C. Grant and H. H. Rowley; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1963), p. 992.

In direct contrast, the attitude of a modern textual critic who follows in the line of Burgon may be seen in a statement by Edward Hills:

. . . therefore the Byzantine text found in the vast majority of the Greek New Testament manuscripts is that true text. To reject this view is to act unreasonably. It is to fly in the face of the facts.

Those, moreover, who reject this orthodox view of the New Testament text have rejected not merely the facts but also the promise of Christ always to preserve the true New Testament text and the doctrines of the divine inspiration and providential preservation of the Scripture implied in this promise.⁷

These two views are obviously irreconcilable, and it would be impossible for one working with the text to hold both at the same time. Both cannot be true; either one or the other may be correct, or they may both be in error. The writer feels that neither of these two groups is right in its theory of the Byzantine text. Furthermore, it is felt that each of them is over-confident in asserting that the theory he follows is based on established facts. This book seeks to show that the claims of both lack a solid foundation.

A third attitude toward the use of the Byzantine text involves what might be termed the *eclectic approach*. This is held by some, who, because of certain recent discoveries, feel that WH were too severe in their condemnation of the "Syrian" text. They are, therefore, willing to acknowledge that the Byzantine text has preserved early and in rare instances even original readings which somehow have not been retained in the other text-types or in the early uncials. Most of the critics in this category advocate an "eclectic" method of textual criticism. This method endeavors to have no favorite manuscript and no preferred type of text. Those using the method profess to be willing to consider various readings, from whatever source they may come. On the basis of internal criteria, judgment is made between the readings as to which is most likely the original. The eclectic approach, though quite objective in the sense of being will-

⁷John W. Burgon, *The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel According to S. Mark* with an introduction by Edward F. Hills (h.p.: Sovereign Grace Book Club, 1959), pp. 65-66.

ing to consider all readings, is admittedly very subjective in that much depends on the personal element in the evaluation of the evidence. A concise statement of the method, together with a comment on some of its weaknesses, may be found in Robert M. Grant's *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*:

F. C. Grant has listed three basic principles of textual criticism which deserve further analysis. They are these:

- “1. No one type of text is infallible, or to be preferred by virtue of its generally superior authority.
2. Each reading must be examined on its merits, and preference must be given to those readings which are demonstrably in the style of the author under consideration.
3. Readings which explain other variants, but are not contrariwise to be explained by the others, merit our preference; but this is a very subtle process, involving intangible elements, and liable to subjective judgment on the part of the critic.”

Robert Grant evaluates these principles by pointing out that

All three principles, indeed contain a large measure of subjectivity. The first is more valuable negatively than positively; it means basically that all manuscripts and all types of manuscripts may contain errors. The second point introduces literary criticism . . . into textual study, and makes us raise the question whether an author always writes in what we may call his style. If not, the principle is not altogether persuasive. The third brings us in the direction of historical criticism . . . and since it is admittedly subjective we need say no more than that the meaning of “explain” is clearer than the means by which the principle is to be employed.⁸

One of the most thoroughgoing and consistent defenders of the eclectic method is George Dunbar Kilpatrick of Oxford, England, editor of the second edition of the British and Foreign Bible Society's “Nestle Text.”⁹ Kilpatrick seems to be determined to have no favorite text in his application of this method. His stance may be

⁸New York: Harper & Row, 1963, pp. 48-49.

⁹H KAINH ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ (London: 1958).

clearly seen in part of the concluding statement of his article: "An Eclectic Study of the Text of Acts."

The readings which have been examined . . . seem to admit of certain conclusions. We have not sought to decide for one or another kind of text as a whole but have tried to consider each reading on its merits. Where readings remain unclassified we have found that no one text has a monopoly of error or of truth. The same is true for kinds of variation. . . . No manuscript or type of text is uniformly right or wrong.

This conclusion applies as much to the Byzantine text, represented by HLPS and many minuscules, as to the Western text and the Old Uncials. The outright condemnation of the Byzantine text by Westcott and Hort was one of the main errors in practice of their work.¹⁰

Kilpatrick, however, proves to be rather unique in his consistent application of the principle of playing no favorites. He treats readings of the Byzantine text on a plane with those of the other text-types. Other writers and textual scholars have given lip-service to a similar approach, but in practice they do not appear to carry out the theory or the method with consistency, especially with regard to the consideration of Byzantine readings.¹¹

Therefore, for all practical purposes, because of the low esteem in which the text is still held by most critics, a Byzantine reading does not generally receive much consideration even under the eclectic method unless it happens to be attested by an early papyrus or unless it offers the only really acceptable reading among the available variants.

That this is not an overstatement may be seen by an examination of the comments made by the authors of recent works on textual criticism as they discuss the application of method or the eclectic approach in examples of specific passages. The allusions which are made concerning the relative merit of types of texts, and of the Byzantine type in particular, reveal the low opinion in which it is

¹⁰*Biblical and Patristic Studies*, ed. J. Neville Birdsall and Robert W. Thompson (New York: Herder, 1963), p. 76.

¹¹On eclecticism see Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament, Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 175-79; and J. Elliott, E. Epp, G. Fee and J. Ross in the bibliography.

still held by most New Testament scholars. Vincent Taylor, for example, simply ignores the Byzantine evidence in his "Notes on Select Readings."¹² J. Harold Greenlee concedes the possibility that

in some instances the true reading has been lost from the mss. of the other text-types and is preserved only in the Byzantine text. For this reason Byzantine readings must not automatically be rejected without examination.

But, lest anyone gather that he is giving full weight to the K text or its readings, he hastens to add:

At the same time, the general impression which is given by readings which are characteristically Byzantine is that they are inferior and not likely to be original.¹³

Moreover, Greenlee gives no example of such a preserved Byzantine reading in his section on the "Solution of Some New Testament Variants."¹⁴ In fact, as the section is perused, one detects a rather deep-seated bias in favor of the Alexandrian text-type and against both the Byzantine and Western texts. Bruce Metzger, in his chapter on "The Lucianic Recension of the Greek Bible," concludes in part:

The lesson to be drawn from such evidence, however, is that the general neglect of the Antiochian readings which has been so common among many textual critics is quite unjustified.¹⁵

One might gather from the tone of this conclusion that a much more extensive use of the Byzantine text is advocated by him. In his work on the *Text of the New Testament*, which was published after the above article, he does cite a few examples where the Byzantines have preserved the correct reading in his estimation (one of them distinctive).¹⁶ But Metzger, while urging that Antiochian readings

¹²*The Text of the New Testament, A Short Introduction* (London: St. Martin's Press, 1961), pp. 76-107.

¹³*Introduction to New Testament Textual Criticism* (Grand Rapids: 1964), p. 91.

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 114-34.

¹⁵*Chapters*, p. 39.

¹⁶Metzger, *The Text . . .*, pp. 238-239.

should not be neglected, apparently still considers the Byzantine text-type secondary and inferior. He says that "readings which are supported by only Koine or Byzantine witnesses (Hort's Syrian group) may be set aside as almost certainly secondary. . ." ¹⁷

For an earlier description and recommendation of the eclectic method see the discussion by Leo Vaganay, who seeks to steer a middle course in the use of external as well as internal evidence. ¹⁸ Vaganay, however, also joins the prevailing attitude toward the TR saying: "today it seems this famous text is dead at last and, let us hope, forever" (p. 173).

The rise of the eclectic method with its increasing emphasis upon internal criteria coincided with and stemmed mainly from a disenchantment with certain major elements in the theory of WH. ¹⁹ In particular, it is generally agreed that the "Neutral" text of WH is a "will-of-the-wisp" and that even Vaticanus (B), its leading MS, is not "neutral" but shows definite signs of an edited text. ²⁰ In connection with this, the distinction which WH made between the text of \aleph and B (i.e., their "Neutral" text) and what they termed their Alexandrian text is no longer felt to be tenable. Many textual critics add the further criticism that WH's almost complete dismissal of the Western text is unjustified, some even holding that the Western is closer to the original than the Alexandrian. For statements on these changes in attitude toward the theory of WH, see such writers as Sir Frederick G. Kenyon, ²¹ Vaganay, ²² and E. C. Colwell. ²³ Colwell deals a devastating blow to the genealogical method as applied (or rather, as it was not applied) by WH. In his conclusion, he says in part:

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 212.

¹⁸*An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, trans. B. V. Miller (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1937), pp. 91-95.

¹⁹See also J. K. Elliott, "The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus," *Studies and Documents*, vol. 36 (1968), pp. iii and 1-14, in which he faults WH and defends the eclectic method.

²⁰This non-neutrality of the Egyptian text has been set forth by several writers and was extensively demonstrated by Hoskier in his *Codex B and Its Allies, A Study and an Indictment*, (London: Bernard Quariteis, 1914).

²¹*The Text of the Greek Bible* (London: Gerald Duckworth and Co., 1949), p. 171.

²²*An Introduction*, pp. 180-181.

²³"Genealogical Method: Its Achievements and Its Limitations," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, LXVI (1947), pp. 109-133.

No patching will preserve the theory of Westcott and Hort. Kirsopp Lake called it "a failure, though a splendid one" as long ago as 1904; and Ernest von Dobschutz felt that its vogue was over when he published his introduction (1925). But the crowd has not yet followed these pioneers . . .²⁴

Werner Georg Kümmel, in a section where he discusses the present state of New Testament textual criticism, has occasion to say:

Other parts of Westcott-Hort's theory have proved a failure, above all (a) the exaggerated preference for B and the Neutral text, and (b) the general repudiation of the Western text.²⁵

A fourth theory of the use of the Byzantine text-type is the one set forth by Hermann Freiherr von Soden in his *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*.²⁶ It allows a more or less equal status to the Byzantine text-type along with the Alexandrian and what he termed his Iota or "Jerusalem" type. Von Soden reasoned that the manuscripts which support these types of text are the remains of three recensions (edited revisions of the New Testament text) which were executed in different localities during the third and fourth centuries. The I or Iota group represents the recension of Eusebius and Pamphilus in Palestine, the H or Eta group represents the recension of Hesychius in Egypt, and the K or Kappa group represents the recension of Lucian in Antioch.

According to von Soden these three recensions go back to the lost archetype, the I-H-K text, used by Origen, but already corrupted in the second century by Marcion, in the case of the Pauline Epistles, and by Tatian, in the case of the Gospels and Acts. The discovery and elimination of these corruptions bring us to the original text.²⁷

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 132.

²⁵*Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. A. J. Mattill, Jr. and completely re-edited by Werner George Kummel, 14th revised ed. (New York: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 383; *Journal of Bible and Religion*, XXX (1962), pp. 314-315. See article by Harold Hunter Oliver on "Present Trends in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," particularly his remarks in regard to the genealogical method of WH and their attitude toward the Western text.

²⁶I Teil: Untersuchungen, II Abteilung: Die Textformen, Göttingen, 1911.

²⁷Metzger, *The Text*, p. 141.

Von Soden's theory has not had a general acceptance among English, German, or French critics, though some Spanish scholars seem to have found value in it.²⁸

Later, Burnett Hillman Streeter was not persuaded by von Soden's theory of a relatively independent recension of the K text. Streeter, in his work on the Gospels,²⁹ made an advance on the theory of WH as he developed his own theory of "local texts." As for the origin of the Byzantine text, he retained the WH theory that it derived from a recension made at Antioch and was dependent on the other text-types. However, Streeter broadened the theory in order to include Old Antiochian readings. This made a third source in addition to the Alexandrian (combining Hort's Neutral and Alexandrian) and the Western text-types. The editors at Antioch obtained these Old Antiochian readings, not so much from old Greek manuscripts preserved in and around Antioch, as from early translations which had been made into Syriac. Therefore, according to Streeter, the Old Antiochian readings, which contributed to Lucian's revision, are found now in the Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac.³⁰ Though Streeter acknowledges that "it is probable that some of the readings of the Lucianic text which do not appear in the Syriac were derived from the old text of Antioch,"³¹ he does not place much weight on this, as is evident from his chart and his discussion. Streeter, along with the writers mentioned above, abandoned WH's idea of a "Neutral" text.³² In addition, Streeter also questioned some of WH's criteria for internal evidence of readings;

²⁸See the article by Kurt Aland: "The Present Position of New Testament Textual Criticism," *Studia Evangelica*, ed. K. Aland, F. L. Cross and others (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), p. 721; Metzger's; "Recent Spanish Contributions to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament," *Chapters . . .*, pp. 136-141; and John R. Janeway, *An Investigation of the Textual Criticism of the New Testament Done by Spanish Scholars, with Special Relation to the Theories and Text of WH* (unpublished dissertation, University of Southern California, 1958), pp. 164-165, 320-325 and other scattered references.

²⁹*The Four Gospels a Study of Origins, Treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, & Dates* (eighth impression; London: Macmillan and Co., 1953).

³⁰See charts of his own and WH's theory (*The Four Gospels*, p. 26) which graphically illustrate this point. Note also his discussion of the revision by Lucian, especially pp. 112-119.

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 119.

³²Cf. his section on the recension of Hesychius *Ibid.*, pp. 121-127.

he speaks, for example, of the "the fallacy of the shorter text."³³

While WH's theory of a "Neutral" text and their attitude toward the Western text has been abandoned by many scholars, Hort's theory of the "Syrian" text still dominates the field. Moreover, those scholars who follow the "eclectic" approach (i.e., of choosing readings on the basis of internal criteria) usually feel free to reject the points of WH's theory that have been mentioned. At the same time, however, probably a majority of them continue to share WH's view that the Byzantine text is secondary in nature and dependent upon the Alexandrian and Western texts.

While those who follow WH in this matter characterize the "Syrian" as the worst and most useless text for help in recovering the original, the followers of Burgon, contrariwise, maintain that the Byzantine is the best text, the "traditional text," and the text which most closely represents the original.

Because of this clear-cut antithesis, and the irreconcilable nature of these two viewpoints, together with the fact that the theory of WH in regard to the Byzantine text seems to hold the predominant position in the western world, the approach of the next chapter will be to outline the theory of WH with regard to the K text. Following this, in Chapter 3, the rebuttal to WH by Burgon and Hills is reviewed. Chapter 4 indicates reasons for turning away from the position of Burgon and Hills. In Part 2 reasons are presented for believing that the Byzantine text-type, though it may not necessarily be considered the "best" or the "standard" text as is contended by Burgon's followers, nevertheless should not be set aside as insisted upon by the theory of WH. Part 2 seeks to show that the Byzantine text should be recognized as having an important and useful place in textual criticism because it is an independent witness to an early form of the New Testament text.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 131 ff.

LIST I

Papyrus-Distinctively Byzantine Alignments Opposed by Westerns, Alexandrians, and Westcott and Hort

MATTHEW

- 26:22 εκαστος αυτων (*p*³⁷)*p*⁴⁵AWΓΔ(Θ)ΠΣΦ 074 unc⁸ λ φ 28
565 700 1241 1582 *pl sy*^p Eus *K* ς
εισ εκαστος ΝBCLZ 33 102 892 sa eth (it vg); WH
εισ εκαστος αυτων DM(Θ) *al*¹⁰ *sy*^{pmg} bo
εισ αυτων 1200 1424
————— *p*⁶⁴ (Or)

MARK

- 5:42 εξεστησαν *p*⁴⁵AWΘΠΣ unc⁹ λ φ 565 700 *pl* it vg sy sa
geo *K* ς
εξεστησαν ευθυσ ΝBCLΔ 33 579 892 co eth; WH
εξεστησαν παντες D c ff² g² i q gat bo (1 ms)
6:2 εν τη συναγωγη διδασκειν *p*⁴⁵ANWΠΣΦ unc⁹ *pl* λ φ
28 565 700 1071 g^{1,2} i q vg go *K* ς
διδασκειν εν τη συναγωγη ΝBCDLΔΘ 33 569 579 892
f ff² sa bo sy arm; WH
6:45 απολυση *p*⁴⁵AE²FHMSUVWΠ 33 *pm* *K* ς
απολυει ΝBL(DΔ) 1 *H*; WH
απολυσει (D?)E*ΚΓ φ 28 700 *al*
απελυσεν Θ 565 *pc*

Note: For the discussion on readings such as these in List I see pp. 61-69. For the arrangement and content of the Lists, see pp. 137-143.

- 6:48 ειδεν *p*⁴⁵EFGHSUΓΠ² λ φ 565 700 *pm sy arm eth K* ς
 (ιδεν iticism? AKMVXΠ* *al*)
 ιδων *NBDΛWΘ* *pc a b f ff² q vg co H; WH*
- 6:50 ειδον (or ιδον iticism) (*P*⁴⁵)AKLMVXΓΔΠ *pl K* ς
 ειδαν *NB; WH*
 _____ (_____ γαρ αυτον also) *DΘ* 565 700 *a b*
c ff² i q
- 7:12 και ουκετι αφιετε *p*⁴⁵AWXΓΠ *unc*⁹ 579 *pl f g² vg go sy*
arm K ς
 ουκετι αφιετε *NBDΘ* λ φ 565 700 *pc a b c ff² i q co eth*
H; WH
 ουκ εναφιεται *D*
- 7:30 το δαιμ. εξελ. και την θυγ. βεβλ. *p*⁴⁵ANWXΠ *unc*⁹ φ
pl a n sy^p go arm K ς
 το παιδ. (την θυγ. Δ λ 700) βεβλ. . . και το δαιμ. εξελ.
NB(D)LD(Θ)(λ) 565 (700) *al¹⁵ it^{pl} vg co sy eth H; WH*
- 7:30 επι τησ κλινησ *p*⁴⁵W λ φ 33 565 *pl K* ς
 επι την κλινην *NBD* *pc; WH*
 υπο την κλινην *L*
- 7:31 και σιδωνοσ ηλθε *p*⁴⁵ANWXΓΠ *unc*⁹ λ φ *pl q sy^{sp} go*
arm (sa) K ς
 ηλθεν δια σιδωνοσ *NBDLDΘ* 33 565 700 *it(exc q) vg*
co sy^h eth; WH
- 7:32 μογιλαλον *p*⁴⁵ALNXΓΠ *unc*⁹ λ φ *pl co sy^{sp} go*
(arm) K ς
 και μογιλαλον *NBDWΔΘ* 565 700 *pc it vg (arm)*
eth; WH
- 7:35 ευθεωσ *p*⁴⁵AEFGHKMNSUVWXΓΘΠ 0132 λ φ 565
 700 *pl c f l vg sy^{sp} (sa) go eth arm K* ς
 _____ *NBDLD* 33 *pc a b ff² iq co; WH*
- 7:35 διηνοιχθησαν *p*⁴⁵ANXΓΠ 0132 *unc*⁹ φ 579 *pm K* ς
 ηνοιγησαν *NBDΔ* λ; *WH*
 ηνοιχθησαν *L*
 διηνοιγησαν *WΘ* 565 700 *pc*
- 7:36 αυτοσ αυτοισ *p*⁴⁵EFGHKMNSUVΓΠ φ *pl sy go*
arm eth K ς
 αυτοισ *NABLWXΔΘ; WH*
- 9:6 ησαν γαρ εκφοβοι *p*⁴⁵AKNUWXΓΠΦ *unc*⁹ λ φ 700 *pl*
f l g^l vg sy^p co go K ς

- εκφ. γαρ εγενοντο NBCDLΔΘ 33 565 *pc it^{pl}*; WH
 9:20 ευθεωσ το πνευμα *p⁴⁵AINWXΓΘΠΦ unc⁹ λ φ 700 pl σ*
 το πνευμα ευθυσ NBCLΔ 33 *pc*; WH
 το πνευμα D a b ff² i q
 9:20 εσπαραξεν *p⁴⁵AINWXΓΘΠ unc⁹ λ φ 565 700 pl K σ*
 συνεσπαραξεν NBCLΔ 33; WH
 εταραξεν D
 12:6 αγαπητον αυτου *p⁴⁵ANWXΓΠΦ unc⁹ λ φ 28 pl K σ*
 αγαπητον NBCDLΔ 565 700 a b ff² g^{1,2} i l q vg sa co
 sy; WH
 12:16 ειπον *p⁴⁵NXΓΘΠ unc⁹ λ φ pl K σ*
 ειπαν NBCDLWΔ *pc*; WH
 λεγουσι A b d i l q vg

LUKE

- 6:28 καταρωμενουσ υμιν *p⁷⁵EHLSUVΔΘΛ pm Just*
 (Or) *K σ*
 καταρ. υμασ SABDKMPRXΓΞΠ *al* (Or) Eus; WH
 6:39 δε *p⁴⁵[p⁷⁵]APΓΔΛΠ unc⁷ pl co go sy^p K σ*
 δε και [p⁷⁵]NBCDLRWXΘΞ φ 33 *pc it^{pl} vg arm*; WH
 9:30 μωσησ *p⁴⁵AEGHMPSUVΓΛ λ pm (K) σ*
 μωσησ (*p⁷⁵*)NBCDKLRWXΔΘΠ φ *al*; WH
 10:21 τω πνευματι *p⁴⁵AEGHMSUVWΓΔΛ φ pl f g bo^{pt} Cl*
 Bas Cyr *K σ*
 τω πν. τω αγιω *p⁷⁵NBCDKLXΞΠ λ 33 al⁵ a b c e ff² i l*
 sy^c, h arm eth; WH
 10:39 του ιησου *p⁴⁵p⁷⁵(—του) AB³C²PWΓΔΘΛΠ unc⁹ λ φ pl b*
 sy^{ptxt} Bas *K σ*
 του κυριου *p³NB*C*DLΞ pc it(exc b) vg co sy^c, pmg arm*
 eth; WH
 11:12 η και εαν *p⁴⁵AWXΓΔΘΛΠ unc⁹ pl K σ (AΘΛ pc αν)*
 η και *p⁷⁵NBL λ φ 33 (item sa bo nil nisi aut)*; WH
 εαν δε και D (d et si)
 η ει R (it vg aut si)
 11:12 αιτηση *p⁴⁵EFGMSUVWXΠ φ pm K σ*
 αιτησει *p⁷⁵NABCDHKLΓΔΘΛ λ pm Dial H*; WH
 11:33 το φεγγοσ *p⁴⁵ALWΓΔΛΠ unc⁸ 28 33 pm K σ*
 το φωσ *p⁷⁵NBCDXΘ al H*; WH
 11:50 εκχουομενον *p⁷⁵HKMSVXΓΘΛ λ pl K σ*

TABLES

In an effort to obtain a complete picture of the kinds of early Byzantine readings, all the papyrus-Byzantine readings in each of the major alignments of the first three lists were tabulated.¹ Five tables were necessary in order to tabulate the readings for the three lists. The charts which follow the tables summarize the data given in the tables.

Tables 1 through 3 constitute a breakdown of the three kinds of alignments in List 1, those with the papyrus-supported distinctively Byzantine readings. Three tables are needed here in order to set off the differences because distinctively Byzantine readings are not supported by either the Alexandrian or the Western text. As these two ancient texts stand against the Koine (K), they are at times separate from each other, but often they are together in their opposition, particularly where the text divides into but two readings, one of which is read by K.

Therefore, in the places in List 1 where the Alexandrian and Western texts are separate, Table 1 delineates K's variation from the Alexandrian text-type. Table 2 gives the papyrus-supported Byzan-

¹Inasmuch as Lists 4 and 5 involve less clear-cut alignments, they therefore have no firm textual basis of comparison (i.e., from which the Pap-Byz- + varied) which would show up meaningfully in a table. For this reason Lists 4 and 5 were not tabulated.

tine variants as over against the Western. In Table 3 are found the kinds of variations in distinctively Byzantine readings when the two other traditions are combined against it. Table 4 gathers its material from List 2—those papyrus-Byzantine readings which were aligned with the Western text but opposed by the Alexandrians and WH. Table 5 gathers the statistics on kinds of readings involved in List 3, where Papyrus-Byzantine-Alexandrian alignments are followed also by WH but opposed by the Westerns.

The table 1 shows the kinds of variants in Papyrus-supported Byzantine readings (PB) as compared with opposing Alexandrian readings (where the Alexandrian reading is separate from the Western). The other abbreviations and symbols used in this and the other tables are as follows: *art* = article, *pro* = pronoun, *con* = conjunction, *oth* = other (other word or words), form = the same basic word but a different form of it), word = a substitution of a different word which may or may not be a synonym; wo = word order (a different arrangement of the same words); x = substitution and/or addition or omission of more than one word and often accompanied by some change in word order.²

²Tables 1-3 are compiled from List 1.

Table 1: Papyrus-Byzantine versus Alexandrian

<u>Reference</u>	<u>PB adds:</u> <u>art pro con oth</u>	<u>PB omits:</u> <u>art pro con oth</u>	<u>PB subst.:</u> <u>form word</u>	<u>wo x</u>
Matt. 26:22	x	x		
Mark 5:42		x		
6:45			x	
6:48			x	
6:50			x	
7:30				x
9:20			x	
12:17	x		x	
Luke 11:12	x			
12:30			x	
24:47			x	
John 5:37			x	
6:57			x	
7:39	x			
9:28		x		
10:19	x			
10:31	x			
11:19	x			
11:21				x
11:32				x
12: 9		x		
13:26			x x	
14: 5	x			x
19: 4			x	x
19:35				x
Acts 10:37			x	
16:39			x	
Rom. 16:23				x
I Cor. 9:21		x	x	

Table 1 (cont.)

<u>Reference</u>	<u>PB adds:</u> <u>art pro con oth</u>	<u>PB omits:</u> <u>art pro con oth</u>	<u>PB subst.:</u> <u>form word</u>	<u>wo x</u>
Phil. 1:14		x		
Heb. 10:38		x		

The table below shows the kinds of variants in Papyrus-supported Byzantine readings (PB) as compared with opposing Western readings (where the Western reading is separate from the Alexandrian):

Table 2: Papyrus-Byzantine versus Western

<u>Reference</u>	<u>PB adds:</u> <u>art pro con oth</u>	<u>PB omits:</u> <u>art pro con oth</u>	<u>PB subst.:</u> <u>form word</u>	<u>wo x</u>
Matt. 26:22		x		
Mark 5:42		x		
6:45			x	
6:48			x	
6:50		x		
7:30				x
9:20			x	
12:17			x	
Luke 11:12			x	x
12:30			x	
24:47			x	
John 5:37		x		
6:57			x	
7:39		x		
9:28		x		
10:19	x			
10:31	x			
11:19	x	x		

Charts

The following charts are an attempt to draw some statistical conclusions based on the preceding tables of the four basic textual alignments. As in the tables, the charts will use the following symbols: PB = papyrus readings supporting the Byzantine text; A = the Alexandrian text; and W = the Western text. Thus PB/A/W means the Papyrus-Byzantine readings are being compared against the Alexandrian where it differs from the Western readings (see Tables 1 and 2). This aligning of textual readings is also done for PB/AW, PBW/A, and PBA/W (see Tables 3, 4, and 5 respectively).

Chart 1 shows the number of occurrences for each alignment considered in the Tables and the percentage of the total variants each table represents.

Chart 1

<u>Tables</u>	<u>Readings Compared</u>	<u>Number of Occurrences</u>	<u>Percentage of Total</u>
1-2	PB/A/W	31	6.3
3	PB/AW	121	24.7
4	PBW/A	169	34.4
5	PBA/W	170	34.6
	Total:	491	100.0%

Chart 2 shows the number and the relative percentages for each basic textual alignment. The total is greater here than Chart 1 because some verses contain more than one variant. As in the Tables, Chart 2 uses the following symbols: *Add* = a word is added to a reading; *Omit* = a word is omitted; *word* and *form* = either a word form is changed or a word is substituted by a synonym; *x* = substitution and/or addition of more than one word.

Chart 2

<u>Table</u>	<u>Readings Compared</u>	<u>Add</u>	<u>Omit</u>	<u>word form</u>	<u>wo</u>	<u>x</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	PB/A	8	7	15	4	3	37
2	PB/W	6	9	11	6	4	36
3	PB/AW	28	20	64	16	0	128
4	PBW/A	53	34	72	24	2	185
5	PBA/W	<u>50</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>184</u>
	Totals:	145	101	235	71	18	570
1	PB/A	21.6	18.9	40.5	10.8	8.2	100. %
2	PB/W	16.7	25.0	30.6	16.7	11.1	100. %
3	PB/AW	21.9	15.6	50.0	12.5	0.0	100. %
4	PBW/A	28.6	18.4	38.9	12.9	1.1	100. %
5	PBA/W	<u>27.2</u>	<u>16.8</u>	<u>39.7</u>	<u>11.4</u>	<u>4.8</u>	<u>100. %</u>
	Average Percentages:	23.2	18.9	39.9	12.9	5.0	100. %

Charts 3-5 analyze more specifically the nature of the variants among the alignments. For additions and omissions (Charts 3 and 4), the particular variants listed for each alignment are articles (*art*), pronouns (*pro*), conjunctions (*con*), and other miscellaneous changes (*oth*). Chart 5 shows the numbers of form and word changes for each alignment.

Chart 3: Additions

<u>Table</u>	<u>Readings Compared</u>	<u>art</u>	<u>pro</u>	<u>con</u>	<u>oth</u>	<u>Total</u>
1	PB/A	0	1	2	5	8
2	PB/W	1	0	1	4	6
3	PB/AW	4	6	6	12	28