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By REV. S. W. WHITNEY, A.M.

Πάντα δοκιμάστε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε
Prove all things; hold fast that which is good

BOSTON
SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
1892
PREFACE.

In the minds of some, if not of most, of the careful readers of the R. V.1 of the New Testament, the question involuntarily arises here and there whether the variations from the Received Text, which the Revisers have introduced into their Greek Text are altogether proper and really trustworthy; in other words, whether the new readings adopted by them, as far as can now be determined, are all genuine readings, and consequently worthy of universal and hearty acceptance. To this question the author addresses himself in the following pages; and the aim of the work here presented to the reader is to give as clear a conception as is possible of the true nature of the changes that have been introduced. To do this, the author has found it necessary to adduce the so-called ancient authorities for many of the changes that the Revisers have made, together with the authorities that support the rejected readings; so that those who may not have the means of otherwise getting at the facts in the case may be able to judge for themselves respecting the genuineness and value of the new readings.

Most of the examples considered are necessarily such as appear to the author to be readings of questionable genuine-

1 It is hardly necessary to say that the abbreviations A. V. and R. V. in the following pages denote respectively the Authorized Version and the Revised Version.
ness. While his readers may not accept every conclusion at which he has arrived, there can be but little question that most of them will agree with him that the Revisers' Greek Text is far from being perfect. They may even find good reason for believing that, as a whole, it is less trustworthy than the best editions of the commonly accepted Text; and that, as a necessary consequence, a well-tested and more generally accepted Greek Text of the New Testament must be agreed upon before we can really look for any further satisfactory revision of the English Version of the New Testament.

The reader must not suppose, however, that every apparently false reading in the Revisers' Greek Text has been brought under review. Numerous instances remain unnoticed, which are just as truly false readings as any that have been examined, though generally less important or noteworthy than the most of these. At almost every turn, one or more spurious readings appear in the Revisers' Greek, which need to be corrected or eliminated before a proper English text can be obtained from it. These must be left for other hands to bring to light, if the work is to be done at all. It is by no means an enviable task; but it needs to be performed. It should be undertaken and carried on, however, with extreme care, great wisdom, a large acquaintance with Biblical facts, a thorough experimental knowledge of divine truth, and, if possible, with perfect freedom from bias.

These pages have been prepared with special reference to readers of English, or such as are not altogether at home in Greek. Hence, where Greek words have been introduced, the corresponding English will generally be found accompanying them. In many instances, as far as could well be done, English representatives alone have been given. This placing of the English in connection with the Greek word, while enhancing the value of the work to readers generally, whose acquaintance with the original might not be such as to enable them readily to grasp the meaning without the aid of a lexicon, of course has added to the bulk of the volumes. But most readers will not object to this.

Conscious that the work is but imperfectly performed, the author nevertheless ventures upon its publication, and does it with the earnest hope and prayer that others may be edified and blest in the perusal of it. If any shall be led, through what they may herein find, to a more intelligent and just estimate of the true character and value of our English Version, and especially to desire and labor for a still more correct version, the author will be richly rewarded for his toils.

In closing this Preface, the writer desires thus publicly to acknowledge his indebtedness to the Rev. Henry C. Graves, D.D., of New Bedford, for many valuable suggestions, and especially for suggesting and preparing the General Index at the close of these volumes. For that portion of the work, the reader is indebted to him; and no one who knows how to appreciate a well-made Index can fail to unite with the author in hearty thanks to him for the genuine service he has thus rendered in making the volumes more complete and acceptable than they could otherwise have been.

S. W. WHITNEY.

TAUNTON, MASS., March, 1891.
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THE UNCIAL MANUSCRIPTS.

The following is a list, with brief descriptions, of the Uncial (or Square-letter) Manuscripts to which references are made in the following pages. The accounts given of them have been condensed from Tischendorf and Scrivener.

A. Codex Alexandrinus, in the British Museum, presented to Charles I. in 1668 by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch first of Alexandria, then of Constantinople. Contains the Septuagint almost complete, the whole New Testament, except Matthew i. - xxx., 6, and John vi. 50 - viii. 52. Dated from the middle of the 5th century or earlier; in corrected in a few places by later hands. May have been written at Alexandria. "It exhibits, especially in the Gospels, a text more nearly approaching that found in later copies than is found in most of its high antiquity." — Scrivener.

B. Codex Vaticanus, in the Vatican Library at Rome. Published in 1648. "Hug and others have referred the origin of Codex B to Egypt." — Scrivener. Contains nearly all the Septuagint and all the New Testament except Hebrews ix. 14 to end, i and ii Timothy, Titus, Philemon, Revelation; these are found in it indeed, but supplied by a late hand, probably of the 15th century. First hand, of the 4th century, probably Alexandrine. Tischendorf thinks that the copyist who wrote out this MS. was one of the two scribes who produced the original Sinaitic MS., of the New Testament. Corrected in some places by later hands of the 4th or 5th century, and of the 10th or 11th century.

C. Codex Ephraemi Syri Rescriptus. So called because certain tracts by St. Ephraem the Syrian had been copied upon it above the old writing. Now in the National Library at Paris. Mutilated, containing about half the New Testament, no single book being entire. First hand, of the 5th century, Alexandrine, or at least Egyptian, Tischendorf thinks; later, of the 6th century, apparently Syrian or Egyptian, and of 4th century, Constantinopolitan.

D. (Gospels and Acts.) Codex Bezae. In the University Library at Cambridge; presented to the University in 1581 by Theodore Beza. Contains the Gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin, except a few chapters. The first hand, of the 6th century. Some of the missing portions are supplied, "perhaps from the original leaves," by a hand of about the 10th century. Has many words and some passages not found in other MSS.


F. (Epistles.) Codex Basilensis, in the Public Library at Basle, apparently brought thither from Constantinople. Contains the Gospels, except a few verses of Luke. 8th century.
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G (Epistles). Codex Boernerianus; in the Royal Library at Dresden. Contains the Pauline Epistles, except the Hebrews, with some omissions. It has much resemblance to Codex Augiensis, F., and Scrivener believes that both were copied from one MS, some centuries older than either. Date, late in the 9th century.

H (Gospels). Codex Andre. Seidelli, now at Hamburg. Contains the Gospels, with many omissions. 9th century.


L (Gospels). Codex Parisiensis Regius. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the Gospels, except a few passages. 8th century. Has "a strong resemblance to Codex B; but is carelessly written, and abounds with errors of the ignorant scribe, and in what are termed Alexandrian forms beyond any other copy of its date." — Scrivener.


M (Gospels). Codex Campianus; in the National Library at Paris. Contains the four Gospels complete. Latter part of the 9th century. "Its readings are very good." — Scrivener.

N (Gospels). Codex Purpureus. Fragments; four leaves in the British Museum; six in the Vatican; two at Vienna; and others at the Monastery of St. John in Patmos. Of the 6th century.


P (Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse). Codex Purpureus, at St. Petersburg. 9th century MS.


R (Gospels). Codex Tischendorfis ii. Fragments of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles from seven different MSS. The first two, of the 5th; the next three, of the 6th; and the remaining two, of the 7th century. "The first five fragments must be placed in the highest rank as critical authorities." — Scrivener.
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T1, T2 Fragments of John and Matthew, at St. Petersburg. 6th century.

T Among the Borghian MSS. at Rome. A fragment of a Greek and Thaebic Lexiconary of the 7th century. Contains small portions of Matthew, Mark, and John.


W (Gospels). Codex Mosquensis. Of the 9th century.

W This letter, with the additional small letters from a to i, embraces a number of small fragments of the Gospels, belonging to the 8th and 9th centuries.

X (Gospels). Codex Montecassinii, in the University Library at Munich. Contains the four Gospels, with many defects. Of the 8th or 10th century.

Y Codex Barberini, at Rome. A fragment, of the 5th century, containing John viii. 3-19, vii. 41.

Z Codex Palimpsestus Dublinensis. In the Library of Trinity College, Dublin. Passages of Chrysostom and Epiphanius written over the old writing, in a hand of the 10th century or later. Contains part of Matthew. 6th century.


Δ (i.e. Delta). Codex Sangallensis. In the Monastery of St. Gall in N.E. Switzerland. Contains the Gospels, except part of John. "Written by Latin (most probably by Irish) monks in the west of Europe during the 9th century." — Scrivener.

Θ (i.e. Theta). This letter includes eight small fragments of the Gospels, extending from the 6th to the 9th or 10th century. At St. Petersburg.


Ξ (i.e. Sigma). Codex Rossanensis, in the Archbishop's Library at Rossano, in Calabria. Of the 6th century, if not earlier.
A LIST
OF
Ecclesiastical Writers and Patristic Writings Referred to or Cited in the Following Pages.

The italicized names denote Latin in distinction from Greek writers. The dates annexed indicate generally the death of the writers referred to.

Ambrose, Bp. of Milan . . . . 397
Ambrosiaster (i.e. Hilary the Deacon) . . . . 3d century.
Ammonius of Alexandria . fl. 220
Anastasius . . . . 401
Andreas of Cesaerea in Cappadocia . . . . 5th century.
Andreas of Cretae . . . . 635
Antiochus . . . . 7th century.
Aphraates the Persian, a Syrian Bp. . . . . 345
Apostolic Constitution . . . . 3d and 4th century.
Arethas, Bp. of Cesaerea in Cappadocia . . . . 10th century.
Arius . . . . 336
Arnobius . . . . 306
Athanasius, Bp. of Alexandria . . . . 373
Augustine, Bp. of Hippo . . . . 430
Basil the Great, of Cesaerea in Cappadocia . . . . 379
Basil of Sebaste . . . . 400
Bede, the Venerable . . . . 735
Cesarius of Constantiopolis . . . . 368
Cassiodorus, a monk of Italy, about 565
Chrysostom, Bp. of Constantinople . . . . 407
Clement of Rome . . . . 102
Clement of Alexandria . . . . 194
Cosmas Indicopleustes of Alexandria . . . . 535
Cyprian, Bp. of Carthage . . . . 258
Cyril, Bp. of Jerusalem . . . . 386
Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria, De Promissiomibus, etc., 4th century.
Didymus of Alexandria . . . . 395
Dionysius, Bp. of Corinth . . . . 170-180
Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria . . . . 265
Ephraem Syrus . . . . 378
Epiphanius, Bp. of Cyprus . . . . 403
Eulogius of Alexandria . . . . 581
Eusebius, Bp. of Cesarea . . . . 340
Eusebius of Hermopolis . . . . 360
Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch . . . . 337
Euthalius, Bp. of Sulca . . . . 458
Eutherius of Tyana . . . . 419
Euthymius Zigabenus . . . . 1119
Fulgentius, Bp. of Ruspe . . . . 533
Germanus, Abp. of Constantinople . . . . 715
Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bp. of Neocesarea . . . . 270
Gregory, Bp. of Nazianzus . . . . 389
Gregory, Bp. of Nyssa . . . . 396
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A.D.

Bp. of Halberstadt . . . . 583
Bp. of Poictiers . . . . 367
Bp. of Portus (Romanus) . . . . 237
Bp. of Antioch . . . . 197
Bp. of Lyons . . . . 432
Isidore of Pelusium . . . . 420
Eusebius, Patriarch of Constantinople . . . . 485
Pseudo-Caesarius . . . . 7th century.
Polemeus, the Gnostic, 2d century.
Questions ex utroque Testamento . . . . 379
Rufinus of Aquileia . . . . 410
Seclusius . . . . 5th century.
Severianus, a Syrian Bp. . . . . 409
Severus of Antioch . . . . 530

A.D.

Porphyry . . . . 233-305
Primasius, Bp. of Aedunum, fl. 550
Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople . . . . 485
Pseudo-Caesarius . . . . 7th century.
Polemeus, the Gnostic, 2d century.

Bp. of Portus (Romanus) . . . . 237
Bp. of Antioch . . . . 197
Bp. of Lyons . . . . 432
Isidore of Pelusium . . . . 420
Eusebius, Patriarch of Constantinople . . . . 485
Pseudo-Caesarius . . . . 7th century.
Polemeus, the Gnostic, 2d century.
Questions ex utroque Testamento . . . . 379
Rufinus of Aquileia . . . . 410
Seclusius . . . . 5th century.
Severianus, a Syrian Bp. . . . . 409
Severus of Antioch . . . . 530

A.D.

Tatian of Antioch . . . . 172
Terulian . . . . 220
Theodore, Bp. of Mopsuestia in Cilicia . . . . 428
Theodore, Bp. of Cyrillus in Syria . . . . 458
Theodosius of Ancyra . . . . 439
Theophylact, Abp. of Bulgaria, 1108
The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles . . . . 120
Thichonius, the Donalist . . . . fl. 390
Titus, Bp. of Bostra . . . . 375
Victor of Antioch . . . . 375
Victor of Turin . . . . 565
Victrinus, Bp. of Petai in Austria . . . . 304
"All those rules which have for their basis a practicable and actual classification of manuscripts, and which assign peculiar weight to some in consequence of belonging to a particular class, I must regard as little better than a petitio principii in the whole matter of New-Testament Criticism. *Lis sub judice:* and, while it is so, and is confessedly and plainly so in the judgment of so many impartial and enlightened critics, why should we speak, and argue, and lay down rules, as if it were not so?" — Moses Stuart.

INTRODUCTION.

The Greek text from which the so-called Authorized Version of the English New Testament was made is commonly called the Textus Receptus, or Received Text. This text, in the main, is supported by the Greek manuscripts, as a whole, and by the versions and Fathers generally. With here and there a variation, it has been the generally accepted Greek text of the New Testament for the last eight or ten centuries at least. That from which the Revised English Version of 1881 was made is called, by way of distinction, the Revisers' Text. This, as far as its peculiarities are concerned, is founded, in the main, upon certain readings of less than half a dozen, and sometimes of only one or two, of the oldest extant Greek manuscripts in connection with such later ones and such versions and patristic writings as may correspond with them and support or seem to support their readings. A few moments' comparison of these two Greek texts with each other reveals many differences of greater or less importance between them. The plea in behalf of the alterations found in the Revisers' Text is, that between the first and the tenth or twelfth century changes were gradually introduced until the text became so largely corrupted as to need to be corrected by returning to the readings found in the oldest manuscripts, versions, and Fathers. These changes are of two kinds: (1) such as are supposed to be due to pure accident, and (2) such as seem to have been intentionally made by copyists and others.

In regard to the first of these classes, it is said that universal
experience has proved that nothing is more difficult than to get any large amount of copying done with absolute correctness. Transcribers will, through incompetence or carelessness, make mistakes. This is true in reference to the copyists of all ancient manuscripts; and it has given rise to many differences between the earlier and the later manuscripts of the New Testament. In other words, repeated transcription involves multiplication of errors; and the inference is that a relatively late text is a relatively corrupt text.

This reasoning is plausible, and to a certain extent, no doubt, true. But it is true only in reference to mere transcription. While much of the copying of New-Testament manuscripts was unquestionably performed blindly and mechanically, there is abundant evidence that much, especially after the fourth century, was carefully and critically done,—the transcribers acting the part of editors as well as of copyists, comparing the various manuscripts in their possession, and following those readings which, according to their best judgment, embodied the true text. Some manuscripts, in fact, like Codices 20 and 300, contain the record that they have been collated with ancient and approved copies. This well-known endeavor among copyists after the fourth and especially after the fifth century resulted in what was really a purer, more uniform, and far more correct text than many earlier manuscripts presented. It produced what Dr. Hort is pleased to call “an eclectic fusion of the texts of different exemplars.” But it is only what Westcott and Hort themselves did in their “attempt to present exactly the original words of the New Testament”; for, while these modern editors adhered, as far as they could, to the text of a single ancient Greek manuscript, they found themselves compelled to depart therefrom in multitudes of instances, and might well have done it in very many more. In other words, many if not most later ancient copyists were governed by the same motives as modern editors are in their endeavors to present the best available text. In this way very many errors introduced both accidentally and intentionally by earlier critics and copyists were eliminated by their successors, and are unknown to later manuscripts.

Again; it is well known that the greatest departures from the original text, the greatest deprivations of the New-Testament writings, were made in the second and third centuries, and are, many of them, preserved to us only in the earliest extant Greek manuscripts, or in the oldest versions and patristic writings, which date even farther back than the earliest known manuscripts. Within less than half a century after the last of the New-Testament Scriptures had been committed to writing, heretics began their work of corrupting the text by introducing additions, omitting portions not to their liking, and making various other alterations. The Gnostics Basilides (A.D. 134), Valentinus (A.D. 140), and Marcion (A.D. 150), during the middle of the second century are known to have been especially fruitful in deprivations of the text. This gave rise to much complaint among the early Fathers. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, A.D. 168-176, in speaking of these “apostles of the devil,” as he calls them, tampering with his own letters, “filling them with weeds by taking away some things and adding others,” says, “No wonder, seeing that they have perpetrated similar frauds upon the sacred writings.” Both Irenaeus, A.D. 115-190, and Origen, A.D. 186-254, complain of the existence of corrupt texts and of the licentious tampering with the New-Testament Scriptures which prevailed among some in their days. “Men add to or leave out,” says Origen, “as they think proper.” Hence Dr. Hort is constrained to say: “During the earliest centuries, the reverence paid to the apostolic writings, even to the most highly and most widely venerated among them, was not of a kind that exacted a scrupulous jealousy as to their text as distinguished from their substance.”

1 The laxity of those ancient modifiers of the text, however, did not confine itself, as Dr. Hort’s language rather implies that it did, to mere textual changes as distinguished from changes in the ideas and thoughts or the mode of presenting them. In very many and often marked instances,
the language of the historical books was treated with more freedom than the rest; but even the Epistles, and still more the Apocalypse, bear abundant traces of a similar type of transcription. After a while, changed feelings and changed circumstances put an end to the early textual laxity, and thenceforward its occurrence is altogether exceptional; so that the later corruptions are almost wholly those incident to transcription in the proper sense,—errors arising from careless performance of a scribe's work, not from an imperfect conception of it." To the same effect is the testimony of Weiss. He says: "The purity of the original text was vitiated from the first by copies which could easily be disfigured by every kind of careless and arbitrary procedure, in the absence of all official control, since careful adherence to the letter was completely unknown at that time. . . . It was not until a much later period . . . that doctrinal alterations were really attempted; and they could be removed easily enough from the original text, because the latter was preserved in so many manuscripts. But, along with this, complaints were made about the differences in the copies, already noticed by Irenæus (in his work Against Heresies, v. 30, 1), which Origen refers partly to the carelessness of transcribers, partly to the audacity of improvers. . . . That Origen himself undertook a formal critical recension of the New Testament, he expressly denies. Something of this nature, however, certainly appears to have been done by the Egyptian Bishop Hesychius and the Alexandrian Presbyter Lucian in the third century, respecting which Jerome complains in his Epistle to Damasus; but we know nothing of the method and results of their endeavors, which were entirely rejected in the West. On the other hand, the traces of various

by omissions, verbal modifications, additions, and other changes, the substance, the very statements and forms of thought presented by the sacred writers, were grossly tampered with, rejected, or otherwise materially changed.

1 Introduction to Greek Testament, p. 7.
or less sustained by any rational principles of external evidence than that of Codex D, of the Latin codices, and (so far as it accords with them) of Cureton’s Syriac. Interpolations, as insipid in themselves as unsupported by other evidence, abound in them all. . . . It is no less true to fact than paradoxical in sound, that the worst corruptions to which the New Testament has ever been subjected originated within a hundred years after it was composed; that Irenæus and the African Fathers and the whole Western with a portion of the Syrian church used far inferior manuscripts to those employed by Stunica, or Erasmus, or Stephen thirteen centuries later when moulding the Textus Receptus.”¹

The views thus presented by some of the ablest living textual critics of the New Testament not only accord with facts, but are very far from sustaining the widely received notion that our oldest manuscripts of the New Testament are necessarily the purest and most trustworthy, and that the later ones are scarcely deserving of notice because of blunders and oversights supposed to be consequent upon repeated transcriptions. On the contrary, one is prepared to believe as a necessary consequence that a manuscript written, it may be, a hundred or even several hundred years later than another may contain a purer and more trustworthy text than the older copy. In fact, it by no means follows that a New-Testament manuscript of the fourth century, for example, simply because it is a fourth-century manuscript, presents a more correct text than one of the fifth or even of the tenth century. It may even be said that the probabilities are that the later manuscript, as a whole, is quite as likely to present the genuine text as the older, if not more so.²

² To this statement, of course, Codex D, as compared with older manuscripts, must be considered an exception, as it clearly presents more of the early corruptions of the text than any of its older companions.

What then? Shall we follow the younger manuscripts, and pay no attention to the testimony of the older ones? By no means. The older manuscripts, while more likely on account of their antiquity to present many early corruptions, especially false readings of the second class or such as were knowingly introduced, are also on account of their age likely to present, now and then, a genuine reading, which may not be found in the great majority, if in any, of the more recent ones. They should not therefore be discarded. Neither should they, on the other hand, be treated as if all truth were lodged in them, or in one or more of them. It is a false and altogether unsafe principle of action to accept unquestioningly the bare testimony of a handful of documents as affording the genuine text of the New Testament, simply because of their antiquity, and to exclude all other and opposing documentary evidence as worthless. Especially is this the case when we find, as we do, that these documents from beginning to end are more or less at variance with each other, and even when in agreement are often united in palpable and gross error. When thus united, they should be treated as witnesses unworthy of confidence, and passed by. The New-Testament writings, like all other books, were written to be understood, and as such we have a right to expect to find them free from unnatural, absurd, and impossible readings; so that when such readings present themselves in any of the documents that claim to give the text of the New Testament or any part of it, they may safely be regarded as erroneous. If ancient manuscripts stand alone or almost alone, it is safe to heed their voice only when they call for a reading which the facts in the case or the requirements of the passage clearly demand. In other words, their testimony may be safely accepted and followed when the weight of internal evidence preponderates so strongly against the testimony of the great body of witnesses as to leave scarcely a doubt that the reading of the few is the true reading. On this ground, the reading δ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἑρμοῖν κηρύσσων, adopted by Westcott
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and Hort in Mark i. 4, in place of the common reading βαπτιζον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων, must be accepted as the true reading, although the presence of the article is favored by only five uncialis (the two oldest being among the number), and by two cursives and one version, while the omission of και is supported by only one uncial and three cursives,—the uncial in this case being the oldest extant Greek manuscript. Another similar case, supported by only one uncial (the Sinaitic Codex), five cursives, and the Peshito Syriac Version, appears in Mark vii. 19. Instances of this kind, however, are exceedingly rare.

As to the nature of the errors introduced in those early days, the reader will bear with us if we quote still further from Weiss, and give his comprehensive summary of them: “The commonest mistakes are in the omission of letters, syllables, words, and clauses in cases where the like or same followed, and the eye of the copyist wandered from one to the other by homoioteleuton [i.e. in consequence of a sameness of endings]. The instances in which letters or syllables were doubled are much less frequent. Many letters in the square character like one another were readily interchanged [as the last four of “Magdala,” for example, in Matt. xv. 39, transforming the word into “Magadan”]. In dictating, consonants of like sound were very often exchanged [hence, in all probability, the reading καυχῆσομαι for κανθῆσομαι in 1 Cor. xiii. 3]; while vowels and diphthongs similarly pronounced, chiefly in consequence of itacism [or the mistaking of one for the other] were also confounded. The expression was often involuntarily conformed in words to the context, even to senselessness in the endings of words. [An example of this appears in the transformation of αὔτον, “his,” in connection with “kinsmen,” in Acts x. 24, into αὔτος, “them,” a reading given only by the scribe of the Vatican, the oldest extant Greek manuscript;—the s having been involuntarily added through the influence of the preceding

words (one of which is αὔτος) ending in the same letter.] Many transpositions arose merely from the fact that a word was omitted by mistake [as δυνάμεις, “powers,” for example, in Rom. viii. 38]; and, since the omission was soon observed, it was rectified by the first transcriber putting the word in a later place; or, after the corrector had marked the error, the word was introduced into a wrong place by a later抄写者. Abbreviations also were sometimes read incorrectly [as in Rom. xii. 11], original glosses erroneously put into the text [as in 1 Pet. v. 2], a word altered or supplied after New-Testament parallels or (in citation) after the Septuagint either unconsciously or on the presupposition of the text’s being necessarily wrong, because it does not agree with the parallels passing through the mind of the copyist. . . . The text has suffered much greater injury from intentional emendations. In this respect, there is naturally a superabundance of additions consisting of subject and object, copula and verb, genitives (especially pronouns) and adjectives or pronouns, of articles and appositions, of conjunctions, adverbs, and prepositional additions, even amounting to glosses of all kinds which serve the purpose of elucidation. Synonyms and pronouns, simple and compound words (especially verbs), conjunctions and prepositions, moods and conjugations, cases and persons, word-forms and flexions are here exchanged one with another; sometimes to make the expression more correct or to beautify it, sometimes to make it more emphatic or more conformable to the context. To this head belong the majority of word-transpositions serving the purpose of emphasis or elucidation. Occasionally, real difficulties are removed; at other times, there is an intentional conforming to parallels. Many emendations are meant to facilitate the sense, or to obviate the misunderstanding of it; they also express the exegetical mind of the transcribers. But no consistency should be looked for in these emendations, especially as they have passed over into later
copies but partially, or have been partially corrected again by means of an older text."\(^1\)

The documents on which most modern editors rely as presenting the original and true text of the New Testament are the Sinaitic (\(\Sigma\)) and Vatican (\(B\)) Codices of the fourth century, Codex Alexandrinus (\(A\)) and Codex Ephraemi (\(C\)) of the fifth, Codex Bezae (\(D\)) of the sixth, and, in the Gospels, Codex Regius (\(L\)) of the eighth century, and the Curetonian Syriac Version. The old Latin and the two Egyptian (Thebaic and Memphitic) Versions are also much relied on, especially where they correspond with the two oldest Greek manuscripts, which are, no doubt, of Egyptian origin also. To give the general reader some idea of the character of these ancient documents, we subjoin some of their peculiar readings. We shall do nothing more, however, than to instance a few from the second Gospel.\(^2\) *Ab uno discé omnes.* From these few specimens, the reader can form his own judgment as to the trustworthiness of these documents in their entirety, and the propriety of reverently, not to say superstitiously and blindly, following them, oftentimes to the exclusion of all other evidence. We will simply add that some of the errors about to be presented have been corrected in these manuscripts by later hands. Most of them, however, remain as originally written.

---

2 We take Mark rather than one of the other Gospels, not because a proportionally greater number of errors, or errors of a more flagrant kind, are to be found in it than in any of the others (of which, if such is the case, we are not aware), but simply because it is shorter than any of the others, and because the texts of the five oldest Greek manuscripts are as perfectly preserved to us in this as in any other portion of the New Testament, if not more so.

---

### INTRODUCTION.

**A Few Readings Peculiar to the Sinaitic Codex, \(\Sigma\), as Originally Written.**\(^1\)

#### Additions.

Mark vi. 36. "Buy themselves victuall, something to eat."

vii. 4. "Answered him and said, Whence" etc.

d. 15. "Bring me here a penny."

xii. 42. "A poor widow woman."

#### Omissions.

i. 32-34. "They brought unto him all that were sick [and them that were possessed with devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And he healed many that were sick] with divers diseases."

vi. 34. "Because they were [as sheep] not having a shepherd."

ix. 9. "He charged them that they should tell no one what they had seen, [unless] after the Son of man had risen from the dead."

x. 19. "Thou knowest the commandments, [Do not commit adultery.] Do not kill, Do not steal," etc.

xi. 2. "Go your way into the village [that is over against you;] and" etc.

xiv. 16. "And the disciples went forth [and came] into the city."

xv. 47, xvi. 1. "And Mary the Magdalene [and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid. And when the Sabbath was past, Mary the Magdalene] and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, brought spices."

#### Modifications.

ii. 13. Plural for the singular: "And they went forth again . . . and all the multitude came to them."

iv. 14. Future for the present: "The sower shall sow the word."

xii. 43. Imperfect for the aorist: "This poor widow was casting in more than all" etc.

Sometimes a passage exhibits both an omission and a modification; as, vii. 18. "Whatsoever from without entereth [into the man] defileth not the man," instead of "cannot defile him."

---

1 Additions and modifications are given in italics; omissions, in brackets.
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SUBSTITUTIONS.

i. 28. “Of Judea” for “Of Galilee.”

ii. 12. “It never before appeared thus in Israel” for “We never before saw it thus.”

vi. 38. “When they came” for “When they knew.”

vii. 24. “He could not speak” for “He could not be hid.” A blunder, the scribe having mistaken one of the letters.

viii. 7. “He set them [i.e. the fishes] before them” for “He commanded these also to be set before them.” This erroneous reading is adopted by Tischendorf on the sole authority of the copyist of the Sinaitic Codex, even though set aside by the “proof-reader” of that manuscript.

xiv. 58. “He said” for “We heard him say.” Two old Latin manuscripts also have this reading.

A FEW READINGS PECULIAR TO THE ALEXANDRINE CODEX, A,
AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN.

There are no additions or modifications in Mark peculiar to this manuscript that are worthy of note. Before we close our citations, however, we shall present instances of both, in which A is joined by other documents.

OMISSIONS.

ii. 18. “Why do John’s disciples [and the disciples of the Pharisees] fast?” etc.

xiv. 10. “And Judas Iscariot, [one of the twelve,] went” etc.

xiv. 37. “And he cometh, and findeth them sleeping, [and] saith unto Peter,” etc.

SUBSTITUTIONS.

iv. 36. “And leaving him” for “And leaving the multitude.”—A sheer blunder.

ix. 22. “But yet thou canst” for “But if thou canst do anything.”

The result of omitting one letter.

xv. 21. “Coming from a height” for “Coming from the country.”—The consequence of mistaking one consonant for another of similar sound.

xv. 41. “The many other women” [αἱ ἄνδρας = (?) αἱ ἑρπαῖς] for “Many other women” [Δλαί].

INTRODUCTION.

A FEW READINGS PECULIAR TO THE VATICAN CODEX, B,
AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN.

The only really noteworthy addition in Mark peculiar to this manuscript is in

i. 40. Where Κύπε is inserted before δς (not after it), as if the meaning were, “kneeling down to him [though B and others omit this expression], and saying to him, Lord, [I come to thee] because, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean.”

We will also add

iv. 5. “And other fell on the rocky ground, and where it had not much earth.”

OMISSIONS.

i. 9. “[And] it came to pass in those days.”

ii. 12. “And glorified God, [saying,] We never,” etc.—B is joined in this by the Old Latin manuscript δ.

iv. 16. “These . . . are they that are sown upon the rocky ledges, [who,] when they have heard the word, straightway receive it,” etc.—the ετ, “who,” having been mistaken for the ending of the preceding word, which consists of the same letters, and so was overlooked.

vii. 15. “That defile [the] man,”—making instead, “that defile a man.” This is a common error of B’s. In xi. 30, this manuscript stands alone in omitting the article three times.

x. 46. “[And they come to Jericho.]”

xiv. 24. “And he said [unto them], This is,” etc.

xiv. 32. “Sit ye [here], while I pray.”

xv. 12. “What then [will ye that] I shall do with [him whom] ye call the King of the Jews?”—making the question read, “What then do ye say I shall do with the King of the Jews?” or “What then, tell me, shall I do with the King of the Jews?”

xv. 34. “My God, [my God,] why hast thou forsaken me?”—Omitted perhaps as unnecessary; or perhaps by homoioteleuton.

MODIFICATIONS.

ii. 21. ‘Ἀνερνοῖ, “taketh from itself,” for ἀν’ ανερνοῖ, “taketh from it.”

iii. 9. Plural for the singular: “little boats,” for “a little boat.”

vii. 2. Dative for the nominative, in order to ease the construction:
They have been with me for three days already" for "It is already three days that they have been with me."

As specimens of substitutions, we give

v. 33. "And worshipped him" for "And fell down before him."
ix. 29. "This kind cannot come forth but" etc. for "This kind can come forth by nothing but" etc.

A FEW READINGS PECULIAR TO CODEX BEZÆ, D.

ADDITIONS.

i. 34. With additions and transpositions, this verse is made to read:
"And he healed them, and those having devils; from these he cast them out, and suffered them not to speak, because they knew him; and he healed many that were sick with divers diseases, and cast out many devils." 

OMISSIONS.

ii. 7. "Who can forgive sins but [one, even] God?"
iv. 3. "Behold a sower went forth [to sow]."
xiv. 48. "Have ye come out [as] against a robber," etc.
xv. 20. "And when [they had mocked him,] they took off" etc.

MODIFICATIONS.

iv. 2. Dative for the accusative: "He taught them in many parables."
vi. 48. A conjunction and participle in place of a preposition and an infinitive employed as a noun: "He saw them toiling and rowing, for the wind" etc.
xiv. 29. The accusative οὖθεν erroneously written for the dative οὖθεν after εἰ, — making an impossible construction.
xvi. 3. The masculine οὖθεος for the feminine οὖθάς, "themselves," — as if the reference were to men instead of to women.

A FEW READINGS PECULIAR TO CODEX EPHERAEII, C,

AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN.

In this manuscript, chapter vii. is wanting, as well as portions of five other chapters of Mark's Gospel, amounting in all to 115 verses. It contains chapter xvi. in full.

Among the comparatively few additions peculiar to C's text of Mark, we note only

ii. 5. "Be of good cheer, son; thy sins" etc.
v. 20. "In all the Decapolis."
A Few Readings Peculiar to Codex Regius, I.

Additions.
i. 14. "Jesus came into Galilee, teaching and preaching the gospel" etc.

Omissions.
i. 34. "He healed many that were sick [with divers diseases]."
ii. 21. ["And a worse rent is made."]
vi. 23. "And he swore [unto her], Whatsoever thou shalt ask" etc.

Modifications.

Substitutions.

The Curetonian Syriac Version, which some consider one of the most important witnesses to the original text of the New Testament, is almost wholly defective in Mark. The surviving fragments contain only the last four verses (xvi. 17-20) of this Gospel. To show something of the character of the version, however, we give from Matthew

A Few Readings Peculiar to the Curetonian Syriac Version.

Additions.

iii. 15. "Then he suffereth him, that he should be baptised; and he baptised him."
v. 12. "For so did your fathers persecute the prophets" etc.

Substitutions.

i. 21. "He shall save the world (instead of "his people") from their sins."
i. 24. "He took unto him Mary," instead of "his wife."
x. 34. This verse is made to read, "I came not to send peace on earth, but a division of purposes and a sword."
xii. 2. "Why do thy disciples" etc. in place of "Behold thy disciples" etc.

xvii. 5. "And a voice was heard out of the cloud, saying," for "And, behold, a voice out of the cloud, saying."

xix. 7. "Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement, so that whosoever wished to put away his wife might give her a bill of divorcement?"

xxii. 11. "And he who may wish to be great among you" for "But he that is the greatest among you."

To these we add the rendering which this Version gives of the Saviour's reply to the penitent thief, found in Luke xxiii. 43: "Verily I say unto thee to-day, that thou shalt be with me in the garden of Eden," instead of "Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise."

The foregoing readings, and multitudes of others which might easily have been added, it will be remembered, are readings peculiar to the documents to which they are here attributed. Whatever value one may be inclined to attach to them, they can scarcely be regarded otherwise than as mere curiosities; though, in some instances, they serve as important indirect helps to the attainment of the true text. Very rarely, if ever, is a genuine reading found lurking among readings peculiar to a single document; and only occasionally is such a reading confined to but two documents. On the other hand, alterations of the original text were not always confined to the single document in which they first appeared. Hundreds upon hundreds of them were copied into others, and more or less widely circulated. Hence the manifold false or perverted readings that are found among extant ancient manuscripts, versions, and patristic writings; and, in many instances, these readings are very largely and, as is generally said, strongly supported, because very widely adopted among these documents.

We will here add a brief list of such readings from the Gospel of Mark, in connection with the "authorities" by which they are supported, simply adding that our limits forbid the giving of anything more than a few examples from the long list that might be given.
represented by Ferrar’s group of cursive (13, 69, 124, 346), 157, δ, of the Old Latin, and the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac Versions.

ix. 11. “Saying, the Pharisees and the Scribes say.” Χ, L, four copies of the Old Latin, and the Vulgate. Added also by Tischendorf.


x. 28. “And have followed thee. What then shall we have?” Χ, two cursive, one copy of the Old Latin, and one of the Vulgate.


xii. 14. “Tell us therefore whether it is lawful.” C first hand, D, M, N, and several copies of the Old Latin Version.


xiv. 20. “He that dippeth the hand with me.” Codex A, five copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the two Egyptian Versions.


xvi. 16. By the addition of the article, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” becomes “He that believeth and he that is baptized shall be saved.” L, Δ, only.

xvi. 18. “And in their hands they shall take up serpents.” C, L, the margin of M, X, Δ, six cursive, the Curetonian and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions.

Omissions.

i. 11. “Came.” Χ first hand, D, and two codices of the Old Latin Version. Omitted also by Tischendorf.

i. 16. “Ἀμφιβληθήσοντο, “a net.” Χ, B, L, and 33. This word, which is needed here to give expression to the meaning in Greek as well as in English, was probably omitted through the resemblance of its first six letters to the corresponding number in the first half of the next word,— an error of frequent occurrence. (Compare omission in xiii. 22.) Without this word, the text is left to mean that the two brothers were “thrashing” about in the water, as if they were bathing. Instead of throwing a net around, they are represented as throwing themselves around, in the sea.

Some early scribe, seeing this, yet not knowing just what word was lost, supplied τὰ δίκτυα, “their nets.” Hence the reading of D, our lost uncial, 28, and other documents. Other and later transcribers, finding this plural, δίκτυα, in some of their copies, changed the singular of the evangelist’s word to ἀμφιβληθήσοντο, “nets,” supposing that to be the proper form of the word.

i. 19. “Thence.” B, D, L, a few cursive, four copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, and two or three later versions. The word seems to have been omitted because implied in “having gone forward,” especially in connection with “a little.” The scribe of the Sinitic Codex, instead of omitting “thence,” omitted “a little.”

i. 21. “Having entered.” Χ, C, L, Δ, less than ten cursive, the Peshito Syriac, some editions of the Memphitic Version, and Origen twice. At the same time, ἐβίβασαν, “he taught,” was transferred to take the place of the omitted word. But the preposition εἰς, “into,” was left unchanged to bear witness against this false reading.

i. 25. “Saying.” Χ first hand, A first hand, and John Damascene. It is omitted also by Tischendorf because found in Luke iv. 35!

i. 26. “The spirit.” Omitted only by B, and 102, a manuscript whose readings Westcott thinks were derived from Codex B.

i. 27. “What is this?” D, three lectionaries, and seven or eight copies of the Old Latin Version.

i. 35. “And departed.” B, five cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, and two editions of the Memphitic. — Doubtless omitted as superfluous.

i. 44. “Nothing,” — leaving the clause to read, “that thou speak to no one.” Χ, A, D, L, Δ, our lost uncial, 33, etc.

i. 45. “Hæ, was.” B, 102, and δ and ε of the Old Latin. These copies of the Old Latin Version also omit the “and” that follows immediately after,—making the last half of the verse read, “So that he [i.e. Jesus] could no more openly come into town, but they came out to him in desert places from every quarter.” On the restoration of the conjunction, the copula was still omitted in some transcripts as unnecessary. Hence its absence from B and 102.

ii. 4. “When they had broken it up.” D, most copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, and the Ethiopic. It was omitted as redundant.

ii. 8. “Immediately.” D, three cursive, six or seven copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. It was omitted apparently because it is wanting in Matthew’s and Luke’s accounts.

ii. 8. “So.” Omitted only by B and its copy 102, and from the Old Latin codices a and p. Probably dropped as unnecessary.

ii. 16. “And drinketh.” Χ, B, D, 102, 235, 271, and four or five copies
of the Old Latin. Evidently an early omission, preserved only in a few copies taken from second-century manuscripts.

ii. 19. “As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast.” D, U, i, 33, and five other cursive, six or seven copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, Ethiopic, and some later versions.


ii. 26. “In the days of Abiathar the high priest.” D, 271, and five copies of the Old Latin. A second-century omission, due probably to the fact that the reading τελετὸς ἄβιαθρος ἀπεράτος, “when Abiathar was high-priest,” which was so common then, is historically incorrect. The restoration of the article after ἄβιαθρος removes the whole difficulty.

iii. 1. “The” before “synagogue,” K, B, and 102. This omission is an obvious emendation, due to the fact that no previous mention is made of any synagogue after i. 39. The article is plainly called for by “again”; which points back to i. 21, while ii. 1 shows where Jesus was at the time, and that the synagogue referred to must have been that mentioned in i. 21. Tischendorf, however, omits the article because it appears in Matthew (xii. 9) and Luke (vi. 6); and Westcott and Hort do the same, though for a very different reason.

iii. 6. “Straightway.” D, L, five cursive, eight or nine copies of the Old Latin Version, and the Ethiopic.

iii. 29. “During eternity” or “for ever,” — reading simply “hath no forgiveness.” D, five cursive, seven copies of the Old Latin, Cyprian of course, and Athanasius.

iii. 35. “For.” B, C, of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version. Omitted also by Tischendorf, because found in Matt. xii. 50, in all the manuscripts.

iv. 4. “It came to pass.” D, F, a few cursive, nearly all copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, and the Peshito Syriac. Probably omitted as unnecessary.

v. 2. “Immediately.” B, five copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, and the Armenian Version. Apparently omitted as redundant,— “As he came out” etc. being equivalent to saying, “Immediately upon coming out” etc.

v. 22. “Jairus by name.” D and a, 4, 7, 9, 10 of the Old Latin, while D, 4, 7 omit also the following words, “seeing him.”

vi. 27, 28. “And he went, and beheaded him in the prison, and brought his head.” K, 33. Omitted by homoioteleuton.

vii. 25. The αὕτη, “her,” after θησαυροῦν, “little daughter.” K, D, Δ, our lost uncials, 1, 28, and nine or ten other cursive. Omitted as needless.
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xiv. 34. “Thou art.” Ν, L, only.

xiv. 34. “After that.” D, 433, and six other cursive, a few Latin codices, and the two Egyptian Versions.

xiii. 6, 7, 9. “For.” In verse 6, omitted by Ν, B, L, the Ethiopic, and the Persic of Walton’s Polyglot; in verse 7, by Ν first hand, B, and the two Egyptian Versions; and in verse 9, by B, L, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. The word is rejected by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort in each instance, but by the Revisers in the first two only. Lachmann very properly retains it in each of the three verses, with the weight of documentary evidence strongly preponderating in his favor.

xiii. 22. “False Christs and.” D, 124, and two Old Latin codices. Overlooked and omitted in consequence of sameness of beginnings in the two words rendered “false Christs” and “false prophets.”

xiii. 23. “Behold.” B, L, 28, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions. Omitted also by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort.

xiv. 5. “For.” D, k of the Old Latin, and the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions. The conjunction is a part of the original text here as truly as in Matt. xxvi. 9.

xiv. 25. ὥστεν, “no more”—reading “I will not drink” etc. Ν, C, D, L, one cursive, four copies of the Old Latin, and two of the Vulgate, and the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions.

xiv. 30. “Twice.” Ν, C first hand, D, two cursive, ε and five other Old Latin codices, two copies of the Vulgate, the Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. This is obviously a deliberate critical emendation, with a view to make Mark’s account correspond with that of the other evangelists. The omission (by Ν, B, L, one lectionary, ε of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version) of “and a cock crew,” verse 68; and of “the second time,” and “twice,” in verse 72 (the former by Ν, L, ε, and another copy of the Old Latin, and the latter by Ν, C first hand, Δ, 251, ε and four other copies of the Old Latin, and the Ethiopic Version) are but parts of the same emendation, consistently preserved only in Ν and ε.

xiv. 31. Δε, “and” or “also,” near the end of the verse. B, 1, 209, a few other cursive, and α, ε, j, k. Bracketed by Westcott and Hort, as if the omission might be genuine!

xiv. 39. “Saying the same words.” D, α, ε, j, k. Again bracketed by Westcott and Hort.

xiv. 47. “A certain.” Ν, A, L, M, ten or twelve cursive, ε and four other codices of the Old Latin, the two Egyptian, and the Philoxenian Syriac and Ethiopic Versions.

xiv. 47. “Of them that stood by.” Omitted only by D, and a of the Old Latin Version.

INTRODUCTION.

xiv. 65. “And to cover his face.” D, and α, j.

xiv. 69. “Again.” B, M, one cursive, f of the Old Latin, the two Egyptian, and Ethiopic Versions.

xiv. 4. “Saying.” Ν first hand, 1, 209, 473, a of the Old Latin, and the Thebaic Version. An omission, apparently for the sake of conciseness, in accordance with Mark’s general, but by no means invariable, manner of connection with τερμάτως, “to ask.”


xiv. 20. “Him” after “crucify.” Omitted by Ν, D, 1, 122 second hand, two copies of the Old Latin,—apparently as unnecessary. Followed by Tischendorf.

xiv. 36. Και, “and,” connecting the two participles “having run” and “having filled.” B, L, ε, and the Memphitic Version. It is impossible on such evidence to believe that Mark should have written, “But one running filling a sponge with vinegar, having put it on a reed, gave him to drink.” He must have connected the first two participles with a conjunction, if not the second and third. And so the more trustworthy witnesses, in fact nearly all the witnesses, represent him as having done. But the four documents just mentioned give the sentence without anything to connect the participles, and Westcott and Hort accept this as the true reading.

xiv. 41. “And ministered unto him.” C, D, Δ, nine cursive, and n of the Old Latin omit.

xiv. 6. “Of Nazareth.” Ν first hand, and D, only.

xiv. 9-20. These twelve verses are omitted by Ν and B alone of all the Greek manuscripts, k only of the Old Latin, an Arabic lectionary of the ninth century in the Vatican Library, and some codices of the Armenian Version; while L, and Ψ, the recently discovered Codex Athous Laures, an eighth-century manuscript, after verse 8 give a brief apocryphal ending, then the usual form of verses 9-20.

MODIFICATIONS.

i. 2. Future, “I shall send,” for the present, “I send.” Ν, a few cursive, the Memphitic Version, and Origen in one place.

i. 7. Singular, “shoe,” for the plural, “shoes.” L, a few cursive, the Philoxenian Syriac, Clement of Alexandria, and Basil, each freely quoting the passage, while elsewhere they give the plural.

THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.


i. 24. Plural, "we know," for the singular, "I know." K, L, Δ, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and several of the Fathers. Changed, to correspond with what precedes.

ii. 2 Present, "he heals," for the future, "he will heal." K, Δ, and 271. Adopted by Tischendorf as genuine.

iii. 8. Present, "is doing," for the imperfect, "was doing." B, L, only. Adopted by Westcott and Hort, who relegate the true reading to the margin.

iii. 13. Singular, "he went," for the plural, "they went." A first hand, and L only.

iii. 29. Future, "shall be," for the present, "is." (A difference of only one letter.) K, D, L, Δ, less than ten cursive, ten copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic. Cyprian in his Treatises reads "shall be," but in his Epistles, "is." The future is adopted by Tischendorf.


vi. 14. Plural, "they said," for the singular, "he said." B, D, two cursive, and five copies of the Old Latin. The preceding "and," as well as verses 15, 16, calls for the singular. Westcott and Hort, however, adopt the plural, and consign the singular to the margin.

vi. 35. Present, "is spent," for the aorist, "was spent:" a common itacism,—an early scribe having written an iota instead of an epsilon. K, D, only; yet adopted by Tischendorf.


vii. 17. Plural, "they had entered," for the singular, "he had entered." K, U, about a dozen cursive, and one edition of the Memphitic Version.

ix. 14. Plural, "when they came," and "they saw," for the singular, "when he came," and "he saw." K, B, L, Δ, ε of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version. An impertinent change, early introduced so as to include Peter, James, and John, lest they might be regarded by some as among the disciples spoken of in the verse. There is no temptation to change the reading from the plural to the singular, especially as Matthew (xvii. 14) and Luke (ix. 37) both give the account of the descent in the plural. The plural is adopted, however, as might be expected, by Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers.

INTRODUCTION.

x. 36. Future indicative, first person singular, με παλιμονον, "What do ye wish me I shall do for you?" instead of the aorist infinitive, παλιμονον, "What do ye wish me to do for you?" So Κ as amended in the seventh century, B, and the Armenian Version. And so Tischendorf reads. Codex C, and ten or twelve cursive, omit "me," and read, "What do ye wish (that) I shall do for you?" All of these, except two cursive, are without the, "that." And so Westcott and Hort read. But D, and its Latin Version, read simply, "What shall I do for you?"—a reading which, as far as we know, no one defends or accepts. The first of the above readings, θαρετ με παλιμονον, is the result of a transcriber's stupidly and mechanically following the structure of the clause he had just written, αντριμονον σε παλιμονον, without observing either the meaning of his words or the wording of his exemplar.

x. 43. Present imperative, "let him be," for the future indicative, "he shall be." Found in Κ, C, X, Δ, ten cursive, and the Gothic Version.

xiv. 18. Plural, "one of you who are eating with me," for the singular, "one of you, who is eating with me." B, and the two Egyptian Versions. An obvious change to ease the construction.

xv. 27. The aorist, "they crucified," for the present, "they crucify." B, five copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, and Gothic Versions.

xvi. 13. Nominative for the dative: "Neither did they believe," for "Neither did they believe these." L, Jฟฟ, and Zohrab's Armenian Version.

SUBSTITUTIONS.

i. 16. "Simon's brother" for "his brother." Κ, A, B, E second hand, L, M, Δ, twenty-five or thirty cursive, one copy of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic and Armenian Versions; while E first hand, F, H, K, S, U, V, H, most of the cursive, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions, try to combine the two, and read "his, Simon's brother." The noun was evidently substituted in place of the pronoun for the sake of definiteness, as some, no doubt, insisted that "his brother" meant Jesus' brother, not Simon's.


ii. 4. "โอρος," "where," for ὁρός, "on which." Κ, B, D, L, and two copies of the Old Latin Version. It was evidently introduced because of the δωρον just before, which an early copyist, retaining in mind, and not closely observing his exemplar, naturally wrote as suitable to the connection, and passed on. Such errors are of frequent occurrence, as in iv. 21,
for example, noticed just below. Though early introduced here, it was soon detected, and well-nigh universally rejected. It is accepted, however, by Tischendorf and by Westcott and Hort.


iii. 21. "When the scribes and the rest heard concerning him." D, most copies of the Old Latin, and the Gothic Version. An obvious gloss, designed to prevent οἱ παρ' αὐτῷ from being taken to mean "his friends."


iv. 21. "Under" for "upon." Σ, B first hand, Σ, Ferrar's group of cursive, and 33. An obvious blunder, made by mechanically repeating the preceding preposition a second time: "under a bushel, . . . under a bed, . . . under [instead of upon] a lamp-stand." It is similar to the error of L in vii. 30, noticed on page 30.

vi. 3. "Joseph" for "Joses." Σ, 121, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the Ethiopic.

vi. 29. "Him" for "it": "They came, and took up his corpse, and laid him in a tomb." Σ, 346, only; yet adopted by Tischendorf as genuine.


vi. 56. "In the streets" for "in the market-places." D, 473, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions. Changed because the original reading, "market-places," was apparently not in keeping with "fields" or "country-places."

vii. 6. "Leaveth me" for "honoreth me." D, and a, b, c, of the Old Latin Version, while the Ethiopic Version has "honour me and love me."

viii. 3. "Are" for "have come." B, L, Δ, and the Memphitic Version. Adopted, of course, by Westcott and Hort. If ελατίν, "are," had been the original reading, it is incredible that any one would ever have substituted Ἕλατιν, "have come," in its place. This anomalous form, which appears nowhere else in the New Testament, not only gave rise to the early reading ελάτιν, but also to the later and more widely adopted Ἕλωτιν, "are present." Compare Buttman, Gram. of N. T. Greek, p. 59, Amer. edition.

viii. 22. "Bethany" for "Bethsaida." D, 262 first hand, six copies of the Old Latin, and the Gothic Version. It would seem sometimes as if a mere glimpse of the first syllable of a word, without seeing any more of it, especially if that word is a proper name, was enough to warrant some of those ancient copyists in going forward and writing the whole word,

Multitudes of instances occur among the various manuscripts in which the first syllable, or first two syllables, of proper names are right, and the rest more or less misspelled, making as here a very different word from that originally written. Westcott and Hort honor this false reading with a place in their margin. Others as false as this, but somewhat "better" attested, are advanced by them to a place in the text itself.

v. 26. "Unto him" for "among themselves." Σ, B, C, Δ, the Memphitic Version, and the Arabic of the Polyglot. Mark's expression for denoting speaking to one or any one is not λέγειν πρός αὐτόν, but λέγειν αὐτῷ. But to express the idea of persons speaking one with another, or among themselves, he uses the form λέγειν πρός άντρον, or λέγειν πρός ἄλλην. See iv. 41; viii. 16; ix. 33, 34; xi. 31; xii. 7; xv. 31; xvi. 3. Yet Westcott and Hort adopt the form with the simple personal pronoun in the accusative preceded by πρός as the genuine reading here simply because a few of their favorite documents, not all of them, so read, though not another instance can be found where Mark expresses in this way the idea of speaking to a person, while the form λέγειν αὐτῷ appears in every chapter of his Gospel, and in some chapters at least ten times.

x. 41. "The two brethren" for "James and John." Codex A, and 91.

x. 46. "Thence" for "from Jericho." D, 473, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Gothic Version, and Origen twice. An attempt at verbal improvement.

xi. 22, 23. "If ye have faith in God, verily I say" etc. for "Have faith in God; for verily I say" etc. Σ, D, 28, 124, three copies of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version. An early alteration of the text. On the restoration of the first clause of this quotation to its original imperative form, the "for," introducing the next clause, failed to be restored in some copies. Hence the reading adopted by the Revisers.

xii. 19. "And let" for the second "and have." D, 28, and seven copies of the Old Latin Version.

xii. 36. "Underneath" for "a footstool." B, the Greek text of D (not its accompanying Latin Version), T, 28, and the two Egyptian Versions. Adopted by Westcott and Hort, as if genuine.

xiii. 22. "But" for "for." Σ, C, only.

xiv. 2. "For" for "but." Σ, B, C first hand, D, L, eight copies of the Old Latin, and ten of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac. Matthew (xxvi. 5) reports the other five words among which this stands, precisely as Mark does; and here he gives "but," which the context calls for, and not "for." Nor is there any reason why Mark should report the circumstance in such a manner as to give a different turn and force to the thought. The true reading, plainly enough,
is "but." With a certain class of editors, however, the very fact that Matthew has "but" is enough, in view of the so-called "authorities" in support of a different reading, to condemn "but" as the true reading here! It is far more rational, and just to the evangelist, to attribute the unmeaning "for" to the carelessness or ignorance of an early transcriber of his words than to suppose that he himself inserted it with a view to introduce a reason for a desire, for which no reason is expressed in the words that follow, or can be put into them without distorting their obvious import, and setting him at variance with Matthew.


xiv. 1. "Having prepared a tribunal," or council, instead of "having held a consultation." N, C, L, only. Adopted, however, by Tischendorf.

xiv. 6. "Ου παρηγορον, whom they asked from him," for διηγορον, "whomsoever they demanded." Found only in N first hand, A, and B first hand. (N and B were afterwards corrected.) Codex Δ, which is full of errors, without any change of letter from the genuine, falsely divides the words, and gives διηγορον, — an unmeaning combination of letters. Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort adopt the foregoing false reading of the scribes of their favorite manuscripts, though corrected by later hands; and from them the Revisers accepted it, and set aside the true reading.

xiv. 25. "They guarded" for "they crucified." D and three copies of the Old Latin. See Westcott and Hort's Notes on Select Readings, p. 27.


xvi. 1. "And they, when they had gone away," in place of "And when the Sabbath was past, Mary the Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome." Codex D, and several copies of the Old Latin Version, with variations.

xvi. 7. "There ye shall see me," for "There ye shall see him." D and k of the Old Latin.

The foregoing are but specimens of what might be adduced to show the character of the ancient documents, on which many modern editors rely almost wholly for the original text of the New Testament. Their number could easily be more than doubled and even trebled. But we have given enough for our purpose. Most of them, it will be noticed, are innocent and harmless, as far as the meaning is concerned; but they clearly show that, while mere transcriptional errors crept into the texts of our earliest extant manuscripts, those manuscripts are also more or less vitiated by additions, omissions, substitutions, and other alterations, made deliberately and for a purpose. It may occur to some of our readers as they examine the following pages, that possibly our oldest extant manuscripts and other documents are not, after all, among "the best," but are really copies that are more or less largely depraved, and that this very fact may account for their surviving to our day. This is by no means improbable. Having long since been found to be corrupt, they may have been laid aside as worthless, and so escaped the destructive use to which their better contemporary copies were necessarily subjected. And when it is considered that, in the early centuries, the New Testament writings were viewed as writings that might justifiably be modified more or less, according to the reader's judgment or notions, we need not wonder at the corruptions existing in them. We should rather wonder that any one, especially any textual critic, should look upon such documents with superstitious reverence, as if they were all but infallible, when at every turn they display so many marks of error not only in themselves, but in contradicting each other. For it is a well-known fact that where there are variations in the text, it is a difficult thing to find the five, or even the three, oldest extant Greek manuscripts of the New Testament in accord, especially in the four Gospels. There, in every ten consecutive cases in which various readings occur, the five oldest manuscripts will be found oftener more or less divided nine times than in agreement once. Even the two oldest (N and B), though very frequently united in such cases, are repeatedly at variance, as the foregoing examples from Mark abundantly show.

In these circumstances, it is neither reasonable nor just, where two or more rival readings present themselves, to accept implicitly the reading of the two, or three, or four, or even five
oldest manuscripts, if they should chance to be thus agreed, and disregard all other considerations that may present themselves. If the earliest extant copies of our English Version were similarly disfigured and depraved, no publisher of the present day would accept any text made up from half a dozen of them without reference to later copies as a text of superior correctness and excellence. Nor would any editor’s work, consistently carried out on this principle in regard to the Greek text, be tolerated for a day as a fair representation of the text of the New Testament as it came from the hands of its writers. Such readings as “his daughter Herodias” (κ, B, D, L, etc.), in Mark vi. 22; “of Judea” (κ, B, C, L, etc.), in Luke iv. 44; the omission of Jesus’ petition, “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they are doing” (κ, B, D, etc.), in Luke xxiii. 34; “having saluted Festus” (κ, A, B, L, etc.), in Acts xxv. 13; “Let us also bear the image of the heavenly” (κ, A, C, D, L, etc.), in 1 Cor. xv. 49; and all the other readings of a similar character, peculiar to three or more of the five oldest manuscripts and their allies, would hopelessly and justly condemn it as an impossibly genuine text. And yet some of our modern editors of the Greek New Testament have proceeded in part on this principle. None have ventured to carry it out consistently. If any one were to do it, the result of his labors would at once show the absurdity of the scheme.

The only place that can stand in need of the textual critic’s notice or touch, is where obvious error of some kind exists in the text, and where rival readings are presented, concerning which he needs to pass judgment, and decide, if possible, what the true reading may be. Otherwise his work as an editor would be simply that of a transcriber. As Dr. Hort says, “The office of textual criticism is always secondary, and always negative. It comes into play only where the text transmitted by the existing documents appears to be in error, either because they differ from each other in what they read, or for some other sufficient reason. . . . Where there is variation, there must be error, in at least all variants but one; and the primary work of textual criticism is merely to discriminate the erroneous variants from the true.”1 In doing this, one is not to be governed necessarily by the testimony of the oldest documents, much less by that of a few of them only. Through the mistakes of copyists, or the changes introduced by others, such testimony may be, and often is, clearly false. Nor is the united testimony of a majority of the witnesses, of necessity, a sure and safe criterion to follow. In cases of this kind, agreement may be due to the echoing, one after another, of errors perpetuated through similar channels, possibly for centuries, each transcription simply repeating and continuing those errors. In multitudes of instances, the textual critic must be governed more or less by the demands of the context, by the usus lo-quenti of the author, and by other forms of internal evidence. Indeed, the force of such evidence may be so strong as to require him to set aside what might otherwise be regarded an overwhelming array of external evidence. It will not do to make nonsense of the text, or to introduce a palpably false reading of any kind, simply because such a reading is supported by certain documents generally regarded as of more than ordinary weight or value, as if they were infallible. “The books of Scripture,” says Archdeacon Farrar, “were written with the object of being understood.” Nonsensical, impossible, and otherwise false readings are no part of their real texts. This, we believe, is virtually admitted on all hands. If it is not, it certainly ought to be, at least by all reverent and impartial students of the Word.

In order to enable one to arrive at just and safe conclusions where variations exist, certain obvious general principles have been agreed upon among textual critics; but, in the application of these principles, editors, from one cause or another, are often led to very different conclusions. Hence, of the comparatively

---

1 Introduction to Greek Testament, pp. 1, 2, 3.
recent critical editions that have been put forth by different editors of the Greek New Testament, no two present substantially the same text. The Revised and that of Westcott and Hort perhaps come as near to being identical as any two that may be named. This, however, is but the natural, not to say necessary, result of Westcott and Hort’s being members, and in all questions pertaining to the Greek text influential members, of the English Committee of New-Testament Revisers. And yet the two texts — the Revisers’ and Westcott and Hort’s — are by no means one and the same. In the Gospel of Luke alone, to say nothing of the other books, they differ, more or less, more than four hundred times. Each individual editor (or company of editors) has acted to a certain extent on a theory, principle, or hypothesis of his own, which others have been compelled to ignore, modify, or reject.

But the principles or rules of internal evidence, to which reference has just been made, being, in the main, founded in the nature of things, are more or less self-evident. Hence their general acceptance. And yet they need to be frequently qualified, and always to be judiciously and wisely applied, in order to be of any real service as helps to the true text. Take, for example, Bengel’s prime canon: *Prættiv scriptioni præst at ardua*, a difficult reading is to be preferred to an easy one. This may be pressed, as it has been again and again, to mean that the more difficult a reading is, the more likely it is to be genuine,—which is simply absurd. But in its true intent, and wisely applied, it is a sound and safe rule to go by. In exemplification of this, we will give one or two illustrations, which no reader can fail to understand. In most of our hymn books is the hymn beginning

"Guide me, O thou great Jehovah."

In some of them, the third line of stanza 3 reads,

"Bear me through the swelling current."

In others, we read instead,

"Death of death, and hell's destruction."

If we were called upon to say which of these is, in all probability, the original reading, without really knowing the truth in the case, but simply judging by the foregoing rule, we should unhesitatingly pronounce in favor of the latter. The other has every appearance of having been substituted in order to avoid what probably seemed a harsh, offensive, or possibly meaningless reading; whereas, it is obvious that no "hymn-tinker" would ever have been tempted to substitute "Death of death, and hell's destruction" for the inoffensive words

"Bear me through the swelling current."

As another example, take the familiar lines

"Why to yon mountain turns the musing eye,

Whose sun-bright summit mingles with the sky?"

And compare them with the following:

"Why to yon mountain, mingling with the sky

Its sun-bright summit, turns the musing eye?"

No one, capable of judging, would pronounce the latter the original reading. It may be smoother, more linguistically correct, and possibly even more poetical than the other. But it is evidently an attempt to improve upon the author's words, which gave offence to some sensitive soul because of the close contact of the relative "whose" to the word "eye." Had it been the original reading, the other would probably never have appeared. In cases like these, the application of the rule, leading to the adoption of the harsher reading as the original one, is but just and legitimate.

Let us, however, look at some other examples. Take the familiar words

"Vaulting ambition, which o'erlcaps itself,

And falls on the other side."
This may be truly said to be a hard reading. The statement that ambition, or, for that matter, anything else, overleaps itself is not merely difficult of comprehension; it is really without meaning. Now to insist on perpetuating such a reading as the language of Shakespeare, because it is a hard reading and perhaps overwhelmingly supported against the simpler and sensible reading "o'erleaps its self," i.e. its saddle, and lands on the other side of it, is simply criticism gone mad. The true reading shows that "its self"—the old spelling of "itself"—is only a misprint, or taken from a false copy.

Again; we find, in a volume of select songs published within the last ten years, the lines

"Hither come! for here is found
Balm and flowers for every wound."

The reading "balm and flowers is found" is sufficiently hard for most cultivated ears; but "flowers for every wound" is something that is absolutely beyond our comprehension, owing perhaps to our ignorance of the medicinal properties of flowers. We turn, however, in our perplexity, to another volume containing the same hymn; and we there find the lucid statement,

"here is found
Balm that flows for every wound."

The difference between the two readings is so great that we cannot account for it; but there it is. And, as we prefer light to darkness, whether old or new, we accept the latter as the true reading, though it exists in only one copy within our reach, while the former appears in twenty-five copies.

We give but one more example for the consideration of such as believe that the more difficult a reading is, the more likely it is to be genuine. Early in 1887, in one of our religious journals, we encountered the following sentence, purporting to be taken from a sermon preached only a few days before: "The church's crucifixions never end; and there are not wanting Pharisees to plot them, San Pedroans to endorse them, and bigots to shout them." As we stumbled over "San Pedroans," we wondered what they could be. The next day, however, light came. The morning mail brought another religious weekly to hand, which we opened for perusal. Judge of our feelings when, on glancing over this journal, we encountered the same sentence. But instead of "San Pedroans" was that "wonderfully simple and familiar term "Sanhedrins!" We thought, at once, of some of the strangely hard names of persons and places that we had so often encountered among the strange and hard readings of "the old and best manuscripts." Is it possible that, away back in those early centuries, transcribers committed just such blunders as type-setters are known to commit in the nineteenth century? Yet here we are taking those blunders as the ipsissima verba, the very words written by the apostles themselves, or by their amanuenses. Such were our thoughts, and such was the conclusion to which we came, from which we cannot yet escape.

Another rule of textual criticism is Griesbach's Brevis ractio preferanda est verboriori. In other words, a shorter reading is to be preferred to one that is more wordy. But this really needs more or less qualification. Griesbach thought it sufficient to add, "unless the shorter reading altogether lacks the authority of the old and weighty documents." But this implies that the support of the oldest manuscripts is necessary to establish the genuineness of a shorter reading; while it virtually assumes the converse, namely, that a longer reading cannot be genuine without the support of the older documents. But both of these positions are untenable. In proof of the falsity of the first, we refer to Mark iii. 14, and Acts iv. 25. Luke ix. 10 might also be adduced, where the oldest extant manuscripts are more or less at variance. The oldest of all known manuscripts (B) and its allies D and L, as well as the early seventh-century emendator of S, have scarcely a vestige left of the original reading, two of the three original words having been
superseded by three others. The genuine reading, the shortest of all the variants, is found, it is true, in old documents; namely, in K as originally written, and as corrected again later in the seventh century, and virtually in Φ and the Curetonian Syriac Version, as well as in later documents; but not in the oldest. In proof of the unsoundness of the second of the above assumptions, it is enough just now to refer to Mark i. 16, where a “net” is omitted by K, B, L; to Mark ix. 38, where the clause, “who would not follow us,” is omitted from K, B, C, L, A, the Peshito Syriac Version, the Memphitic, and other ancient documents; and to Luke vi. 1, where the important epithet “second first,” or “second chief,” is omitted by K, B, L, some copies of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, and other ancient “authorities.” Other examples, showing the untenableness of both positions, will present themselves over and over again to the reader as he advances. A shorter reading, in multitudes of instances, is no doubt to be accepted as the true reading, in preference to a longer one. But such a reading is not, of necessity, evidence of genuineness any more than of spuriousness. It may be due to the omission of a word, expression, or clause, through oversight, or because it seemed to somebody to be unnecessary, obscure, unmeaning, inapposite, repetitious, or offensive. So that one needs to exercise great judgment and care in the application of the rule. Indeed, the same may be said concerning every principle of textual criticism. A liberal use of common sense, of critical knowledge and acumen, of candor and wisdom in the adjustment of conflicting evidence, and above all else, the exercise, if possible, of downright freedom from bias in favor of this or that document, or set of documents, or in favor of one or another reading, except as it may appear after due consideration to be the true reading, is essential to anything like a sound, successful, and satisfactory application of these principles. Here, in fact, is where the textual critic needs to be most guarded. By misapplying a rule, or pressing it to an unwarranted extreme, he is not only failing of the true end in view, but introducing false readings, and misleading others. His position and work are thus seen to be fraught with the weightiest of responsibilities.

In short, as Davidson says, “It must be admitted that the choice of readings on internal evidence is liable to abuse. Arbitrary caprice may characterize it. It may degenerate into simple subjectivity. But, though the temptation to misapply it be great, it must not be laid aside. Readings must be judged [more or less] on internal grounds.” 1 It is impossible in multitudes of cases to do otherwise. While allowing due weight to external evidence, we must not forget that oftentimes evidence of another kind needs to be weighed. If the two classes of evidence agree, let the reading they jointly sustain and call for be cheerfully accepted. If one overpower the other, let the voice of the stronger be heeded, and its decisions be conclusive. The two should not be divorced, nor should either, in its obvious inferiority and weakness, be made to override the other to the injury or the suppression of the truth.

MATTHEW.

i. 7, 8, 10.

Against the names of "Asa" and "Amon" in these verses, the Revisers have the notes, "Gr. Asaph" and "Gr. Amos"; that is, their Greek so reads. The Received Text has 'Ασά and 'Αμώς. The Revisers, however, set these aside for the corrupt readings of \( \mathfrak{N} \), B, C, a few cursives, six copies of the Old Latin Version, and the Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, but in translating return to the Greek of the Received Text, which is attested by E, K, L, M, S, U, V, II, most of the cursives, the Syriac Versions, the Latin Vulgate, and others. (A and D are defective here.) We say "corrupt readings," for it should be remembered that 'Ασά and 'Ασάφ are not interchangeable forms of one and the same name, like "Ashdod" and "Azotus," or "Joshua" and "Jesus," or "Zarephath" and "Sarepta." Nor are 'Αμών and 'Αμώς. These are all different names, having different significations. The four are employed a number of times each in the Old Testament; but nowhere are either two of them applied to the same individual, or is one confounded with another. It is impossible, therefore, that Matthew should have written 'Ασάφ for 'Ασά, or 'Αμώς for 'Αμών. Moreover, if 'Ασάφ and 'Αμώς are the true readings, they should not be abandoned in translating. This is not an instance of the ordinary changes,—one of the thousand and more which the Revisers have made in the Greek Text,—which in no way affect the translation, or are necessary or helpful to a correct version. If the Revisers' Greek says anything, it is that in their judgment 'Ασάφ and 'Αμώς are the names
written by Matthew; but if their English text says anything, it is that “Asa” and “Amon” are those names. It looks as if the Revisers had indeed been misled; for the truth is, that the genuine readings, testified to by versions from one to two hundred years older than the oldest of known Greek manuscripts, are “Asa” and “Amon”; and though “Asaph” and “Amos” are adopted in the editions of Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, as well as by the Revisers, they are palpable errors — “clerical errors,” as Grimm calls them. These names may have been more familiar to some old copyist than “Asa” and “Amon,” and thus crept into the text; or, ‘Aμως may have been so written under the false impression that the Amon of Matthew was the same person as the Amos of Luke iii. 25, and consequently that Matthew’s spelling should be altered to make the name correspond in form with Luke’s. But, whatever may have led to the change in either or both of these names, ‘Aσαφ and ‘Aμως are obviously false readings.

1. 18.

The marginal note, stating that some “ancient authorities” read of the Christ in place of “of Jesus Christ,” seems hardly called for, inasmuch as Ιησους, “Jesus,” appears in every known Greek manuscript. In the Vatican codex, it follows Χριστου, as so to read “of Christ Jesus.” But every other Greek manuscript, whether uncial or cursive, reads “of Jesus Christ.”1 The only ancient testimony in favor of the omission of “Jesus” consists of the Old Latin and Vulgate Versions, the Curetonian Syriac, and Wheelocke’s Persic Version, together with the doubtful testimony of Irenæus. We say “doubtful,” though his testimony as given by his Latin interpreter is obviously in support of the marginal reading. Irenæus’ utterance, as written by himself in Greek, is lost. He is represented by

1 Tischendorf is in error in citing cursive 71 as omitting Ιησους. See Scrivener’s Introduction, note 1, p. 568.

his interpreter to have written, “Matthew might have said, ‘Now the birth of Jesus was on this wise.’” But the Holy Spirit, foreseeing that there would be corrupters of the truth, in order to guard against their trickery, says by Matthew, ‘But the birth of the Christ was on this wise.’” In weighing this testimony, we need to bear in mind that the Latin versions all read “the birth of the Christ,” not “of Jesus Christ”; and that this interpretation is given by a Latin writer, who may unwittingly have followed his Latin version instead of Irenæus’ exact words. On the other hand, Irenæus’ Greek, as given by Germanus of Constantinople, himself a writer of Greek, is Ιησους Χριστου, “of Jesus Christ.” This makes Irenæus say, “Matthew might have said, Now the birth of Jesus was on this wise [leaving it an open question as to what Jesus might be meant]. But the Holy Spirit, foreseeing that there would arise corrupters of the truth, etc., says by Matthew, But the birth of Jesus Christ was” etc.,—making a definite reference to Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah. If this presents the truth in regard to Irenæus’ statement, then his testimony, instead of being against the reading of the text, affords additional and exceedingly strong evidence in its support; while the reading of B — “Christ Jesus” — may be very easily accounted for by its being the favorite form in which this name is given by that manuscript. The fact that the Latin version d, of Codex D, omits the word “Jesus” is not in itself positive proof that D (which is defective here) omitted it, as d frequently forsakes the readings of D for those of other Latin versions. Yet, as the Latin versions all read “of the Christ,” and D is closely related to them, in all probability this was the reading of Codex D. The omission of Ιησους seems to have proceeded, not from supposing the article to be inadmissible before it, but from the idea that in the evangelist’s day Χριστου was not used as a surname for Jesus, but simply to denote his character as the anointed of God. And yet the phrase δ Ιησους Χριστου, though found nowhere else in any known uncial of the New Testament, might
be expected from the preceding words (in verse 16), "Jesus, who is called (or the so-called) Christ." The purpose of the article in the original here seems to be to particularize the Jesus of whom the evangelist had just spoken, and makes the expression equivalent to "this Jesus who is called Christ." The name Ὁ Χριστός, with the article, is also found in the Revisers' Text in Acts viii. 12 and Phil. ii. 21, though unsupported in either instance by any uncial manuscript.

1. 25.

Received Text. ἔως οὗ ἔτεκεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον—till she had brought forth her firstborn son.

Revised Text. ἔως οὗ ἔτεκεν υἱόν—till she had brought forth a son.

Against the former of these readings it is commonly urged that it is taken from Luke ii. 7, where no rival reading exists. This, however, is pure conjecture. There is no proof that it was adopted from Luke; nor can any valid reason be given why it should have been. It certainly could not have been done to afford an argument against the perpetual virginity of Mary, for that was not needed. Besides, the statement that Mary had brought forth her firstborn son was in the text long before the doctrine of her perpetual virginity was originated. If Matthew had written only the words given in the Revisers' Text, we cannot see what possible motive there could be for changing it to the longer reading of the Received Text. On the contrary, if Matthew wrote the words commonly ascribed to him, it is easy to see that a believer in the perpetual virginity of Mary might have been tempted to strike out the word πρωτότοκον. We find Jerome, who contended for the doctrine, though he preserves the reading "her firstborn son" in his Latin Version, saying in his Commentary on Matthew, in allusion to Helvidius and others who denied the doctrine, that "from this passage some very perversely infer that Mary had other sons also, saying that none but a person who had brothers would be called a firstborn son." The presence of πρωτότοκον would very naturally lead a person who believed in the doctrine, but who was less scrupulous than Jerome, to remove the objectionable phrase; for, explain the word as you will, the evangelist could not, as a historian, have used it if he had regarded Jesus as the only son born to Mary. Matthew afterwards speaks in language in which no one would write who knew that Mary had no other children; for, if the meaning of words can be depended upon at all, ἄδελφοι and ἄδελφαι, in Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55, 56, mean brothers and sisters in the commonly accepted sense of the words as truly as μήτηρ means mother. By thus speaking, the evangelist shows most clearly that, as a historian familiar with the facts in the case, he not only would naturally have written "her firstborn son," but could hardly have written otherwise. In fact, the very presence of υἱόν, unaccompanied by the article and accepted as a part of the text, is proof conclusive that the longer reading is genuine. After having recorded, in verse 21, the words of the angel to Joseph, "she shall bring forth a son," and again, after quoting, in verse 23, the prophecy concerning Mary, that she should "bring forth a son," Matthew could hardly have gone on in his narrative, and written immediately after, "he knew her not till she had brought forth a son." The article would of necessity have appeared (if ἄνδρα, "her," did not), in connection with υἱόν, denoting a reference to the son already mentioned as promised and predicted. This difficulty seems to have been long ago seen and felt; hence the Memphitic Version inserts the article, while the Thebais inserts both the article and "her," and reads, "till she had brought forth her son." Again, the presence of "firstborn" is necessary, in order to bring out the evangelist's idea that Joseph knew not Mary till after the birth of Jesus. The word "till" of itself does not show this; it merely indicates that he had no intercourse with her up to that time. But the insertion of "firstborn" clearly implies what is indirectly declared in Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55, 56, Mark vi. 3, and elsewhere, that Mary had other
children, of whom Joseph was the father. It is just what might be expected to have been written by this evangelist. And that it was, the documentary testimony before us leaves no room for doubting. The shorter reading is attested only by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts and one other uncial (Z, of the sixth century), two cursives, five copies of the Old Latin Version, and the Curetonian Syriac. The common reading, on the other hand, is sustained by C, D, E, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, four copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Ethiopic, Slavonian, Armenian, Georgian, and even the two Egyptian Versions; for, though “firstborn” is not expressed in these, their reading indicates that the word is a part of the genuine text. Then, as to patristic testimony, that is overwhelmingly conclusive, — not less than nineteen or twenty of the Fathers, from the second century downward, testifying in support of the common reading. Yet Prebendary Humphry says, “There is but little manuscript authority for the reading which the A. V. here follows.” ¹ If by “authority” he means evidence, we know not what more evidence one could reasonably ask for, whether from manuscripts or from other sources, than we have in proof of the genuineness of this reading. The advocates of the brevior lectio appear to consider Griesbach’s canon, the testimony of three uncial, and a surmise as evidence outweighing everything else.

But just here it may be well, in passing, to reply to a query which may have arisen in the minds of some. And that is, Why should any one have omitted these words when they were known to exist in Luke? In other words, How is it that passages like this and xi. 19, for example, could have been changed in Matthew, while corresponding passages in one or more of the other Gospels were left unchanged, and their readings continued unquestioned, or all but unquestioned? The query is a fair one. But it is based upon a false assumption. And it is to this that the whole trouble with the querist is due. We cannot assume that those who are supposed to have made the alteration really knew that similar language existed elsewhere. The presumption is rather that they were not aware of it. These alterations were made at a very early date,—very soon after the apostles’ days. As Dr. Hort says, a transcription including a “tolerably free modification of language and even rearrangement of material . . . was carried on during the earliest centuries.” ¹ At that time, however, the Gospels were not bound up in one volume, but were written each on a separate parchment or collection of parchments. These were, moreover, expensive, and not easy of attainment. So that, during the first two or two and a half centuries after Christ’s death, comparatively few persons, at the most, owned copies of any portion of the New Testament, and fewer still, copies of the whole. One might be able to become the possessor of one of the Gospels, or at most, though rarely, of two of them, and possibly of one or more of the other books of the New Testament, without knowing what the rest of the books really contained; for the making up of the canon of the New Testament was a slow and progressive work. So that it is not to be wondered at in the least that alterations should have crept into one and not into the other of two passages in different Gospels, which were originally precisely or almost precisely alike. Compare Matt. vii. 25 and Luke vi. 48.

¹ Commentary on the Revised Version.

¹ Introduction to Greek N. T., p. 7.
sion. It is true, Eusebius also omits the conjunction in quoting the passage; but this he might easily have done without being sustained by his copy of the Gospel. The presence of "and," is demanded by Ν, C second hand, D, E, K, S, U, V, Γ, II, the great majority of the cursive, and all the old versions except the Memphitic, the generally faithful ally of the Vatican Codex in its peculiar readings,—a weight of evidence too great to be set aside by the scanty testimony favoring the omission of the conjunction. The word is by no means superfluous, as some early copyist seems to have regarded it. It properly means "even," here, emphasizing demoniacs, epileptics, and paralytics, as among those previously mentioned as "sick, afflicted with various diseases and torments."

v. 4.

Against this verse stands a marginal note informing the reader that "some ancient authorities transpose verses 4 and 5." These "authorities" are D, 33, the Curetonian Syriac, the Latin Vulgate, and most of the Old Latin Versions, together with the more or less doubtful testimony of Clement of Alexandria, Ammonius of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Hilary, Jerome, and possibly other Latin Fathers,—witnesses many of them noted for certain corruptions and variations peculiar to the Codex Bezae and its allies. The change, thus insufficiently supported, is evidently due to the notion that the "meek" would more naturally be spoken of than those "that mourn" after the "poor in spirit." It is hard to conceive why a marginal note of this kind should be deemed necessary, unless it was because certain modern editors have adopted, and attempted to defend, this reversed order.

Rec. T. εἰ μὴ βληθήναι ἕως καὶ καταπατισθαι — but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot.

Rev. T. εἰ μὴ βληθήν ταύτα καταπατισθαι — but to be cast out and trodden under foot.

The Revisers' text, which, literally rendered, would read, "except, when cast out, to be trodden under foot," is attested by Ν, B, C, 1, 33, a single manuscript of the Philoxenian Syriac Version, and a quotation from Origen. It has every appearance of being an attempted improvement upon the simple, unaffected statement of Jesus as recorded by the evangelist. All the other uncials, cursives, versions, and Fathers are united in supporting the common reading. Any one can easily see, therefore, which form of the Greek has the preponderance of testimony in its favor. In meaning, there is substantially no difference between the two; it is only a difference in the mode of expressing the thought. As the Revisers themselves admit by adhering to the old rendering, there was no need of their changing the original. Their task was not the revision of the Greek Testament. Still, they have done nothing more here than in hundreds of other places. And yet we are assured in their Preface that in cases in which "the English rendering [in the A. V.] was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek," "the question of the text was usually not raised." We find by an examination of Luke's Gospel that in that book alone it was thus unnecessarily "raised," and decided against the Received Text, not less than 375 times, or more than forty-seven per cent of the whole number of times that changes from that Text were introduced. If this book is a fair criterion by which to judge of the number of the changes that have been made throughout the volume which in no way have affected the English Version, and we know no reason why it should not be, one is tempted to suspect that there is an error of some kind, either typo-
Here the Revisers read, "Every one who is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgement." Against the word "brother" they have the marginal note, "Many ancient authorities insert without cause." If ὁ ὀργίζομενος, "he that is angry," were equivalent in meaning to "he that hateth," there would of course be no need of the word εἰκη, "without cause." But ὀργίζεσθαι is a word of very different meaning. So far from denoting the cherishing of enmity, it expresses, like its root ὀργη, "anger," a feeling perfectly compatible with a holy, sinless frame of mind. Thus Jesus himself is said (Mark iii. 5) to have looked around on the Pharisees μετ' ὀργης, "with anger," being grieved at their hardness of heart. Again, the Apostle Paul, in Eph. iv. 26, says, ὀργίζεσθαι, "be angry," though he immediately adds "yet sin not." There is, therefore, a holy anger as well as one that is sinful; the former awakened by a just provocation, being a righteous indignation, while the latter is without just ground, and is to be condemned. ὀργίζεσθαι in the passive means to be provoked or aroused to anger, to be angered or offended. Here, in the middle voice, it is to be angry in the sense of suffering one's self to be provoked or excited to wrath. This may be either justifiably or unjustifiably, for good reasons or without cause. Then we need to note the connection: "Ye have heard that it was said to the ancients, Thou shalt not commit murder; and, whosoever committeth murder shall be liable to punishment (that is, from men). Now I say unto you, whosoever is angry, or suffers himself to be offended or become incensed, with his brother [without cause, without just provocation] shall be liable to punishment" (that is, from God). He looks at the heart and judges accordingly. Now if we give to ὀργίζομενος the stronger sense of cherishing angry feelings or harboring a wrathful, malicious purpose, of course the bracketed words are not only superfluous, but altogether inappropriate. But this is a sense which the word hardly admits. Taking it in its proper signification of being provoked to anger, or of suffering one's self to be offended, the bracketed phrase is both appropriate and necessary. Εἰκη seems to have been stricken out of the text under a misapprehension of the true meaning of ὀργίζομενος. Its absence from the text is supported only by Ν, Β, two cursive, the Ethiopic, Latin Vulgate, and of course Frankish and Anglo-Saxon Versions, and Origen twice. Neither Justin Martyr, nor Ptolemæus, nor Irenæus, nor Tertullian, admits the correctness of this reading, though they have all been adduced in support of it. Its presence as a necessary part of the text is attested by all the other extant witnesses, namely, D, E, K, L, M, S, U, V, Ι, Δ, Π, 1, 33, and all but two other cursive, all the Syriac and Old Latin copies, the Memphitic, Armenian, Gothic, and other Versions; not only by Irenæus, Eusebius, and Cyprian, but by Pseudo-Justin, Origen himself, the Apostolic Constitutions, Basil again and again, Gregory of Nyssa very explicitly, Epiphanius, Ephraem Syrus, Isidore, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom repeatedly, Cyril, Theodoret, Hilary, Lucifer, Salvian, Philastrius, Augustine, Jerome, John of Damascus, Euthymius, Theophylact, and others,—"the later authorities uniting with Codex D and its associates against the two oldest manuscripts extant." With such a cloud of witnesses testifying to the acknowledged genuineness of Εἰκη, it is hard to believe that the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, which are often united in the wrong, are to be depended upon and followed here, when we see that the connection does not call for the omission of the word without putting a strained and unjustifiable interpretation upon ὀργίζομενος. The false reading of these manuscripts was evidently confined within comparatively narrow limits, and soon disappeared, the offensive word being everywhere recognized as genuine.
v. 25.

Against this verse appears the note, “Some ancient authorities omit deliever thee”; that is, the second time the words occur. The same might be said of hundreds of expressions in other places not thus noted, but as worthy of note as this. The words appear to have been omitted with a view to freeing the sentence from a seemingly unnecessary repetition, — a common occurrence in B, which is distinguished for its “dignified conciseness,” as Bishop Ellicott calls it. The omission is attested only by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, four cursive (one of these second hand), one copy of the Old Latin, the Ethiopic, and Armenian Versions, Chrysostom, and the two Latin Fathers, Arnobius and Hilary. It was hardly worth the while to notice the circumstance in such a way; and the only apparent reason for so doing is the fact that Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort omit the words.

v. 30.

Rec. T. δλόν το σώμα σου βληθή εσ γέλαν — thy whole body should be cast into hell.

Rev. T. δλόν το σώμα σου εσ γέλαν ἀπέλθη — thy whole body go into hell.

If the revised reading ἀπέλθη appeared only here among the manuscripts, it might be safe to infer that it was merely the result of an attempt to introduce variety of expression. But, as the same reading is given by a smaller number of documents, without any change in the order of the words, in the preceding verse, it is safer to regard it as originally an endeavor to avoid the harsher word βληθή. In verse 29, Codex D, the Curetonian Syriac and Memphitic Versions, and six copies of the Old Latin read “should go” in place of “should be cast.” This is not considered by modern editors evidence sufficient for setting aside the latter reading in that verse. But, when those witnesses are re-enforced, as they are in this verse, by B, a few cursive, the Vulgate, Origen, Lucifer, and others, with an altered arrangement of the words, apparently with a view to breaking up the sameness of Jesus’ language, the evidence seems to be too strong to be withstood! And yet it is the same false reading here as there, — adopted, too, in the face of one of the most obvious facts in reference to New-Testament readings; namely, that Jesus was not in the habit of varying his language for the mere sake of variety. On the contrary, his discourses, parables, and conversations generally are distinguished for the sameness of the phraseology in which identical thoughts are expressed. (Compare Note on xxiii. 19.) In a word, ἀπέλθη is no more deserving of a place here than in verse 29. Βληθή is sufficiently attested as the true reading by E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, Π, Δ, Π,, the great majority of the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, one copy of the Old Latin, the Armenian, and Chrysostom; to which we should probably be able to add A and C if their testimony were not lost.

v. 37.

Another needless note is appended here, namely: “Some ancient authorities read But your speech shall be,” instead of “But let your speech be.” In other words, B and a single cursive, bearing the date of 1199, read έστω in place of έστω, — a reading that is doubtless due to a clerical blunder in writing α for ο. The reading is also found in Eusebius’ Demonstratio Evangelica. This is all the “authority” there is for it. It is, plainly enough, a false reading; though, on account of its appearance in the Vatican manuscript, Westcott and Hort give it a place in their margin.

vi. 8.

In the place of “your Father knoweth,” another marginal note says, “Some ancient authorities read God your Father knoweth.” This, however, is a transparent gloss, designed to prevent the ignorant reader from making a wrong applica-
tion of the term “your Father,” and found only in the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, and in the Thebaic Version, the ally of B in several of its peculiar and evidently false readings, such as Acts xxvii. 37, “about seventy-six” for “two hundred and seventy-six”; Rom. xiii. 13, “strifes and jealousies” for “strife and jealousy”; Heb. iii. 2, “in his house” for “all in his house”; 1 John. ii. 14, “the word abideth in you” for “the word of God abideth in you.” It seems really unwise to place such notes before the reader, who generally has no knowledge, or means of obtaining a knowledge, of the facts in the case, and who is naturally led by them to suppose that these readings may be genuine, though the evidence of their genuineness was not sufficient to induce the Revisers to insert them in the text. If the reader only understood that most of these readings are rejected readings, and deliberately rejected because considered false, they might not do any harm. But then the question might very naturally arise, If they are false readings, why place them in the margin at all? or, Why not fill the margin with other rejected and false readings as well?

vi. 13.

In regard to the doxology, which the Revisers have thrown out of the Text, we prefer quoting the language of Dr. Scrivener to giving any comments of our own, beyond a few introductory words. The oldest known copy of the Greek Testament in which the doxology appears is Σ, a sixth-century manuscript, of the same date as D, or possibly a little earlier. It is a manuscript that agrees with A, C, Δ, Π, 1, 33, etc. more fully than with Σ or B. The recently discovered Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, which some consider as dating back to the beginning of the second century, has this partial presentation of the doxology: “For thine is the power, and the glory for ever.” But the omission of the words “the kingdom, and” is not to be wondered at; for, in its other quotations of Scripture, The Teaching is far from being verbally correct. Even in giving the Lord’s Prayer it has ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ καὶ τῷ φαβρῷ, and τὸν φαβρὸν for τὰ φαβῆμα, and the ἀρίστεις of the Received Text in place of the Revisers’ ἀρίστεις. Its quotations seem to have been largely, if not wholly, made from memory; and, if so made, the difference should not be a matter of surprise at all. The presence, however, of as much of the doxology as there is in a document like this, dating back to the beginning or even to the middle of the second century, is a strong testimony in its favor. But we turn to Dr. Scrivener, who is known to be one of the most learned, candid, and trustworthy of textual critics. He says: “It is right to say that I can no longer regard this doxology as certainly an integral part of S. Matthew’s Gospel; but (notwithstanding its rejection by Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort) I am not yet absolutely convinced of its spuriousness. It is wanting in the oldest uncials extant, Σ, B, D, Z; and, since A, C, P, (whose general character would lead us to look for support to the Received Text in such a case) are unfortunately deficient here, the burden of the defence is thrown on Σ and the later uncials, E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, Δ, Π (hiat Γ), whereof L is conspicuous for usually siding with B. Of the cursives, only five are known to omit the clause, 1, 17 (has ἄμπιγν), 118, 130, 209; but 566 or hcr (and as it would seem some others) has it obelized in the margin, while the scholia in certain other copies indicate that it is doubtful; even 33 contains it, 69 being defective, while 157, 225, 418 add to δόξα, τοῦ πατρός καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῦ άγίου πνεύματος, but 422 τοῦ πρεσ. only. Versions have much influence on such a question. It is therefore important to notice that it is found in all the four Syriac (Cureton’s omitting καὶ ἡ δίναμ, and some editions of the Peshito ἀμβίν, which is in at least one manuscript), the Thebaic (omitting καὶ ἡ δίναμ), the Ethiopic, Armenian, Gothic, Slavonic, Georgian, Erpenius’ Arabic, the Persic of the Polyglot from Pococke’s manuscript, the margin of some Memphitic codices,
the Old Latin \( k \) (quamiam est tibi virtus in sæcula sæculorum), \( f, g^1 \) (omitting amen), \( q \). The doxology is not found in most Memphitic (but in the margin of Hunt. 17 or Bp. Lightfoot's Cod. 1) and Arabic manuscripts or editions, in Wheelocke's Persic, in the Old Latin \( a, b, e, f^1, g^2, h, i \), in the Vulgate or its satellites the Anglo-Saxon and Frankish. (The Clementine Vulgate and Saxon add Amen.) Its absence from the Latin avowedly caused the editors of the Complutensian N. T. to pass it over, though it was found in their Greek copies. The earliest Latin Fathers naturally did not cite what the Latin Codices for the most part do not contain. Among the Greeks it is met with in Isidore of Pelusium (A.D. 412), and in the Pseudo-Apostolic Constitutions, probably of the fourth century. Soon afterwards Chrysostom comments upon it without showing the least consciousness that its authenticity was disputed. The silence of earlier writers, as Origen and Cyril of Jerusalem, especially when expounding the Lord's Prayer, may be partly accounted for on the supposition that the doxology was regarded not so much a portion of the Prayer itself, as a hymn of praise annexed to it; yet this fact is somewhat unfavorable to its genuineness, and would be fatal unless we knew the precariousness of any argument derived from such silence. The Fathers are constantly overlooking the most obvious citations from Scripture, even where we should expect them most, although, as we learn from other passages in their writings, they were perfectly familiar with them. Internal evidence is not unevenly balanced: it is probable that the doxology was interpolated from the Liturgies, and the variation of reading renders this all the more likely; it is just as likely that it was cast out of S. Matthew's Gospel to bring it into harmony with S. Luke xi. 4. I cannot concede to Scholz that it is in interruption of the context; for then the whole of verse 13 would have to be cancelled (a remedy which no one proposes), and not merely this concluding part of it.

"It is vain to dissemble the pressure of the adverse case, though it ought not to be looked upon as conclusive. The Syriac and Thebaic Versions bring up the existence of the doxology to the second century; Isidore, Chrysostom, and perhaps others, attest for it in the fourth; then come the Latin codices \( f, g^1, k, q \), the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and, lastly, Codex \( \Sigma \) of the sixth century, and the whole flood-tide of Greek manuscripts from the eighth century downwards, including even L, 33. Perhaps it is not very wise to complain about what we cannot have; yet those who are persuaded from the well ascertained affinities subsisting between them, that A, C, P, or, at least, two out of the three, would have preserved a reading sanctioned by the Peshito, by codices \( f, k \), by Chrysostom, and by nearly all the later documents, may be excused for regarding the indictment brought against the last clause of the Lord's Prayer as hitherto unproven."  

One word more. A more appropriate or Christlike conclusion for this prayer seems hardly possible. It embraces in brief the reasons or grounds on which the preceding petitions are based. "For thine is the kingdom" on behalf of which and in reference to which these requests are made; "thine is the power" to answer and make efficient these requests; "and thine the glory" in their being answered. This very fact of itself is, to us, strong internal evidence of its genuineness; while it is by no means improbable that some early transcriber, failing to see its appropriateness, or possibly even regarding it a cumbersome addition, and not finding it appended to Luke xi. 4, omitted it from the text. He may possibly, too, have placed it in the margin, as a reading, in his view, more or less if not altogether questionable. This would readily explain its absence from some, if not its partial preservation in other, manuscripts.

1 Introduction, pp. 569-571.
vii. 13.

Against this verse stands the note, "Some ancient authorities omit is the gate." The same note might also have been placed opposite the next verse. The "authorities" for the omission here are Ν first hand, six copies of the Old Latin Version, one of the Vulgate, Origen, who supports the accepted reading also, Clement of Alexandria, Naassenus, Eusebius, Cyprian, Lucifer, and possibly one or two others; and for the omission in verse 14, are three cursives, 113, 182 first hand, 570, four copies of the Old Latin Version, and about the same list of patristic writers as just cited. To show how little attention should be given to this testimony, and how utterly undeserving of note the rejected reading is, we give the language of one of these witnesses—Naassenus: "The Saviour explicitly says, Because narrow and straightened is the way that leadeth unto life, and few are they δουρχομένου εἰς that enter into it; but wide and broad is the way that leadeth unto destruction, and many are they δουρχομένου that go through by it," misquoting as well as reversing the order of the clauses. The quotation seems to have been given from memory.

viii. 9.

The marginal note here says, "Some ancient authorities insert set; as in Luke vii. 8,"—reading "I am a man set under authority." This addition is attested by Ν, B, the cursives 4, 238, 421, 543, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Chrysostom, Hilary, and other Fathers of later date. In passing judgment on the genuineness or want of genuineness of this word, we need to bear in mind that the verse is a part, not of the writer's own language, but of a report he is giving of what some one else has said. And just here the language of Dr. Roberts, penned with reference to "the similarities and the diversities which exist between the first three evangelists," is exceedingly pertinent, and embodies what seems to be the

truth on this point. He says: "It is to be observed that it is in their statements of what was said [by others] that the authors of the Gospels mostly agree, while they vary in their descriptions of the attending circumstances. This is exactly what happens on every like occasion. The reporters who give an account of a public meeting will harmonize, word for word, throughout many consecutive sentences, as to the matter which was spoken, while they will inevitably differ as to the descriptions which they give of the scene, or of the individuals present. Here, then, we seem to have found a sufficiently simple and satisfactory explanation of those features, alike of harmony and diversity, presented by the first three Gospels. They agree so strikingly, because they are faithful reports of what was said; they differ so naturally, because they are the productions of three different men, who wrote independently of one another. . . . [The centurion, like] Christ, spoke in the same language in which the evangelists have reported his words. As a matter of course, therefore, they could not but verbally agree in the reports which they furnished." 1 These words of the centurion, like many of the sayings of Jesus, were doubtless familiar to the evangelists and the apostles generally, having been in all probability repeated again and again among themselves, and treasured in their memories in the same form. So that we ought to be prepared to find his utterances, like the language attributed to Jesus and others, agreeing word for word as reported by different evangelists. And, where the agreement continues through a considerable number of words as here, the omission or the variation in form or position of a single word should be regarded as the work of the copyist rather than of the original writer, when such omission or variation changes in any manner the meaning or the construction, and documentary testimony is not overwhelmingly against it. Now B is not often found erring by adding to the text; its habit is rather to

1 Old Testament Revision, p. 198.
abbreviate. And, inasmuch as the rest of this verse of more than average length—consisting of thirty words—corresponds in every other respect with Luke’s report of the centurion’s reply, we cannot but conclude that ῥασσοῦμος, “set,” is a part of the genuine text. Documentary evidence is by no means decisively against it, as it is, for example, against ἰαθητω, “let—be healed,” for ἰαθητερο, “will be healed,” in Luke vii. 7—a reading attested by only B and L, though adopted by Westcott and Hort through their partiality for B. The meaning, however, is the same whether we read “a man under authority” or “a man set under authority.” The question is one that relates merely to textual correctness.

viii. 10.

Here we find the marginal note, “Many ancient authorities read With no man in Israel have I found so great faith.” That is, this reading is found in the Vatican manuscript, the two cursive 4 and 22, three or four copies of the Old Latin Version, one of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Ethiopic, Curetonian Syriac, and in the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, as well as in Augustine and other Latin Fathers; while the three cursive 1, 118 first hand, and 209, omitting “in Israel,” read simply, “with no one have I found so great faith.” The change—for it is an obvious change, of the nature of a gloss—was introduced to obviate what was thought to be an ambiguity in the expression “in Israel,”—some impertinent scholar or scribe fearing the Saviour might be understood to mean “Not even in Israel (i.e. in Jacob) εἰπον did I find so great faith.” The same gloss may be found at Luke vii. 9, in more than half a dozen copies of the Old Latin Version and in the Ethiopic Version. But neither there nor here does it deserve any notice whatever, though it is adopted in this verse by Lachmann and, as a matter of course, by Westcott and Hort.

MATTHEW.

viii. 23.

Rec. T. εἰς τὸ πλοῖον—in a ship. (Literally, “in the boat.”)
Rev. T. εἰς πλοῖον—in a boat.

The rejection of τῷ by the Revisers, though called for by the sixth-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, B, C, and a number of cursive, is not supported by the weightier documentary evidence of X first hand, and again of the earlier seventh-century corrector amending the work of the sixth-century corrector, E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Τ, Δ, II, the majority of the cursive, and Chrysostom’s quotation; substantiated as it is by internal evidence. Jesus had just given orders—verse 18—about going to the other side of the lake. The evangelist, referring to the boat that the Saviour had called for, as a matter of course inserted the article. This, however, appears to have been dropped (from B, C, etc.), either because its force was not perceived, or to make the reading correspond with that in Luke viii. 22, where no article is needed, as no boat had previously been alluded to.

viii. 28.

Rev. T. τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν—of the Gadarenes.

There is nothing in the whole range of New-Testament textual criticism in which there is more confusion and liability to error than in the spelling of proper names. If a name is in the least degree unusual or unfamiliar, it is almost sure to be presented in two or more forms. Nor need we wonder at it when we consider that the copyists were frequently ignorant persons, giving in their work many indications of both ignorance and want of care. We have already seen how it is with “Asa” and “Amon” in the first chapter of this Gospel. There are other names in that same chapter in a similar condition of cacography among the manuscripts, even the best of them.
We have here three different words or forms of words given as the name of the people to whose country Jesus had come, — "Gergesenes," A. V.; "Gadarenes," R. V.; and "Gerasenes," Lat. Versions. In addition to these, the Sinaitic manuscript, first hand, reads "Gazarenes"; while the Codex Sangallensis (Δ) has "Garadenes." Some of these variations are simply clerical blunders, or possibly preferences; as "Garadenes" or "Gazarenes" for "Gadarenes." But others can hardly be so considered; and it is difficult oftentimes, in fact impossible sometimes, to decide from mere documentary evidence which is the correct form. Nor can we in this matter always trust our oldest known manuscripts. These are by no means always in agreement; and sometimes they are widely astray, as the reader will have abundant occasion to see before he reaches the close of these volumes.

But let us look at the testimony of the manuscripts in regard to the name in the verse before us. In support of the reading "Gergesenes," we have the Sinaitic Codex as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, C amended by its second corrector, E, K, I, S, U, V, X, II, nearly all the cursive, the Memphitic, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and Origen,—the oldest of these witnesses being the Memphitic Version, of the second century. The margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version testifies to both "Gergesenes" and "Gerasenes." —In attestation of "Gadarenes," we have B, C first hand, M, also X first hand, and Δ (if we consider their modes of spelling as the consequence of preference or mere clerical error), about sixteen cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Persic Versions, Epiphanius, one catena, and "a few" copies in the hands of Origen. The oldest testimony in favor of this reading reaches back also to the second century. It is the reading adopted by Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, and Westcott and Hort.—"Gerasenes" is the reading attested by the Thebaic Version, all copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Frankish, and Anglo-Saxon Versions, and by the Latin Fathers generally. It is adopted by Lachmann as the true reading, and preferred by Griesbach. Yet it is not supported by a single known Greek manuscript. We may therefore safely set it aside as not being the genuine reading here. This name,—"Gerasenes,"—for which the attestation is so strong in Mark v. 1 and Luke viii. 26, 37, instead of denoting the people of Gerasa in Perea opposite Samaria, as Origen and others suppose, is only another form for "Gergesenes." The name Gergesa, among the Arabs of the present day, is pronounced Kersa, Geresa, or Gerasa.¹ It was probably so called by many in the time of Christ, while others, like the Galilean Jews, who spoke a slightly different dialect, gave utterance to the guttural sound represented by "g" in the middle of the word. Both Mark and Luke may have given the preference to the shorter and smoother form of the word. At any rate, "Gerasenes" must be considered as only a clipping down of the harsher and probably less familiar "Gergesenes," while it is really the same name, and denotes the same people. This will readily account for what is only a seeming discrepancy between these two names among the various manuscripts and versions. But here, in Matthew, the question lies between "Gergesenes" and "Gadarenes." —In the time of Christ, Gadar was the capital of Perea, situated near the south bank of the Hieromax, the present Jermuk (or Yarmouk), and several miles southeast of the outlet of the sea of Galilee. In order that Christ, by crossing over to the east side of the sea, should "come into the country of the Gadarenes," we must suppose that the territory that in some way belonged to them lay in part north of the Hieromax, and extended several miles to the northwest of the city, reaching some little distance along the southeastern and eastern shore of the sea, "over against Galilee," as Luke expresses it. Otherwise Jesus, in crossing over from Capernaum, would not have found himself in their country. But we have

no reason to believe that the country of the Gadarenes extended beyond the immediate vicinity of the city itself. It seems, however, that there was a city very near where Jesus and his disciples landed; for we read (verse 34) that "the whole city came out to meet Jesus." Luke says (viii. 27) that, on his arrival, when he stepped forth upon the land, "there met him out of the city a certain man," etc. These statements indicate that the city, whatever its name may have been, was near by. This could not therefore have been Gadara; for that was several miles away. And, if it was not Gadara, it is not at all probable that the people would have been called Gadarenes. The place of Jesus' landing would naturally be spoken of as the country of the people who lived there,—especially as they turned out en masse in their wonderment to see him. And the people who lived there would naturally be designated by the name of their own place of residence, not by the name of some other city. It is not to be supposed that Matthew, who was with Jesus for two years, more or less, to say nothing of his previous life, and who was probably with him on this occasion, and was well acquainted with all this region, did not know what the name of the city or the people was, or where Gadara was. Theophylact, commenting on Mark v. 1, says: "the most correct copies have the country of the Gergesenes." It is true, he says this of Mark's text. But, if this is the correct reading in Mark, we cannot suppose that Matthew made a mistake, and wrote another name instead; for both are speaking of the same occurrence, and both well knew where and in whose country it occurred. It is far more probable that some early scribe, who knew of no such place as Gergesa, but to whom Gadara as a city of Peraea was well known, should have erred in supposing that Matthew's word was "Gadarenes" instead of "Gergesenes," and so wrote it,—especially as there is some resemblance between the two words, and the location of Gadara might easily have led to such a conclusion. Origen, commenting on this name, speaks as if most of the copies in his possession read "Gerasenes," a reading found in Matthew in no extant Greek manuscript. In a few copies he finds "Gadarenes"; while it is implied that other copies in his possession read "Gergesenes." He says: "The incident concerning the swine that were precipitated by the demons is recorded to have happened in the country of the Gerasenes. But Gerasa is a city of Arabia, situated near no sea or lake; and the evangelists, men possessed of a painstaking knowledge of localities about Judæa, would not have stated so obvious and easily disproved a falsehood. But then we find in a few copies, 'into the country of the Gadarenes.' As to this, it must be said that Gadara is indeed a city of Judæa, about which are famous warm baths; but there is nothing like a lake or a sea bordered with precipitous banks there. But Gergesena, whence the word 'Gergesenes,' is an ancient city near the lake of Tiberias, as it is now called, near which is a precipitous steep bordering on the lake, from which they say the swine were cast down by the demons."—On John i. 28.

Amidst the conflicting testimonies of the old manuscripts, we turn to Dr. Thomson's work, The Land and the Book; and, as we read, we cannot but feel that the facts thus laid before us ought to be allowed to decide the question. He says (the italics are his): "Our first point is that the miracle could not have occurred at Gadara. It is certain, from all the accounts we have of it, that the place was near the shore of the lake. Mark says that when he came out of the ship immediately there met him a man, etc. With this precise statement the tenor of all the narratives coincides, and therefore we must find a locality directly on the shore, and every place must be rejected that is not consistent with this ascertained fact. Again, the city itself, as well as the country of the Gergesenes, was at the shore of the lake. All the accounts imply this fact. Lastly, there was a steep mountain so near at hand that the herd of swine, rushing down it, were precipitated into the lake. Now Gadara does not meet any one of these necessary conditions. I take for granted, what I believe to be true, that Um Kels
marks the site of Gadara; and it was, therefore, about three
hours to the south of the extreme shore of the lake in that
direction. There is first a broad plain from Khurbet Samra
to the Jermuk, then the vast gorge of this river, and after it an
ascent for an hour and a half to Um Keis. No one, I think,
will maintain that this meets the requirements of the sacred
narratives, but is in irreconcilable contradiction to them. It
is true that a celebrated traveller, from his lofty standpoint at
Um Keis, overlooks all intervening obstacles, and makes the
swine rush headlong into the lake from beneath his very feet.
But to do this in fact (and the evangelists deal only in plain
facts), they must have run down the mountain for an hour and
a half, forded the deep Jermuk, quite as formidable as the
Jordan itself, ascended its northern bank, and raced across
a level plain several miles before they could reach the nearest
margin of the lake, a feat which no herd of swine would be
likely to achieve, even though they were 'possessed.' The
site of the miracle, therefore, was not at Gadara. This is an
important result. Nor was it in the country of the Gadarenes,
because that country lay south of the great river Jermuk; and
besides, if the territory of that city did at any time reach to the
south end of the lake, there is no mountain there above it
adapted to the conditions of the miracle; and, further, the city
itself where it was wrought was evidently on the shore. There
we must find it, whatever be its name. And in this Gersa or
Kersa we have a position which fulfils every requirement of
the narratives, and with a name so near to that in Matthew, as
to be in itself a strong corroboration of the truth of this identi-
fication. It is within a few rods of the shore, and an immense
mountain rises directly above it, in which are ancient tombs,
out of some of which the two men possessed of the devils may
have issued to meet Jesus. The lake is so near the base of the
mountain that the swine, rushing madly down it, could not
stop, but would be hurried on into the water and drowned.
The place is one which our Lord would be likely to visit,
having Capernaum in full view to the north, and Galilee 'over
against it,' as Luke says it was. The name, however, pro-
nounced by Bedwin Arabs is so similar to Gergesa, that, to
my inquiries for this place, they invariably said that it was at
Kersa; and they insisted that they were identical. I have an
abiding conviction that Matthew wrote the name correctly;
\textit{i.e.} Gergesenes. He was from this region, and personally
knew the localities. . . . Gergesa, or Gerasa, or Kersa, how-
ever pronounced, was small and unknown, while Gadara was
a Greek city, celebrated for its temples and theatres, and for
the warm baths on the Hieromax just below it. . . . If the
light shed upon this question by careful topographical exa-
ninations cannot settle it, then must it remain forever unsettled.
Let any one examine the various readings of these passages,
and he will despair of ever arriving at a safe probability from
mere manuscript authority.\footnote{Vol. ii., pp. 34-37.}
Ethiopic Versions. It is also given by Eusebius, Chrysostom, and others,—affording testimony running back nearly to the first century. The omission affords a reading which would naturally be given, in preference to the longer one, by B and its allies, some of which, notably 1 and 33, omit the word in Mark also, while 1, and several others, omit it in Luke as well. Nothing, however, is more natural than that the demoniacs should have called Jesus by name, as the other evangelists represent them to have done; and Matthew, who probably heard the outcry, would scarcely have omitted so prominent and important a word as this. Moreover, Ιησοῦ could hardly have been taken from Mark or Luke without the transfer also of τὸ υψίστον, "the most high," making the whole form of address here as there, "Jesus, thou Son of the most high God." We have no doubt that Ιησοῦ is genuine in Matthew just as truly as in the other Gospels.

ix. 4.

Against the word "knowing"—in the clause "And Jesus knowing their thoughts"—stands the marginal note, "Many ancient authorities read seeing," i.e. ἀνοίγω, "seeing" or "perceiving," instead of εἰδὼς, "knowing." This use of ἀνοίγω, as referring to mental vision, is not foreign to Matthew, as a reference to xxvii. 3 and 24 will show; though the usual word in such a connection is εἰδὼς. The former certainly has the preponderance of documentary evidence in its support, unless the Vatican manuscript outweighs nearly everything else, for it is attested by N (A is defective here), C, D, E first hand, F, K, L (which generally sides with B where it can), M, S, U, V, X, A, B second hand, the majority of the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, and Memphitic, and possibly some other versions. ἀνοίγω is the reading of only B, E second hand, M, P first hand, fifty odd cursives, and Chrysostom. The versions cannot be relied upon here, for they might give "perceiving" or "knowing" as the rendering of ἀνοίγω as well as of εἰδὼς. If the latter were the original word, it is difficult to believe that any scribe would have changed it to εἰδὼν; whereas if ἀνοίγω was really Matthew's word, a copyist might easily have considered it an error, or simply preferred εἰδώς, and substituted it instead, especially if he observed it to be the word used in xii. 25. The meaning, of course, is the same, whichever word is used. But external, as well as internal, evidence calls for the marginal reading as the true one. It is that of the Received Text, and is retained, very properly, by Tischendorf, Alford, and others.

ix. 18.

The "ancient authorities" that are referred to here as omitting "oft" are only N first hand, B, and the two cursives, 27, 71, — testimony hardly sufficient to condemn a reading supported by N as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, every other uncial (B only excepted), all the cursives but two, and all the ancient versions. The omission of the word from the four manuscripts from which it is missing, was plainly enough due to the belief that its presence was not necessary, as it is not found in Mark ii. 18. If the aim had been to make Matthew correspond with Luke (v. 33), the word employed would not have been πολλά, "many times," but πολλά, "oft," — the word that was actually inserted by the sixth-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex from Luke v. 33.

Rec. T. ἄρχειν ἀνοίγω — there came a certain ruler and.
Rev. T. ἄρχειν εἰς ἀνοίγω — there came a ruler and. [Margin: "Gr. one ruler."]

The manuscripts and versions present much confusion and variation just here. The Sinaitic (second corrector) and Vatican manuscripts read ἄρχειν εἰς προσελθών, "one (or a) ruler came up and." This reading is adopted by Lachmann and preferred by Westcott and Hort. It is supported by four copies of the Old Latin (a, b, c, ff') and the Vulgate Version.
first hand, 13, 157, and some other cursive s together with the Thebais Version read ἄρχων προσέλθων, “a ruler came up and.” C’s second corrector, G, L, U, and a large number of cursive s read ἄρχων τις προσέλθων, “a certain ruler came up and.” Γ and a number of cursive s have ἄρχων τις ἐλθών, “a certain ruler came and”; while other copies read ἄρχων ἐις εἰσελθών, “one (or a) ruler came in and,” or ἄρχων τις ἐσιελθών, “a certain ruler came in and.” The text adopted by the Revisers is that of K, S, V, Δ, Π, about forty cursive s, two copies of the Old Latin (d, f), the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions. But the reading that seems to be most clearly the true reading is that adopted by Tischendorf and Alford, the reading of Ν as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, M, X, more than thirty cursive s, and given by Basil and Chrysostom,—namely, ἄρχων εἰσελθών, “a ruler came in and”; i.e. into the house of Matthew (verses 9, 10, and Luke v. 29), where the circumstances of the preceding verses took place. While “at meat” there, the Pharisees queried why Jesus should eat with publicans and sinners. (Verses 10–13.) But “then,” — i.e. while they were yet in the house,—John’s disciples came up to him and started a question which called for a reply. (The record of this occupies the next four verses.) And while he was answering them, “behold, a ruler came in and worshipped him,” etc. “And Jesus arose” from the table, etc. (Verse 19.) The order here given must be accepted as the true order of the events recorded; for Matthew was an eye-witness of what he speaks of, and could not but state the facts as they occurred. But copyists and correctors of manuscripts, failing to see the force of the prepositional prefix εἰς-, from time to time made confusion with Matthew’s words. Some, taking εἰςελθών as two words instead of one, considered the prefix as the numeral ἕν, “one,” — giving the reading adopted by the Revisers. Others, taking a similar view, thought it necessary to insert προσ between the two, as a prefix for the participle. (So B, etc.) This would remove all doubt as to the meaning. But, this not being satisfactory to all, others retained the προσ-, but rejected ἕν. (Ν, etc.) This, however, did not suit every one; hence some, while retaining προσ-, changed ἕν to τις. (C, etc.) Others, rejecting προσ- but retaining ἕν-, prefixed τις; and still others made other changes. The reading of the Received Text cannot be maintained; it has no uncials to support it, and but a few cursive s besides the Memphitic Version and one copy of the Old Latin Version.

ix. 32.

Rec. T. προσήνηκαν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπον κυρίαν δαιμονίζόμενον — they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil.

Rev. T. προσήνηκαν αὐτῷ κυρίαν δαιμονίζόμενον — there was brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil.

The omission of ἄνθρωπος of course makes no difference in the meaning; but it makes less verbose Greek. The same difference appears between the two corresponding English expressions “a dumb demoniac” and “a dumb demoniacal man,” in choosing between which no elegant writer would hesitate a moment. Hence the appearance of the more concise form in Ν, B, four cursive s, the Peshito Syriac, the two Egyptian, and Ethiopic Versions. If this had been the original wording, no scribe would ever have been tempted to insert ἄνθρωπον, any more than an English copyist would be to change “a dumb demoniac” to “a dumb demoniacal man.” This is one of those instances in which “the shorter reading” is a transparent attempt at improvement on the original, and to be rejected as a false reading. And so it is by Tischendorf and others. But Lachmann and, of course, Westcott and Hort adopt the reading of the Vatican Codex. The change in the Revisers’ Text is purely a work of supererogation, the revised English text corresponding to these words remaining the same, letter for letter, as that of the A. V.
Rec. T. πέμψας δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ — he sent two of his disciples, and.
Rev. T. πέμψας διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ — he sent by his disciples, and.

"By his disciples." This reading is strongly vouched for by manuscripts and versions. At the same time, we are far from being assured that it is the true reading. It has the appearance of having been introduced through an error on the part of the translator of the Peshito Syriac Version. In the first place, it implies too much. It implies that John sent the great body of his disciples, if not all of them. This is the meaning of the words "his disciples," just as we understand the words when used of Christ's disciples in xii. 1, 2, and elsewhere; and as we understand "his brethren," in xii. 46, and elsewhere: i.e. his disciples as a body; his brethren, all of them. If the reading were "by some of his disciples," or if the article were omitted, so that it read "by disciples of his," it would be a plausible reading, indicating a portion only, perhaps not more than two or three. But the reading "by his disciples" is unnatural and scarcely possible, to denote only two of them.

Another thing that militates against this reading is the fact that it destroys the force of the phrase; it renders the words altogether useless. For by whom could John, imprisoned as he was, send to Jesus but by some of his own disciples? No others would be sufficiently interested in his doubts and perplexities, or care enough about him, to go to Jesus on such an errand. Besides, he could find no others to whom he could entrust such a message with any expectation of receiving a faithful answer. Now to say that John sent on this occasion "by his disciples" is to say what is not needed. If he sent at all, it must have been by some of them, not by Herodians, or Jews who were not in sympathy with him, or by anybody else. The phrase is therefore useless, uncalled for. But if we are told that John, when he heard in prison of the works of Christ, "sent two of his disciples," we have language that is not only natural, but forcibly significant. The phrase "two of his disciples" is no useless appendage. It is commonly objected that this reading is taken from Luke. This, however, is pure conjecture, and of no weight whatever. Matthew was one of the immediate followers of Christ. By his place among the twelve disciples, he would be likely to know just how many of John's disciples came to Jesus with this inquiry. And if only two came, as Luke declares was the case (and no witness but one untrustworthy copy of the Old Latin Version leaves his language indefinite as to the number), then certainly Matthew ought to have known it, and beyond all question did know it. And knowing it, there is not the least probability that he would have told us that John sent "by his disciples," and not that he sent "two of his disciples." It is far more credible that some careless early translator or transcriber mistook δύο for διὰ, as the first printer of King James's Version mistook "out" for "at" in Matt. xxiii. 24, —to which blunder we are indebted for the false reading that appears to this day in all our copies of the Authorized New Testament.

In short, while the manuscript testimony in favor of "by his disciples" is strong, it is by no means overwhelming or conclusive. It consists of seven uncials, B, C first hand, D, P, Z, Δ, the two cursives 33, 124, one copy of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, as well as the Armenian and Gothic. On the other hand, the common reading is attested by the thirteen uncials, C third hand, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Ψ, II, nearly all the cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Ethiopic, and margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version; also Origen, Chrysostom, and others of the Fathers. The Curetonian Syriac and several copies of the Old Latin Version, as well as Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho, read "sent his disciples," —omitting both "two of" and "by." In the face of external testimony thus contradictory, we are constrained to yield to the overwhelming internal evidence in support of the old reading, "he sent two of his disciples."
Rec. T. τί ἠξήλθεστε ἵδιν; προφήτην; — what went ye out to see? A prophet?
Rev. T. τί ἠξήλθεστε; ἵδιν προφήτην; — wherefore went ye out? to see a prophet?

To obtain this rendering, it will be seen that the Revisers have simply altered the punctuation. But this form of the Greek text, while favored by the Memphitic Version and the two copies f and k of the Old Latin Version, is without the support of a single known Greek manuscript. The reading presented by only Ν first hand, B, and Z, is τί ἠξήλθεστε ἵδιν προφήτην; But this is a different reading from the Revisers', though its meaning is the same. It is an arrangement made by some early corrector of the text, who, conceiving either that this gave the true meaning, or that it would afford variety to the discourse if it did not make the words more impressive to take them in this sense, transposed them to make sure of having them so understood by others. It certainly has every appearance of being an attempt at emendation. Our only surprise is that any candid, thoughtful scholar should consider the reading genuine. The preponderance of external, to say nothing of internal, evidence is greatly against it. All the other uncials (Ν amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π), every known cursive, all the versions except the three just mentioned, and Origen and Chrysostom unite in support of the common reading. And very properly. It must be remembered that the language is not Matthew's own. He is simply giving a report of the words of another. Now, while it is easy to say that the common reading found here was taken from Luke vii. 26, it is impossible to prove it. The report of Christ's words as given by Luke is universally accepted as genuine. That is, Jesus is represented as three times asking the same question, the only difference being in the use of θεάσασθαι and the additional words "into the wilderness" the first time he asks it, and of ἵδιν afterwards both times. Now, with the exception of this changed reading of the two oldest manuscripts, the two reports given by Matthew and Luke of this thrice-asked question are, as we should expect them to be when given by true and faithful reporters, almost precisely alike. In meaning they are quite so. Nor has either taken from the other, as the slight variation of wording between them shows. Where Matthew says "They that wear soft clothing are in kings' houses," Luke says "They that are gorgeously apparelled and live delicately are in kings' courts." But the thought is the same in both, and the mould into which it is cast is the same. Not so, however, with the queries, "What went ye out to see? a prophet?" and "Why went ye out? to see a prophet?" Now what we insist upon is, that if Luke has given a faithful report of Jesus' words, — and no one questions this, — then the report of Matthew, who was probably present and heard them, as that report is presented in the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices and the Dublin palimpsest Z, is an improbable and incredible one: — improbable, for it is by no means likely that Jesus, after having twice asked "What went ye out to see?" should have changed the question and given it another meaning, — "Why went ye out?" when there is nothing in the connection to indicate any such intention, or any reason for such a change; and incredible, because it passes belief that two faithful reporters, in recording the same utterances, should agree twice, and the third time differ, yet employ precisely the same words; that is, that both should give Christ's words correctly twice, and yet, when they came to give them the third time, should have understood them differently. Especially so is it when we consider that the one whose report is received without a question was not present to hear the words, while the one who was present is the one whose report is brought into doubt by his copyists. It amounts, in fine, to this, that

if the reading of B is the true reading, one of the evangelists
has certainly made a mistake. For, if Christ said “What went
ye out to see? a prophet?” as Luke says he did, he certainly
did not say “Why went ye out? to see a prophet?” Or if, on
the other hand, he said “Why went ye out? to see a prophet?”
Luke misrepresents him in making him say something else, though
he attributes to him the same words. Besides all this, Jesus’
immediate answer to his own question shows the impropriety
of the Revisers’ punctuation and interpretation. The very
brevity of that answer implies that the inquiry is “What?”
not “Why?” We cannot therefore escape the conclusion
either that one of the evangelists is in error here, or that the
three old manuscripts that would make him out to be so are,
in this respect, false witnesses. And is the latter conclusion
too hard to accept? We have but to look only seven verses
farther along (xi. 16) to find that Z, B, C, D, Z, nine other
uncials, and more than fifty cursives, are united in one of the
most palpably false readings in this Gospel; namely, “who call
unto the others,” τοῖς ἄφροις, in place of “who call unto their
fellows,” τοῖς ἄφροις. This reading, though adopted by Tisch-
endorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, and perhaps plaus-
ibly explained by certain commentators, is simply a blunder in
writing ε for αι — not an uncommon itacism among ancient
copyists — admitted into the text so early as to have affected
a large number of manuscripts and versions.

xi. 15.

A marginal note informs the reader that “some ancient
authorities omit to hear.” The only evidence we have that
ἀκούειν is not a part of the genuine text is the testimony of the
two uncialς B and D, one twelfth-century cursive, and one
copy ε of the Old Latin Version. For those who are aware
of the untrustworthiness of the testimony of D in readings more
or less peculiar to itself, and of the almost invariable habit of
B to adopt the more concise rather than the seemingly verbose
reading, it is not difficult to decide what weight should be
attached to this testimony, especially when all the other uncial,
cursives, versions, and the only Fathers that give the passage,
are arrayed without a dissenting voice against it, and read,
“He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.” There can scarcely
be a reasonable doubt that some early scribe or self-consti-
tuted corrector omitted the word, because he could not see its
emphatic character, and very possibly regarded it a positive
blemish. But, however that may be, the testimony greatly
preponderates in favor of retaining it, some of which testimony,
as that of the Peshito Syriac, the Old Latin, the two Egyptian
 Versions, and Justin Martyr, runs back to the second cen-
tury, and from different quarters of Christendom, Lachmann,
Tregelles, and Alford very properly retain the word, but Tisch-
endorf and, as might be expected, Westcott and Hort reject it.
(Compare Note on xiii. 9.)

xi. 19.

Rec. T. Ἰδοκιανή ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς — wisdom is justi-
 fied of her children.

Rev. T. Ἰδοκιανή ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῆς — wisdom is justified
by her works.

The translator of the Gospel of Matthew into what is now
known as the Peshito Syriac Version, the earliest of all the ver-
sions of the New Testament, on coming to the word τέκνων here,
misread it as ἔργων, and consequently translated it “works.”
Some early transcriber or possessor of the Greek Gospel of
Matthew, having this Syriac Version at his side, and seeing the
rendering “works” given in that Version instead of “children,”
wrote ἔργων, “works,” in the margin of his copy as a reading
that might possibly be the true one. From that margin, the
word soon got into the text of a few early manuscripts; and
thence into other versions as well as into the Revisers’ Text.
It is obviously, in the language of Dr. Hort, “a fundamentally
and distinctively Syrian reading,” attested by B, the single
twelfth-century cursive 124 (one of Ferrar’s group, and the
only one of them that here reads "works"), some copies known to Jerome, as well as the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Persic Versions. Jerome, in commenting on this verse, says, "In some Gospels [in quibusdam evangelis, which can only mean in some copies of Matthew’s Gospel, possibly Latin copies], the passage reads, ‘Wisdom is justified by her works.’ And in fact wisdom does not seek the testimony of words, but of works.” Yet in his own Latin version he reads “children,”—in attestation of which we have the margin of B (where τέκνον is inserted by the original scribe himself or by his trusted “proof-reader,” which amounts to the same thing), C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Η, all but one of the cursives, most copies of the OH Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Curetonian and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic and Armenian Versions, and the Persic of the Polyglot, which is made from the Peshito Syriac, and implies that the copy or copies of that version from which this Persic Version was obtained had “children,” not “works.” One manuscript of the Ethiopic Version contains both readings. Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort read “works,” as does Tregelles also in his text; but in his margin he has “children,” the reading adopted by Lachmann, Alford, Scrivener, and others. It is true, Luke (vii. 35) has the same reading. Hence those who adopt “works” as the true reading say that the other reading is “from Luke,” without a particle of evidence to support the statement, and apparently overlooking entirely the fact that the word is a part, not of the evangelist’s own language, but of his record of one of the utterances of another, of which the evangelist himself is simply a reporter. On the contrary, the very fact that Luke wrote “is justified by her children,” and that this reading is accepted as the genuine reading with him (it being attested by every known witness except the Sinaitic Codex), is prima facie evidence that it is also the true reading in Matthew. And when we lay by the side of this fact the other fact that the external evidence in support of this reading is extremely strong, we cannot but conclude with Dr. Scrivener that “τέκνον is undoubtedly the only true reading.”

xi. 23.

Rec. T. η ήως τού οδρανών υψωθησα, — which art exalted unto heaven.
Rev. T. μή ήως τού οδρανού υψωθηση; — shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?

It seems incredible that any devout reader of the New Testament should ever bring himself to believe that Jesus really expressed himself in the manner thus represented by the Revised Version. It is not like Christ to ask such a question as this in regard to the future condition of Capernaum, when he knew perfectly well that there was no possibility that Capernaum would ever attain to that condition, and immediately answer it in the negative by saying that, on the contrary, the opposite will be the case. Besides, he had no occasion for asking such a question. Capernaum had already been exalted to heaven in privileges by having been blest with his presence, his miracles, his teaching. It would be impossible for it to be raised to any higher position at any future time. Aside from this passage and the corresponding one in Luke (x. 15), as given in the Revised Version, there is not another instance in all the Gospels in which Jesus thus expressed himself. But the reading is an obviously false one. If the Greek New Testament had been written from the first in cursives, with the words separated one from another as we write, this reading would never have originated. But the manuscripts for the first nine centuries were written in uncial or capitals, and the earlier ones with no spaces between the words. These were run together in an unbroken succession of letters; and, not to mention other evils resulting from this mode of writing, a letter was frequently repeated where it should not have been, or omitted where it should have been doubled. This is a common occurrence in the old manuscripts of the New Testament. We have an instance of the former here. Jesus’ words, σου
"Thou Capernaum, which hast been exalted," by the doubling of the final letter of "Capernaum," were made to read Καπερναοῦν, μη, etc. The next scribe or critical reader that got hold of this manuscript, not seeing any propriety in the utterance, "Thou, Capernaum, not having been exalted to heaven, shalt be brought down to hell," and not detecting the blunder that had been made, but considering μη to be the sign of a question, and the fault to lie in the participial form that follows, altered this into a very similar personal form, ἢψωθησα, "shalt be exalted," and so changed the Saviour's solemn, pertinent, truthful declaration, "Thou, Capernaum, which hast been exalted to heaven," into the flippant question, "Thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted to heaven?" — a reading which was afterwards taken up by B, first hand, C, three cursive, half a dozen copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and one Persic Version. This reading must have been known also to Irenæus, unless his words were changed by Rufinus, his Latin translator. D first hand, and L retain the article as a relative (ἡ) with the verbal form (slightly changed in L), and read, "Thou, Capernaum, which shalt be exalted to heaven," — a reading followed in only one copy of the Old Latin Version. Eight other uncials (E, F, G, S, U, V, Τ, II second hand), about fifty cursive, and some codices known to Jerome, take the article as a relative, and, changing the false reading ἢψωθησα into ἢψωθησε, read "Thou, Capernaum, which hast been exalted to heaven," which, though really a false reading, is equivalent in meaning and force to the genuine one. All the other uncials (B amended by the sixth or seventh-century corrector, K, M, X, Δ, II first hand), most of the cursive, four copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, all copies but one of the Persic, Cæsarius of Constantinople, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theodoret, the only Fathers that quote the passage, sustain the genuine reading, — that of the Received Text. The same change has been
eected in Luke x. 15, and adopted by the Revisers as genuine. It is, however, the same transparently false reading there as here.
Against the words "go down," — "Thou shalt go down unto Hades," — stands the marginal note, "Many ancient authorities read be brought down." This is misleading. The true statement of the case would be, "Nearly all the ancient authorities read be brought down"; for the truth is that B and D are the only Greek manuscripts that read anything else. It is true that the Old Latin, Vulgate, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions support the reading "shall go down," as well as Cæsarius and Eusebius. But the same class of witnesses (B, D, the Curetonian Syriac and Ethiopic Versions) vouch for the same as the genuine reading in Luke x. 15, which the Revisers reject there, and very properly. Both there and here the word seems to be an importation from Isa. xiv. 15, as rendered in the Septuagint. Tischendorf and Alford reject this reading in both places; while Lachmann, as well as the Revisers, adopts it here, but rejects it in Luke; and Westcott and Hort adopt it in

1 This marginal note, in its misleading character, reminds one of the note in Westcott and Hort's Greek New Testament opposite the word εἰρήν in Mark iv. 21; namely, "MSS. άρα Αφ." Although the Appendix, here referred to, which is in another volume and may not be accessible to the reader of Westcott and Hort's text, explains that άρα is virtually the reading of only four manuscripts, — to which Σ should now be added as a fifth, — the expression "MSS. άρα" naturally, if not necessarily, implies that the manuscripts generally, or to a large extent at least, read άρα. But, when one comes to learn that, in the eyes of Westcott and Hort, K and B are about the only manuscripts worth regarding, and are so vastly superior to all other documents that may be arrayed against them "that no readings of K, B, can safely be rejected absolutely" (Introduction, p. 225), he understands how there should be so much apparent assumption couched in that little marginal expression "MSS. άρα," which means simply K and B read άρα; for these two uncials and two cursive witnesses were the only documents then known to Westcott and Hort as being guilty of the gross blunder of saying that a candle is brought to "be put under a candlestick." The note, "Many ancient authorities read be brought down," seems to have emanated from a very similar source. Both notes are evasive, misleading, and of like untrustworthy character.
both, setting the true reading in the margin in Luke. Westcott and Hort are consistent in their readings,—clinging to the false text of B in both places. But Lachmann and the Revisers are not; for, if Luke is correct in reporting Christ as saying, “Thou shalt be brought down,” there is no probability that Matthew gave a different report,—“Thou shalt go down.” The passive would indeed be the natural form for Christ to make use of after having used the passive just before,—“having been exalted.” The weight of evidence certainly greatly preponderates in favor of the passive in both Gospels.

xii. 4.

The plural reading, “they did eat,” presented in the margin, is supported only by S, B, and 569, and seems to be an alteration, perhaps inadvertently made from ε to o because of the context. And yet the preceding εἰσῆλθεν, “he entered,” as well as αἰτῶν θαγεῖν, “for him to eat,” shows David to be the leading object of thought, and consequently the singular form of the verb to be the true form. This is confirmed by a reference to Mark ii. 26 and Luke vi. 4, where Jesus is reported as having used the singular. —The following δ, “what,” which is adopted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, and Lachmann in his text, though not by the Revisers, instead of οὐ, “which loaves,” is an equally questionable reading, introduced apparently on account of the supposed indefiniteness of the plural as referring to loaves of bread, which in themselves considered are not unlawful food. And, to obviate any such misconception, οὐ would have been changed to δι, meaning “something which” it was not lawful for him to eat. Mark and Luke show the true reading to be οὐ, referring directly to ἀρτοῦ, “loaves.”

xii. 31.

The only “ancient authorities” that support the marginal reading “unto you men” are B, τ, and Athanasius, who may have been acquainted with, if not in possession of, Codex B itself. The presence of ὑμῶν, “you,” here seems to be a mere repetition of that word from the line above through some copyist’s inadvertence, and is plainly an impossibly genuine reading, unworthy of notice. —The omission, by the Revisers, of τῶν ἀνθρώπων, “unto men,” at the end of the verse, is unquestionably a mistake. The word is omitted by S, B, about ten cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and four or five Fathers, but simply as an intended improvement upon the original wording. Other manuscripts and Fathers for the same reason changed the reading to ἀνθρώπος, “unto them.” The Textus Receptus, however, preserves the true text, which is somewhat repetitious and less elegant, and for this reason must be considered genuine, attested as it is by the preponderating testimony of C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Ῥ, Δ, Π, the great body of the cursive, four copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and several of the Fathers.

xii. 46.

Rec. T. ἐμὴ μητρὸς καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι αὐτῆς εἰσῆλθεν ἔξω — his mother and his brethren stood without.

Rev. T. ἐμὴ μητρὸς καὶ οἱ ἄδελφοι εἰσῆλθεν ἔξω — his mother and his brethren stood without.

The omission of ἀνθρώπος, “his,” from the Greek text is a wholly unnecessary alteration, affecting the English version in no way whatever, not even with italics. Why it should have been made is more than we can understand; for it is favored only by the sixth-century emender of the Sinaitic Codex, by Z, three cursive, seven copies of the Old Latin Version, and a single passage in Origen and Chrysostom each; whereas, its presence is called for by the original scribe as well as the earlier seventh-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, by B, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Ῥ, Δ, II, and all the other cursive, versions, and Fathers. It is bracketed by Lachmann as a possible interpolation, but is accepted as genuine by Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and other editors.
A marginal note says that "some ancient authorities" omit this verse. These authorities are N first hand, B, L, T, four cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, and the Curetonian Syriac Version. Those who regard these manuscripts and versions as presenting the original text, conclude, without any other reason for so doing, that the verse is an interpolation from Mark iii. 32, or Luke viii. 20. Westcott and Hort omit it from the text, though they have it in the margin. But nearly all other editors accept it as genuine, or probably genuine. The testimony against it is by no means sufficient to call for its rejection. In fact, the hand that tampered with the longer reading in Matt. i. 25 seems very plainly to have been at work here and on the autóω of the preceding verse, trying to eliminate from this Gospel all traces of the fact that Mary had more than one son. The emendator, having stricken out autóω from verse 46, and omitted verse 47, could very well afford to continue, in verse 48, the presence of μω in connection with ἀδελφοί (though B first hand omits it), because, in verses 49, 50, Christ makes the expression mean others than brothers by birth. But to have a by-stander say to Jesus, "Thy mother and thy brothers stand without," etc. was too much for our ancient critic; and so he rejected the whole verse. Yet the ἀποκριθής, "answered," and τῷ εἶποντι αὐτῷ, "him that told him," of verse 48, make an uncomfortably suspicious and unaccountable reading if this verse is omitted.

Revised Text, xi. 47.

Rec. T. ὁ ἵχων ὁτα ἁκοὶν ἁκοῖντα — Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

Rev. T. ὁ ἵχων ὁτα ἁκοῖντα — He that hath ears, let him hear.

This omission is called for by only N, B, L, and four copies of the Old Latin Version, — evidence only a little stronger than that which calls for the omission of ἁκοῖν in xi. 15, and altogether insufficient, of itself, to condemn a rival reading. Yet, in xi. 15, the Revisers retain the word. The reports of Mark (iv. 9) and Luke (viii. 8) show conclusively that it was a part of Jesus' utterance on this occasion, and it is an important word. "He that hath ears to hear" is tantamount to saying, He that hath hearing ears,—ears that are not closed against the truth, but are capable of hearing and conveying to the mind the true import of what is heard. It calls for special emphasis, and adds greatly to the significance of the phrase. But remove it, and it reduces the language to a comparatively unmeaning form of words; for hearing ears are generally the possession of a select few, while every one has ears. The close connection in which the verse stands to verses 13–16, and especially to verse 16,—"Blessed are your ears, for they hear,"—shows the importance and necessity of the word in this connection. We find no reason for thinking that it is borrowed from Mark or Luke. It is far easier to believe that some concealed reader or scribe, having an undue regard for brevity, and not seeing the force of the word, omitted it as unnecessary; and that his copy, falling into other hands, led to the omission in B and its associates, while the genuine text has come down to us supported by the strong testimony of all the other witnesses, including C, D, E, F, G, K, M, S, U, V, X, T, Δ, Π, all the cursives, and all the versions except the four copies (a, c, f', and k) of the Old Latin Version just referred to. The same may be said concerning the omission of ἁκοῖν, in verse 43, which is supported, as here, by not a single cursive, but only by N first hand, B, four copies of the Old Latin Version, three of the Vulgate, and some copies in the hands of Hilary. It is noteworthy that B and k alone insist on the omission in both xi. 15 and these two verses, while their co-witnesses are more or less divided against them. Of all unfounded probabilities, there is none more groundless than the supposition that the presence of ἁκοῖν in these places in all the other documents is an interpolation. It is Christ's own
language faithfully recorded by one who probably heard it and knew its importance, as well as by Mark and Luke, who only received it from others. (See Note on xi. 15.)

**xiii. 35.**

The omission of κόσμου, "of the world," noted in the margin, is supported by the sixth-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, by B, two cursive (1, 22), two copies (r, k), of the Old Latin Version, and the Curetonian Syriac, and is noted by Clement, Origen, and Eusebius. But it seems to be due to some copyists' having in mind Psa. lxviii. 2, whence the quotation is made, and where, in the Septuagint, δακρύσας, "from the beginning," takes the place of the phrase "from the foundation of the world." Having written δικαίωσαν, and taking it in the sense of "from the beginning," it is but natural that the scribe should have passed on without adding κόσμου, or noticing that he had omitted it. It is a common error, and very easily and unconsciously made. The fact of its being so feebly attested in this instance is proof sufficient of its true character; whereas, the common reading is supported by the original scribe and afterwards by the earlier seventh-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, by C, D, E, F, G, K, I, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, almost the whole body of the cursives, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the two Egyptian, the Ethiopic, and other versions, as well as by Clement (Homilies) and Chrysostom.

**xiii. 36.**

Rec. T. μαθητήσαι — Declare to us.
Rev. T. Διασκεδάζωσαι — Explain to us.

The latter reading is attested only by Χ first hand, B, and Origen in one passage,—with whom, in fact, the reading may have originated, for it has every appearance of being a gloss. The former, a word less likely to be employed in such a connection, though apparently used both on this and on a subsequent occasion and by the same person in both instances, is the word that is presented to us by every other known uncial as well as by the earlier seventh-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, by the entire body of the cursives, and by Origen himself in four different places. Yet, because φράσαν, "declare," appears in xv. 15, it is inferred that it cannot be the true reading here. As if Peter could not have uttered the same word twice under the same conditions, it must give place to διασκεδάζωσαι, even if this is a most insufficiently attested reading.

**xiii. 43.**

On the omission of διακόναι, "to hear," see note on verse 9.

**xiii. 55.**

Rev. T. Ἰωσῆφ — Joseph.

"Joses" and "Joseph" are not different forms of the same name. They are distinct, unrelated names, from different sources, and of different significations. In chapter xxvii. 56, the person here spoken of is called Joses. So, too, in Mark vi. 3, xv. 40, as well as seven verses farther on (verse 47), he is called Joses. Not that all the manuscripts, or even editors, by any means, are agreed on "Joses" in all these places. But the preponderance of evidence in each of these instances favors the common reading "Joses." This is the only place where the name "Joses" of the Received Text has been set aside by the Revisers for "Joseph." They seem to have been made to believe that the genuine reading is that given by the Sinaitic Codex as amended by its "proof-reader," by B, C, three cursive, the Curetonian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and two or three other versions, while the other two readings, "Joses" and "John," are set aside as equally unworthy of notice. This, it would seem, could scarcely have been done except on the supposition that "Joses" and "Joseph" are but different forms of the same name. As the other passages clearly show, the true name is Joses,—written
in uncials \textit{IUCHC}. This, some ignorant reader either mis-
took for, or considered an erroneous or imperfectly written
form of, the more familiar name \textit{IUCHCF}. He merely changed
the final \textit{C} into \textit{F}.

\textbf{xiv. 12.}

Rec. T. \textit{ἐραν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἔδαψαν αὐτὸν}——took up the body, and
buried it.

Rev. T. \textit{ἐραν τὸ πτώμα, καὶ ἔδαψαν αὐτὸν}—— took up the corpse,
and buried him.

Πτώμα, “corpse,” is probably the true reading. It is strongly
attested. But this is more than can be said of \textit{αὐτόν}, which is
supported only by \textit{X} first hand, B, \Theta, and two copies (\textit{a, ff'})
of the Old Latin Version. According to the above texts, “him”
is certainly a harder reading than “it”; and in that respect,
if there is no other consideration, it is favored by internal
evidence of readings. But \textit{X} first hand and \textit{ff'} have the reading
\textit{τὸ πτώμα αὐτοῦ}, “his corpse”; and this might very readil have
led to the introduction of the unemphatic “him” in place of
“It.” Codex \Theta and the Old Latin Version \textit{a} support the reading
πτώμα. Codex B only, then, is left of the witnesses that
support πτώμα to read “took up the corpse, and buried him.”
This can hardly be considered enough to sustain this reading,
especially when it is seen how easily \textit{αὐτόν} might have been intro-
duced by one whose mind was still dwelling on the previous
\textit{αὐτῷ}——“And his disciples came, and took up \textit{his} corpse, and
buried \textit{him}.” On the whole, the evidence is decidedly in favor
of the common reading, which is attested by \textit{X}'s sixth-century
emendator, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, I, \Delta, \Pi, the
entire body of the cursives, and all the versions but the two
copies just mentioned of the Old Latin Version.

\textbf{xiv. 24.}

In place of the words “was now in the midst of the sea,”
the marginal note says that some ancient authorities read
“was many furlongs distant from the land.” This is the read-
ing of the Vatican manuscript, of three of Professor Ferrar's
group (13, 124, 346, carefully written manuscripts with some
very unusual readings), which practically constitute but one wit-
ess, the Peshito and Curetonian Syriac, Armenian, and Persian
Versions, — a reading rejected by Lachmann and Tischendorf,
though adopted by Tregelles and Westcott and Hort, while the
other reading is placed in their margins. The Philoxenian
Syriac combines the two, and reads “was many furlongs dis-
tant from the land in the midst of the sea”; while one cursive
(238) has simply “was many furlongs distant” ; and the Mem-
phitic and Arabic Versions read “was \textit{about twenty-five} furlongs
distant from the land,” apparently from John vi. 19. The ex-
pression bears the evident stamp of a false reading, — a gloss,
to prevent the words from being misunderstood by some stupid,
matter-of-fact reader as meaning, not midway across the sea,
but in the midst of the waters with which they were contending.
There need not be a moment's question as to what is the true
reading.

\textbf{xiv. 29.}

In support of the marginal reading “and came,” which
“some ancient authorities read” in place of “to come” or
“to go” to Jesus, there are but two uncials, B and apparently
C first hand, two versions, the Curetonian Syriac and Armenian,
and a single patristic writer, Chrysostom; while the writer of
the Sinaicit manuscript, to make sure of having the right word,
\textit{ἐλθὼν ἡλθεν} \textit{οὖν}; \textit{i.e.}, Peter walked upon the waters “to
come — therefore he came” — to Jesus! This, the earlier
seventh-century corrector of that manuscript amended by strik-
ing out “therefore he came” and the sixth-century corrector
of C makes this manuscript also have the verb in the infinitive,
— the form presented in all the other uncials, in every cursive,
and called for by all but two versions. Yet Tischendorf and of
course Westcott and Hort read “and came.” Immediately
after the words “to go to Jesus,” Matthew adds, “But when he
[Peter, apparently on his way to Jesus] saw the wind boister-
ous, he was afraid, and beginning to sink *cried out,* — not "said" as if he was already beside Jesus, but εἴραςτέ, "shouted," to him. From this, it is obvious that the object of the evangelist, in the word ἔλθεν, was to state the purpose for which Peter undertook to walk on the water, not the fact of his having gone to Jesus. To do this, of course, the infinitive was necessary. A critical reader, intent on making corrections, as some of those old readers seem to have been, not observing the force of the infinitive, would very naturally change it so as to make the construction correspond with what precedes: "Peter went down . . . and walked . . . and came to Jesus," — especially as such a statement would find apparent corroboration in verse 31. But the only really admissible reading is ἔλθεν, "to go."

xiv. 30.

Rec. T. βλέπων δὲ τὸν άνεμον ἱσχυρόν — But when he saw the wind boisterous.

Rev. T. βλέπων δὲ τὸν άνεμον — But when he saw the wind.

The latter is the reading of א, B first hand, 33, and the Memphitic Version only. It may seem very proper to conclude that, because ἱσχυρόν, "boisterous," is not found in the two oldest known Greek manuscripts, it is not a part of the original text. This conclusion would be sound if those manuscripts were invariable. But we find omissions in them as well as in other manuscripts. In this very chapter, the Sinaitic Codex first hand omits (in verse 16) "Jesus," and (verse 23) "having sent the multitudes away." B first hand in like manner (verse 2) omits "therefore." Nor are these errors indulged in singly by any means. At verse 22, Β first hand unites with C first hand and two versions in omitting "straightway" (verse 27); with D, T, one cursive and four versions in omitting "Jesus"; and (verse 35) with T in omitting "that." In like manner B unites (verse 22) with 33 and other cursives in omitting the article before πλοῖον, "boat," by which reference is made to verse 13; while, in verse 36, B first hand agrees with

Origen in omitting "him." In fact, this omitting of one or more words, sometimes accidentally, sometimes intentionally, is a very common thing among the oldest as well as the later manuscripts, not singly always, but often two or more of them conjointly. The omission therefore of "boisterous," in itself considered, is not to be wondered at, even if the omission does appear in the two oldest known manuscripts. And when we consider, what is now generally conceded, that א and B are, in part at least, the work of one and the same hand, that they are transcripts of the same or nearly the same prototype, and that they were both written in Egypt, the country of the Memphitic Version and of 33, and other like cursives, it is not hard to see how they should agree in an omission like this. It is very easy to say, "We can see no good reason for the omission unless the word was absent from the original." But there need be no difficulty concerning the matter. The case is a plain one: the manuscripts agree because they are of a more or less common parentage. These very witnesses and a large number of others agree in other omissions and transparently false readings. But these omissions and false readings must not be adopted simply because old but clearly vitiated manuscripts contain them. "To see the wind" is a phrase we may reasonably conclude no sane writer, at least no plain, ordinary speaker like Matthew, would employ unless for some evidently special reason,—which is not the case here. The word "boisterous" is found in B as corrected soon after it was written, as well as attested by C, D, F, G, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, X, Τ, Α, Β, all the cursives but one, and all the versions but the Memphitic. It is therefore but justice to the writer, when the overwhelming testimony of witnesses favors such a conclusion, to infer that some copyist has either inadvertently failed, or intentionally declined, to reproduce his language. In this instance, we believe the former to be the true reason and explanation of the omission.
“having come unto Gennesaret.” The Revisers’ Greek, if Anglicized, is simply “They came upon (or to) the land unto Gennesaret,”—an unmeaning combination of words, plainly indicating an error in the reading somewhere. Nor do we need to go very far, or to waste much time, to find that error. “Gennesaret” is a word that appears in the New Testament only three times. Twice, that is, here and in Mark vi. 53, it is given as the name of a district; and once (Luke v. 1), as the name of a lake. In this last instance, there are no various readings in connection with it, aside from (1) the omission which X, a ninth or tenth century uncial, makes in leaving out the words “of Gennesaret, and saw two boats standing by the lake”; and (2) the omission in the Sinaitic Codex, by its original scribe, of the word λίμυν, “lake,”—a word not supplied till the seventh century, —making the clause read, “He was standing near Gennesaret,” as if “Gennesaret” denoted some village or place. Now this explains the trouble in this verse, and in Mark vi. 53 as well, where the Revisers have substantially the same reading as here. The meaning of the critical reader or scribe who made this reading was not “They came to the land, unto Gennesaret,” whatever that may be thought to be, but “They came to the land at Gennesaret.” Any copyist or critic who, like the depraver of X in Luke v. 1, considered Gennesaret as the name of a village instead of a district, on coming to the words ἦλθον εἰς τὴν γην Γεννησαρέτ, would very naturally conclude that a preposition had been omitted from his exemplar after γην; and so, in order to correct what he considered the error, insert εἰς, “at,” and change the preposition preceding τὴν γην into εἰς, so as to make the evangelist say “They came to the land at Gennesaret.” A few succeeding scribes perpetuated the error, not knowing that there was no such village or hamlet as Gennesaret by the lake-side,
and that the word denoted a district, three or four miles in length, bordering on the lake. This is all there is of it. The genuine reading is given us in the Received Text, and the proper rendering in the A. V. It speaks for itself, besides being ably and sufficiently attested.

**xv. 4.**

Rec. T. ὅ γὰρ Θεὸς ἐντολάριον λέγων — For God commanded saying.

Rev. T. ὅ γὰρ Θεὸς εἶπε — For God said.

The former of these readings is vouched for by Ν first hand, and afterwards by the later seventh-century corrector, C, E, F, G, K, I, M, S, U, V, X, Π, Δ, Θ, Π, nearly all the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin and the Philoxenian Syriac Version; while the latter is attested by Ν as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, B, D, Τ, 1, 124, most copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Curetonian and Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and some later versions. The former certainly has more of the appearance of being the genuine reading, — "God gave commandment (i.e. by Moses), saying "; while the latter looks like an attempt at conformity to Mark vii. 10, Ἡῳ ὁ γὰρ εἶπε, "For Moses said." Moreover, it makes the reports of the two evangelists correspond more fully in thought than the revised reading does; which, by introducing a sameness in the verbs, creates a discrepancy respecting the speakers. If any believe εἶπε to be the true reading, and to have been changed into ἐντολάριον λέγων because of the τῶν ἐντολῶν, "the commandment," of the preceding verse, they should remember that, as far as that is concerned, the same reason exists for a like change in Mark. The former, which seems to be the true reading, is followed by Tischendorf, while the latter is adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort as well as the Revisers.

**MATTHEW.**

**xv. 6.**

Rec. T. καὶ οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ — and honor not his father.

Rev. T. οὐ μὴ τιμήσῃ τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ — he shall not honor his father.

The conjunction καὶ is here improperly translated "and " in the A. V. Its omission, however, is not called for, nor can it be justified; for though it is omitted by Ν, B, C, D, Τ, five cursive, most copies of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, Memphitic, and Ethiopic Versions, the omission is a false reading. This conjunction would never have been inserted if not genuine. It was omitted only for the purpose of freeing the sentence from what seemed to be a superfluous word. So that if we ask what the true text is, καὶ must be retained. Its presence affects the meaning in no manner whatever. It is a Hebraism, equivalent to our English conjunction "that." Sometimes it should be translated; at other times it need not be. An example of its use occurs in chapter ix. 10, "And it came to pass, as he sat at meat in the house, that, behold, many publicans and sinners came" etc. (Here neither of the two versions translates the word.) In the passage before us, as also in Mark vii. 12, it was evidently omitted because it was not understood. It points back to the word λέγετε, "ye say." The verse may be translated, in accordance with English idiom, as follows: "But, when any one saith to his father or his mother, 'That with which thou mightest have been profited by me is devoted to God,' ye say that he shall not honor his father"; i.e. he is under no obligation to do it. In Mark it is, "But, if a man saith to his father or his mother, 'That wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban,' that is, Given to God, ye say that ye no longer suffer him to do aught for his father or his mother." By the transposition which we have thus made of "ye say" in the rendering, it will be seen that this expression together with καὶ and the words following it constitutes the apodosis of the sentence, while the words between λέγετε and
express the protasis or condition on which the "saying" is based. The true reading, as found in the Received Text, is sufficiently attested by E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, \( \Delta \), \( \Theta \), \( II \), nearly all the cursives, at least three copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions; while its omission in many other versions may be the natural result of a correct though not slavish translation from a Greek copy containing the conjunction.

The omission of this word in Mark vii. 12, which is supported by substantially the same witnesses, having been originally made for the same reason as here, is an equally false reading.

**xv. 6.**

If the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities add or his mother," had read "Most ancient authorities" etc., it would have stated the truth; for these words are found in every known document except \( \text{S} \), B, D, and the Curetonian Syriac Version. And their omission in these documents is obviously due to their having been overlooked by some early copyist in consequence of the similarity of ending (\( \tau \varepsilon \rho a \alpha 
\rho o o \)) existing between this and the preceding expression, "his father." The previous words give every reason to believe that Jesus included the mother along with the father here as before. Having quoted the command to honor father and mother, then having mentioned both father and mother twice after that, there is no apparent reason why he should have omitted mentioning the mother on this fourth and final reference to the command; or why Matthew should not have reported him as having included the mother. The preponderance of evidence is in attestation of the fact that he did include her. Moreover, Mark, in his report of the Saviour's words (vi. 10-12), gives the full expression in each of the four instances in which either word is used. The probabilities thus presented in favor of the genuineness of the phrase ought certainly to outweigh the testimony of four witnesses that are far from being infallible, especially when the omission is so easily accounted for, and is one of a species of errors that abound throughout these manuscripts.

**xv. 14.**

Rec. T. \( \dot{o} d e g o i \ e i o i \ \tau \nu \phi l o i \ \tau \nu \phi l \dot{a} \nu \) — they be blind leaders of the blind.

Rev. T. \( \dot{o} d e g o i \ e i o i \ \tau \nu \phi l o i \) — they are blind guides.

The evidence in support of the omission here made,—namely, \( \text{S} \) first hand and the later seventh-century corrector, B, D, 209, the Curetonian Syriac, and two copies of the Memphitic Version,—is insufficient to set aside the testimony in favor of \( \tau \nu \phi l \dot{a} \nu \), "of the blind," which includes \( \text{S} \) as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, and all the other (sixteen) uncials, all but one of the cursives (including, of course, L, Z, 1, and 33, which usually side with B in the Gospels), the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and all copies but two of the Memphitic, together with Origen, Basil, Cyril, Cyprian, and other Fathers. The word was probably omitted in consequence of the proximity of \( \tau \nu \phi l o i \) following immediately after, just as K omits \( \tau \nu \phi l o i \) because of the presence of \( \tau \nu \phi l \dot{a} \nu \), which took the scribe's attention instead,—a circumstance by no means unusual in copying. And as the sense was not perceptibly injured by the omission, the absence of \( \tau \nu \phi l \dot{a} \nu \) passed for a while unnoticed. The expression "a guide of the blind" seems, from Rom. ii. 19, to have been a common form of speech among the Jews. Hence Jesus would very naturally have used it. But the double use of the word "blind" appears to have been designed, so as to include not only the Pharisees themselves, but the multitude (verse 10) who followed them. These were blind also, though they claimed that they were not blind. (Compare John ix. 18, 34, 40, xii. 37-40.) This meaning needs to be preserved by retaining \( \tau \nu \phi l \dot{a} \nu \).
on the western shore of the sea of Galilee, the modern El-
Mejdal, about three miles north of Tiberias; and Dalmanutha
adjoined Magdala. But where Magadan was seems to be a
mystery. It is obvious that ΜΑΓΔΑΛΑ by a slight change
in the last four letters might very easily be converted into
ΜΑΓΔΑΛΑΝ, a careless scribe mistaking the former for the
latter. But, inasmuch as the latter form is found in some of
the older documents, it is concluded that the change was the
other way,—from Magadan to Magdala, from an unfamiliar to
a familiar name. The conclusion is certainly natural, but not
necessarily just. The oldest extant manuscripts may preserve
a false text, while later codices, as already shown, hand down
to us the reading of a still older and more correct text from
manuscripts no longer in existence. It certainly does not of
necessity follow, because "Magadan" appears in the two old-
est extant Greek manuscripts instead of "Magdala," that it
must be accepted as the true reading. Such a principle would
make it necessary always to accept the readings of these doc-
uments when in agreement, however unreasonable, absurd, or
palpably false they might be.¹ A scribe who would intention-

¹To give the general reader some idea of the untrustworthiness of
many of the readings of proper names in our oldest codices, we append
a few illustrations taken at random. We have already noticed Matt. i. 7, 8,
10, where certain manuscripts read "Asaph" and "Amos" for "Asa" and
"Amon," as well as viii. 28, where the impossible reading "Gadarenes" is
found in some of the oldest codices. See Notes on i. 7, 8, 10, and viii. 28.
Matt. i. 5 presents another instance, where Μ, B, C first hand, Δ, half a
dozen cursives, and theMemphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Ver-
sions, supported by Ephiphanius, Jerome, and the Septuagint of the Alex-
andrine Codex, read Ιωβήδ, "Jobed," for "Obed." (The writer of cursive
33, mistaking the final Δ for A, gives Ιωβήδον, "Jobel"). And, since this
reading is found in these old documents, it is adopted by Lachmann, Tre-
gelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and others who seem to believe in
the impeccability of the older manuscripts. While the Revisers did not
follow them in this, we see no reason why they should not have done so,
and read Ιωβήδ here as well as Ασαφ in verses 7, 8, and Αμών in verse 10.
ally change a name would, as a matter of course, change an unfamiliar if not unknown name to one that was more or less familiar, and so might change "Magadan" to "Magdala." But, if the change was made accidentally and unconsciously, as greater changes than this often are made in transcribing, we see no reason why the last four letters of "Magdala" in uncial characters might not have been mistaken for "-adan." This we believe to have been the case; hence the new reading. There is also this additional consideration: We know that Magdala was a place on the western shore of the sea of Galilee. But no one knows of any such place as Magadan. In view therefore of the uncertainty and even questionableness concerning "Magadan" as the true reading, and the ease with which it might have unwittingly grown out of the other, we cannot possibly see

Luke iv. 44 affords another instance. Here a respectable number of old codices read "of Judea" for "of Galilee," though the whole context shows it to be a false reading. See Note on Luke iv. 44.

In John i. 42, as well as xxi. 15, 16, 17, a number of old witnesses testify to "Simon son of John" as the true reading instead of Simon son of Jonas or Jonah. One of these precious witnesses, the Old Latin copy f², calls Barabas in John xviii. 40, "Rabbi Barabas." See Note on John i. 42.

In Acts xviii. 7, two or three old witnesses say that "Titus Justus" ought to be read instead of simply "Justus"; others, that "Titus Justus" is the true name; while others still, that it is "Titus" only. See Note on Acts xviii. 7.

In Acts xviii. 24, Ν first hand, 15, 180, and the Memphitic and Armenian Versions read "Apelles" instead of "Apollos"; while D reads "Apollonius." Ν first hand, and 180, have "Apelles" also in xix. 1.

In Acts xxviii. 1, the Vatican manuscript first hand is supported by other false witnesses in reading "Melitene" in place of "Melite." See Note on Acts xxviii. 1.

The old codices give too frequent evidence that their scribes or some of their predecessors were no more exempt from the application of the general principle Errores humanum est than were those of later documents. We must therefore be excused if, in view of such evidences of the want of their entire trustworthiness, we do not accept certain readings simply because they appear in two or three or even half a dozen or more of these old manuscripts and versions.

what is to be gained by abandoning the old reading for this. There is really nothing to assure us that "Magadan" is the genuine reading.

xvi. 2, 3.

Most of the second and the whole of the third verse, says the marginal note, "are omitted by some of the most ancient and other important authorities." They are omitted by Ν, B, V, X, X, V, fifteen cursive, the Curetonian Syriac and Armenian Versions, and certain codices that were in the possession of Origen and Jerome. In the notes of X and 39, the passage is referred to and explained. Codices E and 606 have it marked with asterisks, indicating that its authenticity was in dispute; while 482 has it only at the foot of the page and not by the original scribe. In Egypt, where the omission was probably made, the phenomena here mentioned are unknown; so that the words might very easily have seemed incomprehensible to an ignorant scribe, and altogether at variance with facts. To save the text, therefore, from stating an apparent untruth, the passage was omitted, and the omission continued by others. This false reading, which may have been favored by the absence of the words from Mark viii. 12, was evidently current in the second century, which sufficiently accounts for its being in so many documents of later date and different regions; while the presence of the passage in C, D, the Peshito Syriac and Old Latin Versions shows that it was accepted by others as genuine at that early date. A passage of thirty-one words like this, if not genuine, would hardly have got into all the uncials but five, into all but a dozen or fifteen cursive, and into all the versions but two.

xvi. 8.

Rec. T. ἄρτοις ὑμῖν ἐδόθη — ye have brought no bread.
Rev. T. ἄρτοις ὑμῖν ἐδόθη — ye have no bread.

The latter reading is found in Ν, B, D, three cursive (13, 124, 346) of Ferrar's group, most copies of the Old Latin
Version, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and apparently the Memphitic Version. The former is attested by C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, all but three cursives, one copy (/*) of the Old Latin Version, all the Syriac Versions, and by Origen, Eusebius, and Chrysostom among the Fathers. It is true “ye have” corresponds with Mark’s report (viii. 17) of Jesus’ language. But Mark also says “we have” no bread, in the preceding verse; so that, after that, he would naturally represent Jesus as saying “ye have.” But Matthew in verse 7, instead of putting “we have” in the mouth of the disciples, represents them as saying “we have taken”; after which he would naturally report Jesus as having said “ye took,” rather than “ye have.” A careless copyist, without any intention of making the language correspond with that in Mark, yet, at the moment carrying in mind Mark’s word rather than Matthew’s, would unconsciously write the former’s instead of the latter’s word. The true reading here, beyond any reasonable doubt, is “ye took.” — A. V., “ye have brought.” — which Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Alford retain, while the Revisers side with Lachmann and Westcott and Hort.

xvi. 13.
Rec. T. Τίνα με λέγουσι οἱ ἀνθρώποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον; — Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?
Rev. T. Τίνα λέγουσι οἱ ἀνθρώποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἄνθρωπον; — Who do men say that the Son of man is?

The omission of the emphatic personal pronoun here is supported by S, B, one copy (c) of the Old Latin Version, most copies of the Vulgate, and of course the Anglo-Saxon and Frankish Versions, the Memphitic, Jerusalem Syriac, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Persic Versions, and Irenæus, Origen, and Ambrose. Its presence is strongly vouchèd for by C, D, E, F, G, H, K, I., M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, the entire body of the cursives, all but one copy of the Old Latin Version, two copies of the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian

Versions. Internal evidence also calls for it. Jesus’ question was, not “Who do men say that the Son of man is?” but “Who do men say that I am?” This is evident from both Mark’s and Luke’s report of his words. (Mark viii. 27; Luke ix. 18.) It is evident also from the question as repeated in verse 15. If the omission of “me” presented Jesus’ real question, we should expect to find, and would unquestionably find, in verse 15, “Who say ye that he is?” not “Who say ye that I am?” with the “ye” as emphatic as it is. The change from asking a question concerning the Son of man as such to asking one concerning himself as represented by the pronoun “me” is unnatural, and under the circumstances altogether improbable. Besides, the phrasing of the fifteenth verse shows that the expression “the Son of man” in verse 13, is only a subordinate term, as does its position here after ἔδω. The real subject of the infinitive, the word upon which the stress falls as the subject of inquiry, needs to occupy a more emphatic position; and that is where μακ stands, near the beginning of the question. The presence of the pronoun where it is, evidently created a difficulty in the mind of some early scribe or reader. The words appeared naturally to mean, “Whom do men declare me to be? the Son of man?” Inasmuch, however, as no such modifying words follow in the reply of the disciples as “No, but some say” etc., so as to indicate this to be the true meaning; and as “me” seemed misplaced, and too far removed from the phrase “the Son of man” for the latter to be in apposition with it, to obviate all difficulty and fix the meaning if possible, the pronoun was omitted. It is one of those semi-glosses not uncommon in the Vatican and a few other manuscripts.

xvi. 21.

The reading “Jesus Christ,” which the note says some ancient authorities read instead of “Jesus,” — “From that time began Jesus Christ to shew unto his disciples” etc., seems to be only a mechanical insertion of Χριστός after Ἰησοῦς from the
line above. It is found only in \( \mathbf{K} \) first hand, B first hand, and the Memphitic Version. In both these Greek Codices it was early detected and corrected as an erroneous reading.

**xi. 4.**

Rec. T. \( \epsilon \lambda \delta \alpha \lambda \gamma \mu, \varphi \iota \iota \sigma \omega \mu \nu \varepsilon \) — If thou wilt, let us make.

Rec. T. \( \epsilon \lambda \delta \lambda \alpha \gamma, \varphi \iota \iota \sigma \omega \mu \) — If thou wilt, I will make.

The only witnesses in support of the latter reading are \( \mathbf{K}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C} \) first hand, and two copies \( \delta, \beta' \) of the Old Latin Version. It is accepted as the true reading by certain textual critics because it differs from the reading in Mark (ix. 5) and Luke (ix. 33). But, if Mark and Luke have reported Peter correctly, — and there is no room for questioning this, — then we have good ground to believe that these five ancient witnesses misrepresent Matthew; for they make him give a different statement from that presented by the other two evangelists. These represent Peter as speaking for his companions as well as himself. But the Revisers' reading makes Matthew represent him as ignoring them altogether, and proposing to make the tabernacles himself. It is easy to see the source of this reading. Mark and Luke do not use the expression "If thou wilt." But some fastidious reader of Matthew, away back in the early centuries, not relishing the phraseology "If thou wilt, we would make," *i.e.* let us make, etc., evidently thought to improve it by changing it to "If thou wilt, I will make." This was effected by omitting the last three letters of \( \varphi \iota \iota \sigma \omega \mu \nu \varepsilon \), which may have been taken for the particle \( \mu \varepsilon \nu \), "indeed," and dropped as superfluous or improperly inserted. If the clause originally read "If thou wilt, I will make" etc., there would have been no temptation to change it to "If thou wilt, let us make," — even though Mark and Luke have the subjunctive; for the clause "If thou wilt" would naturally deter one from making the change.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

xvii. 20.

Rec. T. Διδὰ τὴν ἀπίστιαν ὑμῶν — Because of your unbelief.
Rev. T. Διδὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ὑμῶν — Because of your little faith.

The former reading is supported by C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, T, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and one manuscript of the Armenian. The latter is the reading of Σ, B, r, 22, 33, and three representatives (13, 124, 346) of Φ, the fourth (69) being defective here, and the Curetonian Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. Both readings were evidently current during the second century. But it does not seem difficult to decide between them. The latter is a word Jesus is nowhere else recorded as having used. On one occasion, he applied the adjective δικαιοσύνης, “of little faith,” to Peter, and on three other occasions to the disciples collectively. On this occasion, however, he went further; he pronounced them (verse 17) a faithless generation, an unbelieving company; not that he charged them absolutely with having no faith in him, but with not having the faith necessary to effect the cure of the lunatic. To this, the three synoptic Gospels testify. After having charged his disciples in verse 17 with being faithless or unbelieving, it was but natural that Jesus should give unbelief, want of faith, incredulity, as the reason of their not being able to effect the cure. But this expression probably disturbed the tender sensibilities of some early Christian, who misunderstood the word, and took it to mean absolute want of faith in God; and he naturally desired to soften it down by substituting the milder word δικαιοσύνη, “little faith.” This he could very easily do, as Jesus had already three or four times called his disciples persons of little faith. Jesus, however, did not hesitate after his resurrection to upbraid his disciples with unbelief or want of faith (Mark xvi. 14) as well as hardness of heart; and we see no reason why he should not have done the same on this occasion, especially after having associated them with “an unbelieving and perverse generation.” He was evidently deeply moved by their perversity and want of faith; hence his use of this word. Under the circumstances, the other word is tame, and altogether unsuitable.

xvii. 21.

This verse is omitted on the testimony of Σ first hand, B, 33, two copies (ε, ff') of the Old Latin Version, the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Thebaic, one copy of the Memphitic Version, and the Roman Ethiopic. It is found in Σ as amended by the sixth-century corrector, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, T, Δ, Π, the whole body of the cursives with but one exception, all but two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and most copies of the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, as well as vouched for by more than a dozen of the Fathers from Clement of Rome down, including Tertullian and Origen. Some of this testimony shows the verse to have been considered genuine in several quarters as early as the second century. The words were undoubtedly spoken by Christ on this occasion, as Mark ix. 29 clearly proves; and certainly the preponderance of testimony goes to show that Matthew also reported him as having spoken them. The only variation in the manuscripts that give the verse, is in the Sinaitic Codex as corrected, which has ἐξῆλθεν, “is cast out,” and several cursives that have ἐγείρηκεν, “goes out,” in place of ἐκπροείκασεν, “goes out.” These, however, afford no argument against the genuineness of the passage, for such variations are everywhere to be found in connection with readings of unquestionable genuineness. If, as some suppose, the verse was introduced from Mark, there would hardly be so much difference in the phraseology as there is between the two. Each passage, while expressing the thought of the other, is stated in terms that indicate an independence and want of collusion on the part of the reporters. How then did the verse come to be
omitted, if genuine? There is, in the statement itself, room for question and perplexity to readers of a certain class; and this might easily have led to its rejection, just as other readings have been rejected on account of their obscurity or offensive-ness. A person holding that, in order to a cure, faith was necessary only on the part of the healer, would be likely to reason thus: "The verb goeth out seems to imply that prayer and fasting are required of the sick; but it is incredible that Jesus should have taught such a doctrine respecting persons in this condition." Consequently, as the simplest mode of overcoming the difficulty, the passage is dropped; while others, like the sixth-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, substitute "is cast out" for "goes out," as if called for by verse 19, while seeming to clear up the passage and determine its meaning. The omission, however, having once been made and at a very early day, retained its hold for a while, but only within a comparatively limited territory.

xvii. 22.

Against the word "abode"—"While they abode in Galilee,"—stands the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities read were gathering themselves together." This, or rather αὐστρεφόμενον, is the peculiar reading of Β, B, and the cursive ρ, — a reading which is absolutely nonsensical, unless we look at it through the Latin conversantibus,—the word by which αὐστρεφόμενον is properly represented in the Vulgate and several copies of the Old Latin Version,—meaning "turning about" in a place; that is, being present, dwelling, or abiding. This rather indicates that αὐστρεφόμενον was substituted for ἀναστρεφόμενον by some old scribe, who, knowing more of Latin than he did of Greek, supposed that the latter meant simply "returned," or rather, could not mean "abode," and that the former was the proper word to represent this idea. The reading is palpably false, and unworthy of notice; yet Lachmann, Tregelles in his text, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, in their reverence for the Sinaitic and Vatican Codices, adopt it!

xviii. 11.

This verse is omitted by only three uncials, — Β, B, L first hand, — three cursive, two copies (e, ff') of the Old Latin, the Thebaic, most copies of the Memphitic, the Jerusalem Syriac, and one copy of the Ethiopic Version, apparently on account of its supposed want of appropriateness. This is the more apparent when we consider that, of those versions that retain the verse, two copies of the Old Latin (a, n) change "for" into "and," while one (b) omits the connective altogether, and the Curetonian Syriac, with its customary freedom of manner in translating, in order to connect the verse with the clause "I say unto you," in verse 10, reads "And that the Son of man came" etc. No good reason can be assigned for the insertion of the passage if it is not genuine; for it is incredible that any reader or copyist would think of assigning it as a second reason why Christians should not be despised. The omission is evidently a part of the work of that critical hand which displays itself here and there in certain manuscripts, pruning and lopping off what appeared unsuitable, superfluous, unmeaning, or of questionable propriety.

xviii. 14.

The marginal reading "my Father" in place of "your Father" has the support of B, F, H, I, Π, about twenty-five cursive, the Egyptian versions, the Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. But it is evidently an alteration, intended to make the reading correspond with that in verse 10. If "my" were the original reading, there would be no apparent reason for changing it.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

xviii. 15.

"Some ancient authorities omit against thee," says the marginal note; that is, in the clause, "If thy brother sin against thee." These "authorities" are B, three cursive, the Thebaic Version, and Origen, Cyril, and Basil. This omission, however, is not because the words are not genuine or were introduced from verse 21, as might be supposed; but because some early critical reader, perhaps even before Origen's day, thought it better to generalize the statement, so as to obviate the objection that may have been raised against a person's employing this text in justification of his pursuing the course here prescribed, when the offence was not, strictly speaking, against himself. It may be a duty incumbent on Christians generally to take an erring brother, whatever may be his offence, and seek to reclaim him. But it is not the duty that Christ is recorded as having taught his disciples on this occasion. The very language of the context seems conclusive on this point. In the first place, if the reference of Jesus had been to sinful conduct in general, he would hardly have used the unmodified word ἁμαρτήσῃ, "should sin," but rather πλανήσῃ, "should err," especially after having used this word just before. Nothing would have been more natural than to have turned from the primary use of this word in verses 12, 13, to an employment of it in its secondary sense in this verse. The fact that Jesus did not do this, goes far to show that he was not here speaking with reference to sins generally. Again, the expressions "go, shew him his fault," "if he hear thee, thou hast gained," "let him be unto thee as a heathen," etc., indicate that they relate to a personal offence. And finally, the conclusion seems unavoidable that it was simply because Jesus had been speaking of unbrotherly treatment from others, that, as soon as he had finished speaking, Peter was led to ask, "Lord, how oft shall my brother"—not merely sin, but—"sin against me, and I forgive him?" The words "against me," of course, are not emphatic; but they show that Peter, and unquestionably the other disciples too, understood Jesus as speaking of offences against themselves personally and individually. This view is also confirmed by external evidence, which greatly preponderates in support of this reading,—consisting of sixteen uncials, all but three cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, and Memphitic Versions, the Peshito, Curetonian, and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and the Ethiopic, Armenian, and other versions, as well as Basil again and again, Chrysostom, Lucifer, and Hilary.

xviii. 28.

Rec. T. ἀπόδος μοι δὲ τι ὀφείλεις—Pay me that thou owest.
Rev. T. ἀπόδος εἴ τι ὀφείλεις—Pay what thou owest.

The readings δὲ τι and εἴ τι both have the appearance of being the results of an early clerical error for μοι τι, which by the accidental omission of μ became δὲ τι, and afterwards εἴ τι in the unconditional sense of δὲ τι, "whatever," for which there is apparent but doubtful precedent among classic authors, but none in the New Testament, unless it be in 1 Tim. i. 10, where, however, the Revisers do not consider it as thus used. This reading seems to have been converted still later into εἴ τι, while μοι was retained and transmitted from earlier manuscripts. As Meyer says, "where εἴ τι, like siuid, is used in the sense of quicquid (or whatever), εἴ always has a conditional force." This is its New-Testament use, being always in a conditional clause, as in Luke xix. 8, John xiv. 14, Acts xix. 39, xxv. 5, and elsewhere. But this use of the expression would, of course, be out of place here. Notwithstanding the preponderance of manuscript evidence in support of the Revisers' reading, which, properly translated into English, is, "Pay, if thou owest anything," we should retain the other, which commends itself by its naturalness as the genuine reading, "Pay me what thou owest."
Rec. T. Εἰ ἔστιν ἄνδρόςς ἀπόλύσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ—Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?

Rev. T. Εἰ ἔστιν ἀπόλύσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ—Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?

The presence of ἄνδρόςς, "for a man," omitted by the Revisers from their Text, is called for by the article and pronoun in connection with γυναῖκα, "wife," and is strongly attested as genuine by καθεκθομένας as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Δ, II, all but three or four cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac, both Egyptian, the Ethiopic, and Armenian Versions, as well as Origen, Gregory of Nazianzus, John Damascene, Hilary, and others; — testimony which covers all the centuries as far back as the middle or early part of the second century. Its presence is also favored by Mark's report (x. 2), in which ἀνδρόςς, "for a man," appears instead; though this, by some, would be most unjustly taken as a reason why its presence should not be considered genuine. The only ground for omitting the word is the fact that it is wanting in four uncials (καθεκθομένας first hand, B, I, α), three cursive, and two copies of the Slavonic Version, and that its absence in these documents is unaccountable unless it is considered as the result of a careless omission on the part of some early transcriber, —a thing which is hardly supposable of the copyists of our oldest known manuscripts, though the most careful transcribers of the nineteenth century will do such things sometimes! It may not be impertinent to ask why its English equivalent should after all have been forced into the R. V., if it was necessary to omit the word from the corrected Greek Text in order to prepare the way for a proper revision of the A. V.

Rec. T. οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ—His disciples.

Rev. T. οἱ μαθηταὶ—The disciples.

The omission of "his," which occurs so often in the R. V. in connection with "disciples," is here made on what seems to be rather slight evidence,—the testimony of καθεκθομένας, B, two cursive, three copies of the Old Latin Version, and one copy of the Thebaic, the usual ally of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts in their peculiar readings. Some may consider this to be preponderating evidence in favor of the omission; but to others it looks like placing undue confidence in the simple
attestation of two witnesses whose united testimony in many other places is known to be false. In this instance, it is opposed to the unbroken testimony of almost all the other witnesses in the case, some of whom are quite as trustworthy, and the voice of whose testimony reaches us from a much more remote antiquity. The omission, however, makes no difference whatever in the meaning; and the simple fact of its affording a shorter reading without altering the sense is enough to account for the preference given to it by these more concise oracles.

**xix. 16, 17.**

Against these verses are two marginal notes, each beginning with "Some ancient authorities read," and ending with "See Mark x. 17, 18; Luke xviii. 18, 19." The readings included in these notes are the familiar words "Good Master," in the first; and, in the other, "Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, even God," — which have been set aside in favor of the readings, "Master," and "Why askest thou me concerning what is good? One there is who is good." But why not state facts? Instead of saying "Some," why do not the notes say "Most ancient authorities read," etc.? for it is the new readings that are supported respectively by "some ancient authorities," while the readings of the Received Text are attested by witnesses outnumbering those "authorities" many times over. The presence of "Good" in connection with "Master" is certified to by C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Τ, Δ, nearly all the cursives, even 33, and 69, which usually side with B, several copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Arabic Versions, and Justin Martyr, Basil, Chrysostom, Cyril, Irenaeus, Hippolytus, and others among the Fathers — some of which testimony reaches back nearly to the first century. The only witnesses that omit the word "Good" here are the four uncialss S, B, D, L, three cursive, one lec-

tionary, three copies of the Old Latin, the Ethiopic Version, Origen, and Hilary. — In the other verse, the common reading is supported by C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Τ (this last, however, together with the Old Latin copies g^1, h, m, omits the words, "Why callest thou me good?"); Δ, nearly all the cursive including 33, 69, five copies (f, f^1, h, m, q) of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, Ethiopic, and Arabic Versions, and Justin Martyr. Irenaeus, Chrysostom, Hilary, and others support the reading, "Why callest thou me good?" and Eusebius vouches for the words, "There is none good but one, that is, God." The witnesses that support the Revisers' reading in this verse are S, B, D (this last omitting the article before both ἄγαθων and ἄγαθος, while the cursive 1 omits it before the latter only), L, only three cursive (1, 22, 604), nine copies (a, b, c, e, f^1, g^1, h, l) of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, and Armenian Versions, and Origen. The Memphitic Version has only the first part of this reading; while the Old Latin copies b, c, f^1, l, the Vulgate, and the Curetonian Syriac Version add Θέος, "God," to the last part. The cursive 251 reads verse 17 just as the Received Text does, then goes on in verse 18 thus: "He saith unto him, Which? But Jesus said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning a good thing? There is none good except one, that is, God;" etc. All this shows that, while a large majority of the documents support the common reading, there is much confusion especially among those that favor the Revisers' reading in part. Thus, the Old Latin Version f^1, the Curetonian Syriac, and one copy of the Memphitic Version very inconsistently support the reading, "Why askest thou me concerning what is good?" after representing the young man as having said, "Good Master, what shall I do?" etc. Other documents also are similarly more or less inconsistent. — The references at the end of the marginal notes imply that the words set aside in those notes were introduced here from one of the other Gospels. But the implication is unjust, and with-
out a shade of truth to support it. Mark and Luke report this interview between the young ruler and Jesus in language substantially the same. But, because they agree, no one who is at all competent to express an opinion on the subject considers that one of their accounts must have been copied from the other, or at least been made to conform to that of the other. Such an insinuation would be as base as it would be groundless. Each is considered an independent and faithful reporter of what was actually said by the two parties; and the reports agree simply because they are those of faithful historians. Now Matthew's report, as given in the Received Text, agrees substantially with those of Mark and Luke, the slight differences between them being only such verbal variations as we should expect to find in reports given by different persons. These go to establish, rather than undermine, the genuineness of the reading. Now the readings introduced into these verses by the Revisers give a meaning that differs strikingly, not to say essentially, from that of the old readings attributed to Matthew. But this is not all; they set Matthew at once at variance with Mark and Luke. It is not such a difference as that, for example, between Matt. iii. 17 and Mark i. 11, both of which state the same truth in a slightly different form. All three of these evangelists are reporting what took place and was said during a certain interview. Two of them represent the young man as addressing Jesus and saying, "Good Master, what shall I do?" etc. And so does the third, as most of the documents assure us, with the slight addition of a single word — "Good Master, what good (thing) shall I do?" — which is generally attested as genuine, and which does not really alter the meaning. But a few witnesses insist that the evangelist wrote, "Master, what good shall I do?" etc. This difference, in itself considered, is perhaps nothing more than might be expected. It makes no essential difference, so far, between this and the other evangelists. Mark and Luke, however, continuing the record, make Jesus say, "Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God." So, too, does Matthew, according to the testimony of most witnesses in the case. But a few tell us that Jesus replied, "Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good," — giving a meaning entirely different from that presented by the other evangelists. Now the only conclusion to which we can reasonably come in view of this is, that, if this reading is genuine, either Matthew's words misrepresent Christ's language, or Mark and Luke have falsely reported him; for Augustine's idea that Jesus may have used both expressions in this connection is utterly inadmissible; it is simply the dernier ressort of a believer in a false reading. The truth in the case is simply this: Matthew reported the language and circumstances of the interview substantially as the other evangelists did. But some early reader of his Gospel, being offended with Jesus' apparent disavowal of goodness in saying, "Why callest thou me good? No one is good but God," wilfully set himself to work to remove the objectionable language. And a stepping-stone to this he found in the expression, "What good thing." To make his way secure to verse 17, he strikes out the word "good" in connection with "Master." This being removed, there is no pertinence in such a reply from Jesus as "Why callest thou me good?" Then the next thing was to change this question and the following clause as best he could, to eliminate the offensive idea of the Son's inferiority. And the result was, "Why askest thou me concerning the good? The Good is one;" or, as D and codex 1 read, "One is good." This was afterwards accepted by "some" who sympathized with the oversensitive critic, and so gained a limited currency as a genuine reading. But it speaks for itself. It shows that "Good Master" was originally a part of Matthew's record. If it were not, how should this reference to a good being, "one who is good," have got into his text? According to the Revisers' reading, nothing but a good thing had been referred to before. The utter inappropriateness and incoherence of this reading are enough to condemn it, to say nothing of its irreconcilability with Jesus' language as reported by Mark and Luke.
The omission of these words is made on the authority of \( \text{S} \) first hand, B, L, 1, 22, four copies of the Old Latin, five of the Vulgate, Irenæus, Cyprian, Jerome, and other Latin Fathers. Yet the preponderance of evidence is clearly against it. First, there are the documents that vouch for the genuineness of the reading; namely, \( \text{S} \) as amended by the later seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), all but two cursive including of course 33, 69, eight copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate generally, all the Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Ethiopic, Origen, Hilary, and others. Then, there is no doubt that the ruler used the expression since he is reported as having done so by both Mark and Luke. And if he used such a phrase in such a connection, it is not at all probable that Matthew failed to give it, any more than they. In fact, if any one of the three evangelists can be supposed to have given his exact words rather than either of the other two, that one would be Matthew, because of his having been one of the twelve, and probably present on the occasion. And finally, it is easy to see why a critical copyist should have omitted the phrase. Matthew says, "The young man saith unto him, All these things have I observed from my youth." The idea that a young man — \( \text{νεανίσκος} \), a youth — should speak of doing something \( \text{from his youth} \), seemed to this censorious scribe incongruous and perhaps ridiculous; hence the omission of the words from his transcript, and their probable erasure from his exemplar. It is the work of the same pruning hand that we have met elsewhere.

The words "or wife," which are placed in the margin with a reference to Luke xviii. 29, are omitted by B, D, the single cursive 1, seven copies of the Old Latin, and the Jerusalem Syriac Version, Origen, Irenæus, Hilary, and Paulinus. They are strongly attested, however, by \( \text{S}, \text{C}, \text{E}, \text{F}, \text{G}, \text{H}, \text{K}, \text{L}, \text{M}, \text{U}, \text{V}, \text{X}, \text{\Gamma}, \text{\Delta} \), every cursive but one, seven copies of the Old Latin, all the Syriac Versions except the Jerusalem, both Egyptian, the Ethiopic, and Armenian Versions, Clement of Alexandria, Chrysostom, Cyril, Basil, and John Damascene. Of course, the supposition is that they were introduced from Luke; but it is quite as easy, and possibly a little nearer to the truth, to suppose that they were omitted either by oversight in the transcription of so long a list, or more probably from similar motives as led to the omission of "or father," both here and in Mark x. 29, in D and kindred documents, like the Curetonian Syriac, copies of the Old Latin Version, Hilary, and Paulinus. The words should undoubtedly be retained as part of the original text.—The other marginal reading, "manifold" in place of "a hundredfold," is simply a toning down of the apparent hyperbole contained in the latter, the true reading. It is supported only by B, L, the Thebaic, and Jerusalem Syriac Version, and given by Origen several times, and Cyril once; but it is a transparent gloss, possibly from Luke, and deserves no serious consideration.

The omission of \( \text{η}, \text{"eh?"} \), the sign of a question, equivalent to the Latin \( \text{αν} \), does not affect the meaning; nor is the omission demanded by the evidence. The particle is wanting only in B, D, I, Z, the Curetonian Syriac and Armenian Versions. Its presence, however, is called for by \( \text{S}, \text{C}, \text{E}, \text{F}, \text{G}, \text{H}, \text{K}, \text{M}, \text{N}, \text{S}, \text{U}, \text{V}, \text{X}, \text{\Gamma}, \text{\Delta}, \text{II} \), all the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, and Ethiopic Versions, and by a passage of Chrysostom.
With an intelligent reader of Greek there would have been no motive for omitting it; but some ignorant transcriber, not understanding the force of the particle, and seeing no propriety in its use as a disjunctive conjunction (equivalent to "or"), probably omitted it on this account. If originally wanting, there is no good reason why it should have been inserted and be found in so great a variety of documents.

**xx. 16.**

Rec. T. 

This clause is set aside as spurious because it is wanting in Η, R, L, Ζ, 36, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, and one copy of the Ethiopic, probably corrupted through contact with the Thebaic. If there were strong internal evidence to support this testimony it might be considered valid. But there is nothing of the kind. The documentary evidence testifying to the genuineness of these words is all but overwhelming,—that of C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, I, Δ, II, all the cursives but one (even τ, 33, 69, and 157 forsaking B here), the Old Latin, Vulgate, Armenian, Ethiopic, and all the Syriac Versions, and Origen himself expressly and in two different places. If it were not genuine, no one would have thought of inserting it here. It certainly was not introduced from xxii. 14. There is nothing in the connection demanding its insertion. On the contrary, to readers generally, its pertinence is not as obvious as it might be; it has rather the appearance of being out of place. This is probably what led to its omission, and why a few copies are without it; at the same time it may have been considered an interpolation from xxii. 14. But, when considered closely, it is found to be exceedingly pertinent. Its application and significance, however, which differ somewhat from those of the same words in xxii. 14, are not such as would naturally occur to a casual reader of the latter verse. It is truly sad to see the Saviour's teachings thus tampered with by those who centuries ago failed to understand him, and then to find their perversions adopted and placed before a confiding public as genuine readings, under the supposition that a few old documents cannot be united in error, while all others differing from them must be, no matter how ancient any of them may be, or from how many widely separated regions their united testimony may come. "By their fruits," said the Saviour, "shall ye know them"; not by their ripening first, or by their ripening last, necessarily.

**xxi. 4.**

Rec. T. 

The omission of διον, "all," though it does not affect the sense, is hardly justified. The word does not appear in Η, C first hand, D, L, Ζ, most copies of the Old Latin, a few of the Vulgate, the Frankish, the Curetonian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Wheelocke's Persic Version, or in Origen, Chrysostom, Hilary and other Latin Fathers. Elsewhere in this connection Matthew employs this word. It was his usual way of expressing himself, as appears from i. 22, and xxvi. 56, the only other places in which the expression τοῦτο γέγονεν occurs. Still, just because the word appears in these two places as genuine, and a few documents that are regarded as trustworthy deny its genuineness here, most modern editors conclude that it is an interpolation, and reject it. This may be just; but it seems to us more like denying to the evangelist the right to express himself in his own way, because one of his early copyists appears to have considered the word unnecessary, and a confessedly respectable number of others have been found who have given currency and continuance to his emasculated reading. The same thing, no doubt, would have occurred at i. 22 if the witnesses against διον there had been a little more respectable, or a little more numerous. But,
as the objectors to the use of the word there are only the Curetonian Syriac (one of the most prominent false witnesses in the verse before us), Irenæus, and Epiphanius, of course no attention is paid to them. But the same spirit and motive—a desire and intention to cut down and improve the text—show themselves there as here. The reading of the Received Text is certainly well supported, being attested by B, C third hand, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, T, Δ, Π, the whole body of the cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Thebaic, Armenian, and (Polyglot) Persic Version, and Appian. In view of all the evidence, external and internal, we cannot but consider the word a part of the original text.

**xxi. 6.**

Rec. T. καθὼς προσέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς — as Jesus commanded them.

Rev. T. καθὼς συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς ὁ Ἰησοῦς — even as Jesus appointed them.

The reading of the Received Text is attested as the genuine reading by N, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, S, U, V, X, Z, Γ, Δ, Π, all but one cursive, Origen three times, and Eusebius twice; that of the Revised Text by B, C, D, one cursive (33), and one lectionary or service-book of the Greek church, written by one Peter, a monk, A.D. 1056. The two words mean substantially the same. Each is used elsewhere by Matthew twice; the former in i. 24, viii. 4; and the latter in xxvi. 19 and xxvii. 10. The reader can judge for himself in favor of which the documentary evidence preponderates, and how important it was to make the change so as to prepare the way for a proper revision of the English text. Some will wonder why the first ἐπιβαίνο, "on," in verse 7, was not also changed to ἐπὶ, "upon," which is much more strongly attested there than συνετάξεω is here. The change seems to be quite as necessary.

**xxi. 12.**

"Many ancient authorities," says the marginal note, "omit of God." The exact phrasing τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ὁσιοῦ, "the temple of God," is something unusual, nowhere else to be found in the New Testament, though ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Ὁσιοῦ, "the sanctuary of God," occurs several times. It is simply on this account, and because the phrase "of God" was considered an imper tinence in connection with τὸ ἱερὸν, that it was dropped, and is wanting in N, B, I, three cursives, one copy of the Old Latin Version, the two Egyptian, the Armenian, Ethiopic, and Anglo-Saxon Versions. That the phrase does not appear in certain quotations by Origen, Methodius, Chrysostom, and Hilary, is not to be wondered at. They would be liable to omit it, unless quoting very carefully. Yet Origen elsewhere gives the whole expression, "the temple of God." If this were not the true reading, it would hardly be possible for him to have given it even once, or for it to have got into the text, much less to have been so widely accepted as to be found in C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Curetonian, and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Basil, and Origen not less than four times.

**xxi. 13.**

Rec. T. ὑμῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποίησατε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν — but ye have made it a den of thieves.

Rev. T. ὑμῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ποιεῖτε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν — but ye make it a den of robbers.

This change from the past to the present is supported by N, B, I, 124, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, two passages in Origen and one in Eusebius,—a body of witnesses largely the same as that supporting the false reading in the preceding verse, yet on the whole of less weight. This reading—"ye are making"—is simply an attempted improvement on the
original. In charging the Jews with making the house of God a resort for plunderers, Jesus meant to cover not merely their present but their past profanation of the temple. Hence his use of the aorist, "ye have made and are still making." And so Mark (xi. 17) and Luke (xix. 46) represent him; though critical hands have been at work on both these passages also, trying to alter them. It is far less probable that Matthew should have understood Jesus as speaking merely with reference to a present misappropriation of the temple, when the other evangelists record him as having spoken with reference to the past also, than that some one should have thought of enlivening his language by throwing it into the present. That the aorist should appear in all three of these evangelists is not therefore to be accounted for on the supposition that it was introduced into Matthew from one of the other two, but rather because all three have reported Jesus' words as he uttered them. If τοῦ Θεοῦ should be retained in the preceding verse, much more should the aorist of the Received Text be retained here; for the testimony against this is even weaker than against that.

xxi. 15.

Rec. T. τοὺς παιδίας κραίοντας — the children crying.
Rev. T. τοὺς παιδίας τοὺς κραίοντας — the children that were crying.

The revised Greek implies that there were other children in sight or in the vicinity, but that only those that were crying "Hosanna" etc. attracted the attention of the chief priests and the scribes. It implies, moreover, that it was the children rather than what they were doing that moved the chief priests and scribes to indignation: "When the chief priests, and the scribes saw the wonderful things that he did, and the children that were crying in the temple and saying, Hosanna to the son of David, they were moved with indignation." The employment of the article here particularizes a certain number of children, — those shouting in the temple, — and thus throws the emphasis upon the word "children" as the word embodying the particular idea referred to. This is the necessary result of the use of the article to introduce a limiting participial clause. Thus, in i. 16, we read, — "of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ," that is, the one so called, — that particular Jesus. So again in iv. 16, — "the people, those sitting in darkness" etc. And so in every other instance. The article introducing the restrictive clause of necessity brings into prominence, not the clause itself, but the word to which that clause is attached. Or, applying the principle to the case before us, the use of the article to introduce the participial clause makes the presence of these children, and not their crying, "Hosanna," the cause of the indignation of the chief priests and the scribes. If we hold to the meaning of the words, this exegesis is unavoidable. But we are informed in the very next verse that these priests and scribes, in their indignation, said to Jesus, "Hearest thou what these are saying?" — showing clearly that not the presence of the children, but what they were saying was what awakened indignation. In other words, the presence of the article here makes Matthew's statements inconsistent with each other. Either therefore the evangelist did not know how to express himself, or else some careless or ignorant copyist has misrepresented him by inserting the article. But nowhere else in all his Gospel has Matthew given us false Greek like this. The conclusion therefore is inevitable that the insertion of the article is the work of some later hand. Its presence is enough to show that any manuscript that contains it is carelessly written or has followed a carelessly written exemplar, and is unworthy of implicit confidence. It is attested, however, by B, D, I, N, — these five uncials only. The reading of the Received Text, the only genuine reading possible, is that of C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, II, the entire body of the cursives, Origen, and Methodius.
Some ancient authorities," says the marginal note, "omit verse 44." That is, it is omitted in D, 33, and five copies of the Old Latin Version. Tischendorf rejects the verse apparently because Origen, in commenting on the passage, makes no mention of it, and Eusebius and Irenæus quote the preceding verses without quoting this; but it does not necessarily follow on this account that it was not in their copies of this Gospel. That it was omitted at an early date is obvious. And the omission being found only in these documents, the natural conclusion is that it was generally and justly regarded as improperly omitted, and should be so regarded still. It could not have been introduced from Luke xx. 18. If it had been, it would undoubtedly have been inserted where it naturally belongs,—after the words, "is become the head of the corner," in verse 42,—where it also appears in Luke. It is evident enough that the omission is due to its having been considered out of place, and forming an unsuitable ending of the parable; and the omitter, not having Luke's Gospel to be governed by, instead of inserting it in verse 42, dropped it altogether. That Jesus uttered the words in this connection, or that Matthew reported him as having done so, there is no reasonable ground for doubting.

A slight difference in the reading without any difference in the meaning. Each reading is fairly well attested:—the former by C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, as also by the rendering of the Old Latin and Vulgate Versions, and Origen twice; the latter by σ, B, J, two cursives, and Origen in four other places. But, as Matthew elsewhere (verse 26, and xiv. 5) writes ὅς, "as," in connection with this verb used in this sense, it is less likely that he should have adopted the Hebraism ἐχειν αὐτὸν εἶπεν προφήτην here than that some early copyist familiar with the language of the Septuagint should have mistaken UC for ΕΙC. It is as if a person, accustomed to saying, "They held (i.e. regarded) him as a prophet," should so far depart from his usual mode of speaking as to say, "They held him for a prophet." The question, however, is one of no importance as far as the evangelist's meaning or the revision of the Λ. V. is concerned.

Another uncalled-for change appears in the text without any change of meaning. The former reading is supported by C, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Δ, Π, all but five cursives, all but one copy of the Old Latin Version, and by the Curotonian and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions; the latter by σ, B, D, J, 1, 33, 69, 124, 209, one copy of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Origen. Origen, however, though commenting on the verse, may not have quoted the words carefully in their order, any more than Chrysostom quoted them correctly from his copy in giving them without αὐτοῖς, "unto them," as the Peshito Syriac and Ethiopic Versions also read. After all, are we any surer that the order adopted in the Revised Text is genuine than we are that no one of the readings to which these same witnesses bear testimony in verse 5 is the true reading there? In verse 1 their testimony is accepted, and the common reading set aside; in verse 5 none of them are believed, and the old reading stands. That is to say, instead of ὅ μου, "one," and ὅ δὲ, "another," B, J, 1, 22, 69, 124, 238, 346, and one or two other cursives, and Origen twice, read ὅς μου and ὅς δέ; while σ and C first hand read ὅ μου and ὅς δέ;
and D, followed by several copies of the Old Latin Version; reads οἱ μὲν, "some," and οἱ δὲ, "others." The cursive 33, which is partly defective here, reads μὲν and δὲ δὲ. Why these "authorities," which are so greatly divided among themselves in verse 5, should be any more trustworthy in verse 1, is not altogether clear. One thing, however, is perfectly clear: the supporters of the reading of the Received Text in verse 5 are as a whole the supporters of the reading of that same Text in verse 1. If their testimony is trustworthy in verse 5, why should it not be in the other?

xxii. 13.

Rec. T. Δήσαντες αὐτὸν πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, ἀρατε αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκβάλετε εἰς — Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into.

Rev. T. Δήσαντες αὐτὸν πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἐκβάλετε αὐτῶν εἰς — Bind him hand and foot, and cast him out into.

In D, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac Version, Irenæus, Lucifer, and other Fathers, δήσαντες αὐτὸν πόδας καὶ χεῖρας is changed to ἀρατε αὐτῶν πόδας καὶ χειρῶν καὶ, "Take him up by his feet and hands and" cast him out. This is evidently a very early modification of the text. But, on restoring the reading δήσαντες αὐτὸν πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, the words ἀρατε αὐτῶν καὶ were dropped, probably from being considered unnecessary, and hence are wanting in C, B, L, four cursive, the Peshito Syriac, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Augustine, and others. These are the three words that the Revisers have set aside; while, to make the omission good, αὐτῶν is inserted after ἐκβάλετε. If the reading thus presented had been the original reading, there would have been no temptation to insert ἀρατε αὐτῶν καὶ here any more than in viii. 12, or xxv. 30. The very fact, however, that the first part of this passage was tampered with by changing it to ἀρατε, etc., shows that this word is genuine as it appears in the Received Text, — a reading which, besides being strongly supported by internal evidence, is well attested by C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Δ, Π, most of the cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Philoxenian Syriac Version, Ambrosiaster, Victor of Tunis, and others.

xxii. 23.

Rec. T. Σαδδουκαῖοι οἱ λέγοντες — the Sadducees, which say.

Rev. T. Σαδδουκαῖοι λέγοντες — Sadducees, which say.

The American Revisers recognized the fact that the omission of the article introduces a false reading,—a reading that cannot be followed without misrepresenting the evangelist. The only rendering for the participle unaccompanied by the article, as the marginal note says, is "saying," as it is rendered at the beginning of the next verse. But, because K, B, D, M, S, Z, Π first hand, about fifty cursive, the Ethiopic Version, Origen, Methodius, and Epiphanius have the passage without the article, the Canterbury Revisers considered this the genuine reading. Yet they virtually rejected it when they came to translate. It shows for itself that it is a false reading, and will not bear a faithful rendering. The Peshito and Curetonian Syriac Versions, however, follow it, and render it faithfully: "Sadducees came and said . . . and questioned him," etc. It it easy to say with some that the article was introduced from Luke xx. 27, or with others that it was inserted to remove a textual difficulty. This is virtually saying that Matthew did not know how to express himself in Greek quite as well as some of his copyists. But such conjectures are simply the subterfuges of critics who seem to believe in the unimpeachable character of certain old manuscripts. The absence of the article is readily accounted for as other similar omissions are. In the original text it was preceded, as it now is in the Received Text, by another α, — the last syllable of the Greek for "Sadducees," — and some very early but careless transcriber evidently mistook this OIOI for a doubling of the article, and
omitted the latter half. Such errors are not uncommon in the 
old manuscripts. Thus, in Luke xxiii. 29, $\mathbf{S}$ omits $a\xi$ after 
$\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\mu\alpha$; the scribe of B omits, in Mark iv. 16, $a\xi$ after $\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\omicron\-\mu\nu
$, and in Mark xii. 36, $\epsilon\nu$ after $\delta\pi\nu\nu$; D, M first hand, in 
Matt. xiii. 16, omit $a\xi$ after $\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\mu\alpha$; and D, K, M, S, U, V, 
$\Gamma$, II, and a majority of the cursives, in Mark iii. 28, omit $a\xi$ 
$\kappa\alpha\omicron$, as may be seen in the Received Text. Such omis-
sions ought to convince an impartial critic that the error in the 
reading here is not Matthew's, but an error of a scribe, even 
though it was largely followed by others. The correct reading 
is supported by $\mathbf{S}$ as amended by the earlier seventh-century 
corrector, E, F, G, H, K, L, U, V, II second hand, most cur-
sives, the Old Latin and Vulgate, the two Egyptian, the Philox-
enian Syriac, and Armenian Versions.

xxii. 27.

Rec. T. $\text{'\pi\theta\alpha\nu}$ $\kappa\alpha\omicron$ $\eta$ $\gamma\nu\nu\eta$ — the woman died also.
Rec. T. $\text{'\pi\theta\alpha\nu\nu}$ $\eta$ $\gamma\nu\nu\eta$ — the woman died.

This language of the Sadducees is reported also by Mark 
(xii. 22) and Luke (xx. 32), and both have $\kappa\alpha\omicron$, “also.” It is 
hardly possible that a little word so significant and important as 
to be given by two reporters should have been omitted by the 
third. Its presence here is not only demanded by internal 
evidence, but attested as genuine by D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, 
V, $\Gamma$, II second hand, nearly all the cursives, all but one copy 
of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian 
Syriac, Memphitic, Thbaic, Armenian, Georgian, and other 
versions, and by Chrysostom; while the omission has the 
support of only $\mathbf{S}$, B, L, U, $\Delta$, II first hand, six cursives, one 
copy of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, and Ethiopic 
Versions. C is defective.

MATTHEW.

xxii. 30.

Rec. T. $\dot{\omicron}$ $\dot{\gamma}\gamma\nu\lambda\omicron$ $\tau\omicron$ $\Theta\omicron\omicron$ $\iota$ $\sigma\omicron$ $\pi\rho\alpha\nu$ — as the angels of God in 
heaven.
Rec. T. $\dot{\omicron}$ $\dot{\gamma}\gamma\nu\lambda\omicron$ $\iota$ $\sigma\omicron$ $\pi\rho\alpha\nu$ — as angels in heaven.

The omitted words “of God,” which the marginal note says 
“many ancient authorities add,” have every appearance of 
being genuine. The phrase “angels in heaven” is not one 
that could be misunderstood, or that would naturally tempt a 
person to change it to “angels of God in heaven.” It it nowhere 
else treated in this way. On the contrary, the latter expression 
might very readily seem to some to be overburdened; and 
this, together with the fact that the expression is nowhere else 
to be found, is sufficient to lead to the conclusion that the 
apparently needless words “of God” were omitted in some 
copies, rather than, for no apparent reason, added in others. 
The omission is supported by B, D, two cursives, eight copies 
of the Old Latin, one of the Vulgate, the Curetonian Syriac, 
Thebaic, and Armenian Versions, Origen, Ambrosiaster, and 
others. The presence of $\Theta\omicron\omicron$ (either with or without 
the article) is vouched for by $\mathbf{S}$, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, $\Gamma$, 
$\Delta$, $\Theta^\ominus$, II, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian 
Syriac, four copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Memphitic, 
and Ethiopic Versions, as well as by Origen, and Methodius, 
Epiphanius, and Chrysostom. Its rejection, in view of all 
these considerations, seems unwarranted.

xxii. 32.

Rec. T. $\delta\kappa$ $\iota\omicron$ $\iota$ $\omicron$ $\Theta\omicron\omicron$ $\nu$ $\kappa\rho\alpha\nu$ — God is not the God of the 
dead.
Rec. T. $\delta\kappa$ $\iota\omicron$ $\iota$ $\omicron$ $\Theta\omicron\omicron$ $\nu$ $\kappa\rho\alpha\nu$ — God is not the God of the dead.

A literal rendering of the Revisers’ Greek would be, “He 
is not the God of the dead,” just as in Mark xii. 27; though 
in the latter verse the Revisers have rejected the Greek article. 
The presence of the article before $\Theta\omicron\omicron$ here does not make
it necessary to take this word as the subject instead of the predicate after having dropped the other Θεός, any more than in the former part of the verse, where it appears in the predicate in similar circumstances three times, accompanied by the article each time. Nor does the fact that neither Mark nor Luke reports Jesus as having said, "God is not the God," etc., but that both have, "(He) is not the God," indicate that Matthew must have reported Christ's words in the same way; i.e. without using Θεός twice. After giving Jesus' statement of God's words to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob," there is substantially no difference among the three reporters, two of whom go on to tell us that Christ added, "(He) is not the God of the dead," while the third represents him as having said, "God is not the God of the dead,"—any more than there is any real difference between Mark's saying ὥστε Θεός νεκρῶν and Luke's Θεός ὥστε νεκρῶν because they do not follow the same order. Christ may have used the word Θεός in this connection only once, as Mark and Luke represent him to have done; or he may have used it twice, as Matthew (according to the Received Text) reports him: in either case, his utterance is correctly reported, with a meaningless verbal difference. Now the presence of the second Θεός in Matthew is not easily accounted for if not genuine; while its omission has the appearance of being an attempt to conform the language to that given by Mark. There certainly is no necessity for its presence; nor can any one be supposed to have introduced it under the idea that it was necessary. The omission is attested by Ν, B, D, L, Δ, about ten cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, two Egyptian, Peshito and Curetonian Syriac, Arabic (in the Paris Polyglot), and Persic Versions, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Irenaeus, and Hilary. (The testimony of the Fathers in a case like this is generally of but little weight. In quoting from memory, as they often did, they would be as likely in such a connection as this to say "He is not," etc., as to say "God is not.") The genuineness of the second Θεός is sufficiently attested by E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Θ, Π, most of the cursive, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, Origen, Chrysostom, the Apostolic Constitutions, and a catena. C is still defective.

xxiii. 4.

The words "and grievous to be borne," as the marginal note states, are omitted by a number of ancient documents. These are Ν (which also reads μεγάλα βαρέα, "great, heavy," as an apparent substitute for "heavy and burdensome"). L, two cursive, five copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Curetonian Syriac, Memphitic, Arabic, and Persic (Polyglot) Versions, and Irenaeus,—witnesses that led Westcott and Hort to place the words in the margin as doubtful, and Tischendorf to reject them as spurious. The testimony in support of their genuineness consists of B, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Θ, II, nearly all the cursive, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Thebaic, Armenian, Philoxenian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, and Chrysostom and John Damascene. The fact that Luke (xi. 46) reports Christ as employing the very unusual word δωρβάστακτα, "grievous to be borne" (though he omits βαρέα, "heavy"), is as good evidence as we could well have that Christ really used it in this connection. It is but just, therefore, to conclude that Matthew must have reported him as having used it. But, from the very fact that Luke has the word, some infer that since the manuscripts are divided, it must have been introduced here from Luke. But the testimony in favor of its presence is too weighty to be set aside in this way. The case is very different from that in Luke xi. 46, where the testimony in favor of βαρέα, "heavy," (namely, C, X, a dozen cursive, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version, and Basil), is altogether insufficient to sustain the reading. The true solution of the question is rather, that, since there is an apparent identity of meaning between the two adjectives βαρέα,
"heavy," and δυσβάσταστα, "burdensome," the latter with its conjunction was dropped by some early critical reader or scribe as superfluous; hence its omission in so many documents. The words, though similar in meaning, are by no means identical; for an object may be heavy without being hard to carry. The latter, rather than the former, contains the idea to which Christ seems more especially to have referred, — the irksomeness and intolerable nature of the requirements of the Pharisees and scribes. The word should be retained.

xiii. 14.

This verse is omitted on the assumption that it was transferred hither from Mark xii. 40 or Luke xx. 47, and accommodated to this place. The fact that this language appears in those Gospels, though in a slightly altered form, is proof that it was actually spoken by Christ on this occasion. But the oldest extant manuscripts are without them; namely, N, B, D, L, Z, six cursives, as well as several copies of the Old Latin, nine or ten copies of the Vulgate, the Thebaic (according to Münter), the Armenian, and certain codices of the Memphitic Version, and Origen. The verse appears in E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, T, A, C, II, the great majority of the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, some codices of the Memphitic, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Ethiopic, and other versions, and was also known to Chrysostom and John Damascene. It may indeed be a genuine part of Matthew's text, and yet have been overlooked by a copyist on account of its beginning with the same words as the verses following, — the writer's eye, after he had copied the first five or six or seven words, on returning to his exemplar, resting unconsciously on the next verse instead of this. If it was thus omitted in the early centuries, the passage would very naturally come down to us mutilated in a variety of old documents, while the true text would be found only in the more numerous and generally later transcripts of exemplars long since lost.

MATTHEW.

xiii. 17.

Rec. T. ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἱερός τῶν χρυσῶν — the temple that sanctifieth the gold.

Rev. T. ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἱερός τῶν χρυσῶν — the temple that hath sanctified the gold.

The common reading is that of C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, T, A, C, II, and all the cursives, supported by the Peshito Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, and other versions; while the Revisers' is found only in N, B, D, Z, and α, the Latin version of D. The former may seem at first view to be adopted from verse 19, where there is no rival reading. But, assuming that the latter is the correct reading, it may be asked why Jesus should have said, in the one instance, "the temple that sanctified the gold," and in the other, "the altar that sanctifieth the gift" or offering. The only apparent reason is, that he referred to the time when the gold was placed in the temple, and that his meaning is that the temple then sanctified the gold once for all, while the altar sanctifies the offering that is laid upon it from time to time. But it seems hardly possible that Jesus should have made such a strange distinction. The gold of the temple did not become sanctified in the act of being devoted to temple adornment and use as such, as the aorist participle implies. It was sanctified simply by and during its connection with the temple as something given up and dedicated to its use and adorning. This fact would naturally lead Jesus to speak of the temple as sanctifying, not as having sanctified, the gold; just as he afterward speaks of the altar as sanctifying, not as having sanctified, the gift lying on it. The introduction of the aorist here appears like the work of one who looked upon the gold of the temple as sanctified for all time to come because of its having once been brought into connection with the temple, — a view that savors of superstition rather than reverence for what is truly sacred. In view of this fact in connection with the very limited external testimony in its favor, we cannot but regard the Revisers' reading as a false one.
xxiii. 19.
Rec. T. μωροι καὶ τυφλοί — Ye fools and blind.
Rev. T. τυφλοί — Ye blind.

There is one peculiarity in Jesus’ use of words which may enable us sometimes to distinguish the true from the false in the documents that profess to give his language. He did not study variety of expression. When he had occasion to reproduce a thought, it was almost invariably in the same words as first given. Thus, if he had occasion more than once to say, “Ye have heard that it was said,” he reiterated the thought in the same words and form of words in the same order. Matt. v. 21, 27, 33, 38, 43. “He that receiveth,” in x. 40, 41, is expressed four times in the same form, where another might have said once or twice, “Whosoever” or “Every one that” instead of “He that.” So, too, “What went ye out to see?” in xi. 7, 8, 9; “And others fell” in xiii. 5, 7, 8; “And he that was sown” in xiii. 19, 20, 22, 23. Again, in this very chapter, no less than six times do we find him using the expression “Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!” In verse 16, for an obvious reason he varies his words, and says, “Woe unto you, ye blind guides,” where he addresses the scribes and Pharisees with reference to their teaching; while in all the other instances he refers to their acts. Unless there is some such obvious reason for it, he observes as a rule an unvarying form in speaking in the same connection of the same thing or to the same persons. — Now, in the verse before us, Christ is made by the Revisers’ reading, for no apparent reason, to change the expression, “Ye fools and blind: for whether is greater,” which he had just used in verse 17, to “Ye blind: for whether is greater.” The evidence on which this is done is the testimony of Ρ, D, L, Z, i., 209, nine copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Curetonian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions; while the familiar reading of the Received Text, which is more in accordance with Jesus’ style of speaking, is testified to by B, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, all but two cursive, two or three copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Thebais, and Armenian Versions, and Origen. External as well as internal evidence sustains the reading of the Received Text. The omission is probably due to some unscrupulous copyist’s disrelish for the word, leading him to employ it no oftener than he felt it really necessary.

xxiii. 38.

The marginal note calls attention to the fact that in some manuscripts, in the clause “Your house is left unto you desolate,” the last word is omitted. The omission seems to have arisen from a desire to save Jesus from the appearance of having made a mistake. It appears only in B, L, one copy of the Old Latin, one manuscript of the Memphitic Version, and in Origen in a single instance. Westcott and Hort, from their confidence in the Vatican Codex, adopt this reading, and relega ἀποκαλεῖται, “desolate,” to the margin as a possible interpolation. Lachmann also omits the word on the authority of B. But the true reading seems to be, beyond question, that of the Received Text, adopted by Tregelles and Tischendorf. It is overwhelmingly attested, and followed by the Revisers. (Compare Note on Luke xiii. 25.)

xxiv. 31.

Another marginal note informs the reader of another omission made by “many ancient authorities,” whom Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort have been induced to follow. But the question arises, If the omitted word, φωνή, “sound,” is spurious, how did it get into the text? This is by no means apparent. It is true that D, a dozen or so cursive, most copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, John Damascene, Hilary, and others read “with a trumpet and a great sound,” as given in the margin of the A. V.; and the Jerusalem and Philoxenian
Syriac and Ethiopic Versions read "with the sound of a great trumpet"; while χ, L, Δ, eight or nine cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions, and Origen, Eusebius, Cyril, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Cyprian omit φωνή, and read "with a great trumpet," — the reading of Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort's text, and the Revisers' margin. But these variations are all due to the perplexity of scholars and scribes in regard to the meaning of the true text,—a thing by no means uncommon among ancient manuscripts.¹ The genuine reading is that of the text, which is adopted also by Lachmann and Tregelles, and is well attested. If understood, it affords the reader no embarrassment whatever.

xxiv. 36.

Rec. T. οὐδὲς οἶδαν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν σώματων, ἐλ ὁ πατὴρ μου μόνοι—knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.

Rev. T. οὐδὲς οἶδαν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν σώματων, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, ἐλ ὁ πατὴρ μόνοι—knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only.

That Jesus uttered in this connection the added words "neither the Son," there can be no question; for Mark (xiii. 32), with scarcely a dissenting witness, reports him as having spoken them. The only question is whether Matthew really so reported him. The evidence, both external and internal, is divided; yet we do not consider it impossible to arrive at the truth. The documentary evidence in favor of the added words consists of χ first hand, as well as the later seventh-century corrector, B, three cursives, eleven copies of the Old Latin

1 Thus, υἱὸν Βαρακλαβ, in Matt. xxiii. 35, being considered a mistake for υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωάννη, "the son of Jehoiada," is omitted by χ, in which the scribe is supported by Eusebius and four lectionaries. In a similar manner, from sheer perplexity, δευτεροπρωτύς, in Luke vi. 1, is omitted by χ, B, L, and a number of cursives and versions, while other manuscripts vary the expression. See Note on Luke vi. 1.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

is followed by six copies of the Old Latin and by the Philoxenian Syriac Version; while L (the usual ally of B), one lectionary, three copies of the Old Latin and the Thebaic Version, and Origen read "in the days of the flood." Others, as the Peshito Syriac Version, omitting "the days which," read simply "For as, before the flood," etc. The reading of B, as well as that of D, is a stupid gloss. As if Matthew's readers might suppose that "the days that were before the flood" meant the whole period of time previous to the flood, and not simply "the days of Noah," some ignorant would-be critic inserted ἐκείνους.

In order to bring out his idea, the rendering should be punctuated thus: "For as in those days (i.e. the days of Noah, just spoken of), which were before the flood, or, which preceded the flood, they were eating and drinking," etc. The reading virtually makes the relative clause following the word "days" parenthetical, if not really superfluous. The reading of D is but an attempted improvement on this; while that of L, which has the same end in view, of limiting the days to the time of Noah, is an attempt to simplify the expression still farther.

The gloss was too palpable to be adopted except as far as it is yet known, by a single cursive of the twelfth century, and is too feebly supported to deserve serious consideration. Of course Westcott and Hort adopt it, for, according to Dr. Hort, "B is found to hold a unique position." It "very far exceeds all other documents." 1 The reading of the Received Text, however, commends itself as genuine. It is adopted by Tischendorf, and well attested by Ν, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, Π, Δ, II, and almost the entire body of the cursive. Didymus of Alexandria among the Fathers also supports it.

1 Introduction, etc., pp. 150, 171.

MATTHEW.

xxiv. 42.

Rec. T. οὐκ οὗται ποιεῖ ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἐρχεται—ye know not what hour your Lord doth come.

Rev. T. οὐκ οὗται ποιεῖ ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἐρχεται—ye know not on what day your Lord cometh.

By referring to the parallel passage in Mark (xiii. 33, 35), we find that the time denoted by Christ on this occasion is, not a day as a current portion of time, but a subdivision of the day, an hour or watch; —"Watch therefore;" he said, as Mark reports him; "for ye know not when the Lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cock-crowing, or in the morning." This gives us Jesus' thought. Now it is not to be supposed for a moment that Matthew would attempt to express this thought by saying, "Watch therefore; for ye know not on what day your Lord cometh." He would rather say "in what hour." It is easy to say that "day" was changed to "hour," to correspond with verse 44, or to make the time more definite. But there is no proof of this. It is just as easy to say that "hour" was changed to "day" on account of the foregoing remarks concerning "the days of Noah," or in conformity with verse 50, where the lord of the servant is spoken of as coming "in a day when he expecteth not." And, in view of Christ's utterance as recorded by Mark, this seems to have really been the case. Matthew could not very well have written ἡμᾶς, "day." There is nothing in the facts of the case to warrant the supposition that he wrote any different word here from what he wrote in verse 44. The testimony in support of this is certainly not easily set aside. Besides the internal evidence, we have that of E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Π, II, most of the cursive, most copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions, and Origen, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Theodoret. On the other hand, the Revisers' reading has the support of Ν, B, D, I, Δ, five cursive (i.e. four, besides three
of Ferrar's group, which are virtually but one), two copies of the Old Latin, and the Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, Irenaeus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Athanasius, and Hilary. In addition to this, one copy of the Old Latin Version and two of the Vulgate have "in what hour or what day"; while Eusebius and the Ethiopic Version have "on what day and hour," — a conflation apparently deduced from verse 50.

**XXIV. 48.**

Rec. T. Χρονιζει δ κύριος μου ἐλθεῖν — My Lord delayeth his coming.
Rev. T. Χρονιζει δ κύριος μου — My Lord tarryeth.

The omission here made in the Revisers' Text is one of those abbreviations occurring from time to time in \(\mathfrak{K}\) and B, where a seemingly unnecessary or superfluous word or expression is dropped. In many instances, these codices are supported in these omissions by other documents. In this instance, they are seconded by two cursive, the Memphitic, Thebaic, and Arabic Versions, and by Irenaeus and Ephraem the Syrian. In place of the omitted ἐλθεῖν, "to come," Luke (xii. 45) has ἐρχομένων. This shows that the omitted word was not taken from Luke. It also shows that Jesus in all probability supplemented the verb χρονιζει, "delayeth," with an infinitive. If he did not, Luke would have done it in reporting his words. And if Jesus did employ an infinitive, as Luke's record leads us to believe he did, Matthew, as a faithful reporter, would naturally have so represented him also. And most witnesses testify to his having done so, though that infinitive is a different form from Luke's, but a form of the same verb, — a fact which makes the testimony all the more credible. Had all the witnesses done as the three cursive 1, 157, 209, and Basil, and Origen in one instance, have, — that is, had they handed down to us Luke's form χρονιζει ἐρχομένων, — it might be said, in view of the abbreviated reading of \(\mathfrak{K}\), B, that the latter reading was taken from Luke; whereas the genuineness of the reading of the Received Text is confirmed by the fact that the infinitive which Matthew employs is not ἐρχομένων. This reading is attested by C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, Τ, Δ, Π, all but two cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, and other versions, and Origen, Chrysostom, and John Damascene.

**XXV. 2.**

Rec. T. πέντε δι ἤσαν ἐκ αὐτῶν φρονόματι, καὶ αἱ πέντε μωραί. — And five of them were wise, and five were foolish.
Rev. T. πέντε δι ἤσαν ἐκ αὐτῶν μωραί, καὶ πέντε φρονόματι. — And five of them were foolish, and five were wise.

In the arrangement of these words, the Received Text follows the later uncials E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Τ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursive, one copy of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Chrysostom, and Basil in three different places. The order adopted by the Revisers is that of \(\mathfrak{K}\), B, C, D, L, Z, six cursive, the Old Latin Version with the exception of a single copy, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Jerusalem Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Arabic Versions, and Origen. In speaking of two different objects or classes of objects, the natural order is to introduce first the more worthy or that which is so regarded, unless there is some obvious reason for adopting a different order. On this principle, we say "the rich and the poor," "husband and wife," "right and wrong," "sun, moon, and stars." On this principle, Jesus said, "Swear not at all: neither by heaven, . . . nor by the earth, . . . neither by Jerusalem" (Matt. v. 34, 35). "Every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit" (vii. 17). "They gathered the good into vessels, but cast the bad away" (xii. 48). The doer of the word, he likened to a wise man; then the non-doer to a foolish man (vii. 24-27). And so elsewhere. In like manner, Paul wrote "I am debtor both to Greeks and
to Barbarians, both to the wise and to the foolish" (Rom. i. 14). Now there seems to be nothing in the nature of the parable or in the context that requires Jesus in uttering these words, or the evangelist in recording them, to forsake the natural order, and introduce the foolish before the wise. It looks like the work of another who arranged the words thus, so as to have them stand in the order in which "the foolish" and "the wise" are spoken of in verses 3 and 4. But, admitting that, with all its seeming improbability, this may be the order in which the evangelist penned the words, what shall we say of the reading with which verse 3 begins? The witnesses that give the revised as the true order of Jesus' words, on proceeding to the next verse, seem to be puzzled to know what reading to give. Codices Z, 157, the Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions, and most copies of the Old Latin give αἱ διπλα. The two cursives 1, 209, read λαβοὺσαι διπλα αἱ αἱ. D and one copy of the Old Latin give us αἱ διπλα. But six of them—N, B, C, L, 33, and the Memphitic Version—adopt αἱ γάρ as the most satisfactory,—making the verse appear to be introduced as a reason for something, rather than with D as the consequence. This, the Revisers and some other editors accept as the original reading. But nothing has yet been said of the foolish virgins beyond the bare statement that there were five of them. If verses 2 and 3 read simply, "But five of them were foolish; for, though they had taken their lamps, they took no oil along with themselves," the last clause would evidently be designed to show why they were called foolish. But to say that five of the virgins "were foolish and five were wise, for the foolish, though they took their lamps, took along with themselves no oil," is not very conclusive reasoning. It has the ring of false coin. What Jesus said in verse 3 concerning the foolish virgins, he evidently did not offer as a proof of their folly, any more than he said what he did in verse 4 concerning the wise as an evidence of their wisdom. He simply stated the facts in the case, leaving the hearer to draw

his own conclusions: "Five of them were wise, and the other five were foolish. Those that were foolish, though they took their lamps, took with themselves no oil; but the wise took oil in their vessels along with their lamps." The documents that attest the natural and commonly received order in verse 2 are in the main agreed upon αἱ τιμίαι as the true reading in the beginning of verse 3,—a fact which, in itself considered, goes far toward establishing the genuineness of the text upon which they are agreed. It is simply possible, however, that the Revisers' reading αἱ γάρ is an early transcriptional error for αἱ τιμίαι, "as many as were," by a simple change of TET to Γ, somewhat as the seemingly true reading δυνητινοὺς ποιητούς, "whomsoever they desired," in Mark xv. 6, became early changed in a few copies to ὅσοι παραγγέλλοντο, "whom they asked for." If this is so, then the two readings, αἱ τιμίαι and αἱ γάρ, though neither of them the true reading, substantially represent a common lost reading αἱ τιμίαι, whose meaning is properly preserved in the former.

xxvi. 26.

Rec. T. καὶ ἔδιδον τοῖς μαθηταῖς καὶ εἶπε,—and gave it to the disciples, and said.

Rev. T. καὶ δόθη τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπε,—and he gave to the disciples, and said.

The difference in the texts is an unwarranted difference. The latter reading is obviously a change from the former to make the construction correspond with what precedes as well as with what follows. It is attested by N, B, D, L, Z, five cursives (reckoning 13, 69, the two of Ferrar's group that have this reading, as one), and the Memphitic Version,—testimony none too strong at the best. Had the aorist participle been the original reading, it is hard to conceive of any reason why it should have been changed to the imperfect. It would naturally, and beyond question, have been changed to the aorist, ἔδωκε, as the reading is in Mark xiv. 22, and Luke xxii. 19, as well as in verse 27, and as a few cursives have it here, and not to the imperfect,
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xxvi. 53.

Rec. T. ὅδε δόναμαι ἄρτι παρακάλεσαι . . καὶ παραστῆσαι μοι πλεῖον — [Thinkest thou that] I cannot now pray to [my Father,] and he shall presently give me more [than twelve legions of angels?]

Rev. T. ὅδε δόναμαι παρακάλεσαι . . καὶ παραστῆσαι μοι ἄρτι πλεῖον — [Or thinkest thou that] I cannot beseech [my Father,] and he shall even now send me more [than twelve legions of angels?]

The Revisers' reading, which transfers ἄρτι, "now," from its usually acknowledged place as the sixth word in the verse to the sixth from the end of the verse, is that of $\mathbf{X}$ as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, B, L, one cursive, two copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions, Cyril, Chrysostom, and Jerome. The Sinaitic Codex first hand, and the Memphitic Version read ὅδε ἄρτι, "here now," while Origen in commenting on the passage, Basil, and two cursives read ὅδε, instead of ἄρτι after μοι, "me," — readings that are plainly false. That ἄρτι belongs only where the Received Text has it, is the preponderating testimony of A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, most copies of the Old Latin Version, the Philoxenian Syriac Version, Origen three times, and Paulus Orosius. The Revisers' reading evidently originated with some early reader, who, failing to see the force of ἄρτι in connection with παρακάλεσαι, thought to improve the reading by transfer-

xxvii. 4.

The marginal reading "righteous" blood, which is found in L, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Jerusalem Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, as well as in Origen, Cyprian, Lucifer, and others, is simply a gloss, suggested probably by the "righteous" blood mentioned in xxiii. 35. It appeared at first as a marginal reading in some old manuscript, as it does in B, whence it was afterwards introduced into the text in place of the unusual word ἀδικίαν, "innocent." The latter, which appears in the New Testament only here and in verse 24, is unquestionably the true reading. The Revisers' note is hardly called for.

xxvii. 5.

Rec. T. ἐν τῷ ναῷ — in the temple.

Rev. T. εἰς τὸν ναὸν — into the sanctuary.

The preponderance of evidence is against this reading of the Revisers. The common reading is attested by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Syriac, Old Latin, and Vulgate Versions, and Cyril; — that of the Revisers, by $\mathbf{X}$, B, L, 33, 69, 124 (the last two, however, being virtually the testimony of but one witness), the Gothic and Ethiopic Versions, Eusebius and Chrysostom. Origen, in
different places, has both readings. The change would be a very natural one for a person to make who regarded \( \epsilon v \) with the dative as unsuitable after a word meaning “having cast,” and who held that only \( \epsilon v \) with the accusative was admissible, as in Luke iv. 35 and xvii. 2. But Matthew everywhere (ix. 36, xv. 30, and here) uses \( \delta \pi \tau o \) in the sense of “cast down,” and would therefore naturally follow it with \( \epsilon v \; \tau o \; \nu o\pi o \), “in the sanctuary.”

xxvii. 24.

The “ancient authorities” referred to in the marginal note as reading, “I am innocent of this blood; see ye to it,” are B, 1, an unknown cursive (102) containing extracts from Matthew and Mark, which Westcott believes to have been taken from B itself, two copies of the Old Latin, and one of the Vulgate Version, Origen, Chrysostom, and Pseudo-Athanasius. It is a reading from which \( \tau o \; \delta \kappa a i o \) was omitted under the belief that Pilate could not have spoken of Jesus as a “righteous” man. It really deserves no such notice as the Revisers have thus given it; for the reading “the blood of this righteous man” is overwhelmingly attested by documentary evidence. In addition to this, the reply of the multitude, “His blood be upon us,” shows conclusively that Pilate spoke to them of some person. If this marginal reading were genuine, Matthew would have represented the multitude as answering Pilate by saying, not “His blood,” but “This (or That, or simply The) blood be upon us,” etc.

xxvii. 28.

The common reading, “they stripped him,” is plainly required by the context. They stripped him to put on him a scarlet robe, as Matthew goes on to say; or as John has it (xix. 2) to array him in a purple garment, the attire of royalty, preparatory to ridiculing his claim to being king of Israel. After they had completed their work of mockery, they removed the scarlet robe, and replaced his own clothing, as the evangelist states in verse 31. Yet certain ancient documents, which the marginal note calls “authorities,” read “clothed” him instead of “stripped” him. The only ground on which it can be supposed that this is the genuine reading is the assumption that Pilate, after having scourged Jesus (verse 26), delivered him naked to the Jews,—a pure assumption unwarranted by the language of the evangelist, and one which no scholar would for a moment entertain except to defend a false reading. It assumes that \( \epsilon v \; \delta \kappa a i o \) instead of meaning “having clothed,” means “having put on his under garment” only, leaving his upper garments to be put on afterward (verse 31), the same word (\( \epsilon v \; \delta \kappa a i o \)) being used for the putting on of these as is used in the other case,—supposing \( \epsilon v \; \delta \kappa a i o \) to be the genuine reading. It assumes also that the plural form \( \tau a \; \iota \mu a r a \) (verse 31) of necessity means upper garments, whereas it denotes any and, as in verse 35, all garments sometimes. But, because \( \epsilon v \; \delta \kappa a i o \), which ought in all seriousness to be considered as nothing more than “a mere error of the pen”¹ unconsciously admitted through carelessness, but carefully duplicated through ignorance, appears in two or three of the oldest known Greek manuscripts and a few other documents, it must be viewed by some as a possibly correct reading! It is found in \( K \) as changed by the earlier seventh-century corrector, B, 1, the twelfth-century cursive 157, five copies of the Old Latin Version, and Origen. On the other hand, the reading of the Received Text is overwhelmingly attested by \( K \) first hand and afterward by its later seventh-century corrector amending the error of his predecessor, A, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, S, U, V, \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), \( \Pi \), every cursive but one, six copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Peshito, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, and Armenian Versions, Origen in his comment on the passage, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and Augustine.—There are really too many of these needlessly distracting notes cumbering the margin of the R. V.

¹ Scrivener, Introduction, p. 480.
xxvii. 49.

To this verse, the marginal note says, "many ancient authorities add And another took a spear, and pierced his side, and there came out water and blood. See John xix. 34." Those "authorities" are א, B, C, L, U, T, the cursive 5, 48, 67, 115, 127 first hand, the text of five good manuscripts of the Vulgate and the margin of another, the Jerusalem Syriac in its lectionary, the Ethiopic Version, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. On the other hand, the omission is called for by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, V, Δ, II, all the cursive except the five just mentioned, the Old Latin, most copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Jerusalem Syriac in its text proper, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Gothic Versions, Origen, Eusebius, Hilary, Jerome, and Augustine. The clause is generally regarded as an interpolation from John xix. 34, as the marginal note indicates, and as having crept into the text from Tatian's Diatessaron.1 This, however, is but conjecture, and not the most reasonable at that; for, if it came from the Diatessaron, Tatian must have represented Christ as having been pierced both before and after his death; for, in following John's narrative, it is hardly credible that he should not have represented the Saviour as pierced after his death. So that, in order that the account of the piercing contained in these omitted words could be taken from Tatian, he must have inter-

1 The note that appears on the margin of Codex 72 against Matt. xxvii. 48, to the effect that this passage "was inserted into the historical Gospel of Diodorus, and Tatian, and various other holy Fathers," must not be allowed more weight than really belongs to it. The manuscript itself was written during the eleventh century. How long after that time this note was placed in its margin no one knows. It may have been during the same century, and may not have been for two or more centuries later. Even at the earliest date, testimony given so recently can hardly be called ancient, or said to be from one properly qualified to say that the words were indeed in Tatian's Diatessaron, a work that probably perished centuries before the author of the note was born, except as partially preserved in Ephraem's commentary upon it.

polated it. But Tatian was not given to adding to the text. He "habitually abridged the language of the passages which he combined."1 The omission rather than the insertion of these words would be more likely to have crept into the text through Tatian. For, supposing the passage to be genuine with Matthew, Tatian on combining the two accounts — Matthew's and John's — in one continuous narrative would almost of necessity have omitted one of them as superfluous, or seemingly inconsistent with the other, — both statements being referred to one and the same act. In that case, the omitted account was Matthew's, while John's was retained. This omission having once been made, its continuance was favored by the seeming inconsistency between the omitted words and the universally accepted record of John, till finally Pope Clement V. attempted to settle the matter at the Council of Vienna, A.D. 1311, by condemning the idea that Jesus' side had been pierced while he was yet alive. In addition to this, it should be noted that there is not such a oneness in the language of this passage and that of John xix. 34 as to warrant us in concluding that the former was necessarily taken from the latter. The Greek of this passage is ἀλλὰ δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἐνέχει αὐτῷ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἔξηλθεν ὑδωρ καὶ αἷμα, while John's words are ἀλλ' εἰς τὸν στρατιωτὸν λόγχην αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευρὰν ἐνέχει, καὶ ἔξηλθεν εὕθε αἷμα καὶ ὕδωρ, — "Howbeit one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and straightway there came out blood and water" (R. V.). If the former passage had been introduced from John, it would be but reasonable to conclude that it would more nearly have resembled the latter. As the sentence stands, however, there is nothing to indicate that it is not as truly original with Matthew as the other is with John. Nor should the documentary evidence in attestation of this reading be overlooked. It is true, the combination א, B, C, L, is by no means inspiring or decisive of the genuineness of a reading. But when it is considered that B is characterized, not by admitting interpolations into the text, but by its
numerous omissions, a seeming interpolation like this, when supported by a number of other documents, ought to suggest that perhaps, after all, the passage is really genuine, though at first sight it may seem to be spurious. And the more we consider the matter the more are we convinced that this is the case, though every modern editor has rejected the passage except Westcott and Hort; and even they have admitted it, as it were, under protest, by double-bracketing it as if it might possibly be an interpolation. Its presence here, to say nothing else, is exceedingly apposite; for it explains why Jesus died so soon; and this may have been the evangelist’s design in introducing the words. This will be apparent by reading verses 48-51 connectedly, with this clause included: “And straightway one of them ran, and took a sponge, and filled it with vinegar, and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink. And the rest said, Let us see whether Elijah is coming to save him. But another took a spear, and pierced his side, and water and blood flowed forth. Then Jesus, having cried again with a loud voice [saying, It is finished; Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit], gave up the ghost.” Nor is there anything in this that is really inconsistent with John’s statement. We give the entire passage,—John xix. 31-34,—that we may the better arrive at his real meaning: “The Jews therefore, since it was a preparation day, in order that the bodies might not remain upon the cross over the Sabbath, for that Sabbath was a prominent day, asked Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that they might be taken away. Then came the soldiers and broke the legs of the first and of the other that had been crucified with him. But on coming to Jesus, as they saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs.” This finishes the narrative as far as it relates to the matter of seeing that those who had been crucified were dead. And here the narrative of the evangelist on this point would also have closed, but that he desired to show, in addition to this, that Christ’s death was in accordance with prophecy. Hence he goes on to say, “Nevertheless (i.e. Though they did not break his legs, yet), one of the soldiers [not one of those who had been breaking the legs of the others; for if that had been the case, the evangelist, after what he had already written, would have said ‘one of them,’ but he says, ‘one of the soldiers,’ i.e. one of the four that crucified him and were there on guard, some time previous to this] with a spear had pierced his side, when forthwith there came out blood and water. And one who saw these things beareth witness, and his witness is true, and he knoweth that he speaketh what is true that ye also may believe. For these things came to pass that the Scripture might be fulfilled, Not a bone of him shall be broken. And again, another Scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced.” The evangelist mentions the piercing of Christ’s side as an afterthought in connection with the breaking of the legs, in order to prepare the way for the quotations from Scripture which he immediately introduces. It is true he uses the aorist; but he uses it as a pluperfect, just as he uses aorists for pluperfects elsewhere; as in vi. 22, 23, “his disciples had gone away alone; nevertheless there had come boats,” etc.; also xviii. 24, “Annas had sent him.” That this is the evangelist’s meaning in verse 34 instead of the one that is commonly given to his words, is evident from his quotation, “They shall look on him whom they pierced”—which, to have any significance, must mean whom they slew or put to death by piercing, the meaning which the passage evidently has in Zech. xii. 10. They could not, however, have put him to death with a spear-thrust if he was already dead. Again, the statement that blood and water at once flowed forth from Jesus’ side implies that he was still alive. For it is a well-known fact that when a person dies the blood at once ceases to flow and begins to coagulate; so that an incision made into a body a few hours after becoming lifeless fails to draw blood. And if Jesus died “about the ninth hour,” from two to three hours must have passed before

1 See Note on the rendering of this verse in *The Revisers’ English Text.*
his side was pierced, if it was not pierced till the leg-breaking took place, a period sufficiently long to enable the blood to become more or less coagulated. This manner of closely connecting in writing circumstances that were separated in time or place is, to a great extent, characteristic of all the evangelists, but especially so of John. To take a single illustration, turn to chapter vi. If we connect the circumstance related in the beginning of this chapter immediately with those of the preceding chapter, the verb ἀπήλθω, "went away," is made to refer to departing from Jerusalem. But from the account of Mark (vi. 31–33), to say nothing of anything else, we are constrained to believe that the word has no reference to Jerusalem, but rather to Capernaum or some neighboring locality,—there being no real connection in point of time or place between the incidents thus closely brought together in these chapters. John's aim was not, like Luke's, to give an orderly narrative of the life and ministry of Jesus, but to present various evidences of his being the divinely fore-announced Messiah, the Son of God. Hence his Gospel is largely made up of locally or temporally disconnected facts. All things considered, we cannot resist the conclusion that the marginal reading is genuine, and should have an unquestioned place in Matthew's Gospel.

**xxvii. 58.**

Rec. T. ὁ Πιλάτος ἐκλευσεν ἁπαθοθήναι τὸ σῶμα — Pilate commanded the body to be delivered.

Rev. T. ὁ Πιλάτος ἐκλευσεν ἁπαθοθήναι — Pilate commanded it to be given up.

There seems to be no good reason for the rejection here of τὸ σῶμα, "the body." Its omission is found only in Σ, B, L, about fifteen cursive, and the Jerusalem Syriac Version; and it has every appearance of being an attempt at improving the language,—σῶμα being used just before, as well as immediately after. A critical reader would scarcely have inserted it in such a connection. He would have been far more likely to drop the word, or to insert αὐτῷ instead as some did.

The omission of "from the door" appears only in Σ, B, D, three cursives, nine or ten copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions, Origen and Dionysius of Alexandria. Its presence is called for by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, II, nearly all the cursives, two copies of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions, Eusebius and Chrysostom. It is no argument against the genuineness of this expression that some of these witnesses have supplemented it by adding "of the tomb," any more than the addition, for example, of νυκτὸς, "by night," in certain manuscripts proves the spuriousness of ἐλθότας, in xxvii. 64, with which it is connected, and which those very manuscripts attest to be genuine. The phrase "of the door" is one which the evangelist would very naturally add after having mentioned "the sepulchre" just before; and one, too, which a critical reader would as naturally strike out, considering it not only unnecessary, but obstructing the flow of the discourse by standing between the words "rolled away the stone" and the statement "and was sitting upon it." The omission, of course, was an early one; but the evidence in support of the genuineness of the phrase dates back quite as early as that against it, while the fact that C, L, the Memphitic Version, and the cursives that usually side with B are here arrayed against it, and the additional fact that the phrase in itself considered has every appearance of being genuine, afford strong ground for believing that it is a part of the original text. In the unstudied simplicity of the evangelist's narrative, nothing is more natural. But if the words are not his, there is no conceivable motive for their being inserted by another hand; for
it is impossible for the dullest reader, on the supposition that
the phrase is wanting, to misunderstand the meaning, or to
imagine from the context that any other stone can be referred
to than the one that closed the sepulchre.

xxviii. 6.

The “many ancient authorities” of the marginal note that
omit “the Lord” are S, B, 33, 102, one copy of the Old Latin,
the Memphitic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and one Arabic Version,
Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and a catena. Its
presence is attested, however, by A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L,
M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursive, every copy but one
of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian
Syriac Versions, and Chrysostom five times. The fact that the
appellation is omitted by some of the Fathers is no proof of
its want of genuineness; for, quoting as they often did from
memory, it would not be at all strange if it were omitted,
as indeed we find it is twice by Chrysostom, who elsewhere
employs it five times. Its presence is by no means essential
to complete the construction; and this fact is sufficient
to account for its absence from the two oldest codices, which
are given to omitting unnecessary, strange, and obscure expres-
sions. Westcott and Hort, repeating Meyer’s objection, that
the designation is foreign to Matthew, say, it is “never applied
to Christ in Matthew except in reported sayings,” 1 of which this
happens to be one, and one in which it would very naturally
appear,—the saying being that of an angel. If not originally
given by Matthew, there is no apparent reason why it should
have been inserted and become so widely current.

1 Select Readings, p. 23.

MARK.

1.1.

The marginal note here informs the reader that “some
ancient authorities omit the Son of God,” making the verse
read simply, “The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ.”
This, however, is supported by but one unical (S), and that
corrected by a contemporary of the copyist, two cursive, and
not a single version. The note is uncalled for, as the reading
of the text is above suspicion.

1.2.

The reading “the prophets,” of the Received Text, is placed
by the Revisers in the margin, in deference to the testimony of
S, B, D, L, Δ, 33, and twenty-five other cursive, the Old Latin
Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac Versions,
the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac as well as the text of some
copies of that version, the Memphitic, some codices of the
Armenian, Erpenius’ Arabic, the Persic and Gothic Versions,
Irenæus, Origen, Porphyry (A.D. 233-305), Titus of Bostra,
Basil the Great, Epiphanius, Severianus, and others. The com-
mon reading, “the prophets,” is attested by A, E, F, G, H, K,
M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Π, most of the cursive, one manuscript of
the Memphitic (which has the conflate reading, “in the prophets,
in Isaiah the prophet”), the text of the Philoxenian Syriac,
Zohrab’s Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Roman Arabic as well as
that of the Polyglot, the Slavonic, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, Photius, and Theophylact. In view of
the testimony of the older manuscripts and versions, it is gener-
ally considered that the received reading is an early emendation to avoid the ascribing to Isaiah of words that are taken only in part from Isaiah. This is plausible; and yet there is another view to be taken. The author of this Gospel was born a Jew. He had, beyond a doubt, like Timothy, known the Old Testament writings from his childhood. His mother was evidently a devout, conscientious Jewess, a fit subject to become one of the early followers of Jesus, as we find that she was. (Acts xii. 12.) So that Mark would, at least, be quite as well able to say from which of the Old Testament writings he was quoting, as, for example, any well-read student of the Old Testament to-day would be to say in what book this or that passage might be found. In view of this, it seems hardly just to conclude that Mark, in giving two passages from different prophecies, like these from Malachi and Isaiah, would speak of them both as taken from Isaiah, especially when the first of them was one that he must have known was not in Isaiah. This, however, is the conclusion to which we are forced if our oldest documents are really trustworthy, and the reading presented by eight or ten of them here is to be accepted as the genuine reading. But these documents are not altogether trustworthy. They are continually in conflict one with another. They contain many of the erroneous readings that were early and inconsiderately introduced into the New-Testament Scriptures. We are therefore warned not to be hasty in accepting their testimony. We should inquire whether the reading they present may not after all be a spurious one. The expression, “in the prophets,” is somewhat indefinite. It may have seemed unsatisfactory to some early scribe. So, in order to give it definiteness, or perhaps simply to make Mark correspond with Matthew, he would naturally change “in the prophets” to “in Isaiah the prophet,” as Matthew has it in iii. 3. This was the conclusion to which Jerome came nearly one thousand five hundred years ago. For, though in deference to the evidence which he had before him when he revised the Old Latin Version, he retained the reading in Esaia propheta in the Vulgate, he says, in commenting on Matthew iii. 3, in reference to Mark i. 2, that he thinks the name of Isaiah is a vitiation of the text by scribes like similar readings in other places. And when it is borne in mind that this reading appears in the margin of one and in the text of the other of the Syriac Versions,—the versions of the country of Tatian’s Diatessaron, we need not be at a loss to see whence or how or when it got into the text. It evidently came from Matthew iii. 3, through Tatian in the latter part of the second century. It is what Dr. Hort would call a Syrian, a distinctly Syrian reading, though preserved in \( \text{n, B, L, 33, Origen, etc.} \) The genuine reading, as found in the Received Text, comes down to us in later uncials and other documents.

\( \text{i. 4.} \)

The Revisers have failed fully to correct the obviously false reading of this verse, and have given a rendering which, like that of the A. V., represents anything but the evangelist’s statement. They have correctly inserted the article before \( \betaαπτιζον \), “baptizing,” in accordance with \( \text{n, B, L, T}^4, \Delta, 33, 570 \), and the Memphitic Version. To complete the correction of the text, they should have omitted, with Westcott and Hort, the \( \kappaα \), “and,” preceding \( \epsilonροσον \), “preaching.” This reading, it is true, has but feeble documentary support, being attested only by B, 33, 73, and 102, against all other witnesses. But the internal evidence is overwhelming in its favor, and against the ordinary reading which retains \( \kappaα \). In other words, it is incredible that Mark should speak of John as one “who \( \text{baptized in the wilderness,} \) then in the very next breath say that all they of Judea and Jerusalem went out to him and “\( \text{were baptized by him in the river Jordan,} \)” Nor does he, if his language is properly understood. With the text corrected as Westcott and Hort have it, Mark says that, in accordance with what is written in prophecy, “\( \text{John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness,} \)
preaching the baptism of repentance" etc. ὁ βαπτίζων, instead
of being equivalent to ὁ ἤβαπτυς, "who baptized," as the
Revisers make it, or even to ὁ ἤβαπτυξε, "who was baptizing,"
represents the idea of the verb substantively, "the baptizing
one" or "the baptizer," as Mark uses the expression in vi. 14,
and in the Revisers' text in vi. 24. If the connection required
it, it might be equivalent to the relative and the imperfect, ὁ
ἐβαπτύξε, "who was baptizing." But there is nothing to call for
this interpretation. It would make the evangelist's language
imply that John was one who was known to have been baptizing
in the wilderness, but that he now came preaching the baptism
of repentance. This construction and interpretation, however,
because of its irrelevancy, is untenable. The only correct view
to take of the phrase is to consider it as a substantive, as the
evangelist elsewhere uses it; and, in doing this, the conjunction
before κατὰ σάνων must be rejected. This removes all difficulties,
makes the language consistent, and Mark's record correspond
with the statements of Matthew. See Matthew iii. 1, 5, 6.

1. 8.

Rec. T. ἐγὼ μὲν ἠβαπτυσά τῷ μά
— I indeed have baptized you.

Rev. T. ἐγὼ ἠβαπτυσά τῷ μάν — I baptized you.

The particle μὲν, "indeed," is rejected here by some editors,
if not by the Revisers, not so much because three or four
uncials and three cursive manuscripts happen to be without it, but
because Matthew (iii. 11) and Luke (iii. 16) have it. The evangelist
is not giving his own words, but recording the words of the
Baptist; but because his report herein corresponds with that
of the other reporters, as might be expected, and a few manus-
scripts are found to have omitted this word, it is concluded
that it was foisted into the text from Matthew or Luke. The
word was doubtless lost sight of by an early copyist because
his mind at the time unconsciously reached forward from the
emphatic subject ἐγὼ to its verb ἠβαπτυσά, and his pen followed
his thought. This overlooking of an intermediate word or
expression is a very common occurrence in transcribing, and
is no doubt the cause of many omissions in the ancient manu-
scripts of the New Testament. The presence of μὲν, the genu-
ineness of which ought not to be questioned, is sufficiently
vouched for by A, D, E, F, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, and
all but three cursive manuscripts,—69 and 124, which omit the word,
being but transcripts of the lost uncial Φ. C is defective here.

i. 13.

Rec. T. ἤν λειτυ τῷ ἔρημῳ — he was there in the wilderness.

Rev. T. ἤν ἔν τῷ ἔρημῷ — he was in the wilderness.

The received reading here is rejected on the assumption
that it is a "conflate" reading, or made up from two other
readings. K, A, B, D, L, 33, 102, two (13, 346) of Ferrar's
group and a few other cursive manuscripts, together with the Old Latin,
Vulgate, Memphitic, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions sustain
the revised reading. Origen and Eusebius also quote the pas-
sage in a similar manner; but their quotations can hardly be
relied on as furnishing the real text even of their own manu-
scripts. K, II first hand, about a dozen and a half cursive
manuscripts besides 69 and 124 (the other two of Ferrar's group), and one
copy of the Armenian Version omit "in the wilderness," and
read "there" instead, referring to the words "the wilderness"
just before. Now, each of these readings is evidently a clip-
ping down of the original reading,—the one rejecting the
word "there" as superfluous, and the other discarding the
phrase "in the wilderness" for the same reason. If either of
these alone had been the original reading, it is incredible that
the common reading would ever have been adopted. But the
accepted reading is the reading not only of the Peshito Syriac
Version dating back at least two centuries earlier than the
oldest known Greek manuscript, but of E, F, Η, M, S, U, V,
Γ, Δ, II second hand, most of the cursive manuscripts, the Philoxenian
Syriac, and Zohrab's Armenian Version. The phraseology,
"He was there in the wilderness," is perfectly in accordance with Mark's mode of speaking. Compare v. 11, "Now there was there nigh unto the mountains" (A. V.), or "Now there was there in the mountain side" (R. V.). The mountains had been spoken of just before in verse 5. There can hardly be a reasonable doubt that early scholars or scribes considered the expression "there in the wilderness" as verbose or redundant; hence, one sought to amend it in one way, and another in another. The omission of the single word ἐκεῖ, "there," being the simpler of the two ways, was more generally adopted than the other. But the weight of internal evidence is against both readings, as alike mutilations of the original text.

1. 14.

Rec. T. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ Θεοῦ — the gospel of the kingdom of God.

Rev. T. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Θεοῦ — the gospel of God.

The evidence seems hardly sufficient to justify the conclusion that the phrase "of the kingdom" is spurious, and must be banished from the text. Both its presence and its absence are attested by versions running back to the middle and latter part of the second century, showing that both readings are of a very early date. The passage is quoted by Origen in two different places without this phrase; but this does not necessarily imply that such was the reading of his manuscripts, as his quotations were often given from memory and imperfect. The phrase does not appear in S, B, L, about ten cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, one of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Philoxenian Syriac in its printed form. On the contrary, it is given as genuine in A, D, E, F, H, K, M, S, U, V, Π, Δ, Π, most of the cursives, the oldest copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac (the latter in its manuscript form), Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions. The use of the expression, "the glad tidings of the kingdom of God," i.e. concerning the kingdom of God, though not demanded by the context, is certainly favored by it; while the omission of the phrase "of the kingdom" may have been due to a failure to see its force and a desire for greater conciseness, as is the omission of καὶ λέγων, "and saying," immediately afterwards in some of the very documents that omit τῆς βασιλείας, and in no others. We believe the phrase to be genuine, and rightfully entitled to a place in the text.

1. 23.

Rec. T. ἦν ὢν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν — there was in their synagogue.

Rev. T. εὐθὺς ἦν ὢν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν — straightway there was in their synagogue.

The insertion here of "straightway" is in deference to the testimony of three uncials, four cursives, the Memphitic Version, and a single passage in Origen. But it looks more like a mechanical repetition from verses 18, 20, 21, than like a genuine reading. In each of these verses, the singular uniformity give καὶ εὐθὺς in preference to the common reading καὶ εὐθώς, — B, of the three uncials, giving the latter form in verses 18 and 21 only. But the expression καὶ εὐθὺς ἦν, "and straightway there was" a man etc., is not in accordance with Mark's way of speaking. When he uses this adverb, it is in a connection in which action of some kind, not a mere state of being, is denoted or implied: it is either straightway "they forsook," or "he called," or "the leprosy departed," or "there met him," or "they were amazed," or something similar. He might have said that a man "straightway appeared in" or "came into" the synagogue, — and the word would not be misplaced. But the verb is not εὐθὺς; it is the substantive verb ἦν without any participial adjunct. The very fact that this verb, standing thus without a complement, is found modified by εὐθὺς even in S, B, L, 1, 33, and Origen indicates that a clerical error has been committed rather than that Mark so far failed in the proper use of words. But
documentary evidence, as well as intrinsic probability, preponderates against the reading. A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, all but four cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions, without a dissenting voice, attest the spuriousness of "straightway" in this connection.

i. 39.

Rec. T. ἤν κηρύσσων — he preached.
Rev. T. Ἡλθε κηρύσσων — he went . . . preaching.

The Revisers' reading is supported only by Ν, B, L, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions. That of the Received Text on the other hand is strongly attested by A, C, D, E, F, G, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Θ, Π, the entire body of the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, Armenian, and Gothic Versions. Ἡλθε was probably introduced on account of its being considered a more appropriate word than ἤν to follow διαγΩμένων, "let us go," — the change being also favored by the ἔις coming immediately after. It is preferred by Tischendorf, not because it has the support of preponderating documentary evidence, but because Luke (iv. 44,) has ήν, — as if two different writers, in expressing the same thought, could hardly have used the same word or words! Westcott and Hort of course adopt it, inasmuch as it is a reading of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts. (See Note on the rendering of the passage in The Revisers' English Text.)

i. 40.

The omission of the words and kneeling down to him by "some ancient authorities," as the marginal note has it, is plainly the result of a copyist's oversight. The phrase in the original ends in the same letters (-ων απορών) as the clause preceding, and the one was mistaken for the other; hence the omission, under the impression that the words had already been copied. The omission appears in B, D, G, Γ, and less than ten cursive; also in half a dozen copies of the Old Latin, and in these only. It hardly deserves a marginal note, and would not have received it but for the fact that Westcott and Hort omit "to him" altogether, and bracket the rest of the expression as of doubtful genuineness, though attested by Ν, L, and a large number of other documents. The Peshito Syriac, with the freedom which that version occasionally exercises, places the expression before "beseeching him," so as to present the events in their apparently natural order, making the verse read, "And a leper came to him, and fell at his feet, and entreated him, and said," etc. This, however, does not detract from the genuineness of the phrase. It only shows the liberty exercised by an early translator in adapting his rendering to what he deemed the exigences of the case or the proprieties of Syriac speech.

ii. 1.

Rec. T. πάλιν εἰσῆλθεν εἰς Καπερναούμ — again he entered into Capernaum.
Rev. T. εἰσῆλθεν πάλιν εἰς Καπερναούμ — when he entered again into Capernaum.

The Revisers' reading is attested by Ν, B, D, L, half-a-dozen cursive, one or two copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. But it is an evident attempt at improving the style, by varying the simple, unstudied language of the evangelist. The true position of πάλιν, "again," is undoubtedly just before εἰς Καπερναούμ, as is attested by all the uncials and most of the cursive. But the substitution of εἰσῆλθεν for εἰσῆλθεν and the following καὶ, "and," is simply an attempt to relieve the first verse or two of one of their personal verbal forms, and at least one of their "ands." Had this reading of the Revisers been the original reading, it seems hardly possible that any scholar or copyist could have been tempted to change it into the less elegant reading of the Received Text, which is attested as the genuine reading by A, C, E, F, G, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Θ, Π, the greater part of
the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Vulgate, and Gothic Versions, and most copies of the Old Latin, including a, the Latin Version of D.

ii. 2.

Rec. T. ἐφέκαλος συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ — straightway many were gathered together.

Rev. T. συνήχθησαν πολλοὶ — many were gathered together.

The vividness of Mark's descriptions is strikingly illustrated by the use of εὐθείᾳ here. It shows the immediateness with which the crowd gathered together after hearing that Jesus was in the house, so that there was no farther room even about the door for some little time before a sick man was brought to be healed by him. This enlivening of a sentence by the use of a single word is one of the characteristics of this evangelist, and it gives good ground for believing in the genuineness of εὐθείᾳ in this connection. But χ, B, L, two cursive, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, by omitting the seemingly unnecessary word, at once rob the narrative of this peculiar feature of Mark's style. Notwithstanding the evidence of the early date of the omission, there is hardly room to doubt that the true reading is that preserved in A, C, D, E, G, K, M, S, U, V, I, Δ, Θ, Π, nearly all the cursive, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions, and in most copies of the Old Latin.

ii. 3.

Rec. T. ἵρχονται πρὸς αὐτὸν, παραλυτικὸν φίλον — they come unto him, bringing one sick of the palsy.

Rev. T. ἵρχονται φίλον πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικὸν — they come, bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy.

The reading of the Revisers is attested only by χ, B, L, two cursive, two copies of the Old Latin Version, and five of the Vulgate. It has the appearance of being a reading made to escape a seeming difficulty. As if the words "They come to him, bringing" etc., implied that they came, not to the house where Jesus was, but to his very feet, some pious hand changed the position of "bringing," and placed it before "to him," so as to make the words read "They come, bringing to him" etc. This makes them mean that, while Jesus is speaking, persons are on their way bringing to him a paralytic. This was obviously done to save the evangelist from the supposed contradiction of saying that they came to Jesus, bringing a paralytic, when he himself says in the next verse that they could not get to him. But the transposition destroys the straightforward simplicity of the evangelist's record: "They come to him, bringing" etc. This order, which is that of the Received Text, is fully attested as genuine by A, C, D, E, G, K, M, S, U, V, Δ, Θ, Π, nearly all the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, most copies of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, and the Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions. Some of these, however, place παραλυτικῶν after instead of before φίλον, — a change which in no way affects the sense.

ii. 4.

The marginal wording "bring him unto him," or rather "bring [him] up to him," which "many ancient authorities read" in place of "come nigh unto him," has more of the appearance of a gloss than of an original reading. In the preceding verse the idea had been introduced of bringing to Jesus the paralytic. After that change, it was thought necessary to make a more explicit statement here than is conveyed by the wording could not "come nigh unto him," by changing it to could not "bring [him] up to him" (προσενύκακα αὐτῷ, not ἐνύκακα πρὸς αὐτῶν). Though the reading is not admitted into the text by the Revisers, it is but the sequel of the false reading they have adopted in the preceding verse, and is vouched for by substantially the same witnesses; namely, χ,
B, L, less than half a dozen cursive, two copies of the Old Latin version, Vulgate, Memphitic, Philoxenian Syriac, Ethiopian, Arabic, and Persic Versions. On the other hand, the reading of the Revisers’ (as well as of the Received) Text has the support of A, C, D, E, G, K, M, S, U, V, Τ, Δ, Θ, II, nearly all the cursive, the Peshito Syriac, Armenian, and Gothic Versions, and most copies of the Old Latin. Besides, like more than seventy other words in this Gospel, the word προσεγγίσατο, “to come nigh to,” appears in no other portion of the New Testament, thus affording strong presumptive evidence that its use here originated with Mark himself, not with any of his copyists. If “to bring up to” had been Mark’s word, it is hard to conceive how “come nigh to” should have crept into the Text, for it explains nothing, and is not as definite in expressing the real desire and purpose of the persons spoken of as the other term. All this clearly indicates that προσεγγίσατο is a false reading, a gloss, though adopted by Tischendorf in his partiality for the Sinaitic, and by Westcott and Hort in their apparent reverence for the Vatican Codex.

ii. 12.

Rec. T. ἤγερθη εὐθὺς, καὶ ἔρας τὸν κράββατον — immediately he arose, took up the bed, and.

Rev. T. ἤγερθη, καὶ εὐθὺς ἔρας τὸν κράββατον — he arose, and straightway took up the bed, and.

The Revisers’ reading is that of Ν, B, C first hand, L, 33, the Armenian Version, and one manuscript of the Memphitic Version. But it lacks the support of intrinsic probability as well as of convincing external testimony. It may have arisen unconsciously through the careless transposition of εὐθὺς and καί by some early scribe; but more probably through the intermeddling of some critical reader, who, not seeing the significance of “immediately” as connected with “arose,” considered it more pertinent to say that the man took up his bed immediately on rising; or rather, that the man arose, and straightway, having taken up his bed, went forth before them all. That is to say, according to the Revisers’ Greek, what the man immediately did was to go forth, after having risen to his feet and taken up his pallet. This leaves it to be inferred that no inconsiderable length of time might have elapsed after he was healed, before he arose; but that, as soon as he was fairly on his feet, he went forth from the midst of the multitude. But this reading overlooks the very purpose for which εὐθὺς was introduced; namely, to show the immediateness as well as the thoroughness of the cure, not the immediateness with which the man started for his home after he had risen to his feet. Luke (v. 25) notices the same fact in somewhat different terms: “Having immediately (παραχρῆμα) risen up before them, he took up that whereon he lay, and departed” etc. But, because Luke writes thus, some are ready to say that the common reading is an attempt to make Mark’s statement conform to Luke’s. This, however, is simply a subterfuge without a shadow of support. The truth is, both Mark and Luke are recording the same circumstance. While they vary in their language, they have the same facts to record; hence the correspondence of their statements. There is no call for either of them to say that the man at once proceeded homeward; nor can there be any question as to the true reading in either case. It is next to a moral impossibility that Mark or any other historian should have given such a statement as the Revisers’ Text gives. After being cured, and having risen to his feet, the man took up his bed; but whether he went out of the crowd at once or not is a question of no moment whatever. The common reading, connecting “straightway” with “arose” instead of “went forth,” cannot be set aside on the ground of a preponderance of evidence against it; for this is not the case. Besides being strongly supported by internal evidence, it is attested as genuine by A, C third hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, W, Τ, Δ, Θ, II, nearly all the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, as well as the Latin Vulgate, Ethiopic, Gothic,
most manuscripts of the Memphitic as well as its printed form, and most copies of the Old Latin. Five copies of this last Version omit "straightway" altogether.

ii. 15.

Rec. T. ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ κατακείσθαι αὐτόν — it came to pass that as Jesus sat at meat.¹

Rev. T. ἐγένετο κατακείσθαι αὐτόν — it came to pass that he was sitting at meat.

The omission of ἐν τῷ, "as" or "while," is supported by N, B, L, half a dozen cursives, and two editions of the Memphitic Version. Its presence is called for by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, W, Γ, Δ, Π, most of the cursives, and nearly all the versions. D and half a dozen copies of the Old Latin Versions have a reading of their own. The omission seems to be due to the presence of the κατ', "that," immediately after; the Hebraistic use of which by Mark was not perceived or understood. To obviate the seeming difficulty, the scribe dropped the expression; just as at Matt. xv. 6, and Mark vii. 12, the scribe, being in a similar dilemma, omitted the κατ'. It seems hardly possible that any scribe could have been tempted to insert the omitted words if they had not been a part of the original text; for without them the reading, like that at verse 23 and elsewhere, is too plain to present any difficulty or suggest any need of an addition of this kind. (See Note on Matt. xv. 6.)

ii. 16.

Rec. T. Τί ὅτι μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθήσατε καὶ πίνετε; — How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners?

Rev. T. Τί Μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἀμαρτωλῶν ἐσθήσατε καὶ πίνετε. — He eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners.

In connection with this reading, the R. V. has the marginal note, "Or, How is it that he eateth . . . sinners?" The

¹ The A. V. has "Jesus" instead of "he" to represent αὐτὸν here, simply to prevent any misapprehension that might arise in the mind of an

revised reading is attested only by B, L, and four cursives; and one of these is changed to τί δει by a subsequent corrector. The Sinaitic Codex and D alone read δὲ τί; while τί δει is attested by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, and nearly all the cursives. But neither of these last two forms is to be found elsewhere in Mark. Notwithstanding the feeble attestation of the Revisers' reading, it must be considered the genuine one. It accords with Mark's use of the word, — not, as the Revisers have taken it in the text of their version, pleonastically as the sign of a quotation or of something said by others than the writer; nor even as in their marginal note, in its common and most general sense of "that"; but interrogatively, — commonly written δει — in the sense of δὲ τί (or Mark's occasional δι τί), "wherefore" or "why." Mark uses the word thus in ix. 11 and 28. B and a single cursive (570) also read δει instead of τί in ii. 7, — which Westcott and Hort place in their margin as a secondary reading, and which may possibly be the true one. It is certainly more forcible and more in keeping with the character of the Scribes and Pharisees for them to have said, "Why eateth and drinketh he with publicans and sinners?" than to have said, with the R. V., "He eateth and drinketh" etc. The latter, in view of the circumstances, is tame, not to say flat, and altogether inappropriate. Besides, both Matthew (ix. 11) and Luke (v. 30) represent the Scribes as uttering their objection in the form of a question. This seems to afford conclusive evidence that Mark's words here should be taken as a question, as Westcott and Hort very properly punctuate them, for he is reporting the same utterance. — The other readings — δὲ τί and τί δει — are only glosses upon Mark's expression, with a view to save him from being misunderstood.

unlettered person on reading the words "as he sat at meat in his house," where one might suppose "he" and "his" referred to the same individual, whereas the former stands for "Jesus," and the latter for "Levi's."
37; it being a principle with him that, of two rival readings in the Gospels, the one which differs from that found in another Gospel is generally the true one, without any regard to whether it is a part of the writer's own language or merely his report of the words of another. On this principle, and on altogether insufficient evidence as far as we can see, he rejects the last clause of this verse as an interpolation from Luke, overlooking the fact that Mark and Luke are reporting Jesus' words, and might be expected to agree in so doing.

The omission of "must be put," at the end of the verse, is supported by \( \text{N} \) first hand, B, and the single cursive 102, which unites with L in the nonsensical reading referred to on the last page. D and five copies of the Old Latin Version, and only these as far as is known, omit the whole clause, "But new wine must be put into new bottles." On this slender evidence Tischendorf strangely enough concluded that the clause is not genuine, that it has crept in from Luke v. 38, and infected all the other manuscripts! Hence its omission from his Text. Other editors, on the same principle, omit "must be put," as if the scribe of \( \text{N} \), B, could not have given a false copy as well as that of D. But the presence of this word in the text is demanded (1) by the fact that the sentence is incomplete (i.e. the sense cannot be expressed) without it; (2) by the fact that Christ actually employed the word, so that Mark could not have reported his language without using it; and (3) by the documentary evidence that attests its genuineness; namely, \( \text{N} \) as amended, if not by the original scribe, by his contemporary reviser, A, C, E, F, G, H, K, L (which here refuses to follow B), M, S, U, V, F, A, II, every cursive but one, seven copies of the Old Latin (a house divided against itself!), the Vulgate, Memphitic, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions, — an array of witnesses whose testimony certainly ought to outweigh that of the three that are opposed to them under circumstances so strongly indicative of error on their part.
The readings referred to in the marginal notes here are at best but "conflations,"—the former apparently taken from Luke vi. 13, and the latter being simply a repetition of the first clause of verse 14. Both are found in N, B, C first hand, and Δ, and are of course adopted by Westcott and Hort. Tischendorf, however, adopts only the latter, though it is a less strongly attested reading than the other, having only the support of an Ethiopic manuscript in addition to that of the foregoing four uncials, while the other is additionally attested by two cursive besides the four that compose Ferrar's group, the Memphitic Version, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, and the Arabic of the Polyglot. Lachmann and Tregelles reject both readings.

Rec. T. ήχων ξενιστάν θεραπευν τάς νάσους καὶ ἱεβάλλειν τάς δαμόνας — to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils.

Rev. T. ήχων ξενιστάν ἱεβάλλειν τάς δαμόνας — to have authority to cast out devils.

The words "to heal sicknesses and" are rejected by the Revisers and some modern editors because they are not found in N, B, C first hand, L, Δ, 102, and the Memphitic Version, being regarded as introduced from Matt. x. 1, or Luke ix. 1. But they are attested by A, C second hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Π, almost the whole body of the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic of later date, the Armenian, and the Gothic. Though omitted by the two oldest known Greek codices, they were evidently accepted as part of the original text at least two centuries before those codices came into existence. If, as some suppose, they were interpolated, they would hardly stand where they do. Both Matthew and Luke represent Christ as empowering his disciples first to cast out demons, then to heal diseases; whereas Mark reverses this order. If the words "to heal sick-

nesses" were not genuine in Mark, they would unquestionably follow the words "to cast out demons," just as they do in the other evangelists. But their standing in the order in which they do, is an indication of their genuineness. Some early possessor of this Gospel, on coming to them, seems to have considered the power to heal sicknesses as something by no means likely to have been conferred, since physicians generally in a certain sense possess this power, and so he erased the words from his text. Hence the abbreviated statement found in a few documents. That Christ gave his disciples authority to heal diseases as well as to cast out demons, there can be no question; but why Mark should have omitted to record this fact in connection with the other passes comprehension. In view of all the evidence presented, it is incredible that he really did omit it.

Rec. T. οὐ δύναται σταθήναι — cannot stand.

Rev. T. οὐ δύνασται σταθήναι — will not be able to stand.

There is no apparent reason why Christ, in this verse, should not have said, "is able" or "can," as in each of the two preceding verses and in the two following. It was not his custom to vary his language for the sake of variety.1 Nor is the testimony in support of "shall be able" by any means overwhelming. The documentary evidence in its favor consists of the testimony of N, B, C, L, Δ, three copies of the Old Latin, and a few of the Vulgate; while those that read "is able" are A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Π, all the cursive, most copies of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, including Codex Amiatinus, the best of all the manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and others. Δυνάσται seems to be the work of some critical reader, who, offended at finding, δύναται used five times in immediate succession, sought to vary the phraseology by

1 See Notes on Matt. v. 30, and xxiii. 19.
changing the form of the word in this instance. There is no reason why the word should have a different form here from that in the preceding verse. The structure of the sentences is the same, and the grammatical construction and force of the words precisely the same, in both verses. And when we consider the simplicity and even sameness of phraseology peculiar to Jesus' language, we cannot but be satisfied that the revised reading is an attempt at improvement by some early hand.

iii. 26.

Rec. T. καὶ μετέριστας,—and be divided.

Rev. T. καὶ ἐλεηθῶς,—and is divided.

The propriety of this change is doubtful. It makes no difference in the meaning. The reading is attested only by Κ, Β, C first hand, Ι, and Δ; but that of the Received Text has the support of A, C second hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, \( \Gamma \), \( \Pi \), and the entire body of the cursives, while it is favored by all the versions. It seems hardly possible that it should be a false reading. If ἐλεηθῶς is the original reading, it is difficult to see why it should have been changed to the perfect without a corresponding change in the preceding ἀνέστη, “hath risen.” It looks rather as if the perfect μετέριστας had been mistaken for the aorist, and been unconsciously made to correspond in tense with ἀνέστη, with which it is so closely connected, just as in John x. 25, in a London edition of 1613 of the A.V. we find “I told you and ye believed not,” — a printer’s very natural mistake in reading the past for the present after the word “told.”

iii. 29.

Rec. T. ἀλλ’ ἐνοχὸς ἵστατι αἰωνίου κρίσεως.—but is in danger of eternal damnation.

Rev. T. ἀλλ’ ἐνοχὸς ἵστατι αἰωνίου ἀμαρτήματος.—but is guilty of an eternal sin.

The reading of the Received Text is attested by A, C second hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, \( \Pi \), nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and one copy each of the Old Latin and the Vulgate. The revised reading, adopted also by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, is that of Κ, Β, Ι, Δ, and three cursives; while C first hand, D, three of the four cursives of Ferrar’s group, and Athanasius read ἀμαρτίας instead of ἀμαρτήματος. The Latin Versions generally, together with some others, support one or the other of the latter readings; but which of the two, it is hard to determine. Generally a variation like ἀμαρτήματος and ἀμαρτίας in connection with an invariable reading like κρίσεως is considered a ground of suspicion against such variants. But in this instance it does not seem to be the case, probably on account of the supposed high character of the manuscripts containing one of these forms. When we consider the meaning of the words, we may find the suspicion growing upon us, if not becoming a settled conviction. Let us take the revised rendering of the whole sentence: “Whoever shall blaspheme against the Holy Spirit hath never forgiveness, but is guilty of an eternal sin.” If we mistake not, almost any thoughtful, intelligent person, on reading or hearing these words for the first time, must be more or less impressed with a sense of the want of appositeness in the concluding clause. It is more or less of a non-sequentur. This, however, is not the case with the common reading; nor would it be with this, if it only read “unpardonable” in place of “eternal.” The impossibility of an offender’s obtaining forgiveness does not imply that his offence is an endless act. There is, indeed, no such thing within the range of human deeds as an endless act. Hence the absurdity of calling any form of sin, especially an act of blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which is the sin here under consideration, and which may be committed in a moment, an eternal sin,—that is, a sin that would require all eternity for its performance. Forgiveness involves an exoneration and deliverance from condemnation of some sort; and a forgiveness that can never be had implies that there is something in the nature
of the sentence under which the offender lies that stands in the way of its being removed by an exercise of pardoning power. It implies that the offender’s crime is so heinous and his guilt so great that his sentence, which is assumed to be just and proportioned to his crime, cannot be removed; it must be endured to the bitter end. If the offence, as is the case with the sin against the Holy Ghost, is a deliberate maligning of the intervening Power through whom pardon is offered and a spurning of the only means by which forgiveness can be obtained, there is, of necessity, no forgiveness to be had. Nothing remains for the offender but to continue under bonds. He is in the grasp of an unending sentence of condemnation. Hence the appositeness of the reading, “Hath never forgiveness, but is deserving of and subject to, or rather in the grasp of, an eternal sentence.” The word ἐπωνομάζει, literally “held in” or “held in the power of,” denotes exposure, liability, subjection, to condemnation or punishment. In Christ’s use of the word elsewhere, this is its only meaning. The fact that the word is followed in this verse by a genitive instead of a dative does not militate against this idea, or require the word to be taken in the sense of “guilty.” But some early reader of Mark, not being able to take ἐπωνομάζει in any other than this sense before a genitive, seems to have thought it necessary to place ἐπωνομάζει-στάντις in the margin from verse 28, as a gloss, or a presumably more suitable word to be employed than κρίσις, so as to read “guilty of an eternal sin”; and from the margin the word crept into the text in some copies, while into others ἐπωνομάζεις, as a preferable form, found its way. The reading seems clearly false. The other is certainly far more strongly attested. The expression “guilty of an eternal sin” can be true in no legitimate sense of the words. Taken literally, it can mean only that the blasphemer is guilty of a sin of eternal duration. But the

1 The distinction which Schaefer (on Demosthenes, V. p. 323) lays down between these two constructions [i.e. with the genitive and with the dative] does not appear in the N. T.” — Winer, § 28, 2, note.

sin of blasphemy, considered as a deed, as it is here, is the act of a moment. The guilt is what endures or may endure, as well as the punishment to which the transgressor is exposed. The notion of eternity therefore belongs to the guilt and the doom rather than to the act of the sinner. And yet “an eternal sin” cannot mean eternal guilt or eternal punishment; for the words “guilty of eternal guilt” or “guilty of eternal punishment” have no significance. Indeed, the expression, “guilty of an eternal sin,” and the manner of its employment are altogether unlike anything of Christ’s elsewhere on record, and speak their own condemnation.

iv. 10.

Rec. T. ἐρώτησεν αὐτὸν . . . τὴν παραβολὴν. — asked of him the parable.

Rec. T. ἐρώτων αὐτὸν . . . τὰς παραβολὰς. — asked of him the parables.

This plural form, “the parables,” is attested by N, B, C, L, Δ, one copy (g) of the Old Latin, five of the Vulgate, and the Memphitic Version; that of the Received Text, by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, I, the great majority of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, Petraeus’ transcript of the Memphitic of Mark, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, and the Gothic; while D, two cursives, in addition to Ferrar’s group, ten copies of the Old Latin, and Origen give a reading that is similar to that found in Luke viii. 9, but which is evidently a gloss, pointing, however, to the singular form as the original from which it was derived, and so sustaining the common reading. This is regarded by some as a correction of the plural form to make the reading tally with Jesus’ answer in verse 13. But the emphasis there laid upon the word “this” forbids any such view. Jesus’ inquiry, “Know ye not this parable?” shows clearly that the question asked by his hearers had reference, not to all the parables that he may have spoken on this occasion, but to the one parable recorded in the preceding
verses. The plural — "asked of him the parables," or "asked him concerning the parables" — looks like a reading originally placed in the margin by some reader who observed that the plural was employed in the following verse as well as in verses 2 and 13 (and possibly, too, that Matt. xiii. 10, reports the disciples as asking, "Why speakest thou unto them in parables?" — an entirely different question, however, from that recorded here —), but afterward incorporated into the text, and preserved in a few manuscripts and versions. That it is not the original reading seems clear from the following considerations. In the first place, the reply of the Saviour in verse 13 to this inquiry is not, "Know ye not these parables?" but "Know ye not this parable?" after which he goes on to say, "How then will ye know all the parables?" As if he had said, If ye understand not this parable, but need to have me explain it to you, how are ye going to understand the rest of my parables? The whole answer points to an inquiry concerning one particular parable. As an answer to an inquiry respecting more than one, it has no fitness or significance. Then a reference to Luke viii. 9, where the same question is recorded as here without that given by Matthew, shows that the question had reference to this particular parable, and could not therefore have been worded in the plural as if referring to more than one.

v. 27.

Rec. T. ἀκούσας τοῦ λόγου λαλοῦμενον — when she had heard of Jesus.
Rev. T. ἀκούσας τα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, — having heard the things concerning Jesus.

The revised text is supported only by Ξ first hand, B, C first hand, Δ, and a single lectionary of the eleventh century. Of the two readings, it is, of course, the more difficult. But it is a manifest error, committed by an early scribe. After he had written the preceding word, his eye, on returning to the exemplar before him, probably rested on the σασα τα παρ' in the preceding verse, and mistaking this for the σασα περὶ he was copying, he naturally enough was led to insert the article. Yet some insist that the article was considered superfluous, and so was omitted in all the other Greek manuscripts, and in every version throughout ancient Christendom! The error of inserting τα was confined almost wholly to three manuscripts of Egyptian origin, and in two of these it was afterwards corrected as an obvious blunder. The ninth-century codex Δ may have received the error from one of these very manuscripts. Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort adopt it on account of its being the harder reading, and found in Ξ and B. But the common reading is overwhelmingly attested by Ξ as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C as amended by its sixth-century corrector, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Π, all the cursives, and all the versions.

v. 36.

Rec. T. ἀκούσας τοῦ λόγου λαλοῦμενον — heard the word that was spoken.
Rev. T. παρακούσας τοῦ λόγου λαλοῦμενον — not heeding the word spoken.

The rendering "overhearing," given by the Revisers in the margin to the compound παρακούσας is hardly allowable, as it was not a meaning commonly attached to the word as late as the Saviour’s day. The word at that time had come to denote an unwillingness or refusal to hear,—a disregard of what was said. This is the sense in which it is used here, as the Revisers correctly give it in the text,—"not heeding," "paying no attention to." The only question is whether it is the word really used by Mark. On this point, the witnesses are divided. The Sinaitic Codex by its original scribe and afterward by its later seventh-century corrector, B, L, Δ, and one copy (ε) of the Old Latin are the only ones that have it, while they also omit ειδήως, "as soon as." In this omission, they are strongly supported by D, eight cursives, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic,
the Peshito Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Arabic, and the Persico Versions. In attestation of the uncompounded form ἀκούσας, “having heard,” we have the Sinaitic Codex as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Π, all the cursive, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, and every other known version. In the face of all this testimony, especially of the united testimony of the various versions, it is hard to conclude that the common reading is not genuine. But let us look at the words themselves. Take the reading δὲ Ἰησοῦν ἀκούσας τὸν λόγον λαλοῦμενον. The only legitimate meaning of these words is, “But Jesus having heard the word spoken”; that is, having heard it as or when it was uttered. A critical person might easily be dissatisfied with this reading, ending as it does with an apparent pleonasm, which he would gladly see removed. On this account, no doubt, D and several copies of the Old Latin read “having heard this word.” But B, to obviate the difficulty altogether if possible, inserts the article after λόγον (as well as before), and changes ἀκούσας to παρακούσας (which last only appears also in a few other copies), making the clause mean, “not having heeded the word that was spoken.” The true reading, rendered more certainly true by its apparently pleonastic character is, “But Jesus, on hearing the word as it was spoken,”—that is, as it fell from the lips of the messengers themselves, and not waiting to be told it by the ruler. If παρακούσας were genuine, it would never have been set aside on the ground that its meaning was not understood. It was a familiar word, with the well-known meaning of “paying no attention to”; and for this very reason it found a place here, under the hope of improving the phraseology. Instead of improving it however, it makes λαλοῦμενον without the article an unmeaning addition; for why should Jesus be said not to have heeded the word when (or as) it was spoken? Such a statement implies what we have no reason for believing,—that the word was uttered in his hearing afterward. Besides, if

παρακούσας were Mark’s word, we may be assured that his statement would have been simply, “As Jesus did not heed the word,” or else, as B has it, “the word that was spoken, he saith” etc. But neither of these has a respectable support from external sources. Hence we take ἀκούσας to be the true reading.

vi. 2.

The only “ancient authorities” that “insert the,” and read αἱ πολλοί, “the many,” are B, L, 28, and three of the four cursive of Ferrar’s group,—virtually only four witnesses. All the other “ancient authorities” testify against the reading. The marginal note seems to be inserted in deference to Westcott and Hort, who unite with Tischendorf and a few other modern editors in adopting the reading. It matters but little whether we read “many” or “the many,”—that is, the generality, the most of those that were present. The latter is verbally more inclusive, expressly denoting nearly all; while the former, which is really more in accordance with the New Testament use of the word, especially that of the evangelists, does not forbid this meaning, though it does not necessarily convey it. It is the safer reading. The other looks like a gloss, an aiming after classical precision, not called for by the context.

vi. 14.

A marginal note here intimates that the verb, which in the text assigns the saying, “John the Baptist is risen from the dead,” etc., to Herod, appears in the plural in a few ancient documents, and makes Mark say, “And they said [this word “they,” being unexpressed in the Greek, and without any antecedent], John the Baptist is risen,” etc. These documents are B, D (the latter reading ἔλεγον instead of ἔλεγα), two cursive, four copies of the Old Latin Version, and Augustine of course. But the plural verb, especially without any subject,
comes in very awkwardly after the evangelist's reference to Herod. Evidently the verb was changed to the plural on account of verse 16, to save Mark from attributing the same statement to Herod a second time. But, if the plural were a genuine reading, we should expect to find καὶ ἀλλαξ ἔλεγον, or of ἐν ἔλεγον, "And some said," instead of the simple verb. The absence of a nominative in connection with a plural verb following so closely after an otherwise almost unmeaning reference to Herod, repeated as that verb afterwards is, indicates that the plural is a false reading. At the same time, the statement of verse 16 comes in quite naturally after verse 15. In addition to all this, the reading of the text is very strongly attested, and must be considered the true reading.

vi. 20.

Rec. T. πολλὰ ἔρωι — he did many things.
Rev. T. πολλὰ ἡπόρει — he was much perplexed.

The Revisers place the received reading in the margin, and translate it "did many things," in accordance with the A. V. Their own reading is supported by Ν, B, L, and the Memphitic Version only, — all Egyptian documents. But it is evidently a false reading introduced by some pious soul away back in the early centuries. Not comprehending Mark's meaning, and considering ἔρωι a clerical error, he undertook to rectify the supposed mistake by substituting ἡπόρει for it, taking his cue from Luke ii. 7, where ἡπόρει, "was much perplexed," is used by the evangelist in speaking of Herod. But the references of the evangelists in the two passages are to very different things. Mark is speaking of what Herod did after having heard John; and Luke records Herod's feelings on a subsequent occasion on hearing of the fame and deeds of Jesus. The plain meaning of the verse according to the common text, which Lachmann follows, and which is supported by all the uncials and versions except the few above mentioned and the entire body of the cursive, is that Herod reverenced John, knowing him to be an upright and holy man, and at the same time took good care of him; and having heard him once, he did it frequently (πολλὰ ἔρωι), and heard him with pleasure. This use of ἔρωι, "he did it," in place of ἔκανεν αὐτοῦ, "he heard him," is as legitimate in Greek as the corresponding form of words is in English.1 The use of the imperfect, indicating repetition of the action, confirms this view of the evangelist's meaning. The revised reading introduces a confusion of ideas not at all in accordance with Mark's manner. Nothing but a misunderstanding of his meaning would ever have led to the change.

vi. 22.

"Some ancient authorities," says the marginal note here, "read his daughter Herodias," in place of "the daughter of Herodias herself." Verses 24 and 28 speak of the girl as the daughter of Herodias; and Josephus (Antiquities, Bk. xviii., chap. v., sect. 4) says not only that she was the daughter of Herodias by Philip, whom her mother deserted for Herod Antipas after she was born, but that her name was Salome, and not Herodias, as this false reading would make it. And yet Ν, B, D, Μ, Δ, κατ. 238, 473, and 558, by reading "his daughter Herodias," would make Mark contradict himself and the truth of history. The reading, of course, is spurious; and yet Westcott and Hort adopt it as the only reading worth noticing, — the true reading!

vi. 33.

Rec. T. ἔγνωσαν αὐτὸν πολλοὶ — many knew him.
Rev. T. ἔγνωσαν πολλοὶ — many knew them.

The former of these readings is that of E, F, G, H, S, V, G, and a large proportion of the cursive. The latter is attested

1 See Matt. xxii. 6; xxv. 40, 45; xxvi. 12; Mark xi. 3; xv. 8; Luke vi. 10; ix. 54; Acts xix. 14, etc.
by B, D, ten or twelve cursive, three copies of the Old Latin, and the Vulgate. There is a third reading, — ἐστὶν ὡς αὐτοῖς πολλοῖς, "many knew them," — which is vouched for by \( \text{S} \), A, K, L, M, U, Δ, Π, about seventy cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, and the Ethiopic. The first of these is not attested by a single version or early uncial, and seems to be a later reading. Still, it may be as early as the others, and even earlier. The last of the three, being apparently the most strongly attested, is adopted by Tischendorf as the true reading. But the second is accepted by the Revisers in consequence, we suppose, of its adoption by Westcott and Hort, as well as by Lachmann. The true reading, we are inclined to think, is lost; for no one of these gives a pertinent sense, whether we read "many knew him," or "many knew them," or "many perceived it." There is no apparent propriety in the evangelist's saying, in this connection, that many knew Jesus, or knew him and his disciples, or perceived his departure. The multitudes, as a matter of course, knew them, and saw them go, as the evangelist had just said. The statement is therefore without significance, and seems utterly uncalled for. But, if we suppose that the evangelist wrote \( \text{e} \)ς \( \partial \)ν [\( \tau \)τον being undrestood], as John (vi. 21) wrote \( \text{e} \)ς \( \gamma \)ν, meaning "whither," and referring back to "the desert place" mentioned in the previous verse, we have a pertinent reading. Of course \( \tau \)\( \text{ο} \)ν \( \tau \)\( \text{ο} \)ν, "the place," would be a somewhat simpler reading; but, if the evangelist had written this, the transcribers, in all probability, would never have stumbled over it. But with the other reading, an early scribe might easily have been puzzled, and in his haste or carelessness have written \( \alpha \)\( \text{τ} \)\( \text{ο} \)\( \text{i} \)ν. Another, considering this improper, since more than one are supposed to be spoken of, changed it to \( \alpha \)\( \text{τ} \)\( \text{ο} \)\( \text{i} \)ς. And still another, sensible of the impropriety of both \( \alpha \)\( \text{τ} \)\( \text{ο} \)\( \text{i} \)ν and \( \alpha \)\( \text{τ} \)\( \text{ο} \)\( \text{i} \)ς, omitted the word altogether. Taking \( \text{e} \)ς \( \partial \)ν as the original reading, there seems to be no difficulty; the remark of the evangelist becomes perfectly natural. Jesus and

his disciples "went away by boat to a desert place apart. And they [i.e. the people generally] saw them going, and many [though not all of them perhaps] knew whither, and on foot from all the cities they ran together thither, and went out them." This, besides giving coherence to the verse, makes the word "thither" refer back easily and naturally to the word "whither," instead of, in a somewhat unnatural manner, to the phrase "a desert place" in the previous verse.

vi. 53.

Rec. T. ἔλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν Γεννασαρὴν,—they came into the land of Gennesaret.

Rev. T. ἔπει τὴν γῆν ἔλθον ἐκ Γεννασαρῆς,—they came to the land unto Gennesaret.

The revised reading here, which is supported by \( \text{S} \), B, L, Δ, and three cursive only, like that at Matt. xiv. 34, originated in the misconception that Gennesaret was a town or village instead of a district or territory. The proper rendering is not that of the R. V., nor yet that of the margin,—"to the land, they came unto Gennesaret"; but rather, "they came to the land [or landed] at Gennesaret." (See Note on Matt. xiv. 34.) The received reading is well attested by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Γ, nearly all the cursive, and the versions generally. C is defective here; but in Matt. xiv. 34 it supports the reading of the Received Text.

vii. 4.

The "ancient authorities," which, the marginal note says, "read sprinkle themselves" in place of "wash themselves" or "bathe themselves," are \( \text{S} \), B, and nine or ten cursive. The reading, though adopted by Westcott and Hort in their devotion to B, especially when supported by the Sinaitic Codex, is opposed to facts as well as to documentary testimony generally. It is an attempt on the part of some ignorant reader to set aside a word appropriately descriptive of an outward per-
sonal cleansing common among Jews, for one descriptive not of a real cleansing, but of a symbolic cleansing. It is a reading suggested by Heb. ix. 13, Num. viii. 7, and similar passages in the Old Testament, in place of what may have seemed to be an exaggerated statement, and it is justly rejected by editors generally. It is on a par with that false reading in Matt. xxviii. 19, "Go, disciple all nations after having baptized them," etc., which is found only in B and D, and which Westcott and Hort place in their margin as a possibly genuine reading!

vii. 4.

Rec. T. βαπτισμὸς . . . χαλκών καὶ κλινῶν.—The washing of . . . brazen vessels, and of tables.

Rev. T. βαπτισμὸς . . . χαλκών.—washings of . . . brazen vessels.

The omission of "and of tables" or couches, is probably the work of the same hand that changed "bathe" to "sprinkle" in the beginning of the verse. It is supported by Σ, B, L, Δ, a single cursive (102), two lectionaries (of the middle of the eleventh century), and the Memphitic Version; while the genuineness of these words is attested by A (C is defective), D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, nearly all the cursives (including all those that usually side with B), the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Origen. The omission is due to the difficulty which some early reader, not familiar with Jewish customs, found in admitting the fact of the ceremonial washing or bathing of tables or couches. If the omitted reading were not genuine, it certainly never would have found a place in the text. The very fact that the omission appears in only a limited number of Egyptian manuscripts, some of them of early date, is prima facie evidence of early deletion. The words ought without any doubt to be restored to the text. They are retained by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Meyer, and others.

MARK.

vii. 12.

The omission of καὶ (= ὅ, "that") at the beginning of this verse is supported by Σ, B, D, Δ, eight cursives, half a dozen copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, and the Ethiopic Version. The absence of its equivalent from the versions, however, does not necessarily indicate its absence from the original Greek from which the version was made. The presence of the word, which is scarcely to be accounted for if not genuine, is supported by A (C is defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, most of the cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, and the Armenian. L has its proper Greek equivalent ὅτε, which of course is an interpretation, but it points to καὶ as the original reading. Instead of there being an apophasis or suppression of the conclusion after ὕφελθης, as the rendering of the A. V. implies, and as some still suppose, the conjunction really connects λέγετε, "ye say," in the beginning of verse 11, with ἀφίητε, "ye suffer," in the beginning of this verse, and introduces the clause to which the former refers as that which is said, —"Ye say, if etc., that ye no longer suffer," etc. As the R. V. reads however, the words "ye say" seem to be left without an object. (See Note on Matt. xv. 6.)

vii. 16.

This verse is omitted; but the margin says, "Many ancient authorities insert verse 16, If any man hath ears to hear, let him hear." The propriety of this omission is exceedingly questionable. The verse is wanting only in Σ, B, L, Δ first hand, two cursives (28, "most carelessly written by an ignorant scribe," — Scrivener; and 102, already referred to as a partial copy of Codex B), and the Memphitic Version, — mainly if not wholly Egyptian witnesses. It is attested as genuine by A (C is defective), D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ as corrected, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin Version, the
Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The verse has by no means the appearance of an unquestionable interpolation as similar language has in some copies of Luke xii. 21 and xxii. 4. It comes in, not only appropriately, but most naturally and in perfect keeping with the context, following as it does one of those somewhat enigmatical declarations of Christ's, to which he was wont to attach this saying for the purpose of arresting attention or enforcing the truth presented. ¹ The omission looks like the work of an abbreviator, who might naturally have considered it unnecessary to repeat an utterance appearing so frequently elsewhere, especially on finding it wanting after Matt. xv. 11. If the words were not genuine, they would doubtless have been introduced, like the interpolations at Luke xii. 21, and xxii. 4, by some such phrase as “Saying this, he cried.” The evidence in favor of retaining the verse is too strong to warrant its rejection.

vii. 19.

The Revisers are unquestionably right here in setting aside the accusative καθαρίζων (which makes the word refer to ἄφεσιν), for the nominative, καθαρίζων, which they render “making clean.” But this is leaving their work only half done. Hence the necessity, under which they were, of referring καθαρίζων to Jesus, or “he” at the beginning of verse 18, as Origen, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Chrysostom, and others have erroneously done, and trying to make the evangelist say that the Saviour meant by the preceding teaching to show that no meats were unclean. To do this, they found it necessary to supply three words not found in the original, and to render the evangelist's words καθαρίζων τά βρῶματα by “This he said, making all meats clean.” But, in the first place, βρῶμα does not mean what Americans, at least, generally call meat; it denotes simply food—any solid food as distinguished from milk and drinks generally. Then again, Christ's aim was not to teach that all kinds of food are clean or suitable for eating. His words have no reference to clean or to unclean meat, so called. They were directed solely against the idea that it was defiling to a person to eat without first washing his hands; because, as he goes on to say, it is not what one eats that defiles him, but it is the impure thoughts, the base purposes, the unhallowed feelings that proceed from his heart. Things that are eaten, Jesus says in so many words, “cannot defile” a person. They pass into the stomach, whence they are expelled into the drain or sewer. This false rendering of the Revisers, plainly perverting the Saviour's teaching, ought to have led them to suspect the correctness of the text. And yet the “authorities” are overwhelmingly in support of the reading as otherwise presented in this verse, by both the Received and the Revised Text. By turning to Matt. xv. 17, we find that in place of the word, ἐκπορεύεται, “goeth out,” Matthew has ἐκβάλλεται, “is cast out,”—the former word denoting activity, the latter passivity, on the part of the subject of the predication. This difference in the manner of expressing the action points to the error that seems to have crept into Mark's text just here. The Sinaitic Codex, one of the two oldest extant manuscripts of the New Testament, together with a few cursive manuscripts, reads here just as all the manuscripts do in Matt. xv. 17,—ἐκβάλλεται, “is cast out.” It may also be said, in passing, that the oldest known version of the New Testament, the Peshito Syriac, was evidently translated from a manuscript or manuscripts that read ἐκβάλλεται, not ἐκπορεύεται; for its rendering of the word is not “goeth,” but “is thrown” or “is cast.” To Tischendorf and all others who act on the principle of rejecting the one of two rival readings that corresponds with an apparently genuine reading found in a parallel passage, this correspondence is enough to condemn this reading. It is proof to them that it was taken from the parallel passage, where there

¹ Compare Matt. xi. 15; xiii. 9, 43; Mark iv. 9, 23; Luke xiv. 35.
is no doubt about its being the true reading. But it should be borne in mind that the two evangelists here are simply recording Christ's language. So that they would naturally employ the same words; at least, one of them would not give an unwarranted turn to the thought by employing an unsuitable word or form of expression. On this point there need be no doubt. Then, on looking at the verse itself, it will be seen that it begins with "goeth into," and is made to end with "goeth out." These words also occur in the immediate context both preceding and following. In such a connection, and especially as in the very next verse the word ἐκπορευόμενον occurs, expressive of an apparently similar act, it would be by no means strange if a transcriber's mind should become somewhat confused, and of two words expressing the same idea, the one actively, and the other passively, he should write the former instead of the latter. It is one of the most likely mistakes that a transcriber may be supposed to be capable of making. Now, on the supposition that just this thing occurred here in one of the early manuscripts, and that τάυτα and the few cursives that agree with it, and the Peshito Syriac Version have preserved to us Mark's word, let us see how the passage reads: "Perceive ye not that anything that goeth into a man from without cannot defile him, because it goeth not into his heart, but into his stomach, and is cast out [by him] into the drain, he (thereby) purging away all kinds of food?" i.e. whatever he has eaten. The word "he" naturally refers back to "him" in the phrase "by him," which is implied in the passive form "is cast out," and which we have inserted in brackets simply to show the real connection of the words. The only apparent objection to this reading, as far as we can see, is that it lacks the strong support of manuscript evidence which might be desired. And yet, in view of the internal evidence in its favor, the antiquity of the two principal witnesses in support of it, and the ease with which the other reading can be satisfactorily accounted for, this fact ought not to have much if any weight. The reading is a more than probable one, and calls for no harsh and self-condemning construction, like that of the Revised Version. The meaning it demands for καθιστέων is that which the word obviously has in Matt. viii. 3, — "his leprosy was cleansed," i.e. was purged away. As to the construction, it differs essentially from that in iii. 39, where the evangelist adds the remark, "because they said, he hath an unclean spirit," — which he plainly enough adds to explain why Christ uttered the words recorded in the two preceding verses. The word "because" not only sends, but was meant to send, the reader back to those verses for that which the clause following it gives the reason for, and which is obvious to every intelligent reader. The remark comes in naturally, and, without a word added for explanation, presents no tinge of obscurity or harshness of construction. But here the closing words of the verse are a part of what Jesus himself uttered. If taken otherwise, they misrepresent him. The construction corresponds precisely with that in Luke xxiv. 47: "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached [i.e. by you] in his name unto all nations, beginning at Jerusalem"; — i.e. "ye beginning," — this being implied in the passive "should be preached," — the only possible subject to which the word "beginning" can be referred. If ἐκπορευόμενον could be rendered "is made to go" or "is caused to go," meaning "is sent forth," there would be no difficulty. But this is an unwarrantable rendering, though the active ἐκπορευόμενον means "to cause to go forth."

Mark.

vii. 24.

We have here the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities omit and Sidon." That is, they read "He arose and went away into the borders of Tyre." This reading is supported by D, I, Δ, two cursives (one of them being that "most carelessly written" cursive 28), six copies of the Old Latin, and Origen twice. (And he might very easily have omitted "and Sidon" more than twice if his purpose had been served thereby.) On the
other hand, the reading of the text,—"Tyre and Sidon,"—is abundantly attested by \textit{a}, \textit{b}, \textit{e}, \textit{f}, \textit{g}, \textit{h}, \textit{k}, \textit{m}, \textit{n}, \textit{s}, \textit{u}, \textit{v}, \textit{x}, \textit{t}, \textit{ii}, nearly all the cursive, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Gothic, and the Ethiopic. Now let us pass on to verse 31, where the Revisers adopt the reading, "And again he went out from the borders of Tyre, and came through Sidon unto the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis." This is attested by \textit{s}, \textit{b}, \textit{d}, \textit{l}, \textit{\alpha}, two cursive, all the copies of the Old Latin but one, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Jerusalem Syriac, and the Ethopic. Of the two readings,—the marginal reading at verse 24 and that introduced into the text at verse 31,—while both date back to a very early day, the latter is evidently the older; for there is an obvious difference in their ages. And yet it is a strange reading. There is an unnaturalness about the phrasing. Why should Mark say that Jesus "came through Sidon to the Sea of Galilee," and then go back and say "through the midst of the borders of Decapolis," rather than "He came through Sidon and through the midst of the borders of Decapolis to the sea of Galilee"? The construction looks suspicious. Besides, "Sidon" can mean only the city of that name. It cannot be taken as equivalent to "Sidonia" or "the borders of Sidon," any more than "Tyre" can be taken to denote the country round about Tyre or belonging to that city. The word is always used to denote the city itself. Now it is incredible that Mark really wrote that Jesus "came through [the city of] Sidon to the sea of Galilee, through the midst of the borders of Decapolis." This is not Mark's way of speaking. Moreover, Mark, of course, knew where Sidon was. Yet, if this strange reading is correct, we must believe that Jesus, on leaving the borders of Tyre for the Sea of Galilee, took the city of Sidon on his way, thereby going a number of miles in almost the opposite direction from Galilee, before turning his steps southward. The reading, viewed from more points than one, certainly looks suspicious. This, however, is simply because it is a false reading. An early careless copyist, who had no knowledge of the geography of Phoenicia, evidently mistook the conjunction \textit{KAI} connecting the names "Tyre" and "Sidon" for the preposition \textit{\Delta IAI},—a mistake by no means unnatural. A subsequent copyist, thinking it more suitable to have the verb \textit{\gamma I\e\w} precede rather than follow the phrase "through Sidon," made the transposition; hence the reading "came through Sidon." After a while some other copyist or reader, finding Jesus spoken of in verse 31 as having gone forth "from the borders of Tyre," and not from the borders "of Tyre and Sidon," felt it necessary to correct what he considered an error in verse 24, by omitting or erasing the words "and Sidon." But this error, not being found in the older copies from which \textit{s}, \textit{b}, the Memphitic, and a few other versions were taken, does not appear in these documents, though it does in their later allies, \textit{d}, \textit{l}, \textit{\alpha}, etc. This is the obvious genius of these readings, and it satisfactorily accounts for the testimony of the manuscripts in which they appear. The reading of the Received Text in verse 31—"And again departing from the borders of Tyre and Sidon, he came unto the sea of Galilee through the midst of the borders of Decapolis,"—is attested by \textit{a} (C is defective), \textit{e}, \textit{f}, \textit{g}, \textit{h}, \textit{k}, \textit{m}, \textit{n}, \textit{s}, \textit{u}, \textit{v}, \textit{w}, \textit{x}, \textit{\tau}, \textit{\i}, nearly all the cursive, one copy (g) of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, Armenian, Persic (of the Polyglot), and Slavonic. (The Peshito Syriac, however, reads "to the border of Decapolis" instead of "through" etc.) This reading is as much superior to the other as can well be conceived; and its simplicity, naturalness, perspicuity, and apparent correspondence to facts bear ample corroborative testimony to its genuineness. When we consider that much of the copying of the early manuscripts was done in Egypt by persons ignorant of the geography and other peculiarities of Palestine and Phoenicia, we need not wonder at the frequent erroneous readings that occur in them.
vii. 28.

Rec. T. καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια—yet the dogs.
Rev. T. καὶ τὰ κυνάρια—even the dogs.

The omission of γὰρ is according to Ν, B, H, Δ, ten cursive besides two of Ferrar's group, the Memphitic, Peshito Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. The received reading is that of A, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, P, II, the great majority of the cursive, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Gothic. D and five copies of the Old Latin Version read "but even." Tischendorf and others reject the common reading because it corresponds with Matthew's text; and Westcott and Hort even go so far as to place D's manifestly false reading, Κύριε ἀλλὰ καί, "Lord, but even," in the margin, omitting the preceding Ναῖ, "Yea." The common reading, however, is the true reading. Both evangelists are reporting the same utterance, and on this very account ought to be expected to agree, especially in the use of a word on which the argument turns. (See Note on the rendering of Matt. xv. 27.) The reading of the Revised Text is no better than that of D, — the resort of some ignorant scribe to escape the supposed difficulty presented in the use of the combination καὶ γὰρ. Several of the documents that support this reading, — notably Ν, Δ, 28, 69, — for a similar reason omit ἀπὸν after θυγάτριον in verse 25, — an obviously false reading; and they are no more worthy of confidence here than there. Even in Matt. xv. 27, B, the Peshito Syriac Version, and ε of the Old Latin omit γὰρ, "for," and attempt to change the meaning and intent of the clause following.

vii. 30.

Rec. T. εὑρε τὸ δαμόνον ἕξεληλυθός, καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα βεβλημένην ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην.—she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.
Rev. T. εὑρε τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην, καὶ τὸ δαμόνον ἕξεληλυθός.—found the child laid upon the bed, and the devil gone out.

The revised reading is supported by Ν, B, L, Wd, Δ, 1, 28, 33, 209, 473, and ten other cursive (except that 1, 33, and a few others have τὸς κλίνην instead of τὴν κλίνην, and L gives the preposition erroneously as ἐντὸς, "under," instead of ἐπὶ, "upon"), and by the Vulgate, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac, the Ethiopic, the Persic, and the Arabic Versions. D, and two other copies of the Old Latin, have the same order, but read "the daughter" instead of "the child," — in which they are also joined by 1, 209, and 473. The common reading is attested by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, P, II, the great majority of the cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Gothic. As the presence of the demon appears to have been the uppermost idea in the mother's mind, rather than the thought that her daughter was the object of the demon's power, she besought Jesus "that he would cast forth the demon out of her daughter" (verse 26), not that he would deliver her daughter from the power of the demon. In accordance with which, Jesus' final reply to the woman was, "Go thy way; the demon is gone out of thy daughter" (verse 29), not thy daughter delivered from the demon. In like manner, the evangelist would almost necessarily give the events in the natural order of their occurrence, and say, — especially after having just recorded the statement, "The demon is gone out of thy daughter," — that "on returning home, she found the demon gone forth, and her daughter lying composely upon the bed," as the Revised Text has it, rather than that "on returning home, she found the child lying upon the bed, and the demon gone forth," as the Revised Text gives it, — leaving the principal thing to be mentioned last. One, however, who did not observe the prominence given to the thought concerning the demon by both the mother and Jesus, might suppose the writer would naturally mention first the fact of the mother's finding her child prostrated on the bed, and then that of the departure of the demon, as a conclusion to
which she afterwards but immediately came. This, however, is too cool and calculating a mode of writing to be attributed to Mark. His sympathies and modes of expression are perfectly natural. And as the mother’s first anxiety was in reference to the presence or the departure of the evil spirit, Mark would naturally state the result on this point first. The fact that the departure of the demon preceded the exhausted condition of the child, which necessitated her resorting to the bed, would also have led him naturally to state the facts in this order. The variations among the documents in the details of the order adopted by the Revisers are not in favor of the genuineness of their reading as a whole.

vii. 31.

See Note on verse 24.

vii. 35.

Rec. T. ἔδωκε διηνοίξθησαν αὐτῷ αἱ ἀκαίν.—straightway his ears were opened.

Rev. T. διηνοίξθησαν αὐτῷ αἱ ἀκαίν.—his ears were opened.

The omission of “straightway” is supported by Ν, B, D, L, Wd first hand, Δ, 33, 102 (of course), six copies of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version. But Ν, L, Δ, place the word farther along in the sentence, “and straightway the bond of his tongue” etc. This shows that in their exemplars it had become misplaced; and this early misplacement in some manuscripts seems to have led to its entire omission from others. Hence its absence altogether from B, D, one or two cursive, the Memphitic, and certain copies of the Old Latin Version. Its presence is loudly called for by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, Wd second hand, X, Γ, Π, all but two cursive, at least three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and the Gothic Ver-

sion, as well as by Mark’s well-known peculiarity of inserting “straightway” in recording any sudden and naturally unexpected occurrence.

vii. 37.

Rec. T. τοὺς ἄκοιιν ἔλαλεν.—the dumb to speak.

Rev. T. ἄκλεξιν ἔλαλεν.—the dumb to speak.

The omission of the article is an obvious error, though attested by Ν, B, L, Δ, and 33. If Mark had omitted the article before κωφον, “deaf,” immediately preceding, of course its omission here would necessarily follow, as it does in Matt. xv. 30, 31. But its uncalled-for rejection, after having been used in a similar clause just before, is not natural. Not another such instance is to be found throughout this Gospel. The Revisers themselves, while setting aside the Greek article, found it would not do to make a corresponding distinction in English, and say, “He maketh the deaf to hear, and dumb ones to speak.” The presence of the article is not only called for because of its insertion before κωφον, but sufficiently attested by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, Wd, X, Γ, Π, and the whole body of the cursive, with the single exception of 33.

viii. 16.

Instead of the words, “saying, We have no bread,” the marginal note says that some ancient authorities read, “because they had no bread.” That is, D alone of all the Greek manuscripts reads διχώμα, “they had”; while only B, 1, 28 (after B), 209, and 473 read διχώμα, “they have”; — a variation which is not only feebly attested, but rendered still less probably genuine by its appearing in two rival forms. The only versions that favor the third person are the Old Latin (and not all the copies of this) and the Memphitic. The first person, as given in the text, is attested by all the other uncial and cursive; it is also the reading of the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the
Vulgate, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic Version. Its genuineness, therefore, can hardly be called in question. Lachmann, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, however, follow B and the three or four cursives that read ἐξεταίνετε. Hence, apparently, the marginal note. But the reading, “They reasoned one with another because they had no bread,” seems to be taken from verse 17, in which Jesus is represented, as in Matt. xvi. 8, as asking his disciples, “Why reason ye [and come to the conclusion that ye do] because ye have no bread?” And this is accepted the more readily by Tischendorf as the true reading in preference to the other, because it differs from Matthew’s way of stating the case. But, on looking at the preceding verse, one will find that the cause of their “reasoning” together was not the fact that they had no bread, but the fact that Jesus had charged them to beware of the leaven of the Pharisees. This led them not only to reasoning among themselves, but to conclude their reasoning by “saying, It is because we have no bread.” It is merely to this conclusion that Jesus refers in the next verse. Mark, viewing the facts just as Matthew did, would almost necessarily express himself in the same way. But a person changing Mark’s words to make them conform to the statement in the next verse would unwittingly give the non-sequitur of this marginal reading.

viii. 17.

Rec. T. ἢτι πεπωρωμένη ἔχετε τὴν καρδιὰν ὑμῶν;—Have ye your heart yet hardened?
Rec. T. πεπωρωμένη ἔχετε τὴν καρδιὰν ὑμῶν;—have ye your heart hardened?

The omission of “yet” is supported by S, B, C, D, L, N, Δ, eight cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. But the word might very easily have been lost in copying by having been carelessly dropped after the preceding letters -etc, as similar omissions frequently occurred. Its presence is called for by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, most of the cursives, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac. It is certainly in keeping with the preceding οὐπώ, “not yet.” The reference in both οὐπώ and ἢτι seems to be to the occasion recorded in chapter vi. 51, 52, where the disciples are spoken of as “not understanding,” and their hearts as being “hardened”; and the presence of both οὐπώ and ἢτι here seems most naturally to be accounted for by considering them as having been uttered in succession by Christ, and accordingly as having been so recorded by the evangelist. This is far more probable than that ἢτι should have originated with some later hand.

viii. 20.

Rec. T. οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον, ἔπτατ. — And they said, Seven.
Rec. T. καὶ λέγουσιν αἴτητε, ἔπτατ. —And they say unto him, Seven.

There may be good ground for changing οἱ δὲ ἔλεγον to καὶ λέγουσιν; but the addition of αἴτητε is not so well attested. It is found only in B, C, L, Δ, 115, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, and the Ethiopic, and might very easily have crept in from the λέγουσιν αἴτητε of the preceding verse. It does not appear here in S, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, or in any of the cursives. Eight copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, and Armenian Versions are also without “unto him.”

viii. 23.

Rec. T. ἐπηράσα αἴτιν οὐ τι βλέπει. — he asked him if he saw aught.
Rec. T. ἐπηράσα αἴτιν, Εἰ τι βλέπεις; — he asked him, Seest thou aught?

The latter reading is attested by B, C, D first hand, Δ, 473, and the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions. But Mark nowhere else certainly uses οὐ to introduce a direct question as Matthew
and Luke do. Even in x. 2, there is nothing to indicate that the words were meant to be taken as they are by the translators of the A. V. and the R. V. They form, as in classical Greek and in Luke xxiii. 6, a question indirectly stated, "The Pharisees asked him whether it is lawful for a man to put away his wife,— tempting him." In Matt. xix. 3, the question is plainly direct; it cannot be taken otherwise. But not so here. Mark's ordinary if not invariable use of the interrogative εἰ is to introduce an indirect question, and is equivalent to our "whether." (Compare iii. 2; xi. 13; xv. 36, 44.) Hence, in view of the comparatively feeble attestation of βλέπεις, we take this reading to be an attempt to enliven the discourse by introducing an Alexandrian usage, not uncommon to the Septuagint, but in no wise characteristic of Mark. The reading of the Received Text is attested by Σ, A, D second hand, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, almost the entire body of the cursives, every copy of the Old Latin, including the Latin Version of D, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, and the Armenian. It is also adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles in his text, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort in their margin.

viii. 26.

Rev. T. Μηδε εις την καμης εσταλης, μηδε εις την καμης νιν.

Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any one in the town.

Rec. T. Μηδε εις την καμης εσταλης. — Do not enter into the village.

The former of these readings is that of A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and the Armenian. The latter is the reading of Σ, B, L, codex 1 first hand, 209, and the Memphitic Version, except that Σ first hand has μη instead of μηδε. Tischendorf, who also omits the latter clause, consistently reads μη and not μηδε, which latter belongs to the other reading. The revised Greek, it is true, is "the shorter reading." But it obviously presents a garbled and false text. It originated in the apparent superfluousness of the last clause, especially in the supposed inconsistency of saying, "Neither go into the village, nor tell it to any one in the village"; as if the man could not tell it to any one in the village without going thither. Properly understood, however, the Saviour's words, "any one in the village," mean any one connected with the village, whom the man might meet at his home or on his way thither. To obviate the seeming inconsistency of Jesus' words, some early copyist or critical reader omitted or struck out the last clause; and, lest the first word of the remaining clause might appear unsuitable, as already seen, changed it to μη, "not." Codex D, in its own peculiar way, makes Jesus say, "Go to thy home, and speak to no one in the village." In this it is followed by the Old Latin manuscript q. The Old Latin manuscript a varies this somewhat, and reads, "Go to thy home, and enter not into the village, nor speak to any one." Others, like the lost uncial represented by Ferrar's group, read, "Go to thy house (or home); and if thou shouldst enter into the village, speak not (or say nothing) to any one, not even in the village"; or simply "speak not to any one." This is the reading of most copies of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate. Every one must see that all these readings are due to the seemingly offensive expression contained in the genuine reading as found in the Received Text, which, in one way or another, they all eliminate. It is impossible that this expression should have found its way into the text and into so many manuscripts and versions if it were not genuine. Besides, the Revisors' reading speaks for itself. It represents Jesus as sending the man away to his home, simply adding, "Do not even enter into the village." If one were to ask, "And why not?" echo would answer, "Aye, why not?" For without reading into the passage what the passage does not contain, no reason is apparent. The poor man certainly could not have inferred the reason of
his being thus strongly forbidden to go there. To say nothing of the unmeaning emphatic "even" here, the statement lacks point. It has the appearance of unnecessary harshness, of arbitrariness, if not of cruelty, utterly unlike Christ. It needs the additional words, "Neither tell it to any one (whom thou mightest meet) in any way connected with the village." Of course, Jesus might have said, and Mark might have written, "any one from the village." But neither of them did this. "From" would not have expressed Jesus' real meaning. By saying "in the village," he gave expression to the idea of fixed and close relation with it. His words may perhaps be best anglicized by saying, "any one intimately connected with the village,"—any one in close contact with it, whether inhabitant or not, by whom news might be carried to and fro. This is not an uncommon meaning of in, "in." Thus, for example, in Matt. xxii. 40, "On these two commands the whole law depends." In them, i.e. in intimate connection and union with them, its whole observance centres. So, too, 1 John iii. 24, "He that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him"; i.e. abides in close connection and constant intercourse and fellowship with him. And so elsewhere. To spread the news of this man's cure through Bethsaida would give the affair a publicity which Jesus was not prepared for, and which he desired as yet to avoid. Hence he uttered the additional clause, as Mark reports him to have done. But the Revisers, by following the two oldest manuscripts and three or four of their usual allies in error, here present an abbreviated text of Mark.

vil. 37.

Rec. T. ἢ τι δύνασθαι ἐνθρωπίσαι — Or what shall a man give?
Rev. T. τι δMonad δοῦναι ἐνθρωπίσαι — For what should a man give?

The latter reading is that of Ν, B, and L, though Codex L and the earlier seventh-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex have the common form δοῖ instead of δοῦναι. But though this reading is supported by the two oldest known Greek manuscripts, it conveys a different form of thought from that embodied in the Saviour's words as reported by Matthew (xvi. 26), where there is no question as to the reading. There it is, "What shall a man give?" That is, What object of sufficient value can a person possibly find to give? But the thought presented by the reading, "What should a man give?" is, What ought a person to give? — implying that it is the duty of no one to give anything, however valuable it may seem. We say nothing against this truth, considered in itself. Only it is not the truth embodied in Jesus' words as given by Matthew. But we cannot suppose that Mark would record so different a truth in giving what purports to be a report of the same statement. Faithful reports of speeches as commonly given do not differ in this manner. Viewed in this light, it would seem that the attestation of the three above-mentioned witnesses ought to go for nothing, especially when opposed to such strong and decisive testimony as that of A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, all the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, all the rest of the Versions, and Origen.

ix. 1.

Rec. T. έσοι τινὶ τῶν ὧδε ἑστηκότων — there be some of them that stand here.
Rev. T. τινὶ τῶν ὧδε ἑστηκότων — There be some here of them that stand by.

The witnesses in support of this revised reading are B, D first hand, and the Old Latin copies c, and k first hand; while the readings given in d and ff may mean either "There are some of those standing around here with me," or, "There are some here of those standing around me." Probably the latter is their intended meaning. A literal rendering of the Revisers' reading is not, "There be some here of them that stand by"; for the word "by," it will be observed, is in italics. It is supplied to make good the loss felt by connecting "here"
with "be." Παρεστηκότων is the word that means "standing by," and which Mark would probably have used if he had intended to say what the Revisers have made him say. (See xiv. 47, 69, 70, etc.) The literal rendering of this new reading is, "There are some here of them that are standing"; — which implies the presence of others who are not standing. But there is nothing in the context to warrant such a reading; and Mark nowhere uses ἔστηκα in the sense of παρέστηκα. The reading is an obviously corrupt and impossible one, due to the unconscious misplacement, by some inattentive copyist, of one little word, — a circumstance of no uncommon occurrence among copyists even in these days. Matt. xvi. 28, and Luke ix. 27, as well as the Received Text here, show what the true order of the words is. Lachmann recognizes this as the true order. But because B, and D first hand, present a different reading, though plainly false and easily accounted for, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, the Revisers, and others accept the false reading as a genuine part of Mark's Gospel! But the truth is, if Matthew and Luke give a correct report of Jesus' words, either Mark in this reading misrepresents Jesus, or some one else has altered his report. The case, it will be seen, is very different from what it would be if the words were a part of Mark's own narrative and not of language uttered by another, of which Mark is merely giving an account. Two other reporters agree in testifying what those words were. Their testimony comes down to us unquestioned as far as the order of the words is concerned. Mark, a third reporter, agrees with them except (according to four witnesses) in reference to the relative position of two little words, which, taken in the order in which these four witnesses say they should be taken, make an irreconcilable difference between the meaning of his report and that of the other two. But all the other witnesses, numbering several hundred, and many of them fast friends of the four witnesses just referred to, testify that the third reporter's words have been tampered with, — that, as originally given, they correspond in number, form, and arrangement with the words given by the other two reporters. These witnesses are N, A, C, D second hand, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, S, U, V, X, I, Δ, II, all the cursives except one (which places δικαίων after instead of before ἔστηκότων, and writes it δικαίων), several copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and, virtually, Origen, who gives the words, probably from memory, τῶν ἔστηκότων δικαίων. — Now, it may be interesting to some to know that the scribe of D, one of the two uncials that attest the revised reading δικαίων τῶν, felt the same necessity that the Revisers felt, of having some modifying word after "stand," and so added μετ' ἑмοῦ, "with me"; that is, D has the doubly false reading, "There are some here of them that are standing with me." This addition, one cursive (473) and six copies of the Old Latin also have. It must be said, however, that, as an addition, it is better than the Revisers' "by"; for the rendering, "There be some here of them that stand by," is simply tautological. It is equivalent to saying, "There be some here of them that stand here." It is impossible that a reading which requires such bolstering to make such an unnatural statement should have emanated from Mark.

ix. 11.

The reading, λέγοντες δὲ λέγουσιν, which the Revisers give instead of the commonly edited reading, λέγοντες ὁτι λέγουσιν, as Westcott and Hort have it, should rather be λέγοντες ὁτι λέγουσιν, i.e. "saying, Why say," as Dr. Bloomfield edits it both here and in verse 28. Dr. Bloomfield adduces several instances from classic authors in support of the position that the true word is οτι, equivalent to the interrogative διότι or διὰ τι, "wherefore?" or "why?" and sufficiently justifies his departure from the common mode of writing the word. (See Note on ii. 16.)
There are not many passages that have given greater perplexity to critical readers than this. It is hard to believe that Jesus ever uttered, or that Mark ever committed to writing, such an incoherent statement as the following: "Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things: and how is it written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things and be set at nought?" But I say unto you that Elijah is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him. Indeed, to attach a satisfactory meaning to the words from first to last is a task that New-Testament exegetes have as yet failed to accomplish. The following, from one of the Revisers, is a fair illustration of the manner in which commentators labor to give coherence to the passage: "The disciples desire an explanation of the saying of the scribes that 'Elijah must first come.' Our Lord answered, 'He is coming, and is to restore all things; and now I ask you how it is that it is written of the Son of Man, that he is to suffer?' The answer to that question," this Reviser goes on to say, "is, that as Elijah, though he came and suffered in fulfilment of prophecy, is to come again and restore all things, so the Son, though he is to suffer, shall come again in his kingdom, and fulfil that which is written of him. The latter part of the comparison, however, is not expressed, but left to be inferred from the former part, or made clear by future events." This, however, fails to show the pertinence of the question, "How is it that it is written of the Son of Man?" in the connection in which it stands. The comment may be said to be simply an attempt at explanation, which nothing but devotion to a false reading seems to call forth; for there can be but little if any doubt

1 Or, to give the punctuation of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, and others,—"and how is it written of the Son of Man? That he should suffer many things and be set at nought."

written concerning the Son of man, that he must suffer?" Others, however, as we have seen, omitted καί before καθὼς; just as A first hand, E, and two copies of the Old Latin Version omit the word under the same conditions in John xiv. 31; B, K, and three cursive, in Rom. iii. 8; A first hand, and eight or ten cursive, in 1 Cor. xi. 2; A, the Thebanic Version, and Augustine, in 1 John ii. 27; and as Origen does, and Cyprian several times, in quoting 1 Cor. xv. 49, and that too in connection with the preceding verse. There can be but little doubt, it would seem, that the present reading arose in this way, and that καί καθὼς should be considered the true reading in place of καί πῶς. The clause introduced by ἵνα is to be connected, not with "it is written," as if ἵνα were equivalent to δέ, but with καθὼς to be supplied after καί from the καθὼς of the first clause. The passage thus corrected and construed will read, "Elijah indeed cometh first, and restoreth all things; and [cometh], as it is written concerning the Son of man, to suffer many things and be set at nought. But I say unto you, that not only hath Elijah come, but they have also done unto him whatsoever they desired, even as it is written concerning him;" — καί ... καί, in this last sentence, being best translated perhaps by "not only ... but also."

ix. 23.

Rec. T. Τὸ εἶ δύνασαι πιστεύειν. — If thou canst believe.

Rev. T. Τὸ εἶ δύνασαι. — If thou canst!

The revised reading is that of Ν, B, C first hand, L, Δ, ι, 118, 209, 244, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. The fuller reading of the Received Text is attested by A, C third hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, the great body of the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom. The reading may perhaps properly be said to be "left dubious by the manuscripts." There certainly is not that preponderance of documentary evidence in favor of the shorter reading as to compel its acceptance. And when we look at it from other points, we may see that it has really no claims to regard, but is merely the work of one who, not understanding the Saviour's words, thought to enliven the discourse by the change. Dr. Roberts thinks it "is a beautiful emendation," and so the ancient author of it probably thought. Dr. Schaff considers it an "interesting reading" as compared with the "flatter corruption," as he is pleased to call it, "of D" and other documents which come down to us from all parts of Christendom. This "interesting reading," in the first place, does not sound like Christ. It was not his manner of dealing with a pleading sufferer to catch up his language and fling it back into his face in the form of an abrupt, questioning exclamation, as if he was surprised at the poor man's speaking as he did, and wanted to rebuke him for doing it. There is not another such instance on record. But, in order to settle the question, we need to look at the force of the little word τῶ which both the A. V. and the R. V. leave untranslated, and which one of the Revisers, speaking only for himself however, says, "cannot, without being cumbersomely over-translated, be given in English." It is used here to introduce an indirect interrogative clause, whether we take the longer form of the Received Text or the shorter one of the Revisers. As Meyer very justly says, it is not to be taken "as a sign of quotation of the direct discourse," as De Wette, the Revisers, and others take it. In every other instance of its use in the New Testament to introduce an indirect interrogative clause, it is equivalent to the English "as to."

3 Humphrey, Commentary on the Revised Version, p. 80.
4 Compare Luke i. 62, "They made signs to his father, as to what he would have him called;" ix. 46; xii. 23, 24, "as to which of them;" xix. 48, "could not decide as to what they should do;" xxii. 2, "they were questioning [or debating] as to how they might" etc.; xxii. 4, "as to how
So here: "Jesus said unto him, It is (or, The question is) as to whether thou canst believe [not as to whether I can do it]; all things can be to him that believeth." In other words, "Jesus said unto him, Canst thou believe?" This is natural; it is Christ-like; it commends itself to the devout reader. But, to express this meaning, the omitted word is necessary; it is an emphatic as well as essential word, as the next clause shows. The "beautiful emendation," as Dr. Roberts calls it, arose from an entire misconception of Jesus' meaning, coupled with a vain wish to improve the language. If that meaning were what the Revised Version seems to indicate, the words should be, without the article, εἰ έγώ τι δώναμι; "If I can do anything!" as much as to say, How canst thou speak so doubtingly as to ask me whether I can do it? Jesus does not reprove the poor man's doubtful manner of expressing himself; he simply calls his attention to the state of mind necessary to secure the desired blessing. Besides, to put what seems to be the Revisers' meaning upon the words ignores entirely the New-Testament use of τό in introducing an indirect interrogative clause. Taking that clause as the Revisers present it to us, and giving to τό the obvious meaning it has in every other similar condition in the New Testament, the only rendering for it is, "The question is whether thou canst,"—without any emphasis on "thou," which is unexpressed in the original. But this gives an unmeaning combination of words. In view of all these considerations, we find it impossible to conclude with Dr. Roberts "that the enfeebling [?] believe of the common text has somehow slipped in as a supplement." Its omission is rather the obvious work of an early sciolist.

he might" etc.; Acts iv. 21, "finding no way as to how they might punish them;" xxii. 30, "wishing to know the certainty as to what he was accused of;" Rom. viii. 26, "For, as to what we should pray for as we ought, we know not;" 1 Thess. iv. 1, "As ye received [instructions] from us as to how ye ought to walk" etc.
IX. 26.

Rec. T. κραζαν και πολλα σπαραζαν αυτον, ἔξηλθε. — the spirit cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him.

Rev. T. κραζαν και πολλα σπαραζα, ἔξηλθε. — having cried out, and torn him much, he came out.

Aside from the improper omission of αυτον (see verse 20), the difference here is simply that the Received Text gives the participles in the neuter as agreeing with πνευμα, “spirit,” while the Revised Text gives them in the masculine. The former reading is supported by A, C third hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Π, ΠΙ, and nearly every cursive. The latter reading of B, C first hand, D, L; while Δ supports both in part, — reading σπαραζε with the Received Text, but κραζα with the Revisers. The latter is regarded by some as the original form, and the former as a correction. But it is incredible that Mark, who was particular to distinguish the demon from the child elsewhere throughout the passage by the use of αυτον, “it,” and other neuter forms (verses 18, 20, 25, 28), should here have forgotten himself, and applied masculine forms instead. The truth is, these two masculine forms were brought into the text through the influence, on the copyist’s mind, of the masculine pronouns just preceding, — a very common source of error among copyists. The change, however, does not affect the sense in the least. It is only a question of correctness of text.

IX. 29.

Rec. T. Ετ μη Εν προσευχῃ και νηστειᾳ. — but by prayer and fasting.

Rev. T. ετ μη Εν προσευχῃ. — save by prayer.

After having rejected και νηστειᾳ from the text, the Revisers appended to the verse the marginal note, “Many ancient authorities add and fasting.” A more just statement, however, would have been “Most of the ancient authorities add and fasting.” The omitted words are overwhelmingly attested as a part of the text by Ν as amended by a seventh-century corrector, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, S, U, V, X, Π, Δ, ΠΙ, the entire body of the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Persic, and other versions, as well as Clement of Rome, Cyprian, and others of the Fathers, though a few of these last invert the order of the two words “prayer” and “fasting.” The omission is attested only by Ν first hand, B, and one copy (Κ) of the Old Latin Version, — a reading evidently of very limited and short-lived acceptance, as a generally acknowledged error. That the words are genuine, there can hardly be a question. Christ believed in fasting as well as in praying, as his teaching and example abundantly show. Believing in it as a means of strengthening one’s faith and of growth in grace generally, he naturally coupled it with prayer in his teaching. And those who know by experience the effect of fasting in keeping the mind clear, and in preserving a spiritually minded condition of soul, are prepared to see the propriety and appositeness of coupling the two duties. The apostles and early disciples both fasted and prayed, and were enjoined to do so. (See Matt. vi. 16, 17; Acts x. 30; xiii. 3; xiv. 23; 1 Cor. vii. 5.) Nothing was more natural than for Jesus, in addressing his disciples on this occasion, to couple fasting with prayer, or for Mark to have reported him as having done so. But some early scribe, not relishing the words “and fasting,” considered that he might discharge his duty as a transcriber even if he omitted them, and acted accordingly. His omission, however, was not accepted as presenting the language of the evangelist or the teaching of Christ; nor should it now be.

IX. 40.

This verse and Luke ix. 50 are evidently reports, by different writers, of one and the same remark. Here we read,
"For he that is not against us is for us"; while in Luke the Revised Version has "For he that is not against you is for you"; and the preponderance of testimony is certainly in favor of this reading. In other words in Luke, the later seventh-century corrector of \( \mathfrak{N} \), B, C, D, K, L, M, \( \mathfrak{Z} \), \( \Pi \), more than twenty-five cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Curetonian, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic, all read "against you is for you." The original scribe of \( \mathfrak{N} \), A, X, \( \Delta \), and some cursive read "against you is for us"; while a few other cursive have "against us is for you"; — both of which may be unhesitatingly set aside as erroneous readings. The common reading, "against us is for us," is supported by the earlier seventh-century corrector of \( \mathfrak{N} \), E, F, G, H, S, U, V, \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), and most of the cursive. It is a strong argument against this reading that no ancient version supports it. So that the Revisers are apparently justified in changing Luke ix. 50 to "He that is not against you is for you." But the question arises, Why should not the same reading have been adopted here? The documentary evidence in its favor may not be quite so strong; but it is by no means to be despised. It consists of A, D, E, F, G, H, M, N, S, U, V, \( \Gamma \), \( \Pi \), about seventy cursive, nearly all copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, and the Ethiopic. In attestation of "against us is for us," we have \( \mathfrak{N} \), B, C, the majority of the cursive, one copy (\( \xi \)) of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac; while L reads "against us is for you"; and U, X, and ten or twelve cursive "against you is for us." Thus, it will be seen that even here the testimony of the versions preponderates in favor of the reading, "He that is not against you is for you." If Jesus really said "He that is not against you is for you," it is unreasonable to suppose that any one who heard him utter the words, as Mark may have done, should report him as having said "He that is not against us is for us." Hence, we may conclude that the true reading here is "you" instead of "us." And this, not only because the two reports would naturally be expected to correspond in an utterance like this, but because Jesus was addressing his disciples, and reproving them for the course they had taken. To make his words more effective as a reason why they should not forbid another from doing good works similar to their own, even though that person did not follow them, he would naturally say, "He that is not against you is on your side." The erroneous readings are due simply to the mistaking of \( \varphi \varphi \sigma \lambda \omega \nu \nu \) for \( \varphi \mu \omega \nu \nu \), — one of the most common errors that occur among the old manuscripts. And, as there is nothing in the context that absolutely and plainly forbids the erroneous reading, or in that reading itself tending to awaken suspicion on the part of scribes, it passed the more readily from one copy to another.

\section*{Mark.

The "ancient authorities" to which the marginal note refers as omitting the clause, "and shall cleave to his wife," are only \( \mathfrak{N} \), B, one lectionary (48), and the Gothic Version. But this testimony, in itself considered, affords no good ground for calling in question the genuineness of these words, much less for rejecting them. According to the testimony of all other witnesses, Mark represents Jesus as quoting word for word the Septuagint rendering of Gen. ii. 24. He is also represented in Matt. xix. 5, as doing the same thing; but the manuscripts there are agreed that the clause, "and shall cleave to his wife," is a part of what Matthew says Jesus quoted. Here, however, three or four witnesses, for some unknown reason, are not willing that Mark should testify to the same fact. Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort, as might be expected, omit the clause, but for different reasons: Tischendorf, because the clause appears in Matthew's report, just as if Matthew and Mark would not naturally give the same report of another's words; and Westcott and Hort, because they believe that with two or three
exceptions all readings of S, B, should be accepted as true readings until strong internal evidence is adduced to the contrary.

Here another marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities omit for them that trust in riches." These "authorities" are S, B, Δ, Ε of the Old Latin Version, and Petriæus' transcript of the Gospel of Mark in Memphitic. Tischendorf, who like Westcott and Hort omits this clause, admits that something of the kind may seem to be required by the context; but he thinks that it is hardly safe, as he expresses it, to desert those very ancient authorities that are usually followed. Hence he persuades himself that the clause is from some later hand than Mark's. But no one need wonder at this; for it accords with Tischendorf's principle respecting parallel passages, when various readings appear among the documents. In Matt. xix. 23, as in the preceding verse here, Jesus is reported as having taught that it is difficult for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. This is the very point of his teaching on the occasion; and to rob this twenty-fourth verse of the clause under consideration is to take the heart and life out of it. Jesus had just said, "With what difficulty shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!" The disciples being amazed at this remark, he repeated it, let us suppose, by saying simply, "Children, how hard it is to enter into the kingdom of God!" Every one must see that this presents a complete evacuation of the point and purpose of the utterance, making it wholly inapplicable to the particular case and circumstances connected therewith. The discourse may flow on evenly enough; but that is not the main point to be considered. It does not teach the truth that Jesus was here teaching. Indeed, the Saviour nowhere advances the unqualified statement that it is hard to enter the kingdom of God. Nor is it hard for the childlike, the humble, the willing; but only for such as are wedded to another god than the true God. The truth is, this omission appears in these manuscripts, not because they present an older and purer text than other documents do. It is rather because that they have the misfortune of presenting a text that has been tampered with by some one who would tone down, if possible, the declaration of Jesus, and make it of universal application. And because this emasculated statement has come down to us in our two oldest known Greek manuscripts, it must forsooth be revived and placed in our improved Greek and English New Testaments as a genuine or a possibly genuine utterance of our Lord! The received reading, adopted by Lachmann and followed by Tregelles and the Revisers in their texts, is placed by external as well as internal evidence beyond the reach of permanent rejection. It is attested by Α, Β, Δ, Ε, Φ, Γ, Η, Κ, Μ, Ν, Ρ, Σ, Υ, Β, Τ, Γ, II, nearly every cursive, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian Version, and by Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, and other Fathers.

The change from "shall be" to "is" is a mistake. It is supported by S, B, C first hand, D, L, Δ, most copies of the Old Latin, of course, and the Vulgate. But three of these documents, namely, S, C, Δ, also read ἵστατι, "let him be," instead of ἵσυν, "shall be," in the latter part of the verse. And, if they are in error there, we see not why they may not be here. Jesus is not speaking of what is in the case of his disciples, but of what is to be. Accordingly Matthew (xx. 26) reports Jesus as using the future, although B, D, Z, one copy (m) of the Old Latin, the Thebaic Version, and Chrysostom
(according to some codices) represent him as employing the present. These witnesses, it will be observed, as far as their testimony can be had, are the principal ones that call for the present here. Tischendorf rejects their testimony in Matthew because it corresponds with their testimony here, but accepts their testimony here because it differs from that of most witnesses in Matthew! It is safer to reject it in both cases, and accept that reading which agrees best with the demands of the context and is best supported, all things considered, by documentary evidence. The external evidence in attestation of the future as the true reading consists of A, C third hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Τ, Π, the whole body of the cursives, one copy (v) of the Old Latin, the Peshito, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Gothic Version. (The Ethiopic Version does not express the verb at all.) Both ἐστίν and ἔστω, in Matthew as well as in Mark, are to be attributed to some early would-be corrector of the text.

X. 49.

Rec. T. ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλευθέρως ἔστιν αὐτὸν ἐφηθήναι — Jesus ... commanded him to be called.

Rev. T. ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐλευθέρως ἔστω — Jesus ... said, Calle ye him.

The Revisers' reading here is supported only by Ν, B, C, L, Δ, eleven or twelve cursives, Κ of the Old Latin Version, the Memphitic, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac. The Received is attested by all the other witnesses, including Origen, who expressly says that Jesus here "does not, as according to Matthew [xx. 32], call him, but commands him to be called." It is true, as Dr. Dwight says, that "the text which the R. V. follows in these verses (49, 50) is noticeable in two points, as giving greater life and vividness to the scene. ... The words which Jesus used are introduced, and the reader is, as it were,

1 Sunday School Times, March 9, 1889, p. 150.

carried back to the time of the event, and made to hear what was said. ... In the fiftieth verse, instead of the word 'rose,' which the A. V. has, the better text followed by the Revisers has the verb 'to spring up.' The blind man sprang to his feet immediately on hearing the invitation." No doubt, the expressions "Call him," and "sprang to his feet," are more lively than the historical record, "commanded him to be called," and the less energetic word "arose," — but there is no reason to suppose that the man did not act "immediately on hearing the invitation," because he is said to have "arisen."

We wish we could see that these readings of what some suppose to be the better text were the genuine readings. But a candid and correct application of Bengel's canon, that the more difficult reading is to be preferred to the easier one, forbids it. The very beauty and vividness of these readings is what condemns them; not because vividness is not a characteristic of Mark's writings, but because the common and less taking reading would never have found a place here and become so widely adopted if the other had been genuine.

We are reminded just here of the following lines of Cowper's: —

"E'er since by faith I saw the stream
Thy flowing wounds supply,
Redeeming love has been my theme,
And shall be till I die.

"Then in a nobler, sweeter song
I'll sing thy power to save,
When this poor lisping, stammering tongue
Lies silent in the grave:"

The last of these stanzas some one has changed, and made to read, —

"And when this lisping, stammering tongue
Lies silent in the grave,
Then, in a nobler, sweeter song,
I'll sing thy power to save."

Considering the hymn as ending here, the latter arrangement
of these lines, following the expression "till I die," with which the preceding stanza closes, is apparently more appropriate, certainly more pleasing, and better fitted, perhaps, to leave a proper impression upon a devout reader by lifting his thoughts upward and onward, instead of carrying them downward, and leaving them in the grave. But when we come to ask which of these is the order in which Cowper wrote the lines, there can be but one answer. The very beauty and apparent superiority of the latter arrangement, as compared with the other, stamps it at once as an evident improvement on the original. The other would probably never have been thought of if this had been Cowper’s arrangement. The same principle applies here in deciding between a more animated and picturesque reading, and one less vivid and perhaps less pleasing; or else there is no truth in the laws of textual criticism, or reliance to be placed on their proper application.

This is, by no means, the only instance that appears among the old manuscripts of an endeavor to enliven the discourse by adopting the form of direct address in place of the indirect, employed by the writer himself. Thus, in Matt. x. 11, where nearly all the witnesses represent the evangelist as having written, "Inquire who in it is worthy,"  K, and Codex 570 place "in it" before instead of after "who." "The sole object of this transposition seems to be to make the sentence read, "Inquire therein, Who is worthy?"—But we need not go beyond the Gospel of Mark for examples of unquestionable attempts of this kind. Thus, in iv. 10, where the witnesses are pretty generally agreed upon the indirect form of address, "They asked of him the parable," D, two cursives beside Ferrar’s group, nine copies of the Old Latin, and Origen, according to his Latin interpreter, give the direct, "They asked him, What does this parable mean?" In viii. 23 a few witnesses give the direct address, which the Revisers have adopted, though the original form is the indirect as given in the Received Text. (See Note on that verse.) In xv. 44, where the indirect form of inquiry,

"Whether he had been any while dead," is overwhelmingly attested, Δ alone reads instead, "and said, Is he dead?" In Luke viii. 9 the direct address of the Received Text, "His disciples asked him, saying, What might this parable be?" is only another attempt at improving the original reading, "His disciples asked him what this parable might be;" which the Revisers have very properly adopted. Codex D gives this reading; but, to prevent its readers from mistaking the construction, inserts το before the interrogative, making the evangelist say, "His disciples asked him as to what this parable might be." In John ix. 15, too, the indirect form, "The Pharisees asked him how he had received his sight," is changed in several copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, and the Armenian Version, to "The Pharisees asked him, How was thy sight restored?" or "By what means dost thou now see?" The change in John xx. 18 seems to be merely the result of an itacism, in writing εώρακε for εώρακε. Acts xxiii. 34, however, presents still another instance in which the indirect form of address is intentionally changed, in two documents at least, to the direct: "He asked Paul, From what province art thou? He said, Cilicia." These changes generally make the discourse more life-like. But this life-likeness is no evidence of genuineness. It is simply the result of the work of some early critic or copyist. Hence we may safely conclude that, as a rule, where the external evidence in support of the less animated indirect style of address is reasonably strong, the appearance of the direct form affords unmistakable evidence of the presence and work of the emendator.

Rec. T. καὶ εἶδος αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει ὦτε.—and straightway he will send him hither.

Rev. T. καὶ εἶδος αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὦτε.—and straightway he will send him back hither.

The literal rendering of the revised reading is, as the margin indicates, "and straightway he sendeth him hither again." The
present here cannot consistently be considered as having the force of the future. The verb "sendeth" does not in itself imply a future. The context does not make it necessarily denote futurity; nor can the word be taken in the sense of "intends to send" or "will send." This calls for the future. So that we are constrained to believe that the present, ἀποστέλλει, though found in Ν, B, C, D, E, F, H, K, L, M, S, V, X, Γ, Δ, and more than a hundred cursive, is a clerical error for the future, ἀποστέλλει, which differs from the present in having but one ι instead of two, and which has a comparatively feebly manuscript support. In the parallel passage in Matthew (xxi. 3) the same error appears in C, E, G, K, L, N, S, U, V, X, Z, Γ, Δ, Π, and about a hundred and fifty cursive; yet the future, ἀποστέλλει, is the form adopted there by most editors; it is the form required by the connection in both Matthew and Mark. If it were not, the Revisers would not have rendered their Greek present by "will send." Few errors are more common or more strongly supported by manuscript readings than this improper doubling of a letter; so that, in not a few instances, as here, the demands of the context or the obvious meaning of the writer must decide which is the true form. The adverb ἀπαγγελλων for ἀπαγγέλει; Acts xix. 16, where Ν as changed by its seventh-century corrector, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursive, and Chrysostom, in common with the Received Text, read ἐφαλάμφος, while D has ἐφαλάμφως instead of ἐφαλάμφος; xvi. 22, where Δ, L, a large number of cursive, and Theophylact read περιβάλλοντας instead of περιβάλλοντας; xxvii. 22, where Α, D, two or three cursive, and Theophylact read συνιδέατο in place of συνιδέας; xxii. 21, where D, 513, and Athanasius read ἐπιστελλω for ἐπιστελλεῖ; xxvii. 6, where Ν, H, L, a large number of cursive, and Chrysostom read, as do the Received Text and some modern editors, μεταβαλλωμενω, while the true reading is μεταβαλλόμενων; Rev. iii. 5, where C has περιβάλλεται instead of περιβάλλεται; iii. 18, where B and half a dozen cursive reads περιβάλλη (present subjunctive passive) instead of περιβάλλη (aorist subjunctive middle). On the other hand, the omission of one of the two double letters is an error of not uncommon occurrence; an example of which appears in 2 Thess. iii. 10, where B and 509 read παραγγελομεν for παραγγελομεν.
otherwise. The word was evidently inserted by some early reader, who, referring the two verbs ἐκκατος and ἀποστέλει back to the same subject ὁ Κύριος, understood the passage to mean, “The Lord hath need of him, and will send him hither”—again. And, in order to free the clause from what he deemed an ambiguity, he inserted πάλιν in the margin to show the meaning according to his false interpretation. For no one can really suppose that Jesus, in order to obtain the colt, promised to return it immediately to its owner, or that Mark reported him as having so said. That this is not what Jesus said is evident from Matthew’s account, which gives the words, “and immediately he will send them,” as a part of what he said to his disciples, not as something that they were to say to the owner of the colt as an inducement to let the animal go. It is plainly a false reading, inconsistent with Christ’s character, a perversion of his charge to his disciples, and at variance with Matthew’s report of the same circumstances.

xi. 8.

Rec. T. ἄλλοι δὲ στριβάδας ἐκκατος εἰς τῶν δέντρων, καὶ ἱστράμματος ἐν τῇ ὅδε. — and others cut down branches of the trees, and strewed them in the way.

Rev. T. ἄλλοι δὲ στριβάδας, κοψαντες εἰς τῶν ἀγρῶν. — and others branches, which they had cut from the fields.

A marginal note states that the Greek word corresponding to the Revisers’ English word “branches” means “layers of leaves.” The participle κοψαντες, “having cut,” is attested by only Ν, Β, Λ, Δ. The change from the personal form ἐκκατος, “they cut,” to this participial form became necessary in consequence of making the preceding word στριβάδας dependent on the foregoing ἱστράμματος, “strewed,” by the excision of the closing clause of the verse, “and strewed them along the way,” which was considered an unnecessary repetition. Then the introduction of “fields,”—attested by Ν, Β, C, Λ, Δ, the Thebaic Version, Origen, and some copies of the Memphitic,—was thought to be necessary in consequence of the giving up of Mark’s unfamiliar word στριβάδας, “branches” or “twigs,” for the more familiar στιβάδας, “beddings,” made of leaves, straw, rushes, or other similar materials,—these materials being obtainable from fields rather than from trees. Mark’s στριβάδας is a word equivalent in meaning to Matthew’s (xxi. 8) κλάδους, “branches,” and John’s (xii. 13) βαία, “palm-branches.” This was evidently confounded with the more familiar word for “bedding”; as we see was done by Origen, who in one place wrote στιβάδας, though only a few pages before he had written στριβάδας. Matthew says that “others cut branches from the trees,” i.e. along the road side; while John says, they “took branches of palm-trees”; both of which statements are inconsistent with the idea of their “cutting” bedding “from the fields.” Mark’s use of the word “cut” clearly indicates, if nothing else did, that what they spread were not “layers of leaves,” but twigs or branches, and that these were cut not from “fields,” but from trees. The received reading is commonly supposed by modern editors to be an assimilation of the text to Matthew. But this is a mistake, as the difference in the prepositions and in the relative position of ἐκκατος and its object in the two Gospels shows. The final clause, which is rejected by the Revisers, is abundantly attested as genuine by Α, Β, Δ, Ε, Γ, Η, Κ, Μ, Ν, Σ, U, V, X, Γ, Π, Π, the whole body of the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Gothic, and the Armenian Version, and Origen. It is wanting only in four uncials. There can be no question that the revised reading is an emendation, and a very poor one at best.

xii. 4.

Rec. T. κάκειον λειθομολήσαντες ἐκεφαλαίωσαν, καὶ ἀποστέλαν ἣπιμωμένον. — and at him they cast stones, and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled.

Rev. T. κάκειον ἐκεφαλαίωσαν, καὶ ἠτύμωσαν. — and him they wounded in the head, and handled shamefully.
The Revisers say in their Preface that where "the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek, ... the question of the text was usually not raised." But here they have given us two words, ἐκφαλάων and ἡτίμωσαν, whose English renderings are the same precisely as those of ἐκφαλάωσαν and ἡτιμοῦσαν, which they have set aside. It is one of the hundreds of instances in which they were betrayed into undertaking to revise the Greek Testament instead of the English. The changes in this instance, as in many others, are not merely uncalled for, but positively injurious, introducing depraved and spurious forms of text. Ἐκφαλάωσαν is the reading of three uncials only,—S, B, L.

One of the Revisers says that "the discovery of S has relieved us of a lexical difficulty; for its testimony has decided the matter."¹ That is, he supposes it has decided the true form of the word. What if it should prove true, as Tischendorf believed, that one of the scribes of S was the scribe of B? Dr. Hort admits that at least six leaves of S, the opening verses of the Apocalypse, besides corrections, etc., "are from the hand of the same scribe that wrote the New Testament in B."² And Dr. Scrivener says, "The internal evidence ... is cumulative and irresistible, ... and leaves scarcely a doubt that Tischendorf's judgment was correct."³ Now, if the two manuscripts were here the work of one hand, is it any wonder that they should agree in their spelling of this word? And if L, in the Gospels, should prove to be largely a transcript of B, then the three witnesses would after all be but one, and that a false one. For the truth is that κεφαλίω is a word nowhere else found in all Greek writings. It was probably coined by the scribe of B or some critical reader just preceding his day, and on this wise: Not knowing of ἐκφαλάωσαν being used elsewhere in the sense of "wounding in the head," and supposing that the word was derived from κεφάλαιον, meaning the chief point or head of a discourse, not the head of an animal, he regarded it as simply a false spelling for ἐκφαλάωσαν, which, though an unknown word to him, might naturally enough, as he conjectured, have been coined by Mark from κεφάλαιον, "a little head." Hence the form that appears in these manuscripts. And yet, if the adjective κεφάλαιον, "pertaining to the head," can be derived from κεφαλή, "a head," why should not κεφαλαιώ also not only be derived from κεφαλή, but used by Mark to denote wounding in the head?¹ The word is attested as Mark's by all the other uncials and the whole body of the cursive,—an unaccountable fact if the form is a false one. Ἡτιμοῦν, too, which is almost as strongly attested, was, on account of its being an unfamiliar word and nowhere else employed in the New Testament, set aside, probably by the same individual, for the familiar ἀτιμάζειν, and the phraseology at the same time abridged to suit the critic's notions, while he retained on the whole the evangelist's ideas. If this revised reading had come from Mark's hand, we may rest assured it would never have been altered into the form found in the Received Text.
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them, unless to conform them to what goes before and what follows. In that case, they would have been changed simply to καὶ ὁ πονὴ ἀφήκεν. The common reading is sufficiently attested by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, nearly every cursive and copy of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, and the Armenian. X and two or three cursives, however, have οἷτος in place of αὐτός.

xiii. 8.

Rec. T. ἵππονει λυμοὶ καὶ ταραχαὶ — there shall be famines, and troubles.

Rec. T. ἵππονει λυμοὶ — there shall be famines.

The omission of “and troubles” is supported by Ν, B, D, L, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Ethiopic, and Erpenius’ Arabic Version, which is considered to have been revised upon the Memphitic. The presence of the words is vouched for by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Π, Δ, І, all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, and Armenian Versions. Origen also, who wrote a hundred years or more before the date of our oldest known Greek manuscript of the New Testament, says expressly (iii. 855), “Mark adds, ‘and troubles.’” There is no conceivable reason why the words should have been added by any of his readers or copyists. Ταραχαὶ is a word used elsewhere in the New Testament only in John v. 4,—a passage whose authenticity is questioned,—and there in a very different connection. But it might very easily have dropped out in copying, through the disturbing influence of the ἀρχαί or ἀρχή following.

xiii. 11.

Rec. T. μὴ προερμιμάτε τε λαλήσητε μὴ δὲ μελετάτε — take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate.

Rec. T. μὴ προερμιμάτε τε λαλήσητε — be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak.

The omission of “neither do ye premeditate” is called for by Ν, B, D, L, half a dozen cursives, eight or nine copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Ethiopic, and the Polyglot and Erpenius’ Arabic Versions. The clause, however, is attested by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, two copies (α, π) of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and Origen. That the words are genuine is evident from Luke’s report (xxi. 14), which represents Christ as having uttered the thought. That they are not taken from Luke, is equally evident from the fact that they differ from Luke’s wording. The clause was probably unconsciously overlooked by an early copyist, in consequence of the similarity between it and the preceding clause in their endings; or possibly omitted from having been considered superfluous.

xiii. 22.

Rec. T. πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλαπάνεται, εἰ δυνατῶν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς — to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.

Rec. T. πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλαπάνεται, εἰ δυνατῶν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς — that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect.

The genuineness of the omitted καὶ here is attested by A, C, E, F, G, H, I, M, S, U, V, Wb, X, Γ, Δ, Π, the entire body of the cursives, all the versions, and Origen. The only authority for its omission is the testimony of Ν, B, D. Tischendorf and others omit it on the supposition that it is introduced from Matt. xxiv. 24, where its genuineness is unquestioned. But the testimony in support of its genuineness here is too strong to be set aside; for, in addition to the documentary evidence, Matthew’s report shows that the word is a part of Christ’s utterance, and there is no reason why Mark should not have reported it as well as Matthew, especially as it is an important and emphatic word, wonderfully strengthening the force of the entire declaration. It was omitted apparently because it was considered either inappropriate or unessential.
The omission of “his” is according to B, D, L, six copies of the Old Latin Version, and Petæus’ transcript of Mark from a Memphitic manuscript, which, Scrivener says, “judging from the readings, does not appear to have had any high value.” The presence of the word is called for by $N$, A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, W, X, $T$, $\Delta$, II, all the cursives, four copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and Origen, who says expressly, iii. 870, that Mark reads “his angels.” But “his” is rejected because it is supposed to be taken from Matt. xxiv. 31. Its presence there, however, shows that the word was employed by the Saviour; and to reject it from Mark because a few documents omit it, when Origen and several versions more than a hundred years older than the oldest of these documents expressly attest its genuineness seems like giving too easy credence to testimony of questionable character.

The omission of $\kappa\alpha\iota$, “and,” is found only in $N$, B, L, and the Memphitic Version. Every other uncial and version, and every known cursive has the word; which would hardly be the case if it had not been placed in the text by the evangelist himself. Its absence from only these four documents gives strong ground for believing that it was overlooked through inattention or want of due care on the part of a copyist. The preponderance of evidence is certainly in favor of retaining it. The Revisers have the corresponding English, notwithstanding they omit the Greek word,—one of the many instances in which a revision of the Greek text was not the necessary foundation of their work, as revisers of the A. V.
as distinguished from the other. The Revisers' text presents three changes,—the omission of εἰς, the transposition of τις, and the substitution of συνηκολούθη for the simple ἥκολονθη; no one of which, unless it be the last, in any way affects the meaning. Each of these changes is attested by \( X, B, C, L \); while \( D \), in omitting εἰς, reads καὶ ναύισκος δὲ τις instead of καὶ ναύισκος τις. All of them, however, are plainly alterations of Mark's language. The omission of εἰς is due to its having been considered superfluous, just as in verse 47 τις is omitted for the same reason in \( S, A, L, M \), etc. On rejecting εἰς, the emendator transposed τις, and presented the words in the usual order, ναύισκος τις. The compound form of the verb seems to have been taken from ν. 37, the only place in which it appears in Mark, and there it is accompanied not by αὐτῷ, but by μετ' αὐτῷ, where the evangelist speaks of Jesus' following the ruler of the synagogue into the house, and suffering no one to follow along with him but Peter, James, and John. In this instance, however, a young man is spoken of, not as accompanying him to trial, but as following him in the ordinary way as others were. In other words, Mark's use of αὐτῷ indicates ἥκολονθη to be the word he employed in accordance with his usual mode of expressing himself, and not συνηκολούθη. His invariable method is to employ the dative to denote the object followed in connection with ἐκκολούθη; while in the only instance in which he employs συνηκολούθη, it is to denote an accompanying by others of the one following some other person.

**xiv. 52.**

Rec. T. γυμνὸς ἔφυγεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν. — he fled from them naked.

Rev. T. γυμνὸς ἔφυγε. — he fled naked.

The omission of "from them" is according to \( S, B, C, L \), two copies (\( c, k \)) of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, the two Egyptian Versions, and the Ethiopic. But the phrase, which seems more likely to have been omitted as superfluous than to have been added, is supported by \( A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, \)

P, S, U, V, X, \( \Gamma, \Delta, \Pi \), all the cursives, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian. The meaning, however, is the same whether the words are omitted or retained.

**xiv. 68.**

The last marginal note appended to this verse says that "many ancient authorities omit and the cock crew." These are \( S, B, L \), one lectionary, one copy (\( c \)) of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version. But the omission is manifestly due to an attempt to conform the record of Mark to Matthew's statement, xxvi. 71. This is evident from the fact that, of these six witnesses, \( S, L \), and \( c \) omit the phrase "the second time" in verse 72; and \( S \) and \( c \) the word "twice" in verse 30 as well as verse 72. B and the Memphitic Version, however, retain both these expressions as they occur in these verses; while \( L \) retains only the latter — δις, "twice" — in verses 30 and 72. In so doing, they show that their texts in these respects have been corrected by other texts than those followed by \( S \) and \( c \), which consistently maintain the error throughout, making Mark, like Matthew, Luke, and John, speak of but one cock-crowing; whereas the genuine text of Mark calls for two cock-crowings. Notwithstanding that the omission of these words is an obvious error, it appears in Westcott and Hort's text as the true reading.

**xiv. 72.**

Rec. T. ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλκτωρ ἰφώνησε. — the second time the cock crew.

Rev. T. εὗθεν ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλκτωρ ἰφώνησε. — straightway the second time the cock crew.

The insertion of "straightway" is supported by \( S, B, D, G, L \), twelve cursives (counting the four of Ferrar's group one), the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and Eusebius. It is omitted in \( A, C, E, H, K, M, N, S, \)
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, most of the cursive, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Philoxenic Syriac, and Gothic Versions. The evidence in favor of its insertion is, no doubt, strong. But a word of so frequent use by Mark and so appropriate could hardly be wanting in such documents as A, C, and the Egyptian Versions if it were a part of the original text. It is easier to regard its presence as due to a desire to bring the text into agreement with Matt. xxvi. 74, especially when the leading witnesses in attestation of this reading are clearly involved in testifying to the genuineness of other similarly fabricated readings in this immediate connection. It may safely be set aside as a false reading.

XV. 8.

Rec. T. καθὼς ἐφεσα αὐτοῖς. — as he was ever done unto them.
Rev. T. καθὼς ἐφέσα αὐτοῖς. — as he was wont to do unto them.

The revised reading is that of Ν, Β, Δ, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Peshito Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions. The other has the attestation of A, C, D, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, all the cursive, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Philoxenic Syriac, the Armenian, and the Gothic. (F and L are defective here.) The word ἐφέσα, "ever" or "always," gave some early critics trouble, inasmuch as Pilate had been governor but a comparatively short time. He became procurator and governor of Judea ad 27, and gave Jesus up to be crucified apparently ad 30. But to speak of one who had been in office only about three years as having always done a certain official act appeared to some early reader a misuse of language. This is evident from the so-called renderings of the two Old Latin Versions ε and ζ. The former glosses the word thus: "just as he had been wont to do upon a feast day"; the latter, "as he did on every festal occasion." But it should be remembered that ἐφέσα does not necessarily imply a long period. It is used here as the words "ever" and "never" often are in common parlance with us: "Have you ever called

on Mrs. Jay?" "No," says B, "I never have." And yet Mr. B. had not been in the place eighteen months. The Jews desired Pilate to do simply as he had previously done. They are represented as saying only what Matthew says, in xxvii. 15, in a little different form. A critical reader or copyist could have no temptation to insert ἐφέσα here. The Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, as was usual with them when they came to such a place, dropped the offensive word, as it could be dropped without materially affecting the sense. This accounts for its absence not only from Ν, Β, and their allies, the Egyptian Versions, but from the other three documents also. The word could not have found its way into the text if not genuine.

XV. 12.

Rec. T. Τί οὖν θέλεις ποιήσαι — What will ye then that I shall do.
Rev. T. Τί οὖν ποιήσω — What then shall I do.

The received reading is that of Α, D, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, most of the cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenic Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions. The other is that of Ν, Β, Κ, Δ, half a dozen cursive, and the two Egyptian Versions. It is evidently an abbreviation made to correspond with the beginning of Pilate's question as given in Matt. xxvii. 21,—several of its supporters also omitting the words ὅν λέγετε, "whom ye call," which follow immediately after, while B, by omitting only the ὅν, gives a highly improbable reading. — Τί οὖν ποιήσω λέγετε τῶν βασιλεία ἑως Ἰουδαίων; "What then shall I do, say ye, with the King of the Jews?" — a reading which Westcott and Hort correct, by placing ὅν in brackets!

XV. 39.

Rec. T. ὅπως ὁ κραζὼς θερέσως, — that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost.
Rev. T. ὅπως οὕτως θερέσως, — that he so gave up the ghost.

A marginal note says that "many ancient authorities read so cried out and gave up the ghost." It would perhaps have been
more satisfactory to the reader to have been informed that the only ancient documents that seem to deny the genuineness of κράξας by omitting it are N, B, L, and the Memphitic Version, which also omits "so." That κράξας is a part of Mark's text is well attested by A, C, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Ρ, Δ, Η, all the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and Origen, Chrysostom, and Augustine. Its omission presents one of those cases of inadvertence that so often occur among copyists. Some early scribe, on having written οὕτως, probably unwittingly lost sight of κράξας, and passing on immediately to the next word, made the evangelist's statement read, "When the centurion, who stood by, over against him, saw that he so breathed his last, he said, Truly this was the Son of God." And, as the construction was not affected thereby, the omission passed unnoticed, and obtained a limited currency. It changes, however, very perceptibly the evangelist's record, which is, that Jesus uttered a loud voice,—he cried, It is finished,—and expired. And when the centurion, who stood by and directly in front of the cross, saw that Jesus after having cried out in this manner had breathed his last, he said, Truly, this was the Son of God. It is incredible that κράξας should have been inserted by any second hand, there being nothing to tempt any one to separate οὕτως from ἐξήνευσεν and form the additional clause of the Received Text. But it is perfectly in accordance with Mark's mode of writing to note by a single stroke of his pen what less graphic writers would pass over altogether. And the employment of κράξας here is one of those master strokes of this evangelist which speaks for itself. The point with Mark was not that, when the centurion saw that Jesus breathed his last as he did, he said, Truly, etc., but that, when he saw that Jesus was dead after having cried out in this way, he exclaimed, etc. It is sad that a record so full of power and pathos should, by the carelessness of an unknown hand, be so misrepresented, and that this misrepre-

sentation, through devotion to the manuscripts in which it is found, should be thrust upon the public as a genuine utterance of the evangelist.

**Mark.**

**XV. 45.**

Rec. T. ἔδωρεν τὸ σῶμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ.—he gave the body to Joseph.

Rev. T. ἔδωρεν τὸ σῶμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ.—he granted the corpse to Joseph.

"The corpse" is the reading of N, B, D, L, 473, and the Ethiopic Version. But D and the Ethiopic Version also read "the corpse" in verse 43, where all other documents have "the body." And B says the body was given to Ἰωσήφ, Jose, instead of to Joseph, though in verse 43 it says, in common with all other Greek manuscripts, that it was Joseph who came to Pilate for the body. This shows that the readings of these manuscripts are not to be taken with unlimited confidence, but need to be carefully scrutinized. The common reading — "the body" — is supported by A, C, E, G, K, M, S, U, V, X, Ρ, Δ, Η, almost every cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, and Gothic Versions, and Theodoret. This testimony is confirmed by the fact that Mark says in verse 43 that Joseph came to ask for the body of Jesus; and it is not natural that he should have closed his account by saying that the corpse, not the body, was granted him. A careless copyist, however, might very easily mistake the latter for the former, and unconsciously write the one for the other, as the scribe of D, or a predecessor of his, actually did in verse 43.

**XVI. 9-20.**

The genuineness of this passage is questioned by some. Hence the Revisers set it apart from what precedes, with the marginal note, "The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end. Some other
authorities have a different ending to the Gospel." Yes; and there are other passages which "the two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other authorities omit"; as Matt. xii. 47, xvi. 23, Luke xxiii. 34, John iii. 13, v. 4, vii. 53, etc. But this does not of necessity prove them to be spurious. They are simply not found in Ξ, B, and a few other witnessing documents. If this is to decide the question of genuineness, it does it as effectually in these and all other instances of omissions in "the two oldest Greek manuscripts and some other authorities" as in Mark xvi. 9-20. We cannot, however, go into any extended argument to prove the genuineness of these verses. It would require more space than our limits allow. Besides, it is unnecessary. Those who desire to see the subject thoroughly and ably, not to say laboriously and exhaustively, treated, are referred to The Last Twelve Verses of the Gospel according to S. Mark vindicated against recent objectors and established, by John W. Burgon, B.D., pp. 334; Parker & Co., Oxford and London, 1871. Dr. Broadus' Examination of the Exceptions to Mark xvi. 9-20, in the Baptist Quarterly for July, 1869, is sufficiently conclusive as far as the objections to the diction are concerned, though not so thoroughly overwhelming as Dean Burgon's, who in chapter ix. pp. 136-190 of his book treats the subject in a way entirely different from that pursued by Dr. Broadus. The reader is also referred to Scrivener's Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament (3d edition), pp. 583-590, and memorandum v. on p. xii. of that volume; as well as to Hammond's Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament (5th edition), Oxford, 1890, pp. 120-128. The first of these treatises ought to satisfy any and every candid reader as to the genuineness of the passage, and the injustice to both Mark and his readers in setting these verses apart from the rest of his Gospel. We quote a few sentences from Dean Burgon's book to show his manner of handling the subject. But one needs to read his book in order to realize the strength and force of his argument.

After stating that it is admitted on all hands that these verses constituted the conclusion of Mark's Gospel as early as the second century, and that in default of proof that previous to that time this Gospel ended abruptly at verse 8, he adds: "Nothing short of the utter unfitness of these verses to be regarded as the work of the Evangelist would warrant us in assuming that they are the spurious accretion of the post-apostolic age; and as such, at the end of eighteen centuries, to be deliberately rejected. We must absolutely be furnished with internal evidence of the most unequivocal character, or else with external testimony of a direct and definite kind, if we are to admit that the actual conclusion of S. Mark's Gospel is an unauthorized substitute for something quite different that has been lost. I can only imagine another thing which could induce us to entertain such an opinion; and that would be the general consent of MSS., Fathers, and Versions in leaving these verses out. Else it is evident that we are logically forced to adopt the far easier supposition that not Mark, but some copyist of the third century, left a copy of S. Mark's Gospel unfinished; which unfinished copy became the fountal source of the mutilated copies which have come down to our own times.... The course which has been adopted towards S. Mark xvi. 9-20 by the latest editors of the New Testament is simply illogical. Either they regard these verses as possibly genuine, or else as certainly spurious. If they entertain, as they say they do, a decided opinion that they are not genuine, they ought, if they would be consistent, to banish them from the text. Conversely, since they do not banish them from the text, they have no right to pass a fatal sentence upon them; to designate their author as 'pseudo-Marcus'; to handle them in contemptuous fashion. The plain truth is, these learned men are better than their theory, the worthlessness of which they are made to feel in the present most conspicuous instance. It reduces them to perplexity. It has landed them in inconsistency and error."

1 Last Twelve Verses, pp. 17, 18.
We will also add, for the satisfaction of the general reader, the following extract from an article of Dean Burgon's (the italics here as well as in the foregoing quotation being his), in the London Quarterly Review of October, 1881, p. 172: "Dr. Roberts assures us that 'Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome, as well as other writers, especially Greeks, testify that these verses were not written by S. Mark, or not found in the best copies.' Will the learned writer permit us to assure him in return that he is entirely mistaken? He is requested to believe that Gregory of Nyssa says nothing of the sort — says nothing at all concerning these verses; that Victor of Antioch vouches emphatically for their genuineness; that Severus does but copy, while Jerome does but translate, a few random expressions of Eusebius, and that Eusebius himself nowhere 'testifies that these verses were not written by S. Mark.' So far from it, Eusebius actually quotes the verses, quotes them as genuine. Dr. Roberts is further assured that there are no 'other writers,' whether Greek or Latin, who insinuate doubt concerning these verses. On the contrary, besides both the Latin, and all the Syriac — besides the Gothic and the two Egyptian Versions — there exist four authorities of the second century; as many of the third; five of the fifth; four of the sixth; as many of the seventh; — together with at least ten of the fourth — contemporaries therefore of codices B and S — viz., Eusebius, Macarius Magnes (A.D. 300-350, whose dispute with a heathen philosopher, which has recently come to light, contains an elaborate discussion of S. Mark xvi. 17, 18), Aphraates, Didymus, the Syriac 'Acts of the Apostles,' Epiphanius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Jerome, Augustine; — which actually recognize the verses in question. Now, when to every known manuscript but two — besides every ancient Version — some one-and-thirty Fathers are added, eighteen of whom must have used copies at least as old as either B or S, Dr. Roberts is assured that an amount of external authority has been accumulated which is simply impregnable in discussions of this nature." Hammond, in introducing his remarks on the subject, well says: "It is impossible in a short space to do justice to the many considerations which arise at every turn in this case. Dean Burgon has written a volume on these 'Last Twelve Verses,' wherein he proves that much of the evidence commonly arrayed against the verses is simply non-existent; statements having been incautiously copied by one great critic after another, which, incredible as it may seem, when examined carefully turn out to have no foundation at all, or even in some cases to have an exactly opposite bearing to that alleged. He will find that much of the adverse Patristic evidence consists, not, as is represented, of the independent opinions of certain Fathers, but of so many almost verbal transcriptions of a passage in Eusebius, in which moreover Eusebius is not giving his own judgment; while several of the Fathers cited as hostile, give in other parts of their works clear evidence in favor of the verses. And he will find it shown that the so-called proofs from style and phraseology (proofs which for the most part proceed upon the extraordinary assumption that if a writer does not use a word or phrase at least twice in the course of his writings — however short the writings may be, and however inappropriate the word or phrase might be in other parts of the writings — it is abhorrent to his style, and a sign that the passage in which it occurs is not authentic!) are either false, or that they prove a great deal too much."\[1\]

In addition to this, we will give only the following words of the German Hug, which contain two or three thoughts worthy of note in this connection, not presented in the preceding pages: "Mark's mode of narration is never so irregular and disorderly as to lead us to expect such an awkward termination of his work as εφοβοιντο γάρ, 'for they were afraid,' would be. It is plain that this, instead of being a conclusion, is but a preparation for something to follow.

\[1\] Textual Criticism, p. 120.
"Let us consider the tenor given to his account of the resurrection by this termination: The women came to the sepulchre, found the stone rolled away, were addressed by a young man clothed in a white garment, who told them that Jesus had risen, and commanded them to communicate this information to the disciples, with the injunction that they should go into Galilee, where they should see our Lord. They, however, said nothing to any man, for they were afraid. Here the Gospel would end. But, if Mark terminated it in this way, he closed his account of an occurrence which was the most important evidence in favor of Christianity with assuring us that nothing was known of the resurrection at the time; that nothing could have been known about it, as much as those on whose testimony the fact rests told no one of it. He himself might then be asked how he knew and was able to relate what happened to the women, if they told no one of it. An inconceivable want of consideration is so important a matter! Even if he had no intention of attesting the occurrence by further evidence, he was at any rate bound to inform the reader how the incident in respect to the women was divulged and became notorious. He would thus present clearly at least one argument drawn from the declarations of witnesses, though that be the weakest of all that are exhibited in the Gospels.

"Now this very portion of the history which is denied to have been written by Mark relates how the women came to tell of what had happened to them, how little credit was given to their narrative, and from what other subsequent occurrences satisfactory assurance of the fact was obtained.

"The preposterous nature of such a termination, both in a grammatical and a historical point of view, was perceived even by those Greek critics and copyists who did not receive the passage; for some of them added a conclusion of their own, which satisfied at least the principal requisitions that could be made of the author. It was as follows: But all things that have been declared were briefly made known to Peter's company. And afterwards Jesus himself sent forth by them, from the east even unto the west, the sacred and imperishable message of everlasting salvation. This is the ending found in Codex L, and it appears in the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version. Let us hear what that great master in matters of New-Testament criticism, Griesbach, has to say on this subject. He calls the conclusion, 'for they were afraid,' a most abrupt little clause; and further declares that it ought to be manifestly incredible to any one that Mark should have ended his brief commentary in this manner."

Nothing short of absolute servile deference to the negative testimony of Ν and B can lead any candid inquirer after the truth to set aside the all but unanimous testimony of antiquity, and regard these twelve verses as spurious.

1 This is also the ending found in the recently discovered Codex Ψ; and it is introduced by Westcott and Hort into their Greek Testament on the same footing with, and immediately after, the preceding twelve verses, which have been and still are commonly regarded the original and only ending. These editors seem to have no faith in either as the genuine conclusion of the Gospel, but are willing the reader should take his choice.

2 Hug's Introduction, Part ii., sect. 75.

3 Some of our readers may be desirous of obtaining a clearer idea than can be had from the foregoing, concerning the scope of the late Dean Burgon's work, The Last Twelve Verses, from which we have quoted a few sentences. We add therefore the headings of the chapters contained in the volume:—

i. The case stated.

ii. The hostile verdict of Biblical critics shown to be of recent date.

iii. The early Fathers appealed to, and observed to bear favorable witness to these Verses.

iv. The early Versions examined, and found to yield unaltering testimony to the genuineness of these Verses.

v. The alleged hostile witness of certain of the early Fathers proved to be an imagination of the Critics.

vi., vii. Manuscript testimony shown to be overwhelmingly in favor of these Verses.

viii. The purport of ancient Scholia and notes in MSS. on the subject of these Verses shown to be the reverse of what is commonly supposed.
ix. Internal Evidence demonstrated to be the very reverse of unfavorable to these Verses.

x. The testimony of the Lectionaries shown to be absolutely decisive as to the genuineness of these Verses.

xi. The omission of these twelve Verses in certain Ancient Copies of the Gospels explained and accounted for.

xii. General review of the question: summary of the evidence; and conclusion of the whole subject.

LUKE.

Rec. T. ἐπεσκέφασο ἡμᾶς ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους, — the dayspring from on high hath visited us.

Rev. T. ἐπισκέφθηκαι ἡμᾶς ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους, — the dayspring from on high shall visit us.

Appended to the closing words is the note, “Many ancient authorities read hath visited us.” That is, the common reading is supported by Ν as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, W, Γ, Δ, Ε, all the cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Philoxenian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, the Armenian Version edited by Bishop Uscan, Irenæus, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Paschal Chronicle of Alexandria. The future, which the Revisers have adopted, is the reading of Ν first hand, B, the Memphitic, the Peshito Syriac, and the Armenian Version edited by Zohrab. The Gothic has the present, “is visiting”; while L reads, ἐπισκέφθηκαί, which is neither future nor aorist indicative, but a hodgepodge of aorist indicative, optative, and subjunctive, and is supposed (from the termination, and from the fact that L generally agrees with B) to be intended for the future. The only positive testimony in attestation of the future is that of the two oldest uncial and two of the oldest versions, that of the Armenian Version being questionable. The evidence in favor of the aorist, on the other hand, is strong; and it is strongly supported by the context. The aged Zacharias opens his prophecy with saying in verses 68, 69, “Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel; for he ἐπεσκέφασο hath visited . . .
his people; ... He hath raised up a horn of salvation for us." Not that the Lord had already done this; for the visiting of the people and the raising up of the horn refer not to the infant John, but to the unborn Saviour, whom the aged priest in anticipation, because of the birth of his forerunner, viewed as already come. It was under the prophetic inspiration of the moment that he, in those verses, spoke in a past tense of the Messiah, who was yet to come; and it was under the influence of the same divinely inspired faith and forereaching vision that he referred in this verse to the Saviour as "the dayspring from on high that hath visited us." But some matter-of-fact critical scribe, seeing that the words referred to Christ, who had not yet come, and not perceiving that Zacharias was viewing the future as already present, thought it necessary to change the aorist of the evangelist into the future. That is all. The true reading is obviously, "whereby the dayspring from on high hath visited us"; as Lachmann, Tischendorf, the Received Text, and others read.

ii. 14.

Rec. T. καὶ ἐν γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώπως εὐδοκία. — and on earth, peace, good will towards men.

Rev. T. καὶ ἐν γῆς εἰρήνῃ ἐν ἀνθρώπως εὐδοκίαις. — and on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.

To this, the Revisers affix two marginal notes. The first is, "Many ancient authorities read, peace, good pleasure among men"; the other, "Gr., men of good pleasure"; i.e. the Greek to which they have given the so-called rendering, "men in whom he is well pleased." The only rendering that the Greek words ἀνθρώπως εὐδοκίας will bear is "men of good will," or, as the note has it, "men of good pleasure"; which, if it means anything, means, "men who are well disposed towards each other," not, "men in whom God is well pleased." The latter cannot by any possibility be fairly regarded as the meaning of the Greek. It is a rendering which, as one of the Revisers has well said, "can be arrived at only through some process which would make any phrase bear almost any meaning the translator might like to put upon it." — Scrivener, Introduction, etc., p. 592.

The Revisers' Text here, which differs from the other only in the addition of a single letter to the last word of the verse, is that of Ν first hand, A, B first hand, D, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Gothic Versions, and, of course, Augustine and the Latin Fathers generally. The received reading is supported by Ν as amended by its early seventh-century corrector, A in its reading of this passage as it occurs in the Morning Hymn appended to the Psalms, B as amended by its sixth-century corrector (C and F are defective), E, G, H, K, L (which deserts B's original reading here), M, the great Zurich Psalter O¹ of the seventh century, P, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Ε, all the cursives, the Memphitic, the Peshito, the Philoxenian Syriac in both text and Greek margin, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic Version; and by overwhelming patristic testimony. That of Ireneus is lost. But Origen testifies in support of εὐδοκία three times, Gregory Thaumaturgus six times, Methodius once, the Apostolic Constitutions twice, Eusebius twice, Aphraates the Persian twice, Titus of Bostra twice, Didymus three times, Gregory Nazianzen once, Gregory Nyssen four times, Cyril of Jerusalem once (though wrongly quoted by Tischendorf in favor of the other reading), Epiphanius twice, Ephraem Syrus and Philo bishop of Carpasus each once, Chrysostom nine times, who also interprets εὐδοκία by καταλαγή, "reconciliation," Cyril of Alexandria at least fourteen times, Theodoret four times, Theodotus of Anycra five times, the Patriarch Proclus of Constantinople, Paulus bishop of Emesa, Basil of Seleucia, the Eastern bishops in council at Ephesus, a.d. 431, Cosmas five times, Anastasius, Eulogius of Alexandria, Andreas of Crete, John Damascene, Germanus archbishop of Constantinople, and others,—all of whom are really equivalent to codices of the respective periods and countries to which they belong.
The whole trouble in connection with this passage arose from the early losing of \( \epsilon \nu \), "among," in the copy from which the first Latin Version was made,—the preposition having been absorbed in the first syllable of \( \alpha \nu \theta \rho \rho \omega \alpha \sigma \). The preposition being lost, it was necessary to put some meaning into \( \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \) before it could be translated. The only feasible way to do this was to consider it an error for \( \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \). In proof of this, we find that the Latin Versions all read \( \pi \alpha \ k \omega \ i \mu \iota \ \eta \iota \ \omicron \ \nu \ i \sigma \ \beta \iota \ \mu \iota \ \nu \) \( \beta \eta \nu \ \theta \o \mu \iota \nu \ \kappa \alpha \) voluntatis, and make the whole verse read "Glory in the highest to God, and on earth peace of good-will to men," as Jerome would have it that Origen understood it,—or, "peace to men of good-will," as others understood it.1 Origen's testimony, however, as given in his own words, is in support of the common reading.

This absorption of \( \epsilon \nu \) before \( \alpha \nu \theta \rho \rho \omega \alpha \sigma \) appears also at Acts iv. 12 in D, 117, 163, the Vulgate, Irenæus as represented by his Latin interpreter, Cyprian and the Latin Fathers generally,—all which read \( \delta \iota \delta \iota \nu \ \alpha \nu \theta \rho \rho \omega \alpha \sigma \), \( \delta \iota \mu \iota \nu \ \alpha \nu \theta \rho \rho \omega \alpha \sigma \), "given to men," instead of "given among men." Like absorptions of other words occur not unfrequently among the old manuscripts. Though no Greek manuscript is known to survive to our day with \( \epsilon \nu \) absorbed by \( \alpha \nu \theta \rho \rho \omega \alpha \sigma \) in Luke ii. 14, the various copies of the Old Latin Version leave no room to doubt that it was thus lost in the exemplar from which that version was made; and that the change from the nominative to the genitive in the word \( \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \), as found in its Latin rendering, was only a last resort by which to obtain some kind of sense, if possible. Had the well-meaning "editor," as we may call him, supposed that the trouble was due to the loss of \( \epsilon \nu \), "among," he would undoubtedly have restored the preposition, and left \( \epsilon \iota \delta \iota \kappa \alpha \) unchanged. But, poor soul! his depraved exemplar was the only copy he had; and in his perplexity and ignorance he did

1 It is, in fact, to this false reading of the Latin Vulgate that we are indebted for the rendering of the A. V., "good-will towards (to) men."
Armenian Version. Its presence, as a part of the text, is called for by \( \text{X} \)'s earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C, E, G, H, K, L, S, U, V, X, \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), \( \lambda \), all the cursive, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian, the Peshito, and the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Origen and Eusebius, as well as by the very thought to be expressed. The Old Latin copy a attempts to supply the deficiency by reading \( \text{verba ejus omnia, "all his words."} \) But this, to say nothing of its pointlessness, which shows its failure to express the evangelist's meaning, can hardly be obtained from the three Greek words \( \text{πάντα τὰ ῥῆματα} \) even in this connection. It would require the addition of \( \text{αὐτῷ}. \) \( \text{Τάῦτα} \) was evidently overlooked by an early copyist, possibly in consequence of similarity of termination with the preceding word; and the omission was confined to a very limited number of copies.

iii. 17.

Rec. T. \( \text{καὶ διακαθαρισε} \ \text{τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτῷ, καὶ συνάξει} \ \text{τὸν οἶνον} — and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat.

Rev. T. \( \text{διακαθαρισε} \ \text{τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτῷ, καὶ συνάξει} \ \text{τὸν οἶνον} — thoroughly to cleanse his threshing-floor, and to gather the wheat.

These infinitives of the Revised Text are supported, the former by \( \text{X} \)'s first hand, B, two copies (\( \alpha \), \( \epsilon \)) of the Old Latin Version, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Irenæus as represented by his translator's Latin version; and the latter by \( \text{X} \)'s original scribe, B, \( \epsilon \), and the Armenian Version only. But these are transparent attempts to improve the simplicity of the Baptist's language. His words as given by Matthew (iii. 12), without any variation among the manuscripts, are as here in the Received Text. And this reading is amply attested as the true reading by \( \text{X} \)'s contemporary reviser and seventh-century corrector, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), \( \lambda \), all the cursive, Irenæus' own Greek, Origen, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, as well as the Gothic, the Ethiopic, etc. As a report of one of John's well-known utterances, it should agree in form with Matthew's rather than differ from it.

iii. 20.

Rec. T. \( \text{καὶ κατέλειψε} \ \text{τὸν Ἰωάννη} — that he shut up John.

Rev. T. \( \text{κατέλειψε} \ \text{τὸν Ἰωάννη} — that he shut up John.

The Revisers omit \( \text{καὶ}, \) yet give its English equivalent "that," just as the A. V. does, without italicizing it. This is hardly fair. It is the Hebraistic \( \text{καὶ} \) for \( \text{ὅτι} \), found everywhere throughout the Septuagint. (See 1 Sam. iv. 3, 5, 15, xvii. 10, etc.) It is omitted, apparently from having been misunderstood and deemed out of place, by \( \text{X} \) first hand, B, D, \( \Xi \), and two copies (\( \beta \), \( \epsilon \)) of the Old Latin Version. But it is given by \( \text{X} \)'s earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, \( \chi \), \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), \( \lambda \), \( \Pi \), all the cursive, the remaining copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions. It should be retained.

iv. 1.

Rec. T. \( \text{καὶ ἤγετο} \ldots εἰς τὴν ἡμέραν — and was led . . . into the wilderness.

Rev. T. \( \text{καὶ ἤγετο} \ldots ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ — and was led . . . in the wilderness.

The latter reading implies that Jesus was not led into the wilderness, but was conducted about in it. The only Greek manuscripts that support this reading are \( \text{X}, \) B, D, L. In this, they are followed by the Thebaic Version and a few copies of the Old Latin and Vulgate Versions. The common reading, on the other hand, has the support of A, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, W, \( \text{W}^{\beta} \), \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), \( \lambda \), \( \Xi \), \( \Pi \), all the cursive, most copies of the Old Latin and Vulgate, the Memphitic, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions, Eusebius, Basil, and Theodoret. This is set aside for the other on the authority of the four first-
mentioned manuscripts, because it corresponds with the reading of Matthew (iv. 1) and Mark (i. 12), who say respectively “was led into the wilderness,” and “driveth him into the wilderness.” We see no reason why Luke should not have written ἐστιν ἔρημος in this connection as well as the other evangelists; nor have we any idea that he did not. It is far easier to believe that some old copyist, having just written ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, carried this construction along in his mind as he proceeded to write the next three words; and under this impression, without referring back to his exemplar, wrote ἐν τῷ ἔρημῷ instead of ἐστιν ἔρημος, and passed on. Elsewhere in the New Testament the verb ἀγέωθηκα is used in speaking of one’s being led, not in, but into, a place; i.e. not with ἐν, but with ἐστι, followed by an accusative denoting the place, — and by Luke at that. (Acts xxi. 34; xxii. 24.) This verb is also used actively in the same manner in more than a dozen other places with ἐστι, but nowhere with ἐν. If Luke’s meaning here were that given by the Revisers, he would undoubtedly have said “returned from the Jordan to the wilderness,” or something to that effect, then, as a writer of good Greek, have written καὶ πνεύματο... ἐκεῖ, “and was led about there” etc. But to speak of Jesus as “led in the wilderness,” without giving the reader any previous intimation of his being there, is not like Luke. Even in textual criticism, it is well to exercise a little common sense, and not to assume that a few old manuscripts, because they are old, are necessarily infallible, or all but infallible.

iv. 4.

Rec. T. ἀλλὰ ἐπὶ παντὶ πνεύματι Θεοῦ.—but by every word of God.
Rev. T. Omit.

The only evidence in support of this omission is the testimony of Ν, B, L, and the two Egyptian Versions. The fuller reading of the Received Text is attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Wb, X, Π, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Wilkins’ Memphitic, the Gothic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Arabic Versions. The clause omitted by the Revisers is supposed to be from Matt. iv. 4. But if taken thence it would be more in accordance with Matthew. Its omission seems to be due to the apparent offensiveness of the idea of living on every word of God, and possibly to a desire to obtain a divine warrant for not living on bread only. It is impossible to sound every motive that influenced those second- and third-century corrupters of the New Testament writings in their alterations of these writings. But it is by no means improbable that some such motive was at work here. The omitted clause is certainly a part of what Jesus said on the occasion; and there is no reason why Luke should not have reported it as well as Matthew. The fact that five closely related documents should be the only ones to omit the phrase, while several that might be expected to be found with them if they were not in error should be against them, to say the least, is not altogether assuring; in addition to which, the fact that the words are present in nearly every ancient version is well-nigh conclusive of their genuineness. It forms a more than ordinarily strong argument in favor of their retention.

iv. 17.

Rec. T. ἀναπτύγας τῷ βιβλίῳ—when he had opened the book.
Rev. T. ἀνοίξας τῷ βιβλίῳ—he opened the book, and.

The latter reading is supported by A, B, L, Z, two cursive, and apparently, just as in our A. V., by the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. The former, which properly means “having unrolled,” is attested by Ν, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Wb, Π, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Gothic, Jerusalem Syriac, Origen, and Eusebius. It is a word nowhere else used in the New Testament; but it is the very word that Luke would be likely to use in speaking of one’s unfolding or unrolling a scroll, the ancient form of books. The more common ἀνοίξας
is simply a gloss or explanation. It is the general word for opening, and is used by Luke half a dozen or more times in speaking of opening a door, opening the mouth, etc. In the Apocalypse it is used in speaking of books or scrolls as well as other things; but it is in reference to breaking the seal, or obtaining admission to the contents, and not to unrolling them for the purpose of finding a particular passage. Tischendorf can hardly be said to have been influenced by his partiality for $\pi\tau\rho\varepsilon\varsigma\varsigma$ in retaining $\varphi\alpha\varphi\alpha\rho\iota\kappa\varsigma$, "having unrolled," as Westcott and Hort probably were by their reverence for B in adopting $\varphi\alpha\iota\kappa\varsigma$ instead. He must have been convinced that it is the true reading from verse 20, where $\pi\tau\rho\varepsilon\varsigma\varsigma$ is attested as genuine by all the manuscripts. In the verse before us, Jesus is said to have unrolled or unfolded the scroll; and in verse 20, to have rolled it up, or folded it together, — not to have "closed" it, as the A. V. and R. V. make it. This word, "closed," applied to ancient scrolls, properly denotes sealing or otherwise fastening them after being rolled up or folded.

iv. 44.

The marginal note says, "Very many ancient authorities read Judea"; that is, instead of "Galilee." This reading is supported by $\aleph$, B, C, L, Q, R, nearly twenty-five cursive, the Memphitic Version, and the text of the Philoxenian Syriac. Tregelles gives it a place in the margin as a secondary reading. But Westcott and Hort introduce it into their text, while they place $\Gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$ in the margin as one of their so-called "Western" readings. $\Gamma\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\iota\varsigma$, however, is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles in his text, it being attested as the true reading by $\Lambda$, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, $\Gamma$, $\Delta$, $\Lambda$, $\Pi$, most of the cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, one manuscript of the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Ethiopic. It is also called for by the very verse in which it stands, as well as by the preceeding and succeeding context. In addition to this, the passage is plainly parallel to Mark i. 39, which speaks of Christ as preaching among the synagogues of Galilee. All this seems to indicate that "Judea," though strongly attested, is a false reading. But it may be said that Luke uses the term here, as in i. 5, and vii. 17, in the broader sense of all Palestine. Even granting that the manuscripts use the word in this sense, the reading is plainly false; for what would be the evangelist's object in saying that Jesus continued preaching in the synagogues of Palestine, when his whole ministry was confined to Palestine, and especially when the subsequent context shows that he remained preaching in that portion of it which Luke elsewhere calls Galilee? The reading shows for itself that Luke could not have written "Judea," meaning Palestine thereby. Yet Alford, commenting on the word, and admitting that "our narrative is thus brought into the more startling discrepancy with that of S. Mark, in which unquestionably the same portion of the sacred history is related," with wonderful simplicity adds, "Still, these are considerations which must not weigh in the least degree with the critic. It is his province simply to track out what is the sacred text, not what, in his own feeble and partial judgment, it ought to have been." Is a textual critic, then, to exercise no common sense? In what does his right to be called a critic consist? Is he not to employ his own judgment, "feeble and partial" though it may be, in determining as far as he can between the false and the true among rival readings? If not, how is he "to track out what is the sacred text?" He certainly cannot do it by blindly adopting the readings of any one or more ancient manuscripts which, in the exercise of his feeble and partial judgment, he may think ought to contain the true text. Bible students and readers generally have already had quite as many choice morsels of such textual criticism as are healthful. Perhaps it is not to be wondered at that Luke's "Galilee" should have been converted into "Judea." It was not an uncommon thing
for copyists centuries ago to write one name for another, any more than it is nowadays. Thus, the original scribe of Κ, in Mark i. 28, and Luke i. 26, commits the same error as here, giving Ἰουδαίας, "Judea," when the genuine reading as given by all but one or two other manuscripts is Γαλατίας, "Galilee." In John vii. 3, D, on the other hand, has Γαλατίαν, "Galilee," for Ἰουδαίαν, "Judea." In Matt. xxvi. 69, C, two cursive s, the Peshito Syriac, and Persic of Walton's Polyglot have Ναζωραῖον, "Nazarene," for Γαλατίαν, "Galilean"; while in John iv. 47, the Curetonian Syriac Version reads, "Jesus was come out of Γαλιλαία into ᾿Ἰουδαία," instead of "out of Judea into Galilee." The only wonder, if there is any, is how such an error should become multiplied. Yet, perhaps, if we knew the character of the copyists generally, and with what lack of care they often performed their tasks, we should rather wonder that their work was not more erroneous. However that may be, we have here the undeniable fact that not less than six of the old uncials, and four of them, those that are commonly regarded the most trustworthy, are guilty of an egregious error; and the reader will yet find that other errors, some of them even worse, because not inadvertently but deliberately made, are attested as genuine readings by our so-called "best" manuscripts.

v. 1.

Rec. T. ἐν τῷ τον ὄχλον ἐπικείμενον αὐτῷ τοι ἄκοιντα τὸν λόγον — as the people pressed upon him to hear the word.

Rev. T. ἐν τῷ τον ὄχλον ἐπικείμενον αὐτῷ καὶ ἅκοιντα τὸν λόγον — while the multitude pressed upon him and heard the word.

The latter reading is that of Κ, A, B, L, X, 1, 131, 3 of the Old Latin, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, one edition and two manuscripts of the Memphitic. The former is that of C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, Q, R, S, U, V, Τ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursive, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, and Wilkins' Mem-

phitic. In the words "to hear the word of God," the evangelist seems more naturally to have given the reason why the multitude pressed upon Jesus than to have added another circumstance of what "came to pass." He does not say that Jesus had yet begun to teach the people; but he says simply that he was standing by the lake,—not even speaking. In verse 3 we find that, after he had entered into one of the boats, put out a little into the sea, and seated himself, he then taught the multitudes. The legitimate inference from this is, that he had not yet begun to teach them while he was on the shore. In that case, the common reading must be the true one.

v. 5.

Rec. T. ἄκορπθεδε ᾧ Σίμων ἔπειν αὐτῷ, — Simon answering, said unto him.

Rev. T. ἄκορπθεδε ᾧ Σίμων ἔπειν, — Simon answered and said.

The omission of αὐτῷ here is attested by Κ, B, 3 of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version only. It is not in accordance with Luke's general manner. His habit is, where one is mentioned as addressing others, unless a noun is used as in i. 18, v. 24, etc., to use a pronoun in connection with εἶπε, — αὐτῷ, αὐτή, αὐτῆς, or πρὸς αὐτῷ, πρὸς αὐτῶν, etc. If one is not especially addressed, as in i. 38, or where εἶπε is introduced as continuing the discourse, in the sense of "he added," as in iv. 24, the pronoun is omitted. But the omission here is an abbreviation by some one else on account of its apparent needlessness,—the next word showing instantly to whom the words are addressed. There seems to be nothing to tempt any one to insert αὐτῷ here; and yet, if spurious, aside from intrinsic probability, it has in favor of its genuineness, a strong array of witnesses,—A, C, D, E, F, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Τ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursive, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions.
v. 9.

Rec. T. τὴν ἀγρα τῶν ἱχθῶν ἐν συνέλαβον,—the draft of the fishes which they had taken.

Rev. T. τὴν ἀγρα τῶν ἱχθῶν ἐν συνέλαβον,—the draft of the fishes which they had taken.

The change of text makes no manner of difference in the rendering, or in the essential meaning; but simply in the reference of the relative. This, according to the Received Text, refers to “draft”; but according to the Revised Text, to “fishes.” The testimony in support of the former consists of Ν, A, C, E, F, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, T, Δ, Λ, Π, all the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Gothic. The latter is the reading of only B, D, Ε, and the Gothic Version. If ὠν had been the original reading, there is no probability that it would ever have been changed to γ, and made to refer to a more remote and less obvious antecedent. But, under the idea that συνέλαβον must mean “brought together” or “collected,” it is easy to see that one might be led, as no doubt was the case, to change γ to ὠν so as to make the word refer to “fishes” rather than to the catch or haul on which the evangelist had his eye when he wrote. And the comparatively feeble support given to this reading lends additional weight to this supposition.

v. 17.

Rec. T. δύναμις Κυρίου ἐν εἰς τὸ λάσθας αὐτοῦ.—the power of the Lord was present to heal them.

Rev. T. δύναμις Κυρίου ἐν εἰς τὸ λάσθας αὐτοῦ.—the power of the Lord was with him to heal.

A marginal note says “Many ancient authorities”—it would have been more correct to have said Most ancient authorities—“read that he should heal them.” This reading is attested by A, C, D, E, H, M, S, U, V, X, T, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Gothic; while the Revisers’ αὐτῶν is vouched for by only six witnesses; namely, Ν, B, L, Ε, the Ethiopic Version, and Cyril, whose testimony is somewhat conflicting,—he giving in one place, “and the power of God was present for him to heal”; and in another, “and the power of the Lord was upon him to heal all.” It is a strong point in proof of the genuineness of the received reading, that all the oldest versions (some of which are centuries older than the oldest of extant Greek codices) have it. But we are told that αὐτῶν was changed to αὐτοῦ under the idea that ἰάσθαι needed an object. If any change had been made for this purpose, πολλοῖς, “many,” or δόξας, “multitudes,” would have been the more probable word,—certainly not αὐτοῦ. The change, on the contrary, was the other way, in order to obviate the seeming reference of αὐτοῦ to the Pharisees and doctors spoken of just before,—a reference which some readers insisted on as the true one. In confirmation of this, we find that the texts of D and X omit the words “and the power of the Lord was present,” and read, “There were Pharisees and doctors of the law sitting by, who had come out of every village of Galilee and Judea and Jerusalem [D also omits and Jerusalem], for him to heal them.” On account of this misunderstanding of αὐτοῦ, some well-intentioned early reader changed it to αὐτῶν; and because his work is preserved in the two oldest known Greek manuscripts, as well as in four other documents, some suppose that it is impossible for it to be other than genuine. Its spuriousness, however, is quite obvious.1

v. 33.

Rec. T. Διατέλεσεν ὁ μαθητὴς Ἰωάννου ἡμετέρως.—Why do the disciples of John fast?

Rev. T. Οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου ἡμετέρως.—The disciples of John fast.

The received reading here, it is true, corresponds with that of Matt. ix. 14 and Mark ii. 18. And why should it not? Is

1 K and lectionary 11, instead of following Ν, B, etc., explain αὐτοῦ by respectively substituting for it πάρας and ἀνθρώποι.
there any reason why Luke’s words, any more than Mark’s, should not correspond with Matthew’s? or why, any more than Matthew’s, they should not correspond with Mark’s? Are not the three evangelists reporting one and the same utterance made by others? Two of them report it as a question; and no objection is raised. Why should not the third do the same rather than give it as a flat, spiritless declaration? Must we believe that he did not, simply because one of \( \text{S} \)’s correctors, B, L, \( \Xi \), two cursive, and the Memphitic Version give it as a cold asseveration? Are these seven witnesses infallible, and all others false? In view of the errors of which the foremost among these documents are again and again guilty hereabouts, we have reason to question their testimony very seriously, not only on internal grounds, but in the face of the opposing testimony of the original scribe of \( \text{S} \), A, C, D, E, F, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, X, T, \( \Delta \), \( \Lambda \), II, nearly all the cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, Ethiopic, and a tenth-century manuscript of the Memphitic Version,—an array of evidence scarcely less than overwhelming. In short, there is every reason to believe that the revised reading is either an accidental or a deliberate falsification of Luke’s text.

vi. 1.

Rec. T. ‘Εγίνετο σι ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτερόπαστῳ — And it came to pass on the second Sabbath after the first.

Rev. T. ‘Εγίνετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ — Now it came to pass on a sabbath.

To this, the Revisers annex the note, “Many ancient authorities insert second-first.” These authorities, or at least some of them, are A, C, D, E, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, \( \Delta \), \( \Lambda \), II, most of the cursive, not less than six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Gothic, Armenian, the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Ambrose twice, Pseudo-Cæsarius, Epiphanius twice, the Paschal Chronicle, Chrysostom, Isidore of Pelusium, Theophylact, and Euthymius Zigabenus; while

R, \( \Gamma \), 117, 235, and two (13, 124 first hand) of Ferrar’s group read \( \delta ευτεροπάστῳ \), which is probably the true reading. The unusual word is omitted from the text in \( \text{S} \), B, L, 1, 22, 33, 69 (another of Ferrar’s group), 118, 157, 209, and certain lectionaries, as 150, 222, 234, 257, 259. Its omission from these last is in accordance with the usual custom of omitting the designations of time from the beginning of church lessons. A number of versions, as Jerome confesses, ob translationis difficililem, “on account of the difficulty of translating” the word, have also omitted it; among which are several copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, Peshito Syriac, Ethiopic, Persic, and the Polyglot Arabic, though the Roman and Erpenius’ Arabic both have \( \delta ευτεροπάστῳ \), as well as the Ethiopic according to Scholz. Tischendorf retains the word; Tregelles rejects it; Lachmann includes it in his text within brackets as a doubtful reading; while Westcott and Hort relegate it to the margin as a “Western and Syrian” interpolation, having no real claim to a place in the text! The margin of the Philoxenian Syriac says the word “does not appear in all the exemplars,” as we find to be the case with \( \text{S} \), B, L, and a few others. But its non-appearance is due to the simple fact that its meaning was not understood, as is evident from the various interpretations that have been put upon it almost from the first. Its presence is utterly unaccountable except on the hypothesis of its being a part of the original text. It is not found elsewhere in the New Testament, or anywhere in classical Greek, and may have been introduced by the evangelist (if \( \delta ευτεροπάστῳ \) is not the proper spelling) from the colloquial Greek of his day. Notwithstanding the various false interpretations that have been put upon it, its meaning seems to us clear and unquestionable. Among the Jews there were three principal yearly feast-days or sabbaths; namely, at the passover or feast of unleavened bread, which lasted seven days; then, seven weeks after, the feast of weeks or day of pentecost; and thirdly, at

1 Vallarsi, ii. 261.
the close of the vintage, the feast of tabernacles, continuing eight days (Deut. xvi. 1–16). The last day of the feast of unleavened bread (Deut. xvi. 8; John xix. 31), and of the feast of tabernacles (Neh. viii. 18; John vii. 37), and the day of pentecost were the three 

megála or πρώτα σάββατα, notable or principal sabbaths, their three chief national feast-days. The δευτερον πρώτων (or δευτερόπρωτων) σάββατον was therefore “a second chief sabbath,” the day of pentecost, which occurred about the end of May, at the close of their wheat-harvest. On this day, as Jesus and his disciples were passing through a wheat-field, his disciples picked a few heads of the grain that had been left standing by the reapers, rubbed them out, and ate the kernels. The evangelist’s word δευτεροπρώτως or δευτέρως τρώγω fixes the time of the occurrence of the event, and shows that the disciples were no trespassers, but were simply taking what the law entitled them to. (See Lev. xxiii. 22.) It is a very informing and important word, and would never have been dropped from the text but through ignorance.

vi. 6.

Rec. T. ἐγνῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ — And it came to pass also on another Sabbath.

Rev. T. ἐγνῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ — And it came to pass on another Sabbath.

Καὶ is set aside here probably by the same hand whose work we have just been exposing. The omission is found in very nearly the same documents as contained the last; namely, 

K, B, L, X, about fifteen cursive, counting the three (13, 69, 124) of Ferrar’s group as one, eight copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, Peshito Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Cyril.

Καὶ is attested, however, by A, E, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, most of the cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Philoxenian Syriac, and possibly the Gothic. It refers, in connection with ἐγνῦτο, to what is said in verse 1, and is introduced to give emphasis to the statement respecting a sec-

ond circumstance as happening also upon a sabbath,—“And it came to pass also on another sabbath that” etc. If the word is not genuine, it is hard to see why it should have been added. It is far more likely that, in connection with δὲ and τρώγω, some early critical reader rejected it as superfluous or inconsistent with due conciseness.

vi. 23.

Rec. T. κατὰ ταύτα γάρ ἐποίησαν . . . οἱ πατερεῖς αὐτῶν. — for in the like manner did their fathers.

Rev. T. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γάρ ἐποίησαν . . . οἱ πατερεῖς αὐτῶν. — for in the same manner did their fathers.

The revised reading ἄλλα αὐτὰ is attested by B, D, Q, X, Ξ, 33, and Marcion as cited by Epiphanius twice. But then D and Marcion omit the following γάρ. The received reading is upheld by Κ, A, E, H, K, L, M, P, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, nearly every cursive, Origen, and Tertullian. In the Received Text, γάρ occupies the third place in the clause; while, in the other, it holds the fourth. This last, as every Greek scholar knows, is a very unusual, not to say unnatural, position for it in prose. As a general rule, it stands second unless preceded by two closely connected words, like ἐν μέσῳ or εἴπο ὁδά, or by such particles as μὲν and τό, that cannot stand first. In that case, it stands third in the clause. If, however, μὲν or τό is preceded by two closely connected words, then even in prose γάρ occupies the fourth place. (See Xen. Anab. VII. iii. 37.) But there is no such necessity in the verse before us. Hence we are led to suspect the reading. (The same is true of the revised reading in verse 26, and in 2 Cor. i. 19,—the only instances, we believe, in the New Testament besides the present, in which γάρ is made to occupy the fourth place in the clause.) The form κατὰ ταύτα γάρ, — giving γάρ the third place, — is not uncommon; though, beyond this and verse 26, there is not another instance of it in the Gospel of Luke; and in the Acts it occurs only at xvii. 28 and xxvi. 16, where the
writer is reporting as here the words of another. The fact therefore that the revised reading is a grammatically unnecessary and improbable reading for κατὰ ταυτὰ γὰρ, and is altogether unlike Luke, compels us to believe that the true reading is that of the Received Text properly accenteduated, — ταυτὰ, not ταυτά. This is substantially the same reading as that of the Revisers, only the two words are brought into one. And the documentary evidence in favor of this form is certainly weightier than that supporting the revised reading, especially when we consider that D and Marcion omit γὰρ, so that their testimony on this point goes for nothing. The reading of B and its allies originated in some early reader's or scribe's desire that Luke's ΤΑΥΤΑ might not be mistaken for ταυτα; to make sure of which, he expanded it into τὰ αὐτὰ, without realizing that γὰρ was witnessing and protesting against his work. The same thing is true of the same false reading in verse 26, as also in xvii. 30.

vi. 34.

Rec. T. παρ' ὀν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν, — of whom ye hope to receive.
Rev. T. παρ' ὀν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, — of whom ye hope to receive.

The former reading is attested by A, D, E, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, and nearly every cursive; the latter by Ν, B, L, Ε, 237, and Justin Martyr, Ἀπολ. i. 15. But Justin evidently quotes from memory, as follows: εἰ γὰρ δεινεῖτε παρ' ὀν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καὶν ποιεῖτε; τούτο καὶ οἱ τελῶνιν παιδεύειν. In doing so, he differs from the text in at least nine words out of the fifteen, without counting λαβεῖν. So that whatever weight may be accorded to the testimony of the other five witnesses that support the Revisers' reading, that of Justin is of little worth. While the simple verb may fulfill the demands of the context, the compound form more fully meets it by more fully expressing the idea involved, — that of receiving in return from another. By so doing, it commends itself as the original word, while the other has the appearance of being an abridgment. This reading is also favored by the fact that the same word is employed in a similar connection, in accordance with Jesus' customary manner of speech, before the verse closes,— "for sinners lend to sinners to receive as much in return." Besides this, the attestation in its support is not to be overlooked. It is too strong, taken with the internal evidence, to allow a change of text.

vi. 35.

The reading μηδένα, "no one," referred to in the marginal note,—"Some ancient authorities read despairing of no man,"—though found in Ν, Ε, II first hand, and in the Syriac, Arabic, and Persic Versions, is hardly worthy of notice. It originated in an obvious misapprehension of the evangelist's meaning in the participle ἀπελπίζοντες. If this had not been taken to mean disappointing one's expectations, μηδένα would never have received the additional letter, by which the Saviour is represented as saying, "Do good, and lend, disappointing no one," instead of "Do good and lend, hoping for nothing in return." The αὐτό in composition with ἐλπίζειν, as the words παρ' ὀν ἐλπίζετε, "from whom ye hope," in verse 34 clearly indicate, has the same force here as in connection with λαμβάνειν in that verse, making the word mean ἀπὸ τινος ἐλπίζειν, "to hope for from some one." But this being an unusual use and meaning, the word was misunderstood and misinterpreted. Hence the μηδένα. Compare απελπίζων for ἀπὸ τινος λαμβάνειν, "to eat of something"; and ἀπογεύσασθαι for ἀπὸ τινος γεύσασθαι, "to taste of something." 1

vi. 48.

Rec. T. τεθυμόλωτο γὰρ ἐκ τῆς πέτρας. — for it was founded upon a rock.
Rev. T. διὰ τὸ καλὸς οἰκοδομήθη αὐτήν. — because it had been well builded.

The common reading here is attested by A, C, D, E, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, nearly all the cursive's, the Old

1 See Liddell and Scott, Robinson, and Thayer on these compounds, ἀπολαμβάνειν, etc., as well as Pickering's Lexicon under ἀπὸ, viii. (17) (18).
in other words, is based upon the truth, is one who is able to withstand and survive the storms and tests to which his character is subjected, not because it is a symmetrical, well-built character, but because it is "rooted and grounded" in firm and enduring principles. The trouble with the Revisers' text is that it is the work of one who was not satisfied to leave the house in the unfinished condition in which Jesus' statement concerning it seems to leave it by referring to the foundation only. The house spoken of in the next verse is a completed house; hence our ancient reviser concluded that this should be. And inasmuch as it was well begun by having a good foundation, he inferred that it was "well builded" throughout. Hence his reason why the house did not fall, which implies not so much that the house had a solid foundation as that it had been strongly and substantially built. This reason, however, not only contradicts, but robs of its force and point, the reason that Jesus gave, which represents the house in an unfinished state, and therefore the more liable to have been carried away if it had not had a deeply laid and solid foundation.

vii. 11.

Rec. T. ἵππος ἔτοις πόλιν— he went into a city.
Rev. T. ἵππος ήταν & πόλιν—he went to a city.

The aorist of the Revised Text is supported only by Ν, Б, Ρ, and the lost uncial represented by Ferrar's group; while the imperfect of the Received Text is attested by А, С, Д, Е, Ф, Г, Η, Κ, Ι, Μ, Σ, Υ, Χ, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursive except 13, 69, 346, and by the Old Latin and Vulgate Versions. The imperfect is what the context demands. The aorist takes us in thought to Nain,—"he went to a city called Nain." But in the next verse we read, "as he drew near to the gate of the city," and find that Jesus had not yet arrived there. The imperfect, however, which is by far the best attested form, gives a reading in accordance with fact, and with what Luke

Latin, Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, and Armenian. The revised is vouched for by Ν, Б, Η, Е, two cursives, the Memphitic Version, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Cyril of Alexandria. The Ethiopic Version combines the two, and reads, "because it had been built upon a rock, and had been well built." Those who accept the revised reading consider the other as a gloss from Matt. vii. 25. But it is plainly the true reading. Matthew reports Jesus to have given, as the reason why the house fell not, that "it was founded upon rock," and not on sand; and this reading has come down to us without having its genuineness questioned. We cannot doubt therefore that the reason which Jesus really gave why the house did not fall was, that "it was founded on rock," and not because it had been well built. In fact, if Matthew's report of Christ's words is correct, we should expect that Luke's would correspond with it; not that the latter would represent Jesus as assigning a different reason for the stability of the structure from that which Matthew ascribes to him. And this conviction grows, the more the passage is considered. The beginning of the verse represents Jesus as speaking of a house in process of erection; one that a man "was building," not "had built," as the Revisers' perfect ὁικοδομῆσαι, at the end of the verse, says. "He is like a man building a house, who had digged, and gone deep, and laid the foundation on rock; but (apparently while he was in the process of building) a freshet came, and the river dashed against that house, and could not shake it," not because it had been well builded, but "because it had been founded on (solid) rock." The point of the Saviour's comparison lay in the nature of the foundation given to the house. The house might have been well builded, yet if it had not been on a solid foundation, it could not have withstood the flood. And this accords with the teaching of the context. Jesus is speaking with reference to the groundwork, the foundation of character. The man that accepts his teachings and obeys them, whose life,
would naturally say, — "he was going to a city called Nain, and many of his disciples were accompanying him; and as he drew near to the gate of the city, behold," etc.

vii. 32.
Rec. T. καὶ λέγουσιν — and saying.
Rev. T. δὲ λέγει — which say.

The Revisers' reading, which is found only in Ξ as left by its original scribe, B, and the cursive τ, is far too feebly attested to be allowed to supersede the common reading, which is supported by Α, Ε, Γ, Η, Κ, Μ, Ρ, Σ, Υ, Χ, Π, Δ, ΠΙ, nearly all the cursive, five copies of the old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions. D, L, the four cursive of Ferrar's group, and half a dozen copies of the Old Latin, — as the result of some old scribe's regarding λέγουσιν as the third person plural of the present indicative instead of the dative of the present participle, and of his desire to remove all ambiguity in regard to it, — have λέγοντες instead of καὶ λέγουσιν; and Tischendorf adopts this as the true reading! But, because παιδία is neuter, Ξ as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, Ξ, and 157 read λέγοντα instead. The Revisers' reading may be an apparently hard reading; and on this account, as it is the reading of Ξ, B, it was the more readily adopted by Westcott and Hort, from whom it passed into the Revised Text. But it is simply another attempt to solve the difficulty that presented itself to the critic whose reading D, L, etc., adopted; only, instead of adopting a participial construction, these manuscripts adopt a relative clause with the verb in the singular. The ninth-century manuscript Α and the cursive 262 prefer the plural form of λέγοντες, which differs from the original only in taking λέγοντες as a third person plural instead of a participle, and substituting οἱ for καὶ. The original construction, which is followed by Lachmann, is obviously the simple, natural reading of the Received Text, — λέγουσιν being, of course, a present participle like the preceding ones, with which it is connected by καὶ. If this word had invariably been taken as a participial form, there would have been no rival readings.

vii. 33.
Rec. T. μὴ ἄρτον ἱσθίων μὴτε οἶνον πίνων, — neither eating bread, nor drinking wine.
Rev. T. μή ἄρτον ἱσθίων μὴτε οἶνον πίνων, — eating no bread nor drinking wine.

This singular reading, — which literally translated makes Jesus say, John the Baptist has come, " not eating bread, nor drinking wine," — is supported only by Ξ, Β, Ε, 157, and ι of the Old Latin, which Orosius partially quotes as follows: Venit Johannes non manducans neque bibens, without the additional words panem et vinum. The common reading is overwhelmingly attested by Α (C is defective), D, E, G, H, K, L, M, Ρ, S, Υ, Χ, Π, Δ, Λ, ΠΙ, every cursive and copy of the old Latin; but one, the Vulgate, and all other versions. With this testimony before us, it is incredible that Luke wrote μὴ, "not" . . . μὴ, "nor," when his usual manner of negatively coupling two similar phrases or expressions is μή, "neither" . . . μή, "nor." In reporting a familiar saying of Christ's like this, given without variation in Matthew (xi. 18), and in perfect accordance with his own manner of speaking, it would have been hardly possible for Luke to depart from his customary style. So obvious a departure under such circumstances, especially when so feebly attested, is far more justly to be attributed to some inadvertent scribe than to so correct a writer as Luke.

viii. 3.
Rec. T. αἴτινες διηκόνουν αὐτῷ — which ministered unto him.
Rev. T. αἴτινες διηκόνουν αὐτῷς — which ministered unto them.

The "many ancient authorities" to which the marginal note refers as supporting the received reading are Ξ, Α, Λ, Μ, Χ, Π, ι, 33, and a multitude of other cursive, four copies of the Old Latin, the Clementine and several manuscripts of Jerome's
Vulgate, the Memphitic, Armenian, Ethiopic, the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Tertullian. The revised reading is attested by B, D, E, F, G, H, K, S, U, V, Π, Δ, Λ, about ninety cursive, six copies of the Old Latin and as many of the Vulgate, the Curetonian and Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian, the Gothic, and Anglo-Saxon Versions, and Augustine. So that the external evidence is about equally divided. Considered with reference to textual probabilities, it may seem at first view as if αὐτός was the result of transcriptional error, though not very probable, arising from lingering impressions received from Matt. xxvii. 55 and Mark xv. 41; while αὐτοῖς could not have crept into the text in any such way, but must be there because placed there by the evangelist. But it will be seen that not only the twelve are spoken of (verse 1) as being with Jesus, but certain women who ministered to him. Now, for Luke to have said that the twelve and certain women who ministered to them were with Jesus, is morally impossible. Nor can he be supposed to have written αὐτοῖς, intending thereby to include both Jesus and his disciples. The whole context forbids such a supposition. The women followed Jesus, and ministered, not to his disciples' wants, but to his. And so Mark (xv. 41) gives us to understand in speaking of the Magdalene and others as women who, "when he was in Galilee, followed him and ministered unto him." They "had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities" by him; and, in their gratitude and love, they followed him and ministered to him. Their hearts were centred on him; it was he whom they desired to serve and did serve. Αὐτοῖς is plainly the work of a stupid "reviser," a "Western" reading, but is found in some of the so-called "best" documents, as B, D, and the Curetonian Syriac.

viii. 6.
Rec. T. ἄριστος ἐπεσε — some fell.
Rev. T. ἄριστος κατέπεσε — other fell.

On seeing this new reading, one instinctively asks why Luke, within the compass of four successive verses (5–8), in expressing one and the same idea, should three times have written ἐπεσε, "fell," and once κατέπεσε, "fell down." There is absolutely no apparent reason for it. The latter word is used but twice elsewhere in the New Testament, and there by Luke (Acts xxvi. 14, xxviii. 6), where there is an obvious reason for its use. On consulting the manuscripts, however, for the testimony in support of this reading, and finding that it consists of only B, L, R, Ξ, the enigma is solved. It is that group of false witnesses, headed by the Vatican Codex, with which we have been contending and must still contend through this Gospel on account of the almost constant deprivations which they present as genuine readings. The word is an emendation introduced by a second- or third-century corrupter of the text to give variety to the phrasing. And because it appears in B, L, Ξ, and differs from Matthew's and Mark's language, each of whom uses ἐπεσε every time, most of our modern editors conclude that it is the true reading! Lachmann, however, very properly holds to the received reading, which is attested by N: A (C is defective), D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, and every known cursive.

Rec. T. οἱ ἀκούοντες — they that hear.
Rev. T. οἱ ἀκούοντες — they that have heard.

This is another false reading, supported by N, B, L, U, Ξ, and half a dozen cursive only. It is an early alteration of the genuine text to make the reading correspond with that in verses 14, 15. If ἀκούοντες had been the original word, there would have been no temptation to change it. The received reading is attested by A (C is defective, and D has ἀκούοντες, — a blunder), E, G, H, K, M, R, S, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursive, Origen, and every ancient version, — a circumstance utterly inexplicable if we deny that this is the genuine reading.
viii. 26, 37.

On the various readings, "Gerasenes," "Gergesenes," and "Gadarenes," appearing here in the ancient manuscripts, and referred to in the marginal note, see Note on Matt. viii. 28. The received reading "Gadarenes" is, no doubt, spurious. Which of the two forms "Gerasenes" and "Gergesenes" is the true one here may be a question. Lachmann, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort adopt the former; while Tischendorf, with the preponderance of Greek manuscripts in his favor, adopts the latter.

viii. 27.

Rec. T. ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν αὐτῷ ἀνήρ τις — And when he went forth to land, there met him a certain man.

Rev. T. ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν ἄνήρ τις — And when he was come forth upon the land, there met him a certain man.

The omission of the second αὐτῷ here is called for by only Ν, B, E, Ζ, about a dozen cursive, and Pseudo-Athanasius. The word was considered superfluous because of the preceding ἐξελθόντι αὐτῷ. But Luke, in accordance with oriental usage, repeated the pronoun for the sake of perspicuity after the preceding words which separate from the verb its true object. The phraseology is common to Luke and the other synoptic writers. In this case it is attested as genuine by A (C defective), D, F, G, H, K, L, M, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, and all but a dozen cursive. If this redundant word were not genuine, it would hardly have found its way into the text, and been so generally accepted.1

1 Compare Winers's Gram. § xxii. 4, a. Also Buttmann's Gram. of N. T. Greek, § 130, marg. 2, p. 143 of Amer. edition; and Note 2, same page.

LUKE.

viii. 35.

Rec. T. ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἔξελθεν, — out of whom the devils were departed.

Rev. T. ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἔξελθεν, — from whom the devils were gone out.

The Revisers have here adopted a reading found in no Greek manuscript except Ν and Β. Nor is this all. They have changed the tense of the Greek verb, but not that of the corresponding English. If there is anything in their plea of necessity for a revision of the Greek in order to get at a correct revision of the English, they should have given us "went out" instead of "were gone out," which is equivalent to "had gone out," the English for the Greek pluperfect which they have set aside. It seems hardly worth while that a reading which, three verses farther on, is used to express the same thought under the same conditions, and which every one admits is genuine there, should be branded as spurious here on the sole testimony of two manuscripts which are given to just such alterations, and which we have shown to be repeatedly united in error; then, after the adoption of a questionable reading, that this reading should be rendered, not by a tense-form which properly belongs to it, and for which it might be supposed it was adopted, but by one that belongs to the discarded reading.

viii. 43.

"Some ancient authorities," says the marginal note, "omit had spent all her living upon physicians, and." That is, B and Zohrab's Armenian Version simply omit these words, while D and the Thebaic Version omit them, then change the rest of the verse so as to make it read "whom no one could heal." If it were a mere omission it might be attributed to oversight. But the tampering by some with the last clause plainly shows it to be a deliberate abridgment of the text. Instead of the
words omitted from B, Origen (Wks. iii. 239) reads, ἐδεικνύει
τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα ἑλς τῶν ἱατρῶν, "had used up all that she
possessed upon her physicians"; and it is not unlikely that
the scribe of B, as was his wont, in his inability to decide
whether this reading or the commonly accepted one is the true
one, cut the Gordian knot by simply ignoring both. And this
he could the more readily do, because the omission does not
materially vitiate the narrative; it only weakens the statement.
That the words omitted by B are genuine, there can be no doubt.
They are overwhelmingly attested by S, A, C, E, F, G, H,
K, L, M, P, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Ζ, Π, all the cursives, and
all the early versions except the Thebaic, and the Armenian
as it appears in one edition. Yet Westcott and Hort, in their
devotion to B, D, omit them, without intimating, in either text
or appendix, the fact or the ground of the omission. Hort's
"Introduction" intimates (p. 177) that the common reading
here is "a distinctively Alexandrian reading, indubitably such,"
i.e. to the writer of that Introduction, because not found in B,
and therefore it does not "approve itself [to him] as genuine
against Western and neutral texts combined"; or, in plain
English, against D and B combined! A fair specimen of the
reasoning with which that Introduction abounds.

viii. 45.

The "ancient authorities" that "omit and they that were
with him" are B, Π, less than ten cursives, the Thebaic, and
the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac Versions,—a company
of witnesses by no means the most assuring or trustworthy.
At first glance, it is true, the words may appear to have been
added so as to make the statement agree in substance with
Mark's (v. 31) "and his disciples said unto him." But, in that
case, "Peter said" would probably have been changed to "his
disciples said." It is much more likely that the words were
omitted because of their seeming indefiniteness,—as possibly
referring to the other disciples, and possibly to the crowd,—
possibly to those with Jesus, possibly to those with Peter. To
obviate all this uncertainty, they were dropped as unnecessary.
Westcott and Hort accept the omission as representing Luke's
text, though the words are attested as genuine by S, A, C, D,
E, G, H, K, L, M, P, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Ζ, all the cursives, and
every version except the three above mentioned.
Some of the Greek manuscripts, however, represent "with
him" by μετ' αὐτῷ, others by σὺν αὐτῷ.

viii. 45.

Rec. T. καὶ λέγεις, Τίς ὁ ἀφάνενς μου; — and sayest thou, Who
touched me?
Rev. T. Omits.

The omission is supported by S, B, L, 1, 22, 131, 157, the
two Egyptian and the Armenian Versions. But the words are
attested as a part of Luke's text by A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K,
M, P, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all but four cursives, the Old
Latin, the Vulgate, all four of the Syriac Versions, and the
Gothic and Ethiopic. Because the words are wanting in ten
documents, it is inferred by some that they were imported into
the text from Mark (v. 31), though several hundred other doc-
uments, by having them, testify to the contrary. But it is said,
two of the ten are the oldest Greek manuscripts of the New
Testament that we have, and two others are among the oldest of
the versions. Very true; but it does not follow from this that
their testimony is infallible, and should set aside that of all the
other witnesses. Codex A, among the latter, is but a few years
younger than S and B, which date no farther back than the
middle of the fourth century, while A is generally assigned to
the beginning or middle of the fifth century, "though it may
be referred even to the end of the fourth century, and is cer-
tainly not much later." 1 Codex C is assigned to the middle
of the fifth century,—being perhaps a hundred years or so
later than S and B. But there are no older New-Testament

1 Scrivener, Introduction, p. 97.
documents extant than the Old Latin and two of the Syriac Versions, which reach back nearly to the first century. So that, if age of documents is to decide the question, it is decided in favor of the received reading. But a few years' difference in age has less to do with the question than the general character of the documents. Tried by this standard, the testimony of A and C will lose nothing whatever by a comparison with their somewhat older rivals. And when, as in this instance, the testimony of the former is so generally and strongly supported, we cannot but believe that the reason of this is that it is testimony in support of the truth. This will become more apparent perhaps from the following considerations. The fact that Mark represents the disciples as having uttered these words in this connection is evidence sufficient that they did do it, but no evidence whatever that Luke did not insert the same words in his text. The testimony of the oldest witnesses that we have, and, in fact, of all but ten of the witnesses that we have, is to the effect that Luke did embody these words in his record. And we see no reason why he should not have done it just as well as Mark. Indeed, the position of the word ἔθανο, which follows immediately after in Jesus' reply, or rather the emphasis which that position demands for the word, implies that Luke did insert the omitted words. His ἔθανο is correctly translated "did touch"; and the fact that Jesus is recorded by Luke to have said, "Some one did touch me," necessarily implies that Luke also recorded the disciples' words, "And sayest thou, Who touched me?" If he had given Jesus' reply as in the Revised Text, as if it referred to the more general declaration, "The multitudes throng thee and press thee," he would naturally have written, "But Jesus said, τίς ἔθανόν μοι, Some one touched me; for" etc. — without the special emphasis of "did touch," implied in the position given by him to ἔθανο. The words are wanting in the few documents that are without them, probably as many others are wanting, from the abbreviating propensity of some early copyist, who lessened his task by omitting here and there a word or a clause, and at the same time satisfied himself that he was doing his duty because that word or clause seemed to him unnecessary or obscure. And the fact that the omission is confined to a few copies, and those mostly if not altogether of Egyptian or Alexandrian origin, is prima-facie evidence that it is a false reading.

ix. 2.

"Some ancient authorities," says the marginal note, "omit the sick;" — making the verse read, "And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal." The only known Greek manuscript that does this is B; and the only version, the Curetonian Syriac; — on the strength of which, Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort omit "the sick." It would not have been strange if Luke had left both verbs in this sentence without an object, and written simply "And he sent them forth to preach and to heal." But, with no better evidence of the fact, it is incredible that so careful and elegant a writer as Luke should have written so unbalanced a sentence as "And he sent them forth to preach the kingdom of God, and to heal." The omission is probably due to there having arisen at an early day a difference of reading in what follows, — some having τοὺς ἀπεθανόντας, and others τοὺς ἀσθενείς. In some scribe's indifference, or inability to decide, as to the true object of the latter verb, that object was omitted altogether, and the reader left to infer what it might be. The omission is a palpable one, and hence its very limited acceptance.

ix. 10.

Rec. T. ὑπεκάρπησε καὶ ἵλαν ἐίς τόπον ἢμην πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαϊδα. — he went aside privately into a desert place, belonging to the city called Bethsaida.

Rev. T. ὑπεκάρπησε καὶ ἵλαν ἐίς πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδα. — he withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida.

The revised reading is that given by the earlier seventh-century corrector of Χ, B, L, X, Σ, 33, the Memphitic, The-
baic, and Erpenius' Arabic Version. D alone reads κώμη, "a village," instead of πόλις, "a city." The received reading is attested by A, C, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, most of the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, except that Α and five or six cursives read ἐρημοῦ τοῦτον instead of τοῦτον ἐρημοῦ, which latter, from the fact of its being an unusual order yet almost universally adopted, may be considered the true one; while the original scribe and the later seventh-century corrector of Ν, two cursives (counting 13, 69, and 346 of Ferrar's group as one), and the Curetonian Syriac read simply "to a desert place"; three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the Peshito Syriac, "to a desert portion of Bethsaida"; and three other copies of the Old Latin, "to a desert place called Bethsaida." Thus, it will be seen, the original text has been greatly disturbed. If we can find the cause of this disturbance, we may be able to decide upon the genuine text. The first three evangelists are united in pronouncing the place where the five thousand men, and perhaps as many more women and children, were fed "a desert place" (Matt. xiv. 13, 15; Mark vi. 31, 32, 35; Luke ix. 12). All the above readings except that adopted by the Revisers, that is, all the witnesses in the present instance except ten, also represent Jesus as retiring with his disciples to a desert place. Of these ten, nine say that Jesus withdrew "to a city," and one that he withdrew "to a village." A city, it must be confessed, is a less likely place than a village for one to withdraw himself to, "apart" from a crowd. This may account for the reading of D, "to a village." Generally, when Jesus withdrew from the multitudes, and sought to be "apart" or by himself, he went to some solitary place, a wilderness, or a mountain. This is the only passage in which we read of his withdrawing apart to a city; and even this reading is attested by only nine or at most ten witnesses, two of them dating from the second or third century, one from the fourth, and the rest being of later date, while the great majority of the witnesses testify against it. And these include not only A and C of the fifth century, and hundreds of witnesses in after centuries, but even the Syriac and Latin Versions of the second century, and Ν, the Vulgate, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions of the fourth century. All this testimony goes to show that the reading, "He withdrew apart to a desert place," is not only the natural but the true reading. So far then we are justified by the documentary evidence before us in considering this reading genuine. How is it as to the additional expressions, "of Bethsaida," "called Bethsaida," and "belonging to a city called Bethsaida"? At first view, one might think that, if Luke had neither given one of these forms, nor used the phrase "to a city called Bethsaida," no scribe would ever have devised such an adjunct in this connection. But the fact that this qualification of the term "desert" appears under three different forms naturally awakens suspicion respecting its genuineness. And when we consider the indefiniteness of the unqualified expression "a desert place," it is not difficult to see that some early reader,— wishing to locate the desert, and knowing from Matt. xiv. 22, 34 that the place was on the east side of the lake, and knowing also that there was such a place near the head of the lake easily accessible by land from the northwestern shore, adjacent to what was formerly called Bethsaida, and is even so called in Mark viii. 22,— probably placed in the margin the word Βηθσαΐδα, "of Bethsaida," "belonging to Bethsaida," or "which was Bethsaida," simply to note his idea as to its locality. This word soon afterwards naturally enough found its way into the text. Hence its appearance in the Peshito Syriac Version, in a few manuscripts of the Old Latin, and in the Vulgate. Others, to define it more accurately, inserted the word καλοῦμενος, making it read, "to a desert place called Bethsaida." But some one, not satisfied with either of these readings, changed the expression to πόλεως καλοῦμενης Βηθσαΐδα, "belonging to a city called Bethsaida," as the Received Text has it, while another, having no knowledge
of any Bethsaida but that in Galilee, or of any desert place worthy of mention near that city, boldly struck out τόπον ἐρημ. μον. and instead wrote πόλιν (which still another changed to κόμην) καλομινήν Βηθσαία, "a city called Bethsaida," as the Revisers have it, or "a village called Bethsaida," as Codex D has it. The location of the desert is no doubt correctly given by those documents that attempt to locate it; but each of the forms in which it appears must be considered simply a gloss. We may be assured also that Luke could not have said that Jesus withdrew apart to "a city," when Matthew (xiv. 13) and Mark (vi. 31, 32), as well as Luke himself indirectly in verse 12, state that the place to which Jesus and his disciples retired was a desert.

ix. 35.

Rec. T. Οὔτος ἦσαν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός—This is my beloved Son.
Rev. T. Οὔτος ἦσαν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλειπομένος—This is my Son, my chosen.

The ancient authorities, referred to in the marginal note as sustaining the received reading here, are A, C, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursive, five manuscripts of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, Epiphanius twice, and Tertullian. The revised reading is attested by Ν, B, L, Ξ, the margin of one cursive, three copies of the Old Latin, one of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, one manuscript of the Ethiopic, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version. The other, though the more strongly attested, is rejected because it corresponds with the reading in Matt. xvii. 5, and Mark ix. 7; while this is adopted mainly because it differs from that reading. It is not, however, in the middle voice, as the word is everywhere else in the New Testament. Nor is it the word that Luke elsewhere employs to express this meaning. (See xviii. 7; xxiii. 35.) It has the appearance of being the work of another hand. The fact that the received reading corresponds with that given in Matthew and Mark, instead of militating against its genuineness, is rather in its favor; for these evangelists are giving a report of the utterance of another,—a brief, sententious, well-known, and easily remembered form of words, that like a proverb had passed from one to another in precisely the same language probably till long after it had been committed to writing. It is a significant fact that the Apostle Peter gives this utterance in the language in which it is recorded by Matthew and Mark: "This is my beloved Son." (2 Pet. i. 7.) It indicates that this was the only wording known in the apostles' days, and consequently must be the mould into which Luke cast the thought. Besides all this, the abundant testimony from nearly every part of ancient Christendom in support of the common reading ought to satisfy any candid, thoughtful person that it is the true reading.

ix. 54.

A marginal note informs the reader that some ancient documents omit the final clause of this verse,—"as Elijah also did." These documents are Ν, B, L, Ξ, two cursive, four copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian Syriac, one manuscript of the Memphitic, the Armenian, Wheelocke's Persic Version, and Cyril of Alexandria; in view of which testimony the words have been omitted by the Revisers also. But they are attested as genuine by A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursive, the best copies of the Old Latin, Schwartz's and Wilkins' editions of the Memphitic, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic and Ethiopic Versions, Basil, Chrysostom, and others. It was but natural that the words should have been uttered in this connection by persons familiar with the history of Elijah, as James and John of course were, to justify themselves in making the request they did. And unless one has made up his mind that the testimony of Ν, B, L, and the Curetonian Syriac Version is...
necessarily conclusive, and all other evidence must be set aside, there is no good reason why this reading should not be considered genuine. It seems to have been omitted to save Elijah from the apparent rebuke implied in Jesus' censuring the two disciples for expressing themselves as they did; just as if his case was really similar to theirs.

ix. 55.

The closing part of this verse,—“and said, Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of,”—which is omitted from the text by the Revisers, is wanting in \( \text{K}, \text{A}, \text{B}, \text{C}, \text{E}, \text{F}, \text{G}, \text{H}, \text{I}, \text{S}, \text{V}, \text{X}, \text{A}, \text{E}, 28, 33, 36, 71, 157, \) and about sixty other cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, and two of the Vulgate, some editions and manuscripts of the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, Basil, and Jerome,—a strong array of witnesses, it must be confessed; while it appears in \( \text{D}, \text{F}^\text{W}, \text{K}, \text{M}, \text{U}, \text{I}, \text{A}, \text{II}, \) the majority of the cursives; most copies of the Old Latin and Vulgate Versions, some copies of the Memphitic, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Armenian, the Gothic, and one copy of the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and others. If the words could be found in any of the other Gospels, it would be said at once that they were imported thence; but this cannot be done. This short, pointed utterance does not seem at all like a transcriber's addition. It is every way worthy of Jesus himself. Nor does it seem as if Luke could have written the verse without adding the very language of the rebuke to which he refers in the preceding words, and without which his narrative appears tame and unfinished. It may have appeared to some early scribe to be too harsh and severe an utterance to be attributed to Jesus, and, on this account, dropped from the text. This would readily account for its non-appearance in so many ancient documents. It is so apposite, and has so strong marks of genuineness, it ought to be retained as a part of Luke's text.

The clause that follows, however, in verse 56, is so destitute of the support of the earliest extant Greek manuscripts that possibly it will need to be abandoned as a later and yet a very early addition; for, though wanting in the oldest known Greek manuscripts, which date only from the fourth and fifth centuries, it is found in our earliest extant documents, the Old Latin, Syriac, and Memphitic Versions, which reach back to the second and third centuries. It is also attested by Cyprian, A.D. 253, and by Ambrose, of the fourth century.

x. 1.

The addition of \( \delta\iota\sigma\omega \) here and in verse 17, referred to in the marginal note, making the number seventy-two instead of seventy that the Lord appointed and sent out, is found only in \( \text{B}, \text{D}, \text{M}, \text{R}, 1, 42, \text{a}, \text{e}, \text{g}^\text{I}, \text{l} \) of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian Syriac, the Armenian, Clement of Alexandria, Hilary, Epiphanius, and Augustine. It is simply giving "in round numbers"—six dozen—what is more exactly stated as seventy by \( \text{K}, \text{A}, \text{C}, \text{E}, \text{G}, \text{H}, \text{K}, \text{I}, \text{S}, \text{U}, \text{V}, \text{X}, \text{I}, \text{A}, \text{E}, \text{H}, \text{II}, \) all but two cursives, \( \text{b}, \text{f}, \text{q} \) of the Old Latin, the Peshito, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and the earlier Fathers Irenæus and Tertullian, as well as Eusebius,—in at least five different places,—Basil, Ambrose, and Cyril of Alexandria.

x. 15.

Rec. T. σύ, Καπερναούμ, ἡ ἡδον τοῦ οἴκου υφωθείσα, — thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven.

Rev. T. σύ, Καπερναούμ, μὴ ἡδον τοῦ οἴκου υφωθείση; — thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?

The former is the reading of \( \text{A}, \text{C}, \text{E}, \text{G}, \text{K}, \text{M}, \text{R}, \text{S}, \text{U}, \text{V}, \text{W}, \text{X}, \text{I}, \text{A}, \text{II}, \) all the cursives, \( \text{e}, \text{f}, \text{g}^\text{I}, \text{q} \) of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Augustine; the latter, that of \( \text{K}, \text{B}, \text{D}, \text{L}, \)
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E, a, b, c, i, l of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, the Memphitic, and the Ethiopic Version. This reading, however, is not genuine. It originated, as did the same false reading in Matt. xi. 23, by a careless doubling of the last letter of "Capernaum," making μη out of η, which subsequently required the changing of υψωθεῖα into the personal form υψωθήση. (See Note on Matt. xi. 23.)

X. 21.

Rec. T. ἡγαλλίσατο τῷ πνεύματι,—he rejoiced in spirit.

Rev. T. ἡγαλλίσατο τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἁγίῳ,—he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit.

The words τῷ Ἁγίῳ, "the Holy," though attested by S, B, C, D, K, L, X, Ε, Π, 1, 33, and five other cursive, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, must be viewed as "a pious addition," a gloss early introduced to prevent πνεύματι from being taken by ignorant readers in the same sense as the πνεύματα, evil "spirits," of the preceding verse. The only reading is the natural one of the Received Text, which is sufficiently attested by A, E, G, H, M, S, U, V, W*, Γ, Δ, Λ, nearly all the cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Gothic, Clement of Alexandria, and Basil.

X. 32.

Rec. T. καὶ Δευτής γενόμενος κατὰ τὸν τόπον, Ἡλθὼν καὶ ἦσαν—And a Levite, when he was at the place, came and looked on him and.

Rev. T. καὶ Δευτής κατὰ τὸν τόπον Ἡλθὼν καὶ ἦσαν—a Levite also, when he came to the place, and saw him.

The omission of γενόμενος is favored by the earlier seventh-century corrector of S, who in fact supplies the whole verse omitted through oversight by the original scribe, also by B, L, X, Ε, 1, 33, 118, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and apparently the Ethiopic Version. But the word was evidently dropped as

redundant in connection with θλῶν. There is no reason for its being introduced into the text by any transcriber or reader; and its presence can be accounted for only by its being genuine. It is attested by A, C, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursive, q of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions. The omission of the superfluous τυχάνοντα in verse 30, an omission which the Revisers have also adopted, is doubtless due to the same cause. No transcriber would ever have introduced it.

X. 38.

Rec. T. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ πορεύοντα αὐτοῖς καὶ—Now it came to pass, as they went, that.

Rev. T. Ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύοντα αὐτοῖς—Now as they went on their way.

In support of the former reading, we have A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly every cursive, every copy of the Old Latin and the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The latter is the reading of S, B, L, Ε, 33, the Curetonian Syriac and Memphitic Versions. The expression "It came to pass that" may be said to be a characteristic of Luke's style. He uses it more than five times as often as all the other writers of the New Testament combined. Hence, in Luke, when we find this expression largely supported by respectable witnesses, and at the same time wanting in the text of other documents, we cannot but suspect that it has been eliminated from the latter by some hand aiming after a more concise style. Especially is this the case when, as here, the statement embodying the occurrence referred to is connected to Ἐγένετο by καὶ. If the revised reading had been the original reading here, it is incredible that any one, whether critic or copyist, would ever have changed it to the more cumbersome Hebraistic form found in the Received Text.
X. 41, 42.

The entire passage, "Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things; but one thing is needful, and Mary hath chosen," etc., is reduced in a marginal note to "Martha, Martha, thou art troubled; Mary hath chosen," etc. This, we are told, is the reading of "a few ancient authorities." But who are they? and what right has any one to expect that they can claim our assent to this as the genuine text? They are D, the Old Latin copies a, b, e, ff\(^2\), i, l, and Ambrose, who of course followed his Old Latin Version. The Old Latin manuscript e omits only the words "but one thing is needful"; which Clement of Alexandria also omits in giving the passage evidently from memory. But such testimony is hardly worthy of a moment's consideration in the face of all the witnesses arrayed against it. The note is wholly undeserving of a place in the margin of any copy of the New Testament.

The same may be said, too, of the marginal reading, "but few things are needful, or one," which "many ancient authorities" are said to read in place of "but one thing is needful." That reading is an evident attempt to obviate the apparent narrowness of limiting to "one" thing the need to which the Saviour referred; and that, too, after misconceiving his obvious meaning. The critic or copyist, taking the words as referring to Martha's preparing for a meal, and considering as absurd the idea of the Saviour's saying that one thing (or dish) was all-sufficient, felt it necessary to modify the statement and make it read, "Martha, Martha, thou art anxious and troubled about many things; but few things will do, or (even) one; for Mary hath chosen the choice part," etc. That is, she is provided for, and as there is but one other, or two at the most, to prepare food for, there is no need of being troubled about preparing much; — thus materializing and perverting the whole passage. And this view has been transmitted through the centuries by means of \(\text{\$}, \text{B}, \text{C}'s\) sixth-century emendator, L, r, 33, 36, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Origen as quoted in Victor's Commentary on Mark, and by Jerome, and Cyril of Alexandria. A reading similar to this, but only another gloss, is that of cursive 38, "but there is need of few things," or, as the Jerusalem Syriac has it, "and there is need of little," or, as the Armenian Version prefers, "but there is need of few things here." That is, "Man needs but little here below." The reading of the Received Text is, however, the true reading. It is attested by A, C first hand, as well as its ninth-century corrector, E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, \(\Gamma, \Delta, \Lambda, \Pi\), all the cursive but three, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Basil, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Augustine, and others.

The change which the Revisers have made from "but Mary hath chosen" to "for Mary hath chosen" is an error. The "for" is a part of the false reading of the margin which we have just noticed; and it should have been left with the rest of that reading in the documents in which it was found. There is no propriety whatever in using "for" as a connective here, — the Revisers' text being otherwise the same as the commonly received text which calls for a continuative conjunctive.

XI. 11.

The marginal note informs the reader that "some ancient authorities" make this verse read "And of which of you that is a father shall his son ask a fish, and he for a fish give him a serpent?" — omitting after "ask" the words "a loaf, and he give him a stone? or." The only Greek manuscript that does this is B; the only versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and three copies \(\text{ff\(^2\), i, l}\) of the Old Latin; and the only patristic writers, Origen and Epiphanius. If a few more documents favored the omission, it would doubtless be said that the words thus omitted were introduced from Matt. vii. 9.
But we see no reason why Luke should not have represented Christ as uttering the words as well as Matthew. The two passages in almost every other respect are alike; yet neither should be regarded as taken from the other. The expression “for a fish” rather implies the putting of a previous question like that omitted by B. It may be difficult to say why the words were omitted, unless it was that they were deemed an unnecessary presentation of the thought that reappears in the two following queries.

xi. 34.

Rec. T. ὁ λόγχος τοῦ σώματος ἵστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός — The light of the body is the eye.

Rev. T. ὁ λόγχος τοῦ σώματος ἵστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου — The lamp of thy body is thine eye.

The translation thus given to the Revisers’ Text is inadmissible. The proper rendering is “The lamp of the body is thine eye.” There is nothing in the sentence as it stands, or in the context, implying that τοῦ σώματος, “the body,” stands for τοῦ σώματος σου, “thy body,” as would be the case if the sentence read “Thine eye is the lamp of the (i.e. thy) body.” But this transposition cannot be wrought. “The lamp of the body” is the subject, and “thine eye” is the predicate. This is plain. In the preceding verse, Jesus is represented as speaking of “a lamp” in the ordinary sense of the word, and of what men do with lamps. This leads to his speaking of another kind of lamp, the lamp of the body. This, he says, is the eye. And this it is, by enabling the body or the individual to find his way from place to place with ease, as persons do with a lamp at night. But because, in the very next clause, Jesus passes from the general statement that the lamp of the body is the eye to a personal application, — “When therefore thine eye is single” or sound, — some early critic took it upon himself to insert σου, “thy,” in connection with the preceding ὀφθαλμός, “eye,” as the Revisers have done. Hence we find, at Matt. vi. 22, that B, several copies of the Old Latin, the printed copies of the Vulgate, the Ethiopic Version, Origen according to his Latin interpreter, Hilary, and other Latin Fathers have the same reading that the Revisers have here, though the latter do not adopt that reading in Matthew. To make that reading good, its author must have transposed the construction, though not the words, of the evangelist, making them mean “Thine eye is the lamp of the (thy) body.” The same thing was done, probably by the same hand, here; and his work is preserved by almost the same documents and a few others; namely, Ν first hand, A, B, C, D, M, a few cursives, all the extant manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Ethiopic Version. The scribes and translators of several of these documents, however, like the Revisers, were sensible of the incorrectness and impropriety of this reading without “thy” in connection with “body.” Hence we find D, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, all add σου, “thy,” or its equivalent, to “body,” making the clause read, as the Revisers do, “The lamp of thy body is thine eye.” Thus one wrong required a second to hide the first, if possible. But this additional error not being adopted by the leading manuscripts, especially Ν, B, C, on which the Revisers relied as furnishing the true text, they did not feel warranted in inserting it into their Greek, though they could not keep it out of their English text after having adopted ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου as the predicate of the clause in the original. The only genuine reading is that of the Received Text, which is sufficiently vouched for by Ν as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, E, G, H, K, L (whose testimony is all the stronger from the fact of its deserting B and its usual allies), S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Curetonian Syriac (which also forsakes D and its accustomed companions), and the Armenian Version.
xii. 25.
Rec. T. πῆχυν ἤνα; — one cubit.
Rev. T. πῆχυν ἵνα; — a cubit.

The omission of ἤνα is supported by Ν first hand, B, D, two copies of the Old Latin Version, and the two Egyptian Versions. But its presence is called for, if not by the original scribe, by the contemporary reviser, of Ν, A, E, G, H, K, L, M, Q, S, T, V, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, every known cursive, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, and Eusebius. The weight of external evidence is plainly in support of the received reading. The word might very easily have been omitted under the impression that ἡλικία here denotes "stature," as it sometimes does. If this were the meaning, the use of "one" would appear not only unnecessary but improper; for the addition of eighteen inches to one's height is proportionally no small addition; and to emphasize that measure by saying that a person cannot add "one cubit," meaning thereby even so much as one cubit, is an unnatural, not to say unwarrantable, use of words. Hence the omission of "one" by some early owner or copyist of this Gospel. But the reading "a cubit," leaving the word without anything to note the idea of comparative smallness implied in the original expression, obtained very little currency. The reading "one cubit," ἤνα being emphatic by its position as the last word in the sentence, is confirmed as the true reading, not only by the general documentary evidence in its support,—the error of omitting ἤνα being corrected in Ν almost as soon as made,—but by the fact that the entire sentence including this term agrees word for word with Matthew's report (vi. 27) of the same utterance. This agreement, so far from implying that "one" was added by another hand than Luke's, seeking to conform his report to Matthew's, shows rather that each evangelist, independent of the other, reported the Saviour's words in the only form known at the time of writing the Gospels. The true meaning of the utterance really calls for this word: "Who of you by being anxious can add to his term of life one cubit?" or, as we would naturally say, can prolong his existence a single hand's-breadth or span?

xii. 38.
Rec. T. μακάριοι εἰσιν οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι.—blessed are those servants.
Rev. T. μακάριοι εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι.—blessed are those servants.

It is true the words οἱ δοῦλοι do not appear in B, D, L, of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, one manuscript of the Memphitic, or in the younger Cyril's Commentary. But they are well attested by A, E, G, H, K, M, P, Q, S, T, V, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, all the cursive, ε, η, ι, of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the printed Memphitic, the Thelaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Basal, and John Damascene. Their presence in these is regarded, by those who consider the words spurious, as introduced from verse 37. But why they should have been introduced thence, any more than δ δοῦλος in verse 45 should be from verse 43, or τοῦ δοῦλου ἐκεῖνου (for which I, ε, and the Latin interpreter of Irenæus substitute "his") in verse 46 from verse 43 or 45, is by no means clear. The omission is rather to be regarded as one of those abbreviations that are peculiar to B and a few other documents, but which are simply false readings. The Sinaic Codex, first hand, omits the whole expression "those servants," as do b, f, f, i, l of the Old Latin, two manuscripts of the Vulgate, and Irenæus' Latin interpreter,—a reading which Tischendorf adopts as genuine. But, of the three readings, the common one is most in accordance with Jesus' mode of employing the same phrase again and again after having once used it, and consequently most likely to be the original and true one.
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xiii. 27.
Rec. T. ὅτι ὁ διὰ τοῦ νόμον τὸ δείγμα εἰστὶ— I know you not whence you are.
Rev. T. ὅτι ὁ διὰ τοῦ νόμον τὸ δείγμα εἰστὶ— I know not whence ye are.

The omission of ὅμοιος, "you," is in accordance with B, L, R, Tsoi, 157, 346, two copies of the Old Latin, and one of the Vulgate. But it is an obvious and poorly supported simplification of the more natural Greek form of expression as given in the Received Text, as well as in both texts at verse 25, — where also ε of the Old Latin and one manuscript of the Vulgate adopt the more natural English form of expression, "I know not whence ye are." The meaning, of course, is the same in both cases, as the English rendering should be; but simply as a question of textual correctness, the decision must be given in favor of the Received Text. It is supported by Ν, A, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, 1, 33, and nearly all the other cursives, the Peshito Syriac, several copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Origen. D has instead the reading "I never knew you"; while C is defective. A similar attempt at simplifying the Greek idiom appears in Acts iii. 10, and xvi. 3, the last of which the Revisers have also adopted, notwithstanding the strong testimony in support of the idiomatic form.

xiii. 35.
Rec. T. ἀφείται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος— your house is left unto you desolate.
Rev. T. ἀφείται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν — your house is left unto you desolate.

The common reading here is attested by D, E, G, H, M, U, X, Δ, the majority of the cursives, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Clementine Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, and two manuscripts of the Memphitic, as well as by Chrysostom repeatedly, and Irenæus as represented by his Latin interpreter. The other is vouched for by Ν, A, B, K, L, R, S, V, Γ, A, II, about 80 cursives, four copies of the Old Latin, nine manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and two other manuscripts of the Memphitic. C is defective. This is one of those instances in which manuscript authority is insufficient to satisfy the candid reader that the reading most strongly supported by documentary evidence is of necessity the true one. Hence the Revisers, while omitting ἔρημος from their Greek text, were constrained to retain its equivalent, "desolate," in their version. For, if Luke's text is really what they have given as such, why should they not have conformed to it in their rendering, and said simply "Your house is left unto you,"—especially after having stricken out ἔρημος? It seems as if the fact that they could not really do this ought to have awakened their suspicions in regard to the correctness of their text, notwithstanding it is so strongly attested. The revised Greek text in Matt. xxiii. 38 is the same as here, except that ἔρημος is retained in the text, while a marginal note informs the reader that some ancient copies omit it. The words, in both Gospels, record an utterance of Christ's. Their meaning therefore ought to be substantially the same. According to Matthew, Jesus is allowed to have said, "Your house is left unto you desolate." The emphatic word, the word in which the whole meaning of the declaration centres, is "desolate." All else but leads up to and ends in this. This word, then, may be said to contain the idea for which the sentence was uttered. Take away this, and it is like having "the play of Hamlet with Hamlet left out." As already intimated, some ancient text-tinkers attempted to rid Matthew's record of this word, though their attempt thus far has deceived no one among modern editors, as far as we are aware, but Lachmann and Westcott and Hort. A similar and seemingly more successful attempt was made on Luke's text. The end was the same in both. It was to save Christ from the appearance of having made an erroneous statement,—a statement which was not thought to be justified by subsequent events. For, after Jerusalem had
been destroyed by Titus, and, as Josephus says, had been "so thoroughly laid even with the ground, ... that there was left nothing to make those that came thither believe it had ever been inhabited," ¹ it was less than two generations before it was rebuilt. It was not very long "left desolate," deserted, uninhabited. Hence some pious second-century critic thought it necessary to strike out ἐρμος from this recorded utterance of Christ's. It was, no doubt, well meant; but it was an unwitting elimination of the very heart and soul of that utterance. In view of all this, notwithstanding the array of witnesses in support of the Revisers' reading, it is incredible that Luke could have reported this saying in a manner almost identical with Matthew's, and yet so unlike his as to leave it disembodied of its real meaning.

xiv. 5.

A marginal note calls attention to the fact that a number of ancient documents read "a son" in place of "an ass" in the sentence, "Which of you shall have an ass or an ox fallen into a pit, and will not at once draw him out on the Sabbath day?" A reference to chap. xiii. 15 is then added, as if the word óνος, "an ass," might have crept into the text here from that verse! The documentary witnesses to this marginal reading, which is adopted by almost all textual critics, are A, B, E, G, H, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, about 130 cursive, three copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic Version, the younger Cyril as cited in different catenae, Titus of Bostra, Euthymius, and Theophylact. One cursive (508) and the Curetonian Syriac read, "a son, or an ox, or an ass"; while Codex 215 has "a son or an ass." The received reading, that of the text, is attested by Ξ, K, L, X, Π, 1, 33, 66 second hand, 71, 207 second hand, 211, 213, 253, 259, 407, 413, 492, 509, 512, 547, 549, 550, 569, 570, 599, 602, and probably other cursive, five copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Jerusalem Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic; while D has πρόβατον, "a sheep," in place of "an ass." Textual critics, generally speaking, cannot withstand the mass of documentary evidence in support of "a son"; hence they adopt that reading, under the idea, as expressed by one of them, that "the heterogeneous collocation a son or an ox excited objection, so that a son was displaced in some authorities by an ass (following xiii. 15), in others by a sheep (following Matt. xii. 11)." This may be specious, but it is of no weight. The reading "a son or an ox" is heterogeneous. It was not Christ's way to couple things in this incongruous manner. Looking at the mere probabilities of the case, it is not at all likely that he would have thus spoken of a son and an ox conjointly. To have done it would have been unnatural in the extreme,—altogether unlike anything elsewhere attributed to him. But this is not all. The Saviour evidently sought to convince his hearers that they themselves would not only do a deed of mercy on the Sabbath, but to a creature inferior to man, and that too under circumstances that would require a seemingly greater infraction of the fourth commandment than they considered him to be guilty of. The main point of Jesus' inquiry on this occasion lay in his reference to an animal like an ass or an ox. This is lost if we introduce "a son" instead. However liable a little child might be to fall into an open well or pit, a "son" would hardly be in danger of it; and, if such a one should fall in, he might extricate himself with but little or no help, and do it in a short time. Not so, however, with an ass or an ox. To get one of these large animals out of a pit or well, especially if it were deep, might require much help, in fact the aid of several persons. It might require the greater part of the day. At the best, it would be a laborious task; it would call for hard work,—something that in ordinary circumstances would not be expected or allowable on the Sabbath. Hence the pertinence of the inquiry; this is what

¹ Wars, VII. i. 1.
makes the question not only coherent but exceedingly apposite; which would not be the case if asked with reference to "a son or an ox." The whole argument from internal evidence is plainly and decidedly against the marginal reading; while the close resemblance between ONEW and OYIOH (the reading of A, S, U, etc., the original form of this false reading, from which the article was afterwards dropped) is enough to account for the blunder of the scribe who changed the text to ὃ νός, "son." The fact that this erroneous reading occurs in so many ancient manuscripts and versions only shows that it was made at a very early day. Its antiquity is in itself no evidence of genuineness.

xiv. 17.
Rec. T. ἦδη ἐτοιμά ὅτι πάντα.—all things are now ready.
Rev. T. ἦδη ἐτοιμά ὅτι.—all things are now ready.

The presence of πάντα, "all things," is called for by B as amended probably by the scribe’s "proof-reader," A, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the whole body of the cursive, four copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and by Eusebius of Emisa in his Commentary on Luke. Its omission is found only in B first hand, and afterwards as its first corrector’s emendation was changed by a seventh-century corrector, B, I, R, and half a dozen copies of the Old Latin. The omission looks more like the result of carelessness on the part of a scribe than the work of the original writer, who would hardly have left the sentence thus unfinished; for, without πάντα, the clause is absolutely without a subject; it needs to be translated, "They are now ready." But, if we ask, What are ready? there is nothing in the context to which "they" can be referred. The only thing that has been spoken of is a great supper in preparation. The clause cannot be translated "It is now ready"; for ἐτοιμα, "ready," is in the plural. The presence of πάντα, "all things," is a necessity in order to express the meaning and complete the sentence. The Revisers show this by their rendering, in which "things" is just as much unrepresented in the original as is "all," which they have italicized. No doubt the word was carelessly omitted, or lost through defacement of an early manuscript.

 xv. 16.
Rec. T. ἐπέδημα γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλιὰν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κερατῶν— he would fain have filled his belly with the husks.
Rev. T. ἐπέδημα χορτασθῆναι ἐκ τῶν κερατῶν— he would fain have been filled with the husks.

The revised reading is supported by B, D, L, R, 1, 94, 131, 251, and the four cursive of Ferrar’s group, three copies of the Old Latin, apparently the Gothic, the Thebaic, the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, and the Ethiopic. It is adopted, of course, by Westcott and Hort, but placed by Tre- gelles in the margin as a secondary reading. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and the American Committee of Revisers follow the common reading, which is attested by A (C is defective), E, G, H, K, M, P, Q, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the rest of the cursives, nine manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, and the Armenian Version, and Chrysostom. The revised, which is evidently borrowed from chap. xvi. 21, appears to be but an attempt at softening down the harshness of the common reading. This will readily account for its adoption; whereas, if this revised reading were genuine, it would be hard to account satisfactorily for the existence and widespread adoption of the other, which is far from being euphemistic.

 xv. 17.
Rec. T. ἵνα διέ λυμα ἀπόλλυμαι; — and I perish with hunger?
Rev. T. ἵνα διέ λυμα ὑδί ἀπόλλυμαι. — and I perish here with hunger!

The common reading is vouched for by A (C defective), E, G, H, K, M, P, Q, S, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives but
ten or twelve, the Thebaic and Gothic Versions. The other is the reading of $\mathbf{N}$, B, L, e of the Old Latin and the Philoxenian Syriac Version. The reading, $\gamma \omega \delta$ δοκε λυμο $\alpha \pi \omega \lambda \lambda \mu \eta$, however, is given by D, R, U, 1, 67, 73, 127, 131, 184, 209, and three of Ferrar's group, nearly all copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Curetonian, Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, and Chrysostom. This last we believe to be the original reading, from which the other two were derived;—the common reading, by the absorption of δοκε, “here,” in the last three letters of $\gamma \omega \delta$, it being considered a mere repetition of these letters; while the revised reading seems to be a critic's device for saving δοκε to the text by placing it after λυμο. The absorption of δοκε in $\gamma \omega \delta$ is much more probable than that δοκε should have grown out of $\gamma \omega \delta$ from a duplication of the letters. Besides, it is far more likely that the prodigal son, in contrasting his situation at the time with that of his father's servants, should have emphasized his utterance by using the word “here” than that he should not. Indeed, it is but natural that he should have said, “How many hired servants of my father's have bread enough and to spare, and I here am perishing with hunger!” The omission of the word “here” gives the language an unnatural stiffness for one in his circumstances. Then the words that follow, “I will arise and go,” etc., as if he felt an utter disgust for the place where he was, render it morally certain that δοκε, “here,” entered in as a part of his recorded language in verse 17.

**XV. 21.**

Appended to this verse is the marginal note, “Some ancient authorities add, make me as one of thy hired servants. See verse 19.” These additional words are found in $\mathbf{N}$, B, D, U, X, about twenty cursive, and four manuscripts of the Vulgate. But they are wanting in the great body of witnesses; namely, A, E, G, H, K, L, M, P, Q, R, S, V, $\Gamma$, $\Delta$, $\Lambda$, $\Pi$, most of the cursive, all manuscripts of the Old Latin, most copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, and the Armenian. Augustine also speaks explicitly of them as wanting. Westcott and Hort, alone of modern editors, insert the words in the text, bracketing them to indicate that, while in their judgment the primary and true reading includes these words, if they are omitted, a secondary and perhaps genuine reading still remains. The testimony in support of the text, however, ought to prevail. Internal evidence favors the omission. The returning son was yet probably too far away from the house for the father, in his joy and unwillingness to hear any more expressions of sorrow from him, to interrupt him by calling to the servants to furnish him at once with the best there was in the house. It is more likely that, after the young man had received his father's kiss and tender embrace (verse 20), he had no heart to add the words he intended, in reference to being treated as a hired servant. In either case, however, he would have been restrained from uttering them. They really appear to have been added by some unappreciative scribe, who, because they are found in verse 19, supposed that they had been overlooked and omitted here by some previous copyist. It is, in fact, what Dr. Hort would call a “conflate” reading, only it appears in B and some of its companions, instead of in “Syrian” documents. If the reading were genuine, it is simply impossible that it should be so generally wanting because of Augustine's influence.

**XV. 32.**

Rec. T. $\alpha v i h e a$ — is alive again.
Rev. T. $\xi o s e$ — is alive again.

The Revisers' reading follows $\mathbf{N}$ first hand, B, L, R, $\Delta$, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions. It is adopted by Tischendorf on the supposition that the other was taken from verse 24. But even there the same hand shows
itself in B, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions, changing the compound to the simple form, apparently under the impression that the former is needlessly redundant. If ἐν ἵππος is the genuine reading in verse 24, that is just the reason why it should reappear here; while a sensitive critic would naturally seek to change it to the simple form in both places. Besides, if ἐν ἵππος is the true form, faithfulness requires that it be translated "is alive," not "is alive again," especially after "again" has been ejected from the original. Lachmann adopts the common reading, which is abundantly attested by Ν's earlier seventh-century corrector, A, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Α, Π, the whole body of the cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, as well as the Apostolic Constitutions, Chrysostom, and others. This form would hardly have found a place in either of these versions if it had not been genuine.

xvi. 12.

"And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?" A marginal note at the close of this verse says, "Some ancient authorities read our own." So read B, L, one lectionary, and Origen once; while the scribe of 157, three copies of the Old Latin Version, and Tertullian, perceiving the absurdity of the reading, changed it to ιμόν, "mine," which, however, is not much better. The reading, of course, is false. And when it is considered that it is due to mistaking a υ for an η — some careless copyist having written ιμόν for ιμόνον — and that this is one of the most common itacisms in the old manuscripts, and one to which B is especially given, there need be no difficulty or question as to the true reading. As the error appeared in B, L, and Origen, however, Westcott and Hort conclude it must be genuine, and adopt it in their text, while they relegate the true reading to the margin; and in deference to their reverence for the Vatican manuscript the word appears in the margin of the Revision. Considered on its own merits, the reading would undoubtedly have been passed by in silence as a transparent blunder.

xvi. 18.

Rec. T. πᾶς ὁ γαμοῦν — whosoever marrieth.
Rev. T. ὁ γαμοῦν — he that marrieth.

The common reading is that of Ν, A, E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, most of the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Gothic Versions. The Revisers' is that of B, D, L, five cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and the two Egyptian Versions. Both yield the same meaning; but the former is more after Jesus' manner of speaking, he having already used the expression πᾶς ὁ in the beginning of the verse. It is more probable that a reviser of Luke's text changed the phraseology by omitting πᾶς, for variety's sake, than that the word was mechanically repeated in transcribing.

xvii. 3.

Rec. T. εἰν δι' ἀμαρτητὸς εἰς σι ό ἀδελφός σου, — If thy brother trespass against thee.
Rev. T. εἰν ἀμαρτητὸς ὁ ἀδελφός σου, — if thy brother sin.

The former is attested as the true reading by D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursive, three manuscripts of the Old Latin, the printed Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac according to the Codex of Balsalibi, Bishop of Anida, the Armenian of Uscan, and Antiochus; the latter, by Ν, A, B, L, six cursive, nine manuscripts of the Old Latin, and several of the Vulgate, the Peshito, Jerusalem, and most copies of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, Zohrab's Armenian, the Persic of the Polyglot, Clement of Alexandria, and John Damascene. Like the omission in Matt. xviii. 15, found in some documents, the omission here of εἰς σι', which occurred at an early day, seems to have originated in a wish to
generalize the statement so that it might be used to justify persons in rebuking, if not in forgiving or attempting to forgive, other sins than those committed against themselves. That the words "against thee" are a part of the text is apparent from the following considerations. As the passage reads without these words, the statement becomes general, — "If thy brother sin," if he do wrong in any manner or against any one, "rebuke him." Yet the words "If he repent, forgive him," show that the sin is of a personal nature; for one cannot forgive a sin not committed against himself, either directly or indirectly. Besides, if this statement were general, εἰς σέ "against thee," in the next verse would necessarily be emphatic. But, as it is not, the unavoidable inference is that the sinning of this third verse has already been limited by that phrase. The documentary testimony in support of the omission, in itself considered, is no doubt strong; but it is by no means infallible, nor even, in view of the internal evidence against it, is it overwhelming. The context makes it almost self-evident that that testimony cannot be relied on.

xviii. 14.

This verse presents one of those vexed passages, the true reading of which it is exceedingly difficult to determine. The common reading ἢ ἐκεῖνος, "rather than the other," is by no means satisfactory. The idea of preference involved in the word ἢ, "rather than," seems hardly admissible as the Pharisee was not justified at all. Besides, this reading is but feebly supported, — being attested by only a few cursives and the Armenian Version, — and cannot be defended as the true reading. A, E, G, H, K, M, P, Q, S, U, V, X, Τ, Δ, Λ, II, about 150 cursives, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, Basil, Cyril, and Theophylact read ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος. This is adopted by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others as the true reading, — meaning "or (went) then the other?" i.e. justified to his house. But this is harsh, unnatural, and really unparalleled elsewhere. It gives an altogether improbable turn to the discourse, which condemns it as a transcriber's error. N, B, L, 1, the margin of 22, 94, 209, the two Egyptian Versions, and Origen read παρ' ἐκεῖνον, "above the other," in the sense of more than or in preference to the other. This is adopted by Lachmann, Alford, Westcott and Hort, and others. But the same objection lies against this that lies against the common reading; namely, that it implies a preference of the publican to the Pharisee, when there was no preference. The Pharisee went home, not justified in any measure, but wholly condemned. Besides, this is less strongly attested than a genuine reading ought to be. Again, D, the Peshito Syriac, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Persic of the Polyglot, Cyprian, and Augustine read instead μᾶλλον παρ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν φαρισαίον, "rather than that Pharisee," or simply μᾶλλον παρ' ἐκεῖνον, "rather than the other." In view of this variety of readings, and of the unsatisfactory character of them all, it may not be rash to conclude that the readings that have come down to us are simply variations of the original, while the true text is probably lost. The Saviour seems to have said, "This one went down to his house justified," not above, or more than, or rather than, but "instead of, the other." The context clearly indicates that this is his meaning. If this is what he said, in place of the foregoing expressions we need to use some such phrase as ἃρτε ἐκεῖνον, or ἐπὶ ἐκεῖνον. Now this last expression, in a blind uncial manuscript, would very easily pass for ἢ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος. Or if the first letter were indistinct or wholly obliterated, it might easily be taken for παρ' ἐκεῖνον. From the first of these variations, a copyist, not knowing what to do with the γὰρ, and considering it an error, would naturally drop it, and so obtain the common reading, as was probably done. Indeed, the more we consider it, the more are we convinced that ἐπὶ ἐκεῖνον, "instead of the other," is the true reading, from which all the other readings have sprung.
THE REVISERS’ GREEK TEXT.

XIX. 18.
Rec. T. Κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου — Lord, thy pound.

This change in the order of the words is vouched for only by Ξ, B, L. It is evidently the work of a critical hand, seeking to introduce variety. The common order, giving these words the same relative position here as in verses 16 and 20, is overwhelmingly supported by all the other witnesses, as well as by the parallel passage in Matt. xxv. 20–25. The change is absolutely uncalled for.

XIX. 20.
Rec. T. ἐτέρος ἡλέ — another came.
Rec. T. ὁ ἐτέρος ἡλέ — another came.

The insertion of ὁ, “the,” though supported by Ξ as amended by a seventh-century corrector, B, D, L, R, three cursives, and the Armenian Version, is an error. It was doubtless inserted to make the phraseology correspond with ὁ πρῶτος in verse 16, and ὁ δεύτερος in verse 18, where its presence is allowable or necessary. But here it is neither. Nor can it properly be translated; for there are eight others, instead of one, whose accounts do not yet appear to have been rendered.

XIX. 26.
Rec. T. λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, — For I say unto you.
Rec. T. λέγω ὑμῖν, — I say unto you.

“For,” connects this verse, not with the preceding, but with verse 24, and introduces the Saviour’s reason for commanding the pound to be given to him that had the ten pounds. But some transcriber, seeing its unsuitableness as a connecting link between this verse and the preceding, and not perceiving its force, omitted it; while others in the same dilemma substituted “but.” The omission is perpetuated in Ξ, B, L, seven cursives, one or two copies of the Old Latin, and the Memphi-

tic; while “but” is preserved in the rest of the Old Latin manuscripts, the Vulgate, and two or three other versions. The received reading is attested by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Curetonian and Philoxenian Syriac; and could hardly have got into the text if it were not genuine.

XIX. 29, 30.
Rec. T. ἀπεστείλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτῶν εἰπὼν — he sent two of his disciples, Saying.
Rec. T. ἀπεστείλει δύο τῶν μαθητῶν εἰπὼν — he sent two of the disciples, saying.

We do not understand why αὐτῶ should be omitted, and εἰπὼν, immediately following, not be changed to λέγων. The manuscript evidence in favor of reading αὐτῶ is certainly stronger than in favor of retaining εἰπόν, though the meaning remains unchanged whether in the one case we omit αὐτῶ or not, or in the other read εἰπῶν or (with Westcott and Hort) λέγων. No doubt, αὐτῶ is often interpolated in connection with μαθηταί, “disciples”; but here it is called for by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, Δ, Α, Π, most of the cursive and Old Latin manuscripts, the Vulgate, the Syriac, Egyptian and other versions, and Origen once; while it is wanting in Ξ, B, L, three cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, and Origen and Ambrose, each once. The change can hardly be justified on the plea of necessity.

XX. 14.
Rec. T. δεῦτε, ἀποκτείνωμεν αὖτῶν — come, let us kill him.
Rec. T. ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτῶν — let us kill him.

The omission of “come” is supported by A, B, K, M, Q, Π, a dozen or fifteen cursives, the Vulgate, Armenian, Gothic, and most copies of the Old Latin. The word appears, however, in Ξ, C, D, E, G, H, I, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, most of the cursives, one copy (ε) of the Old Latin, and one (Cod. Toletanus)
of the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Origen. The fact that Luke nowhere else uses the word is no evidence that it is inserted here from Matt. xxi. 38, or Mark xii. 7. He uses the kindred word δείχνατε, "come," but once (xviii. 22), and that in reporting Christ's language, where Matthew (xix. 21) and Mark (x. 21) both give the same word; but no one objects to this, as if it might have been taken from either of the other evangelists. Nor because Luke uses ἔρχεσθε in xiv. 17, while Matthew (xxii. 4), in reporting a similar parable, uses δείχει, are we justified in concluding that the latter was not in Luke's vocabulary. Christ himself may have made this very difference in speaking on these two occasions. If Matthew and Mark have given Jesus' words correctly in reporting this parable, we see no reason why Luke should not have done the same thing, and given the same words, even though some critical hand may afterward have thought it necessary to abbreviate his record somewhat. The omission in a few documents, under the circumstances, is no evidence that the word was not inserted by Luke. On the contrary, the testimony strongly preponderates in favor of its genuineness.

XX. 23.

Rec. T. Τί με πειράξετε; ἐπιδείκτε μου διενάριον. — Why tempt ye me? Shew me a penny.

Rev. T. Δείκτε μου διενάριον. — Shew me a penny.

The question "Why tempt ye me?" does not appear in Ν, B, L, six cursive, one copy of the old Latin, the Memphitic, and the Armenian Version. Hence Trügelles, Tischendorf, Alford, Westcott and Hort, and some others, as well as the Revisers, omit it. Lachmann, however, adopts it, following A, C, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, T, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and Basil. It is generally supposed, but it is merely a supposition, that the question was introduced from Matt. xxi. 18. But, if this had been the case, the word "hypocrites" would hardly have been left untransferred. It is true, it appears in C, 59, and I of the Old Latin; which simply shows that, as far as these documents are concerned, this word was in all probability brought in from Matthew. But the best evidence we can have that the remaining words are genuine is that they appear in all the other witnessing documents without the word "hypocrites." There is no reason why Luke should not have recorded this question as well as the words that follow, especially after prefacing it, very much as Matthew and Mark do, with the remark, "But perceiving their craftiness [treachery or deceitfulness], he said unto them." Unless we have made up our minds that the true text is confined to the three uncials that omit this question and the few secondary witnesses that agree with them, we must feel that the testimony of the numerous documents that support the common reading cannot be safely rejected. This great and widespread unanimity ought not to be overborne by a handful of witnesses, unless the latter are sustained by other strong and convincing testimony.

XX. 26.

Rec. T. οἷς τοχυσαν ἐπιλαβίσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος — they could not take hold of his words.

Rev. T. οἷς τοχυσαν ἐπιλαβίσθαι τοῦ ῥήματος — they were not able to take hold of the saying.

The only witnesses in support of the Revisers' reading here are Ν, B, L, and 433. It does seem as if a reading so perfectly in accord with classic idiom, if genuine, would have been more widely accepted. A common noun limited by αὐτῷ or αὐτής is usually accompanied by the article. But in the Received Text, ῥήματος, like λόγον in verse 20, is unaccompanied by the article, but limited by αὐτῷ only. This is a peculiarity of Hebraistic and New-Testament rather than classical Greek. (See Luke i. 15, 36, 51, 54, 72, etc.) To a classical ear it is
offensive. Hence a temptation to change the pronoun into the article where practicable. It could not well be done in verse 20; but here there is apparently nothing to forbid. But the fact that the other form is retained in the great body of the documents notwithstanding its irregularity, affords a strong argument in its favor as the genuine reading; for copyists familiar with idiomatic Greek would naturally be inclined to change αἴτων to τοῦ. The reverse could hardly be expected. In verse 20, Luke wrote ἐν ἑπτάβλημα αἴτων λόγου, “that they might take hold of his speech.” This leads us to believe that he wrote in a similar manner here, as represented by the Received Text, and not according to the Revised Text. As far as we are aware, Westcott and Hort are the only modern editors that accept the reading of the Vatican manuscript in this instance as the genuine reading,—the Revisers having simply accepted it from them.

xxi. 6.

Rec. T. οὐκ ἀφεθήσονται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ,—there shall not be left one stone upon another.

Rev. T. οὐκ ἀφεθήσονται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ δὲ,—there shall not be left one stone upon another.

The Revisers' reading is that of ℳ, B, L, Ferrar’s group of cursive, the margin of another cursive, and the Memphitic Version. But it is a palpable addition from the margin of some older copy. X, a few cursive, two manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, the Armenian, the Gothic insert “here” before λίθος, just as it reads in Matt. xxiv. 2; while D and a of the Old Latin read “in the wall here”; three copies of the Old Latin, “here in the wall”; one, “here on the wall”; and two, simply “on the wall,” without “here”; —a sufficient variety of forms to condemn any reading. The common reading is attested by A, E, G, H, K, M, Q, S, U, V, T, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursive, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions. The peculiar wording at the beginning of the verse, “As for these things which ye behold,” calls attention to the objects of which Jesus is speaking in such a manner as to render the word “here” entirely unnecessary.

xxi. 34, 35.

Rec. T. καὶ ἀποκληθεὶς ἔφε άμα ἐπιστῇ ἡ ἡμέρᾳ ἕκειν: ὥς παῖς γὰρ ἐπελεύσθη ἐπὶ πάντας—and that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all.

Rev. T. καὶ ἀποκληθεὶς ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἐπιστῇ ἡ ἡμέρᾳ ἕκειν: ὥς παῖς—καὶ ἐπελεύσθη γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντας—and that day come upon you suddenly as a snare: for so shall it come upon all.

The Revisers follow ℳ, B, D, L, 157, six copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, Methodius, Cyril, and Marcion according to Tertullian,—the punctuation being called for by the reading. The Received Text is supported by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly every cursive, three manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Armenian, all the four Syriac Versions, Eusebius, Basil, and Irenæus. The meaning of the phrase “as a snare” is already expressed in verse 34 by “unawares.” But, more than this, the phrase, or some equivalent expression like “thus,” is needed in verse 35 to complete the meaning, if “as a snare” is included in verse 34. This is obvious from the Revisers’ rendering. Having taken “as a snare” with verse 34, they found it necessary in the next verse to insert “so,” in order to give its true meaning. But, by placing γὰρ after παῖς, where it belongs and where the sense and the great body of ancient witnesses require it to be placed, all is consistent. The words “as a snare” are allowed their proper place, and neither is verse 34 charged with a superfluous phrase, nor is verse 35 rendered deficient. But considerations like these are of very little weight with those who believe that the true text of this Gospel is to be found in ℳ, B, L, and the Memphitic Version, whatever other documents may be produced against them.
We have here another questionable reading supported only by Ξ, B, D, two copies of the Old Latin Version, and one of Petrius' transcripts from an ancient Memphitic manuscript. The conjunction δέ, in the sense of "but," given to it by the Revisers, sets the thoughts of the verse in opposition to what precedes. But this is unsuitable to the connection. In the sense of "and," it would serve merely to continue the charge given in verse 34, "Take heed to yourselves," etc. This is but little, if any, more suitable on account of the intermediate thoughts presented in verses 34, 35. The true reading is obviously αὖν, "therefore," — the verse being given as a conclusion or deduction from the facts stated in the two previous verses, showing the necessity of watchfulness and prayerfulness. This reading is abundantly vouched for by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the entire body of the cursives, nearly all manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic; to which may be added Matthew's (xxiv. 42) and Mark's (xiii. 35) reports of Christ's words on this occasion.

The revised reading is supported by Ξ, B, L, X, 1, 33, 36, 57, 131, 157, 209, the Memphitic, the Jerusalem Syriac, and the Ethiopic, and is adopted by Tischendorf, Alford, Westcott and Hort, and Tregelles in the text. The other is the reading of Α, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all but a few cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and Tertullian. It is adopted by Lachmann, and placed by Tregelles in the margin. In addition to the documentary evidence in its support, which comes from all quarters of ancient Christendom, it has claims in favor of being the original reading which the other has not. Apart from this passage, Luke uses καταχάρετω, "to prevail," but once (xxiii. 23), "And their voices prevailed." But he uses it without an infinitive, and in its ordinary acceptation of overcoming, being successful, accomplishing one's end, a sense in which it hardly admits an infinitive after it. But here the word is employed as synonymous with valere, to have power, to be able, for which Luke generally and frequently uses λόγον. Its use in this sense before an infinitive is unusual. It is thus used but once in all the Septuagint, — Wisdom of Solomon, xvii. 5, "No power of fire availed (or was able) to give them light." To express this meaning, Luke would naturally have employed the simple word λόγον in accordance with his usus loquenti elsewhere both in this Gospel and in the Acts, whether speaking in his own name or reporting the words of others. He simply records the fact that the disciples were to pray that they might be honored or favored with deliverance from the evils referred to, and with the privilege of standing before the Son of man among his elect when he shall appear in glory. But some early, pious reader seems to have mistaken Jesus' meaning. Instead of seeing that Luke represents Jesus as exhorting his disciples to watch, and to make it a matter of prayer that they might be accounted worthy to escape tribulations, and to stand before the Son of man, he seems to have considered the clause "that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things," etc., as presenting the motive to their praying, and consequently as involving the idea of merit on their part for watching and praying. Hence he naturally enough sought what he regarded a more suitable form of expression. But the reading, "that ye may prevail to escape all these things, and to stand before the Son of man,"
does not accord with either Christ's or Luke's style of speaking. It makes these results appear as consequent upon the efforts of individuals rather than upon divine favor. From every point of view, the reading has the appearance of being spurious.

xxii. 16.
Rec. T. δὲν ὄνετι οὐ μὴ φάγω — I will not any more eat.
Rev. T. δὲν οὐ μὴ φάγω — I will not eat.

The omission of "any more" is according to Χ, A, B, H, L, and apparently the original text of C, four or five cursive, a of the Old Latin, and the two Egyptian Versions. The word appears, however, in C second hand, D, E, G, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, A, II, the rest of the cursive, the remaining copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and Origen. Those that regard the Revised Text as presenting the true reading suppose that the word was introduced from Mark xiv. 25. But it is there used in reference to drinking the fruit of the vine; and several of the documents that omit it here omit it there also. There ought to be no question as to the genuineness of the word; for, aside from the documentary testimony in its support, its presence is necessary to express the meaning. Jesus is recorded in verse 15 as having said, "With desire have I desired to eat this passover with you." Then, if ὄνετι is omitted, he is made to say in the very next breath, "For I say unto you, I will not eat of it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God"; a statement that can hardly be reconciled with the other. It is plain from this, taken in connection with the strong concurrent documentary evidence that has come down to us, that ὄνετι must have been early omitted through inadvertence. Yet there are those who, sooner than admit the possibility of such a thing, cling to certain old manuscripts as infallible, just as if earlier scribes could not make mistakes as well as later ones. The consequence is, the reading of from two to half a dozen manuscripts is accepted by them as genuine in the face of all the evidence to the contrary, even though the meaning be incoherent, bordering on absurdity, or intolerable on other grounds. The mystery to us is, how any one can pay such deference to manuscripts that are continually presenting palpably false readings, and again and again disagreeing among themselves. This very disagreement renders their agreement oftentimes suspicious. In this instance, we have no doubt they are united in error. Tischendorf follows the common reading, as do Lachmann and Tregelles in their texts. The Revisers' reading is simply that of Alford, and Westcott and Hort,—themselves members of the Company of New-Testament Revisers of no little influence in the matter of textual readings and in determining the character of the text adopted by that body.

xxii. 19, 20.

The "ancient authorities" to which the marginal note refers as ending abruptly with saying, "This is my body,"—omitting "which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you,":—are D, and four copies of the Old Latin Version. The two Old Latin manuscripts, b and e, also omit these words, inserting, in place of them, verses 17 and 18, which are omitted in their proper place. The Curetonian Syriac Version, while giving verse 19 in full, omits verse 20, and instead gives verses 17 and 18, which are also omitted by this version in their proper place. All this shows a great confusion among these old documents. But the fact is really hardly worthy of notice; for, of all the ancient witnesses to the text of the New Testament, these are among the most depraved and untrustworthy, especially in their omissions and additions. This omission is, plainly enough, the work of one who took exception to the double reference to the use of the cup here,—first in verses 17 and 18, and afterward in verse 20,—not observing that the former recorded
what was done at the regular meal, but the latter, the use of the cup at the institution of the memorial service that followed.

**xxii. 31.**

Rec. T. Εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Ἐλεήμον, Ἐλεήμον, — And the Lord said, Simon, Simon.

Rev. T. Ἐλεήμων, Ἐλεήμων, — Simon, Simon.

The only documentary ground on which the words “And the Lord said” are omitted is the fact that they are wanting in B, L, T, and the two Egyptian Versions, — testimony hardly sufficiently weighty to be called preponderating. Especially so does this appear, when it is considered that these documents are given to omitting words and even whole clauses that may have been thought unnecessary, as these words probably appeared to be to some ancient transcriber, inasmuch as the Lord had been speaking in the preceding verses to his disciples. It would seem as if the genuineness of the words ought to be placed beyond all doubt by the testimony of Ξ, A (C is defective), D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, Q, S, U, V, X, Θ, Δ, Α, Η, the entire body of the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, the Armenian, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and Cyprian. The words are retained by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, and others.

**xxii. 43, 44.**

The “ancient authorities” that omit these verses are A, B, R, T, 124, f of the Old Latin, Wilkins' Memphitic, together with ten or twelve manuscripts of that version, some manuscripts of the Thebaic, and some of the Armenian Version, while some of the latter omit only verse 44. Of the four cursives constituting Ferrar's group, 346 has the two verses here in their proper place; 13 first hand has only “and there appeared,” the rest being supplied by a later hand; and the other two omit the verses altogether, while all of them, together with the margin of C as supplied by the third hand, insert the verses between 39 and 40 of Matt. xxvi. in accordance with the reading of all known lectionaries or church-service books in the lesson for Thursday of Holy Week. Though they are wanting in A, the transcriber of this manuscript, by placing at the close of verse 42 the proper Ammonian and Eusebian numerals, intimates not only his knowledge of the verses, but his conviction that they belonged here, though wanting in his exemplar. The genuineness of the passage is abundantly attested by Ξ, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, Q, S, U, V, X, Θ, Δ, Α, Η (a few of these marked with an asterisk, denoting that the words are wanting in some copies), all the cursive except the few just referred to, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, some manuscripts of the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, the Gothic, Ethiopic, and nearly all copies of the Armenian. That is to say, the reading appears in one of the two fourth-century uncial, and in most of the others, in every cursive but two (counting the two or three of Ferrar's group, in which it is omitted, as one), and in every ancient version; to which must be added the express testimony of the Fathers, some of whom are centuries earlier than the oldest of known Greek codices; namely, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus of the second century; Hippolytus and Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century; Eusebius, Arius, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Syrus, Didymus, Gregory of Nazianzus, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and others of the fourth century; and a long list of others in after centuries from every part of Christendom. The omission of the verses in a few documents is plainly due to pious jealousy on behalf of Jesus' divinity, chafing under the idea of his needing angelic support, and to an inability on the part of certain controversialisists satisfactorily to answer those who used this text as an argument against the general scriptural view of our Lord's essential nature. It is truly sad to see a scholar of Dr. Hort's ability, in his zeal to defend the impec
cability of his favorite manuscript, resorting to utterances like the following: “The documentary evidence clearly designates
the text as an early Western interpolation, adopted in eclectic texts." And yet he admits that "it would be impossible to regard these verses as the product of the inventiveness of scribes." But, to account for their existence, he has recourse to the purely chimerical notion that "they can only be a fragment from the traditions, written or oral, which were for a while locally current beside the canonical Gospels"; and that "these verses and the first sentence of xxiii. 34 may be safely called the most precious among the remains of this evangelic tradition which were rescued from oblivion by the scribes of the second century."1 Such, to one who pins his faith to the readings of a single manuscript, is the utter worthlessness of the testimony of ancient Christendom, everywhere in attestation of the genuineness of a given reading,—testimony which is simply overwhelming.

xxiii. 19.

Rec. T. δοςις ἡ...βεβλημένος εἰς φυλακήν, — who... was cast into prison.

Rev. T. δοςις ἡ...βάλθησις εἰς τῇ φυλακῇ, — one who... was cast into prison.

The revised reading is supported only by B, L, T. The other is that of Ν as amended by its fourth-century corrector, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, and all the cursives. Ν first hand omits the Greek for "cast," but has the rest of the reading as the Revisers have it. It is hardly possible that Luke could have written βάλθησις here, for the use of an aorist participle without the article in connection with the verb ἐκαίνυ, "to be," is not a New-Testament form of expression. It does occur sometimes among classic writers. But it is not grammatically appropriate. Not an instance of the kind can be found elsewhere in the New Testament,—though occasionally among the manuscripts an aorist may be found incorrectly given for a perfect, as in II first hand at Luke xxiii.

1 Notes on Select Readings, pp. 66, 67.

51; or for a present, as in P and a few cursives at Acts xii. 5; or, an anarthrous aorist participle may be improperly connected by a false reading with some form of ἔκαίνυ, to which it does not belong, as in D at Acts viii. 13. The New-Testament mode of expressing periphrastically with ἔκαίνυ the English "was cast," or rather "had been cast," is ἔν βεβλημένος, as the Received Text has it. But this has every appearance of being a correction of the older but false reading, ἔν βάλλεις. The true reading, beyond a doubt, is that of the original transcriber of Ν, δοςις ἡ... ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, "who was in the prison"; i.e. near by. This accounts not only for the variations in the participial forms afterward introduced, but for the expression ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ, "in the prison," instead of εἰς φυλακήν, "into prison," the form of expression which would naturally follow βάλλεις, "to cast," and which does follow it in every other instance in which the word is used in the New Testament in connection with φυλακῇ. But the scribe who introduced the aorist participle βάλλεις left the following words unchanged; while the later corrector of this reading not only corrected the participle but changed the preposition with its case, making it read as in nearly all the manuscripts, and in verse 25 of this chapter.

xxiii. 33.

Rec. T. ἐπεν ἀπέδραν — when they were come.

Rev. T. ἐπεν ἕθαν — when they came.

The common reading is attested by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, nearly all the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, and John Damascene. The latter is that of Ν, B, C, D, L, Q, and a few cursives. Several versions, like our A. V., seem to support this reading, and yet may be translations of the other. Nothing therefore can positively be claimed in its support from the versions. The common reading seems to be the original one, the compound word meaning here, as it does in Matt. iv. 24 and elsewhere, "when they had come forth," i.e. from the city; but being misunderstood, it was cut down
to the simple verb, apparently to make the reading correspond with Matt. xxvii. 33. The force of ἀπό in composition here is the same as in ἀπῆγαγον in verse 26, which should be rendered, not “when they led him away,” but “as they led him forth,” i.e. from the city. It corresponds with Matthew’s (xxvii. 32) ἐξερχόμενος, “as they came out,” i.e. of Jerusalem. The compound verb of the common text is more graphic than the simple one of the Revised Text,—indicating that Calvary was outside of the city; and, though ἀπῆγαγον (verse 26) implies that they had already passed out of the city, on account of the remoteness of that word from verse 33, it is not at all unnatural that ἀπῆλθον should have been employed by the writer here instead of Matthew’s word ἥλθον.

xxiii. 34.

The first half of this verse,—“And Jesus said, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do,”—is omitted by four Greek manuscripts, B, D first hand, and the two cursives 38, 435, together with a, b, d, of the Old Latin Version, the Thebaic, and two manuscripts of the Memphitic. On this account it is bracketed by Lachmann, double-bracketed by Westcott and Hort as an interpolation, and noted in the Revisers’ margin as a passage treated by “some ancient authorities” as spurious. It is as truly a part of Luke’s text as any other passage received as such,—having been omitted in a few manuscripts probably in accordance with Tatian’s Diatessaron, as it is not found in any of the other Gospels. It is abundantly attested by Ν, A, C, D second hand, E, F, G, H, K, L (which usually sides with B), M, Q, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, II, all but two cursives, five copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, all but two manuscripts of the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Irenæus, Hegesippus as quoted by Eusebius, Origen, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Clementine Homilies, Chrysostom, Athanasius, Gregory of Nyssa, Basil, Hilary, Ambrose repeatedly, as well as Jerome and Augustine, Theodoret, John Damascene, and a number of others. To say nothing of the argument that might be drawn from internal evidence, if such a cloud of witnesses is not sufficient to place the passage beyond suspicion, we know not what can be, short of an absolute concurrence of all the witnesses. The marginal note, in our judgment, should not have been introduced. As well might it have been noted at verse 32 that “some ancient authorities [Ν, Β, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions] read “two other malefactors were led to be crucified with him.” Such marginal notes are not called for, even if the omissions or the readings referred to are suspected or adopted by certain modern editors. The rejection of readings so well attested, or the adoption of others wholly unworthy of notice, simply because the former are absent from, or the latter are present in, a particular manuscript, supported perhaps by a few others, instead of tending towards securing an exact transcript of the words of the New Testament writers as far as they can be obtained, simply reveals the falsity of the critical principles that lead to such conclusions, especially when the passages so treated are among the best, most hallowed, and most assuredly genuine portions of the sacred text.

xxiii. 35.

Rec. T. σωσάτω· λατόν, εἰς οὕτως ἔδωκα τὸν Θεόν ἀλεξι

τός.—Let him save himself, if he be Christ, the chosen of God.

Rev. T. σωσάτω· λατόν, εἰς οὕτως ἔδωκα τὸν Θεόν, ὁ ἀλεξι

τός.—let him save himself, if this is the Christ of God, his chosen.

The order and construction of the last four words as given in the Received Text is strongly attested by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, Q, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, II, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, and the Ethiopic Version. That of the Revised Text is the order found in Ν, Β, L, and three cursives only. The passage has evidently been
much tampered with. Not merely has ἐλεκτός been transposed, making the words read ὁ ἐλεκτός τοῦ Θεοῦ,—which, however, does not affect the meaning of the Received Text,—and the position of ὁ been changed as in the Revised Text, but other changes have been made. Thus, instead of the reading “the chosen of God,” three cursives in addition to Ferrar’s group, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, and Armenian Versions, and Eusebius have “the Son of God, the chosen,” or “the chosen Son of God.” Codex B has οὖς, “son” instead of οὗτος, “this.” Codex D, with a more or less altered Greek text, and its Latin Version d read “Save thyself if thou art the Son of God, if thou art the chosen Christ”; while e reads “Save thyself if thou art the Christ, the chosen of God.”—Now, when we take the above rendering of the R. V., we find there is a harshness, an unnaturalness of expression in the use of the emphatic “this” in the connection in which it stands. Had the sentence only been with the conditional clause, “If this is the Christ,” etc., and the other clause followed it, the word “this” would be perfectly natural. On the contrary, however, the conditional protasis follows the principal clause, “Let him save himself,” in which the subject of the verb is not only unemphatic, but unexpressed in the original. See R. V., above. And the Revisers have correctly translated the words. The rendering of the A. V., giving the unemphatic “he” instead of “this,” is less faithful to the original, and awakens no suspicion in regard to the Greek text. On turning to Codex B, we find that that manuscript has οὖς (without the article) in place of οὗτος. (The absence of the article in this manuscript, especially in connection with predicate nominatives, is something of very common occurrence, where other manuscripts have it; it is, in fact, one of the peculiarities of the Vatican Codex.) Codex D, several cursives, and a number of versions also have the title “the Son” in this connection. These facts awaken the thought that ὁ οὖς, “the Son,” may, after all, be a part of the original text. And such, on closer examination, we are convinced is the case. The reading εἶ ΟΥΤΟΣ [οὗτος] ἐστιν might very easily and naturally have arisen, through the carelessness of an early scribe, from εἶ ΟΥΙΟΚ [ὁ οὖς] ἐστιν, by simply mistaking the latter for the former, and consequently placing a cross-bar erroneously over the middle letter of the five. This mistake was certainly made by ancient copyists elsewhere; as, for example, in Acts xviii. 7. Taking ὁ οὖς to be the original reading instead of οὗτος, and the collocation of the last four words of the passage as given in the Received Text to be the true order, as the preponderance of testimony seems to indicate that it is, we have the natural and seemingly genuine reading, “Let him save himself if he is the Son, the Christ, the chosen of God.” This reading gives, not the utterance of one person merely, but, in a condensed form, the different utterances of “the rulers,” as the context requires; some saying, “If he is the Son of God”; others, “If he is the anointed of God”; and still others, “If he is the chosen of God.”

xxiii. 38.

Rec. T. ἢν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ γεγραμμένη ἐν αὐτῷ γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς, Οὖς ἦσσ τὸν Ἡσαῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. — And a superscription also was written over him in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

Rev. T. ἢν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐν αὐτῷ, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὗτος. — And there was also a superscription over him, THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS.

The revised reading here, (1) in the omission of γεγραμμένη, is according to Ρ, B, L, and the Egyptian Versions; (2) in the omission of the words “in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew,” is according to Ρ as changed by the earlier seventh-century corrector, B, C first hand, L, a of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, and the two Egyptian Versions; and (3) in the omission of ἐστίν and the transferring of οὗτος to the end of the verse, is according to Ρ, B, L, and a. Codex
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a king, yet to be enthroned in power; and his prayer was that, when Jesus should come as a king indeed, in royalty and glory, he would remember him. The reading of the text is overwhelmingly attested as the true reading, and is generally accepted as such by modern editors.

xxiii. 45.

Rec. T. καὶ ἔσκοτισθή ὁ ἡλίος, — And the sun was darkened.
Rec. T. τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλείποντος — the sun's light failing.

The common reading here is supported by A, C third hand (C second hand omits the clause), D, E, G, H, K, M, Q, R, S, U, V, X, P, Δ, A, II, all the cursive except a few lectionaries, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Marcion according to Epiphanius, Origen, Hippolytus, Athanasius, Macarius Magnes, Ephraem Syrus, Cyril, and others. The revised reading, ἐκλείποντος, strictly speaking, "becoming eclipsed," is that of only B and a few lectionaries. S, C first hand apparently, L, and a dozen lectionaries read ἐκλείποντος, "having become eclipsed." The two Egyptian Versions and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac also favor this reading. Origen, condemning the reading, says, "How could there be an eclipse of the sun when the moon was full? Matthew and Mark do not say that an eclipse of the sun occurred at that time. Nor does Luke according to most copies, which read, 'And it was about the sixth hour, and darkness came over all the earth until the ninth hour; and the sun was obscured.' In some copies, however," he adds, "it does not read 'darkness came, and the sun was obscured,' but 'darkness came over all the earth, the sun failing' or being eclipsed. Some one, wishing to explain the meaning, doubtless ventured to make the change, thinking that darkness could not have prevailed unless the sun had been eclipsed."¹ The Revisers' rendering, "the sun's light failing," while obscuring the true meaning of the Greek text, is sufficiently clear to show that that text attributes the wide-spread darkness of those three hours to an eclipse of the sun, or, as they have it, to the failing of the sun's light. Whereas, the darkness was a preternatural occurrence, like the three days' darkness in Egypt, mentioned in Exod. x. 22, so great as to obscure the light of the sun; or, as the true text has it, there came a darkness over all the earth, and the sun was darkened, or obscured by it. This was the effect, not the cause, of the darkness. The contrary view, though vouched for by two or three of the oldest extant Greek manuscripts, only shows the falsity of the position that those documents have of necessity a purer text than later ones because of their earlier date of transcription; for the reading of those ancient manuscripts here is an impossible one. It not only empties the words of their originally intended meaning, but so far perverts them as to present a statement declaring a physical impossibility. It will be observed, too, that even here our two oldest Greek manuscripts, while agreeing in the general idea of an eclipse, differ in their statements concerning it,—one saying "the sun being eclipsed," and the other, "the sun having been eclipsed"; the former implying that the eclipse was coexistent with the darkness and indirectly the cause of it, while the latter implies directly that the eclipse was the cause of the darkness by having preceded it.

xxiii. 47.

Rec. T. ἵδοκας τὸν Θεόν — he glorified God.
Rec. T. ἵδοκες τὸν Θεόν — he glorified God.

The aorist of the Received Text here is attested by A, C, E, G, H, K, M, P, Q, S, U, V, X, I, Δ, A, II, all the cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac, the two Egyptian Versions, and Origen twice. The imperfect of the Revised Text has the support of

¹ Works, iii. 922.
meaning, seems to be the result of an early and common transcriptional error, the difference in the two forms in each instance being that of a single letter or two at the most. Besides, the change is in no sense necessary as preparatory to a proper revision of the English text. As an illustration of the evangelist's use of the imperfect as contrasted with that found here in the Revisers' text, the reader is referred to ἐπιστρέφον in (48) the next verse, representing the continuous act of the multitudes turning back one by one from the cross and re-tracing their steps to their homes,—something very different from the single momentary exclamation of the centurion.

xxiii. 49.

Rec. T. γυναίκες αἱ συνακολούθησαν αὐτῷ — the women that followed him.

Rev. T. γυναίκες αἱ συνακολούθησαν αὐτῷ — the women that followed with him.

The present participle adopted by the Revisers is the reading of Ν, B, C, L, R, X, and a few cursives. The aorist participle of the Received Text is that of A, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, and every ancient version. The aorist infinitive συνακολούθησα of Δ is simply a clerical error for the aorist participle, and really supports the common reading. Logically, the aorist participle is the form required; for certainly the evangelist is not speaking of women who "were accompanying" Jesus from Galilee, but of women who "had accompanied" him. The difference in form between the two participles is not so great but that an unheeding scribe might easily mistake the one for the other, as the scribe of Δ evidently did the aorist participle for the infinitive. The fact that every version is with the Received Text is strong documentary testimony in its support; which, added to the internal probability in the case, ought certainly to outweigh the testimony of the mere handful of witnesses against it, especially when that testimony is so easily accounted for. A moment's
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The omissions noted in the margin of these verses as made by “some ancient authorities” appear almost exclusively in D and the Old Latin manuscripts a, b, c, f, l. This shows not only the close relationship subsisting between Codex D and the Old Latin Version, but their descent from a common exemplar which, in these verses, was more or less defective. For it is incredible that these few witnesses, notorious for their depraved readings, should, in these instances, alone be right, while all the others,—comprising the rest of the uncial and versions, the cursive, and a number of the Fathers, among whom are Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Cyril, Theodoret, and John Damascene,—should be in error, and have handed down to us a spurious text. Lachmann brackets verse 12, as if it were of doubtful genuineness; but why he should do it, as long as he admits all the rest of these readings to be genuine, we are unable to conceive. Tischendorf omits verse 12, as well as the last half of verse 36, the whole of verse 40 (which the Curetonian Syriac Version unites with D and its Old Latin allies in omitting), the last clause of verse 51 (where αι first hand unites with D in the omission, which, however, is supplied by the early seventh-century corrector of that manuscript), and the words “worshipped him, and” in verse 52; while Westcott and Hort enclose in double brackets all these passages (except the three words in verse 9, which for no apparent reason are only single-bracketed), as if they were of doubtful genuineness. But no one need have a moment’s question on this point. The evidence of their genuineness is too strong to admit a doubt.

xxiv. 10.

Rec. T. kal ai λεγον συν αυταις, αλλη γεγονον ταύτα. — and other women that were with them, which told these things.

Rev. T. kal και λεγον συν αυταις ληγον ταύτα. — and the other women with them told these things.

The received reading is attested by N as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, K, S, U, V, X, A, most of the cursive, a, εσ, of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and Cyril in his Commentary on Luke,—a strong array of early versions, if not of early uncials. The omission of αι is according to N first hand, A, B, D, E, F, G, H, L, M, Π, Α, Π, nearly fifty cursives, four copies (δ, ε, φ, τ) of the Old Latin, the Thebaic, Curetonian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions. The whole verse, according to the Revisers’ reading and rendering, is, “Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James: and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles.” On reading this, one very naturally asks, What is the special significance of the words, “Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James”? Why should such a clause be inserted here? To what does it refer? Not, of course, to the closing expression of the previous verse; for the words “all the rest” denote those besides the eleven to whom the news was told. If the clause refers to the women spoken of in verses 8 and 9 as having returned and informed the eleven of the empty tomb and other things, then it makes these verses apparently contradict the revised reading of the last half of verse 10, which makes it appear that “the other women,” who were with these, were the ones that told these things to the apostles. It cannot be said that this represents the evangelist, in the first half of the
verse, as naming the women referred to in the preceding verse, while the latter half has reference to an after announcement by "the other women." That would have required him not only to write αὐτοίς δὲ ἤσοαν, "And these were" instead of the unemphatic ἤσοαν δὲ, "And were," or, as we should say in English, "And it was"; but to say "afterwards the other women" instead of "and the other women." Among the witnesses cited above as omitting αὐτοίς, A, D, Γ, about forty cursives, the Curetonian Syriac and Ethiopic Versions omit ἤσοαν δὲ also, in the beginning of the verse. This not only greatly reduces the number of the "authorities" that support the Revisers' reading of the verse as a whole, but materially changes the reading,—making it "Mary the Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women that were with them told these things to the apostles"; —an abrupt, and, after what is said in the preceding verse, a very unnatural and improbable statement. This being a palpably false reading, the first two of the omitted words were early restored; but the omitted relative, a little farther on, appears to have been overlooked. This gave the reading found in Ν, B, etc., and adopted by the Revisers. But it shows for itself that something is wrong; no one would ever write in this style. The only reasonable and self-evidently genuine reading is the fuller one of the Received Text: "And it was Mary the Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and the other women with them who told these things to the apostles." Inasmuch as these women had not been previously named, it was perfectly natural that the evangelist should here say who they were.

XXIV. 11.

Rec. T. τὰ ῥήματα αὐτοῖς, — their words.
Rev. T. τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, — these words.

The former is the reading of A (C is defective), E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, II, the whole body of the cursives, f of the Old Latin, the Armenian, and the text of the Philoxenian Syriac; the latter is that of Ν, B, D, L, six or eight copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Ethiopic. The entire verse, according to the Received Text, reads, "And their words appeared in their sight as idle talk; and they would not believe them." The evangelist's use of pronouns here was obviously offensive to some of his early readers. Hence, to avoid the recurrence of αὐτοῖς, referring to different persons, in the expressions "their words" and "their sight," one critic or copyist dropped the phrase "in their sight," — a reading which appears in X and at least two cursives. Another substituted in its place "to the apostles." This reading is preserved in f of the Old Latin. A third, omitting ταῦτα, read "And their words seemed an idle talk of theirs." This is the reading of Codex 1. A fourth changed "their words," to "these words," — the reading which appears in four uncialss and the majority of ancient versions. That this change was actually made, notwithstanding the numerous witnesses in its favor, is evident from the following considerations. The fact that the last word of the verse is αὐτοῖς, not αὐτοῖς, shows that, in writing it, the evangelist had in mind the women, as he naturally might after having spoken of their words. But, had he written ταῦτα, "these words," the strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, is that he would not have written αὐτοῖς, but αὐτοῖς referring to "these words," and not to the women mentioned further back; just as an English writer,—in penning, for example, the words, "It was Mary, and Joanna, and the mother of James, and other women that told these things to the apostles; and these words seemed in their sight as idle talk; and they would not believe them," —would more naturally refer the closing word "them," to "these words," as its antecedent than to "the women." And so it would be understood by readers generally. In the Greek, of course, there is no danger of a misapplication of the pronoun in this instance. Hence, to a
mere reader of Greek there is no need of changing αὐταῖς to αὐτοῖς to obviate any confusion. But the fact that αὐταῖς still stands as an unquestioned part of the original text shows conclusively that ταῦτα was originally αὐτῶν. Besides, “these words” is not an expression that a writer would use who has not given the words to which reference is made. But, after one had said that certain women had told these things to the apostles, he would naturally add that “their words” seemed as idle talk. The revised reading is, beyond a doubt, an alteration introduced by some later hand than Luke’s, as truly as are the other variations referred to.

xxxiv. 17.

Rec. T. περιπατώντες, καλ ἕστε σκυθρωποί; — as ye walk, and are sad?

Rec. T. περιπατώντες; καλ ἦσθηταν σκυθρωποί. — as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad.

The common reading is supported by A second hand (C is defective), E, F, G, H, I, K, M, N, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the entire body of the cursive, every manuscript but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Curetonian, Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic with one exception, and the Armenian. Codex D and Cyril on Luke, while omitting “and are,” support this reading also. The revised reading, which can hardly be considered abundantly attested, is that of Σ, A first hand apparently, B, Ε of the Old Latin, the two Egyptian versions, and the Roman Ethiopic Version. Codex L reads ἔστησαν, the aorist active, instead of ἦσθηταν, the aorist passive. The testimony of Origen, who quotes the verse only as far as περιπατώντες, proves nothing in favor of either reading, as he quoted no more than served his immediate purpose, which was often the case with the Fathers, as it has been with others in every succeeding age. It is incredible that Luke could have given such a narrative as “What communications are these that ye are having one with another as ye walk? And they stood sad”; then gone directly on with “And one of them, named Cleopas, answering said,” etc., without a word about their moving forward till we reach verse 28, where we find that apparently they had been all the time walking on (instead of standing still) till they were already drawing near to the village whither they were going. The new reading has every appearance of being a second-century amendment or attempted improvement of the evangelist’s words, confined to a few early documents, but soon abandoned on all hands as a false reading, appearing in only a single later document,—Codex L of the eighth century,—in a modified form nowhere else found. It originated in the evangelist’s use of the personal form ἐστι rather than the participle ὄντες. This personal form shows that the connection made by the conjunction is not with περιπατώντες, but with the preceding ἀντιβάλλετε, making virtually two questions condensed into one; thus, “What are these subjects about which ye are conversing one with another as ye walk, and [about which or because of which ye] are sad?” But the connection not seeming pertinent on account of the absence of ἀνθ’ ὄν, “because of which,” in connection with ἔστι, though it is substantially implied in the preceding words, ἔστι was changed to ἦσθηταν, and the question made to stop with the preceding participle. The reading is the transparent emendation of some stupid critic.

xxxiv. 21.

Rec. T. τρίτην ταῦτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον — to-day is the third day.

Rec. T. τρίτην ταῦτην ἡμέραν ἄγει — it is now the third day.

In support of the common reading, we have A, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, W, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, most of the cursive, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Ethiopic Version. Codex D, five cursive, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Augustine have σήμερον, but omit ταῦτην. The Revisers’ reading, which retains ταῦτην but omits σήμερον, is attested by Σ, B,
L, t, and the Curetonian, Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, as well as the Memphitic and Armenian. — The Revisers' rendering would do very well for τριτην αυτη τημεραν αγει, if this were the Greek corresponding to it. But how it is to be obtained from their Greek is a mystery to us, unless αγει is taken impersonally in the sense of "it spends," and the whole expression is converted literally into "It spends this as the third day." Still, the question arises, What spends? It is easy enough to translate τουτοτριτην θερον αγω εν τω θερη, by saying, "This is my third summer in the country": — the literal rendering being, "I am spending this as a third summer in the country." But the impersonal use of αγει, by which the revised rendering may be similarly obtained, as far as we are aware, is without warrant. Meyer does not venture thus to try to solve the puzzle. He considers "Jesus" as the subject. And his rendering is, "He (Jesus) passes this present day as the third." But this is far-fetched and altogether unsatisfactory. Besides, from the rendering "this present day," Meyer appears to take ταυτην and ημεραν together. But the absence of the article forbids this. The Greek for "this day," in such a connection as this, is not ταυτην ημεραν, but ταυτην την ημεραν οτ την ημεραν ταυτην. The truth is, the reading is a false one; and all the bolstering it may receive will not make it good Greek, or such as Luke could have written. The other reading, however, presents no difficulty aside from the fact that σιμερον is wanting in three uncials, one cursive, and five versions. This word, like its corresponding English "to-day," is an adverb; but it is employed here as a neuter noun. That it belongs here as a part of Luke's text is shown by the following ἄφω, "from which," — an expression in which the relative ὧν is evidently in the neuter, referring to σιμερον. If this pronoun referred to ημεραν, the expression would be ἄφω ὧν, as in Acts xx. 18. The whole passage, including the annexed relative clause, may be translated thus: "To-day makes [literally brings] this the third day, from which (reckoning backward) these things oc-
curred." The verb is not used in the sense of passing, — "to pass one's time," — as some suppose it is; nor yet in that of leading, say, a quiet life. It is used in its common, well-known meaning of bringing, leading to, and hence of bringing about, constituting, making. Σιμερον, "to-day," seems to have been omitted in a few copies from having been supposed to be superfluous in connection with the preceding ταυτην, just as ταυτην was omitted, for a similar reason, in other copies that retained σιμερον. The reading has all the appearance of being "distinctively Syrian"; for it had been familiar to the readers of the two older Syriac Versions for fifty years, more or less, before it appeared in the Memphitic Version, and for at least two hundred years before it was fathered by the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts.

xxiv. 47.

The only "ancient authorities" that read "repentance unto remission" instead of "repentance and remission" here are Ν, B, the Peshito Syriac and Memphitic Versions. But for the testimony of B, Dr. Hort would probably pronounce it "an Alexandrian and Syrian" reading.

xxiv. 53.

Rec. T. ανεσουντες και εληγουντες των Θεου.—praising and blessing God.

Rev. T. εληγουντες των Θεου.—blessing God.

The revised reading, which is that of Westcott and Hort, is attested by only four uncials and one version, — Ν, B, C first hand, L, and the Jerusalem Syriac. That adopted by Tischendorf, namely, ανεσουντες των Θεου, "praising God," is supported only by D, six copies of the Old Latin, two manuscripts of the Vulgate, and the Memphitic Version. The common reading, which is adopted by Lachmann and others, and preferred by Tregelles and Alford, is the reading of A, C second hand (E
and G are defective), F, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, all the cursives, c, f, q of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. This cannot be considered, with Westcott and Hort, a “conflate” reading any more than “glorifying and praising” God can be so considered in ii. 13. The phrase αἰνεῖ τὸν ὉΣίων, “to praise God,” is used at least twice as often by Luke as the phrase εὐλογεῖ τὸν ὉΣίων, “to bless God.” And in view of Luke’s coupling praising God with glorifying him in ii. 13, and with rejoicing in xiv. 37, we see no reason why he should not have connected it with blessing God here. There is no apparent reason why any one else should have introduced αἰνοῖτε καί; while either of the shorter readings may easily have resulted from the longer in consequence of a scribe’s being misled, by the sameness of the terminations αἰνΟΥΝΤΕΣ and εὐΛΟΥΝΤΕΣ, into supposing the work of copying the two participles was done when he had transcribed only one. Such errors are by no means infrequent even in the best manuscripts.

APPENDICES.

The following additional notes are presented after a careful review, because the facts and data seem to demand them. We are fully persuaded that, in each instance, the reading as given in both the Received and the Revised Text is an erroneous one. As generally accepted, both these readings of Mark present irreconcilable differences, and even a contradiction of the statements clearly and unmistakably made by other evangelists. Mark, we think, has been misrepresented by most of his copyists whose work has survived to our day. If he is properly represented, he will be found to be, not only consistent with himself, but in harmony with the other evangelists.

I.

AT WHAT HOUR OF THE DAY WAS JESUS CRUCIFIED?

Mark xv. 25.

In John xix. 14 we find the statement that it was the preparation of the passover, i.e. on the Friday before the passover, and about the sixth hour, when Pilate delivered Jesus to the Jews to be crucified. But in Mark we read that it was the third hour when they crucified him. This seems to make Mark say that Jesus was crucified about three hours before Pilate surrendered him to the Jews. Some, however, in order to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between John and Mark,
suppose that John's sixth hour is the sixth hour after midnight, *i.e.* six o'clock in the morning. This would give ample time for all that was done before Mark's "third" hour, or 9 A.M., would have arrived. But, while this may appear to reconcile the statements of the two Gospels, it introduces difficulties almost or quite as great as the one it may seem to remove. In the first place there is in fact no reason to suppose that John should differ from the other evangelists in his mode of reckoning the hours of the day. They, in common with Jews and Romans everywhere, counted the hours from sunrise. Why should John differ from others? The only consistent view of his notations of time requires the same mode of reckoning as theirs. Aside from this place, John speaks of the hours of the day four times, and, in each instance, there is no probability in favor of counting the hours of the day otherwise than from sunrise, according to the universal custom of his day.

Thus, in i. 39, "the tenth hour" corresponds to our 4 P.M., making the statement of the evangelist a good reason for the tarrying of the disciples during the rest of the day, and presumably over night, with Jesus. — In iv. 6, "the sixth hour" is not 6 A.M., nor yet 6 P.M. Jesus had been journeying, and now came to the well, weary and thirsty, after having walked for several hours under a hot sun; while the woman came there also at noon, as the whole succeeding record, which calls for several hours' time, clearly implies. — So, too, "the seventh hour," in iv. 52, was one o'clock in the afternoon, not the early hour of 7 A.M., nor yet the late hour of 7 P.M. — Again, in xi. 9, the inquiry, "Are there not twelve hours in the day?" implies not only that "the day" is the time from sunrise to sunset, but that the hours are reckoned successively from the rising of the sun, and not from some other point, as, for example, from mid-day. The "preparation" (of xix. 14), *i.e.* the day of preparation for the passover, refers in like manner to the interval between sunrise and sunset; so that when John speaks of the day as being "the preparation, and about the sixth hour," he evidently means the sixth hour after sunrise, or after the day had fairly begun; *i.e.* about noon, or twelve o'clock according to our reckoning. Indeed, there is no good reason for supposing that John reckoned the hours of the day in any different manner from Mark or from either of the other evangelists.

In regard to the difference between the statements found in the two Gospels, if the mode of reckoning is the same in both, — and we see no good reason for any question on this point, — we must conclude that there is an error somewhere in one or the other of these records as they have come down to us. It is utterly incredible that two honest historians, one of whom, if not the other, was an eye-witness of what he records, should have differed by about three hours in stating the time of an occurrence so important and well-known as the crucifixion of Christ.

We learn, from Matthew xxvii. 1 and Mark xv. 1 that it was "in the morning," *i.e.* Friday morning, and probably not far from six o'clock, when the Jews delivered Jesus to Pilate for trial. Earlier in the morning, "as soon as it was day" (Luke xxii. 66), he had been brought before the supreme council of the nation. So that it could not have been much if at all earlier than six o'clock when he was brought before Pilate. After some time spent in questioning Jesus, and in other matters, Pilate found (Luke xxiii. 6, 7) that Jesus was a Galilean, and sent him to Herod to be tried by him. Herod, possibly after some little delay, inasmuch as such an examination was something he had not anticipated, questioned him "in many words"; after which, not having obtained any satisfaction from Jesus, he mocked him, arrayed him in gorgeous apparel, and sent him back to Pilate with the message that he could find nothing against him. Pilate then, by various means, sought to release Jesus; he had him scourged, and then, in one way and another, wasted much time in parleying with the Jews and questioning Jesus, before he finally abandoned him to them. In going through all these
various movements, with the delays necessarily attending them, it seems reasonable to presume that several hours must have been consumed. Thomas Scott, in his Family Bible, under Mark xv. 25, says, “The rulers must have been very early and active in their proceedings, to have gone through so much business, and to have surmounted so many difficulties by that hour,” i.e. by the third hour, or nine o’clock in the morning. In fact, they could hardly have gone through it at all in less than five or six hours; so that it must have been well on towards noon, or “about the sixth hour,” before Pilate delivered him to the Jews for crucifixion. After Pilate had performed his last act of preparing the superscription to be placed over the cross, the conveying of Jesus from Pilate’s presence to Calvary by way of the Damascus Gate was the work of a few moments only. The distance was not great; and it was hurriedly traversed by the infuriated mob.

Why, then, it may be asked in view of the foregoing exposition, does Mark say it was the third hour when they crucified him? We reply, it is extremely doubtful whether Mark really wrote “the third hour.” If the crucifixion took place at noon, it is not only incredible that he should have written that it occurred three hours earlier, but morally impossible for him thus to have written. There is, on the contrary, reason to believe that he actually wrote the “sixth” hour. At least one cursive manuscript, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version, and the Ethiopic Version read “the sixth hour.” Nor should this be regarded, as it commonly is, as the result of copyists’ attempts to bring Mark into harmony with John. It is a plain indication that other manuscripts, now lost, once read “the sixth hour.” When it is considered that the Greek uncial characters, representing “three” or “third” and “six” or “sixth” are respectively a gamma, Γ, and a digamma or double gamma, F, and that Mark must necessarily have written a digamma or “sixth,” it will be seen that an early, careless copyist might very easily have mistaken his “sixth” (F) for “third” (Γ), and so have written “third” instead. This was done so early that the true reading is preserved to us in no ancient documents, as far as we are aware, except the three above mentioned. Nor are those among the earliest.

Though the position we have thus taken, namely, that Mark really wrote F (“sixth”), finds almost no support from the documentary testimony found in connection with this verse, it is sustained by an appeal to the documentary testimony respecting John’s language in xix. 14. There can be no doubt that John wrote F, “sixth”; yet five uncials—according to its earlier seventh-century corrector, D as supplied by a later hand, L, X, Δ,—and four cursive credit him with having written “the third hour”; and this again, not necessarily, as some suppose, in order to reconcile John’s statement with Mark’s, but as the result of sheer inattention or want of care on the part of some very early transcriber who had mistaken John’s digamma, the equivalent of our “6th,” for a gamma, the Greek representative of the English “3” and “3d.” And if this comparatively respectable body of witnesses could have been thus betrayed into a misrepresentation of John’s statement, is it beyond belief that a body of witnesses far greater and more respectable should have been betrayed into a like but unconscious misrepresentation of Mark’s record? It certainly is not incredible. On the contrary, in view of all the facts and circumstances in the case, it seems altogether probable that it was so. If there is indeed anything incredible in reference to this reading, it is that Mark should have written “the third hour,” when he knew that Christ was crucified at noon. The only rational way of accounting for the word “third” is to admit that some early transcriber unwittingly blundered in his work, and that others, in reproducing this Gospel, have generally followed Mark’s transcriber rather than Mark himself.

Indeed, Jerome, hundreds of years ago, in his comment on Psa. lxxvii., attributed the reading “the third hour,” in Mark,
to an early transcriptional error. His testimony is: "It is written in Mark that he was crucified the third hour. But this is an error of the scribes. It was originally the sixth hour. But many supposed the Greek symbol F to be Γ." Hence this reading.

In corroboration of the foregoing, we will simply add that Hesychius the grammarian, in his Greek Dictionary, cites a number of Doric words in which the same error appears of mistaking an initial digamma for a gamma; as, for instance, the writing of γεωργία for ιεωργία, Vesta. In fact, it was an error of no uncommon occurrence; and it at once accounts for the strange but only apparent discrepancy between the two evangelists.

Why, then, should we be disturbed about a reading which is so clearly due, not to Mark, but to others? What we need to do is simply to return to what is obviously and necessarily Mark's reading: "And it was the sixth hour when they crucified him"; i.e. to read ἐκ τῆς "sixth," instead of ἡ τῆς, "third." This will save us from all false attempts at seeking to reconcile the statements of two evangelists that need no reconciling. Especially will it save us from the impossible feat of making it appear that Mark and John reckoned in different ways. By taking this as the true reading, we also give an otherwise unknown and wonderful significance to the statement given by three of the evangelists: "And the sixth hour having come, darkness came over the whole land until the ninth hour." As much as if we were told that Nature herself was in mourning not merely one half but the whole of that terrible period during which the Lord of life hung in the agonies of death upon the cross!

1 Matt. xxvii. 45; Mark xv. 33; Luke xxiii. 44.

II.

When did Mary the Magdalene come to the Sepulchre?

Mark xvi. 2.

President Dwight, of Yale University, in commenting on John xx. 1, in the Sunday School Times for 1891, page 757, says, "The coming of Mary Magdalene to the tomb is here stated to have taken place early in the morning, while it was yet dark. ... This is not in exact accord with Mark's statement, though it answers sufficiently to that of Luke, who says 'at early dawn,' and that of Matthew, whose words are, 'as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week.' Mark has two expressions; —one of which is, 'very early on the first day of the week,' and the other, 'when the sun was risen.' The latter expression is one which presents a difficulty as related to what is stated in all the other Gospels; while the former, if standing alone, would harmonize with the statements made by them." Dr. Hovey, commenting in like manner on John xx. 1, says, "It is noticeable that John speaks of the time when Mary Magdalene came to the sepulchre as 'early, when it was yet dark.' But Mark speaks of the women as coming to the sepulchre very early . . . when the sun was risen. John says early; Mark, very early; John says, when it was yet dark; Mark, when the sun was risen. If Mark, then, contradicts John, does he not also contradict himself?" It certainly seems so. "But," as Dr. Hovey immediately adds, "the latter is not to be supposed"; and proceeds to give the explanation advocated by Dr. Robinson, and others. This, however, is an "explanation" that will not bear the test of critical examination; for the Greek aorist participle ἀναρέσατο, "having risen," neither has nor can have any reference to the sun as yet below the horizon. The render-

1 Commentary on the Gospel of John, p. 393.
ing of the A. V., "at the rising of the sun," is the result of an endeavor on the part of King James's Translators to do the best they could in the circumstances. But it is not a correct rendering of the Greek that was before them. The only proper rendering that can be given to the word is that of Tyndale, adopted by the Anglo-American Revisers,—"when the sun was risen"; i.e. after the sun had risen, or was above the horizon. The difficulty originated, not with Mark, but with one or more of his early transcribers. In stating the time, Mark did not contradict the other evangelists, nor did he contradict himself. He wrote: "Very early on the first day of the week, ... ἀναστάλησεν τοῦ ήλίου, as the sun was rising." But some careless or inobservant second-century scribe mistook Mark's present participle for an aorist participle; and this false reading, having come down to us in nearly all the documents that have survived to this day whose testimony has been ascertained, has been accepted as the true reading. The present participle, however, which the context calls for, and which there can be no doubt that Mark employed, is attested by D, three copies (a, π, 9) of the Old Latin Version, and Augustine; while Tichonius the Donatist expressly declares: "Mark says as the sun was rising, not the sun having risen." The difference between the two participial forms is a difference of only two letters,—the mistaking of one form for the other being a clerical error of no uncommon occurrence. Thus, in Mark viii. 6, where the reading of the Received Text is the aorist παραγγέλλει, "he commanded," the Revisers read the present παραγγέλλας, "he commandeth," —the two words differing in three letters easily and often mistaken one for another. The former, which is in harmony with the entire context, and is apparently the true reading, is attested by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, W 4, X, Π II, all the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, all the Syriac Versions, as well as the Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. The latter, which seems to be an early transcriptional error, is supported by S, B, D, L, and Δ only. In a simi-
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PROLEGOMENON.

In view of the examination thus far made of the Revisers' Greek Text, the question may arise, how it is possible that a body of scholars so eminent as the Company of New-Testament Revisers should have been betrayed into introducing so many apparently, and often obviously, false readings. The answer is a very simple one. It was owing in part to the manner in which they performed their self-imposed task, and in part to the principles by which they were governed.

In the first place, as a body they were not textual critics; that is, they were not men who had devoted years to the study of the Greek Text of the New Testament with special reference to its correctness or incorrectness as a transcript of the long-lost autographs. The task of presenting to the Company the arguments pro and con in regard to any questionable reading became therefore a necessity. This was generally devolved upon Drs. Scrivener and Hort, the two members of the body who stood almost alone as entitled to speak with authority on questions relating to the text. After a statement of the facts, and a presentation by each of his views, and his judgment in reference to the reading or readings, there was generally more or less questioning and discussion among the members of the body present at the time; after which the vote of the Company was taken, and the proposed reading accepted or rejected. This was the manner in which, as one of their own number expresses it, "the text was settled."  

1 See Lectures on Bible Revision, pp. 119, 120, by Samuel Newth, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.
was Dr. Hort’s earnestness and eloquence that won the day. This is probably what Dr. Schaff means in speaking of Dr. Hort as one who “excited great influence in the Revision Company on all matters of reading.” 1 And as the readings advocated by him were those adopted by himself and Dr. Westcott in the “advance sheets” of their forth-coming Greek Testament, which had been previously and freely distributed among the Revisers for their examination and information, and which were regarded as presumably presenting the purest and best Greek text of the New Testament in existence, they were almost as a matter of course adopted. The exceptions to this were comparatively few, and mostly on points practically of minor importance. A Text adopted in this hasty manner, without previous personal investigation or a thorough examination of the evidence in support of or against the varying readings, must almost of necessity introduce errors of various kinds.

Is it any wonder, then, that corrupt readings should abound in a Text framed by a body of men who, however eminent they might be in other departments of knowledge and Christian work, after listening to plausible arguments in behalf of those readings, should “settle the text” by voting them in?

That it should scarcely be otherwise will be still more obvious when we look at the principle which may be said to constitute the corner-stone on which this new structure, the Revisers’ Text, was erected, namely, that the readings of the oldest extant Greek manuscripts are to be preferred to those of all other documents. This is the leading principle with Drs. Westcott and Hort in all their labors upon the Greek text of the New Testament; and their views on this point were very largely shared by the majority of the New-Testament Company, and governed them in their decisions. Such is the estimate placed by those learned editors on the readings of the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices that other readings, however strongly attested, are practically of no account. Cursives that differ from these manuscripts are disregarded altogether. Early versions and Fathers that support other readings are similarly set aside and frowned upon. Such documents and readings are everywhere branded as Syrian, or Western, or Alexandrian,—terms of no meaning of course, except at most to indicate the class of manuscripts to which they are adjudged as belonging, and always to show that readings so designated are not found in B, and that, in the judgment of these critics, they are false and unworthy of regard. In their eyes, “B very far exceeds all other documents in purity [i.e. in purity] of text.” 1 “It holds a unique position. Its text is throughout Pre-Syrian”; i.e. ante-Nicene or apostolic. 2 “Even when B stands quite alone, its readings must never be lightly rejected.” 3 “B must be regarded as having preserved not only a very ancient text, but a very pure line of very ancient text, and that with comparatively small depravation either by scattered ancient corruptions otherwise attested or by individualisms of the scribe himself.” 4 “At a long interval after B, but hardly a less interval before all other manuscripts, stands Σ.” 5 “The text of Σ seems to be entirely, or all but entirely, Pre-Syrian.” 6 “The fourth century has bequeathed to us two manuscripts, of which even the less incorrupt must have been of exceptional purity among its own contemporaries.” 7 What utterly depraved and worthless copies of the New Testament its contemporaries, then, must have been! We fairly shudder at the thought of

---

1 Introduction to the New Testament in Greek, p. 171.
2 Ibidem, p. 150.
3 The New Testament in Greek, p. 557.
4 Introduction, etc., pp. 250, 251.
5 Ibidem, p. 171. One feels like stopping to take a long breath on coming to a statement like this.
6 Ibidem, p. 151. Another long breath needed.
7 Ibidem, p. 287.
the critical horrors from which we have been saved by the loss of those corrupt contemporaries of $\mathbf{\Xi}$! Westcott and Hort's belief is that, except in a very few instances, "the readings of $\mathbf{\Xi}$ and $B$ should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and that no readings of $\mathbf{\Xi}$ and $B$ can safely be rejected absolutely"; which, while furnishing a loop-hole of escape, implies that strong internal evidence can hardly be found to overcome their testimony.

These views of Westcott and Hort are also largely shared to-day by not a few in America as well as in England. Hence the frequent use in certain quarters of the phrase "the best texts," or "the preponderance of authorities," not meaning thereby the best, the purest, and most correct texts, or the preponderance of testimony obtainable from all the different sources within reach. What is meant by this language is simply the Vatican and Sinaitic Codices; or, at most, these two manuscripts and the handful of other documents that are for the most part in accord with them in their peculiar readings. Such an application of the expression "the best texts" is obviously a perversion of words. Properly speaking, the best texts are those that are freest from spurious and erroneous readings of every kind. But no careful, impartial, thorough comparison has ever been made among manuscripts to see which are really the best. As a general rule, it has been assumed that a certain manuscript was the best, and that others, more or less coinciding with that, were among the best. This, however, is simply a begging of the whole question. But let manuscripts be compared one with another with reference to what are known to be erroneous readings or are capable of being shown to be such, and let those in which the fewest number of false or spurious readings are found be pronounced the best, and we shall have something like a trustworthy standard of what is best among manuscripts and versions. When

---

1 Ibidem, p. 225. 

one of two manuscripts or versions is found habitually to contain what are obviously false readings, or readings that may be clearly shown to be false, we have a sound basis for judgment, and cannot err in deciding which of the two is the better text. But, as just intimated, this is a work that has never yet been performed, even with reference to any two documents. All that we have as yet is an estimate or judgment formed from a general study or examination of documents, enabling one to say, for example, that $B$ presents a purer text than $\mathbf{\Xi}$, or $A$ a better text than $D$. The true standard of relative excellence among manuscripts is yet to be ascertained, and the comparative superiority and value of documents to be determined.

Again, it is supposed by some that the science of textual criticism in reference to the New Testament is matured; that it admits of very few or no modifications or improvements; that the labors of textual critics hitherto have established principles that determine nearly all the questions that have arisen or may arise concerning the text; so that no trustworthy advance can now be made except in accordance with principles and methods already projected and explained, and that it is vain to look forward to any future recension of the text that will supersede the latest efforts of scholars in this direction. All this implies that there is a very general and hearty concurrence among students of the text in regard not only to the principles of criticism, but to the results attained by the application of those principles. But this can hardly be called an impartial, or even an intelligent, view of the subject.

The truth is, the Greek Text of the New Testament, in its present state, cannot be said to be settled. All modern editors are more or less at variance with each other; some of them, in different editions, are even at variance with themselves. This is due mainly to the principles, general and particular, on which they have proceeded. Of late years, the restoration of the so-called Ante-Nicene Text has been the professed aim of certain editors. But the making up of a text from fourth-
century manuscripts and ante-Nicene versions and writings alone
can never give the text of the writers of the New Testament.
In the first place, those manuscripts, versions, and writings
are not in agreement among themselves; there is no such thing
as a distinctively ante-Nicene or fourth-century text. In the
second place, the earliest extant manuscripts and versions are all
more or less depraved; so that if any one of them were taken
and adhered to,—except where they are universally admitted
to be in error,—as the basis of a correct text, the text thus
obtained would be even more corrupt than any now in print.
Again, were any two editors or companies of editors, altogether
independent of each other, and without any communication,
either direct or indirect, each with the other, to undertake a
so-called restoration of the Text of the first century, or of any
other of the early centuries, beyond what we already have, and
have had for the last three centuries, there would probably be
as much difference between the results of the labors of those
two editors or companies of editors as between any two editions
of the Greek New Testament now before the public. In fact,
the critical study of the Greek Text of the New Testament,
though dating back more than 350 years, is yet in its minority.
The more one carefully and critically and reverently examines
the printed text to which he may have access, though it be
considered the best, the more deeply will he be convinced of
this. There are errors not a few yet to be laid bare, and many
corrections yet to be made, before the text can be properly
regarded as settled. These errors are not of such a character
as to affect in any appreciable degree the truths revealed; nor
are the corrections such as to modify in the least the general
trend and end of Scripture teaching. If their influence is
felt in any degree upon the meaning of the Word, the thoughts
embodied therein, it will be simply in removing obstructions,
in shedding light on what may now be more or less obscure,
in establishing and strengthening the believer's faith, and in
rendering the New Testament as a whole even more clear,
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JOHN.

The reading, "This was he that said," to which the marginal note refers as found in some ancient copies in place of "This was he of whom I said," appears only in \( \S \) as amended by its contemporary reviser (the original scribe having omitted the words), B first hand, and C first hand.\(^1\) The reading, though adopted by Westcott and Hort with a dash before and another after it, is an error into which some early reader or scribe seems to have been betrayed by not finding any record that John had previously uttered the words that follow. But, being palpably false, it was subsequently corrected in all these manuscripts. It was the same circumstance that gave rise to the original reading of \( \S \), "This was he who, coming after me, is preferred before me"; which, though more plausible, is without other support. The common reading is, beyond doubt, the true one. It is abundantly attested by \( \S \) as amended by a seventh-century corrector, A, B as amended by a sixth-century corrector (C third hand reads \( \varepsilon \lambda \gamma \nu \omega \nu \) instead of \( \varepsilon \pi \omega \nu \)), D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, \( \Gamma \), \( \Delta \), A, II, as well as all the cursives and ancient versions.

\(^1\) In Huet's edition of Origen's Works, Vol. vi., 3, Origen is made to quote this passage with this reading, though other editions, in the same place as well as elsewhere, represent him as giving the evangelist's words according to the received reading.
i. 18.

On the reading μονογενὴς Θεός, "only-begotten God," referred to in the margin, and vouched for by N, B, C first hand, L, 33, the reader is referred to the able and exhaustive essays of the late Ezra Abbot, which may be found in the recently published volume of his writings entitled Critical Essays (Geo. H. Ellis, Boston), pp. 241-285. Dr. Scrivener concludes his remarks on this reading with saying that "the present is just such a case as calls for the interposition of the more recent uncial and cursive codices; and when we find that they all, with the single exception of Codex 33, defend the reading of μονογενῆς υἱός, we feel safe in concluding that for once Codices N, B, C, and the Peshito do not approach the autograph of S. John so nearly as Codex A, the Curetonian Syriac, and Old Latin versions." 1

i. 42.

Rec. T. Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννης - Simon the son of Jona.
Rev. T. Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάνου - Simon the son of John.

The reading "son of John" is supported by N, B first hand (C and D are defective), L, 33, five manuscripts of the Old Latin, and four of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Roman Ethiopic, and Nonnus in his metrical paraphrase. The reading "son of Jona" is attested by A, B third hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Π, Δ, Λ, II, every cursive but one, ε and ψ of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic as represented by the manuscripts, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria. The transcriber of the Old Latin manuscript ε, being puzzled by the two readings, and not being able to decide between them, cut the Gordian knot by writing frater Andreae, "brother of Andrew," instead. We see no reason for blindly following the Vatican and Sinaic manuscripts and their allies here any more than in many other places. The reading Ιωάννου (or, as B and the Revisers have it, Ιωάνου) originated in a double error. In the first place Ιωάννης, "Jonah," was mistaken or misread as Ιωάννα, another form for Ιωάννου or Ιωάννου, from the nominative Ιωάννας, as many manuscripts read in Luke iii. 27. Codex 69 has this very form Ιωάννα at xxi. 17; and Codex 91 has Ιωάννα in verses 15, 16, as well as in verse 17 of the same chapter. This error was the more readily committed by taking υἱός in the sense of disciple or follower, as in Matt. xi. 27 and Luke xi. 19, and frequently in the Septuagint, instead of its usual sense of son. This makes the true meaning of the Revisers' reading as given in the documents whence it comes, not "Simon the son of John," but "Thou art Simon as the disciple of John; thou shalt [henceforth] be called Cephas." But this, of course, is a false reading; and that such is the case is evident from the fact that Matthew (xvi. 17) reports Jesus as calling Peter, on an after occasion, "Simon, son of Jonah"; nor is there any difference among the manuscripts in this reading. But "Jonah" and "John" are names quite distinct one from the other in origin, signification, and form, the former meaning a dove, and the latter a gift from the Lord or given by the Lord. Notwithstanding the scholium cited by Tischendorf from the margin of Codex Tischendorfianus III., to the effect that in place of "Barjona" in Matt. xvi. 17, the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew has "the son of John," we cannot but think that the scholiast is in error, since the two names are not interchangeable. If Matthew was correct in reporting the Saviour as having called Peter the son of Jonah, and all manuscripts agree in this, the evangelist John, who knew Peter full as well, and could report his Master's words quite as correctly, as Matthew did, could not have confounded "Barjonah" with a name which to a Jew is so widely different from it as "Bar-john." The reading of "son of John" found in xxi. 15-17 is simply a reading conformed to this, supported by the same class of witnesses.

1 Introduction, p. 606.
i. 49.

Rec. T. σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.— thou art the king of Israel.
Rev. T. σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.— thou art king of Israel.

There is no apparent reason why the Revisers should have adopted this reading on the testimony of A, B, L, two cursives, and possibly Epiphanius,—five witnesses or six at the most,—and not have adopted the reading ἐσμένη in verse 50, which is overwhelmingly supported, instead of ἐσμένη. It is true that neither change is essential to a revision of the English text, for the meaning is the same in either case in both places. But, for that matter, only a portion of the changes made by the Revisers in the original were necessary to a proper revision of the English. Many of them, like this, are evident departures from the original, and reasonably attested at best; for there can be no doubt that Nathanael, after having said, "Thou art the Son of God," added, in the same natural order of words, "thou art the king of Israel." Only a lover of variety of expression would invert a part of the last clause, and make it read, "Thou art king of Israel," and at the same time omit the article as improper. John assuredly would not have so reported Nathanael. That he did not, is abundantly testified by the supporters of the common text,—namely, Ν (C and D are defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Т, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, all the versions, Epiphanius according to one codex (though not according to another), Chrysostom, Cyril, and Theodoret.

i. 51.

Rec. T. ἀπὸ ἀρπη ὑψητε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφέσατα,— hereafter ye shall see heaven open.
Rev. T. ὑψητε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφέσατα,— Ye shall see the heaven opened.

The common reading here is attested by A (C and D are defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Т, Δ, Λ, Π, all the cursive, ε, η, the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Augustine. On the other hand, ἀπὸ ἀρπη is wanting in Ν, B, L, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Origen two or three times, and Epiphanius and Cyril each once. Its presence is attributed by some to its being introduced from Matt. xxvi. 64. But it is more probably a part of the original text, early omitted through failure to perceive its applicability. The word means not "after this" or "hereafter," as the L. V. has it, but "from this time," "henceforth." And as the language connected with it was taken literally and misunderstood, the expression was piously omitted as unsuitable. But a true understanding of Jesus’ symbolic language here reveals the word to be a significant and important one in its true sense of "henceforward" or "from this time onward."

ii. II.

Rec. T. ταῦτην ἐποίησεν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς,—This beginning of miracles did Jesus.
Rev. T. ταῦτην ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς,—This beginning of his signs did Jesus.

The Revisers’ omission of the article is in accordance with A, B, L, Т, Λ, ι, 33, 262, Origen, Eusebius according to some codices, Chrysostom in one place, and the Paschal Chronicle. But its presence is called for by Ν, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Т, Δ, Π, all but three cursive, Eusebius in another place, Chrysostom in two other places, and Cyril of Alexandria. One of the principles of Greek composition also makes the presence of the article necessary, if the rendering of the Revisers presents the exact meaning of the evangelist. That principle is, that a noun limited by a demonstrative pronoun must be preceded by the article. It is not to be supposed that John could have omitted the article. If its meaning had been "Jesus wrought this as a beginning of miracles," he might have
having brothers, in the common acceptance of that word, was offensive. It is the work of an early believer in the perpetual virginity of the mother of our Lord. There need be no doubt as to the true reading, that of the Received Text being abundantly attested.

Rec. T. ἐξέχω τὸ κέρμα — poured out the money.
Rev. T. ἐξέχω τὰ κληρονομα — poured out the money.

There is no difference in the meaning of the two readings; so that the change was not necessary to the revision of the English Version. Tischendorf, and Lachmann in his text, adopt the former; Tregelles and Westcott and Hort, the latter. The former is attested by Ν, A (C and D defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, T, Δ, Λ, Π, every cursive but one, all but two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Nonnus. The latter is the reading of B, L, T, X, 33, Ἐ, of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Origen in a number of places. B, X, Π second hand, ten or twelve cursives, and Origen, as well as Cyril, also read ἀνείτρησεν at the end of the verse,—a reading which no modern editors, however, except Westcott and Hort, adopt as genuine instead of ἀνείτρησεν, though they might do it with almost as good reason as to adopt the plural here instead of the singular,—a form that was introduced under the false idea that it was more appropriate than the singular to use in connection with ἐξέχω, "poured out."

iii. 13.

The "many ancient authorities" that "omit which is in heaven" from the end of this verse are Ν, B, L, T, 33, one manuscript of the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Cyril and Origen each once, simply because it did not serve their purpose to quote the words. The omission, for such it is, was
due to the apparent inconsistency of Jesus' being reported as speaking of himself as the Son of man "who is in heaven" when he was in Palestine. Of course, the words are thrown out of the text by Westcott and Hort; but they are retained by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and other modern editors. The evidence in support of their genuineness is simply overwhelming. They are found in A, E, G, H, K, M, S, V, V, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives but one (though Codices 80 and 88 change "in heaven" to "from heaven"), every copy of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, all four of the Syriac Versions, all but one manuscript of the Memphitic, and the Armenian Version. In addition to this, the words are attested as genuine by Hippolytus, Origen according to his Latin interpreter very expressly, Dionysius of Alexandria, Didymus, Basil the Great, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Eustathius, Theodoret, Cyril, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and other Greek Fathers, not to mention a long list of Latin Fathers. One thing is certain, that, while it is easy to account for the omission of these words, they probably would not have got into the text if they had not been genuine.

iii. 16.

Rec. T. πᾶς ἐπίστευσεν εἷς ἀυτόν . . . ξήρ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — whosoever believeth in him should . . . have eternal life.

Rev. T. πᾶς ἐπίστευσεν ἐν αὐτῷ ξήρ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — whosoever believeth may in him have eternal life. [Margin: "Or, believeth in him may have."]

The only Greek manuscripts in support of the Revisers' reading τὸν ἀυτὸν are B and T. These are seconded, however, by three copies of the Old Latin, and seven manuscripts of the Vulgate. The common reading is attested by S (A has ἐπίστευσεν εἷς τοῦ ζωῆς instead), E, F, G, H, K (L has ἐπίστευσεν τοῦ ζωῆς), M, S, U, V, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, five copies of the Old Latin Version, the printed Vulgate as well as several of its manu-

script copies, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Lucifer, and others. The readings of A and L, which can only mean "on him," and therefore cannot be taken with ξηρ as the Revisers in the text take "in him," are in support of the common reading, — “whosoever believeth on him.” This form of words (πιστεύω εἰς αὐτόν) appears again in verses 18, 36, as well as in verse 16. In fact, it is the evangelist's invariable formula for expressing belief on or in Jesus; so that the Revisers' marginal rendering "believeth in him," though a legitimate translation of their Greek, is the rendering of a form of words which John nowhere uses in expressing that thought. The revised reading is apparently an attempt on the part of some early critic to introduce variety, or possibly to bring the evangelist's language here into correspondence with chap. i. 4. The order of the words, however, is an unnatural one for expressing the thought. Compare xx. 31. The reading may safely be regarded a false one.

iii. 17.

Rec. T. τὸν ὑιὸν αὐτοῦ — his Son.
Rev. T. τὸν ὑιόν — the Son.

The omission of "his" here is the work of the same hand that omitted it in the preceding verse. There, however, the omission is supported only by S first hand and B. Here it is favored by two additional uncials, L, T, and five cursives. Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort may be consistent in omitting αὐτοῦ from both verses, though in neither verse is there sufficient evidence or good reason for doing it.

iii. 31.

A marginal note says that "some ancient authorities read he that cometh from heaven beareth witness of what he hath seen and heard." In other words, S first hand, D, the four
cursives, 1, 22, 118, 473, six manuscripts of the Old Latin Version, the Curetonian Syriac, and the Armenian omit "is above all," together with the words "and" and "this" in the next verse. On this testimony, Tischendorf adopts the reading; while Westcott and Hort place it in the margin as a secondary reading, which in their judgment may possibly be the true one. But it bears too palpable marks of being an attempted improvement of the evangelist's language, and is too feebly attested to deserve consideration. It is plain enough that the words might have been omitted from a desire to avoid a seemingly unnecessary repetition. If they are not genuine, it is difficult to see any temptation for introducing them in this connection.

iv. 9.

The sentence "For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans" is noted as one which "some ancient authorities omit." But such marginal notes are uncalled for. The clause is omitted only by N first hand, D, and three copies of the Old Latin Version. It is true, Tischendorf regards it as a gloss, and omits it; and Westcott and Hort seem to be in doubt, and enclose it in brackets. But it was evidently omitted lest ignorant readers might consider it a part of the Samaritan woman's words to Jesus, instead of a parenthetical explanation thrown in by the evangelist. As he was not writing for Jews, he very naturally inserted the clause to account for the woman's remark, just as he inserted verse 8 to show why Jesus asked the woman for a drink. Its genuineness is abundantly attested by N as amended by the original scribe or his "proof-reader," A, B, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, T*, U, V, T, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Cyril of Alexandria, and Chrysostom in two other places,—which fact not only neutralizes his testimony in favor of the omission, but really indicates that the evangelist wrote not merely "a multitude" but "a great multitude."

v. 3, 4.

Rec. T. ἐκδεχόμενον... νοσήματι.—waiting for the moving of the water. For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in, was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.

Rev. T. omits; but the margin says that "many ancient authorities insert" these words, "wholly or in part."

The entire passage, which consists of the last clause of verse 3, and the whole of verse 4, is wanting in N, B, C first hand, 157, 314, 9 of the old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, the Thebaic, and one manuscript of the Memphitic Version,—altogether, less
than ten documents. In addition to these, D, 33, f, l of the Old Latin, a few manuscripts of the Vulgate, and several of the Armenian Version, unite in omitting the fourth verse, and only this; while A first hand, L, 18, omit simply the last clause of the third verse, — "waiting for the moving of the waters." This clause, however, is supported by A second hand, C third hand, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, II (this last having asterisks attached, to denote omission by some), nearly all the cursive, eight manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, one edition of the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, as well as Chrysostom twice, Cyril, and Nonnus in his free paraphrastic way. The genuineness of verse 4 is quite as strongly attested by A, C third hand, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, S with asterisks, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ with obeli hinting suspicion, II as before with asterisks, most of the cursive, some of them marked with asterisks, and some with obeli, six copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Jerusalem, and Philoxenian Syriac (though in the last the latter half of the verse is marked with obeli), Wilkins' Memphitic, the printed copies of the Armenian, Chrysostom and Ambrose each twice, Cyril, Tertullian, and Didymus, — with some verbal differences (most of which are easily accounted for) among the documents. This, however, is not an uncommon thing in some of the best attested passages, as Luke ix. 25, xvi. 27, and many others. In regard to the documentary evidence, all that we can truly say is, that it is divided; there is nothing really conclusive as to either reading. To decide the question, we need to look further, and consider the probabilities.

It is said by the advocates of the Revised Text that verse 4 was inserted to explain the statement in verse 7 about the troubling of the water. If the account given in verse 4 was foisted into the text, as some suppose, whence was it derived? who would have inserted it? It speaks for itself that it is the offspring of a Jewish mind. But Jews were not among the transcribers and early emendators of the New-Testament writings. Josephus records no such account. Neither he nor any other ancient author within our knowledge gives any intimation that the Jews had any legend or story of the kind. Moreover, the words themselves forbid our viewing them as the record of a superstitious conceit, much less of a natural occurrence. Verse 4 is evidently designed to state a supernatural or miraculous event. The water was agitated by an angel. Whoever after that first stepped in was at once cured, whatever may have been his disease or trouble. Only one, and that the first one after the disturbance of the water, could be healed. No matter what his trouble was, he was invariably and instantly cured. It will not do to say that "the water was found at certain intervals to be impregnated with gases which gave it a strengthening property, and this was sufficient to attract many sufferers." To speak thus is to lose sight of the point altogether. The water not only possessed at times a property which attracted many sufferers, but was endued with power to cure every one who first availed himself of it after it had been imparted to the water, whatever his disease may have been. That property was not merely strengthening; it healed at once, and yet healed but one. As Dr. Bloomfield says, "the circumstances of the narration utterly exclude the notion of anything short of miraculous agency." There is no attempt at attributing the cures to natural causes. The efficacy of the pool, the time, and mode of its curing are considered and represented as results of divine agency. But the writer, instead of saying that God troubled the water, in perfect Jewish style says, "an angel troubled" it. Just so Matthew says (xxvii. 2), "An angel of the Lord rolled away the stone" from before the sepulchre; and Paul speaks of the law (Gal. iii. 19) as "ordained through angels," and (Heb. ii. 2) as "the word spoken by angels." Angels were the agents by whom God wrought. And it is in that sense that the writer speaks here of an angel as troubling the water. It accords with the teaching of scrip-
ture generally, to the effect that angels are the invisible instruments of good to men. So that this way of stating the fact, however different from the manner in which we would naturally express ourselves, is not to be wondered at, much less to be considered as essentially unscriptural and unworthy of acceptance as a part of the evangelist's record. Again, on reading the narrative with this passage omitted, there may be no apparent break in going from the middle of verse 3 to verse 5, as in the text of the R. V. But, in reading on and coming to verse 6, and finding that at least one of this multitude of invalids and sufferers had been there a long time, the reader naturally wonders why this should be so. The next verse explains the mystery in part, though very enigmatically, it must be confessed: "I have no man, when the water is troubled, to put me into the pool; but, while I am coming, another steppeth in before me." Yet, even here, the question naturally arises, What does this troubling of the water mean? and why does he speak of having himself put into the pool? Now if the omitted passage were not genuine, here is just where a corrector or reviser of the text would naturally have inserted it, in order to explain the poor cripple's meaning. But we find no trace of anything of the kind in this connection among the manuscripts or other ancient documents. None but the original writer, in anticipation of what he was about to say, would have inserted the passage where it occurs. It certainly comes in very naturally, and presents no appearance of having been interpolated. Similar introductory remarks, designed to prepare the reader for some following statement or incident, not unfrequently appear in this and the other Gospels. Thus, in Mark v. 24, we read that much people followed Jesus, "and thronged him," preparing the reader for the disciple's words, in verse 31, "Thou seest the multitude thronging thee, and sayest thou, Who touched me?" Compare Luke viii. 42, 45. So, too, in Luke ii. 26, the statement that it was revealed to Simeon that he should not die till "he had seen the Lord's Anointed," is given in order to prepare the reader for the words in verse 29, "Now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word." Other instances appear in John ii. 1, "And the mother of Jesus was there," — a remark introduced to prepare the way for verse 3; vi. 2, "And a great multitude followed him," preparing the reader for the statement in verse 5, "And seeing that a great multitude was coming to him"; vi. 23, "But other boats came from Tiberias," — designed to prepare the way for the statement made in verse 24, "they also took shipping"; ix. 14, "And it was the Sabbath day when Jesus made the clay," in anticipation of the record of the Pharisees' words, verse 16, "This man is not of God, because he keepeth not the Sabbath day." Also xi. 18, in view of the fact mentioned in verse 19, and perhaps those given in verses 45, 46, 47. The only real reason why any consider the passage before us as spurious is that it is wanting in less than ten documents, while its presence in the rest of the documents, consisting of several hundred from all parts of Christendom, is thought to be due to a desire to explain verse 7. But this is an untenable position. Besides, the phraseology of verse 4 shows that that verse was penned after verse 3, — and penned because the last clause of verse 3 called for explanation; for verse 4 explains, not why so many impotent persons were lying round the pool, but why they were waiting for the moving of the water. This being the case, the testimony of A first hand, L, and 18, against the last clause of verse 3 amounts to nothing. The fact of their attesting the genuineness of verse 4 is of itself a virtual attestation of the genuineness of the clause which gave rise to this verse, but which they have omitted. And the chief verbal alterations found in this verse among these manuscripts are due to their omission of that clause. Now, if these three manuscripts misrepresent the text here, as they obviously do, why may not the eight or nine documents which omit verse 4 as well as this clause do the same? And, if these give a false text by omitting this clause, it is by no means impossible or even improbable that
they err, and misrepresent the evangelist by omitting verse 4 also. In fact, the internal evidence, to say the least, is very strongly against them. With all our natural repugnance to this passage, and our first impressions in favor of its omission, and our readiness to find good grounds for rejecting it from the narrative, we cannot persuade ourselves that it is spurious.\(^1\)

### V. 44.

The "ancient authorities" referred to in the marginal note as omitting the word "God," and reading "The glory that is from the only, ye seek not," are the one Greek manuscript B, two copies of the Old Latin, one edition of the Memphitic, some manuscripts of the Armenian, and Origen in one place. Its omission is easily accounted for. In the exemplar from which the Vatican or some closely related manuscript was taken, the three words μόνον Θεοῦ νῦν read MONOYΟΥΥ with the stenographic symbol or horizontal stroke above the letters.

\(^1\) The writer has seen somewhere an attempt to explain this passage as follows: The evangelist's word "an angel" is taken to denote a messenger from the temple, —one of the Levites. At the time of offering the daily sacrifices, that is, every morning and evening, he went down into the pool, into which the blood of the beasts slain for the sacrifices was supposed to have run, and stirred the water so as to make it sure that all the blood and other impurities had run out of the pool, and not settled there to defile the place. After that, whoever first stepped into the water was healed, no matter what his trouble was; the healing being considered the result of his faith in the efficacy of the blood of the slaughtered animals. —This attempt at explanation is a pure conjecture; and its absurdity is apparent. The evangelist says that "a great multitude" of impotent folk lay there, waiting for the moving of the water. But this could hardly be if the pool was disturbed twice a day, enabling more than 700 persons to be cured every year. Yet here was a man who had been there "a long time," probably for years, and had been unable to be cured. If the angel had gone down "daily" into the pool, the evangelist would probably have said so, instead of saying "at a certain season." Besides, where was the efficacy of the blood after it had all run out of the pool? And how could any one have faith in it to cure him, when it was not there?

---

### John.

probably very faint, or obliterated, or altogether omitted; and the Θ being mistaken for an O, ΘΥ, i.e. Θοῦ, was dropped as superfluous. The omission, if found in almost any other manuscript, would not be considered worth noticing. No modern editor of the Greek New Testament omits the word; nor do any consider it necessary to enclose it in brackets, except Westcott and Hort.

### vi. 14.

"Some ancient authorities read signs," says the marginal note. Only two Greek manuscripts (B, and the fragment Θ of the sixth century), a of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic and Armenian Versions here read "the signs" or miracles instead of "the sign" or miracle which Jesus did. The singular, of course, refers to the act of feeding the multitude from five loaves and two fishes, and still having twelve baskets of fragments left. But the plural seems to have been introduced from verse 2, with the design of including together with this miracle those that Jesus had previously wrought, —so representing the remark recorded immediately after as made not in view of or in consequence of this miracle only, but in view of his miracles generally up to this time. The context, however, forbids the idea that such was the evangelist’s meaning, and consequently that he expressed himself in the plural here. The plural, however, being found in B, is introduced into the text by Westcott and Hort. Hence the Revisers' marginal note.

### vi. 47.

Rec. T. ὥς παρεῖν πάς ἐμε ἔχων ἀλώνιον. —He that believeth on me, hath everlasting life.

Rev. T. ὥς παρεῖν ἔχων ἔχων ἀλώνιον. —He that believeth hath eternal life.

The latter reading is supported by N, B, L, T, and Zohrab's edition and a few manuscripts of the Armenian Version; the former, by A, C, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, the
whole body of the cursive, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, Uscn's Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Cyril of Alexandria, and Hilary. The Cretan Syriac, in its own peculiar way, translates the evangelist's words, "He that believeth on God," etc. The shorter reading seems to be an early clipping down of the text that found a somewhat wider acceptance than the same omission in chap. iv. 39, which is perpetuated in the cursive 570, a and e of the Old Latin, and Origen once; or than that in chap. xi. 45, the only extant support for which is C second hand. The omission of the phrase "on him" here is altogether unlike John, and is not favored by the context. The verse, in fact, is a repetition, in the form of a solemn asseveration, of what Jesus had already said in verse 40. Having answered the murmurs of the Jews referred to in verses 41, 42, he returns in this verse to the subject he had already introduced; and there is no apparent reason why he should have omitted the important words "on me," or why the evangelist should have recorded him as having omitted them, contrary to the all but overwhelming attestation of the various witnesses capable of being appealed to. Indeed, the emphatic ἐγώ, "I," with which the next verse begins — "I am the bread of life" — implies a reference to and confirmation of the declaration "He that believeth on me hath eternal life." The omission of these words certainly has a suspicious appearance, and is too feebly vouched for to be accepted as genuine. Among modern editors, besides the Revisers, Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort are the only ones, as far as we are aware, that really consider the words spurious.

vi. 51.

Rec. T. ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὁ ἐγώ δίωσω ἐστιν, ὢν ἐγώ δίωσω υπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. — the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

Rev. T. ὁ ἄρτος δὲ ὁ ἐγώ δίωσω ἐστιν, ὢν ἐγώ δίωσω υπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ζωῆς. — yea, the bread which I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.

The two oldest extant Greek manuscripts are by no means agreed in the readings of this verse. In the Sinaitic manuscript, the second clause reads, "If any one eat of my bread, he shall live for ever." In this reading, Ν is joined by a and e of the Old Latin Version, and by Eusebius, Cyprian, and Hilary. Notwithstanding the feeble attestation in support of this reading, Tischendorf adopts it as the true one, though he is constrained to say that the common reading, "this bread," is the more suitable. In the Vatican manuscript, this clause reads as in the Received Text. The clause before us, the Sinaitic manuscript gives thus,—"The bread which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh." The Vatican manuscript, however, gives it as it appears in the Revised Text. Now it is very certain that at least one of these manuscripts has given us a false text, even if it is one of the oldest known manuscripts of the Greek Testament; for both of these readings cannot be genuine. And, if one of them must be more or less false, it is not impossible that both may be. The order in which the words of this clause appear in Ν is evidently due to a desire to give to the phrase "for the life of the world" the place which seemed to belong to it after omitting the words "which I shall give." In B, these last words are simply omitted as superfluous, because they occur just before. There can be but little question on this point, though the reading is also attested by C, D, L, T, three cursives, five copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Cretan Syriac, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, Origen twice, Athanasius, Cyril, and Cyprian. The common reading, "Yea, and the bread that I shall give is my flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world," is every way like John; while the loosely-jointed form in which the words are given in the R. V. is unnatural and altogether unlike him. The former is evidently the source of the other two readings, and as such must be regarded as the true reading. If that of the Sinaitic manuscript were the original reading, no other would ever have been proposed. If that of the Vatican manuscript were the reading
given by the evangelist, we may be assured that the common reading would never have appeared, but that the reading of the Sinaitic Codex would have been more widely adopted and preserved. It is simply because the common reading is the true reading that it has come down to us. Codex A is defective here; but this reading is well attested as genuine by E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, G, A, II nearly all the cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and by Clement of Alexandria, Origen twice, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret at least seven times.

vi. 71.

Rec. T. τὸν Ἰσκαρίωτον Ἰσκαρίωτην. — Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.

Rev. T. τὸν Ἰσκαρίωτον Ἰσκαρίωτον. — Judas the son of Simon Iscariot.

The difference between the two texts is simply in the application of the term “Iscariot,” which is generally regarded as meaning a man of Carioth or from Keroth. The question is, to which of the two persons,—to the father or to the son,—was the name really applied by the evangelist. Before proceeding to consider the testimony of the manuscripts, we desire to notice one or two other points. The first is that in all the other Gospels the name is applied to the son, and to him only, the father’s name not being given in any of them. In Luke xxii. 3, the son is spoken of as “Judas, who was called (or, as some manuscripts read, was surnamed) Iscariot.” Three of the evangelists are thus agreed in applying the name to Judas. How is it with the fourth? In John xiii. 4, all the witnesses are united in applying the name to Judas,—some calling him simply “Judas Iscariot”; others, “Simon’s [son] Judas Iscariot”; and still others, “Judas Simon Iscariot”; while the Codex Bezae (D) calls him “Judas from Carioth.” Again, in xiv. 22, Judas, the brother of James, is, in nearly all the manuscripts, spoken of as “not Iscariot;” which implies that there was another Judas among them who was surnamed Iscariot. D reads “Judas not from Carioth,” which amounts to the same thing. In Münter’s fragments of the Thebaic Version, “Judas not Iscariot” reads “Judas the Canaanite,” while the Curetonian Syriac, in its own peculiar style, calls him “Judas Thomas.” But this, while displaying one of the singularities of these old versions, in no way impairs the otherwise unanimous testimony in regard to the implied application in this connection of the name “Iscariot” to Judas the betrayer of Christ. In xiii. 2, nearly all the ancient documents apply the name to Judas,—some calling him “Judas Iscariot, Simon’s son”; others, “Judas Simon Iscariot”; and two or three others, “Judas from Carioth.” Only L, M, g of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the Armenian Version apply “Iscariot” to the father here. Origen in the manuscripts of his writings speaks only of “Judas Iscariot the son of Simon,” though in his printed works he is twice made to speak otherwise. In three of the five passages in which the name is employed by John, the documentary testimony may therefore be considered as nearly unanimous in applying the surname “Iscariot” to Judas, and not to his father. In xiii. 26, the Received Text reads “to Judas Iscariot [son] of Simon,” which is the reading of A, E, G, H, K, S, U, V, G, A, II first hand, most of the cursives, eight manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Clementine Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, Origen in six different places, and Cyril; while D has “from Carioth,” leaving it doubtful whether the phrase should be applied to the father or to the son. Two or three cursives, four copies of the Old Latin and two of the Vulgate read “to Judas Simon Iscariot.” The Revisers’ Text in that verse has “to Judas [son] of Simon Iscariot,” which is the reading of S, B, C, I, L, M, X, II second hand, six cursives, one manuscript of the Old Latin, and four
of the Vulgate. In the verse before us, the received reading is
that of E, F, H, K, M, S, U, V, Π, Δ, A, Π first hand, nearly
all the cursives, the printed Vulgate, the Gothic, and Cyril.
(Δ is defective here.) D and several Old Latin manuscripts
read "Judas Scarioth [son] of Simon," or "Judas Simon
Ischariot." The Sinaitic Codex first hand, the lost uncial repre-
sented by Ferrar's group, and the margin of the Philoxenian
Syriac have "from Carioth," which may be applied to either
father or son. The Revisers' Text is supported by N's earlier
seventh-century emendator, B, C, G, L, Π second hand (though
the other reading is afterward restored), one cursive, five or
six manuscripts of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, the
Armenian, and possibly the Curetonian Syriac, and the two
Egyptian versions. In both of these instances, the external
evidence being divided, we are left to the internal evidence to
aid us in deciding what the true reading is. And since "Is-
cariot" appears in each of the other Gospels as the surname of
Judas, and is accepted as such in three other places in this
Gospel, it is but reasonable to conclude that, in the remaining
two passages in which the documentary evidence is nearly
evenly divided, the evangelist applied the name, not to the
father, but as elsewhere, to the son. There is really no appar-
ten reason why he should have applied it to the father in these
two places, when he clearly applies it to Judas in all the
others. The difference in readings between the two forms
"Judas Ischariot, son of Simon" and "Judas, son of Simon
Ischariot" is a difference of only two letters in the Greek; and,
when we consider the position of the words, the Revisers' re-
ading is easily accounted for. In the original, in documents
in which the word "Simon" appears, that word generally
stands between "Judas" and the surname "Ischariot." But,
as already seen, some manuscripts read "Judas Simon Ischariot";
that is, the word "Simon," instead of being in the genitive, is
put in the same case with "Ischariot," and in apposition with
"Judas." Thus, in xiii. 4, F, G, H, U, some cursives, two or
three copies of the Old Latin, and Wilkins' Memphitic read
"Judas Simon Ischariot," and in xiii. 26, Codices 13, 101, 346,
four copies of the Old Latin and two of the Vulgate read
"Judas Simon Ischariot." That is, "Simon" is confirmed in
case to "Ischariot." These, however, are discarded on all hands
as false readings. In other instances, "Ischariot" is put in ap-
position with "Simon," which immediately precedes it, and is
therefore confirmed in case to it. Hence "Ischariot," in some
manuscripts, appears divorced from "Judas," and is not unnatu-
urally, yet improperly, made a surname of Simon instead; as
in I, M, one copy of the Old Latin, and the Armenian,—read-
ing "Judas (son of) Simon Ischariot," in xiii. 2; also in N, B,
C, 1, L, and other documents, as already shown, in xiii. 26;
and in N as amended by its earlier seventh century corrector,
B, C, etc., in the verse before us. This reading, the Revisers
and some modern editors have adopted in these last two places,
but not in xiii. 2, though it is the same erroneous reading in all
three of them, only that in two of them it was somewhat more
widely adopted among the manuscripts than in the third. The
fact that three or four of the oldest extant manuscripts together
with a few other documents contain this reading, instead of
being any evidence of its genuineness, is simply an evidence
that the documents in which a reading so transparently false is
found are not altogether above suspicion, and that even their
combined testimony is not to be implicitly received.

vii. 8.

The second clause of this verse reads, "I go not up yet unto
this feast." A marginal note says, "Many ancient authorities
omit yet"; and the American Revisers adopt this reading,—
"I go not up to this feast." It is vouched for by N, D, K, M,
Π, 17 second hand, 389, 579, six copies of the Old Latin, the
Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Curetonian Syriac, the Armenian,
the Ethiopic, Porphyry, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alex-
andria, and Jerome; while that of the text, "not yet," is attested by B, E, F, G, H, L, S, T, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, nearly all the cursive, three copies of the Old Latin, some manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Gothic, the Thebaic, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, and Basil. (A and C are defective.) Documentary testimony as well as intrinsic probability here preponderates in favor of the accepted reading; for it is incredible that Jesus said "I am not going up to this feast," and yet, immediately after, went up. At the same time, there is no probability that any transcriber intentionally or knowingly changed "not yet" to "not." The probability from this point of view is wholly the other way. So that many able critics consider "not" to be really the evangelist's word, and "not yet" to have been introduced in its place in order to reconcile the utterance of Jesus with recorded facts. It will not do to say, with some, that the difference in meaning, caused by the omission of "yet," is immaterial; that the verb is in the present, and that therefore Jesus really means "I go not up at present," leaving it uncertain whether or not he intended to go up later. Such a meaning cannot, by any fair interpretation of the words, be given to them if Jesus really said "I go not up to this feast." This is an absolute disclaiming of any intention to be present at that feast; the negative applies not to the idea of time, but to that of going as connected with this particular feast. In the phrase "not yet," however, the negative refers directly to the time expressed by the enclitic, and not to the meaning of the verb except through "yet." The supposition that Jesus said "I go not up to this feast," with some such unexpressed, underlying thought as "with you," or "publicly," or "as the Messiah," or "for the purpose for which you would have me go," is utterly inadmissible. It is not like Christ. Nor can we conclude that he was bidden by the Spirit to go sooner than he expected, and for this reason went, though he had said he was not going. Such a view is inconsistent with his manifestly constant fulness of the Spirit and possession of divine prescience.

Nor can the supposition be admitted that Jesus, for some other reason, or in any respect, changed his mind. We have no evidence that he changed his intention on any other occasion, not even during his interview with the Syrophoenician woman, nor as he drew near to Emmaus on the evening after his resurrection. Nor can we take his words in the sense of "I am not going up to observe this feast, but for another purpose." This would misplace the negation ["I am going up not to observe" etc.], and render unmeaning the words that follow. Besides, the idea of observance does not lie in the words "unto the feast," either in this or any other place. These are all mere shifts to find a good meaning in a false reading occurring in documents which some seem disposed to consider as incapable of uniting in a false reading, especially if that reading is a hard one.—The Saviour, no doubt, said just what he meant when he declared: "I am not yet going up to this feast"; and the entire connection is in accord with this declaration. His brethren evidently comprehended his meaning. They expressed no surprise whatever in seeing him at the feast, which would hardly have been the case had he said he was not going thither.

—Now, as Dr. Hort very truly says, 1 "all conflicts between intrinsic and transcriptional probability arise from the imperfection of our knowledge." If we knew the real character of many of the transcribers of the old manuscripts of the New Testament, and realized their unfitness for the task they were engaged in, we might have less confidence in the result of their labors, and the testimony of their manuscripts. Let us see what are our leading witnesses in favor of "not." (1) The Sinaitic Codex, which gives evidences from beginning to end of having been carelessly written, "the whole manuscript being disfigured by corrections"; and (2) the Codex Bezae, which has confessedly a "singularly corrupt text," and is in many respects a very untrustworthy witness. To give the reader some idea of how little
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we can rely on this as a genuine reading because of its being found in these manuscripts, we note in passing that only two verses previous to this (in verse 6), the scribe of the Sinaite Codex gives as the true reading, "My time is not come," instead of "not yet" come,—the very mistake he makes in this verse. In Rev. xvii. 12, he gives oυτω, "thus," instead of oυτων, "not yet." In John viii. 57, D changes oυτω to oυτων, though without changing the meaning. In John xi. 30, it changes oυτω to oυτω, just as in the passage before us,—making the record read, "Jesus was not (instead of not yet) come into the village." Now, as these changes were effected in other places, why should not oυτω be changed to oυτω here? We do not say the change was intentionally made; but we have no doubt that it was made. With such copyists as the transcribers of some of the old manuscripts, it would be no difficult thing to write oυτω instead of oυτων while the influence of the preceding negatives still lingered upon the mind, or to mistake oυτων, standing at the end of a line, for oυτω, overlooking the omega written in a diminutive and possibly obscure form after the Π, as it was often written. In some such way as this, it is by no means improbable that "not" crept into the text; and the sentence that immediately follows rather favors this reading: "And having spoken thus to them, he remained in Galilee"; i.e. he did not go up to the feast with them. The error having crept in, and that too in a very early manuscript, it would of course be almost necessarily transmitted in subsequent copies, and be more or less widely circulated.—An additional consideration that seems to call for "not yet" as the genuine reading is the statement that follows: "For my time is not yet come," i.e. not for going up to Jerusalem, but for going up "to this feast," as his brethren obviously understood it. It is true, they had been urging him to go up to Jerusalem to show himself openly before his disciples, and let his claims be known. To that, he had already replied in verse 6: "My time [for doing this] is not yet come." A moment or two after, he says to them, "Go ye up to the feast;
which in verse 41 is certainly the reverse of this; for, as the words are transposed there in these versions, they are likely to be transposed here also. But, as Tischendorf says, the arrangement of B, L, T, etc., "seems to be a transposition made with a view to separate the words Δαβίδ and Δ Χριστός," so that no one should be in danger of reading the passage, "For he cometh of the seed of David, from Bethlehem, the village where David the Anointed was." In confirmation of this, we find that, while D and the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions retain the arrangement Δ Χριστός ἐρχεται, they place the words in other parts of the verse, that is, away from Δαβίδ, while the Old Latin Version ε omits Δ Χριστός, and follows "David" immediately with the verb "he cometh." The revised arrangement is a transparent alteration of the evangelist's words.

vii. 46.

Rec. T. Ὄδιποτοι οὗτοι ἱλασμένοι ἄνθρωπος ὃς οὗτος ἄνθρωπος.—Never man spake like this man.

Rev. T. Ὄδιποτοι ἱλασμένοι οὗτος ἄνθρωπος.—Never man so spake.

The position given to οὗτος, "so," in the Revised Text may be correct. But the propriety of omitting as spurious the words "like this man," is questionable. Tischendorf not only adopts these words, but inserts λαλεῖ, "speaks," after οὗτος. The revised reading is found in S as amended early in the seventh century, B, L, T, 225, 229 first hand, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Memphitic Version, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria. The common reading is given by S first hand, D (omitting ἄνθρωπος at the end of the clause), E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, T, Δ, A, II, nearly all the cursives, most manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. (A is still defective.) One would hardly have been tempted to add the words, "like this man," for they are wholly unnecessary; but they might very naturally have been, and apparently were, omitted as redundant. Hence, probably the shorter and less generally adopted reading.

vii. 53—viii. 11.

If the genuineness of this paragraph respecting the woman taken in adultery is to be decided by an appeal to documentary evidence, it cannot be maintained. That evidence, as it now stands, is clearly against the passage as a part of John's Gospel. Of all the Greek manuscripts that have come down to us from a date prior to the eighth century, the only one that contains the passage is D, which is noted "for its numberless and strange deviations from other authorities," especially for its "many bold and extensive interpolations." ¹ The only ancient versions that contain the passage are the Old Latin manuscripts b first hand, ἡ, ἰ, ἱ, the margin of ἱ, and the Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions, to which may be added the later Slavonic, Anglo-Saxon, Persic, and Arabic Versions, which were obtained mainly or wholly through the Latin. Of the Greek Fathers, Euthymius, of the twelfth century, is the first to notice the passage as a part of John's Gospel. The "Apostolic Constitutions," of the third or fourth century, alludes to the story of a woman accused before the Lord of many sins; so does Eusebius, following Papias; but he did not consider it as a part of Scripture. Besides, the copies that contain the paragraph vary among themselves in their readings more than in any other part of the New Testament. All of which circumstances naturally lead one to conclude that the passage is not a proper part of the fourth Gospel. And yet, as Scrivener says, "while it is absent from too many excellent copies not to have been wanting in some of the very earliest, the arguments in its favor, internal even more than external, are so powerful, that we can scarcely be brought to think it an unauthorized appendage to the writings of one,

¹ Scrivener, Introduction, p. 126.
who in another of his inspired books deprecated so solemnly the adding to or taking away from the blessed testimony he was commissioned to bear."¹ And one of the foremost of American New Testament scholars has well said, "Uniting the internal with the external difficulties, the numerous varieties of reading (always suspicious) and the absence of the passage from so many manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, the case is strong against it — only, however, against its genuineness here. That it is, if not Johannine, at least apostolic, and describes a real and most remarkable incident in the life of our Lord, cannot be well doubted; there is none in the record of our Saviour's life that is more completely lifted above any conception which belonged to the men of his time, and more completely beyond the probability of fabrication. In the Lord's answer to his accusers, by his ready escaping from the snares laid for him, and that subtle appeal to their consciences, which, by placing the lustful feeling on a virtual equality with the outward act (as Matt. v. 28 ff.), dissolved the accusation and dispersed the accusers; and in his subsequent treatment of the woman, his separating his mission, on the one hand, from human civil tribunals, and his assertion of his divine relation as not here to condemn and punish, but to pity and save, it proves itself worthy of a place — however it got there — in the heart of the most spiritual of the Gospels."² And Dean Burgon, in reference to this passage, says, "I am convinced that the first occasion of the omission of those memorable verses was the lectionary practice of the primitive Church, which, on WhitSunday, read from S. John vii. 37 to viii. 12, leaving out the twelve verses in question. Those verses, from the nature of the contents, as Augustine declares, easily came to be viewed with dislike or suspicion. The passage, however, is as old as the second century, for it is found in certain copies of the Old Latin. Moreover, Jerome deliberately gave it a place in the Vulgate."¹ This seems to be a very reasonable view, if not the real explanation, of the omission of the passage and of the various readings found in connection with it. We should be slow to have the passage stricken from the Bible.

viii. 38.

Rec. T. Ἐγώ, διώκοις τῷ Πατρὶ μου, λαλῶ· καὶ ὅλης οὖν, διώκοτε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ Υμῶν, τουεί. — I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father.

Rev. T. ἐγώ διώκοις παρὰ τῷ πατρί, λαλῶ· καὶ ὅλης οὖν ἥκονσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, τουεί. — I speak the things which I have seen with my Father: and ye also do the things which ye heard from your father.

The common reading, in retaining "my," is supported by Ν, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ the entire body of the cursive, eight copies of the Old Latin, the Clementine Vulgate, and some copies of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Tertullian; in retaining "your," it follows Ν, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and all the other witnesses that read "my Father." The Revisers' Reading, omitting μο, is attested by B, C, L, T, X, two manuscripts of the Old Latin, and seven of the Vulgate, the Roman Ethiopic, Origen, and Cyril of Alexandria; and in omitting Υν, by B, L, T, 13, the Roman Ethiopic, Origen (who in both instances seeks to defend the omission), and Cyril of Alexandria. But there is an evident contrast between τῷ Πατρὶ and the following τῷ πατρῷ, or τοῦ πατρῶς of the Revised Text; and with this contrast existing, it is impossible that the Revisers' Text should present the true reading. Such a reading, in such a connection, moreover, forbids such a rendering as is given in the R. V.; though either

¹ Introduction, p. 610.
295.

¹ The Last Twelve Verses of Mark, p. 219.
of these clauses standing by itself, uncontrasted with the other, might allow the Greek article to be represented in English by an unemphatic "my" or "your." But, as they stand, in connection with each other, and without the genitives (μοῦ and ὑμῶν), the only proper rendering becomes that given in the margin, which makes "the Father" refer in both instances to God: "I speak the things which I have seen with the Father; do ye also therefore the things which ye heard from the Father"; or, the words might be rendered, "Of what I have seen with the Father, I speak; so, too, what ye have heard from the Father, ye do." But either of these — the only legitimate renderings of the Revisers' Text — is so unsatisfactory, so palpably inexpressive of Jesus' thought, that it condemns the text itself. The Jews evidently perceived that Jesus did not refer to God in what he said concerning him whose teachings they were said or enjoined to follow. They saw, too, that he referred to some other father than Abraham. Hence their reply. But this was owing to the Saviour's using the emphatic pronoun "your" in connection with "father," and in contrast with "my Father." The Revisers' rendering, while doubtless giving the Saviour's meaning, is not a legitimate translation of the Greek text which they have adopted. In omitting μοῦ and ὑμῶν, that text is plain at fault.

viii. 39.

Rec. T. Ἐλ τεκνα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἔστε, τὰ ἵγα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐποιεῖτε ἄν.
— If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.

Rev. T. Ἐλ τεκνα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐστε, τὰ ἵγα τοῦ Ἰσραήλ ἐποιεῖτε.
— If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.

To this rendering, against the word "were" the Revisers affix the marginal note, "Gr. are:" that is, "If ye are Abraham's children" etc. — The received reading ἔστε is attested by C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Δ, Λ, Π, every cursive except one lectionary, seven copies of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito

Syriac, Origen three times (in each instance followed by the imperfect, ἐποιεῖτε), Eusebius three times, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Didymus, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Hilary, and other Latin Fathers. (A is defective here.) The Revisers' reading ἐστε (which they found it necessary to abandon when they came to translate) is supported by Ν, B, D, L, T, one lectionary, ff of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Origen ten times, it being followed in each instance by the imperative ποιεῖτε (he having, without doubt, taken both these forms from a different manuscript from that from which he quoted the common reading in the three passages above referred to), and Augustine. As for the second verb, most of the witnesses give the imperfect, some with and some without ἄν. Codex B first hand, and, as just seen, ff, the Vulgate, Origen, and Augustine give the verb in the present imperative. Now, it is this imperative form that points to the origin of the reading ἐστε, which is supported by every witnessing document that has the imperative instead of the imperfect. In some early copy, the augment of the verb seems to have been carelessly dropped, and the ἄν (which would naturally accompany ἐποιεῖτε, just as it accompanies ὑπαναγερήτω, "ye would love," in verse 42), became lost or absorbed in the following νῦν, leaving ποιεῖτε in place of ἐποιεῖτε ἄν. The manuscript that contained this reading, falling into the hands of some one else, was afterwards "corrected" by changing ἔστε to ἐστε, — giving the plausible reading, "If ye are Abraham's children, do the works of Abraham." But the copyists of Ν, D, L, and T, as well as an early corrector of B, or some of their predecessors, finding that the imperative of the second verb was unwarranted, replaced the imperfect ἐποιεῖτε, but retained ἐστε. Hence the Revisers' reading. The reading of the Received Text is placed beyond a doubt as to its genuineness by verse 42. There, precisely the same structure occurs as here; and it is fully attested as genuine. And, inasmuch as the proper grammatical structure is strictly adhered to there, we hazard nothing in saying that it is a moral impossibility for the
writer of verse 42 to have put words together as they appear in
the Revisers’ Text in the verse before us. Such composition is
• due only to others. If John were given to writing like this, the
case would be different. But when he uniformly constructs
his conditional sentences correctly, it becomes his critics to
recognize this fact, and not to seek to fasten on him the errors
of his copyists or others.—It may be added in passing, that
the Revisers’ Text, in Luke xvi. 6, presents a similar case of
false reading, where the revised reading εχετε, “ye have,” is
simply an early attempt at improving the Saviour’s statement,
or possibly a transcriptional error for εχετε, “ye had.” In
either case, it is a false reading.

viii. 44.

There can be but little if any doubt on the part of competent
witnesses that the common reading οὐχ έστηκεν, “standeth not,”
which is followed by the American Committee, is the true reading
here. The English Revisers, however, have transferred this
to the margin, and substituted instead the reading adopted by
Westcott and Hort, οὐκ έστηκεν, “stood not.” This last is
apparently the reading of Ν, B first hand, D, I, X, Δ, Λ second
hand, and six cursives; while the former, which is adopted by
Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf (though he very inconsistently
reads οὐκ έστηκεν), and other modern editors, is that of
B third hand, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Π, Λ first hand, Π,
and nearly all the cursives.—A being defective. “Εστηκεν is
supposed to be the imperfect of έστηκεν, “to stand.” But this verb
is nowhere found in the imperfect in classic Greek, or in the
Septuagint; nor, apart from this passage, even in the New
Testament; while έστηκεν appears everywhere. The latter is
perfectly adapted to the context, it being in fact more in keeping
with Christ’s representation of Satan as the father of the
truth-hating Jews to say that “he standeth not in the truth,”
\textit{i.e.} his permanent attitude is against it, his character is that of

a liar, than to say that “he stood not in the truth,” as if referring
to some past act of his. The fact that so many ancient
manuscripts unite in writing οὐκ, as if the next word began with
a smooth breathing, is no evidence in itself against the perfect
εστηκεν, “standeth.” It only shows the carelessness or the
false mode of pronunciation of certain scribes. Any one at all
familiar with the old manuscripts need not be told that οὐκ
occasionally appears where οὐχ properly belongs; as, οὐκ ἐφέσκον
(Mark xiv. 55), in B first hand, I, Δ; οὐκ ἔφη (Luke xxiv. 3),
and οὐκ ἐπάρχει (Acts iii. 6) in Ν, Δ, Λ; οὐκ ἀρτι (John vii. 22) in
B first hand; and οὐκ ἤκεκ (2 Cor. vii. 12) in Ν, Δ, Λ, E, 17,
etc. On the other hand, οὐχ sometimes usurps the place of
οὐκ; as, οὐχ, ἢδο (Acts ii. 7) in Ν, D, E, 61; οὐχ ὄλγος (Acts
xii. 18) in Ν, A, and (xvii. 4) in B first hand, and (xix. 23) in
Ν, Δ, Λ; and even οὐχ Ἰουδαιώω (Gal. ii. 14) in Ν first hand,
Δ, C, Π, 17, 37; while Ν as amended by its earlier seventh-
century corrector, B, D first hand, and a few cursives have οὐχι
for οὐκ here,—apparently intended as a correction of οὐχ, as if
the final iota had been overlooked or absorbed in the next
word. If any one is disposed to think that the evangelist him-
self may have pronounced έστηκεν with the smooth breathing,
and consequently actually wrote οὐκ instead of οὐχ, he ought
perhaps, in self-consistency, to conclude that John meant to
say, in iii. 36, οὐχ ὑπεται, because D, Λ, Δ, so represent him;
in vi. 42, οὐχ οὕτως, because B, T give this as his language; in
vii. 22, οὐκ ἀρτι, because the copyist of B represents him as
having so written instead of οὐκ ἀρτι; in x. 28, οὐ μὴ ἄρπαση,
because Ν, D, Λ, X, 71, 157, and a few other cursives read thus
instead of οὐχ ἄρπασε; in xvi. 7, οὐ μὴ ἀληθῆ (as Westcott and
Hort do), because B, L, and Chrysostom give us these as his
words instead of οὐκ ἠλευσται; or in xix. 6, οὐκ εἰδίσκω, because
I, Δ say so.\footnote{Those who desire a more complete examination of this passage are
referred to the exhaustive essay of the late Prof. Ezra Abbot, to be found in
his Critical Essays (pp. 286–293), published by Geo. H. Ellis, Boston,
1888.}
ix. 4.

Rec. T. ἔμε δεί ἐργάσσομαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ ποιμνιστὸς με — I must work the works of him that sent me.

Rev. T. ἡμᾶς δεί ἐργάσσομαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ ποιμνιστὸς με — We must work the works of him that sent me.

This is one of the worst of the spurious readings introduced into the Revisers' Text. It is attested only by B, D, and the Thebaic and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, — D, however, reading δεί ἡμᾶς etc., instead of ἡμᾶς δεί etc. It is, of course, adopted by Westcott and Hort, and is given as a primary reading by Tregelles. Ν first hand, I, the Memphitic, Roman Ethiopic, and Erpenius' Arabic Versions, and Cyril of Alexandria read, "We must work the works of him that sent us." This, Tischendorf thinks, could not have originated with a corrector of the text; hence he adopts it. And yet it is plainly a modification and attempted improvement of the other, — the apparent incongruity between "we" and "me" having naturally led to the change. The received reading, which is adhered to by Lachmann, Alford, and others, is attested by Ν's contemporary corrector or "proof-reader," A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the entire body of the cursive, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Platt's Ethiopic. That this is the original reading seems clear. Jesus had just met a blind man, to whom all was as night; and who, by his blindness, was disqualified for working. Yet no one was to blame for his condition. If viewed aright, his blindness was of God, in order that in his restoration to sight there might be a display of divine power. The announcement of this fact naturally draws the attention of the disciples to Jesus as about to make such a display. But, before making it, he goes on to say, "I" — with special emphasis upon the word, contrasting himself thereby with the Jews who were before him, and who were commanded not to work on that day, — "I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day," — while the opportunity for working is presented, though it be the Sabbath. "The night" — the time of darkness, when the eyes must be closed in death to all earthly things — "cometh, when no one can work"; not only the blind, but all will be disabled from farther work. It is this reference to men in general, considered as a reason, though it is not formally stated as a reason, for the Saviour's making the preceding remark, that led some early reader of this Gospel, who failed to see the propriety of Jesus' saying that he, any more than others, should work while it was day, to change "I" to "we," — making the Saviour say, "We [i.e. we all, mankind in general] ought to work the works of him that sent me [i.e. of God] while it is day, [for] the night is coming, when no one can work." It is converted into a general admonition against being "weary in well doing," or sleeping away one's privileges and opportunities. It was by no means necessary to change "him that sent me" to "him that sent us." For the emendator's purpose, there was no fitness, no propriety in the latter wording, while the expression "him that sent me" was altogether suitable, it being Jesus' well-known form of speech for "God." The change to "us," adopted by Tischendorf, was obviously effected by a later hand. — Compare B's reading in xvii. 12, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐπὶ αὐτῶν etc. "While we were with them, I kept them" etc.

ix. 6.

Rec. T. ἐπέστρεψεν τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄφθαλμος τοῦ τυφλοῦ, — he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay.

Rev. T. ἐπέστρεψεν αὐτῶν τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄφθαλμος, — he anointed his eyes with the clay.

Neither this rendering of the Revisers, nor that given in the margin — "and with the clay thereof (he) anointed his eyes" — can be pronounced a correct rendering of the Revised Text. The expression, "the clay thereof," is an unmeaning phrase, — one that can be invested with sense only by inserting some
such word as "made," which cannot be done without reading ἐκ αὑτοῦ. Neither can αὑτοῦ be referred to the blind man, so as to be translated with ὀφθαλμοῖς "his eyes." Its position forbids this. The only legitimate rendering that this text admits is "He spread his clay upon the (his) eyes." The Jerusalem Syriac Version has it correctly, "He overlaid the eyes of the blind man with his moistened earth," or clay. "His," i.e. the mortar which he (Jesus) had made; not "its," or the mortar of the spittle. The only witnesses to this reading as a whole are Χ, L, 1, 33. Codex B differs from them by having ἐπίθηκεν, "placed," instead of ἐπέχρισεν, "smeared" or "spread." Λ, C second hand, four or five other cursive, and Cyril of Alexandria, like the foregoing documents, read αὑτοῦ; but, unlike them, these as well as C first hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, the rest of the cursives, a number of versions, including the Syriac, Chrysostom, and Ammonius of Alexandria also add τοῦ τυφλοῦ, "of the blind man," as the Received Text does. And this Lachmann accepts as the original reading. It is confirmed by D, which in its peculiar way reads αὑτοῦ for αὑτοῦ, and αὑτοῦ in place of τοῦ τυφλοῦ. The Old Latin Version and the Vulgate also testify, by somewhat similar readings, to ἐπέχρισεν αὑτοῦ τοῦ τυφλοῦ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τοῦ τυφλοῦ as the true text,—"He spread his moistened clay upon the eyes of the blind man." But αὑτοῦ, being misunderstood or considered superfluous, was afterwards dropped in some copies, while it led to the omission of τοῦ τυφλοῦ in a few in which the pronoun itself was retained.

x. 18.

The "ancient authorities," here referred to in the margin, that read, "No one took it (i.e. my life) away" in place of "No one took it away," are only Χ first hand, and B. The reading is an impossible one, resulting from carelessness in copying, the proper vowels having been mistaken for others,—an itacism of not infrequent occurrence. Buttmann speaks favorably of the reading; but it is certainly no gnomic or iterative aorist, as he seems to consider it. Westcott and Hort, of course, adopt the reading; but it is indefensible.

x. 22.

The margin here notes the fact that some ancient documents read "At that time was the feast" etc., instead of "And the feast was." Those documents are B, L, 33, and the Thebaic and Armenian Versions; while the Memphitic Version and one manuscript of the Latin Vulgate combine both readings, and say, "And at that time was" etc. On the other hand, nine or ten cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, and Chrysostom omit both, and begin the verse without any connective. The reading, "at that time," is a transparent gloss, designed to give definiteness to the statement. If it had been the original reading, the other would hardly have crept in, much less become so generally prevalent.

x. 22.

Rec. T. καὶ Χριστὸν ἤν — and it was winter.
Rev. T. Χριστὸν ἤν — it was winter.

The conjunction of the Received Text may have been absorbed in the first syllable of the next word, from some early copyist's misunderstanding what was dictated to him; or it may have been omitted by the same hand that changed δὲ to τὸν in the beginning of the verse, to give greater point and terseness to the passage: "At that time occurred the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem. It was winter, and Jesus was walking in the temple in Solomon's porch." This, however, is not in accordance with John's running style: "Now the feast of the dedication was in progress at Jerusalem, and it was winter"; — the

latter clause being incidentally thrown in for the information of non-Jewish Christian readers. Otherwise the writer would have gone directly on, and said, “was in progress at Jerusalem; and Jesus was walking” etc. The conjunction is wanting in Β, D, G, L, X, Π, four cursives, one manuscript of the Old Latin, the Ethiopic, and the two Egyptian Versions; while it appears in A, E, F, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, nearly all the cursives as well as manuscripts of the Old Latin (δ omits the whole clause), the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and in Chrysostom.

Χ. 29.

“That which my Father hath given unto me is greater than all” appears in the margin here as the reading of some ancient documents in place of “My Father who hath given them to me is greater than all.” In other words, some ancient documents read δ, quod, and μεῖζον, majus, where most documents read ὅσ, qui, and μεῖζον, major; in the sentence δ πατήρ μου ὅσ διδοκί μοι πάντων μεῖζον εστί. The only Greek manuscript that reads δ . . . μεῖζον is the Vatican Codex as penned by its original scribe. His contemporary “proof-reader,” however, changed the δ to ὅσ, but left the other word unchanged, as the uncials Α and Χ also read. The Sinaitic Codex and Ι, on the other hand, read δ, but have μεῖζον. All this shows that the transcribers of these manuscripts were at a loss about the text, and left it in obvious error; for neither δ . . . μεῖζον εστί nor ὅσ . . . μεῖζον εστί is grammatical Greek or reasonably translatable. The Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic Version, and the Latin Fathers generally adopt the reading of Β, — “quod mihi dedit majus est.” But the Greek Fathers give no countenance to this reading. Cyril of Alexandria, in opposition to Tertullian’s reading of the passage, quotes the common text as presenting John’s words. Tischendorf says, it is incredible that any one who had found ὅσ and μεῖζον in the text should have deliberately changed them into δ and μεῖζον. We presume no one really supposes that the change was deliberately made. It shows for itself that it was not. The early readings ὅσ . . . μεῖζον and δ . . . μεῖζον declare plainly that the former crept in through the very common mistake of writing an ο for an ω in μεῖζον, or else that the latter arose from the unconscious introduction of δ as the article, but without any breathing, in place of ὅσ through the influence of the preceding δ still lingering on the copyist’s mind. Either one of these blunders having been committed, a subsequent scribe detecting the inconsistency of coupling a neuter with a masculine word, and not perceiving in which the error lay, completed it by making both words neuter, instead of correcting it by changing the neuter back to the masculine. This is all there is of it; and the Vatican Codex is one of the places where just such errors appear. From the fact that B’s “proof-reader” or reviser changed the δ to ὅσ and left μεῖζον uncorrected, the probability is that in B’s exemplar the error was in the latter, not in the former,—the reviser in making his correction simply “following copy.”

Χ. 39.

Rec. T. ἐξῆγον οὖν πάλιν αὐτὸν πᾶσαν. — Therefore they sought again to take him.

Rev. T. ἐξῆγον πάλιν αὐτὸν πᾶσαν. — They sought again to take him.

Οὖν is wanting in Β, Ε, Γ, Η, Μ, Σ, Υ, Π, Α, about forty cursives, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Gothic Versions. D, the Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions read “And they sought” etc. But Β, Α, Κ, L, Χ, Δ, Π, most of the cursives, every manuscript but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom attest οὖν as the true reading. And this is one of the places where John, who employs the word so freely, would naturally, if not of necessity, use it. It was evidently dropped out.
inadvertently because of its following ἑξητεύω, — the copyist not observing that the letters ΟΥΝ needed to be repeated. After its omission from some manuscripts, καί was introduced, as in D, etc., under the conviction that some connective was necessary, and that that was the proper one.

xi. 44.

Rec. T. καὶ ἐξητεύων ὁ τεθνηκός, — And he that was dead came forth.
Rev. T. ἐξητεύων ὁ τεθνηκός, — He that was dead came forth.

This omission of the conjunction is found in B, C first hand, I, one lectionary, one version (the Thebaic), and Origen once. The fact that Origen omits it is of but little weight. The want of connection between sentences embodying thoughts so closely united as these is not in favor of the omission. It misrepresents the evangelist's well-known style. Having recorded Christ's cry, "Lazarus, come forth!" he would naturally follow this up with saying, "And he that had been dead came forth." And so we must believe he actually did write, unless we reject the testimony of A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Syrnic Versions, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. It is true that D, of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Andreas of Crete insert εἰσίν, or εἰσίως, "immediately," in connection with καί; but this does not in the least reflect upon the genuineness of the conjunction. The omission belongs to the same class of readings as ἐκράζεν (in C) and ἐκραίναεν (in L) for ἐκραίγασεν, in the preceding verse, — false.

xi. 45.

Rec. T. θεασάμενοι δ' ἔστησεν, — had seen the things which he did.
Rev. T. θεασάμενοι δ' ἔστησεν, — beheld that which he did.

The plural δ is set aside for the singular δ, with the marginal note that "many ancient authorities read the things which he..." This "many" must be a misprint for "most"; for the "ancient authorities" referred to are A, first hand, E, G, H, K, I, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursive, three of them reading δοσα instead of δ, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Origen at least six times, and Andreas of Crete. The singular, which appears in the Revised Text, is the reading of only A second hand, B, C, D, three cursive, e of the Old Latin, the Thebaic, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, — C second or third hand adding σημαίων, making the words read, "the miracle which." It is clearly a change from the plural to the singular suggested by the one act to which special reference is made. Had this been the original reading, it could hardly have been intentionally changed, much less become so general. The same change to the singular was attempted in the next verse, where it appears in C, D, M, two or three cursive, two copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions. But the evangelist evidently wrote the same in both verses.

xi. 53.

Rec. T. συνεβουλεύσαντο — they took counsel together.
Rev. T. εὐβουλεύσαντο — they took counsel.

In support of the latter reading, we have the testimony of B, D, the lost uncial represented by 13, 69, 124, and 346, Origen in one passage, Athanasius, and Chrysostom; in support of the former, that of A, E, G, H, I, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, all the cursive except Ferrar's group, Origen twice, the Paschal Chronicle, and Cyril of Alexandria. Cyril says explicitly that John "does not say that from that hour they consulted εὐβουλεύσαντο to commit the murder, but that they consulted together συνεβουλεύσαντο; that is, what seemed best to each individually was determined upon by all conjointly." While the weight of "authority" favors the common reading, it is noteworthy that this, and not the simple word, is the one used in the other instances (Matt. xxvi. 4, John xviii. 14), in which the chief
priests, scribes, and elders are spoken of as conspiring against Christ's life; and it is but natural that the evangelist should have used the same word to express the thought here. The circumstances seem to call for the compound form: they deliberated one with another, they "counsell'd together," in order to effect their purpose.

xii. 7.
Rec. T. ἀφεὶς αὐτὴν ἔλεγεν τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιάσματος μου τηρήσειν αὐτῷ. — Let her alone; against the day of my burying hath she kept this.
Rev. T. ἀφεὶς αὐτὴν ἔλεγεν ἔλεγεν τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσειν αὐτῷ. — Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying.

The received reading is supported by A, E, F, G, H, I, M, S, U, Δ, Λ, most of the cursive, one copy of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Gothic. The revised is attested by Ν, Β, Δ, Κ, Ι, Q, II, 33, 42, 145, 157, most manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Jerusalem Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian and the Ethiopic. But the reading is demonstrably false,—having originated in a desire to attach a clearer and more natural meaning to Christ's words than they seemed to have. Jesus spoke of his burial in anticipation, speaking as if he was about to be, or was on the point of being, buried. And this he could do without violence to his words, insomuch as he was laid away in the grave only four or five days afterwards. But some early reader of this Gospel, unable to see how Jesus could be anointed so long beforehand for his burial and while he was still alive and at a feast, considered the words irrelevant if not entirely out of place. To remove the supposed difficulty, he inserted ἔλεγεν ἔλεγεν, "that," and changed the form of the verb correspondingly, from the perfect indicative to the aorist subjunctive, — making Jesus say, "Let her alone that she may preserve it" etc. This, of course, implies that the remark was made before the anointing was effected. It means, "Instead of asking or wishing her to sell the ointment, and to use the money for the poor, let her alone that she may keep it for the day of my burial, and use it then." But Judas's objection, to which the words of Jesus were a reply, was not made until after the woman had used the ointment. His words were not, "Why may (or should) not this ointment be sold?" but "Why was it not sold?" i.e. instead of being used as it has been. "The rendering, Suffer her to keep it against the day of my burying, seems to have little pertinence against the murmuring of the thievish discipie (which was not directed against any supposed future use of the money, but only against its present alleged waste); nor [is it] very intelligible in itself, as that part of it which had been used could not be so preserved [i.e. on the assumption, and it is a mere assumption, that only a part of the ointment had been used], and of a
remaining portion of it the text says nothing." 1 The alternative rendering found in the margin, "Let her alone: it was that she might keep it against the day of my burial," is simply an attempt to make the best of a false reading,—an attempt for which there is no warrant elsewhere in the New Testament. That is to say, though ἵσα appears in the New Testament more than 650 times, nowhere else can a clause introduced by it be found that is dependent on a verb which is neither expressed nor necessarily implied in the context, as this marginal rendering supposes this clause to be,—unless it is in some such connection as we find it in 2 Cor. ix. 4, "we (that we say not ye)." In Mark v. 23, the supplied words, "I pray thee," are fairly implied in the immediately preceding παρακαλεῖ, "beseecheth." And in Mark xiv. 49, and two or three other similarly constructed passages, the words "it is," or "ye did it not," or something similar that might be inserted in a literal rendering, as, "But this is that the Scriptures might be fulfilled," are clearly demanded not merely by the preceding statement, but by ἀλλά, "but," which implies an unexpressed clause. Here, however, there is no such demand. The inserted words, "it was," are intended to refer to the course the woman had pursued, and are equivalent to saying, "She did not sell it, and give the proceeds to the poor,—she used it as she has,—in order that she might keep it against the day of my burial"; which introduces in connection with the evangelist's words an idea that not only is uncalled for by them, but cannot be coherently construed with them. The only consistent, self-evidently genuine reading here is that of the Received Text,—"Let her alone; for the day of my burial hath she kept this."—Because the reading ἵσα... τυρινὴ is found in the two oldest extant Greek manuscripts, it does not of necessity follow that it must be genuine. We know that these two documents are united again and again, and united with other documents, too, in presenting false readings. The mere fact that Ἱ and B were transcribed fifty years, more or less, earlier than A is in itself no proof whatever that they contain an earlier and necessarily purer text than the latter. There is reason in all things; in judging of textual readings, as well as in other things. A reading which presents palpable internal evidence of being spurious or deformed will not do blindly to accept as genuine because it is found in a certain class of manuscripts, when it is opposed in a number of other documents of equally respectable character by a reading which reasonably appears to be genuine; and even forces itself upon our convictions as such.

xii. 23.
Rec. T. ἀπεκρίσατο—answered.
Rev. T. ἀπεκρίσατο—answereth.

The latter reading is attested by Ἱ, B, L, X, 33; the former by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Α, II, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, the Gothic, and the Ethiopic. That there should be a difference in reading here among the Greek manuscripts is not strange, especially as the two words in uncials might be easily mistaken by a careless scribe one for the other. But that every one of the ancient versions, some of which were made long before our oldest known Greek manuscripts were written, should give this verb in a past tense if the present is the true reading, is hardly credible.

xii. 25.
Rec. T. ἀπολέσω αὐτὴν—shall lose it.
Rev. T. ἀπολλύσω αὐτὴν—loseth it.

It is hardly safe to trust to Ἱ, B, L, 33, and ff² of the Old Latin Version as giving us the original text here, when all the other

documents, including not only Greek manuscripts, but versions, and the Fathers as far as we have their testimony, declare in favor of the other reading. When it comes to the translating of a tense which there is no special reason for changing to another tense in translating, and we invariably find that tense rendered by a future in the languages into which it is translated, the unavoidable and just conclusion is that the tense in the originals from which those versions were made must have been a future. The present, "loseth it," of the Revised Text, found in only four Greek manuscripts, is clearly the result of ignorance or inattention on the part of some early scribe, under the influence of the preceding present, "He that loveth his life." The same alteration was evidently wrought, in some one or more lost manuscripts, on the word φυλάσσω, "shall keep," in the latter part of the verse; for several copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Nonnus, and even Origen there have the present, φυλάσσω, custodit, "keepeth," though it is not known to exist in any extant Greek manuscript of the New Testament. The true reading here, beyond question, is ἀπολάσσω, "shall lose," which the Revisers have rejected. It is attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Π, Δ, Λ, Π, every cursive but one, every copy but one of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, and all the other ancient versions, as well as some of the Fathers, Greek and Latin. If we needed any farther proof of the genuineness of this reading, we might find it in the parallel passages, in which Christ is invariably reported as having employed the future, "shall keep." It is so even in Matt. x. 39, where it is preceded as here by a present, — "He that findeth." Critics who, in instances like this, pronounce a reading spurious on account of its identity or similarity with a parallel reading, adopt mere conjecture, not argument, in proof of their position. The existence of the future here in all the versions cannot be accounted for by saying that it was introduced from the parallel passages. Christ's words may be expected to be given by all his reporters in language more or less identical.

The Revisers seem to have strained a point in their margin, in translating the common reading, "He that eateth his bread with me." If this had been the meaning of the evangelist, he would probably have inserted αὐτῶν, "his," after ἄρτον, just as he inserted it after πείραν immediately following, in order to express "his heel." The literal rendering of the Greek is, "He that eateth the loaf with me"; i.e. as the A. V. has it, "He that eateth bread with me," or is a table-companion, a familiar friend of mine. But let that pass. The common reading, which is followed by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others, is attested by Ν, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Π, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, and the Armenian Version, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom twice, Cyril of Alexandria in giving the text, and Theodoret. The reading of the Revisers is that of B, C, L, three cursive, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Ethiopic Version, Origen three times, Eusebius, and Cyril in commenting on the verse. It is an evident attempt at conforming the evangelist's words to the Septuagint in Psal. xi. 10 (xli. 9), ὁ τισθεὶς ἄρτους μου. The other is unquestionably the genuine reading.

Rec. T. Ἐβλεπον οὖν οἱ ἀπῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ.—Then the disciples looked one on another.

Rev. T. Ἐβλεπον εἰς ἄλληλους οἱ μαθηταί,—The disciples looked one on another.

Ὣν is wanting in Ν as changed by its earlier seventh-century emendator, B, C, three cursive of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, ε of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version. Origen, in one place, inserts δὲ instead; but, two pages further on, he quotes the verse without δὲ or ὦν. Quoting it, however,
as he does, it is but natural that he should omit the conjunction, which was not at all necessary to his purpose, but rather in his way. This passage is one of those in which John, whose use of connectives is one of the striking features of his style, and who employed ὥσι more freely and frequently than any other New-Testament writer, would most naturally have used it. It is, in fact, improbable that he could have written the verse without it. The word may easily have dropped out, in transcribing, on account of its resemblance to the preceding syllable. Its presence is well attested by first hand, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursive, all but two manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Cyril. A few cursive, and versions, like Origen in one instance, insert δὲ instead.

xiii. 23.

Rec. T. ἦν δὲ ἄνωτέρων — Now there was leaning.
Rev. T. ἦν ἄνωτέρων — There was at the table reclining.

The conjunction is wanting in B, C first hand, L, four cursive, of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the Philoxenian Syriac Version, and Origen twice. It is found in Β, A, C second hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, the rest of the cursive, most copies of the Old Latin (a few of them and the Vulgate having “therefore”), the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, the Armenian, and Cyril. Its use is perfectly Johannean; and most editors consider it genuine.

xiii. 24.

Rec. T. τὸ δὲ δέχεται τίς ἔν εἶ περὶ οὗ λέγει. — that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake.
Rev. T. καί λέγει αὐτῷ. Εἶπε τίς έστι περὶ οὗ λέγει. — and saith unto him, Tell us who it is of whom he speaketh.

In support of the common reading, we have A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursive, of the Old

Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Cyril of Alexandria. The revised reading is that of B, C, I, L, X, 33, most manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate and Ethiopic Versions. Origen also has this reading in two or more places. There are a number of variations, however, among the documents. The Sinaitic Codex combines the two readings, adding the revised after giving the received. The Vulgate and several manuscripts of the Old Latin, instead of “and saith unto him,” have “and said unto him.” Two Old Latin versions and Origen omit “unto him.” Five copies of the Old Latin have “Ask (him)” instead of “Tell (us)”; while another of these Old Latin manuscripts as well as the Vulgate and Origen omit both “Ask” and “Tell.” Another copy of the Old Latin and the Ethiopic Version omit “who it is.” In a word, the revised reading is attended with so many variations that it is fairly suspicious. But this is not all. It might be asked, If Peter spoke to John, why should he also have beckoned to him, as if John was too far away for him to say to him what he wanted to say? We are neither told nor allowed to infer that he beckoned to him simply to gain his attention. If, from the distance at which he must have been from John to make it necessary to beckon to him, he spoke loud enough for John to hear him, why should he not have addressed his inquiry directly to Jesus, who of course must have heard whatever he might have said to John, inasmuch as the latter was leaning on Jesus’ breast. And again, what propriety was there in Peter’s saying to John, “Tell us who it is” etc.? for Peter cannot be supposed to have thought that John knew whom Jesus meant any more than himself.

The revised reading, however, which is evidently an attempt to enliven the discourse by introducing the form of direct address, seems to have originated in the idea of some early reader that Peter supposed that the Saviour must have told John who it was to whom he referred; whereas the very circumstances mentioned — the sad and troubled state of Jesus’ mind, and
the doubting, questioning look of the disciples themselves—show that there was nothing of this kind. There is no reason whatever for supposing that John had received any confidential disclosure of the secret. The idea that Peter could have entertained any such thought is wholly foreign to the conditions of the narrative. The very fact of Peter's "beckoning" to John is enough to show that he intimated by a gesture what he was not willing to express in words,—namely, his desire that John, because of his nearness to Jesus, would ask him who it was. If Peter were represented, as some of the Old Latin versions represent him, as having said to John, "Ask him who it is," there might be some show of propriety in it. But this is not the reading. On the whole, the revised reading, with its more or less conflicting witnesses and its obvious points of questionableness, has every appearance of being a fabrication. On the other hand, the common reading, sustained by the generally concurrent testimony of its witnesses (only D, as might be expected of this manuscript, reading "who this one might be," and the Memphitic Version, otherwise concurring with the others, omitting "who it might be"), commends itself as presenting every reasonable indication of genuineness. Compare note on Mark x. 49.

xiii. 32.

Rec. T. Et ο Θεος ἐθανάσειν ἐν αὐτῷ. — If God be glorified in himself.
Rev. T. Omits.

This clause is found in S as corrected by its earlier seventh-century reviser, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, I, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, II, nearly all the cursive, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and other versions, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Tertullian. The revised is supported by S first hand, and again as changed by its later seventh-century emender, B, H, A, a few cursives, and Origen twice. But it must be borne in mind that the old manuscripts, in which the breathings and accents are generally omitted, often give αὐτός as their spelling of ιαυτός. Thus in John ii. 24, S first hand, A first hand, B, I, give αὐτός (Westcott and Hort, αὐτόν) for ιαυτόν; in viii. 22, D first hand, Γ, A, a few cursives, and Origen read αὐτός for ιαυτόν; in xx. 10, S first hand, B, L, have αὐτός (Westcott and Hort, αὐτός) instead of ιαυτός; and so in many other places. But it cannot be supposed that these forms are intended always to denote the simple personal pronoun of the third person. In many cases, they are plainly used as the syncopated form of the reflexive, as Westcott and Hort present this form here,—αὐτός.
accepted reading. They throw their testimony in the latter verse against the supporters of the shorter reading, which the Revisers have also adopted there. In verse 4 they unite with them in the abrupt, artificial, un-Christlike utterance, “And whither I go ye know the way.” But, in verse 5, after saying, “We know not whither thou goest,” they cannot sanction the unnatural curtailment of Thomas’s words, “How know we the way?” This language speaks for itself that it is the work of some lover of cold, epigrammatic phraseology, not the utterance of an unlettered, bewildered, anxious disciple, who would naturally say, “and how is it possible for us to know the way?” The simple, twofold reply of Thomas in verse 5, “Lord, we know not whither thou goest, and how can we know the way?” shows plainly enough that Christ’s words in verse 4 must have been, “Both whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.” But some early reader of the Gospel, thinking he could improve upon this, cut it down to suit himself. And the result of his revising, which robs the Saviour’s words of their heart and gracious fulness of meaning, must be accepted as a part of the genuine text.

xiv. 7.

Rec. T. ἐγώ ἀν — ye should have known.
Rev. T. ἂν γέμετε — ye would have known.

The change here seems to have been wholly unnecessary to a revision of the English text. In fact, if the Revisers had followed their Greek, they would have made strange work with the English. The rejected reading is attested by A, C third hand, Q second hand, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, Π, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursive, Athanasius, Pseudo-Athanasius twice according to the codices, and Chrysostom. The revised reading is that of B, C first hand, Q (and, if εἰδητε, the perfect subjunctive, can be considered the same reading, of L and X also), four cursive, Basil, and Cyril. But this is an inherently improbable reading. It is a pluperfect in form, but it has the signification generally of
an imperfect or preterite. In John viii. 19, it appears twice, and is to be translated as an imperfect: "If ye knew (γινομαι) me, ye would know (γνοικεν) my Father also." So in general where it appears as genuine.1 Here, therefore, to be consistent, we need to translate the word, "If ye had known me, ye would know (not would have known) my Father also." The common text represents Jesus as using the same word in both protasis and apodosis. This was Jesus' usual way of speaking. But some one, evidently desirous of introducing variety into his language, changed it to a word which, though in the pluperfect, John never employs except as an imperfect. The only safe course here is to adhere, as Lachmann and others do, to the accepted reading,—especially so, if the end sought is only a revision of the English New Testament.

xiv. 14.

Rec. T. 'Εάν τι αιτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί μου,—If ye should ask anything in my name.

Rev. T. ἐάν τι αιτήσητε με ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί μου,—If ye shall ask me anything in my name.

The American Committee of Revisers here very properly follow the Received Text, but add the marginal note, "Many ancient authorities add me." This received reading is attested by A, D, G, K, L, M, Q, S, A second hand (the original scribe, by a common oversight, having omitted this verse together with the last clause of the previous verse), II, most of the cursives, four manuscripts of the Old Latin, one of the Syriac Version, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Cyril. The revised is vouched for by Ν, B, E, H, U, Γ, Δ, thirty or more cursives, two manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, and Usan's Armenian Version,—the

1 The only exceptions to this are in Matt. xxiv. 43, Luke xii. 39, and Rom. vii. 7.

last of these omitting "in my name." In verse 13, as well as in xvi. 7 and xvi. 26, Jesus presents the same thought without saying "shall ask me." Yet, in verse 13, four cursives insert "me," while others, as here, insert "the Father." All these readings are mere additions, intended to determine to whom the request should be presented,—a point which Jesus himself makes perfectly clear in xvi. 16 and xvi. 23. The critical hand that inserted "me" here was perhaps led to this by the repetition of αἰτήσητε, "ye shall ask," in connection with the emphatic ἐγὼ ποιήσω, "I will do it."

xv. 11.

Rec. T. ἡ χαρά ἡ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν μένει,—that my joy may remain in you.

Rev. T. ἡ χαρά ἡ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν ἔρχεται,—that my joy may be in you.

The former is the reading of Ν, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X; Γ, Δ, A, II, most of the cursives, f of the Old Latin, Chrysostom, and Cyril. The latter is that of A, B, D, ten cursives, the Old Latin with the exception of one manuscript, the Vulgate, the three Syriac Versions, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The Greek manuscripts greatly preponderate in favor of the former; but the versions, in favor of the latter. In the most ancient manuscripts ἔκειν was often written εκεῖ (and vice versa), as we still find it in later ones. Thus ὑμῖν appears in D, at Mark xi. 29, xiii. 37, etc., for ἡμῖν; μικρότερος in the same Codex at Luke vii. 28, for μικρότερος; γενομένης in A and B, at John xxi. 4, for γενομένης; and, not to refer to numberless other instances, the familiar forms Δαυίδ, Παλάτος, Χωραζόν or Χωραζέων appear in very many manuscripts as Δαυίδ, Παλατίος, and Χωραζίου or Χωραζίου. Now the ὑμῖν in this clause was undoubtedly written in early manuscripts ὑμῖν. But, in copying the words ΥΜΕΙΝΗΜΕΙΝΗ, some transcriber inadvertently overlooked and omitted the second ΜΕΙΝ, and the two words became reduced to ΥΜΕΙΝΗ, afterwards ὑμῖν ὑμῖν. Hence
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

The few Greek manuscripts and the various versions with this reading. The fewness of Greek manuscripts in support of ἔρα is not the only thing, however, that naturallyakens suspicion. It is the unusual combination of uncial, — A, B, D. Besides this, the sense which yields is tame in comparison with that thrown into the words by ἀντίθησις. The very context indicates that the Saviour said what he did to his disciples, not so much that his own joy might simply be infused into them and be in them, as that it might continue in them, so that, as he added, their joy might be made to abound. The idea of his joy abiding as a permanent joy in them is what sees to have intended to express; and this calls for the common reading.

xvi. 4.

Rec. T. Ινα δοκιμάσῃ τὸν Πατήρα ἐν τῇ ὑπόμοναί μου, δώσας ψυχήν. — Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.

Rev. T. Ἰνα δοκιμάσῃ τὸν Πατήρα, δώσεις ψυχήν ἐν τῇ ὑπόμοναί μου. — If ye shall ask anything of the Father, he will give it you in my name.

While the Revisers adopt the reading followed by Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort in the latter part of this passage, Griesbach and Lachmann still hold to the common reading as presenting the original text. But this would hardly be the case if the testimony were overwhelmingly against the received reading. In support of it are A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the whole body of the cursive, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom twice, and Cyril once. The revised is supported by Ν, B, C first hand, L, X, Y, Δ, Münter's Fragments of the Thebaic Version, Origen twice, and Cyril once, on a different occasion. It will be seen from the foregoing, that while all the ancient versions, except Münter's Fragments of the Thebaic, have the common reading. This rather indicates that, while the new reading was known in Origen's day, — the middle of the third century, — it did not exist in those earlier exemplars from which the oldest of the old versions, to say nothing of the

uncial represented by Ferrar's group, L, Π second hand, five cursive, eight copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Augustine, and Cyprian twice, retaining the pronoun after ὁ πατήρ, reject the other as unnecessary, and read, "that, when their hour shall come, ye may remember that I told you [of them]." Finally, Δ, one cursive, a of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version omit the pronoun as superfluous in both places, and read, "that, when the hour shall come, ye may remember that I told you [of them]." This glance at the origin of the different readings clearly indicates the common reading to be the genuine one.

xvi. 23.

Rec. T. Ἰνα δοκιμάσῃ τὸν Πατήρα ἐν τῇ ὑπόμοναί μου, δώσας ψυχήν. — Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.

Rev. T. Ἰνα δοκιμάσῃ τὸν Πατήρα, δώσεις ψυχήν ἐν τῇ ὑπόμοναί μου. — If ye shall ask anything of the Father, he will give it you in my name.
The Revisers’ Greek Text.

Rest, must have been taken. These versions all agree in reading, “Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name.” Is it possible that the sources from which they were derived could, every one of them, have been corrupt, and been corrupted exactly alike? The collocation of words given in the Revised Text has every appearance of being the result of a pious desire to fix the supposed true meaning of the passage, effected, apparently, about the close of the second century. It is one of those well-intended efforts which appear in certain ancient manuscripts, but which are blindly received by too many as the veritable work of the Holy Spirit. We can almost see the poor man at work over his manuscript. He finds Christ saying, “In that day ye shall ask nothing.” He goes on, and thinks he finds him saying, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall ask THE FATHER, in my name he will give it you!” To make this, which is not a bad meaning, and which he piously believes to be the true meaning, clear to others,—to fix it so that it shall not be misunderstood,—he finds nothing necessary but to transpose two words. He neither adds to, nor takes from, the text; he simply places δώσει ὃποιος, “he will give you,” before instead of after the other words, so that the meaning, formerly ambiguous, may in future be perfectly transparent: “He will give it you in my name!” Does any one say, he might have done this at xv. 16? There is no such occasion for transposing the words there as here. And in xiv. 13, 14, there is no possibility of making the transposition. Verse 24 shows Jesus’ meaning, and confirms the common reading. It shows that the contrast is between asking Christ for something, and asking the Father in Christ’s name: “In that day ye shall ask nothing; but whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give you. Hitherto ye have asked nothing in my name; ask, and ye shall receive.” If the revised reading, “He will give it you in my name,” were correct, the next verse would need to read, “Hitherto have ye received nothing in my name.” But the reading, “Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name,” which could not truthfully be changed, while irrelevant as connected with the Revisers’ previous reading, is in perfect harmony with the original wording. It harmonizes, also, with all Christ’s utterances in this Gospel in regard to his disciples’ asking in his name. The only act that it is said the Father will do in Jesus’ name is the sending of the Comforter, xiv. 26; and this, not in answer to his people’s prayer, but in answer to his own; xiv. 16. This uniformity of expression in Christ’s use of words to present the same thought, as we have before observed, is one of the evidences not only that the language so given is his, but that the record containing it is genuine, while another would be disposed to introduce some change in the phraseology.

xvii. 3.

The Revisers here had an opportunity to do really needed work in correcting a false reading. But they allowed it to pass unimproved. The text, both received and revised, reads, “And ye will know [ὑμεῖς γινώσκειτε] thee “ etc. In other words, the verse begins as if it was intended to be a definition of the eternal life to which reference is made at the close of the previous verse, but ends with the declaration of a purpose,—“that they might (or should) know,” etc. The trouble lies in the form of the Greek verb, which the text gives in the subjunctive. Instead of this, the true reading is γινώσκω, the indicative, “they know.” This is attested by A, D, G, L, Y, Δ, A, the cursives 33, 244, and the lectionary 222. The other reading may be an itacism; but, more probably, the transcriber who introduced it was led into the error under the idea that the indicative present should never follow ἤμι,—and, once introduced, it was naturally accepted. But the construction of ἤμι with the indicative is unquestioned in 1 Cor. iv. 6, “that ye be not puffed up,” or “not to be puffed up.” Also in Gal. iv. 17,
and possibly elsewhere. And when we consider that "John is much less rigorous than others in his employment of the particle ἰνα, and its original telic force is often obscured by him,"1 while internal probability demands the indicative, and the external attestation is so emphatic in its favor, we can hardly err in the conclusion that the indicative, not the subjunctive, is the original reading here. With this, the language is consistent throughout: "And this is life eternal, to know [ἵνα γινώσκοις, literally 'that they know'] thee" etc. Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, Davidson, and others adopt this as the true reading.

xvii. 4.

Rec. T. τὸ ἔργον ἐπιλείφα — I have finished the work.
Rec. T. τὸ ἔργον ἐπιλείφα — having accomplished the work.

The substitution, as here, of a participle in place of a personal verb, and sometimes, as in verse 1, in place of a verb and a conjunction following, a change which generally makes no real difference in the signification, is as a rule a step of more or less doubtful propriety. The whole context generally — certainly here — shows the participle to be an intruder, the work of a pedant striving to improve the language, to break up the sameness of the style, and to introduce a variety of expression unfamiliar to the evangelist. And when these readings, though vouched for by what are generally considered the best manuscripts, are opposed by a large and respectable, though perhaps not an overwhelming body of other witnesses, it ought to be regarded, in connection with the evidence from internal probability, as decisive proof of their spurious character.

We think not. Jesus was not in the habit of changing his language in this manner. When he did express himself differently after having once uttered a thought, there was a reason for it other than the mere seeking of a varied diction. In verse 2, his words are πάντα διδώκας αὐτῷ, “all that thou hast given him.” Note the words; not merely the singular relative, but the singular antecedent πάντα, which calls for a relative in the singular. Just so in vi. 37, πάντα διδώσει, and in vi. 39, πάντα διδώκει, though the reference, in all these instances, is to those whom the Father had given him. But in verse 6 of this chapter Christ’s words are τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὑμῖν διδῶκας, “to the men whom thou hast given”; and in verse 9 [πρὸπρὸ τῇ αὐτῷ...] πρὸπρὸ τῇ διδῶκας, “for those whom thou hast given.” So, too, in xviii. 9, ὑμῖν διδῶκας μοι... ὑμῖν διδῶκας, “of those whom thou hast given me.” In all these instances, the relative is plural, because its antecedents are in the plural. In these two verses (11, 12), however, this consistency in Jesus’ language as reported by the evangelist is marred. Some early blundering critic, wishing to bring the language of this clause into conformity with that in verse 2, and not considering that the plural antecedent αὐτοῖς would be a standing protest against his work, changed ὑμῖν to ὑμῖν. Hence the reading of D first hand, U, X, etc. But others, not being able to refer δ to αὐτοῖς, and mistaking its intended reference, instead of changing it back to ὑμῖν, as D second hand really did, regarded it as an erroneous transcription of ὑμῖν, referring it to ὑμῖν, “name,” and accordingly gave it this form. This change was wrought in verse 11 at an evidently early date. Hence the appearance of this reading in so many manuscripts and versions. But was not the reading in verse 12 made at the same time? It seems at first sight that, if made at all, it must have been made then. One would hardly be expected to change a reading in one verse, and for no apparent cause leave the same reading un-

1 Note, p. 343 of American Commentary, Gospel of John.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

thou hast given me" must prove a failure; for the reading is obviously a spurious one. Christ's prayer was that the Father would keep his followers in union with himself, and not suffer them to become apostates.

xvii. 21.

Rec. T. Ἰνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὑπὸ γὰρ ἑαυτῶν — that they also may be one in us.

Rev. T. Ἰνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὑπὸ γὰρ ἑαυτῶν — that they also may be in us.

The Received Text here is overwhelmingly supported by Ν, A, C third hand, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Y, Γ, Γ, Δ, Δ, Π, all the cursives, three manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Clement of Alexandria, Origen again and again, Eusebius, Athanasius, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, Cyprian, Hilary, and others. The revised reading is that of B, C first hand, D, four copies of the Old Latin, the Thebaic and Armenian Versions, and possibly three or four of the Fathers. But C first hand is untrustworthy here, for it omits ἐν in the beginning of the verse also, making it read, "That all may be as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they also may be in us." Even Origen's testimony, in the one place where he omits ἐν, is not in favor of this reading. It is, ὡς ἐγὼ καὶ σὺ ἐν ἑσυχίᾳ, Ἰνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ὑπὸ γὰρ ἑαυτῶν, "As thou and I are one, that they also may be [i.e. may be one] in us." These words, however, are not properly a quotation of Jesus' language. Not only is the documentary testimony emphatic in support of the common reading, but the internal evidence is also. The very point of the Saviour's prayer lies in the word that has been omitted from the Revisers' text. In verse 20, Christ is represented as saying, "I pray not for these only, but for them also who believe on me through their word." And what was his prayer? "That they all may be one, even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee; that they also may be one in us;" i.e.

not only united, as he had just prayed they might be, but united "in us." The word ἐν is necessary to give pertinence to the accompanying expression "in us." Omit the word "one," and the prayer becomes simply a prayer that "those who believe on him," and who are therefore "in him," may be in him and the Father! The words are completely emptied of their meaning. And yet the reading must be accepted as genuine, because haply some careless transcriber omitted ἐν from among the several similar syllables of which it is one, and his omission crept into three manuscripts and six or seven ancient versions that have come down to us!

xvii. 24.

Rec. T. οὐδὲ διδοκαί μοι, Θαλὼ ὑπαν... καὶ κοινωνία ὑπὸ μετ' ἐμοῦ — I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me.

Rev. T. οὐδὲ διδοκαί μοι, Θαλὼ ὑπαν... καὶ κοινωνία ὑπὸ μετ' ἐμοῦ — that which thou hast given me, I will that... they also may be with me.

The received reading is attested by A, C, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Y, Γ, Γ, Δ, Δ, Π, all the cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Clement, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Cyprian, and others. The revised is that of Ν, B, D, the Memphitic and Gothic Versions, and a manuscript of the Vulgate to which Lachmann seems to have had access. Yet Lachmann rejects the reading; and rightly, for it is a companion of the false readings found in verses 11, 12. It testifies against itself; for the relative, instead of having an antecedent in the singular as at verse 2, is accompanied by an antecedent in the plural,—ἐκεῖνοι, "they," or "those"; and we may rest assured, at least, until we have better evidence to the contrary than we now have, that John never wrote, and that Jesus never uttered such Greek as ἐκεῖνοι ὅ, "those (or they) which." See Note on verses 11, 12.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

xix. 7.

Rec. T. κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἡμῶν ὅφελε ἄποθανεῖν, — by our law he ought to die.

Rev. T. κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὅφελε ἄποθανεῖν, — by that law he ought to die.

The presence of ἡμῶν, “our,” here is attested by A (C and G are defective), E, H, K, M, S, U, X, Y, Γ, Α, Π, all the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Cyril. The omission is found in Ν, B, L, Δ, all manuscripts but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Origen three times, and, as might be expected, in Hilary and Augustine, as well as in D’s text as restored after the ninth century in certain mutilated portions, of which this from John xviii. 14 to xx. 13 is one. ἡμῶν was probably regarded as superfluous by some early critical scribe; or it may have dropped out, as words often do, in transcribing. Hence its omission in a certain class of documents. And, if the word were not emphatic, its absence would be by no means unusual or strange. Compare verse 26. But some qualifying word like “our” law, “that” law, or the law “to which we refer,” is really essential here. This the Revisers saw. Hence they translated, “and by that law.” Their text, however, reads “and by the law,” or “according to the law.” It would be just as proper to translate τὸν νόμον here, “our law,” as “that law.” But neither is really proper; for, whether we say “our” or “that,” the word is emphatic, and not legitimately represented in Greek by the article. That there is no probability that the evangelist wrote the verse without ἡμῶν is apparent from the fact that he begins it with an emphatic “we”: “We have a law”; and, to carry out the idea thus introduced, this emphatic “we” needs to be followed by “our,” — “and according to our law,” that is, as distinguished from your Roman code, “he ought to die.” And the weight of documentary evidence really preponderates in favor, and in confirmation, of this reading. Compare Revised Text of Luke ii. 51.

xx. 18.

Rec. T. ὅτι ἔφαγε τὸν Κύριον, — that she had seen the Lord.

Rev. T. ὅτι ἔδωκα τὸν Κύριον, — I have seen the Lord.

The received reading is supported by A, D, E, G, I, K, L, M, U, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, five manuscripts of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, and the Armenian, as well as by Cyril and Severianus. “I have seen” is the reading of Ν, B, Χ, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, and the Ethiopic; while S, and 33 read, “We have seen.” In addition to this, two of the three Old Latin manuscripts that support the Revisers’ reading, the Vulgate and the Thebaic Version also read, “and he said these things to me,” instead of “to her”; while the Memphitic reads, “and these are the things that he said to me”; and the Ethiopic and a few others close the verse with the words, “and what things he said to her she recounted,” or, “she recounted to them.” And, if their readings are false here, what assurance have we that they are not at the beginning of the sentence? These various readings, certainly, very naturally awaken suspicion as to the genuineness of the remaining peculiar variation which these documents support. They indicate, as already suggested, that the form of direct address originated in a transcriptional blunder, in writing ἔδωκα for ἔφαγε. But this reading being harsh and not generally acceptable, the last few words became more or less modified, — some documents returning to the original text as found in other copies, and others giving the words a still different turn. Whatever may have been its origin, however, the revised reading is plainly not in harmony with John’s manner of narrating events. On the other hand, it is perfectly in accord with his usual mode of writing, to say, “Mary the Magdalene cometh,
announcing to the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and he had said thus and so to her." — Compare Note on Mark x. 49.

The common text, which Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others follow, is attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, T, Δ, Δ, II, nearly all the cursive, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Philoxeian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The revised reading is that of ν, B, C, 33, and apparently that followed by ε of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, and Schwartz's Memphitic, while Wilkins' Memphitic is without a conjunction. Origen, Cyril, and Chrysostom also support the revised reading. But, if this had been the original reading, the other could hardly have crept in. It looks as if δὲ was introduced to give a more pronounced adversative character to the conjunction than καὶ was supposed to have. John, however, often uses the latter as equivalent to δὲ. For the purpose of revising the English version, the change was wholly unnecessary, even if δὲ could be considered the evangelist's word.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

i. 19.
Rec. T. τῇ θίδα διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν — in their proper tongue.
Rev. T. τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν — in their language.

The Revisers have omitted "own" or "proper" on the testimony of three manuscripts; — ν, B first hand, D. But the Received Text is supported by A, B third hand, C, E, all the cursive but two (which read "Judean" instead), and by Eusebius and Chrysostom. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and most other modern editors accept the word as genuine. It is one that Luke uses elsewhere (ii. 6, 8) in the same connection, — though D, alone of all the Greek manuscripts, in one of these instances rejects it, — and employs it to denote the dialect peculiar to the speakers and hearers referred to. He means not merely their language in a general way, but their own language, — in this instance the very idiom of the inhabitants. The word is really emphatic, though it seems to have been omitted in two or three copies, as it is afterwards in one of these very manuscripts, as unnecessary. While Tregelles gives it a secondary place, Westcott and Hort, as far as we know, are the only editors, aside from the Revisers, who reject it as spurious.

ii. 1.
Rec. T. ἦσαν ἀπάντες ομοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. — they were all with one accord in one place.
Rev. T. ἦσαν πάντες ομοί ἐπὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ. — they were all together in one place.

The common reading ομοθυμαδὸν is vouched for by C third hand, E, most of the cursive, the manuscripts of Athanasius'
writings, as well as by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Augustine in his treatise against the Manicheans. The revised ὅμοιος is supported by Σ, A, B, C first hand, two cursive (18 and 61), the last of which is considered by some, because of its general resemblance to B, the most important of the cursive manuscripts of the Acts), ε of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Augustine in two other places. D and the two Egyptian Versions omit the word as superfluous. And, indeed, ὅμοιος is superfluous. No one of us would think of writing or saying, "They were all in company together," or "in the same place together," which are the literal renderings and only meanings of the Revisers' Greek. No more ought we to suppose that Luke could have written thus. And we must be convinced of this, when we consider two or three facts. The first is that ὅμοιος is a word that Luke nowhere uses,—unless here, in this needless, superfluous way. On the other hand, ὁμοθύμαδός, "with one accord," is a word that Luke employs at least eleven times in this treatise. It expresses just the idea that he would naturally wish to express here; for all know that in those days there was a wonderful unanimity and harmony of action among the disciples. Then the expression ἐν τῷ ἁύτῳ, "in one place," which occurs several times elsewhere is each time rendered "together." The only apparent reason why it is not so translated here is the palpable absurdity of the rendering, "They were all together together," which is partially hidden under the words "together in one place." It looks as if some early transcriber's mind had been preoccupied with the idea embodied in ἐν τῷ ἁύτῳ, which lay just before him, and half-confused with a lingering impression concerning the form of the proper word to be written, unconsciously allowed that impression to control his pen and cause him to write ὅμοιος instead of ὁμοθύμαδός. Mistakes of like character not only appear elsewhere among the manuscripts, but are made again and again even in our day, and sometimes by the most careful copyists. As we are confident that no English writer would put words together thus, we are the more ready to believe that Luke's words were perverted in some such way as this, whoever may apparently testify to the contrary. Indeed, when we consider how excellent a writer of Greek Luke was, and how he expresses himself elsewhere, we cannot bring ourselves to believe that he wrote in this absurd manner.

1 John is the only one of all the New-Testament writers who employs ὅμοιος;—twice in the sense of in company (iv. 36, xx. 4), and once as meaning in the same place (xxi. 2). The word primarily and properly has a local reference. It is nowhere used in Greek as meaning "together," in the sense of being in concert, in harmony or agreement. Yet it may have crept into the text here under the impression that such was the case; though we are inclined to doubt it. The word does not seem to have been introduced intentionally.

2 At Acts iii. 1, the Revisers have taken this expression, and, connecting it with the last verse of chapter ii., translated it "to them,"—a rendering which it does not admit, and for which, if that had been the writer's meaning, he would undoubtedly have written ἄντων, as in chapters v. 14 and xi. 24 he wrote ἄντων Κυρίῳ, "to the Lord."
ii. 47.

Rec. T. ὁ Κύριος προσετεῖθε... καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.—the Lord added to the church daily.

Rev. T. ὁ Κύριος προσετεῖθε... καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.—the Lord added to them day by day.

Here, it will be seen, the Revisers have omitted "to the church," and in its place substituted the first three words of the next chapter. But ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, as every reader of Greek must know, means, not "to them," but as the margin has it, "together,"—at the same time, unitedly. This reading is vouched for by Ἀ, Ἐ, Ἐ, Ῥ, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and by Cyril of Alexandria, and Lucifer. D reads ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, then begins the next chapter with Ἐπὶ δὲ ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις Πέτρος, etc. That is, we will suppose, "The Lord at the same time was adding daily such as were saved in the church,"—possibly, "to the church"; then goes on, "Now in those days Peter and John," etc. The Received Text is attested by E, P, nearly all the cursives, and the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions. Though this lacks the support of the oldest known manuscripts, it is loudly called for by the oldest of the versions and the intrinsic evidence of the readings. The Revised Text seems to have originated in a misapprehension of the true construction. This early led to the connecting of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό with this verse, instead of leaving it to be construed with the verse following. Taken thus, the clause was made to mean, "And the Lord at the same time was adding to the church daily such as were saved,"—a meaning not at all incongruous or improbable, considered in itself. Then, in order to fix this as the real meaning of the evangelist, the two phrases, "to the church" and "at the same time" were made to change places. This accounts for the order in which these words stand in Codex D, with the preposition ἐπί, "in," between the two. But some critic or copyist, afterwards finding that in verse 41 there is no church spoken of, to which the additions were made, or in which the work was going on, and considering that the reading here ought in this respect to correspond with that, omitted "to the church," or "in the church," as superfluous or unmeaning. Hence the reading adopted by the Revisers. The true reading, however, has been preserved in documents, which, though mainly of later date than some of the others, contain what is evidently an older text, and the genuine text. The phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, seemingly out of place here, if not essential to a full expression of the writer's meaning in the next verse, is in perfect accord with the statement there made, and its emphatic position at the head of the sentence indicates its importance there as directing special attention to the fact that the apostles went together and worked together, two and two, as the Saviour had taught them to do.

iii. 6.

Rec. T. ἔγειρας καὶ περιπάτησας.—rise up and walk.
Rev. T. περιπάτησα.—walk.

The Revisers' Text, omitting the two words "arise and," is in accordance with Ἀ, Ἐ, Ἐ, D, and the Thebaic Version. The other represents the reading found in Ἐ, Ἐ, Ῥ, Ἐ, Ἐ, Ἐ, Ἐ, Ἐ, Ῥ, the cursives, one manuscript (Hort's a) of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Irenæus, Origen, Eusebius, Basil the Great, Basil of Seleucia, Chrysostom, Severianus, Theodoret, Eutherius of Tyana, Cyprian, Lucifer, Epiphanius, Didymus, and others. The words "arise and" are rejected on the testimony of four witnesses elsewhere found united in presenting false readings,—it being inferred that the words were introduced from Matt. ix. 5, or Mark ii. 9, or Luke v. 23, or John v. 8. But, as the man was a cripple, in a sitting posture (verse 10), nothing was more natural than that Peter should say to him, "Arise and walk," especially as Peter at the same time took...
him by the hand, and helped him up. On the other hand, nothing could well be more unnatural than to say to one who was reclining, as this man probably was, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk." The man was not in a position to walk. It is far easier to believe that for some unknown reason the words translated "rise up and" were omitted than that they were not written there by Luke, especially when we see the array of witnesses in their support (some of which extend centuries farther back than the oldest known witnesses to the contrary), and are expressly told by the writer of the narrative that Peter, after telling him to rise, "took him by the hand, and raised him up."

iv. 1.

The reading "chief priests," to which the marginal note refers as found in some ancient documents in place of "priests," is attested by B, C, the cursive 4, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions. There is no probability of its being the correct reading, though Westcott and Hort, in accordance with their principles, admit it as such into their text. The priests referred to were those Levites then on duty in the temple as guards, whose business it was to preserve order under the command of "the captain of the temple," who was also a priest. The chief priests had nothing to do with this part of the temple service, and probably were not present at the time the affair spoken of occurred. The word "chief-priests" seems to have been ignorantly introduced from verse 6 or 23, to give the appearance of greater authority to the transaction. The reading of the text is abundantly supported by K, A, D, E, P, 61, and the rest of the cursives, three copies (d, e, and Hort's h) of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the two Egyptian Versions, as well as Lucifer and Chrysostom.

iv. 25.

Rec. T. ὅ δὲ στόματος Δαβίδ τοῦ παιδὸς σου εἶπὼν, — Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said.

Rev. T. ὅ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ Πνεύματος Ἀγίου στόματος Δαβίδ παιδὸς σου εἶπὼν, — who by the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of our father David thy servant, didst say.

In a marginal note, the reader is told that "the Greek text in this clause is somewhat uncertain." The revised reading, while felt to be incorrect, was adopted apparently in sheer desperation, simply because of what was considered its superior attestation. It is the reading of K, A, B, E, a few cursives, and Athanasius. (C is defective.) But it is certainly "a conflate reading," as Dr. Hort would call it; made by combining one or more other readings with the original. The received reading, though attested only by P, the cursives generally, and by Chrysostom and Theophylact, is apparently the original reading. That it is what Luke wrote, we have no doubt. But some very early reader, having in mind Acts i. 16 and ii. 29 (or Mark xii. 36 and xi. 10), wrote in the margin of his copy, as explanatory notes, the words διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου, "by the Holy Spirit," and τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν, "our father"; and some one else, into whose hands this copy passed, afterwards embodied these notes in a certain way in the text, while others in their copies embodied them in other ways. This accounts for the different and variously arranged readings that appear in the old manuscripts and other documents, some of which we append: Codex D reads, "who by (ὁς δὲ) the Holy Spirit, speaking by (λαλήσας δὲ) the mouth of David thy servant, hast said," Didymus, like Codex D, omits "our father," and reads "who by the Holy Spirit and the mouth of David thy servant didst say." With this, the Peshito Syriac and Memphitic Versions closely correspond: "Who hast said by the Holy Spirit in the mouth of David thy servant." The Vulgate gives the full reading: "Who, by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of our father David thy
servant, hast said.” So, too, with variations greater or less, read the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian Version, as well as Irenæus, Lucifer, and the author of De Vocatione Gentium. Hilary and Augustine, while retaining “our father,” omit “by the Holy Spirit.” The fact that there are so many variations——omissions, additions, and transpositions——in the longer reading adopted by the Revisers is in itself ground of reasonable suspicion. This is admitted on all hands. That this is the true explanation of the origin of this aggregated reading, there can be no question. That Luke himself wrote this clause as it stands in the Revised Text, is incredible. And to adopt it as if it came from his pen is an act of flagrant injustice to him, as well as a wrong to his readers. We must not forget that the old copyists of the New Testament writings were very far from being infallible.

v. 16.

Rec. T. συνήρχετο δι καλ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ,
— There came also a multitude out of the cities round about unto Jerusalem.

Rev. T. συνήρχετο δι καλ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν πέριξ πόλεων Ἰερουσαλήμ,
— And there also came together the multitude from the cities round about Jerusalem.

The preposition “unto” is retained by D, E, P, nearly all the cursive, the Demidovian codex of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and Chrysostom. It is omitted by Ξ, A, B, 103, 575, some copies of the Vulgate, the Ethiopic, the two Syriac and two Egyptian Versions, and Lucifer. The arrangement of the words τῶν πέριξ πόλεων forbids the taking of πέριξ as a preposition governing Ἰερουσαλήμ. It can be legitimately construed only as an adverb used adjectively, and meaning, “the surrounding cities.” This necessitates the use of εἰς, or some other preposition before Ἰερουσαλήμ, making the whole clause read, “And the populace also of the surrounding cities (or, of the cities around) came together unto Jerusalem.” The omission of εἰς was the natural result of losing sight of the true construction, and considering πέριξ a preposition, as the Revisers have done. If Luke’s meaning had been “of (or from) the cities round about Jerusalem,” he would doubtless have written τῶν πόλεων πέριξ Ἰερουσαλήμ; but, if he wrote τῶν πέριξ πόλεων Ἰερουσαλήμ, his only meaning could be, “of the surrounding cities of Jerusalem.” But this is a transparently false reading.

v. 28.

Rec. T. Οὐ παραγγέλσαν παρηγγείλατε ὑμῖν—Did not we straitly command you?

Rev. T. Παραγγέλσαν παρηγγείλατε ὑμῖν—We straitly charged you.

The received reading here is supported by Ξ as corrected by its earlier seventh-century emendant, the Greek text of Codex D, E, P, all the cursive, both Syriac Versions, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Athanasius and Cyril each in one place, Basil the Great, Theodoret, and Chrysostom twice. The revised reading is that of Ξ first hand, A, B, the Latin Version of Codex D, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Athanasius and Cyril each in another place, and Lucifer. After “asked” in verse 27, one naturally looks for a question. Hence, certain critics say, οὐ was inserted, and the sentence transformed into a question: “Did we not straitly charge you?” But, really, οὐ was more probably stricken out than inserted. And it was on this wise: An early reader, remembering that the apostles were positively charged (iv. 18), on the preceding day, not to teach in the name of Jesus, considered it absurd that this clause should read interrogatively, and holding that the last clause of the verse is the proper place for the question, struck out the οὐ, making the verse read, “We straitly charged you not to teach in this name; and lo! ye have filled Jerusalem with your teaching; and do ye intend to bring upon us this man’s blood?” After which, the narrative goes on naturally, “And
Peter and the apostles answering, said," etc. But to leave the verse, as the Revisers do, without any question in it, is probably more than the early corrector of the text intended. Yet to transfer the question to the end of the verse is unnatural, and inconsistent with the language of the record itself; for verse 29 shows that the apostles' answer was not to the last but to the first clause of verse 28. The received reading undoubtedly presents the original text, as the documentary testimony warrants us in believing. It is the stronger way of putting the statement, and just the way in which it was likely to be put, considering the circumstances in which the parties were placed.

V. 39.
Rec. T. ἥβουλεύουτο — took counsel.
Rev. T. ἥβουλοντο — were minded.

The common reading is supported by N, D, H, P, most of the cursive, the Latin Version of E, the Vulgate, the two Syriac Versions, and Lucifer. The other is that of A, B, E, about fifteen cursive, the two Egyptian, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions, and Chrysostom twice. But the writing of ἥβουλοντο for ἥβουλεύουτο was an error of frequent occurrence among ancient scribes; and this error seems to have been committed here. Not only is the Revisers' a feeble word than the other, but it fails to meet the apparent requirements of the context. ἥβουλεύουτο, on the other hand, expresses all that ἥβουλοντο does; and, by informing the reader that the Jews "proceeded to take counsel" (which is the import of the imperfect here), it also prepares him for the statement of the next verse: "There stood up one in the council," or Sanhedrin, etc. The context shows that they not only wished or were minded to slay the apostles, but proceeded at once to take measures to execute, if possible, their wish. This calls for ἥβουλεύουτο; and there need be no question that this is what the author of the Acts wrote. Tischendorf, Alford, and others adopt it as the genuine reading.

The present, διώνασθε, of the Received Text is attested by A, H, P, most of the cursive, one copy of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary. The Revisers' future is found in N, B, C, D, E, about thirty-five cursive, a catena, the Vulgate, Origen, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in the other form of his commentary. It seems to be a part of the false reading preserved to us in a few early manuscripts, which, by carrying the thought into the future, called for a change from the present to the future of this verb: "Ye will not be able to overthrow it [or them], neither ye, nor kings, nor tyrants," as D reads; or, as it is in E and a Greek manuscript to which the Saxon Bede had access, "Ye will not be able to overthrow it, neither ye nor your rulers." This future, too, is seemingly favored by the last word of the preceding verse,— "it will be overthrown." This would naturally lead a person who was changing the text to substitute the future for the present here. Without the additional expressions found in D, E, etc., the present is the stronger and more probably genuine reading. — As to the last word, whether we should read aíró or aírois, there also seems to be a question. The common reading is that of C first hand, H, P, nearly all the cursive, the Cen- tine Vulgate, the Demidovian manuscript, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, Chrysostom twice, and Theophylact in both commentaries. Origen, quoting from memory, or paraphrasing, has instead, "the instruction of this one." The revised reading is that of N, A, B, C second hand, D, E, less than fifteen cursive, a catena, two copies of the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The connection, however, does not favor it. Gamaliel
had just said, "If this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown; but if it is of God," — referring to the counsel or work just mentioned, not to the men under arrest, he necessarily went on to say,— "ye cannot overthrow it." Gamaliel could scarcely have positively affirmed of the apostles, "Ye cannot overthrow them": for they could easily have been taken aside and put to death. But, of any divine purpose or work, he could say, without fear of contradiction, "ye cannot overthrow it." Besides, the end sought was not the punishment or overthrow of the disciples, except as a means to something else. That end was the overthrow of the new religion, — which Gamaliel seems clearly to have thought might be a divine institution; and it was to this that his words evidently had reference. But some early emendorer, finding him saying in verse 38, "Refrain from these men, and let them alone," thought that Gamaliel must have referred to the men here. Accordingly, to correct the text, as he supposed, he changed αὐτὸ to αὐτῶς. In view of the other spurious readings that are preserved in D, E, and other manuscripts in this and the preceding verse, one may be prepared to believe that even this strongly attested reading, αὐτῶς, which is plainly out of harmony with the context, is also spurious.

vi. 13.

Rec. T. οὐ παύεις ῥήματα βλάσφημα λαλών κατὰ τοῦ τοῦτον τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου. — ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place.

Rev. T. οὐ παύεις ῥήματα λαλών κατὰ κ.τ.λ. — ceaseth not to speak words against this holy place.

The revised reading may have the stronger external evidence in its favor, it being attested by Σ, A, B, C, D, six cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the two Egyptian Versions, while the other is supported by E, H, P, all the other cursives, a Latin lectionary of the eleventh century, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions only. But no one of us, in speaking of others, would be likely to say that they "spoke words" against us. What else could they speak? We should either omit "words," or else insert some qualifying term, as "hard" or "lying" or something similar. No more ought we to believe that Luke wrote "He ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place." This is not in accordance with his manner of expressing himself. In verse 11, where the same utterance is recorded, the speakers are represented as saying, "We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses" etc. And so, no doubt, it was recorded here. It is very easy to say, however, that the word "blasphemous" was introduced from verse 11. That it really was thus introduced, there is no evidence whatever. On the other hand, it is intrinsically improbable that the expression "to speak words" against a person or thing proceeded from so careful and finished a writer as Luke. Some early transcriber, in all probability, carelessly omitted the word, and the error was left uncorrected. But his blunder should not be accepted as presenting the original text, any more than other blunders, though transcribed into other manuscripts, and even translated into a number of other tongues.

vii. 7.

The old reading here, δουλεύτωσι, "they may be in bondage," is far more strongly supported by the documents than δουλεύσωσι, "they shall be in bondage." Yet the latter, which is intrinsically the true reading, is very properly adopted by Tischendorf, the Revisers, and Westcott and Hort, — Σ, B, and other documents to the contrary notwithstanding.

vii. 36.

Rec. T. ἐν τῇ Ἁλύσῳτοι, — in the land of Egypt.

Rev. T. ἐν τῇ Ἁλύσῳται, — in Egypt.

The former of these readings is supported by the Greek text of Codex D, the greater part of the cursives, a corrector of the
Latin version e of Codex E, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philo-
 xenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, 
and Theophylact; the latter, by B, C, four cursives, a catena 
or commentary, the Latin version d of Codex D, and the The-
 baic Version, while four other cursives read simply dv τ unfinished. 
But probably no one of these is the original reading. Αἶγαπτος 
is a word which occurs in the New Testament twenty-five times, 
—in the Acts fifteen times; but never, either in the New 
Testament or in the Septuagint, is it properly accompanied by 
the article. The only instance now occurring to us in which 
the article accompanies it in the Septuagint is in Isa. xix. 18, 
where we read dv την Αἰγυπτια in Van Ess's edition. But this is 
a misprint or a clerical error for dv γην Αἰγυπτια. It is true, also, 
that in Acts vii. 11 Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and 
Westcott and Hort, as well as the Revisers, read ἀλην την 
Αἰγυπτια "all Egypt." But this, though supported by Ν, A, 
B, C, and 81, is unquestionably a clerical error, which originated 
in writing T for Γ, or την for γην, and Αἰγυπτια for 
Αἰγυπτια,—the original reading there being ἀλην γην Αἰγυπτια. 
Compare the Septuagint at Gen. xlii. 19, 46. Γη Αἰγυπτια, γης 
Αἰγυπτια, and γην Αἰγυπτια are all legitimate expressions; but 
not γην Αἰγυπτια, nor yet την Αἰγυπτια. — In the verse before 
us, the true reading is plainly dv την Αἰγυπτια, as Tischendorf 
reads, following Ν, A, E, H, P, 61, and nearly fifty other cursive 
s, the first hand of the Latin Version of Codex E, and 
Chrysostom. This, too, is probably the correct reading in Acts 
xxx. 17, given by E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a 
catena, Chrysostom, and Theophylact, and followed by Tisch- 
dendorf,—a form occurring again and again in the Septuagint.1
Ν, A, B, and less than twenty cursives, however, here (xxx. 17) 
read dv γην Αἰγυπτια,—which is adopted by Lachmann, West-
cott and Hort, and the Revisers.

1 See Gen. xlvii. 11, 27, 28; Ex. xii. 29; xiii. 15; xvi. 3; xxii. 21; 
xxiii. 9; Lev. xix. 34; Numb. xiv. 2; Deut. x. 19; Psa. lxxvii. (lxviii.) 
12; Jer. xlv. 26, 27, 28.
hardly be accepted as genuine. And yet, if it is an interpolation, it is as old as the second century at least. We should be slow to pronounce it positively spurious.

ix. 25.

Rec. T. λαβώντες δι' αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ — Then the disciples took him. Rev. T. λαβώντες δι' οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ — but his disciples took him.

The received reading here is supported by E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. The revised is the reading of Ν, A, B, C, F, 61 first hand, four manuscripts of the Latin Version, and Origen. But this, in all probability, is a false reading. As Bede says, Paul could not as yet be said to have made disciples; and, if he had, they would not be his, but Christ's; nor can Luke be supposed to have spoken of them as Paul's disciples. Nor, on the other hand, can the word "his" here by any law of speech be referred to Christ. It is simply a copyist's blunder in writing AYTOY, "his," for AYTON, "him," the object of the participle λαβώντες. The fact that this form appears in a few of the earliest extant manuscripts, a few copies of one version, and a single passage in Origen, instead of proving its genuineness, only confirms the view that it is an erroneous reading, which, on that very account, met with but limited acceptance. The disciples referred to were obviously those at Damascus.

x. 3.

Rec. T. ὑστερον ἦν ἡ ἁλῶν — about the ninth hour. Rev. T. ὑστερότερον ἦν ἡ ἁλῶν — as it were about the ninth hour.

The Received Text is the reading of L, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic Version. The Revised is that of Ν, A, B, C (D is defective here), E, twenty-five cursives, a catena, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Irenæus, and John Damascene. The word ὑστερον, Luke uses at least fifteen times; in ten of which he uses it in connection with numerals, and once with words denoting a measure of space. In each of these eleven instances (i.e. of uses with numerals), unless this is an exception, he employs the word in the sense of "about," or "nearly." If the Revisers' reading here is correct, he uses it in the sense of "as it were," — denoting a sort of resemblance to something else, or an implied denial of just what is otherwise said in connection with the word. Thus, we read, in ii. 3, of "cloven tongues resembling fire"; and in ix. 18, that "there fell from his eyes something like scales"; and again, in Luke xxii. 44, that "his sweat became as it were great drops of blood." But why should Luke have said "as it were about the ninth hour"? Did he mean to say that the vision did not really occur about the ninth hour? No one among us surely would be expected to say, "You may look for me to-morrow, as it were about noon." The word "about" covers the entire ground. That certainly is Luke's usus logendi elsewhere. If, however, we will only allow for a moment that ancient manuscripts are not necessarily infallible, but may even be united in error, as every textual critic knows they are again and again, the difficulty is not far to be sought. Some early reader, like some modern ones, had a notion of his own about Luke's meaning; but, finding that Luke's words here were not sufficient to support him in his interpretation, he went to verse 9, and imported thence the preposition περί, "about." This enabled him to give to the clause the meaning he thought he had found in it, or, more properly speaking, thought he had ensured to it, but which the Revisers have ignored; namely, "He saw in a vision, as it were openly (distinctly, with the naked eye), about the ninth hour," etc. The only thing that seems to have stood in the way of making his meaning obvious to others was the position of the words. But while the reading
was accepted by some, and possibly in the sense in which it was thus meant, others, who probably had earlier exemplars to follow, have transmitted to us the genuine text as generally received. If Luke had used the word ὠροι in the sense of "as it were," he would assuredly have inserted it before φανερός, not after it. That he meant to say, "as it were about the ninth hour," is really too much for even the most credulous reader to believe.

**x. ii.**

Rec. T. τίσσαρον ἄρχαις διδημένον, καὶ καθίμενον—knit at the four corners, and let down.

Rev. T. τίσσαρον ἄρχαις καθίμενον—let down by four corners.

The fuller reading is that of C first hand, L, P, 61, and nearly all the other cursives, a catena, the Latin Version d of Codex D (which is defective here), the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, Clement of Alexandria, the Apostolic Constitutions, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The shorter reading is that of S, A, B, C second hand, F, four cursives, the Vulgate, the Ethiopic, Origen in four different places,—though he may have quoted from memory, and as much from chapter xi. 5 as from this verse,—Cyril, and Theodoret. But this reading, found in the three oldest extant Greek manuscripts, is probably the result of a comparison with xi. 5, and a desire to make it correspond with that. It is impossible to account for the presence, in this connection, of the omitted words, if they are not genuine, especially as there is nothing like them in the account given in the next chapter.

**x. 24.**

The reading "he entered," referred to in the marginal note, and adopted by Westcott and Hort, instead of "they entered," is that of B, D, 61, and two other cursives, the Vulgate, the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, and Theophylact.

The common reading, "they entered," is attested by S, A, C, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. If Luke's thoughts at the time were taken up with Peter, as the chief one of whom he was speaking, he may have written "he entered." But the probability is against this; for his having just made mention of others in company with Peter makes it exceedingly probable that he wrote "they entered,"—especially as he immediately follows it with the remark that "Cornelius was waiting for them." The error, whether in writing the singular for the plural or the converse, might very easily have been effected through want of due care on the part of a scribe in mistaking an Ω for an Ε, or vice versa, leading him to write the singular for the plural, or the contrary.

**x. 30.**

Rec. T. Ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας ἠμνημοσύνην, καὶ τὴν ἐναότητα ὑπὸ ἐποίησαμεν — Four days ago, I was fasting until this hour, and at the ninth hour I prayed.

Rev. T. Ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας ἠμνημοσύνην τὴν ἐναότητα ἐποίησαμεν — Four days ago, until this hour, I was keeping the ninth hour of prayer.

The Received Text here is supported by A second hand, D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Thebaic, and Chrysostom. The revised reading is that of S. A first hand, B, C, 61, and three other cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The mention of fasting here, as well as of praying, is an important circumstance, intended to show how Cornelius had been engaged. Some suppose that its omission may be explained by the fact that no fasting is spoken of in verse 3. This is possible. But it seems due rather to a misunderstanding of the preceding words, which some early reader probably took to mean, that on the fourth day previous, only from early
morning until about three o'clock, Cornelius had been without eating. This was thought to render τὸν αἰῶνα, “fasting,” unmeaning. Hence its omission as well as that of the following conjunction, leaving the remaining words to indicate that Peter, who set out in the morning, did not reach Cornelius’ house till some time after three o'clock the next day: “I was keeping the ninth hour of prayer,” said Cornelius; i.e. I was observing the three o'clock prayer service “until this hour,” — which, of course, makes it some time after three. But Cornelius’ men, who started after three p.m. for Joppa four days before, were at Peter’s door within twenty-four hours. The reading, however, is somewhat disjointed, as the Revised Version shows. But restore the omitted words, and all becomes coherent and clear: “Four days ago, I was engaged in fasting [He may have begun to fast the previous day; but on that day he says, I was fasting] until this hour, when [in addition to fasting] I was observing the ninth hour of prayer in my house; and lo! etc. This makes Peter and his companions only a little longer on the way to Cornelius than the others had been in going to Joppa.

The former reading is supported by H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Epiphanius. The latter is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of B, A, B, 61, and five other cursives; while, instead of this, B first hand, E, and four or five cursives have the present participle διακρίνομαι. D and the Philoxenian Syriac Version omit the words. The variation in reading between A, B and B, E naturally awakens suspicion respecting the active participle. In x. 20, Luke reports the Spirit as having said to Peter, “Go with them, nothing doubting.” But here, if the Revisers’ reading is correct, Peter is reported as saying, that the Spirit bade him “go with them, making no distinction.” This certainly is a distinction with a decided difference, not to say an incompatibility of meaning. If the Spirit’s bidding to Peter was as recorded in x. 20, it cannot be what the Revisers’ text here says it was. This text, however, misrepresents Luke. It is language which some early reader thought to be more appropriate for Peter to employ under the circumstances than the Spirit’s bidding. To him it appeared unsuitable for Peter to defend his course by saying that he was told to go unhesitatingly. It was better to say, that he was bidden to go without making any distinction between Jews and Gentiles,—an idea which he readily gathered from the context.

xii. 21.

Rec. T. πολὺς τε ἄριθμος πιστεύων ἐπέστρεψεν — and a great number believed, and turned.

Rev. T. πολὺς τι ἄριθμος ὁ πιστεύων ἐπέστρεψεν — and a great number that believed turned.

The received reading is supported by D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito Syriac Version, and Chrysostom. The other is the reading of B, A, B, 36, 61, and 180, and a catena. The presence of the article makes the words mean that a great number who became believers on this occasion turned to the Lord. But this is not all. It implies either that some who believed did not turn to the Lord, or else that some who turned to the Lord did not believe. That is to say, the presence of the article, to be of any significance, requires us to understand the clause as meaning either that a great number, but not all, that believed, turned to the Lord; or else that a great number that believed, to say nothing of others who did not believe, turned to the Lord. Compare the sentence, “Very many who saw him were convinced of the truth of the report.” This does not mean that all who saw him were convinced, or that none but those who saw him were convinced; but that of those
who saw many were convinced. So the revised reading can only mean that of those who believed or became believers on this occasion, a great number turned to the Lord. To make the sentence read as Luke must have written it, the article should be rejected: “A great number having believed turned to the Lord”; or, as the A. V. has it, “A great number believed, and (as the immediate consequence) turned to the Lord.”

xi. 22.

Rec. T. ἣς τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου — they sent forth Barnabas that he should go as far as Antioch.

Rev. T. ἢς ἀνθρωπίνου — they sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch.

The common reading is that of D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursive, a catena, the Thebaic and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and Chrysostom. The other is supported by Ν, A, B, 61, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. But evidently ἀνθρωπίνου was early omitted as superfluous. If Luke had not written it, there would have been no temptation for any one else to insert it; for there is nothing objectionable in the reading, “They sent Barnabas forth to Antioch,” — ἡς in the sense of “to” or “unto” being a common use of the word with Luke. See Luke iv. 42, xi. 51; Acts i. 8, viii. 10, ix. 38, xiii. 47, etc.

xi. 23.

“Some ancient authorities,” says the marginal note, — that is, the Vatican Codex, the eleventh-century cursive 40, and the two Egyptian Versions, — read, “that they would cleave unto the purpose of their heart in the Lord.” But the word ἀνθρωπίνου seems to have been inserted simply for the sake of definitely fixing the supposed meaning. The rendering “to cleave to,” or “adhere to,” or “abide by,” shows the true meaning here of the verb ἀνθρωπίνου. In a local sense, denoting continuance in a place, the verb would very naturally be accompanied by ἐν, “in,” as in 1 Tim. i. 3. But here, as in Matt. xv. 32, and in Mark viii. 2, or in 1 Tim. v. 5, the preposition is wholly uncalled for, and is, no doubt, spurious.

xii. 5.

Rec. T. προσευχής εἰς ἑν ἐκτενῶς γινόμενη — but prayer was made without ceasing. [In the margin, these words are more properly rendered, “but instant and earnest prayer was made.”] Rec. T. προσευχής εἰς ἑν ἐκτενῶς γινόμενη — but prayer was made earnestly.

The Received Text follows the reading of A second hand, E, H, L, P, 61, and nearly all the other cursive, a catena, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, and Severianus. The Revised adopts that of Ν, B, and what seems to be the original reading of A, three cursive, the Latin Version ε, the Vulgate, and Lucifer. But these Latin “authorities,” as well as D, which reads ἐν ἑκτενῶς, take the word in the sense of incessantly, or without ceasing, as our A. V. does in the text, which is inadmissible. Luke’s word is not the adverb, but the adjective. He is speaking of the character of the prayer that was going up on Peter’s behalf, — earnest, intent, as with feelings drawn out to the utmost on his behalf, — not of the manner of offering it, or of the frequency of it.

xii. 25.

The “many ancient authorities” to which the note refers as reading “returned to Jerusalem” instead of “returned from Jerusalem,” are Ν, B, H, L, P, 61, and about thirty-five other cursive, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Roman Ethiopic, the Arabic of the Paris Polyglot, some manuscripts of Chrysostom, and Theophylact. A few cursive read “returned to Antioch,” instead. The text is supported by A (C
is defective here), a number of cursives, the Peshito Syriac Version, as well as the text of the Philoxenian, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, Platt’s Ethiopic, and some of the manuscripts of Chrysostom; while D, E, nearly twenty cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, and one manuscript of Chrysostom, read δείκτης, “from,” instead of ἐς, “from.” Then again, between twenty and thirty of these documents that read “from” (embracing some that read ἐς and some that read δείκτης), notably E, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic, and Erpenius’ Arabic Version, read “from Jerusalem to Antioch.” A variety of readings surely sufficiently great to please almost any lover of varying texts. The marginal reading cannot, from the nature of the case, be the true reading; yet the accepted reading, which the context plainly calls for, lacks the strong support of nearly all the uncials,—a comparatively rare occurrence respecting a genuine reading. Westcott and Hort conjecture “that the original order was τίν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα πληρώσαντες διακονίαν,”—adding that “the article is more liable than other words to careless transposition.” But this collocation, besides being without a shadow of support, makes such Greek as Luke could not have written. It embraces between the article and its noun the word πληρώσαντες, so making it an adjunct and modifier of that noun instead of its governing word. In order to express their idea of the possible original meaning, the order would need to be either πληρώσαντες τίν εἰς Ἰεροσολύμα διακονίαν, or πληρώσαντες τίν διακονίαν εἰς Ἰεροσολύμα, i.e. “having fulfilled their ministry to Jerusalem.” But either of these transpositions, with nothing whatever to support it, is too violent a wresting of the writer’s language to find acceptance in any quarter. That εἰς early and easily crept into the text, in place of ἐς, need not be doubted. In xi. 29, 30, we read that the disciples at Antioch sent relief to “the brethren that dwelt in Judea” by the hands of Barnabas and Saul. Then follows an episode, relating what happened “about that time,” possibly before Barnabas and Saul left Antioch,—this digression occupying all but the last two verses of chapter xii. At verse 24 of that chapter, Luke resumes his narrative respecting affairs at Antioch,—not very many days having elapsed between the events of xi. 30 and those of xii. 24, 25. But some early reader seems to have perused this portion of the Acts under several false impressions. In the first place, he must have taken the words, “the brethren residing in Judea” (xi. 29) to mean the brethren that were dwelling in various parts of Judaea, instead of simply the brethren in Jerusalem. Then he seems to have regarded the circumstances narrated in xii. 1–19 as necessarily occurring after Barnabas and Saul had left Antioch. He may also have considered the statements in verses 20–23 as made concerning Herod while he was yet in Jerusalem, instead of while spending his last days at Cesarea. Under some or all of these impressions, he would naturally have supposed that Barnabas and Saul, very soon after arriving in Jerusalem from Antioch, left the city and spent the time in passing up and down through Judaea visiting the brethren, till after the death of Herod, when they “returned to Jerusalem,” having fulfilled their ministry in Judaea, to aid them in which they had taken Mark along with them. This will account at once for the introduction of ἐς in place of ἐς, —the latter having been naturally considered an erroneous reading. Hence, too, the appearance of ἐς in so many of the uncials. Instead of going through Judaea, however, Barnabas and Saul went directly from Antioch to Jerusalem, “fulfilled their ministry,” that is, turned over to the brethren there the funds they had brought for their relief, and very soon after returned to Antioch, or, as the text has it, “returned from Jerusalem,” taking Mark along with them.

xiii. 18.

Here, instead of the reading of the text, ἐροποφόρων, “he suffered their manners,” the margins of both the Authorized and
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the Revised New Testament give ἐτρωποφόρησεν, "he nourished them with fatherly care." This, which is regarded as the true reading by the American Revisers, is attested by A, C first hand, E, eight or ten cursives, the Latin Version of Codex D (which is rather significant, being opposed not only to its own Greek but to the Latin Versions generally), the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, both Ethiopic Versions, and Erpenius' Arabic; to which may be added the testimony of the Apostolic Constitutions, Cyril of Alexandria, and the Septuagint Version of 2 Maccab. vii. 27. The common reading is that of Ἑ, B, C second hand, D, H, L, P, 61, and the great majority of the cursives, the catenas, the Vulgate, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Origen, and possibly Chrysostom and Theophylact. The marginal reading has not the strong attestation of Greek manuscripts which the other has, though it is well supported by the Versions. But it certainly harmonizes better with the context, which refers, not so much to God's forbearance with his ancient people, as to his interpositions on their behalf, and his repeated favors and gifts to them. It was more appropriate to the occasion, too, than the reading of the text would have been. "It would hardly have suited the apostle's purpose," in addressing a Jewish audience whom he desired to please, "to have interposed, by way of parenthesis in the midst of his details of benefits received, the unwelcome suggestion of their obstinate ingratitude and of God's long forbearance." Hence, modern editors generally give the marginal reading the preference. It is the reading of Deut. i. 31, as given by A, B first hand, and most other manuscripts of the Septuagint,— the reading which was accepted in the apostolic age, and has been ever since, and which the Anglo-American Revisers of 1885 have there given to the Hebrew verb, as did their predecessors of 1611. There are, in fact, strong reasons for believing that it is the original reading. Origen translated the Hebrew verb in Deut. i. 31 by ἐτροποφόρησεν, "he put up with their conduct," because the apparent comparison of God to a nurse seemed to him unsuitable, and was rather repulsive than otherwise; and for the same reason that reading, which appeared very plausible, was adopted by others. Hence, doubtless, its appearance in most of the uncials and cursives here.

xiii. 19, 20.

Rec. T. κατεκληροδότησεν αὐτοῖς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν. Καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὃς ἔτη τετρακοσίων καὶ πενήντηκοντα, ἐδωκεν κρῖτας — he divided them their land by lot. And after that he gave unto them judges about the space of four hundred and fifty years.

Rev. T. κατεκληρονόμησε τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν, ὃς ἔτη τετρακοσίων καὶ πενήντηκοντα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐδωκεν κρῖτας — he gave them their land for an inheritance, for about four hundred and fifty years: and after these things he gave them judges.

The change from κατεκληροδότησεν to κατεκληρονόμησε is as it should be: the former is a later and feebly attested reading. But the omission of αὐτοῖς is one the propriety of which may be questioned. As for the rest of the passage, the reading of the Received Text is supported by D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Erpenius' Arabic, and the two Ethiopic Versions; D, however, as well as the Peshito Syriac, Erpenius' Arabic, and the Roman Ethiopic omit the phrase, "after these things." The revised reading is that of Ἑ, A, B, C, 61, and six other cursives, the catenas, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Thebaic Version, which also omits "after these things." Tischendorf says that the united authority of the four oldest manuscripts should not be abandoned except for most weighty and sufficiently evident reasons. Yet, in verse 33, he abandons it, as do Lachmann and Tregelles, to read, in accordance with D, Origen, Hilary, and others, "the first psalm" instead of "the second psalm." Of course, the united testimony of the oldest manuscripts is not to be lightly set aside. At the same time, there is such a thing as being slavishly bound to it, and following it
as if it were infallible. The textual critic must seek to avoid both extremes. In the passage before us, according to the Revised Text, the apostle says, apparently, that God gave the Israelites the land of Canaan to be their inheritance for only about four hundred and fifty years. But this, plainly enough, is not the apostle's meaning. Humphry, while not venturing an explanation of the meaning of the Revised Text here, simply says that, by the transposition of phrases which the Revisers have made, "the discrepancy is avoided, which the common text presents, between the statement of S. Paul and the received chronology of the Old Testament as to the interval from the exodus to the time of Samuel the prophet." Without attempting any explanation of our own concerning this "discrepancy," which plainly enough led to the monstrous reading adopted by the Revisers, we prefer to quote the comment of Dr. Hackett on the passage: "This number is the sum of the years assigned in the Old Testament to the administration of the judges... added to the sum of the years during which the nation was subject to foreign oppressors. Hence it would be very natural for the Jews to speak of four hundred and fifty years as the proximate number of years during which the judges ruled. But whether the computation arose in that way, or in some other, it was certainly in use among the Jews; for Josephus (Antiquities VIII. ii. 1) gives the time from the departure out of Egypt till the building of the temple as five hundred and ninety-two years. If we deduct from that the forty years in the wilderness, twenty-five for the administration of Joshua (Antiquities V. i. 29.—not stated in the Old Testament), forty for Saul's reign, forty for David's, and four under Solomon (1 Kings vi. 1), we have for the period of the judges four hundred and forty-three years, which the apostle could call, in round numbers, about four hundred and fifty years. It is evident that Paul has followed here a mode of reckoning which was current at that time,

and which, being a well-known received chronology, whether correct or incorrect in itself considered, was entirely correct for his object, which was not to settle a question about dates, but to recall to the minds of those whom he addressed, a particular portion of the Jewish history." The revised reading is the result of an attempt to obviate a difficulty which thus appears to have no real existence. Compare Meyer, who, in his note on this verse, agrees with Hackett.

xii. 25.

Rec. T. Τίνα με ὑπονοοῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἶμι ἐγώ:—Whom think ye that I am? I am not he.

Rev. T. Τί με ὑπονοοῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἶμι ἐγώ:—What suppose ye that I am? I am not he.

The former of these readings is according to C, D, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. The latter follows N, A, B, 61, the Thebaic, and the Ethiopic Version. The original reading, probably, was τίνα με; and the form of the sentence interrogative. But, on account of the ellipsis of ἀπὸς in the clause following the question, the words were early and somewhat widely misunderstood, and the two clauses taken declaratively as forming one sentence: "I am not the one whom ye suppose me to be." But, as the construction appeared somewhat harsh, τίνα not being a relative, and yet equivalent to ὃν or ὃνια, "the one whom," τίνα με seems to have been considered a transcriptional error for τί γείμι, to which it was accordingly changed,—τί being less harsh, and rendering the sentence more plainly declarative, as Tischendorf makes it, and as others still insist it should be: "What ye suppose me to be, I am not"; or, "I am not what ye suppose me to be." If this had been the original reading, it seems hardly probable that it would ever have been changed to the
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other, which is inherently the harder reading. The other, however, is sufficiently attested, and should be retained as the true reading, introducing a question: "Whom do ye suppose me to be?"

xiii. 33.

Rec. T. ταῦτῃ δὲ Θεὸς ἑκεπελήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῶν, — God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children.

Rev. T. ταῦτῃ δὲ Θεὸς ἑκεπελήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν, — God hath fulfilled the same unto our children.

The first of these readings is found in C as amended by its second corrector, E, H, L, P, 61, and nearly every other cursive, the catenas, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The revised reading is that of S, A, B, C first hand, D, the Vulgate (except one manuscript which reads "your"), both Ethiopic Versions, Hilary (sometimes reading "your," however), Ambrose, and Bede. The Memphitic Version reads "unto the children," and the Thebaic, "unto their children." The eleventh-century cursive 76, alone reads, "unto us, the children." We cannot resist the conclusion that the Received as well as the Revised Text fails to present to us Luke's words as he wrote them. We go farther: we are convinced that the true reading has come down to us in the single cursive 76, which reads τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν, "to us the children," — the words "the children" corresponding to "the fathers," in the preceding verse. But the meaning, and consequently the construction, not being understood, ἡμῶν was early thought to be a transcriptional error, and so became changed to ἡμῖν. Hence the appearance of this form in the five oldest uncials and in Jerome's Latin Version. Others, however, who saw that ἡμῖν was in apposition with τέκνοις, in order to render the text clear to others, inserted αὐτῶν between the two words. Hence the received reading, which is that of the cursives generally. The translators of the two Egyptian Versions dropped ἡμῖν; the one writing "the chil-

dren," and the other, "their children." Westcott and Hort admit that the "text [i.e. the Revised Text] which alone has any adequate authority . . . gives only an improbable sense. It can hardly be doubted that ἡμῖν is a primitive corruption of ἡμῶν, — τοῖς πατέρας and τοῖς τέκνοις being alike absolute. The suggestion is due to Bornemann, who cites x. 41 in illustration."1 There certainly is something exceedingly incongruous in Paul's being represented as saying that God had "completely fulfilled" his promise to "our children," many of whom were yet unborn! — entirely overlooking the parents, whom he was addressing and the very ones, apparently, to whom the promise was fulfilled.

xv. 24.

Rec. T. ἀνασκενάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον, οἷς οὐ διστατέλαμα — subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no such commandment.

Rev. T. ἀνασκενάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, οἷς οὐ διστατέλαμα — subverting your souls; to whom we gave no commandment.

In support of the received reading, we have C, E, H, L, P, nearly every cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The revised reading follows S, A, B, D, 13, 61, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Roman Ethiopic, the Apostolic Constitutions, and Athanasius. Epiphanius omits the words, "subverting your souls," as well as the clause that follows; and Origen, in quoting the passage, stops short at the words "have troubled you." The omitted words are, no doubt, a part of the original text. They were probably omitted through oversight, because of the resemblance between ἤΜΩΝ, the last syllable before the omission, and νοΜΩΝ, the last syllable of the omitted clause. It is very generally supposed, however, that they were supplied by some later hand from verse 1 or 5. But, since those verses show that the necessity of circumcision
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was the very question in reference to which Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem to confer with the brethren there, it is by no means probable that those brethren in their reply would have said nothing whatever in regard to the matter, especially in alluding to what they had heard concerning certain ones that had gone to them from Jerusalem. Besides, the words ὁς οὗ δεσπόζεται, that immediately follow, show clearly that the omitted clause is a part of the original text. If these words are properly translated, they will be represented in English, not by "to whom we gave no commandment," — which comes in rather awkwardly, — but, as in the Peshito Syriac Version, by "things which we have not commanded," or rather "in respect to which things (that is, circumcision and the keeping of the Mosaic law) we have given no commandment." The dative here denotes that in reference to which the action is done. (Winer, § 31, 6.) It is a common New-Testament use of the dative, as in Rom. vi. 20, "Ye were free in regard of righteousness." R. V.1 If the words which the Revisers have omitted had been omitted from the letter to the brethren at Antioch, we question whether they would have "rejoiced for the consolation" or encouragement afforded them by that letter, as we are informed (verse 31) they did. On the contrary, the letter would probably have proved very unsatisfactory if the main subject concerning which they sought information and advice had been utterly ignored.

1 Other instances abound, though the dative is usually translated by " in." Matt. xiii. 14 (R. V.), "unto them is fulfilled"; (A. V.) " in them" etc.; i.e. in regard to them. Acts vii. 51, "uncircumcised in [i.e. as to] heart and ears"; xiv. 8, "impotent in his feet"; xvi. 5, "strengthened in the faith," or in regard to their faith; xviii. 2, "a man of Pontus by race," or as to nationality. Numerous other examples may be had by a reference to Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Diction.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

XV. 34.

Rec. θεοτ. δι τῷ Σίλα ἐπιμέναλα αὐτῶν. — Notwithstanding it pleased Silas to abide there still.

The Revisers omit this verse, with the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities insert, with variations, verse 34." It is generally considered that the verse is an interpolation, made with reference to Silas only, and with a view to account for the statement in verse 40: "But Paul chose Silas, and departed" etc., — a statement which seems to imply very strongly that Silas was in Antioch at the time. From a careful examination of verses 22, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33, we cannot see that any but the four brethren — Judas, Silas, Paul, and Barnabas — were sent down to Antioch with the letter and message from the apostles at Jerusalem. So that we are not justified in supposing that the statement of verse 33 has reference to any others. We are told in verse 35 that two of these brethren "tarried in Antioch," instead of returning to Jerusalem. Of the other two, if verse 34 is omitted, nothing seems to be said; but the reader is left to infer that they returned to Jerusalem. This verse is wanting in κ, A, B, E, H, L, P, 61, and about sixty other cursive. It is wanting, also, in two copies of the Old Latin Version, one of the Vulgate, and some copies of the Syriac and Memphitic Versions, besides being unrecognized by Chrysostom, and by Theophylact in one form of his commentary. But it is attested by C, D, most of the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, some copies of the Peshito, the Armenian, both Ethiopic Versions, and Theophylact in the other form of his commentary. Instead of the accepted reading, αὐτῶν, "there," which seems to be a later reading, C and D have αὐτών, "them." Taking this as the original ending of the verse, we find that it agrees with the ending of verse 33; and this enables us to account at once for the absence of verse 34 from some of the documents. It was omitted by homoioteleuton, — the result of oversight on the part of an early transcriber.
Then, as to its import, it may be said that έδοξε means, in a general way, “it seemed good”; but the word does not necessarily indicate that Silas kept his thought to himself. It sometimes denotes the expression of an opinion. And this is what it seems to mean here. Silas suggested to his brethren that they had better not return to Jerusalem. With the reading αὐτῶν instead of αὐτῶ in the Greek of verse 34, the three verses may be rendered consecutively as follows: “Now, after they had spent some time there, they were given full liberty by the brethren [at Antioch] to return [if they wished] to those that had sent them forth. But Silas thought best [and proposed] that they continue [or persevere, i.e. in the evangelistic work in which they were engaged]. And Paul and Barnabas prolonged their stay in Antioch, teaching and preaching the word of the Lord, with many others also.” There was evidently a great work on their hands. Of course, Silas, who proposed remaining, and Judas, who was his co-worker (verse 32), remained also. Luke did not consider it necessary to state this after what he had said in verses 32, 34, but left it to be taken for granted by his readers. The connection between verse 34 and the context is perfect. It calls for no forced rendering; while the omission of the verse is easily and naturally accounted for. The words of the sacred penman must not be rashly set aside.

xvi. 13.

Rec. T. οὐ ἐνομίζετο προσευχὴ ἐλναι,—where prayer was wont to be made.
Rec. T. οὐ ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν ἐλναι,—where we supposed there was a place of prayer.

The documents are greatly at variance here. The Revised Text follows the reading of E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursive, two catena, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. Codex D and the Old Latin and Vulgate read: “where there seemed (έδοξες) to be a place of prayer.” A and B, apparently: “where we expected to be in a place of prayer.” The Sinaitic Codex: “where he thought that there was a place of prayer.” The Peshito Syriac: “because a house of prayer was seen there.” The Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions have still other readings, no two of which are alike. The revised reading seems to be that of Ὁ, 13, 40, 61, and possibly the Roman Ethiopic Version. But these various readings evidently arose from a misunderstanding of Luke’s meaning, which, it would seem, is expressed with sufficient clearness by the Received Text: “Where was wont to be a place of prayer”; i.e. where the Jews of Philippi were accustomed to meet for prayer. Verse 16 shows that it was more than “a supposition” with Paul and his companions in regard to this place of prayer. After finding it to be such, Luke would hardly have written “where we supposed”; he would rather have said, “where we found,” if he had intended to record their own thoughts or experience concerning it.

xvii. 3.

Rec. T. οὐτός ἦταν Ο Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς,—this Jesus... is Christ.
Rec. T. οὐτός ἦταν ὁ Χριστός, ὁ Ἰησοῦς,—this Jesus... is the Christ.

There is much diversity here among the manuscripts in regard to the use of the article. B alone upholds the Revised Text. Codices A, D, and 61, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, the printed Armenian, and Chrysostom on one page read “Christ Jesus” without any article (and so Tischendorf and some others), making the two words, properly speaking, one name. The Sinaitic Codex, the single cursive 38, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, and the manuscripts of the Armenian Version do the same, only they transpose the two words, and read “Jesus Christ.” The received reading is that of H, L, P, most of the cursive, and Theophylact; while that of E, a few cursive, a catena, and Chrysostom on the
page following that above referred to, by transferring these terms, make Luke say, "This one is Jesus,—the Christ whom I preach unto you." In the reading of B, which the Revisers, following Westcott and Hort, have adopted, the presence of the article before Ἰησοῦς indicates either that the latter is to be construed with ὅτος,—"this Jesus,"—as the Revisers have construed it, though the position of the words does not really favor this construction; or else that it is meant to point out more particularly which Jesus is referred to; in which case, the true rendering would be, "and that this is the Christ, the Jesus whom I proclaim unto you"; as in xix. 13, "I adjure you by the Jesus whom Paul preacheth." It is not usual for Codex B to prefix the article to Ἰησοῦς, unless the latter is coupled with ὅτος, or required to be particularized in some such way as this. This reading, if it can be legitimately construed as the Revisers have taken it, certainly yields an excellent meaning; but, apart from the questionable construction, as it is found only in B and has the appearance of being a critical emendation, it can scarcely be adopted with any degree of confidence as a genuine reading. If we accept the reading of the Received Text, the proper rendering of the verse is not that of the A. V. It should rather be, "Expounding them, and showing that the Christ needed to suffer and to rise from the dead; and that this one,—Jesus, whom I proclaim unto you,—is the Christ." This requires no article before Ἰησοῦς, and gives the words in the natural order in which we should expect to find them,—"This is the Christ, [namely] Jesus, whom I proclaim."

xvii. 14.

Rec. T. πορεύεσθαι ὃς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.—to go as it were to the sea.
Rev. T. πορεύεσθαι ὃς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν.—to go as far as to the sea.

The common reading ὃς is supported by H, L, P, most of the cursive, a catena, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, and Chrysostom. The revised is that of Ἀ, Ὁ, Ὁ, 61, and seven or eight other cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, and the Memphitic. Codex D, about ten cursive, the Thebaic and Ethiopic Versions omit the word. The truth is, ὃς was misunderstood; hence it was early changed in some copies, as if to make its meaning sure, to ἔος, "as far as"; while in others it was dropped as superfluous. Its use here is found nowhere else in the New Testament; but it is a common classical use of the word, which Luke would be very likely to make in this connection. As the elder Buttmann says, when "prefixed to the prepositions ἐν, ἐπί, πρὸς, in answer to the question whither, ... it gives them the signification towards, in the direction of; literally as if, leaving it undetermined whether the point aimed at is reached. Thus, Thucyd. vi. 61, ἀπέπλευσεν μετὰ τῆς Σαλαμίνας ἐν τῆς Σικελίᾳ ὃς ἐστὶν Ἀθῆνας, 'They sailed away in company with the Salaminia from Sicily towards [literally as for] Athens.' It can everywhere be used of a journey not yet completed." So here, it denotes the apostle's intention of going to the sea,—"The brethren at once sent Paul forth" from Berea, "that he might continue on his way seaward," or toward the Gulf of Salonica, some twenty miles distant, as he intended to do, and there take passage for Athens.

xvii. 26.

Rec. T. ἐποίησεν τῇ ἔνσαρμος πᾶν ἔθνος —and hath made of one blood all nations.
Rec. T. ἐποίησεν τῇ ἔνσαρπαν πᾶν ἔθνος —and he made of one every nation.

The Received Text follows D, E, H, I, P, most of the cursive, a catena, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, Irenæus, Theodoret twice, Chrysostom repeatedly, Cosmas of Alexandria, Theophylact, and Eusebius. The Revisers' reading is that of Ν, A, Ὁ, 61, and seven or eight other cursive, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, Platt's Ethiopian, and...
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Clement of Alexandria. The latter reading, however, is an early alteration, made on the ground that it is more rational to speak of every nation as descended from "one nation" than from "one blood." If ἐνός, "one (nation)," had been the original reading, it might have been changed to "one man," or "one couple," but never to "one blood." The idea of the apostle is that God made the world of mankind from one common life-principle, which, in accordance with Jewish views, was in the blood.

xvii. 3.

Rec. T. ἐμεν παρ' αὑτοῖς, καὶ εἰργάζετο — he abode with them, and wrought.
Rec. T. ἐμεν παρ' αὑτοῖς, καὶ ἤργαζοντο — he abode with them, and they wrought.

The singular is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of A, B (C is defective here), D, E, H, L, P, all the cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. The plural is the reading given by the original scribe of A, B, the Memphitic Version, and Origen as represented by his Latin interpreter, who makes him say et operabantur simul, "and they wrought together"; which may express Luke's meaning, but certainly is not what Luke wrote. Both verbs were, doubtless, originally in the singular, and spoke concerning Paul. But on account of the plural "with them," and the plural "they were" which follows immediately after, εἰργάζετο became easily drawn into the plural also. But the plural seems to have found very limited acceptance, and to have been soon abandoned as false. It will be observed that "with them" is connected with "he abode," but not with "he wrought"; because the meaning is not that he wrought with Aquila and Priscilla, but only lived with them, and wrought with Aquila. This last, however, is not stated in words. But it is implied in what follows: "For they by their occupation were tent-makers"; — that is, not Aquila and Priscilla as some suppose, but the two men, Paul and Aquila. The reading, "He abode with them, and they wrought," implies not that Paul and Aquila worked together, but that Aquila and Priscilla did the working, for by occupation they were tent-makers, while Paul possibly was engaged in preaching or doing something else,—thus making the last clause of the verse appear as giving a reason why the husband and wife could not be idle, not as a reason why Paul worked with Aquila.

xvii. 7.

Rec. T. ἔνοματι Ἰουστοῦ, — named Justus.
Rec. T. ἔνοματι Τίτου Ἰουστοῦ, — named Titus Justus.

The received reading is that of A, B third hand (C is defective here), D first hand, H, L, P, nearly all the cursive, the Latin Version of Codex D, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary. The revised follows A, B, four cursive, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Theophylact in the other form. The original scribe of B, the first corrector of D, and the Philoxenian Syriac give "Titus" instead of "Titus." The Peshito Syriac and Thebaic Versions read "Titus" instead of "Justus." Bede, commenting on the name Τίτι Τιτῆς, which appeared in his Latin New Testament, says, "In Greek, the name is written Justinus," which is doubtless the original and only name as given by Luke. The additional name, "Titus," arose from repeating the last syllable of the preceding word and the first three letters of the following word, so making ἔνοματι Τίτου Ἰουστοῦ out of ἔνομα ΤΙΤΟΥΣΤΟΥ, the second I requiring only a horizontal mark at the top to change it to a T; and this the scribe may indeed have found there, or thought was there. This Τίτου became changed in B, and two other documents, to Τιτοῦ; while in two versions it superseded the original "Justus." In cursive 98, τοῦ Τίτου is written over Ιουστοῦ; while, apparently on account of perplexity in determining what the name really
was, the copyists of 2, and 30, omitted the whole expression, "named Justus," or, "named Titus Justus," or, "named Titus Justus." The very changes through which the word passed, and to which it led, to say nothing of its obvious origin, are enough to condemn it as a false reading.

xviii. 21.

Rec. T. εἰπὼν. Διʼ μὲ πάντως τήν ἄρτην τήν ἐρχομένην ποιήσαι εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, πάλιν δὲ ἀνακάμψω—saying, I must by all means keep this feast that cometh in Jerusalem; but I will return again.

Rev. T. εἰπὼν, Πάλιν ἀνακάμψω—saying, I will return again.

The former of these readings is found in D, H, L, P, most of the cursive, a catena, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in both copies of his commentary. The latter is that of S, A, B, E, less than ten cursive, all but one copy of the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, and the Roman Ethiopic. The reference to attending the feast at Jerusalem is wanting in the three oldest extant manuscripts; yet it is not impossible that it might have been early omitted, from the fact that the record in the next verse does not seem to favor it. From that record, one might infer that the apostle went up to Jerusalem, saluted the church, and immediately proceeded to Antioch. But it should be observed that, in both that verse and the one following it, the historian is very brief in his mention of Paul's movements, barely mentioning certain points, and passing on,—the element of time scarcely claiming his attention. Besides, if the omitted words—which are evidently given as the apostle's reason why he could not consent to remain longer in Ephesus at this time—are not genuine, it seems hardly possible that, in view of the record in verse 22, any one else would have represented him as uttering them. It is true, they bear a kind of resemblance to Luke's words concerning him in xx. 16. But there, everything favors such a statement, while here there is no apparent temptation for another to represent the apostle as speaking of the necessity of being in Jerusalem at the feast.

xix. 14.

Rec. T. οἱ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες,—which did so.

Rev. T. τοῦτο ποιοῦντες,—which did this.

The article is attested by E, H, L, P, most of the cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Armenian. It is wanting in S, A, B, seven cursive, and the Memphitic Version. C is defective here, and D has an altogether different reading. After omitting the article, the Revisers should not have retained the rendering of the A. V. The only proper translation that their Greek admits is, "And there were seven sons of Sceva...doing this"; unless ἡσαύ, at one end of the sentence, and ποιοῦντες, at the other, are taken together and rendered, "And seven sons of Sceva were doing this thing." The truth is, οἱ was early dropped on account of its recurrence after νῦν, which led to its being overlooked. Its presence, as in the Received Text, is necessary to express the idea that there were seven sons "who did" this thing. The Revisers have incorrectly translated their own Greek, which is supposed to be correct; that is all.

xix. 16.

Rec. T. κατακρυμήσας αὐτῶν,—overcame them.

Rev. T. κατακρυμίσας ἀμφοτέρων,—mastered both of them.

The whole verse, as revised, reads, "And the man in whom the evil spirit was leaped on them, and mastered both of them, and prevailed against them, so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded." Both of whom? Apparently, of the sons of Sceva; but of these there are seven referred to just before. No two of them are singled out from the rest. Then again, after saying that the man in whom the evil spirit was had "mastered" both of them, why should Luke have added,
“and prevailed against” them? Does not “mastering” mean “prevailing against”? It is not like Luke to repeat his thoughts after this style. It must be obvious to every one that there is a mistranslation here, or that the text has become grossly corrupted; or possibly there is a little of both. Αὐτῶν is the reading of H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, and the Thebaic, which also adds “seven” — making it read, “mastered the seven.” The Roman Ethiopic reads, “mastered them all.” Αὐτοῦς is supported by Ν, A, B, D, about fifteen cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Memphite, the Armenian, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Theophylact in one of his commentaries. Owing to the strong testimony in attestation of the latter reading, and the difficulty of accounting for the presence of Αὐτοῦς if it is not genuine, it must be accepted as the true reading. The others are only variations due to a misunderstanding of Luke’s meaning. And yet we cannot, for a moment, accept Meyer’s interpretation that “the mode of representation is not exact, as we only see from Αὐτοῦς that, of those seven sons, but two on this occasion were active, whom Luke has already conceived to himself in [the foregoing] αὐτῶν.” This is not in accordance with Luke’s mode of expressing himself. He speaks as truly of the seven in αὐτῶν as he does in the preceding αὐτῶν, or his words are meaningless. It is this misunderstanding of Luke’s meaning which has led not only to the substitution of αὐτῶν for Αὐτοῦς, but to several other changes, such as the omission of καί after Αὐτοῦς, the writing of κυρίεσις and κατεκυρίεσον for κατακυριεύσον, to say nothing of still other variations, which have also led to a mistranslation of his words. Indeed, κατεκυριεύεσον is not above suspicion. Codex A reads κατεκυριεύεσον αὐτοῦς, “they mastered both of them.” In the first half of this, A is supported by E, H, L, P, forty-five cursives, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in at least one form of his commentaries; and in the latter half, as stated above, by Ν, B, D, etc. And this, we believe, gives us the original reading, κατεκυριεύεσον αὐτοῦς, καὶ ἴσχυσε κατ’ αὐτῶν, etc. Thus worded, the verse may be rendered, “And when the man in whom the evil spirit was, leaped on them, they [Sceva’s sons] overcame both [the demoniac and the demon]; yet it went hard with them [i.e. with the exorcists, — literally, ‘it availed against them’], so that they fled out of that house naked and wounded.” The last clause is added to show that although Sceva’s seven sons succeeded in mastering their assailants, it was a dearly bought victory. It was not such an exercise of power as Paul displayed. The use of καί, which we insert from Codices 105, 184, in the sense of “but,” or “yet,” is not uncommon. It appears in Luke xiii. 7, Acts x. 28, and elsewhere throughout the New Testament. On the use of the nominative absolute with a participle, as here, see Buttmann’s Grammar of N. T. Greek, American edition, p. 298.

xix. 34.

The Revisers have made no change here in the form of the participle translated “when they knew.” The genitive found in the text is the grammatical form properly required by the connection. But this is an obvious correction, supported by only a few cursives and a catena. The nominative εὐγένοντες, which is not often found thus absolute, is attested by all the uncials, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in both his commentaries. It is but another instance of the same unusual construction that appears in verse 16, upon which we have just been commenting. The historian, in both that verse and this, after having begun to write, changed his mind, doubtless unconsciously, respecting the construction, and proceeded with his sentence, without conforming to the precise customary laws of expression. The change, it is true, makes no difference in the meaning. But we are surprised that the Revisers, who seem to have been desirous of revising the Greek Text, as well as the English, should have left uncorrected a reading that no modern editor can consider genuine.

1 See Butt., Grammar of N. T. Greek, § 144, m. 13, a, c. Winer, § 63, l., 1.
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xx. 3.

Rec. T. ἔγνωκε γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν — he purposed to return.
Rev. T. ἔγνωκε γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν — he determined to return.

The nominative γνώμη of the Received Text, is supported by B third hand, H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Greek marginal reading of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom. The genitive, of the Revised Text, is the reading of N, A, B first hand, E, ten or twelve cursives, and a catena. It is the reading which one would naturally expect to find here on the assumption that the sentence has a strictly grammatical construction. Hence, its presence in connection with an abnormal rival reading naturally awakens suspicion. If this genitive were the original reading, a scribe would not have been tempted to write γνῶμη, when by so doing he would of necessity leave the participle ποιήσας, at the beginning of the verse, in the nominative absolute, or rather without an apodosis, — a comparatively rare construction, but one to which Luke was somewhat given, as we have seen in the two preceding notes. The meaning of the words is substantially the same, whichever reading is adopted. If, however, the genuineness of the reading must be determined, intrinsic probability strongly favors the retention of the nominative. Literally, the rendering would be, "And having tarried [i.e. when he had tarried] three months, ... a decision was made [i.e. it was thought best] to return through Macedonia." This conclusion seems to have been reached after consultation among the brethren. Hence the form that Luke gave to his statement, using γνῶμη instead of γνώμης. The latter would indicate that the decision was Paul's alone.

xx. 5.

Rec. T. οὗτοι προσέρχοντες — These going before.
Rev. T. οὗτοι δι' αὐτῶν — But these had gone before.

The "but" of the Revised Text is found in N, A, B, E, ten or twelve cursives, the Memphitic and Philoxenian Syriac Ver-
sions, and Theophylact in one of his commentaries. It is wanting in D, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in the other form of his commentary. It seems to have crept into the text at an early day, as in many other places, to connect the verse with what precedes, and possibly through impressions received from the context itself, in which the word appears again and again. — ἦλθεν δέ, "having come unto," which is referred to in the margin as found instead of προσέρχοντες in many ancient manuscripts, is simply an early clerical error in writing προσ- for προ-, and is one of common occurrence; as in verse 13, in A, B first hand, E, H, P, more than forty cursives, Chrysostom, and Theophylact; in xii. 10, in D, L, and ten or a dozen cursives; and in Luke i. 17, in B first hand, C, L, V, and several cursives.

xxi. 22.

Rec. T. πάντως δει πλήθος συνελθεῖν ἀκούσοντα γὰρ ὑπὶ Φιλίππης — the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come.
Rev. T. πάντως ἀκούσονται δι' Ἱλίους — they will certainly hear that thou art come.

The common reading here is attested by N, A, C second hand, D, E, H, I, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, and Chrysostom; the revised, by B, C first hand, five or six cursives, the two Egyptian Versions, the Philoxenian Syriac, both Ethiopic Versions, and the Armenian, which also omits "certainly." The Peshito Syriac clips the verse down still more, and makes it read, "Now, because they will hear that thou hast come"; in which it is followed by Erpenius' Arabic Version. The revised reading seems to be one of numberless examples indicating B's readiness to adopt an abbreviated text, its transcriber almost everywhere showing a disposition to abridge by rejecting what may have appeared to him to be superfluous or unintelligible. In view of this, it is difficult to
understand why we should be expected to give up a portion of the accepted text which is not only strongly attested, but in perfect keeping with the context, and presents no real evidence of having been interpolated.

xxi. 24.

Rec. T. ἵνα εὐρήσωνται τὴν κεφαλὴν, — that they may shave their heads.
Rev. T. ἵνα εὐρήσωνται τὴν κεφαλὴν, — that they may shave their heads.

The aorist subjunctive, of the Received Text, is attested by A, B third hand, C, D first hand (who, however, in his haste or carelessness omitted two letters, and wrote εὐρήσωται), H, L, nearly all the cursive, a catena, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The future indicative, of the Revised Text, — which is improperly translated "may shave," — is the reading of S, B first hand, D as afterwards amended, E, P, and half a dozen cursive. It is simply an early change from the subjunctive to bring the word into conformity with the following γνώσωνται, "will know," which the scribe supposed to be also dependent on ἵνα, but which is really independent of it, as the Revisers make it. Others, under the same false impression respecting the construction, early changed γνώσωνται to the subjunctive to make it correspond with εὐρήσωνται. Hence the reading γνώσιν, of the Received Text, which the Revisers have justly rejected.

xxii. 28.

The only ancient witnesses, referred to in the marginal note as omitting the clause, "I brought him down unto their council," are B first hand, and 61. The contemporary reviser of B, however, corrected the error by placing the omitted clause in the margin. The Roman Ethiopic Version omits only the words "unto their council." It was simply a transcriber's error, corrected soon afterward, and found elsewhere in but a single transcript.

xxiii. 20.

The "many ancient authorities" that add the rejected word, "Farewell," are S, E, H, L, P, all the cursive but one, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, two copies of Jerome's Version, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The word is wanting in A, B, 13, two copies of the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, and the Roman Ethiopic. It may have been added by some scribe, as the customary and proper epistolary close, and possibly introduced from xv. 29; but it is quite as likely to have been early omitted as unnecessary. The testimony in favor of retaining the word seems on the whole quite as strong as against it, unless it be the fact that a few of the later witnesses give the word in the plural instead of the singular.

xxv. 13.

Rec. T. ἀπασάμενοι τὸν Φίλιον. — to salute Festus.
Rev. T. ἀπασάμενοι τὸν Φίλιον. — and saluted Festus.

The former of these readings is apparently without the support of a single uncial. It is attested by 61, and most of the other cursive, a catena, the Latin Version of E, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary. Codex C apparently has both readings by different hands, but neither is clear; and D is defective. The latter reading is that of S, A, B, the Greek Text of E, H, L, P, about twenty cursive, the Memphitic, both Ethiopic Versions, and Theophylact in his other commentary. The Revisers must have adopted this reading in sheer desperation, from lack of what they considered sufficient evidence in support of the other. They virtually abandon it when they come to translate, and place the proper rendering in the margin, though it is improperly given, even there, by being noted as an alternative rendering, "Or, having
saluted,” and not as the true one, “Gr. having saluted.” The
Revisers' reading denotes that Agrippa and Bernice had already
saluted Festus before they came to Cesarea; whereas the other,
and apparently the only possible reading, makes it appear that
they came thither for the very purpose of paying their respects
to him. The expression “and saluted” is not a translation of
ἀπασάμενοι, preceded as it is by a verb — κατήμενοι. It is
only a makeshift. Dr. Hort, in his note on the word, says,
“The authority for ἀμένοι is absolutely overwhelming; and, as
a matter of transmission, ἀμένοι can be only a correction. Yet
it is difficult to remain satisfied that there is no prior corruption
of some kind”;¹ that is, if we understand his meaning, no
corruption prior to transmission. It may be difficult for one
who seems to believe in the infallibility of second-, third-, and
fourth-century copyists, to remain satisfied that there was no
error of some kind in the original manuscript; but, for one
who believes that all early copyists were fallible as well as later
ones, there is no difficulty in being fully satisfied that Luke
wrote the future participle here; while some early blundering
scribe made him appear to have written the aorist. It requires
but the change of a single letter; and the mistake thus made
is one of frequent occurrence, and sometimes, as here, of a
glaring character. Thus, in chapter xx. 22, A, the Greek texts
of D and E, H, five or more cursive, and Theophylact in one
form of his commentary, read τὰ σωαντήσαντα, “which have
befallen,” in place of τὰ σωαντήσαντα, “which are to befall
me. Similar to this is the writing of the aorist for the present
participle in Matt. xiii. 18, where Σ's original scribe, B, X, two
cursive, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom read τὸν σπει-
ρατον, “him that sowed,” — the true reading in verse 24,—
instead of τὸν σπειρατον, “the sower”; also in Matt. xxviii.
19, where B, D, read βαπτίσαντες for βαπτίζοντες, making Jesus
teach that his followers should baptize men before making dis-

¹ Select Readings, p. 100.
infrequent construction. The two clauses may accordingly be rendered, “both of those things which thou hast seen, and of those [in reference to] which I will appear unto thee.”

The presence of εἰς, “through,” as in the Received Text, is attested by E, H, L, P, all the cursive, a catena, the Vulgate, and Chrysostom. Codices C and D are defective. The proposition is demanded by the construction, which here changes from the preceding datives to an accusative. But it was early omitted through its resemblance to the preceding syllable, — ἀρρενωτὸν ὀφειῖν, as they appear in uncial letters, — the latter being overlooked after the copying of the former. Hence its absence from Ν, A, B, and one or two copies of the Vulgate. In any other manuscripts the omission would be recognized as an oversight, and treated accordingly.

The common reading γενίσθαι is supported by E, H, L, P, most cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The Revisers’ ποίσασι is attested by Ν, A, B, 13, 17, 40, 61, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic Version, Platt’s Ethiopic and Cassiodorus. It must be admitted that ποίσασι has every appearance of being a genuine reading. It could not have been intentionally introduced in place of γενίσθαι; nor could it easily have got in otherwise if it were not genuine.


Γενίσθαι is evidently a later reading; and it seems to have crept in from the margin, where it was probably originally written in explanation of the supposed sense in which ποίσασι was used by the writer and should be taken by the reader, as apparently indicated in verse 29; as if Agrippa’s meaning was, “Thou persuadedst me to become a Christian.” Ποίσασι, however, is used simply to prevent the repetition of the preceding verb ποισαίνω, “to believe,” just as “to do” is often used in English, and facere in Latin; and the words are to be rendered, “Thou persuadedst me to do it as a Christian”; i.e. to believe the prophets as Christians do, — to accept their view of the prophecies as applying to Jesus. This use of ποισαίνω is by no means uncommon. We have examples of it in Luke vi. 10, “And he did it,” — i.e. stretched out his hand; 1 Tim. i. 13, “I did it ignorantly, — i.e. blasphemed and persecuted; Rev. xiii. 5, “Power (or permission) was given him to do it for forty and two months,” — i.e. to blaspheme. Compare note on Mark vi. 20. — Without the word ἁρματικάν, Agrippa’s answer would imply that he did not believe the prophets till persuaded to do it by Paul. This, however, was not his meaning. He simply did not previously regard the prophecies as applying to Jesus. Hence he employs ἁρματικάν, admitting that Paul had made a strong argument, and had in a measure persuaded him that the prophecies did have reference to Jesus, whom the Jews had crucified. See Note on the rendering of Acts xxvi. 28, 29, in The Revisers’ English Text.

The Revisers, having changed “Clauda” to “Cauda,” add the marginal note that many ancient authorities read “Clauda.” The only known Greek manuscripts that read “Cauda” are Ν, as amended early in the seventh century, and B. Besides
these, the Vulgate alone reads “Cauda,” or “Caude.” The Peshito Syriac gives “Kura”; and Platt’s Ethiopic, “Keda”; — variations that are still farther from the true reading. The received reading, “Clauda,” or “Claude,” is supported by first hand, A, H, L, P, 61, and the rest of the cursives, the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac in both text and margin, the Armenian, Erpenius’ Arabic, Chrysostom, and Bede. Unless the testimony of B and the Vulgate is to be considered unimpeachable, we see no reason why we should not continue to read, with Tischendorf and the Received Text, “Clauda.”

XXVII. 9.

Rec. T. αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἐρρίφαμεν.— we cast out with our own hands the tackling of the ship.

Rev. T. αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἐρρίφαμεν.— they cast out with their own hands the tackling of the ship.

The former of these readings is that of H, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Platt’s Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. The latter is attested by A, B, C, about twenty cursives, a catena, one Old Latin manuscript, the Vulgate, and the Armenian. Verses 18, 19, as given in the Revised Version, read as follows: “And as we labored exceedingly with the storm, the next day they began to throw the freight overboard; and the third day they cast out with their own hands the tackling of the ship.” On reading this, one can hardly refrain from asking why it should be said that the sailors cast out the tackling with their own hands, especially after having been told in the previous verse that they had been engaged the day before in lightening the ship of its freight. Who should it, if the ship’s crew did not? And how should they do it, unless with their own hands? Why, then, this uncalled-for statement? Humphry says it was because the passengers were not called on to help them. If the text means anything, it means this just as truly without these words here as in the previous verse. The four older uncials are assuredly astray here. One of them (B) certainly errs in the very next verse in omitting λοτίον, “at last,” when speaking of all hope as taken away. Another (A), in verse 21, improperly omits “then” before “Paul stood forth.” A third (S), in verse 27, speaks of the shipmen as deeming that some country extended before” them, προάγαι, instead of “was drawing near,” προάγαι, to them. And the fourth (C), in verse 28, says “we found” for “they found” fifteen fathoms of water. It certainly is not impossible, then, that they should be united in error here in representing Luke as saying “they cast out” with their own hands the tackling, — a reading into which some early scribe might easily have been betrayed by finding in the previous verse the statement that “they began to lighten the ship.” If this accounts for the origin of the reading, and the received be accepted as the true reading, there will be no difficulty. It becomes plain enough why Luke should have said, “We cast out with our own hands the tackling.” It was something not expected of passengers, especially of soldiers and their prisoners. And probably the reason why it was found necessary for them to do it was that the seamen were still engaged on that day, as on the previous day, in trying to lighten the vessel of its cargo; for we afterwards find (verse 38) that they were still at work “casting out the wheat into the sea,” and lightening the ship.

XXVII. 37.

A marginal note offers the information that some ancient authorities here read “about three-score and sixteen souls,” in place of the accepted reading, “two-hundred three-score and sixteen souls.” The reader will observe that these authorities are not among the later uncials and the cursives; they consist of B, the oldest of all known Greek manuscripts of the New Testament, and its faithful ally, the Thebaic, one of the early versions,
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— these two, and only these. Epiphanius, who probably could not see the point or the propriety of saying "about seventy-six," says, as most persons would naturally say, "about seventy." Westcott and Hort adopt this unique reading, "about" seventy-six, and place the "two hundred," which appears in all the other documents, in the margin opposite ως, "about," as a secondary reading. Hence the artless note in the Revisers' margin. But though "about" has the "authority" of the Vatican manuscript, the Thebaic Version, and Epiphanius, it is but the result of an obvious blunder. Some early transcriber was copying from an exemplar in which τῷ πλοῖῳ, "the ship," stood immediately before the numeral, as it does in Ν, A, B, C, and a number of cursives, and not before αἱ πᾶσαι ψυχαί, "all the souls," as in the Received and Revised Texts. On coming to σος', the abridged Greek form of writing "two-hundred and seventy-six," corresponding to our 276, he evidently connected the σ of σος' with the last letter of the preceding word, which was inadvertently repeated by him, as was common; and so he changed the reading to ως σος', i.e. "about seventy-six." It was simply a blunder, and later copyists generally had the discernment to see it. And if certain modern editors were not infatuated with an apparently superstitious reverence for B, Bible-readers at this late day would not be introduced to that palpably impossible reading, "about seventy-six souls." The American Committee of Revisers very properly omit this note.

Again some ancient authorities are said to read "bring the ship safe to shore" in place of "beach the ship" or "drive the ship ashore." That is, they read ἐκσώματι instead of έξοματι, — the two words having almost the same sound; so that it is no wonder if, especially in copying from dictation, the former word should have crept into a few copies. It is so given, however, only by B first hand, C, and the Memphitic and Arme-

nian Versions. Persons in the perilous condition in which these sailors were, usually think more of saving themselves than of anything else. They care but little as to what becomes of the vessel if they themselves can only reach the land in safety. In this respect, these seamen do not appear, from verse 30, to have been very different from other men. The idea of saving the ship probably did not enter their minds. Their one thought was how best to save themselves and what little they had left. Hence, as Luke tells us, "they determined, if they could, to beach the ship." The other reading will do to go along with "about seventy-six."

xxvii. 41.

Rec. T. ὑπὸ τῆς βίας τῶν κυμάτων, — with the violence of the waves.
Rev. T. ὑπὸ τῆς βίας, — by the violence of the waves.

Though the Revisers omit τῶν κυμάτων, in accordance with the reading of Ν first hand, A, B, unsupported by any other uncial, or by a single cursive, or version, or patristic writer, they have given us, in italics, the corresponding English words, "of the waves." And this is revision. After omitting τῶν κυμάτων so as to present the genuine Greek Text as the necessary proper basis for the revision of the English Version, it does seem as if, for the sake of consistency, they would have kept from adding in English the words "of the waves." But the trouble is, they have adopted a false Greek Text, by which it is impossible for any version to abide. Amidst the fourfold occurrences of the syllable τῶν immediately after βίας, "violence," some early scribe unquestionably lost himself. Having written the first τῶν, on casting his eye back to his exemplar, he caught sight of the third instead of the first, from which he evidently passed on in perfect unconsciousness of having omitted the two preceding words, τῶν κυμάτων. If the reading which the Revisers have adopted had been the reading of Luke, a glossarist, as Meyer forcibly remarks, would more
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naturally have written on the margin τῆς θαλάσσης, "of the sea," than τῶν κυμάτων. The former occurs repeatedly in this connection, but the latter does not occur again in the whole book of Acts. In support of τῶν κυμάτων as a part of the original text, we have Σ as amended early in the seventh century, C (D is defective), H, L, P, all the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Platt's Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. In view of all the circumstances, it really seems as if a candid inquirer after the truth, who is at all qualified to sit in judgment in the case, ought to be satisfied that the Greek for "of the waves" is a genuine portion of the text. The Revisers, however, have only followed others.

xxviii. 1.

Another marginal note says that some ancient documents read "Melitene" here instead of "Melita" or "Melite." This is a vitiation of the text, the only known ancient supporters of which are B first hand (though this is changed to Melite by what Tischendorf thought might be the contemporary Reviser's hand), a lectionary, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Armenian Version. Besides these, three manuscripts of the Vulgate read Miltene; Jerome has either Miltene or Miletana; the Memphitic Version, Miletine; and Platt's Ethiopic, Malajat. These variations, by the unsettled character of their orthography, do not tend to establish the genuineness of the reading. In fact, there can hardly be any doubt as to its spuriousness or its origin. Where Luke wrote Μελίτη ἡ νήσος, or rather ΜΕΛΙΤΗΝΗΝΗΚΟΣ, some tired or careless copyist, becoming confused among the letters of like or similar form, and very possibly more or less confounding the first of these words with the familiar name Μυτιλήνη (Mitylene), annexed the first syllable of νήσος to Melitny, and wrote instead ΜΕΛΙΤΗΝΗΝΗΚΟΣ, or Μελιτήνη ἡ νήσος. It was a mistake, unconsciously made and easily to be accounted for, and was seen to be such by the Reviser of B, who at once corrected it. But because it appears in B, and is endorsed by a few versions, Westcott and Hort adopt it without comment! Hence this marginal note. But the common reading of the text, which is adopted by all other modern editors, is sufficiently attested by Σ, A, B third hand if not second, C, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Clementine Vulgate, one manuscript of Jerome's, and Chrysostom.

xxviii. 13.

Here the marginal note says some ancient authorities read, "cast loose," instead of "fetched a compass," or "made a circuit." Only Σ first hand, and B read thus. If περελώντες can really mean "having cast loose," it implies that the vessel had been moored or tied up to a wharf. There is nothing in the narrative to indicate that this may not have been the case. The vessel was detained at Syracuse three days. If this detention was in order to discharge a part of the cargo, or to take on more, the ship might have been fastened to a mole or pier. If it was on account of the unfavorable wind, the vessel would more probably have been anchored in the bay. The general course from Malta to Puteoli, through the Strait of Messina, on the east side of which Rhegium lay, is northerly. From the use of καταχθήνετο, "touching," coming to land, or lying by, at Syracuse, as well as from the delay of three days, we may infer that the ship lay at anchor in the bay on account of an unfavorable wind. She could easily come from Malta to Syracuse with a west wind. But, under the high, mountainous range of Etna, which skirts the eastern coast of Sicily, it is impossible, with a west wind, to make any headway northward along that coast, except by rowing. The only way is to put to sea in an easterly or northeasterly course from Syracuse, until a vessel is fairly out from under the lee of the mountain range, then tack about, and run in a northwesterly course toward the strait. After
having waited in the harbor for three days, and still finding
the wind blowing from the west, the captain seems to have
determined to wait no longer, but to put to sea, and take
this roundabout course, περιελθόντας; and so they “arrived at
Rhegium.” This reading, which is the only probable one, is
attested by Σ as amended early in the seventh century, and
all the other uncials except B, by all the cursive, and all the
ancient versions. It is adopted, too, by all modern editors except Westcott and Hort. The other reading, which properly
means “taking away,” and which is altogether unsuited
to the connection, differs from this only in the omission
of a single letter. It looks as if an ancient scribe, not understanding the meaning or seeing the applicability of περιελθόντας,
and remembering that in the preceding chapter a similar
word is used, considered the obscure term an erroneous reading,
and by omitting one letter, changed it to make it correspond
with the word found in xxvii. 40. And the fact that this reading
is confined to these two kindred manuscripts, though afterwards corrected in one of them, confirms us in this position.

xxviii. 16.

The Revisers omit “the centurion delivered the prisoners to
the captain of the guard; but.” These words are not in Σ, A,
B, I, 61, and three other cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito
and Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Erpenius’ Arabic,
or Chrysostom. They appear, however, in H, I, P, 137, and
nearly all the other cursive, a catena, Theophylact in both
commentaries, as well as in the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac
Version. They are generally considered an interpolation; and
possibly they are. But they may have been early omitted and
for a while rejected, as embodying irrelevant matter, having no
special connection with the immediate subject of Luke’s narra-
tive. Yet they have every appearance of being genuine. After
having referred to other prisoners than Paul (xxviii. 1, 42), it

is but natural that Luke should state in a word what befell
them as well as Paul on their joint-arrival at Rome. There
are no various readings here, as there generally are in inter-
polated passages. And perhaps a still stronger evidence of
genuineness is the presence of the article (τῷ) in connection
with στρατωπεδάρχῳ, “the commander of the praetorian
cohorts.” Originally, the command of the emperor’s body-guard
was shared by two prefects. But, during the reign of Claudius,
Burrus Afranius was appointed sole commander; and he con-
tinued to hold this position till the spring of A.D. 62. On his
death, the command was again divided, as before, between two
prefects. Now Paul arrived in Rome as a prisoner early in the
spring of A.D. 61, or 62 at the very latest. So that Burrus
must have been the captain of the guard to whom the prisoners
were delivered. No one but Luke, however, in introducing a
statement of this kind, would have been likely to keep so close
to the truth of history. An interpolator would in all probability
have said that the centurion delivered the prisoners either to
“the captains of the guard,” or to “a captain of the guard,”
—“the captain” implying that there was but one, which is not
in accordance with the well-known general history concerning
the command of this guard. It can hardly be argued with
justice that the article here denotes simply the captain of the
guard to whom this matter was assigned, or whose duty it was
(possibly for that day) to receive prisoners. The command
of the emperor’s body-guard was an office in which, when there
were two commanders, each shared the duties and responsi-
blities alike. Compare, for example, the following sentence:
“The State Treasurer turned over to the select-man of the town
of Utopia the funds voted by the Legislature for the relief
of its sufferers.” It would hardly be said that that meant “the
select-man whose duty it was to receive those funds,” unless
there was something in the context or circumstances mentioned
that plainly implied this. It would rather be understood to
mean that there was but one select-man for that town, at that
time at least.
The manuscripts that support the shorter form of this word are \( \textit{N}, \textit{A}, \textit{B}, \textit{C}, \textit{D} \) first hand, and ten cursives. The common form is given by \( \textit{D} \) third hand, \( \textit{E}, \textit{G}, \textit{K}, \textit{L}, \textit{P} \), the rest of the cursives, Origen, Didymus, Chrysostom twice, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The word is, no doubt, the reflexive. If it had been really necessary to substitute the shorter for the longer form, the rough breathing ought to have been employed also; for the Revisers have translated it as a reflexive; and, among the old manuscripts, which have neither breathings nor accents, the reflexive is repeatedly written in this form. The change, especially the transforming of it into a personal pronoun, can in no sense be called necessary to the revision of the English text. Compare Note on 1 John v. 18.

The change from the singular to the plural is in accordance with the reading of \( \textit{N}, \textit{A}, \textit{B} \), half a dozen cursives, Origen, Clement of Alexandria, and John Damascene; but it is neither sustained nor favored by the apostle's general use of verbs in connection with neuter plural nominatives. In the course of his epistles, he employs verbs with neuter plural subjects, at least ninety times. Three of these are in the future; and these futures are all in the plural. But they are quoted from the Septuagint. Four are in the imperfect. These, on the other hand, are in the singular; for in 1 Cor. x. 11, the true reading is undoubtedly that of \( \textit{N}, \textit{B}, \textit{C}, \textit{K}, \textit{L} \), twelve or more cursives, and several Fathers, \( \textit{τυπεῖται τοῖς σωματικοῖς} \), which is adopted by Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, and for the adoption of which there are stronger reasons than can be found for the adoption of the plural here. Seven of these verbs are in the perfect, all of which are in the singular. Twenty are in the aorist; and of these, only two are in the plural, and they can be easily accounted for. In Rom. xv. 27, the verb is plural because of the connection in which it stands. The idea of plurality evidently prevailed in the apostle's mind throughout the passage, and led instinctively to the plural form in both the verbs connected—the one directly, and the other indirectly—with the neuter plural subject. Hence, he naturally, if not necessarily, wrote \( \varepsilon \iota \gamma \alpha ρ \tau \sigmaις \pi\nu\mu\u03b1\mu\alpha\varsigma \iota\varsigm
for us." In one other instance (2 Tim. iv. 17), Tregelles and the Revisers give the verb in the singular, in accordance with the common reading; but Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, following \( \text{X} \), A, C, D, E, F, G, P, 17, and ten other cursive, read \( \text{ακοινώσων} \). In the remaining fifty-six instances, the verbs are in the present. In two or three of these, the manuscripts are more or less divided; but the singular is commonly adopted. In only two of all the other instances, apart from the passage before us, is the plural unquestioningly admitted; namely, 1 Cor. xii. 25, and xiv. 10. In both these, as in the case of the plural aorists already noticed, the immediate context undoubtedly lent its influence in causing the verbs to be in the plural. This may have been the case here,—the plural \( \text{oυτως} \), following on immediately after the verb, and at the same time representing the more remote \( \text{θην} \), may have caused the apostle to use the plural \( \text{ποιώνων} \) instead of the common singular form. It may be added that in no other instance, unless it be Gal. v. 17, \( \text{ταύτα αλλήλως αντικείμενα} \), "these things are contrary to each other," where \( \text{L} \), from fifteen to twenty cursive, John Damascene, and Theophylact employ the plural, does this disturbing influence in any degree appear. Neither the construction nor the meaning is in the least affected by the change which the Revisers have made; and, as it was in no wise essential to the attainment of the end for which they were chosen, perhaps it would have been as well to have left the Greek unchanged here, as it was in 1 Tim. v. 25, and 2 Tim. iv. 17.

iii. 2.

Rec. T. \( \text{πρώτον μὲν γὰρ δὴ τι εἰσποίνθησαν} \)—chiefly, because that unto them were committed.

Rev. T. \( \text{πρώτον μὲν δὴ τι εἰσποίνθησαν} \)—first of all, that they were entrusted with.

The Revisers, in omitting \( γάρ \), have followed B, D first hand, E, G, five cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphiic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Origen as represented by his Latin interpreter, and Ambrosiaster. The omission has the appearance of an endeavor to free the sentence from an apparently superfluous element. It is hard to account for the presence of \( γάρ \) on the supposition that it is not genuine. The common but more difficult reading is the more strongly attested. It has the support of \( \text{X} \), A, D third hand, K, L, nearly all the cursive, the Philoxenian Syriac Version, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Euthalius, Photius, Theophylact, and Ecumenius. King James's Revisers evidently did not know what to do with \( γάρ \). They made it introduce a reason for saying "chiefly," or "first of all." Its true use, however, is to introduce a reason for saying "much every way," with special reference to the word "much." But that reason is implied rather than given. Fully expressed, it would be \( \text{πρώτον μὲν γὰρ τὸ περισσὸν ἠστήν ὑπὶ κ.τ.λ.} \); literally, "for, in the first place assuredly, they have the advantage that they were entrusted," etc.; or briefly, "for, first of all, they were entrusted with the oracles of God." On account of the ellipsis, \( δὴ \) does not need to be translated, as \( γάρ \) itself often does not after \( ἀλλά \), "but," when the clause which the latter implyed introduces is unexpressed.¹

iii. 22.

Rec. T. \( \epsilonἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας \)—unto all and upon all that believe.

Rev. T. \( \epsilonἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας \)—unto all that believe.

The omission of the words rendered "and upon all" is supported by \( \text{X} \), first hand, A, B, C, P, 47 first hand, 137, the Memphitic, Armenian, and both Ethiopic Versions, Clement of Alexandria, Cyril, and Augustine. Origen also may be said

¹ Compare \( \text{Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ περικέκου ἀνὴρ ἤφα,} \) "But it is now high time to conclude," I. literally, "But (I will say no more), for indeed it is already time to come to a conclusion." — Xen. Anab. III., ii. 32.
to favor this reading, though, instead of quoting the verse, he links together parts of this and the preceding verse. In other words, he cites what suits his purpose, and in so doing does not give the words “and upon all.” At the same time, these words are called for by Σ as amended early in the seventh century, D, E, F, G, K, L, nearly all the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, one manuscript of Jerome’s, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Òcumenius. There is no apparent reason why they should have been added, if not genuine. The sentence is not any more incomplete without them than with them. Nor is there anything that seems to demand their insertion by a glossarist. So far, then, transcriptional probability favors the presence of the expression. On the other hand, it is by no means strange that the words, if genuine, should have been omitted. Their absence in some documents may be due to the common transcriptional error of homoioteleuton,—the transcriber’s eye having gone from the first πάντας to the second, and so caused him to overlook the intervening words. Or they may have been intentionally omitted from having been considered redundant, apparently a mere repetition of the preceding phrase. The fact that several copies of the Vulgate and John Damascene retain the latter phrase while they omit the former, rather strengthens this belief. It must be borne in mind, too, that the reverence paid by second- and third-century transcribers to the apostolic writings, as Dr. Hort says, “was not of a kind that exacted a scrupulous jealousy as to their text as distinguished from their substance,” and that “the Epistles bear abundant traces” of this laxity on their part.1 Besides, the accumulation of prepositions with the same object, so far from being contrary to the apostle’s habit of speaking, is in perfect accordance with it. Witness chapter xi. 36; Gal. i. 1; Eph. iv. 6; Col. i. 16. So here, in the double phrase εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐν

πάντας, he refers to the righteousness that is accounted to believers as coming “unto all” and being “for all” that believe, whether Jews or Gentiles, “for there is no difference” between them before God. We are constrained therefore to consider the omitted words, though not contained in some ancient documents, as a genuine reading, fully sustained by internal evidence, as well as supported from without.

Rec. T. οὗ κατένοησε τὸ ἰαυτοῦ σῶμα—he considered not his own body.
Rev. T. κατένοησε τὸ ἰαυτοῦ σῶμα—he considered his own body.

The common reading is attested by D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive, the Old Latin Versions d, e, f, g, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, Origen twice, Chrysostom according to one edition, Epiphanius, the Paschal Chronicle, Theophylact, Òcumenius, and Ambrosiaster. It is what Dr. Hort is pleased to call “a Western reading.”1 The Revisers omit ω in accordance with the testimony of Σ, A, B, C, 67 second hand, 93, 137, two copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, Erpenius’ Arabic Version, John Damascene, and apparently Origen and Chrysostom in other places. It is thus strongly supported by the oldest known documents. And it yields what many consider an excellent meaning; namely, that Abraham fully recognized his own condition, but was not staggered thereby. Still, we cannot but regard it as a false reading. Let us look at the real meaning of the original. The Revisers’ Greek does not mean, as their rendering indicates it does, that Abraham considered his own body as good as dead, etc., “without being weakened” in faith thereby. In other words, the verb ἀδενεῖν does not mean “to be weakened,” but “to be weak.” By giving ἀδενεῖν, “being weak,” its proper

1 Introduction to New Testament in Greek, p. 7.

1 Introduction, etc., p. 124.
signification and omitting the second negative as the Revisers have done, the reasoning will not be found to be very forcible or altogether conclusive: "And as he was not weak in faith, he considered his own body now as good as dead (he being about a hundred years old), and the deadness of Sarah's womb; but, looking unto the promise of God, he wavered not through unbelief." The question arises, Why should it be said that he considered his own body as good as dead, etc., if he was strong in faith? What is the pertinence of saying that, as he was not weak in faith, he considered his own and his wife's infirmities, etc.? It will not do to introduce, with Buttmann,\(^1\) the particle \(μεν\) in connection with the verb, and read, "He considered indeed his own and Sarah's condition, but nevertheless he wavered not." The apostle, it is true, is somewhat loose in his use of \(μεν\) as compared with classical writers; but in a case like this, where the presence of the particle is essential if the negative is not employed, the omission of \(μεν\) is an offence of which, we can safely say, he could not have been guilty. To insert it here would be to make Greek for him instead of making English out of his Greek. The only satisfactory reading of the sentence is obtained by restoring the negative which the Revisers have omitted. This makes the apostle say, beginning with verse 18: Abraham against hope hopefully believed that he would become the father of many nations, according to what had been told him; namely, So shall thy seed be. And, as he was not weak in faith, he did not take into account [the condition of] his own body, — that having already lost its power of procreation, he being about a hundred years old, — or the deadness of Sarah's womb; but depending upon the promise of God, so far from wavering in unbelief, he was strengthened in faith, giving glory to God, etc. The point is, that, being strong in faith, he did not really consider his own and Sarah's condition any obstacle in the way of their having a posterity;

\(^1\) Grammar of N. T. Greek, p. 356.

but, on the contrary, he believed that God would make good his promise, and confidently left it with him to do it. The whole drift and the very point of the apostle's argument show that he must have used two negatives, — "not weak in faith," "did not consider." But the second of these was evidently early omitted from the text by some meddling hand, perhaps under the idea that it was inconsistent with the statement given in Gen. xvii. 17; whereas, the true reference of the apostle is to Gen. xv. 5, 6. — Compare Meyer on the passage.

v. 1

Rec. T. εὐφημία ἔσχης πρὸς τὸν Θεόν — we have peace with God.

Rev. T. εὐφημία ἔσχης πρὸς τὸν Θεόν — let us have peace with God.

The received reading here, which is that adopted by the American Committee of N. T. Revisers, is supported by N's contemporary "proof reader," B third hand, F, G, P, most of the cursive, and a few of the Fathers. The Canterbury Revisers' reading is that of the scribe of B, A, B first hand, C, D, E, K, L, between thirty and forty cursive, the Latin versions of D, E, F, G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and both forms of the Ethiopic Version. It is also supported by Origen, Titus of Bostra, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. External evidence therefore is greatly in favor of the Canterbury reading.

This reading, however, is entirely unsuitable to the context, which is not hortatory but doctrinal and didactic. So far from being hortatory, the verse introduces the conclusion at which the apostle has now arrived. This is obvious from the word "therefore," with which the chapter opens, and by which it is connected with what precedes. Having concluded the foregoing argument, the apostle goes on to show that, having been justified by faith, believers have peace with God. They are no longer regarded by him as enemies; they have been placed on
a footing of reconciliation and peace with him through Jesus Christ. It is a truth which his readers needed to know in order to understand their true relations to God as believers in Jesus. But suppose we take the verse as an exhortation: "Therefore being justified by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." This implies two things. In the first place, it implies what is not true; namely, that those who are justified do not necessarily have peace with God. It ignores the very point which the apostle makes; and that is, that they have peace with God because of their having been justified by him. It implies also that there may be some other way of being at peace with him than through Christ, though the apostle would have his readers seek only that peace with God which is to be had through Christ. Both of these views, however, are antagonistic to the apostle's belief and teaching, and consequently cannot be involved in his language. His words are not "Let us have the peace of God"; that is, the inward consciousness of security which God imparts to believers. This would be a proper subject of exhortation; but the other is not. Peace with God is the necessary consequence of justification. A believer may not be conscious of it; but this does not affect the truth that he has peace with God, and has it as a believer in Christ. The Greek subjunctive or English imperative, therefore, calling upon him to have peace with God, is manifestly out of place.

But this is not all. Intrinsic probability is still farther opposed to this reading. Peace with God is not obtained by being sought. It follows as an immediate and necessary result of justification. The believer in Christ is one against whom God has no claims for punishment. God loves and deals with him as a child for whom only grace and goodness are in store. How then can believers, those who are already at peace with God through Jesus Christ, be reasonably exhorted to have this peace? There is not in all the New Testament an exhortation to this effect. And to suppose the apostle to have been capable of exhorting his readers as justified persons to have peace with God through Jesus Christ is simply to consider him unacquainted with the subject of which he was speaking. For him to have done it would have been a moral impossibility. And yet the five oldest manuscripts represent him as having done it. The erroneous reading—for it is nothing else—originated in simply mistaking Ω for Ω, an error of common occurrence among ancient manuscripts. The same italics appears among several of them in 1 Cor. xv. 49, making the apostle say, "Let us bear the image of the heavenly." The Revisers, however, in their text, very properly read the indicative, "we shall bear," notwithstanding that four of the five great uncials, together with other manuscripts, have the subjunctive. An exhortation to bear the image of the heavenly would, however, be no more out of place there, or out of harmony with the context, than is the exhortation to believers to have peace with God through their Lord Jesus Christ. The opposite error of writing Ω for Ω is also occasionally found in the best manuscripts. Thus, in Rom. xiv. 19, διώκωμεν appears in Ν, A, B, F, G, L, P, etc., instead of διώκομεν. Yet the Re-
visers, in this case, discard the testimony of these manuscripts, and following what are commonly considered less trustworthy witnesses read, as does the Received Text, “Let us follow after things that make for peace.” Still, they deem it necessary to say in the margin, “Many ancient authorities read we follow,” even though it is evidently a false reading. Prebendary Humphry seeks to justify the reading “Let us have peace with God” by a reference to Heb. xii. 28. But the two cases are by no means parallel. The former is out of harmony with the context, and is really an incredible reading; whereas the exhortation to have a thankful heart or to be thankful is perfectly natural and legitimate, and accords with the context.

If there is anything that should put the textual critic on his guard against an over-confidence in the old manuscripts, it is the fact of the existence among them of errors such as these. They reveal, on the part of copyists, not merely carelessness, but ignorance of the first principles of Christian experience, and a lack of heart to enter into the meaning of the sacred writers, in some of their utterances at least.

The ancient authorities referred to in the marginal note as omitting “by faith” are B, D, E, F, G, the Roman Ethiopic Version, and Origen in two instances. But the genuineness of the words is attested by various manuscripts, C, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive manuscripts, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Platt’s Ethiopic, Origen in two other instances, Chrysostom once, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others; as well as by the reading, ἐν τῇ πίστει (in Ἑρ as amended by its contemporary reviser, A, 93, 124, Titus of Bostra, and Chrysostom in the same connection as before), which is simply the true reading with the final letters of the preceding ἐξομήν[έ] Ν repeated and prefixed. Griesbach and Tischendorf, as well as the Revisers, retain the words. But Lachmann rejects them, Westcott and Hort bracket them, and Tregelles questions their genuineness. But the fact that they may be omitted without injury to the sense is presumptive evidence not only that they are a part of the original text, but that they were really omitted in a few copies as superfluous.

v. 2.

The ancient authorities referred to in the marginal note as omitting “by faith” are B, D, E, F, G, the Roman Ethiopic Version, and Origen in two instances. But the genuineness of the words is attested by various manuscripts, C, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive manuscripts, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Platt’s Ethiopic, Origen in two other instances, Chrysostom once, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others; as well as by the reading, ἐν τῇ πίστει (in Ἑρ as amended by its contemporary reviser, A, 93, 124, Titus of Bostra, and Chrysostom in the same connection as before), which is simply the true reading with the final letters of the preceding ἐξομήν[έ] Ν repeated and prefixed. Griesbach and Tischendorf, as well as the Revisers, retain the words. But Lachmann rejects them, Westcott and Hort bracket them, and Tregelles questions their genuineness. But the fact that they may be omitted without injury to the sense is presumptive evidence not only that they are a part of the original text, but that they were really omitted in a few copies as superfluous.

v. 6.

Rec. T. κατὰ καὶρὸν — in due time.
Rev. T. ἐτὶ κατὰ καὶρὸν — in due season.

By adopting this reading, the Revisers repeat ἐτὶ, but do not translate it. Nor can it be translated without letting ἐτὶ in the beginning of the verse go untranslated. The word is repeated in Ἑρ, A, C, D first hand, two cursive manuscripts, Epiphanius, and John Damascene. But it was evidently introduced here by some early scribe, who, having associated it with ἀπὸθεωρῶν, the meaning of which is modified by it, carried it along in his mind, and inserted it after this word, not realizing that he had already written it in its proper place. Afterwards, certain transcribers, as those of Ἑρ, A, C, D, and others, in the mechanical performance of their duty, allowed both readings to remain, apparently without questioning their propriety. But the scribe of B, or one of his predecessors, was evidently perplexed by this double use of ἐτὶ. In his quandary, he took the second to be the true reading, inasmuch as it stood in immediate connection with the word to be modified by it. But he changed ἐτὶ γάρ, in the beginning of the verse, to ἀ γάρ, “if indeed,” a reading found elsewhere only in Westcott and Hort, to
which Dr. Hort, for himself, adds the note, "But εἰ πορ [for which there is no authority whatever] would better explain all the variations, and be equally appropriate."1 Other scribes and translators, most of them retaining, like B, the second εἰ, changed εἰ γαρ somewhat differently. The Peshito Syriac Version transformed it to εἰ δὲ, "and if." One cursive, the original text of the Codex Fuldaensis of the Vulgate, Isidore of Pelusium, and Augustine read εἰ γαρ, "for if." The Memphitic Version has "for if yet." D as amended at an early date, F, G, the Vulgate generally, and a few Latin witnesses read εἰς τι γαρ, *ut quid enim, "for why." "The misplacement of the εἰ [i.e. its insertion after δοθημένων] came to predominate because a church-lesson began with Χριστάς."—Meyer. This misplacement is given as genuine by S, A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, two cursives, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, possibly Irenæus, Epiphanius, and John Damascene. But it is omitted by D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, both forms of the Ethiopic, and Origen twice. In view of all this evidence, internal and external, the second εἰ must be considered no part of the original reading. Its insertion in any modern Greek text of the New Testament is but a servile acceptance of the testimony of a few old manuscripts as authoritative, even though they present as the true reading a palpable error that is easily accounted for, and that makes an untranslatable combination of words.

v. 17.

The marginal note, "Some ancient authorities omit of the gift," is hardly worthy of a place here, the omission being found in no manuscript but B, and the cursive 49. Irenæus gives the passage once, and Origen twice, without the phrase, as do Chrysostom and Augustine. But they evidently regarded

"of the gift" and "of righteousness" as synonymous, either of which, in their view, expressed the apostle's meaning without the other. Hence Origen, after quoting the passage twice without τῆς δωρεάς, three pages further on quotes it with these words but without τῆς δικαιοσύνης. The scribe of B, or perhaps some preceding scribe, in all probability took the same view, omitting "of the gift," while the scribe of C and the copyist of 70, taking the same view, retained "of the gift," but rejected "of righteousness." The omission of τῆς δωρεάς in B is simply one of those abbreviated forms of speech that abound in the Vatican Codex, and is no more worthy of notice than is C's omission of τῆς δικαιοσύνης. Three other examples of a similar nature occur in B in this very chapter; namely, the omission of ὃ Θεός in verse 8, of χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ in verse 11, and of καὶ, "also," after σὺν, "so," in verse 15. In all these instances of omission in B, except that of ὃ Θεός, verse 8, the omitted word or words have been bracketed by Westcott and Hort as of somewhat questionable genuineness; though, for the same reason ὃ Θεός might have been bracketed as well as the others. The Revisers, however, have no marginal notes acquainting the reader of these omissions, nor of the omission of τῆς δικαιοσύνης by C, 70 first hand, and Origen; though all of them deserve it quite as much as the one noted by them.

vii. 23.

Rec. T. ἀνακαλωτιτοντά με τῷ νόμῳ — bringing me into captivity to the law.

Rev. T. ἀνακαλωτιτοντά με ἐν τῷ νόμῳ — bringing me into captivity under the law.

The Revisers' Text, understood as rendered by them, presents a harsh and unnatural construction; for the verb itself means "to bring under control," "to subdue," and, in circumstances like this, calls for a dative. If ἐν is properly employed here, the only legitimate construction is that of the instrumental dative: "bringing me into captivity by means of (or through)

---

1 Select Readings, p. 108.
the law of sin”; as Theodoret and others who adopt this reading understand it. But Paul can hardly be supposed to have said, “I see a different law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity through the law of sin which is in my members.” An ignorant scribe or annotator, however, not being able otherwise to understand the apostle, would very naturally have inserted ἐν, or written it upon the margin, to aid the construction, or to explain the meaning. Its presence is attested by what might ordinarily be regarded a tolerably strong group of uncials, — Σ, B, D, E, F, G, K, P. But when we look at some of the readings presented by B in the immediate context, our confidence in its testimony here is shaken, and we fear that the rest of the group have also been betrayed into giving false testimony. In only the preceding verse, for example, B stands alone in reading τοῦ νοοῦ, “of my mind,” for τοῦ Θεοῦ, “of God.” Again, four verses farther on (viii. 2), Σ, B, F, G, unite in giving what Dr. Hort pronounces “a very unlikely reading”; namely, σὺ for μου, i.e. “thee” for “me,” after ἐλευθέρωσε, “freed.” With such obvious errors in the Vatican manuscript so close at hand, we may be pardoned if we place very little confidence in its testimony in upholding ἐν as a genuine reading. The common reading is supported by A, C, L, most of the cursiveś, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and several Fathers. It has also every appearance of being genuine,—which is more than can be said of the Revisers’ reading.

viii. 11.

It has long been a question which of the two readings is the true one,—that of the text, “by” or “through” his Spirit, or that of the margin, “because of” his Spirit. The former is attested by Σ, A, C, P second hand, less than twenty cursiveś, the Memphitic, Woide’s Thebaic, the Armenian, both Ethiopic Versions, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus of Portus, Athanasius, Didymus, Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Macarius, John Damascene, and others. The latter is vouched for by B, D, E, F, G, K, L, P first hand, about seventy cursiveś, Mai’s Extracts,¹ the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic according to Griesbach, Origen again and again, Irenæus, Methodius according to Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Euthalius, Severianus, Tertullian, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, and many others. But the question cannot really be decided by documentary evidence alone. This is about equally divided. Internal evidence is altogether in favor of the marginal reading,—“on account of his Spirit.” The New Testament nowhere teaches that the “quickening” of our mortal bodies at the resurrection is to be effected through the agency of the Holy Spirit, as the reading of the text would lead one to suppose it is to be.² It is everywhere “God who quickeneth the dead” through our Lord Jesus Christ.³ And it is because believers are Christ’s that they are to be raised from the dead, and endued with immortal bodies. In other words, it is because of the Spirit of God that dwells in them. Hence, with the attestation which this reading has, we need not hesitate to adopt it as the true reading. Its teaching is that God, who restored to life him in whom dwelt the fulness of the Spirit, will in due time bring out from among the dead the bodies of believers, because of their being endued with the same Spirit.

¹ A compilation (m) of New Testament readings extracted by Cardinal Angelo Mai, 1843, from the Speculum, a Latin work ascribed to Augustine.
² Jesus indeed says, John vi. 63, “It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.” There is no allusion here, however, to the resurrection. Christ refers simply to the life-giving principle in man in distinction from the substance of his body. His meaning is, The spirit is that which animates the body, not the body that which animates the spirit. For this purpose the body, “the flesh,” is of no account. To this animating principle in man he likens his own words: they are an animating principle, they are the source of spiritual life. Compare 1 Pet. iii. 18, R. V.
³ See John v. 21; vi. 39; xi. 25; Rom. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22, 45, 57; 2 Cor. iv. 14; Eph. i. 10, 19, 20; 1 Thess. iv. 14, 16.
viii. 24.

Rec. T. ὁ γὰρ βλέπω τις, τι καὶ λέγει; — for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

Rev. T. ὁ γὰρ βλέπω, τις λέγει; — for who hopeth for that which he seeth?

The Revisers have adopted, with Westcott and Hort, a reading found only in B first hand, and on the margin of the eleventh- or twelfth-century cursive 47, — testimony in itself very far from being conclusive, or even of preponderant weight. Had this been the original reading, it seems impossible that the other should have crowded it out of every known document but two, especially when we consider that, on the supposition that it is genuine, it is difficult to see how the other could have got into the text. The reading is not only improbable; it is not in strict harmony with the context. It seems to be one of B's abbreviated forms, partially corrected, almost as soon as made, by the insertion of τι after τις. τι was evidently dropped as superfluous, because the apostle's words were misunderstood, — τις having been taken interrogatively, and the question supposed to mean, "For who also hopes for what he sees?" This was the first step, leaving the text as given by only two hands, the original scribes of Ν and 47. But καὶ also was felt by others to be unnecessary. Hence its omission in B, and its removal, at least eight centuries afterwards, from Codex 47, by some reader who probably was able to compare that manuscript with B, and consequently noted on its margin, "Anciently it read thus"; i.e. without τι καὶ. But, while καὶ was thought by many to be needless, τι was restored in B by its contemporary reviser, and retained by the scribes of D, F, G, and their Latin translators; also by the translators of the Vulgate and the Peshito Syriac, and by Origen, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster, and others,— all of whom omitted the καὶ. The true reading is, no doubt, that of the Received Text, which is attested by Ν's seventh-century corrector, A, C, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Clement, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and John Damascene; and virtually, also, by B as corrected by its early reviser, D, F, G, and the other witnesses that retain τι, though they omit καὶ,—the omission of this word not materially affecting the apostle's thought, which centres on the hope itself, not on the person who may be indulging it, as the Revisers' reading evidently makes it.

viii. 35.

The marginal note, stating that some ancient authorities read "of God" where the text reads "of Christ," would be more satisfactory if it stated the facts in the case. The Sinaitic manuscript, seven cursive, a lectionary of the Latin Vulgate, together with Origen, Eusebius, Ephraem Syrus, Basil, Hilary, Jerome, Epiphanius, and others read "of God"; — some of these Fathers giving this reading repeatedly. But the Vatican Codex alone of all the ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, reads "of God which is in Christ Jesus," — a reading evidently taken from verse 39 by some ancient copyist who regarded the words "the love of Christ" as conflicting with the expression "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus," and so changed the former to correspond with the latter. Origen, in two out of his ten or more citations of this passage, also gives the reading, "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus"; while in another place he gives the whole expression as it stands in verse 39, "the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord." The previously mentioned witnesses, however, were satisfied with substituting simply, "of God," for "of Christ," as that sufficed to obviate the supposed difficulty. The reading really deserves no notice. Westcott and Hort, however, insert it in their margin, on the principle, we presume, that no readings of Ν, B, can safely be rejected absolutely.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

viii. 38.

Rec. T. οὕτε ἀρχαὶ οὕτε δυνάμεις οὕτε ἐνστάτα οὕτε μάλλοντα—
nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come.

Rev. T. οὕτε ἀρχαὶ οὕτε ἐνστάτα οὕτε μάλλοντα οὕτε δυνάμεις—
or principalities, nor things present, nor things to come, nor powers.

The reading of the Revisers is strongly supported by documentary evidence,—the common reading having only the attestation of K, L, the cursives as a body, the Peshito Syriac, the Gothic, and a few Fathers,—Chrysostom several times. But the truth is, that the documents indicate early and great confusion among copyists, translators, and others, in the giving of this verse,—some transposing, some adding to, some taking from, and some otherwise changing, the terms given by the apostle. The reading seems to have originated with an early copyist, in omitting δυνάμεις οὕτε by homoioleukton. Some one, afterwards observing the omission, probably placed οὕτε δυνάμεις in the margin, whence the words were transferred to the text, but put in the wrong place. That the apostle should have made this arrangement is incredible. His mind was one that grouped objects together naturally. This is obvious everywhere. Hence we may be assured that he could not have inserted "powers" between "things to come" and "height," with neither of which it has any affinity in thought. Again, ἀρχαί, in the sense of principalities, is a word which he nowhere else uses alone. He generally couples it with ἔξωσις, "powers," as in Eph. iii. 10; vi. 12; Col. i. 16; ii. 15; Tit. iii. 1. In 1 Cor. xv. 24 and Eph. i. 21, he uses the singular in connection with both ἔξωσις and δυνάμεις. It is hardly possible, therefore, for him to have used δυνάμεις in this connection without coupling it with ἀρχαί. This constrains us to believe that its true place is after ἀρχαί, —a position from which it was early displaced by some careless transcriber. To say that the apostle dictated the terms in the order given by the Revisers because, as some say, he meant "powers" in the most general sense of the term, is, at best, only an attempt to defend a false reading. There is nothing in the context to indicate that such was the case. A glance at the passage shows, rather, that δυνάμεις is called for after ἀρχαί, or else not at all. With this word, it forms a compound term, "principalities and powers," by which, as by the similar expression in Eph. vi. 12, the apostle designates those evil spiritual agencies against which the Christian has to contend. This seems obvious from the contrasts running through the passage,—death and life, angels and evil spirits, things present and things to come, height and depth,—a succession of antitheses, followed by the all-embracing specification, "nor any other created object." This gives concinnity and harmony to the whole train of thought. But the other order not only breaks up this adaptation of terms to each other, and leaves us without any apparent reason for the introduction of δυνάμεις, but represents the apostle as employing two words in a strangely un-Pauline manner. It will, no doubt, be said, "But we must take the text as we find it, and not try to shape it to our notions of what it should be." Very true. But what is the text? Not necessarily what a few of the oldest known documents, say the five oldest extant manuscripts, present to us. If it were, all we should need to do, would be to follow them without any regard to other witnesses. But this we cannot do, for no two of them present the same text. They are continually in conflict, more or less, one with another. In one verse, they may be united in presenting a true reading; in the next, be more or less divided between true and false readings; while, in the third, they may conspire in presenting a spurious reading. We are not pleading for conjectural readings. The reading we adhere to as presenting the apostle's language here is by no means without support. It is sustained not only by the oldest known version of the New Testament, which fact ought to have some weight, but by strong, if not overwhelming, intrinsic probability. Internal evidence of this character supported by a comparatively few documents is often stronger testimony in favor of a reading than that of scores and even hundreds of external witnesses to the contrary.
X. 3.

Rec. T. ἐν δικαιοσύνην Ἰησοῦς στήσα— going about to establish their own righteousness.

Rev. T. ἐν δικαιοσύνην στήσα— seeking to establish their own.

There is hardly sufficient warrant for the omission of "righteousness" here. The manuscript testimony is about equally divided between the two readings. But the internal evidence strongly favors the received reading. The apostle as the original writer would naturally give this, the word embodying the most prominent idea in his mind, in each of the three instances in which it appears in the verse; while a critical reader would be tempted to improve the phrasing by striking out the word if possible in at least one of the three instances, so as to avoid its unpleasant recurrence. The word appears here in N, F, G, K, L., nearly all the cursives, the Syriac Versions, both forms of the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Ambrose, and others, but is omitted in A, B, D, E, P, three cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Origen again, Clement, Basil, Chrysostom too, and Cyril, Augustine, and others. It would hardly have found a place here if it were not genuine.

X. 5.

Rec. T. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὁ δὲ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἀνθρώποις ζητεῖται ἐν αὐτοῖς— For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law; That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.

Rev. T. Μωϋσῆς γὰρ γράφει ὁ δὲ ποιήσας ἀνθρώποις ζητεῖται ἐν αὐτῇ— For Moses writeth that the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live thereby.

This verse is given as a reason for the statement contained in the preceding verse; namely, that, to every one that believeth, Christ is the end of law unto righteousness. Having thus spoken of the observance of the law as a means to right-

eousness, the apostle seeks to confirm the statement by saying, not because Moses writes that the man that doeth the righteousness which is of the law shall live by that righteousness (Moses nowhere makes such a statement); but because Moses describes the righteousness which is of the law to be, that the man who doeth the things prescribed by the law shall live by them, i.e., by fulfilling those requirements, as stated in Lev. xviii. 5 and Gal. iii. 12. In other words, Moses represents the righteousness required by law as consisting in the doing of something. But Christ is the end of all this. The righteousness of the gospel consists in believing. As far as the law was a means to righteousness, it ceased with Christ's fulfilment of it.

Now there have evidently been a number of alterations made in the apostle's language here by different manuscripts. In the first place, there was no apparent antecedent for αὐτὰ; hence this must needs be dropped. Then there was no antecedent for αὐτοῖς, and this must be changed to αὐτῇ, so as to refer back to δικαιοσύνην. But, since this failed to give a reading altogether satisfactory, it was thought necessary to remove ὁ δὲ, and place it immediately after γράφει. But, while this may improve the sense, it makes a misstatement, and destroys the apostle's argument. The apostle is simply quoting here, as he is also in Gal. iii. 12, in support of his position, the language of Moses as given by the LXX. That he should not quote it in this verse, where his reasoning calls for it, and yet should quote it in a similar connection in the other epistle, is incredible. It should be allowed to stand unchanged, as the Received Text presents it, in both places. These alterations were made, of course, during the second or third century, those early days when the New-Testament Scriptures were so freely tampered with.

X. 9.

The reading of the margin, "confess the word with thy mouth, that Jesus is Lord," is a reading of the Vatican manuscript, found also in Clement of Alexandria, and partly followed
by a single cursive, $\gamma\iota$, and in another part by a single version, — the Memphitic. It deserves no notice, however, having nothing to commend it, and being unsupported by any evidence of weight. In consequence of Westcott and Hort's reverence for the Vatican manuscript, it is adopted by them. Hence its appearance in the Revisers' margin.

xi. 17.

Rec. T. τῆς ἐκείνης καὶ τῆς πλήρης — of the root and fatness.
Rev. T. τῆς ἐκείνης τῆς πλήρης — of the root of the fatness.

The only evidence in support of the Revisers' reading is the testimony of $\Sigma$ first hand, B, and C. John Damascene in different places seems to favor both readings. Tischendorf conjectures that the presence of the conjunction in the commonly accepted reading is due to the troublesome nature of the reading presented by these three manuscripts. But the more troublesome fact concerning this reading is that it is found in only three manuscripts, and receives no support from internal evidence. The absence of the conjunction in certain ancient exemplars may account for the reading found in D first hand, F, G, and their accompanying Latin versions, which omit τῆς ἐκείνης καὶ. But, no doubt, καὶ was accidentally omitted by some early transcriber from whose copy these manuscripts are descended, while $\Sigma$'s seventh-century emendant, A, D as afterwards corrected, E, L, P, all the cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic have descended from exemplars not thus vitiated. Admitting that the Revisers' Text presents the true reading, what does ἐκείνη, "root," here mean? Prebendary Humphry, himself one of the New-Testament Revisers, says, "the source and origin of its richness." If this is true, the apostle does not use the word literally, but figuratively, as in 1 Tim. vi. 10. Yet, in both the previous and the succeeding verse, he contrasts "root" with "branches," and means thereby the literal root, the underground part of the tree of which he is speaking. Even in this verse, he refers to the branches no less than three times, and the last time in such a way as to leave no room to suppose that he means anything different from what he means in the other verses: "Thou didst become partaker in common with the branches of the root (as well as the fatness) of the olive tree." The meaning of which evidently is that the Gentile, being incorporated by faith into the true Israel, denoted by the olive tree, becomes, together with those among whom he is incorporated, a partaker of the root, $i.e.$ of Christ, and of the fatness of the tree, $i.e.$ of the blessings which believers derive from Christ. Compare with this the revised reading: "Thou didst become partaker with the branches of the root (or source) of the fatness of the olive tree," $i.e.$ of Christ. But why this roundabout phrase, "the root of the fatness"? The fatness of the olive tree is something that has not been referred to in any previous verse so as to make the expression "the root (or source) of the fatness" at all pertinent or called for. Had this been the apostle's meaning, he would naturally have said, "become partakers with them of the root of the olive tree." But this is only half of his meaning. Or, if his words had been written in the reverse order and without the conjunction, so as to allow of their being rendered, as in the Memphitic Version, "partaker with them of the fatness of the root of the olive tree," the word "root" still having the same signification as in the verses preceding and following, the reading would be more natural, and more in harmony with the context, though it would transfer the idea of fatness from the tree to the root. But to say that "root" here means not the root of the olive tree, but the source of its richness, is to give an exceedingly lame defence for an obviously false reading. The truth is, the revised reading is a long-discarded error, utterly unworthy of being revived. It disappeared soon after it originated, and should have been left among the old manuscripts where it was found.
xii. 11.

The reading of the marginal note, "serving the opportunity" instead of "serving the Lord," is attested only by D first hand, F, G, one cursive, a few Latin versions and Latin Fathers. It is not the weight of documentary evidence that seems to have called forth the note, but the fact that many commentators and scholars have thought, and perhaps still think, this the true reading. Even so able a commentator as Meyer, while admitting that "κυρίω is certainly the oldest and most diffused reading," says "if it were original, we cannot well see why κυρίω should have been substituted for it." It could not have been done intentionally. But we need not be at a loss to see that some copyist might easily have mistaken the abbreviation ΚΡΩ [κυρίω] for ΚΡΩ [κατρώ], these being the forms in which these words were anciently written. This would have been the more readily done if the scribe regarded, as he probably did regard, the injunction as only another way of expressing what we find in Eph. v. 16, and Col. iv. 5. The main objection urged against κυρίω is that "serving the Lord" is a precept not suited to the context; that, while it enjoins a comprehensive duty, the injunction is thrown in as an independent precept among others of special and less comprehensive range. This, however, is a false view of the passage. The apostle had said, "In zeal, be not backward; in spirit, be fervent." Then, lest any one should misunderstand or pervert his meaning, he adds as a qualifying clause referring back to both these injunctions, "serving the Lord." It shows in whose service he would have their zeal and earnestness employed. The words, so far from being superfluous or misplaced, are necessary; they are altogether pertinent. As an addition to the two previous clauses, they are perfectly Pauline, somewhat similar in effect to the qualifying phrase "in the Lord" affixed to various expressions or clauses in this epistle and elsewhere. The reading "serving the time," or "serving the opportunity," as a possibly genuine reading, is really deserving of no consideration whatever.

xiii. 11.

Rec. T. ἔρας ἡμᾶς ἡδον ἐς ὑπνον ἐγερθήναι — now it is high time to awake out of sleep; i.e. for us to awake, etc.

Rev. T. ἔρας ἡδον ἡμᾶς ἐς ὑπνον ἐγερθήναι — now it is high time for you to awake out of sleep.

The common reading, ἡμᾶς, is attested by Χ's seventh-century emendator, D, E, F, G, L, nearly every cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Gothic, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The Philoxenian Syriac and Ethiopic Versions, and Origen and Cyril, like our A. V., omit the pronoun. The revised reading is that of Χ first hand, A, B, C, P, three cursives, and one passage of Clement of Alexandria,—not overwhelming evidence, it must be confessed. It is adopted, however, by Tischendorf, Alford, and Westcott and Hort, as well as the Revisers; while Lachmann, Tregelles, Meyer, and others adopt the received as the genuine reading. It looks like a change made to save the apostle from including himself among those needing to awake out of sleep,—a change favored by the participle ἐδότες, "since ye know." Or it may have been thought to be the only proper word to follow the passive verb, ἐγερθήναι, taken in the sense of being roused, rather than in its later intransitive and more common New-Testament sense of awakening; as if the apostle meant to say, "It is high time for you to be aroused from your sleep";—the necessary rousing or awakening to be effected by his words to them. But we have no evidence that the Christians at Rome were asleep more than others, so as to make it necessary for the apostle to say to them particularly, "It is high time for you to awake," or, "for you to be roused." The exhortation, from his standpoint in reference to Christ's second coming, was one applicable to Christians generally, on whose behalf he is here speaking. It is therefore altogether unnatural for him to say,—indeed, improbable that he should have said, "It is time for you to
awake." In the succeeding verses, he did not hesitate to include himself among those who should cast off the works of darkness, put on the armor of light, and walk honestly, not in revelling, etc. We are confirmed in the conclusion that he must have written ημᾶς instead of ημᾶς by the fact that it was not Paul's manner of writing to give an irrelevant reason for anything. And yet, if the Revisers are right, he has done it in saying νῦν γὰρ ἐγενέτερον ἡμῶν ἡ σωτηρία, whether we render it, with the A. V., "for now is our salvation nearer," or, with the R. V., "for now is salvation nearer to us," than when we believed. To give a consistent reason for saying "you should awake," one would naturally say, "For now is your salvation nearer," or, "now is salvation nearer to you." ημᾶς seems to be an early alteration that gained but little favor, and was confined to Alexandria, where it undoubtedly originated.

xiv. 4.

Rec. T. ὁ Θεός — God.
Rev. T. ὁ Κύριος — the Lord.

"For the Lord hath power to make him stand." This reading is attested by the four oldest uncial manuscripts, together with P, a ninth-century uncial, and is also the reading of the Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions. The Peshito Syriac Version, which is two centuries older than the Vatican Codex, translates the verse as follows: "Who art thou, that thou judgest a servant not thine own, who, if he standeth, standeth to his Lord; and if he falleth, he falleth to his Lord? But he will assuredly stand; for his Lord hath power to establish him," — explaining the Greek ὁ Θεός by an additional use of the phrase, "his Lord." It is not an uncommon thing for this Version to insert a gloss, instead of closely following the original. (The Philoxenian Syriac, which is noted for its extreme literalness, has "God," not "the Lord," here.) This gloss of the Peshito Version was afterwards introduced into the margin of certain Eastern Greek manuscripts, and, in consequence of its repeated occurrence in the sixth and following verses, readily passed from the margin into the text of subsequent Alexandrian manuscripts, not in the form, "his Lord," but "the Lord," ὁ κυρίος. It is evidently what Dr. Hort would call "a Syrian reading." The true reading is ὁ Θεός, the word that appeared in other manuscripts, and still appears in D, E, F, G, L, and the whole body of the cursive, as well as in the Vulgate and Old Latin Versions. This is also the reading of the Fathers generally, from Origen downward. It is not taken, as Tischendorf intimates it might be, from verse 3, "for God hath received him." There, there was no motive for changing "God" to "the Lord," as there was here; otherwise the change would doubtless have been made, and the entire context would have favored it.

xiv. 6.

Rec. T. καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν Κυρίῳ ὁ φρονεῖ — and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it.
Rev. T. omits.

Meyer, who adopts the reading followed by the Revisers, says, "The opposite of the observance of days, Paul has not added because he has not at the beginning of this verse planned his language antithetically." But this statement will hardly bear testing. Throughout the preceding context, from the first verse of the chapter, the language is antithetical. In verse 1, the receiving of a weak brother is contrasted with his non-reception "to doubtful disputations." In verse 2, one who believeth in eating all things is set in contrast with one who has not this belief, but eats only herbs. In verse 3, the former is counselled not to despise the latter; and the latter is charged not to judge the former. In verse 4, the man that judges another's servant is given to understand that not he, but the servant's master, is that servant's judge. In verse 5, one man is repre-
sent as esteeming one day above another; while another, in contrast with him, is represented as esteeming all days alike. Hence it is scarcely just to the apostle to say that he had not at the beginning of this verse planned his language antithetically. He had so planned it from the beginning of the chapter. It is hardly possible, therefore, to believe that he could have said, "He that regardeth the day, regardeth it unto the Lord," without introducing its antithesis, especially as the antithetical strain continues in the latter part of the verse and the two verses following. It is on account of this antithetical character of the whole context that we are more and more convinced that the words omitted from the Revisers' Text must be genuine. Completeness in expressing the apostle's thought calls for their presence. It is true, the external testimony in favor of the omission appears strong. But the bare fact that the oldest known manuscripts omit these words is not in itself proof decisive against their genuineness. There is, in the very idea of the apostle's speaking favorably of the non-observance of days held sacred by many, something forbidding to a scrupulous mind,—one of weak faith on this point. In those early days of the Christian Church, when the exact language of the New-Testament writers was less sacredly observed than in later centuries, and when we know that liberties were taken again and again with their language, a copyist who questioned the propriety of not regarding one day above another, and to whom the idea was offensive, might very easily have satisfied himself that he had discharged his duty as a scribe by inserting only the first half of what he found here written in reference to the observance of days. This is quite as probable as that the omission is due to homoioteleuton, to which it may possibly be owing. But, whatever may be the reason of the non-appearance of this clause in most of the uncial, we are far from believing that it is an interpolation in the Syriac Versions, one of which runs back well nigh to the apostles' days. It has every appearance of being genuine, and is demanded by the

context and the style of argument adopted by the apostle. The widespread nature of the omission is due to the early date at which it was made. On the other hand, Basil of Cesarea, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Photins, and other Fathers, attest the words as genuine, as well as C third hand, L, P, most of the cursive, and the Armenian and two Syriac Versions.

xiv. 19.

The Revisers attach to this verse the note, "Many ancient authorities read, *we follow*; that is, instead of "let us follow." But this is one of those marginal notes that tend to lumber up the volume, and certainly benefit nobody. It cannot be said to have been inserted in the interests of justice or candor. Though Tischendorf adopts it, he does it from what he feels to be the force of "authority"; that is, the testimony of his favorite Sinaic Codex, supported by A, B, F, G, L, P, and half a dozen cursive. Of all the versions, not one adopts it; and it is all but universally regarded a false reading, having crept into the text at an early day in consequence of the error of some copyist in writing an α for an ω. Such transparent errors, as common as they are transparent, however respectfully supported, ought not to be thus dragged to the light, and made to appear worthy of consideration. It is true that C, D, and E are the only uncials that read διώκειμεν, "let us follow"; but they are supported by the context, by all the versions, by nearly all the cursive, and approved generally by commentators and editors, even by Westcott and Hort.

xiv. 22.

Rec. T. σοὶ πίστιν ἔχεις;—Hast thou faith?
Rev. T. σοὶ πίστιν ἔχεις—The faith which thou hast.

The Revisers' reading is attested by the four oldest manuscripts ∞, A, B, C,—all Alexandrian, and by only one of the ancient versions,—the Memphitic. If this is the true reading,
how shall we account for the fact that it is not found in any of the old versions except that of the people among whom the four oldest codices originated? The testimony of all these witnesses amounts virtually to that of but one witness. Other than these, the only manuscript testimony in support of this reading is a tenth-century copy of the Latin Vulgate Version; whereas the testimony of D, E, F, G, L, P, of the whole body of the cursives, of all other Latin Versions, of the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, — that is, the testimony of all the rest of ancient Christendom, — is in support of the received reading. However we may seek to account for the presence of ἦν, “which,” it has every appearance of being an interpolation, — either accidentally or designedly such. The absence of the article before πίστιν followed by a relative clause is a fatal objection to the admission of such a clause. Compare Gal. i. 23. Again, the presence of ἦν makes οἷς, “thou,” the subject not of ἐκεῖνος but of the more remote ἐκεῖς; and makes it unaccountably emphatic by removing it so far from its verb. It is difficult to see why the subject of this verb need be expressed at all, much more why it should be made so very emphatic. Moreover, admitting that the apostle could have written πίστιν ἦν for τῷ πίστιν ἦν, and that his meaning therefore is, “The faith which thou hast, have thou to thyself before God,” it must be acknowledged the whole reading has an air of stiffness unnatural to Paul, which renders it exceedingly suspicious, though favored by the most ancient of known Greek manuscripts. But, with the common reading, the passage presents all the simplicity, directness, and naturalness peculiar to the apostle. His argument is that Christians should pursue a course that will edify instead of injuring their brethren, even in reference to things lawful and innocent. Consequently they should not knowingly eat flesh that may possibly have been offered in sacrifice to idols, or drink wine, or do anything else that will cause others to stumble. Then appealing to his readers individually, he very naturally says, either concessively, “THOU

hast faith?” or interrogatively, “Hast thou faith?” i.e. to eat all things (verse 2), or what others may consider unclean. (Verse 14) “Have it to thyself”; don’t parade it before others who have different views from yours, and who consider your course sinful. This is relevant, and perfectly Pauline. But to say, “Do thou, [the] faith which thou hast, have to thyself before God,” is to speak in an ungrammatical and apparently uncalled for manner, altogether unlike the apostle’s ordinary mode of expression. This false reading seems to have grown out of a careless repetition of the last syllable of πίστιν, making ΠΙΣΤΙΝΗΝΈΞΕΙϹ out of the two words πίστιν and ἐκεῖς. But a subsequent copyist, naturally considering the second Ti a mistake for H, changed the reading to ΠΙΣΤΙΝΗΝΈΞΕΙϹ, i.e. πίστιν ἦν ἐκεῖς.

xiv. 23.

It is very true that a large number of manuscripts, some ancient, insert after this verse the doxology found in chapter xvi. 25-27. But we question whether it is legitimate revision work to insert this statement in the margin without saying anything more. That the doxology properly belongs here, few scholars at present contend. It was brought in through the Lectionaries or early church service books, which inserted it at the close of a lesson. It was thus that it found its way into the text both here and at the end of the epistle in A, P, 5, 17, and certain copies of the Armenian Version. In some manuscripts, as L, about two hundred cursives, the lectionaries, and a few third-class versions, it appears here, but not at the end of the epistle. And so Griesbach and Matthaei have it in their editions; but this is not generally approved. Others still, as D third hand, F, G, considering it altogether spurious, omit it in both places. But the preponderance of testimony assigns it its place at the end of the epistle, and there only. It would be quite as suitable to append to chapter xvi. 25 the note, “Some authorities question the genuineness of this passage,” as
it is to give the note here annexed, or the one there placed in the margin. Indeed, no such note as we find in either of these places is really called for.

Rec. T. τὴν χάριν τὴν δοξείσαν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ — the grace that is given to me of God.

Rev. T. τὴν χάριν τὴν δοξείσαν μοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ — the grace that was given me of God.

There is no difference here made in the rendering of ὑπὸ and ἀπὸ. There is, however, this difference in the meaning of the two prepositions: the former, employed as here, means "by," and refers to God as the efficient cause, the giver; while the latter means "from," with a reference to God as the primal source of the gift. The weight of external evidence is greatly in favor of the former; the latter being attested only by N, B, F, and the doubtful testimony of John Damascene. This reading may have proceeded from a mistaking of the word in the exemplar by an early scribe, as indeed the other might have proceeded from a misreading of this. But ἀπὸ has rather the appearance of being an altered reading, made with a view of bringing the passage into conformity with expressions found elsewhere, as in James i. 17; also 2 Cor. v. 18, "All things are from God," but by Jesus Christ. In Acts ix. 15, xiii. 47, xxii. 21, xxvi. 16, Rom. i. 5, etc., the apostle is represented as having received his commission as an apostle to the Gentiles through the Lord Jesus,—an idea which would be expressed by ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ rather than by the unqualified phrase ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Hence, apparently, the change from ὑπὸ to ἀπὸ.

Rec. T. ἵσω ὅπως καύχησιν — I have therefore whereby I may glory.

Rev. T. ἵσω ὅπως τὴν καύχησιν — I have therefore my gloriing.

The latter reading is attested by B, C apparently, D, E, F, G, and the single cursive 37; the former, by N, A, L, P, the rest of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, and the Armenian Version, Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and John Damascene. The position of ἵσω shows that special emphasis is to be given to "I have." Accordingly, the Revised Text must mean, I have therefore the gloriing (that I have) in Christ Jesus as regards things pertaining to God. It is not a mere fancy. It is something that truly belongs to me, something that I really possess. Others may deny it to me; but this cannot affect the truth in the case, or prove that I have no such gloriing. But what the special significance or pertinence of such a declaration can be, especially in this connection, it is difficult to see. The apostle has said nothing previous to this concerning gloriing in Christ. Why, then, should he draw the conclusion, "Therefore I have my gloriing in Christ"? It seems to be a very unnatural and strange conclusion to arrive at from the premises in the case. And yet it is the only conclusion that the presence of the article seems to allow. That gives definiteness to the gloriing, and makes it the apostle's. But remove the article, and a different meaning presents itself: "I have therefore a gloriing—a subject or ground of gloriing"; or, "I have therefore whereof I may glory." It will not do to say that καύχησις does not admit this meaning. Both here and in 2 Cor. i. 12, to say nothing of Rom. iii. 27, the apostle uses καύχησις as equivalent to καύχησις, just as in Rom. viii. 39, he uses κτίσις for κτίσμα. Nor is this all. In 1 Cor. v. 6, 2 Cor. v. 12, ix. 3, Phil. i. 26, he uses καύχησις where we might naturally expect to see καύχησις. In short, he employs the two words interchangeably in accordance with later Greek usage. Taking the word, then, without the article,—a reading that is really more strongly attested than the other,—the meaning is both plain and pertinent. In the preceding verses, the apostle refers to the grace that had been bestowed upon him that he should be a minister of Christ among the Gentiles. In view of this unspeakable privilege, he says, "I have therefore ground of gloriing in Christ Jesus in
things pertaining to God." Men may say I have not, but I have. It is an act of unspeakable grace on God's part to permit me to preach Christ among the Gentiles. I glory in it. After thus positively stating that he regarded the relation which he sustained to God in being called to the ministry of the Gospel as a ground of glorying in Christ, he adds as a reason for saying this, "For I dare not speak except of things which Christ has wrought through me," having permitted me to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles from Jerusalem to Illyricum, and through the intermediate countries, especially where no other preacher of the gospel has been before me. Thus favored of God, the apostle felt warranted in saying, "I have therefore reason for boasting in Christ in matters pertaining to God." How the article ever crept into the text, one may not be able to say positively, any more than he can explain how Didymus of Alexandria, in quoting this passage, should again and again have written πεποίθησιν, "confidence," in place of καίξησιν, unless it was to present his idea of the apostle's meaning. It is enough to show that the article does not belong there, and that there is sufficient evidence to justify one in taking this position.

xvi. 27.

The A. V. has "to God only wise, be glory through Jesus Christ for ever," where the R. V. reads, "to the only wise God, through Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory for ever." The Greek in both Texts is the same. But the Revisers have the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities omit to whom." These authorities are B, two cursive, (33, 72), the Peshito Syriac, the Latin Version of F, and Origen; while two other cursive read εἰ ὁ ὑφα, "be glory," in place of ϕ ὁ ὑφ, "to whom the glory." The preponderance of external evidence, therefore, is very greatly in favor of the retention of ϕ, "to whom." But this makes an exceedingly hard reading,—a circumstance, it is true, which in the eyes of some is all the more in its favor, as affording an argument in proof of its genuineness. Yet it is difficult to believe that the apostle could have written these last three verses in this disconnected manner. Nor should this belief be entertained except as a necessity from which there is no reasonable ground of escape. The fact that B alone of all the uncials omits ϕ looks, it must be confessed, like an evident attempt, on the part of the copyist of that manuscript, or of some one who had preceded him, to remove a difficulty. But, if this is true of him, it must be true also of another scribe a hundred years or more earlier than that of B, one of whose copies was in the hands of Origen, who quotes the passage without the relative. And, if true of these, it must also be true of the translator or translators of the Peshito Syriac Version, who lived in another part of Christendom, and at least another hundred years earlier. But if, in these three separate instances, different scribes should have pursued one and the same course, it really seems strange that the same thing was not more extensively done, as it must have suggested itself to others also, and could have been effected so very easily. Now the fact that the Sinaitic manuscript has the relative is proof that ϕ was considered by some as a part of the text as early as the middle of the fourth century. And the fact that it exists in all but one of the earliest Greek manuscripts, and in all but one or two of the earliest Versions, is presumptive evidence that it must have been an accepted reading for many years previous to that, if not from the very first. Still, we believe that ϕ is no part of the original text, but that this text is correctly handed down by B, the Peshito Syriac Version, and the few other documents that omit "to whom." When we consider the length of this doxology (verses
25–27), and the ease with which the connection may be lost by a copyist before reaching the end, especially in the comparatively slow process of writing in uncial, it is by no means difficult to believe that an early scribe, to whom the form of the doxology in Gal. i. 5, 2 Tim. iv. 18, and Heb. xiii. 21, was familiar, having lost the connection, and trusting to his memory for the moment, rather than observing his exemplar, should have unconsciously inserted the Ψ that appears in those places. Any one who is accustomed to do much in copying, as well as in the way of original composition, and observing his mistakes, will realize that a copyist is far more likely, in similar circumstances, to introduce an error of this kind than the original writer would be. And we are the more convinced that “to whom” was thus introduced by the fact that Ν, Α, Δ, Ε, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic Version, and other witnesses for this reading add the τῶν αὐτῶν, “and ever,” of those verses; while Β, Κ, and other documents are without this additional phrase. Codices Π, 31, 54, and the copy of this epistle that was in Chrysostom’s possession, as well as the Memphitic Version, instead of “to whom,” have “to him.” But this is simply an attempt to correct the phraseology by making it correspond with Rom. xi. 36.

1 CORINTHIANS.

1. 15.

Rec. T. οὐκ ἔχεις ἴσης ὅτι ἔστι πάντων δομάτα θεῶν. — Lest any man should say that I had baptized in mine own name.

Rev. T. οὐκ ἔχεις ἴσης ὅτι ἔστι πάντων δομάτα θεῶν. — lest any man should say that ye were baptized into my name.

The first of these is the reading of C third hand, D, E, F, G, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Gothic Versions, Theodoret, Tertullian, and others. The latter follows Ν, Α, Β, Κ first hand, ten cursives, the Latin versions of E and F, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. There is no perceptible difference in the meaning of the two readings; so that the apostle might have expressed himself equally well in either. In verse 13, he expresses his thoughts successively in the passive: “Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or, were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” This is natural; it is Paul-like. In verses 14–16, however, he quite as obviously expressed himself successively in the active: “I baptized none of you . . . lest any should say I baptized in my own name . . . I baptized also the household of Stephanas . . . I know not whether I baptized any other.” This, too, is perfectly natural, and what might be expected from the apostle. But some early critic seems to have taken offence at the monotonous recurrence of the aorist active; and, in order to vary the expression without affecting the apostle’s meaning, substituted the passive form, which he had just found in verse 13. This, however, did not satisfy
every reader; hence it was afterwards changed to ἐν ἀρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ, “he was baptized.” This is the reading of Euthalius, and of the cursive 10, 31. The change was evidently wrought to make the verb correspond grammatically with the one preceding it: “Lest any one should say that he was baptized in my name.” If the passive were the original reading here, it is difficult to see why it should ever have been set aside for the active. The active, however, has every indication of being genuine; and there is no good reason why it should be abandoned.

ii. 1.

Rec. T. καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τῷ μάρτυρι τοῦ Θεοῦ,—declaring unto you the testimony of God.

Rec. T. καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τῷ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ,—proclaiming to you the mystery of God.

The common reading is that of Σ's seventh-century emendator, B, D, E, F, G, L, P, most of the cursive, the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, both Ethiopic Versions, the Armenian, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, John Damascus, Pelagius, and others. The revised is supported by Σ first hand, A, C, seven or eight cursive, one Old Latin Version, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, and by Antiochus, Ambrose, Augustine, and Ambrosiaster. It looks like a gloss, introduced from verse 7, to obviate the difficulty presented by the expression, “the testimony of God,” a phrase nowhere else used as a synonym of the Gospel. “The testimony of Christ” is an expression employed in verse 6 of the preceding chapter as synonymous with “the gospel of Christ”; i.e. the testimony borne concerning him by his followers. But the phrase “the testimony of God” evidently admits of no such interpretation: it can mean only the testimony given by God,—what God testifies to or declares. This supposed difficulty seems to have led to the substitution of μαρτύριον, the “mystery,” i.e. the secret which God had kept to himself from the foundation of the world, but which he revealed to men in the coming of Christ.

This “mystery” is sometimes spoken of as the mystery of God, and sometimes as the mystery of Christ,—quite as often the former as the latter. Hence the ease with which it found its way here in place of “testimony.” If the latter word, as some suppose, had been introduced from i. 6, the phrase would undoubtedly have been changed to correspond throughout with that,—“the testimony of Christ.” We cannot but conclude that the common reading, which certainly has a preponderance of evidence, both external and internal, in its favor, is the genuine reading. It is so regarded by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, and others. But Griesbach favors μαρτύριον; and Westcott and Hort adopt it, placing μαρτύριον in the margin as a secondary reading.

iii. 12.

Rec. T. εἶ δὲ τῷ επικονομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον τοῦτον—Now if any man build upon this foundation.

Rec. T. εἶ δὲ τῷ επικονομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον—But if any man buildeth on the foundation.

The presence of τοῦτον is attested by Σ's seventh-century emendator, C third hand, D, E, L, P, all the cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Origen, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascus, Augustine, and others. The word is omitted in Σ first hand, A, B, C first hand, one Old Latin Version, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, and by Cyril of Alexandria, and Ambrose. Among words of similar ending, it might very easily have dropped out in copying without being missed. It is by no means probable that the apostle introduced the word θεμέλιον, “foundation,” in this connection without τοῦτον as its natural accompaniment, pointing back to the foundation mentioned in the preceding clause. It is easier to believe that the word is wanting in a few documents through the carelessness of some early transcriber than that it was omitted by the apostle or his amanuensis.
The received reading is found in D as corrected by a later hand, E, L, most of the cursive, Origen three times, Didymus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, and others. The revised is that of A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, P, six cursive, the Latin versions of D and E as well as of F and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, both forms of the Ethiopic, Origen once as represented by his Latin interpreter, Augustine, and others. The weight of external evidence is, no doubt, in favor of δικαίου; but, as Principal Edwards, who adopts the reading, says, “it is difficult to fix the meaning.” If taken in the sense of “in this matter,” it makes the phrase “in stewards” redundant. If the meaning is supposed to be “on earth,” it indicates a contrast between faithfulness in this life and faithfulness in some other sphere. But there is evidently no implied contrast here, as there is in Col. iv. 9, or Heb. xiii. 14. To connect it, as Lachmann does, with the preceding verse, so as to read “stewards of the mysteries of God in this matter,” is harsh, and makes the expression superfluous. To render it, with Meyer, “such being the case” or “in these circumstances,” is to give it a signification unwarranted by its New Testament use, and having no special point or applicableness. Indeed, beyond all reasonable doubt, the word is a very early transcriptional error for δικαίου, made in consequence of the scribe’s writing from dictation, and misapprehending the true expression. Taking δικαίου, “and what is more,” as the true reading, there is no difficulty. The two verses taken together may be rendered as follows: “Such being the case, let a person regard us as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God: and, what is more, it is required on the part of stewards that a man be found faithful.”

The rule that the more difficult reading is more likely to be the true reading is, no doubt, an excellent rule in certain circumstances. But to push it to the extreme of making an unmeaning reading, that may easily be accounted for, appear to be the genuine reading, in the face of a plain if not self-evidently correct reading, is an abuse of the rule.

The common reading is supported in the first of these instances by D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic, Theodoret, and John Damascene; in the last, by the same witnesses, together with the additional testimony of Clement, Methodius, and Chrysostom twice. The future of the Revised Text is attested in the first instance by A, B, 6, 17, 46, 67 second hand, Basil, the Memphitic, and its kindred version the Bashmuric; in the last instance, by all these except the Bashmuric, together with the additional testimony of Codex 37 and Euthaliius. This future is an early alteration made for the sake of varying the phraseology. There is no more call for the future at the end of these two verses than in the middle of the latter verse, or at the end of verse 36, where the present, ὁκληροὶ ἀμαρτήτως, “sinneth not,” remains undisturbed. The apostle, no doubt, wrote the present in each of these four instances; but a meddling critic sought to improve his language.
and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Chrysostom twice, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The latter is attested by Ν first hand, A, B, D, E, F, G, P, eight cursive, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Basil, Euthalius, Cyril, Ireneus as represented by his Latin interpreter, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and others. The revised reading thus appears to be the more strongly attested. This, however, is only to be expected; for ἑρῶς has the appearance of being superfluous; and, in copying from different exemplars, one or more of which were without ἑρῶς, though the others had it, a scribe would naturally give the simpler and more concise form of expression the preference. But the bare fact that ἑρῶς appears in any manuscripts is prima-facie evidence of its genuineness; for no scribe or reader would have been tempted to insert a word seemingly so utterly unnecessary.

viii. 7.

Rec. T. τυις δι την συνειδήσει του εἴδους ἠρτι — for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour.

Rev. T. τυις δι την συνειδήσει ἠρτι του εἴδους — but some, being used until now to the idol.

The common reading, συνειδήσεως, is that of the seventh-century corrector of Ν, D, E, F, G, L, nearly all the cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Tertullian, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Revisers' συνειδήσεως is found in Ν first hand, A, B, P, five cursive, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Ethiopic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Euthalius, John Damascene, and others. Of the two readings, the former is the more difficult. Hence, apparently from a misapprehension of its true meaning, the word συνειδήσεως, in its classic sense of familiarity or intimacy, was originally written as a gloss in the margin, whence it was afterward introduced into the text in place of συνειδήσεως, taken in the sense of consciousness or knowledge.

Thus, "conscience of the idol," or scrupulosity in regard to it, became transformed to familiarity with, or habituation to, the idol. The only unquestioned use the apostle makes of συνειδήσεως is in xi. 16, and then in the sense in which the evangelist John (xviii. 39) uses it: "We have no such custom." But this signification is very different from that presented in this verse. If, therefore, we can judge anything from the context, or from the apostle's acknowledged use of συνειδήσεως, the revised reading here, instead of restoring the original text, has only set it aside.

viii. 8.

Rec. T. Βρώμα δι ημᾶς ου παραστήσει τυ Θεο· ουτε γαρ ἡν φάγων, περιστασιόμεν· ουτε ἡν μη φάγων, ὑπερεομένα. — But meat commendeth us not to God: for neither if we eat, are we the better: neither if we eat not, are we the worse.

Rev. T. Βρώμα δι ημᾶς ου παραστήσει τυ Θεο· ουτε ην μη φάγων ὑπερεομένα, ουτε ην φάγων περιστασιόμενα. — But meat will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better.

We have here several points to notice. First, the present παραστήσει of the Received Text is displaced by the future παραστήσεται. This is the reading of Ν first hand, A, B, eight cursive, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and John Damascene, each of the three employing it twice, Cyril, and some manuscripts of Athanasius. The common reading is attested by the seventh-century corrector of Ν, D, E, L, P (as well as by F and G, which read συνιστήσας instead), most of the cursive, the Vulgate, Origen once, Basil twice, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, Tertullian, Cyprian, and others. The word does not properly mean to "commend," but to "present," to "place before." The apostle's idea is, that food does not affect our standing before God; it places us on terms neither of fellowship nor of disfavor with him. It in no way determines our relation to him. The statement is of a general character, as true in reference to one
transposed position of the last two clauses. Meyer thinks that the true order is for the negative clause to come first, as the Revisers have it. His reason is that “a transcriber would have a mechanical inclination to place the positive half of the statement first.” Generally speaking, this is no doubt true. But there may be reasons to lead a transcriber or a corrector of the text to reverse the order, as is the case here. Having begun the verse by making it read, “Now, food will not affect our standing before God”; he would hardly go on with saying, “Neither, on the other hand, if we eat, are we the better,” etc. He would naturally reverse the clauses, and say, “Neither, on the other hand, if we abstain from food — if we eat not, are we the worse”; then allow the clause, “neither, if we eat, are we the better,” to follow as a sort of after-thought. The construction shows the hand of a reviser all the way through. This order is attested by A first hand, B, one cursive, five copies of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Armenian, and Basil once. The order of the Received Text is that of \( \aleph \), D, E, F, G, I, P, about all the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, and some copies of Jerome’s, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Ethiopic, Clement of Alexandria, Origen three times, Basil also once, Chrysostom twice, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Tertullian, Cyprian, Augustine, and others; while Codex A second hand, by a careless misplacement of the negative, reads, “Neither, if we eat not, are we the better; nor, if we eat, are we the worse.” The \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) is omitted by \( \aleph \), A, B, four cursives, two copies of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Origen once, where he begins his citation with \( \sigma \varepsilon \tau \varepsilon \), and would naturally omit \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) as irrelevant, Basil, Euthalius, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine, some of them quoting only what Origen quotes, and in the same manner that he does. The conjunction is given in D, E, F, G, I, P, nearly all the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, three copies of Jerome’s, Clement of Alexandria, Origen twice, Basil also, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. Now, as to the

If, as the Revisers claim, their revision of the Greek Text was the necessary foundation of their work of revising the English Text, it would seem as if that necessity ought to be every-
where manifest in the translation. We have already pointed out changes in the Greek that were in no way necessary to the renderings given,—readings, in fact, which were introduced into the text only to be abandoned in translating. Another of these occurs here. If the change from τινα της κενώσης to οδοίς κενώσει were a necessity to enable the Revisers faithfully to represent the apostle in English, then, on coming to translate, instead of abandoning the latter reading and following the former, they ought in faithfulness to have given some such a rendering as this: “It was good for me to die rather than—— My glorying, no one shall make void.” Some take ἡ to mean “or” instead of “than”:—“It was good for me rather to die; or no one shall make my glorying void.” But this, to say nothing of its obscurity, is a reading calling for a rendering of exceedingly questionable propriety. As far as we are aware, μᾶλλον ἡ invariably means “rather than.” Lachmann adopts the reading; but, in his perplexity to give it a meaning, he punctuates it so as to make the apostle say, “It was good for me that I die rather than (that) my boasting (should). No one shall make (it) void.” The difficulty of finding a satisfactory Pauline construction and meaning for the words is sufficient evidence against the genuineness of the reading. There certainly is some error in connection with it, however well attested it may be. And, as long as it affords an untranslatable phrasing, what can justify the claim of necessity, advanced on its behalf and on behalf of similar changes?

**X. ii.**

Rec. T. τῶν δὲ πάντα τοῦ ποιμένος ἑκάστους. — Now all these things happened unto them for enamples.

Rev. T. τῶν δὲ τοῦκους συνεβάλλον ἑκάστους. — Now these things happened unto them by way of example.

Pάπτομα, as given in the Received Text, is attested by C, K, L, P, most of the cursive, the Latin versions of D and E, the Vulgate, both Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Irenæus, Origen several times, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascus, Ambrosiaster, and others. It also appears in the transposed reading τῶν δὲ τοῦτος, in the Greek texts of D and E, F, G, five or six cursives, the Ethiopic Version, Augustine, and others. It is wanting in A, B, 17, the Thebaic Version, Marcion according to Epiphanius, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, Basil, and others. The word is probably a part of the genuine text, but was omitted as unnecessary, especially in the citations of the passage by the Fathers; and, from some of these, the omission may have crept into the few copies that are without the word.

The reading τῶν is attested by D, E, F, G, L, most of the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, and Thebaic Versions, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascus, and others. The revised reading τοῦκώς, on the other hand, is attested by S, A, B, C, K, P, twelve or more cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian, Marcion twice according to Epiphanius, Origen twice, Hippolytus, Basil twice, Macarius, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. This is probably the original reading, but was changed to τῶν to correspond with the reading of verse 6. After this change, owing to the harshness of the reading τῶν τοῦ ποιμένου συνέβαλεν, the verb was changed to the plural, as it reads in the Received and Revised Texts. This, as we pointed out in our note on Rom. ii. 14, is contrary to the apostle’s usus loquendi. The plural of the verb is given by A, D, E, F, G, L, the majority of the cursives, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascus, and others. But the singular is attested by S, B, C, K, L, twelve or more cursives, Marcion twice, Origen four times, and the rest of the witnesses that read τοῦκώς. As the singular verb τοῦκώς follows immediately after, it is by no means probable that a plural verb preceded, when both have the same subject,—“All these things happened to them typically, and were written for our admonition.”
xi. 9.
Rec. T. ἐν τῷ ἀντί Πνεύματι, — by the same Spirit.
Rev. T. ἐν τῷ ίδι Πνεύματι, — in the one Spirit.

The former is the reading of Ν, C third hand (the original scribe omitted the whole phrase), D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursive's, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, Clement, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others. The latter is the reading of A, B, six cursive's, the Vulgate, Didymus, Euthalius, Basil, John Damascene, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, and other Latin Fathers. The former is apparently the true reading. Ἐνι seems to have been introduced from verse 11 in order to break up the uniformity of the apostle's language. In that verse, after having enumerated the gifts of the Spirit bestowed upon one and another, the apostle naturally closes with saying, "All these worketh one and the same Spirit." But the use of ἰδι in verse 9 seems forced, there being nothing in the connection to indicate that the apostle really needed to say "by the one Spirit," rather than "by the same Spirit," as elsewhere. The evidence, both external and internal, preponderates in favor of the common reading.

xii. 3.

The many ancient authorities, referred to in the marginal note as reading "If I give my body that I may glory," instead of "to be burned," are the three oldest Greek manuscripts, Ν, A, B, the eleventh-century cursive 17, whose text resembles B's more closely than any other known cursive's, the Memphitic, the Thibetian, the Roman Ethiopic, and Ephraem Syrius. The reading is manifestly false, and seems, obviously enough, to have originated in the mistaking of one letter for another,—the only difference between the two readings consisting in a single letter having a similar sound to that in the other. Bishop Wordsworth, in his note on the passage, well says that the reading so plainly spurious "is worth notice, as showing that the best uncial manuscripts are not always to be depended on, and sometimes are blemished with errors." Notwithstanding the transparency of the error, Westcott and Hort adopt it as the genuine and only reading. And Dr. Hort adds that "it gives an excellent sense"; though it is hard to see it, even after he tries to show it.

xiv. 32.

This verse, as given by both the Revisers and the A. V., reads, "But if any man is ignorant, let him be ignorant." That is, the last verb is in the imperative, ἀγνοεῖν. With some, it has been a question as to what the apostle really means. The words might be rendered, "But if any one ignores them [does not recognize and acknowledge the things that I write as commands of the Lord], let him ignore them," — he does it at his peril; it is not worth while to waste words on such a one. But, as the marginal note indicates, a number of ancient witnesses — Ν first hand, A first hand apparently, D first hand, F, G, Origen, and the Latin versions of D and E — give the present indicative passive, ἀγνοεῖται, "he is ignored," as the true reading. And this is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, apparently on account of its being the more difficult reading. But it seems impossible to give it a satisfactory meaning. It cannot legitimately be considered the present for the future. If the apostle meant "he will be ignored," i.e. in the day of judgment, it would have been as easy for him to say ἀγιονεῖται as ἀγιονεῖται. Besides, if this had been his meaning, he would hardly have abstained from inserting the emphatic αἰτός,—making the verse read, "But, if any one ignores them, he will himself be ignored." Jerome in his perplexity translates the word by the future, ignorabitur; "he will be ignored"; and Ambrose and Ambrosiaster approve of this reading, as Origen is also made to do by his Latin interpreter Rufinus. But there is no known Greek manuscript to support it. The only apparently genuine reading is that of the text,—"Let him be ignorant" of them.
XV. 14.

The authorities referred to in the marginal note, as reading "our (instead of your) faith also is vain," are B, D first hand, a few cursive, the Thebaic, Bashmuric, and Gothic Versions, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Epiphanius, Cyril, Ecumenius, Rufinus, and others. The reading seems to have been introduced in consequence of the wording of the preceding clause, "then is our preaching vain," and of that of the clause following, "Yea, and we are found false witnesses," etc. The accepted reading, however, is abundantly attested, though Westcott and Hort adopt the false reading of B, D, etc. Besides,—and this also indicates the genuineness of the common reading,—it yields a stronger argument in support of the apostle's position than if he had said, "Then vain is our preaching, vain also our faith"; for his preaching was but the result of his faith; so that, if the former was vain, the latter could hardly be otherwise. But by urging not only that his preaching, but that his hearers' faith also, was vain if Christ had not risen, he really enforced his reasoning.

XV. 49.

We have here the marginal reading, "Let us also bear the image of the heavenly." This, Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort feel constrained to adopt as the true reading,—another illustration of the untrustworthiness of ancient manuscripts, even when agreed. The context is not hortatory, but argumentative, and designed to afford encouragement. The apostle argues that as the earthly Adam was, such also are his earthly descendants,—corruptible, exposed to sufferings and death; and as the heavenly Redeemer is, such are also the members of his heavenly family to be,—incorruptible, glorified. In other words, as we have borne the image—carried the likeness,—of the earthy, by being subject to vanity, disease, and death, we shall also bear the image or likeness of the heavenly, by being endowed with incorruptibility and glory. The language is in perfect accordance with the apostle's style of presenting truth in different forms. He was not satisfied with simply presenting it once; but he repeated it in other words, to bring it, if possible, more clearly and forcibly before his readers. Compare verses 42–44; also 53, 54. — Εἰκόνον, "image," has but one meaning in both clauses. What that is, the connection clearly shows. The apostle's aim obviously was to encourage his Christian readers to be steadfast and immovable in the faith in view of the resurrection to a life of glory awaiting them after death. An exhortation, in such a connection, to bear the image of the heavenly, would be altogether misplaced and out of harmony with the context. And yet this inadmissible marginal reading, which is very easily accounted for as an error of frequent occurrence, is attested by Σ, A, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, by far the greater part of the cursive, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, and the Gothic, Origen repeatedly, Methodius, Caesarius of Constantinople, Basil, Macarius, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Euthalius, Cyril, John Damascus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, and others,—an apparently overwhelming torrent of authority! On the other hand, the only possibly genuine reading, that of the text, is attested by B, a comparatively small number of cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and the Arabic Version, Origen in some editions, Cyril, Theodoret, Photius, Theophylact, and Ecumenius. (Compare Note on Rom. v. 1.)
Text, is attested by D third hand, E, F, G, K, L, M, most of the cursive, one copy of the Old Latin, all but three manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, Origen two or three times, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophy- lact, Æcumenius, Jerome, and Ambrosiaster. The future of the Revised Text is the reading of Ν, B, C, P, 17, and four other cursive, the Latin version of G, three manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Euthalius, and John Damascene. The Roman Ethiopic has both the present and the future. The difference in readings seems to have originated in the early omission of πέφεκτο as superfluous, making the verse read, “Who delivered us from so great a death, and in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us.” The text is thus given in A, D first hand, the Peshito Syriac, the Latin version of E, one manuscript of the Vulgate, Platt’s Ethiopic, and Chrysostom. Some early reader, by a comparison of manuscripts, having discovered the omission, restored the word incorrectly, perhaps from having confused it with πέφεκτο in the line below, while others replaced the genuine πέφεκτο. This will account for the comparatively feeble uncial attestation of “doth deliver.” That this is the true reading, however, there can hardly be a doubt. A critical reader would not be tempted to insert such an expression in such a connection. But it was just like the apostle to do it. It was an ever-abiding conscious-ness with him that God is the present as well as the past and future deliverer of those who trust in him. It led him on this occasion to say of God, He “has delivered” me from imminent death, and he “continues to deliver” me; and in his confidence in God, he adds, He “will yet deliver” me. His experience was that of the psalmist: “I sought the Lord, and he heard me, and delivered me from all my fears. Many are the afflictions of the righteous; but the Lord delivereth him out of them all. Yea, the Lord shall help them and deliver them; he shall deliver and save them, because they trust in him.” Ps. xxxiv. 4, 19; xxxvii. 40.
iii. 3.

Rec. T. ἐν πλακτὶ καρδίας σαρκίναις. — in fleshly tables of the heart.
Rev. T. ἐν πλακτὶ καρδίας σαρκίναις. — in tables that are hearts of flesh.

In attestation of the received reading, we have F, K, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D, E, F, G (three of them against their own Greek), the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, Irenaeus, Origen several times, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Macarius, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, John Damascene, Hilary, and others, — testimony, some of which runs back to the middle of the second century, or two hundred years earlier than the date of our oldest Greek manuscripts. The revised reading is attested by Ν, A, B, C, D, E, G, L, P, twenty-five or more cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac alone of all the versions, Eusebius also, and Euthalius. The latter, however, is plainly a transcriber's error in writing καρδίας for καρδίας, — an error very easily committed in connection with the plural forms immediately preceding and following. The expression ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις in the foregoing verse may also have had some influence in misleading the copyist. The expression cannot properly be translated, however, as the Revisers have translated it; for σαρκίναις "fleshly" or "of flesh," belongs to πλακτί, "tables" or "tablet," as truly as λίθιναι, "of stone," belongs to the same word just before. The only legitimate rendering that can be given to the words is "tables of flesh (or 'fleshly tablets'), hearts." But the reading "hearts" is a palpable error for "of the heart," — one easily accounted for, and really deserving of no regard. To obtain the Revisers' rendering, the Greek would need to be ἐν πλακτὶ ταῖς καρδίαις σαρκίναις.

iii. 9.

The marginal reading, "For if there is glory in the ministry of condemnation," is attested by Ν, A, C, D first hand, F, G, 17, and six other cursives, several copies of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito Syriac, the Ethiopic, Origen, Cyril, and Ambrosiaster. But it is an attempted improvement of the apostle's language. From the beginning of verse 7 to the end of verse 11, the leading idea with him, either expressed or implied, was the διακονία or "ministration." This naturally led him to express himself here as in the text: "the ministration ... is glory," — not as in the marginal reading: "there is glory in the ministration," or "attaching to the ministration," etc.

iv. 6.

Rec. T. φῶς λαμψει — light to shine.
Rev. T. φῶς λαμψει — light shall shine.

The former is attested by the earlier seventh-century corrector of Ν, C, D third hand, E, F, G, H, K, L, P, all but one or two cursives, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, Marcion several times as cited by Epiphanius, Origen, Justin Martyr, Athanasius, Macarius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Tertullian, and others. The latter is the reading of Ν first hand, A, B, D first hand, 67 second hand, Clement, and possibly the Ethiopic Version. It does not readily commend itself as the true reading. The usual sign of direct address, the recitative δί, is wanting before ἐκ. There is no known occasion on which God is previously spoken of as having said, "Light shall shine out of darkness," to which the apostle might be supposed to refer. There is no apparent reason why the apostle should depart from his ordinary mode of expression to introduce a single clause in direct discourse when the indirect seems far more to his purpose. To all which, it may be added that the reading is an obvious itacism, an early scribe having probably confounded λάμψη with λαμψει as the words were dictated to him, and so wrote the latter for the former.
iv. 14.

The omission of “the Lord,” in the clause “who raised up the Lord Jesus,” to which the marginal note refers, is sanctioned by B, 17, 43, one of the fragments of a fifth-century manuscript of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Armenian, Chrysostom, Tertullian, and others. But the word might easily have been omitted, as it probably was, because of its absence before ἡγεῖον immediately following. None but a believer in the infallibility of Codex B would really think of omitting it.

v. 17.

Rec. T. γέγονεν καὶνά τὰ πάντα. — all things are become new.
Rev. T. γέγονεν καὶνά. — they are become new.

The former of these readings is supported by D second and third hands, E, K, L, P, all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the manuscripts of the Armenian Version, Platt’s Ethiopian, Ignatius in his epistle to Polycarp as represented by his Latin interpreter, also in his epistle to the Magnesians, Justin Martyr, Origen, the Apostolic Constitutions, Methodius, Didymus, Ephraem Syrus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril in two passages, Theodoret, John Damascene, Tertullian, Ambrose in one of his epistles, Ambrosiaster, and others,—a strong array of witnesses from the earliest days. The revised reading is attested by K, B, C, D first hand, F, G, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, an early edition of the Armenian Version, the Roman Ethiopian, Athanasius according to a manuscript, Hilary, Ambrose in a second epistle, Augustine, and the author of De Promissionibus etc., of the fourth century. At the same time, the Peshito Syriac Version omits “and all things” from the beginning of the next verse, running the two verses together thus: “And all things are made new by God.” Cyril of Alexandria, in two other places than those just referred to, summarily and loosely cites the words so as to make them read, “Old things have passed away and become new.” The difficulty seems to have been that some early transcriber, not being able to comprehend the apostle’s meaning in the words, “Behold, all things have become new,” and considering ῥά πάντα an erroneous reproduction of the ῥά πάντα immediately following, omitted it, and made what seemed to him the more natural subject, implied in ῥά ἄρχεια, take its place, giving us the reading, “Old things are passed away; behold, they have become new.” But how old things have both passed away and become new,—that is, have disappeared and yet not disappeared,—he left his readers to conjecture. It is as if the revealer had said (Rev. xxi. 4, 5), “The former things are passed away; behold, I make them new.”

xi. 4.

Rec. T. καλὸς ἡνίκεσθε. — ye might well bear with him.
Rev. T. καλὸς ἡνίκεσθε. — ye do well to bear with him.

The Received Text gives the reading of Codex 47, and a number of other cursives, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others. The Revisers’ reading is that of B, D first hand, 17, and Cyril in a single passage. The true reading, however, seems to be that of K, D third hand, E, F virtually, G, H, K, L, M, P, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, Euthalius, and John Damascene,—namely, ἡνίκεσθε, the reading adopted by Griesbach, Treelles, Tischendorf, and admitted by Westcott and Hort into the margin. This and the received reading, however, are but different modes of writing the imperfect. But, as ἡνίκεσθε is the acknowledged genuine form of the word in verse 1, it is but proper, with all the evidence we have in its favor, to consider it the true form here. In verse 1, the other two forms—the present and the doubly augmented imperfect—are also found among the manuscripts as various readings for ἡνίκεσθε as well as here. But there, those readings are universally rejected as false. They are really deserving of no better fate here. This,
we think, will be apparent on considering the apostle’s meaning. In verse 1, he had said, “I would that ye might bear with my foolishness a little.” He then tells them (verses 2, 3) why he makes this request. After which, he goes on to say, “For, if he that cometh (among you) preacheth another Jesus than the one we preached, or if ye are receiving a different Spirit from the one ye received (through us), or a different gospel from that ye accepted (at our hands), i.e. if ye are in a mood to do this, ye may well bear with (us).” Is it asked why? The apostle himself gives the answer: “For I reckon that I am in no respect inferior to the most eminent apostles,” etc. This gives unity, harmony, and force to his language, which the revised reading does not and cannot give. That reading is a substitution of the present indicative instead of the apostle’s imperfect, apparently on account of the present προετοιμασαί, “preacheth,” and λαμβάνεται, “ye are receiving,” employed by him in the protasis. But Paul must be trusted to say in his own way what he desired to say.

xi. 6.

Rec. T. φανερώθητε— we have been made manifest.
Rev. T. φανερώσασθε— we have made it manifest.

The former is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of S, D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive, a fragment of a fifth-century manuscript of the Old Latin Version, the Clementine Vulgate, two manuscripts of Jerome’s, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and the poet Sedulius. The latter is attested by S first hand, B, F, G, and 17. But it is obviously a part of the gloss φανερώματος ἑαυτοῖς, “having manifested ourselves,” originally written on the margin of an early manuscript to explain the meaning of φανερωθήτε. This gloss actually appears in full in M, two cursive, the Gothic and Armenian Versions; while, in 67, it appears as φανερώσατο ἑαυτοῖς. Codex D first hand, a few Latin manuscripts, and Ambrosiaster give the passive aorist participle in the nominative singular on account of the apostle’s speaking of himself in the singular in both what precedes and what follows; while cursive 1, 108, give it in the dative singular, as agreeing with παρί. The active participle, used without the reflexive originally attached to it, and without any expressed object as it is in the Revised Text, seems to refer back to γνώσει, “knowledge,” to furnish it with an object: “In everything we have made our knowledge manifest among all men to you-ward.” But, just what this means, it is not very easy to see. One of the Revisers, commenting on it, explains it thus: “In every thing we have made the gospel which we preach manifest among all men with a view to your benefit.” The reader can take his choice. We prefer to restore the apostle’s word, which the Revisers have rejected, and read: “But if [we are] indeed deficient in speech, yet [we are] not in knowledge, but [the contrary], as in every respect we showed ourselves in all things relating to you”; i.e. while we were with you. This rendering is necessitated by the participle, which, so far from being equivalent to a verb in an independent clause as the versions make it, introduces a dependent clause; and this clause can depend only on another—namely, “we are the reverse of this”—implied in the second ἀλλα.

xi. 32.

Rec. T. πιάσας με θλον— desirous to apprehend me.
Rev. T. πιάσας με— in order to take me.

The presence of θλον is attested by S, D third hand, E, F, G, K, L, M, P, all the cursives, the Memphitic, Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, and John Damascene. It is wanting in B, D first hand, the Latin versions of D, E, F, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Armenian, Erpenius’ Arabic, and Procopius. The

1 See Humphry’s Commentary.
revised reading has more of the appearance of being an abridgment of the apostle's language than the other has of being an exegetical extension of it. If his precise meaning had been what the revised rendering represents it to be, he would hardly have failed of using his favorite form of expression εἰς τὸ πρῶτον με, "in order to take me." But, in saying "wishing to take me," he would naturally give the infinitive without the preposition and the article.

2 CORINTHIANS.

xii. 7.

Rec. T. ίδα μη υπεράρωμαι,—lest I should be exalted above measure.
Rev. T. ιδι ίνα μη υπεράρωμαι,—wherefore, that I should not be exalted overmuch.

The received reading here is attested by D, E, K, L, P, all but one or two cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Irenæus, Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and others. It is adopted also by Tregelles and Tischendorf. The revised reading is that of K, A, B, F, G, 17, and Euthalius. Codex 67 strikes out ίνα, and inserts ήδο instead. Dr. Hort says, "The documentary and transcriptional evidence place the genuineness of ήδο above doubt: its omission is a characteristic Western attempt to deal with a difficulty by excision." 1 This is plausible, no doubt, but it does not seem to be altogether satisfactory, even to Dr. Hort, who adds, a little farther on: "In all probability there is a corruption somewhere." And it is just here. Some early critic connected the five preceding words of the verse with verse 6 in this manner: "But I forbear, lest some one consider me something more than he sees, or hears from me, that I am, even through the abundance of my revelations." Then, in order suitably to connect what follows with this, he introduced ήδο: "Wherefore, lest I should be exalted overmuch, there was given me," etc. This very construction appears in the Ethiopic Version. Lachmann, in like manner, places a full stop after ἀποκάλυψων, "revelations," but connects that and the four preceding words with the close of verse 5, placing verse 6 within parentheses,—an exceedingly harsh and improbable construction, but one to which he was apparently driven by his faith in the Alexandrine and Vatican Codices. As in other cases, the original text here can be secured only by abandoning the testimony of our oldest Greek manuscripts, and accepting that of other, and in this instance more trustworthy, witnesses,—some of which date farther back than those manuscripts by one or more centuries. This, the American Committee of Revisers have done, though they retain "wherefore" in the margin, as the reading of "some ancient authorities."

1 Select Readings, p. 120.
adopted by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. The apostle's habitual mode of expressing himself declares strongly against the insertion of ὅτι. In verse 13 of this chapter we find a similar critical hand has been at work, omitting the γάρ after γέγραπται, and inserting before it the conjunction ὅτι in the sense of "for," or "because," — a combination that the apostle never employs. Yet the Revisers, following Westcott and Hort, adopt it. This reading is supported by A, B, C, D first hand, E first hand, F, G, two cursive, the Vulgate, the Ethiopic Version, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, Eusebius, Euthalius, John Damascene, Hilary, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, and others; while the received reading, which is in accordance with the apostle's habit of writing, is attested by Ν, D and E as afterwards corrected, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Irenæus' Greek text as given by Theodoret, Didymus, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, and others. In both of these verses, the work wrought upon the text was not only supererogatory, but evidently depraving, and needs to be undone.

iv. 6.

Rec. T. έλις τας καρδιας ὑμῶν — into your hearts.
Rev. T. έλις τας καρδιας ἡμῶν — into our hearts.

The latter reading is attested by Ν, A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, P, fifteen cursive, several copies of the Vulgate, Origen according to his Latin interpreter, Athanasius, Basil, Euthalius, Cyril (against Nestorius), Tertullian, Hilary, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, and others. The common reading has the support of D as afterwards corrected, E, K, L, most of the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, three or more manuscripts of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Didymus, Chrysostom, Cyril (again against Nestorius as well as elsewhere), Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Augustine, and others. Those who accept the
testimony of the older uncials consider "your hearts" a modification of the original text in consequence of the preceding ιςρ, "ye are." But ἵμων is quite as likely to be an instance of an ever-recurring itacism, found in the oldest and best manuscripts. There is no similarity whatever between the use of ἵμων here and that in Rom. vii. 4; for there, the statement is not that "ye should be joined to another" "that we might bring forth fruit," but that "Christ was raised from the dead that we [all who believe in him] should bring forth fruit unto God." Nor can ἵμων as a genuine reading be accounted for on the fanciful supposition that it arose involuntarily from the apostle’s own lively consciousness of the blessedness of adoption. The logical Paul could never have penned two such monstrous non-sequiturs as "Because ye are sons, God sent his Spirit into our hearts" . . . "so that thou art no longer a servant, but a son"; in other words, (1) "Because ye are sons, God has given us the spirit of sons," and (2) "Inasmuch as we have his Spirit, thou art a son." This certainly is not the apostle’s style of arguing. The text speaks for itself, and pronounces "our" a palpably false reading. Notwithstanding the seemingly strong attestation in its favor, the other reading is in reality the more strongly supported, and should be accepted with unquestioning confidence.

iv. 7.

Rec. T. κληρονόμος Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ. — an heir of God through Christ.

Rev. T. κληρονόμος διὰ Θεοῦ. — an heir through God.

The first of these readings is attested by Ν’s seventh-century emendator, C third hand, D, E, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, the Gothic Version, Didymus De Trinitate, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, and John Damascene. The second is according to Ν first hand, A, B, C first hand, 17, the Latin versions of F and G, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Didymus De Trinitate in another place, Cyril, Victorinus, Augustine, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Greek texts of F and G read διὰ Θεοῦ, i.e. an heir "because of God"; while the Armenian and the Roman Ethiopic Version read simply "an heir of God"; and other documents have other readings. The documentary evidence is not only greatly at variance in itself, but largely in conflict with intrinsic probability. If we read, with the Revisers, "an heir through God," and ask How, through God? the reply is, "Through the mercy of God." 1 But, if this had been the apostle’s meaning, he would, no doubt, have so expressed it. If we ask further, An heir of whom? the implication is, of God. This makes the apostle virtually say, "And if a son, then an heir of God through the mercy of God." Can any one believe that this is what the apostle meant? or, if it is, that he would have expressed himself in this questionable manner? He had already said, in iii. 26, "Ye are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus." And if sons through Christ, then heirs through Christ, as a matter of course. His aim is to show that it is not through the law that we become God’s children and heirs, but through Christ, as we everywhere read. But this teaching, which continues down to verse 5, is lost in verse 7 of the R. V. in consequence of the new reading, though the allusion to the law is preserved in the word "bondservant" in the first half of the verse. The fault is plainly with the manuscripts and other witnesses that testify to the apostle’s having written "an heir through God." Obviously some very early copyist, in transcribing, omitted the words Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστοῦ, "of God through Christ," and the omission passed into other transcripts before being observed. (So plausible is this reading that Griesbach considered it as probably the true reading, though there is but one known extant document in support of it.) Readers, who subsequently noticed the omission, or some of them, sought to supply what

1 Humphry, Commentary, p. 347.
was wanting by writing it either on the margin or in the text according to the best of their recollection, — one writing simply \( \Theta \nu \); another, \( \delta \alpha \Theta \nu \); another, \( \delta \alpha \Theta \nu \); another, \( \Theta \nu \delta \alpha \) \( \chi \rho i \tau o \nu \); another, simply \( \delta \alpha \chi \rho i \tau o \nu \); another, \( \delta \alpha \) \( \tau i \sigma \alpha \theta \) \( \chi \rho i \tau o \nu \); another, taking the apostle’s words from Rom. viii. 17, \( \mu \nu \Theta \nu \) \( \sigma n \kappa \lambda \rho \pi \rho \nu \mu o \) \( \delta \alpha \) \( \chi \rho i \tau o \nu \); and one manuscript (Codex 178), if no more, survives with the omitted words still unrestored; while the original reading — the one called for by the context — comes down to us through other channels.

iv. 23.

Rec. T. \( \delta \alpha \tau \theta \) \( \epsilon \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \iota \lambda \iota \alpha s \). — by promise.

Rev. T. \( \delta \iota \) \( \epsilon \pi \alpha \gamma \gamma \iota \lambda \iota \alpha s \). — through promise.

The presence of the article is attested by B, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursive, Origen four times, Theodoret, and others. It is wanting in \( \xi \), A, C, four cursives, Euthalius, Cyril, and John Damascene. The Revisers follow Tregelles and Westcott and Hort in rejecting the article; but Lachmann, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, and others very properly consider it a part of the text. It has reference to the particular promise recorded in Gen. xvii. 16, 19, in accordance with which Isaac was born; and it should not be omitted. Its omission grew out of the fact that the article is wanting before \( \sigma \delta \rho \kappa \alpha \) in the previous clause, with which the phraseology here was made to correspond in this respect.

iv. 25.

Rec. T. \( \tau \delta \gamma \alpha \rho \) \( \delta \iota \) \( \alpha \gamma \rho \) — For this Agar.

Rev. T. \( \tau \delta \iota \) \( \alpha \gamma \rho \) — Now this Hagar.

The Revisers’ \( \delta \iota \) is the reading of A, B, the Greek texts of D and E, four cursives, two manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic and Thebaic Versions, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Ambrosiaster. The common reading \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) is that of \( \xi \), C, F, G, most of the cursive, the Latin versions of D and E as well as of F and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions, Origen, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Theophylact, \( \epsilon \) Ecumenius, Victorinus, Augustine, and others. It was originally overlooked and omitted probably in consequence of the juxtaposition of the syllables \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) \( \alpha \gamma \rho \), — the eye of the transcriber passing unconsciously from the one to the other before his pen had completed its work. After the omission, \( \delta \iota \) was inserted as a connecting link. Westcott and Hort adopt the latter; but Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, and others, adopt \( \gamma \alpha \rho \). It is no doubt the true reading.

v. 1.

Rec. T. \( \tau \delta \iota \) \( \epsilon \pi \theta e r i \alpha \) \( \sigma \nu \), \( \eta \) \( \chi \rho i \tau o \) \( \eta \mu \alpha \) \( \chi \iota \mu e \tau \iota \) \( \rho o \), \( \sigma \theta \kappa \kappa \varepsilon \). — Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

Rev. T. \( \tau \delta \iota \) \( \epsilon \pi \theta e r i \alpha \) \( \eta \mu \alpha \) \( \chi \rho i \tau o \). — With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore.

In attestation of the \( \eta \) of the Received Text, we have D corrected by an early hand, E, F, G, K, L, most of the cursives, the Latin version of D as well as of E, F, and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Marcion, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Theophylact, and \( \epsilon \) Ecumenius. Its omission is according to \( \xi \), A, B, C, D first hand, P, less than ten cursives, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, and John Damascene. The order given in the Revised Text to the next two words, \( \eta \mu \alpha \) \( \chi \rho i \tau o \), is attested by \( \xi \) first hand, A, B, D, E, F, G, P, six or more cursives, Cyril, John Damascene, and others, and is probably the original order. This collocation of words indicates that the relative \( \gamma \) was early dropped by an inattentive scribe on account of its being followed by \( \eta \mu \alpha \), which begins with the same letter, — the omission of the duplicate of a letter being a slip of frequent occurrence, and in some instances the result of ignorance, among ancient
transcribers. If we restore the, the Revisers' reading otherwise cannot reasonably be objected to. But the presence of this word necessitates a revision of their punctuation and rendering; thus: "Stand fast therefore in the freedom with which Christ hath made us free; and be not again entangled with a yoke of bondage."

v. 21.

Rec. T. φθονοι, φόνοι, μέθαι, — envyings, murders, drunkenness.
Rev. T. φθονοι, μέθαι, — envyings, drunkenness.

The received reading is attested by A, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate with the exception of a single manuscript, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Ephraem Syrus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Lucifer, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Revised Text is supported by Ν, B, five cursives, the twelfth-century Demidovian manuscript of the Vulgate, Clement of Alexandria, Euthalius, Chrysostom in one place, Augustine, and Irenaeus and Origen according to their Latin interpreters. The omitted word, in consequence of the resemblance between it and the one preceding, might very easily have dropped out of the text through homoioteleson. Its omission in this way is far more probable than that it was

As examples of this, witness the omission of ν in γένοις in Matt. i. 18, by Ν, B, C, P, S, Z, Δ, and other documents, originating, perhaps, in the influence of γένοις in i. 1; also in γεννηθα in Matt. i. 20, by Κ, Δ; in γεννηθα in Matt. xii. 34, by Δ and a few cursives; in γεννηθα in Mark xiv. 21, by A, L, Δ, 69, and other cursives; and in γεννηθα in John i. 14, by A, B, Δ, and a number of cursives. In Matt. vi. 4, B, Δ, and John Damascene omit the verb γ, "may be," after ηγεμονιζομαι. In Matt. vii. 14, L omits the article τ after συνηγορ. The omission of λ is of frequent occurrence. In like manner, in Matt. xiii. 16, D, M omit the article of after μακαροις, "blessed." This omission of one or more letters preceded or followed by the same letter or letters is one of the commonest errors occurring in the old manuscripts.

vi. 2.

We must unite with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, and others, in regarding the future indicative διαπλησσετε, "ye shall fulfil," as the true reading here, instead of the aorist imperative διαπλησσετε, "fulfil ye." It certainly is more in keeping with the context. The apostle, after having said, "Bear ye one another's burdens; and so (since thus) ye shall fulfil the law of Christ," would very naturally run verse 4 into the same mould: "Let each prove his own work; and then he shall have his glorying in regard to himself, and not in regard to another." Besides, all the other imperatives in these verses are in the present; and the fact that this is in the aorist naturally awakens the suspicion that it is only the future indicative slightly changed. The future is attested by B, F, G, two cursives, four manuscripts of the Old Latin Version, Mai's Extracts, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Theodoret, Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, Jerome, Augustine, Orosius, and others. The aorist imperative is the reading of Ν, A, C, the Greek texts of D and E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, Clement, Basil, Ephraem Syrus, Didymus, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, and John Damascene. The presence of the future rather than the imperative in most of the versions strongly favors this as the original reading.

vi. 15.

Rec. T. ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐτε περιτομή — For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision.
Rev. T. οὐτε γὰρ περιτομή — For neither circumcision.

The received reading here is attested by Ν, A, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic,
Woide's Thebaic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Platt's Ethiopic, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Ambrose, and Ambrosiaster. The Revisers' reading is that of only three Greek manuscripts, namely, B and the two cursive s, 17 of the eleventh century, and 47 of nearly the same age, —the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Thebaic according to Griesbach's readings, the Venetian edition of the Armenian, the Roman Ethiopic, and the Gothic, Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. But it is exceedingly improbable that the apostle, while combating Jewish prejudices, should say absolutely that circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing, even though he had in the preceding chapter (verse 6) qualified the statement by prefacing it with the words "in Christ Jesus." By placing the observance and the non-observance of a God-given, hallowed, national ceremony unqualifiedly on one and the same level of inutility, it would look as if he regarded the Mosaic law a thing of no account. In the circumstances in which he was placed, it was but natural, therefore, that he should restrict his language here, as he had before restricted it, in order to prevent misapprehension, and a perversion of his words. Indeed, it was hardly possible for it to be otherwise. And the strong documentary evidence before us irresistibly leads to the conclusion that he really did do this. But some one, wishing to make the apostle's utterance more striking and perhaps somewhat startling, —or, possibly, merely considering the words "in Christ Jesus" altogether unnecessary, since they had been once given before,—struck them out. The Revisers' reading has, in fact, every appearance of being "a distinctively Syrian reading."

To this verse is appended the marginal note, "Some very ancient authorities omit in Ephesus." To prevent this from being misleading, the Revisers should have added in substance Meyer's remark, "But the words are so decisively attested that they cannot be deprived of their right to a place in the text." These "very ancient authorities" are the original scribes of S and B. A corrector of the twelfth-century cursive 67 (whose corrections betray greater or less affinity with B), marks the expression as doubtful; while Origen and Basil the Great found it wanting in certain copies, and Marcion seems to have interpolated "at Laodicea" instead. On the other hand, the expression is found in all the other uncials and cursive s, and even in these two uncials as afterward corrected, and in 67, as it came from the hand of its original scribe. The evidence of the versions, too, is unanimous for "in Ephesus." Several of the Fathers also, as Ignatius (according to the Syriac Version of his Epistle to the Ephesians, written two hundred years before S and B), Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others, attest the reading. Even Origen and Basil represent the epistle as written to the Ephesians. The omission of the expression appears to have arisen in this way: The letter, after being received at Ephesus, was probably duplicated so that a copy could be sent to one or more other churches in the immediate vicinity. From such a copy the words "in Ephesus" would naturally, if not necessarily, be omitted, and the blank be left without the name of any other place, as no
other name was inserted by the writer. Copies taken from such a copy would naturally appear with a blank where copies made directly from the autograph, but not specially intended for other churches, would have the apostle's words "in Ephesus."
The Colossians were charged (Col. iv. 16) by the apostle himself to have his letter to them read by the church at Laodicea, and to see that they obtained from the Laodicans another letter of his, or a copy of it. The letter thus referred to may have been this Epistle to the Ephesians, which, or a copy of which, the Ephesians had been verbally instructed by Tychicus (Eph. vi. 21, 22), when he delivered the letter to them, to send to the church at Laodicea. Hence, perhaps, Marcion, who may have obtained, in the next century, a copy more or less directly from some member of the Laodician Church, calls it the Epistle to the Laodicans. That Paul inserted the words "in Ephesus" is evident. The language, "to the saints that are, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus," not only differs from his usual style of address, but misrepresents him. Elsewhere, after the expression "to the saints that are," he invariably adds words denoting where they are; as, "in Rome," "in Corinth," "in Philippi." This naturally leads us to conclude that here he added "in Ephesus." If he did not, the words can legiti-
ately mean only, "to the saints that are also believers in Christ,"—as if any saints, in his use of the word, were not of necessity believers in Christ. The apostle could not have given utterance to such an idea. Basil's assumption that "saints that are" is the correct reading, and that the meaning is "saints that are saints," is a mere conceit, alike unworthy of the apostle and unsuited to the connection.—The marginal note is really uncalled for. As it stands, it is more harmful than otherwise. Ordinary readers, for whom, principally, the revision was or should have been designed, are liable to be misled by it.
unquestionably masculine, because the one meant by μυστήριον, and spoken of in what follows, is Christ, precisely as in Col. i. 27. (See Note on 1 Tim. iii. 16.) This is the apostle's habitual mode of writing. Instead of supposing that he departed from it in this instance, it is more reasonable and just to conclude that the neuter ἕ is the work of another, who thought he had discovered an error, and desired to correct it.

Rec. T. καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας — and love unto all.
Rec. T. καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας — and which ye show toward all.

The common reading, τὴν ἀγάπην, is vouched for by the seventh-century corrector of Ἀ, D, E, F, G, K, L, nearly every cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Ephraem Syrus, Chrysostom, Cyril, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Augustine in one of his epistles, Ambrosiaster, and others. The words are wanting in Ν first hand, A, B, P, 17, Origen, Cyril in another treatise, Jerome, and Augustine on Predestination. They were, no doubt, omitted in consequence of the recurrence of τὴν, — the eye of a copyist having passed from one to the other, leaving ἀγάπην and one of the articles unnoticed and unwritten. The sentence as revised indicates that something is wanting. Properly translated, it reads: "Wherefore I also, having heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and [...] which ye have toward all the saints, cease not to give thanks," etc. This double use of connectives without any substantive between them, though common enough with the modern school-boy, is something that was unknown to manly writers of Greek in the apostle's day. In addition to this, the fact that all the versions contain the omitted words leaves no room to doubt their genuineness. It is but justice to the American Committee of Revisers to say that they did not approve of the change in the text.
every cursive, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions, Irenæus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, and others. Irenæus, speaking concerning what the Revisers have omitted, states expressly that the apostle “says this, not of some spiritual and invisible man, for a spirit has neither bones nor flesh, but of a distribution (of the members) similar to what is found in the human body, which consists of flesh, nerves, and bones.” Whatever may be thought as to the correctness of this comment, it proves that Irenæus, A.D. 178, accepted the words as genuine. Their omission, however, is according to \( \Sigma \) first hand, A, B, 17, 67 second hand, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, Methodius, and Euthalius. Those who reject the words consider them as introduced from Gen. ii. 23. But, if they had been thus introduced, they would read \( \text{ἐκ τῶν ὄστιον αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτῶν} \), as in the Septuagint, and not in the inverted order in which they stand here. Besides, no one would think of making such an addition as “out of his flesh and out of his bones,” to language apparently as complete as “We are members of his body”; especially when the glorified body of Christ has neither flesh nor bones, and the addition would naturally appear not only unnecessary but misapplied.

It was rather on this account that the words were omitted,—because their import was enigmatical, and they had the appearance of being irrelevant,—a mode of dealing with obscure and difficult expressions by no means uncommon in a certain class of documents. In writing these words, no doubt, the apostle had in mind the record respecting Eve as formed from Adam’s bones and flesh. The allusion, however, was not made under the idea that believers in Christ are in any sense taken from him and made his, as Eve was from Adam. It was simply to express the thought that the relation subsisting between Christ and his church is as close and intimate as if the latter had been taken and formed from his flesh and from his bones, as Eve was from Adam’s. And so the apostle himself teaches
PHILIPPIANS.

ii. 1.

The change made by the Revisers in this verse from του to τις before σπλάγχνα, "tender mercies," was simply for its own sake, not in order to prepare the text for a correct English rendering. The word may be "overwhelmingly" supported by documentary evidence,—§, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, more than fifty cursive, Euthalius, Chrysostom, John Damascus, and Ὀεκουμενίος; but it is only the result of an early thoughtless repetition of the τις occurring twice just before. The same blunder was perpetrated in changing τι to τίς before παραμιθίων, "comfort," A. V., "consolation," R. V., the second of the four nouns here accompanied by this word,—a blunder which still appears in D first hand, L, 17, 46, 73, 137, and twelve or more cursive, and in Theodoret and Theophylact. Though τίς σπλάγχνα is ungrammatical Greek, the change, like hundreds of other changes, does not affect the English text in the least. Those who defend this reading assume that the combined testimony of certain ancient manuscripts is unimpeachable, and that the apostle employed τις in reference to the abstract idea of compassion embodied in σπλάγχνα, a neuter plural! But Meyer shows conclusively that this latter assumption is altogether untenable. In no one of the other eight instances in which the apostle employs σπλάγχνα, does he treat it as a singular by connecting it with an article or an adjective in the singular. If τις is a copyist's blunder, as we make no question it is (and it is easily accounted for as such), "How," say those who believe in the infallibility of copyists rather than in the apostle's ability to write Greek correctly, "how could such an ungrammatical blunder, if not genuine, be so widely circulated?" We answer, In precisely the same way that it is now continued in circulation by those who believe it to be the true reading,—by holding to it, and handing it down to others. Or,—to give our answer in a little different form,—it is just as the false reading in Matt. xxiii. 24, "strain a't a gnat," has been handed down through nearly three centuries of intelligent printers and editors, whose reverence for the letter of the A. V. has withheld them from correcting it, though Tyndale has it "strayne out," and King James's Revisers could not, in place of it, have sent to the press such a reading as "strain a't." The Greek word διαλέγω means to strain off, or out, through a sieve, cloth, filter, or by some other means; and that any body of Greek scholars should be capable of translating it "strain a't," is utterly incredible. Any one familiar with the mistakes of copyists, and the mechanical way in which copying is generally done, should be the last to ask how such blunders can be perpetuated, and the first to do the original writer the justice of believing that he did not write what he was morally and intellectually incapable of having written.

iii. 13.

Rec. T. ἵπτω εἰμαντὶν οὐ λογίζομαι κατευθύνῃ — I count not myself to have apprehended.

Rev. T. ἵπτω εἰμαντὶν οὐκ ὁ λογίζομαι κατευθύνῃ — I count not myself yet to have apprehended.

The οὐ, of the Received Text and the Revisers' margin, is attested by B, D corrected by a second or third hand, E, F, G, K, L, most of the cursive, the Latin version of D as well as those of E, F, and G, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, Origen, Chrysostom twice, Tertullian, Victorinus, and Jerome on Ezekiel. Οὐπώ is vouched for by §, A, the Greek text of D, P, 17, and
about forty other cursive s, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, the
margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Clement of Alexandria, Basil,
Euthalius, Chrysostom in one place, in another oβιςτευο, and in
yet another oε as just noted, Theodoret, the Paschal Chronicle,
John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, Jerome against Pelagius, and
others. But this reading was introduced in consequence of the
repeated "already," of verse 12. To have been genuine, it
should have preceded, not λογιζόμαι, but καταληψάμαι. As it
stands, it belongs to the former, and should be taken with it,
making the clause read, "I do not yet consider myself to have
apprehended;" whereas the Revisers improperly connect it
with the latter by rendering the clause, "I count not myself yet
to have apprehended." It is true, this rendering is called for
by the statement, "Not that I have already obtained, or am
already made perfect," in verse 12; but the position of oδιτω
forbids it. This, however, is to be expected, as the word is
merely a modification of oε, which belongs to λογιζόμαι.

iv. 23.

The Revisers omit "Amen" at the close of this verse; and
yet the documentary evidence preponderates in its favor. In
support of it, we have Σ, A (C would doubtless be found here
if not defective), D, E, K, L, P, every cursive but one, a
seventh-century fragment of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate,
Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the
Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Arabic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John
Damascene, Sedulius, Ambrosiaster, and others. The ημων, of
the Revised Text, is less strongly attested by Ν, C, D second
hand, E, K, L, P, most of the cursive s, the Latin versions of D
and F as well as that of E, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Phi-
loxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the
Ethiopic, the Arabic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John
Damascene, Sedulius, Ambrosiaster, and others. The ημων, of
the Revised Text, is less strongly attested by Ν first hand, A, B,
the Greek text of F, and of D according to the original scribe,
G, ten cursive s, and only the Latin translation of G among all
the versions. It was carelessly introduced in place of ημων
in consequence of following so closely after the preceding ημων.
That it is a false reading is obvious from iv. 12, 13: "Epaphras,
who is one of you . . . always striving for you (υπερ ημων, as
here), in his prayers, etc. . . . he hath much labor for you"
(υπερ ημων again), etc. The verse might perhaps be more
faithfully expressed in English thus: "Even as ye learned from
Epaphras our beloved fellow-servant, who is faithful on your
behalf as a minister of Christ." The apostle seems to have
been desirous of assuring the brethren at Colosse of Epaphras'
well-doing and faithfulness on their behalf while earnestly labor-
ing with him in his imprisonment.
i. 12.

The marginal reading, ἡμᾶς, "you," in place of "us" in the clause, "who hath made us meet to be partakers" etc., is too feebly attested to merit consideration. It crept in through some transcriber's carelessness under the influence of the preceding context, as is evident from a comparison of this verse with verses 13, 14. It is attested only by S, B, half a dozen cursive, two copies of the Vulgate, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic Version, Didymus, Theophylact, and Ambrosiaster. On Westcott and Hort's principles, it cannot safely be rejected. Hence its appearance in the margin.—It may be added that D, F, G, and a few other documents, read here, "who hath called us to be" etc., while B alone reads, "who hath called and made you meet to be" etc.,—a reading, which, if found in any other manuscript, Dr. Hort would call a "conflation."

i. 21.

The marginal note assures the reader that, instead of "hath he reconciled," "some ancient authorities read, ye have been reconciled." The only known ancient document that reads ἀποκαταλάγητε, "ye were (or have been) reconciled," is B. Codex D first hand, G, the Greek text of F, the Latin versions of D, E, and G, Mai's Extracts, the Gothic Version, Ambrosiaster, and possibly Irenæus, have the nominative plural of the second aorist passive participle, ἀποκαταλαγόντες, "having been reconciled,"—a reading that is by no means suited to the connection. The reading of B evidently arose from beginning a sentence with ρωσ, under the influence of the preceding words, "you being in time past alienated" etc. This was thought to require the reading, "But now ye have been reconciled" etc.,—which throws the construction out of harmony with what follows: "that he might present you" etc. The reading of the text, "he hath reconciled," points back to a fulfilment of God's purpose as expressed by the aorist active, ἀποκαταλάξατω, "to reconcile," in verse 20, and seems to be, beyond doubt, what the apostle wrote. On account of his involved and parenthetical language, which to himself was perfectly clear as well as natural, many and perhaps most commentators have labored over the construction in this verse. But a moment's careful examination of his words ought to suffice to make them clear to every one. Throughout this passage (verses 19-22) the leading subject of discourse is "the Father," as in verses 12, 13. The latter half of verse 20 is parenthetical, placing an interjected thought, that naturally presented itself, between the verb "reconcile," in verse 20, and "even you," a part of its object, in verse 21. With these points in view, the passage may be rendered, "For it pleased the Father, in him [Christ] to have all fulness dwell, and through him to reconcile all things to himself [the Father] (having made peace through him by means of the blood of his cross, whether as to things upon earth or things in heaven), even you, who were once alienated and enemies by your inclination for evil works. But now he [the Father] hath reconciled (you) by the body of his [Christ's] flesh, through his death, that he [the Father] might present you holy, and without a blemish, and unreprovable in his [Christ's] presence." (Compare 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; iv. 14; xi. 2; Eph. v. 25-27; Jude 24, 25.)

Rec. T. ἐς ἐστιν Χριστός—which is Christ.

Rev. T. ἐς ὑπ' Ἑρωδοτοῦ—which is Christ.

The first of these readings is attested by S, C, D, E, K, L, most of the cursive, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, and John of Damascus; the last, by A, B, F, G, P, 17, 47, and 67 second hand. "O was, no doubt, originally introduced to make the gender of the relative the same as that of its antecedent τοῦ μυστηρίου, "the mystery,"—a change
which was favored, and possibly thought to be required, by the
construction σῶματος ἐστιν ἡ ἐκκλησία in verse 24. But
the apostle's usual mode of writing calls for the masculine, be-
cause of the predicate noun, Χριστός, which it represents, and
which embodied an idea of far greater weight in his mind than
μυστήριον, and would thus naturally lead him to write the
masculine instead of the neuter. (See Note on Eph. i. 14.)
While Lachmann and Westcott and Hort adopt δ (though
the latter place δ in the margin as a secondary and possibly
genuine reading), Griesbach, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Meyer, and other
editors follow the Received Text.

ii. 7.

Rec. T. περισσεύοντες ἐν αὐτῷ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. — abounding therein
with thanksgiving.

Rev. T. περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. — abounding in thanksgiving.

The words ἐν αὐτῷ omitted from the text by the Revisers,
are found in B, D third hand, E, K, L, most of the cursives,
the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom,
Theodoret, John Damascene, and Ambrosiaster. They are
wanting in S first hand, A, C, 17, and ten or twelve other
cursives, a few copies of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the
Ethiopic, Euthalius, and others. The presence of the pronoun
and its preposition evidently gave trouble to early readers and
scribes on account of the ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ following immediately
after. This led some to omit the words. Others, instead of
omitting them, took them to be a transcriptional error for ἐν
αὐτῷ, employed by the apostle in the former part of the verse.
Hence the appearance of this phrase in S as corrected by a
seventh-century reader, D first hand, the Vulgate, and other
documents. This reading is too feebly attested to be supposed
for a moment to be the original reading, from which ἐν αὐτῷ
may have sprung. On the contrary, the presence of ἐν αὐτῷ
tends indirectly to prove that ἐν αὐτῷ is a part of the original

text, set aside for what was incorrectly considered the true
reading. Others, while retaining ἐν αὐτῷ, omitted ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ,
— a reading preserved to us in Codex P, which constitutes an
additional witness in favor of ἐν αὐτῷ. The sentence without
these words really seems to stand in no need of any addition.
And certainly no reader or scribe would have been tempted
to insert them if they had not been genuine. When we grasp
the apostle's meaning, — not "abounding in the faith," but
abounding in faith (that in which he would have them ἐβασιλεύω,
"made firm,") with thanksgiving,— we see a propriety,
a special force in the exhortation, which the bare words
"abounding in thanksgiving" do not possess.

ii. 18.

Rec. T. ἡ μὴ ἤρακεν ἤματεάν. — intruding into those things which
he hath not seen.

Rev. T. ἡ ἤρακεν ἤματεάν. — dwelling in the things which he hath
seen.

The negative, which the Revisers have relegated to the
margin, is supported by the seventh-century corrector of S, C,
D second and third hands, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives,
the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the
Armenian, Origen in one edition of his works, Chrysostom,
Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster accord-
ing to one edition, Augustine, and Jerome. The μη is wanting
in S first hand, A, B, D first hand, 17, 28, 67 second hand,
Mai's Extracts, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions, Origen
in other editions, Lucifer, Questions ex utroque Testamento,
and Ambrosiaster according to another edition. There is
nothing in the immediate connection to indicate that either
the presence or the absence of μη is really due to transcrip-
tional error. It is due rather to a misapprehension of
the import of a part of the context. If the word is genuine, its
absence in some manuscripts is owing originally to intentional
omission, from being considered incompatible with the apostle's
meaning. If spurious, its presence is due to the opposite consideration that it is essential to the expression of the apostle's thought, and that it was really inserted by him, but in some way, in transcribing, had been omitted. From a mere transcriptional point of view, the latter is less credible than the former; that is, on this ground, the probability is rather in favor of the genuineness of the negative than otherwise. And when we look at the words themselves, this probability increases. ἐμπατείων, nowhere else used in the New Testament, primarily means stepping in or on, as on an island or into any territory; hence, entering on or coming into possession of; and, by an easy transition, laying claim to, — a meaning necessarily implied in the act of taking possession of. This claim may be just or unjust. That is not determined by the word itself, but by the context. If the apostle's meaning here were, as some suppose, simply entering upon or into, there is no probability that he would have gone so far out of his usual and natural course as to say ἐμπατείων instead of ἐσελθὼν; or if it were, as the Revisers have it, "dwelling inη," that he would have used this word instead of ἐνοικίων. Besides this, the employment by the apostle of the simple ἔσαρκεν to denote the seeing of things in vision or by means of visions is altogether incredible. And yet it must be so taken if the negative is discarded. Grimm, in his Lexicon, under the word ἐμπατείων, says, "If we expunge μη, we must render [the clause], 'going into curious and subtile speculation about things which he has seen in visions granted him,'" — which the Revisers have condensed into "dwelling in the things which he hath seen," though the import of their words is by no means clear apart from Grimm's or some similar paraphrase, like Humphry's, "asserting a knowledge of things supernatural which he has seen." This obscurity, coupled with the unnatural use to which some of the words need to be put in case the negative is omitted, forms a strong presumption that the omission is unwarranted. With the negative, the text is natural, easy, and commends itself as genuine: "Let no one" divert you from your steadfastness and constancy in following Christ by placing any obstacle in your way, and so "beguile you of your reward" — the crown of life — "seeking to do it under the guise of humility and angel-worship, laying claim to what he has not seen, vainly puffed up," etc.

The marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities omit upon the sons of disobedience," and refers to Eph. v. 6, as if these words might have been introduced from that verse. Eph. ii. 2, where the apostle has the expression, "in the children of disobedience," might also have been referred to. The fact that a phrase or expression appears (possibly more than once) in a certain epistle, and again in another epistle written at the same time by the same person, is no reason why we should question its genuineness in one of those epistles any more than we should its genuineness the second or the third time it might appear in one and the same epistle, even though the testimony of a few ancient documents may seem to indicate that it is a false reading. The witnesses here referred to in the words "some ancient authorities" are one Greek manuscript, B, and two versions, the Thebaic and the Roman Ethiopic, — whose unsupported testimony in favor of any peculiar reading may be considered prima-facie evidence against its genuineness. In this instance, they are supported by Clement of Alexandria, Cyprian, and Ambrosiaster. This, however, is not enough to prove the words omitted by them to be no part of the original text. The expression ἐν ὑστ., which follows, is the apostle's own protest against the mutilation of his language. This expression does not mean "in the which," as the A. V., the R. V., and others make it mean, as if it referred to the sins specified in verse 5. It refers, as the same expression does in Eph. ii. 3 (where the same thought is expressed), to "the sons of disobedience" immediately preceding, and means "among whom,"
as the Revisers have it in their margin; for the apostle hardly meant to reason in a circle, and say, "in which things ye also formerly walked, when ye lived in those things." Verse 7, following on after the mention of "the sons of disobedience," should read, "Among whom ye also once walked, when ye were living (or, were alive) in those things." Now, if we omit the phrase "upon the sons of disobedience," as B and its frequent ally in error, the Thebaic Version, would have us do, we lose the true antecedent of αὐτός, and are compelled to make the apostle speak unlike himself, and say what he had no thought of saying. (Compare Eph. ii. 3.) Though this phrase is placed in brackets by Lachmann, and omitted by Tischendorf as a result of one of his false principles of criticism, and also by Westcott and Hort through their partiality for B, its omission is a palpable error, not worthy of a moment's consideration as a possibly genuine reading.

iv. 15.

Rec. T. τὴν κατ᾽ οίκον αὐτοῦ ἱκαληθέντα.—the church which is in his house.

Rev. T. τὴν κατ᾽ οίκον αὐτῶν ἱκαληθέντα.—the church that is in their house.

The common reading, "his house," is attested by D, E, F, G, K, L, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The revised reading, "their house," is that of Ἐ, A, C, P, eight cursives, one copy of the Arabic Version, and Euthalius. In addition to these readings is another, "her house," inserted in the Revisers' margin in deference to Westcott and Hort, who adopt it in their own text in preference to either of the other two. This is supported only by B, the marginal reading of the twelfth-century cursive 67, and the Philoxenian Syriac Version, — unless the ejus of the Vulgate is to be taken as standing for "her" rather than for "his." This, however, can hardly be conceded, since the Latin versions as a rule side with D, and the Latin versions of D, E, F, and G all translate αὐτῶν by ejus, "his." The common reading is, no doubt, the original one. It has in its favor the testimony of the Peshito Syriac and Memphitic Versions, which dates back at least to the close of the second century, and is fully one hundred and fifty years earlier than the earliest evidence in support of either of the other readings. Besides this, it is altogether improbable that Νυμφαὶ represents the Doric feminine Νυμφα. But an early reader, taking it as a feminine name, considered αὐτῶν an error, and accordingly changed it to αὐτῆς, "her." Hence the reading of B. The revised reading, however, originated probably as a simple, perfectly natural, and by no means uncommon transcriptional error, — the scribe's thoughts for the moment dwelling on the idea of Nymphas' household, rather than having Nymphas himself in view. Hence "their house" instead of "his house." That αὐτῶν is the genuine reading, and refers back to "the brethren in Laodicea," including Nymphas, as they all formed one family and lived in the same house, and the "church that was in their house" embraced yet others, is absurd. What, then, is to be gained by changing the plain, strongly supported, and most probably genuine reading, "his house," to the absurd and obviously incorrect reading, "their house," or even to "her house," which is both very improbable and very feebly attested?
I THESSALONIANS.

1. 10.

Rec. T. δὲ τὴν ἡγεῖρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν, — whom he raised from the dead.
Rev. T. δὲ τὴν ἡγεῖρεν ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, — whom he raised from the dead.

The omission of the article is in accordance with the testimony of A, C, K, a large minority of the cursive, the Armenian Version, Eusebius, and Òcumnenius. Its presence is attested by S, B, D, E, F, G, L, P, most of the cursive, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Theophylact. The presence or the absence of the article, especially when it does not in the least affect the translation, may seem to be a point of but little or no moment. And so, no doubt, it often is; but not in this instance. For the apostle, in common with most other New-Testament writers, makes a nice distinction in the use of the article in connection with the plural νεκροῖς, "dead." When he employs this word in reference to a particular class or portion of mankind whom he calls "dead," he invariably connects the article with it.1 But, when he refers to the dead in general, he uses νεκροῖς without the article. This seems to be the use that the apostle here makes of the word, as it evidently is in Rom. iv. 24, vi. 4, 9, and in every other place where he speaks of Christ as "raised from the dead." In the light of these facts, it seems as if A, C, and the other witnesses who unite with them are in the right, while the Revisers and others

---

1 See 1 Cor. xv. 35, 42, 52, that is, the righteous dead; 2 Cor. i. 9, those that are given up for dead, who in the eyes of others are virtually dead; Eph. v. 14, the morally dead; Col. i. 18, the dead in Paradise, the righteous dead, as explained by 1 Cor. xv. 20, "the first fruits of them that have fallen asleep," who constitute only a portion of the νεκρῶν generally, mentioned just before; and 1 Thess. iv. 16. Even here belongs Rom. iv. 17, meaning the inefficient, whether morally or physically so, with a direct reference in the context to the latter class. Here, too, belongs 1 Cor. xv. 29, where νεκροῖς denotes the dead in general, but δὲ νεκροῖς those who have united themselves by faith to a crucified Saviour, and with him are dead to sin, to the world, etc.
who follow \textit{K}, B, D, and their fellow witnesses misrepresent the apostle by inserting the article. We hold to the Received Text therefore, as presenting the apostle’s words without being “added unto.” Similar instances of tampering with his language are found—elsewhere. Thus, in 1 Cor. xv. 15, F and G insert the article before \textit{νεκροί}, where all other known documents are without it. In verse 20, in which the apostle speaks of Christ as raised from the dead, F and G, as in verse 15, insert the article, in which they are joined by John Damascene. In Eph. i. 20, where the apostle again speaks of Christ as raised from the dead, Codex L, about twenty-five cursive, and Eusebius insert the article. In Phil. iii. 11, the Received Text incorrectly reads, with K, L, most of the cursive, the Memphitic and Armenian Versions, Theodoret, and Theophylact, \textit{τῶν νεκρῶν} instead of \textit{νεκρῶν}. And again, in Col. ii. 12, B, D, E, F, G, 17, and most of the other cursive, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others have the same reading instead of the apostle’s anarthrous \textit{νεκρῶν}. We have been thus full and explicit on this point, so that the reader may understand the facts in reference to the apostle’s use of this word as connected with the article.

\textbf{ii. 12.}

Rec. T. \textit{Θεῷ τοῦ καλισαντος ὑμᾶς} — God, who hath called you.

Rev. T. \textit{Θεῷ τοῦ καλυμένης ὑμᾶς} — God, who calleth you.

The aorist participle of the Received Text, which the Revisers have thrown into the margin, is attested by \textit{K}, A, six cursive, the Latin version of F, Mai’s Extracts, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Bashmuric, the Gothic, the Armenian, Chrysostom in his first citation of the passage, Theodoret, and Ambrosiaster. The present, of the Revised Text, is the reading of B, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, P, most of the cursive, the Latin versions of D, E, and G, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Chrysostom in two subsequent citations, Euthalius, John Damascene, and others. The fact that nearly all the ancient versions support the first of these readings, and one of them doing this against its own Greek text, testifies strongly to its genuineness. Another fact pointing in the same direction is, that those whom the apostle is addressing are Christians, persons whom he calls (i. 4) “brethren beloved of God.” A third fact is, that the apostle goes on immediately to say, “And for this reason—that is, not because God is calling you, but because he has called you—we thank him without ceasing that, when ye heard the gospel from us, ye regarded it not as the word of man, but as the word of God,” etc. That is, he thanks God continually for something that has already occurred. In 2 Thess. ii. 13, 14, he writes, “God chose you from the beginning unto salvation through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth; unto which he called you by our gospel for the attainment of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.” He here uses the preposition \textit{dia} in what seems to be two senses,—first, as meaning “unto,” and immediately after as meaning “for,”—unto salvation, for glory. So, in the verse before us (though he does not repeat the preposition because the two meanings would naturally present themselves to his Greek readers in his use of the word), his meaning is, “who hath called you into his kingdom and unto glory”; or, as Tyndale and the A. V. have very well expressed it, simply “unto, his kingdom and glory”; as it is also expressed in 1 Pet. v. 10. But, as the glory referred to was evidently something not yet attained by the Thessalonians, the apostle’s meaning failed of being grasped by some of his early readers. Hence it was thought necessary to change the aorist participle to the present, making the clause read, “who is calling you unto his kingdom and glory,” as something yet future. And possibly this was aided by the apostle’s assurance in v. 24, “Faithful is he that calleth you, who also will do it.” The common reading is on the whole the more strongly attested, and should not be set aside.
iii. 2.

The marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities read, fellow-worker with God"; i.e. in place of the A. V.'s "minister of God, and our fellow-laborer," and the R. V.'s "God's minister." This reading is attested only by D first hand, the Latin versions of D and E, and Ambrosiaster. Nevertheless it seems to be the original and true reading, and is so considered by Griesbach, Lachmann, Alford, Ellicott, and others. (Compare 1 Cor. iii. 9.) The various readings — and there are several of them — can hardly be accounted for satisfactorily on any other supposition. But, if we take "a fellow-worker with God" to be what the apostle wrote, the other readings appear at once as devices to obviate the seeming difficulty presented by this phrase. Thus, — to instance some of them,— B and the Armenian Version suppress "of God," making the words read, "Timothy, our brother and a fellow-worker in the gospel." Ν, A, P, the margin of 67, three other cursive, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Bashmuric, Gothic, Philoxenian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, Basil, Euthalius, and Pelagius substitute "minister" for "collaborer," or "fellow-worker," giving the Revisers' reading, "a minister of God." E, F, G, and 17 combine the two, making "a minister and co-laborer of God"; while the text of the A. V., following D third hand, E second hand, K, L, most of the cursive, the Peshito Syriac, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others, read "a minister of God, and our fellow-laborer."

Rec. T. τὸν καὶ δόντα — who hath also given.
Rev. T. τὸν διδόντα — who giveth.

The καὶ is attested by Ν, D first hand, F, G, K, L, most of the cursive, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Clement, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ecumenius, Pelagius, and others. It is omitted by A, B, D second and third

hands, F, ten cursive, a catena, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Origen, Athanasius, Didymus, Chrysostom, Theophylact, Ambrosiaster, and others. The aorist participle δόντα is attested by the seventh-century corrector of Ν, A, K, L, most of the cursive, Clement, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The present of the Revised Text, has the support of Ν first hand, B, D, E, F, G, seven or eight cursive, Origen, Athanasius, and Didymus. Both of these new readings — the omission of καὶ (which is not approved by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and other modern editors), and the adoption of the present participle instead of the aorist — fail to commend themselves as genuine readings. It seems hardly possible that the conjunction should have got into the text and obtained so extensive a circulation, if it had not been placed there by the original writer. The reason of its omission, however, is obvious. It was thought to connect the words following it with the preceding part of the verse. But, as there was no propriety in such a use of καὶ, it was dropped. At the same time, the participle was changed to the present, so as to correspond grammatically with the preceding presents, ἀδειτῶν, "rejecting," and ἀδείητο, "rejecteth." The fact, however, that the present, "who giveth," makes "unto you" a feeble, and indeed questionable ending for the verse, if it does not render it absolutely superfluous, is an indication of its spuriousness; whereas the aorist participle renders "unto you" or "unto us" necessary, while it naturally corresponds in time with ἐκάλεσαν, "called," in verse 7, to which the conjunction "also" refers: "God called us ... who hath also given" etc.

v. 4.

"Some ancient authorities read as thieves." Only A, B, and the Memphitic Version however; which Lachmann and Westcott and Hort follow as if it were the true reading. But it originated plainly enough in error, and not only misrepresents
the apostle, but is unsuited to the context. It makes the sentence read "But ye, brethren, are not in darkness that that day should overtake you as (one might overtake) thieves"; — not, "as thieves overtake others"; for κλέπται, "thieves," is in the accusative, — a transcriptional error for κλέπτης, "a thief," — and, as such, must be the object of some verb. But the apostle leaves us in no doubt as to what he wrote. In verse 2, he says, "The day of the Lord so cometh as a thief (cometh) in the night"; i.e. unexpectedly. Then, in verse 4, referring back to this, he says, "Ye are not in darkness, that that day should overtake you as a thief" overtakes people; i.e. unexpectedly. If certain textual critics were not apparently infatuated with the idea that the New Testament is to be found only in two or three, or, at most, five of the oldest manuscripts, we should not have such monstrosities and palpably false readings again and again thrust before us for acceptance as possibly genuine portions of the text.

2 THESSALONIANS.

ii. 3.

"The man of lawlessness" is noted in the margin as the reading of "many ancient authorities" instead of "the man of sin." It is the reading of N, B, ten cursives, the Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions, Origen, Euthalius, Tertullian, Ambrose, and Ambrosiaster; and, for obvious reasons, is adopted by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort. The common reading, which is followed by Lachmann, Alford, Ellicott, and others, is that of A, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, Irenæus, Hippolytus, Eusebius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Augustine. There need be no doubt as to whether the reading of the text is the true one. It is unlike anything elsewhere found in the apostle's writings, and would hardly have got into the text if it had not been genuine. But "the man of lawlessness," meaning the lawless man, would very naturally be, and probably was, suggested by and adopted from the phrases "the mystery of lawlessness" and "the lawless one," in verses 7 and 8.

ii. 13.

Again the reader is informed that many ancient "authorities" read "God chose you as first fruits (instead of from the beginning) unto salvation." Yet it is impossible for the apostle to have said this; for the Thessalonians did not receive the Gospel till after Paul had been engaged in preaching Christ and build-
ing up churches in other fields for about seventeen years. The Thessalonian church was not the first fruits of the Gospel even in Macedonia; for a church was gathered at Philippi before Christ was ever preached in Thessalonica. Yet this false reading is fathered and handed down to us by B, F, the Greek text of G, P, 17, and half a dozen other cursive, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, Didymus, Euthalius, Cyril, Ambrosiaster, and others.

I TIMOTHY.

i. 12.

The witnesses that attest the marginal reading "that enableth (or strengtheneth) me," — a reading taken, probably, from Phil. iv. 13, — instead of "that enabled (or hath strengthened) me," are five cursive and Theophylact. The original scribe of Ἐ, however, reads "that strengtheneth," omitting "me," — the only known "authority" for this reading. Tischendorf, who frequently follows Ἐ where no other modern editor does, pays no attention to this reading. And how Westcott and Hort could place it in their margin as a possibly genuine reading, and induce the Revisers to do the same thing, is a mystery; for the entire context shows that the apostle is thanking the Lord, not as his strengthener at the time, or even as the constant source of strength to him, but as the One who had strengthened him in the past, who had stood by him and bestowed upon him power and influence with men, after having counted him worthy of confidence, and entrusted him with the work of the ministry of reconciliation. (Compare 2 Tim. iv. 17.)

iii. 16.

Rec. T. μεγά λειτο το της εὐσεβείας μνηστήριον. Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη — great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest.

Rev. T. μεγά λειτο το της εὐσεβείας μνηστήριον. ὁ ἐφανερώθη — great is the mystery of godliness: He who was manifested.

In connection with this, the Revisers give the marginal note, "The word God, in place of He who, rests on no sufficient
ancient evidence. Some ancient authorities read *which*; *i.e.* some ancient documents have ο, *quod,* instead of ὅς, *qui.* The revised reading is attested by a twelfth-century corrector of *S,* a modern emendator of A, C third hand, D third hand, K, L, P, most of the cursive, the Georgian and Slavonic Versions, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Didymus, Chrysostom, Pseudo-Athanasius, Euthalius, Theodoret, Severus of Antioch, John of Damascus, Theophylact, ÓCumenius, and others. The revised reading is that of *S* first hand, A first hand apparently, C first hand, the Greek texts of F and G, 17, 73, 181, the Peshito Syriac, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, Platt’s Ethiopic, Origen according to his Latin interpreter, Epiphanius, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Eutherius, Cyril, and others. The Revisers’ marginal reading, ὅς, is the reading of D, the Old Latin versions of *d, f, g,* the Vulgate, Gelasius of Cyzicus (A.D. 476), the Latin Fathers generally, including Hilary, Augustine, Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, and others. Besides these, there are several versions whose reading may represent either the masculine ὅς or the neuter ὅς, as the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, Erpenius’ Arabic, the Armenian, and the Roman Ethiopic. Of the three readings, it may be unhesitatingly said that ὅς is not genuine. It is a variation of ἦς, due to the difficulty of making the latter refer back to the neuter noun *μυστήριον.* As such, it supports the reading ὅς. The same grammatical difficulty probably led to the changing of ΟC, the uncial form of ὅς, into ÓC, the usual abbreviated form of Θέος as it appears in the earlier uncial. This change would be favored, certainly, by the fact that the statements which follow are evidently predications respecting Christ, who was in the beginning with God, and was God. That ὅς is the true reading, seems evident from the preponderating external testimony in its favor. In addition to this, it is the hardest reading of the three. If Θέος or ὅς had been the original reading, there is no likelihood that any copyist would have converted either of them into a masculine pronoun to represent a neuter noun. Again, while it may seem impossible to a superficial reader that the Apostle Paul should have written or dictated ὅς in this connection, this construction, as we have already seen, is exactly after his manner of writing.1 The wording, *μυστήριον . . . ὅς ἐστιν χριστός,* “of this mystery, which is Christ,” in you, etc. (Col. i. 27), is precisely what he gives us here. The only exception that we take to the Revisers’ work is that they have given us a most wretched rendering after having corrected the Greek text. Instead of the bungling translation, “Great is the mystery of godliness; He who,” etc., the reader ought to have found, “Great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh,” in accordance with the rendering given in Col. i. 27; or, which we should prefer to see, “Great is the mystery of godliness, *even Christ,* who was manifested in the flesh,” etc. This not only expresses the apostle’s meaning, but does it in clear, intelligible English.

### iv. 10.

Rec. T. κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἐνεπίδειξαμεθα,—we labor, and suffer reproach.

Rev. T. κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἐγκωςιαμεθα,—we labor and strive.

The common reading here is attested by the seventh-century corrector of *S, D, L, P,* nearly all the cursive, the Latin versions of D, F, G, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom again and again, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Revisers’ word “to strive” is supported by the original scribe of *S,* who is noted for his innumerable careless readings, by A, C, K, the Greek texts of F and G, less than ten cursive, and Cyril, but not by a single ancient version. The indications are that, if this reading is not a mere transcriber’s blunder in hastily taking the unfamiliar ΟΝΕΙΔΙΣΠΟΜΕΘΑ to be the familiar ΑΓΥΝΙΣΠΟΜΕΘΑ, which is by no means improbable, and which we believe to

---

1 See Notes on Eph. i. 14 and Col. i. 27.
have really been the case, it is an early adaptation of the text
to Col. i. 29, where the apostle speaks of "laboring and striving"
though in a different way. There it was perfectly natural for
him to speak of laboring and striving to present every man
perfect in Christ, according to the ability which God gave him
for doing it. But here it is not up to the apostle's manner and
meaning to say that "because of this [i.e. the fact that godli-
ness affords promise of life, both now and hereafter], we labor
and strive; for we have set our hope upon the living God," etc.
He meant more than that. Come what might, for him,
union with Christ was life, whether in this world or in that
to come. The consciousness of this enabled him to labor,—to
exert himself in toilsome, painful, and continued effort,—and
to suffer reproach,—to be willing for Christ's sake to be con-
sidered the filth of the world and the offscouring of all things,
as he himself, in 1 Cor. iv. 13, explains his meaning of the
kindred word λοιδορείσθαι, "to be reproached and despised.
And this he could do, as he goes on to say, because his trust
was in God, the preserver of all men, especially of believers.
If, in place of this thought of readiness to endure reproach, we
substitute that of simply striving, we render his language tame
even to flatness, and out of harmony with what follows. As
conclusive evidence that the received is the true reading, we
point to the fact that not a single ancient version contains the
other. Even the Latin versions of F and G are a standing
protest against the reading of their own Greek texts.

vi. 5.

Rec. T. ἀφιέσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων. — From such withdraw thyself.
Rev. T. Omits.

The genuineness of this clause is attested by D third hand,
K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, Mai's Extracts, one copy of
the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian,
Platt's Ethiopic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Dam-
ascene, Cyprian, Ambrosiaster, Lucifer, and others. The
words are wanting in SS, A, D first hand, F, G, 17, 67 second
hand, 93, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Gothic, and Roman
Ethiopic Versions, and Ambrose. Yet they have every appear-
ance of being genuine. They certainly are not imported from
any other of the apostle's writings. Their early omission is
easily accounted for by their seeming interference with the con-
nection. But there is no real obstruction of the thought. The
apostle, having referred to a class of contentious, evil-minded
persons who expected to make religion a source of gain to
themselves, very naturally adds the brief injunction, "From such,
withdraw"; then, without any real break in the discourse, he
goes on, as suggested by the preceding words: "Godliness with
contentment, however, is great gain." A special emphasis is
to be given to the words "is" and "great."

vi. 7.

Rec. T. θὴλων δι' ὅσι δημηγγκαιν τι δυνάμθηα — and it is certain we
can carry nothing out.
Rev. T. δι' ὅσι δημηγγκαιν τι δυνάμθηα — for neither can we carry
anything out.

The first of these readings is supported by S's earlier seventh-
century corrector, D second hand, K, L, P, every cursive but
one, and apparently the Syriac Versions,—"we know that" etc.,—also by Basil, Macarius, Euthalius, Chrysostom, The-
odoret, and John of Damascus. Codex D first hand, has a
similar reading,—ἀληθὰς δι' ὅσι, "and is it true that" etc.,—
which seems to be that followed by the Vulgate and most copies
of the Old Latin. The revised reading is attested by S first
hand, A, F, G, 17, one copy of the Old Latin, one or two of
the Vulgate, and the Thebaic. (The Vatican manuscript is
defective here.) The Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic
Versions have "and" in place of ὅσι. Polycarp, in writing to
the Philippians, has ἀλλὰ ὅσι instead of ὅσι ὅσι, — "but neither
have we anything to carry out." Cyprian three times gives the
same reading, employing verum in place of ἀλλὰ, — "but neither
can we carry anything out." The Revisers' reading is, very
plainly, not the original reading. The apostle did not write in
that illogical style. As for the common reading, it lacks proper
support. It has every appearance of being a mere makeshift.
Dr. Hort thinks that the text adopted by him and the Revisers
is the parent of all the other readings. And he is probably
right in this. But he does not claim that it presents the original
text. On the contrary, he holds, and Dr. Westcott agrees with
him in holding, that "a primitive [i.e. a very early] corruption
must lurk somewhere."[1] But when he attempts to account for
the difficulty by supposing that ἐκατον arose, in transcribing, out of
"an accidental repetition of the last two letters of [the preceding]
κόσμον," by reading -ov as ori, i.e. by not repeating ov, he
is wide of the mark; and Dr. Westcott wisely withholds his
assent. The truth evidently is that ἐκατον is a very early tran-
scriptional error for ἐκατον, made possibly in taking a copy from the
autograph itself. Nothing would be easier than to mistake ἐκατον
for ὄτι; and the error once made at such a time, the true
reading would naturally be lost. It is like printing "selfe" for
"sell" from Shakespeare's manuscript of Macbeth, referred to
in our introduction; or printing "strain at," in Matt. xxiii. 24,
for the "strain out" of the manuscript of King James's Re-
visers; or giving "He" in Matt. xxiii. 39, in the Anglo-Amer-
ican Revisers' "Parallel New Testament," for the "Ye" which
their manuscript called for. Restoring ἐκατον here for ἐκατο
we have the very natural and proper reading, even though it be a pro-
clivior scriptio, "For we brought nothing into the world; nor
yet can we carry anything out." The apostle employs ἐκατο
as in Acts ii. 26: "And moreover, my flesh also shall rest in hope."
So, too, in 1 Cor. iii. 2, "For ye were not previously able to
bear it: yea, ye are not for that matter even now able; for ye
are still carnal." (Compare also Matt. xxvi. 65, — "besides
this"; Matt. xviii. 16, — "more" or "in addition"; and Heb.
xii. 32, 36.)


TIMOTHY.

i. 11.

Rec. T. ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος ἔθνων, — an apostle, and a teacher
of the Gentiles.

Rec. T. ἄποστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος. — an apostle, and a teacher.

The Revisers' reading is found in only two Greek manu-
scripts,— N first hand, and A; yet this is viewed by Tisch-
endorf and Westcott and Hort as authoritative testimony.
Codex 17, which usually sides with these documents, omits
ἔθνων; but, as it reads διάκονος, "a minister," instead of διδά-
sκαλος, its testimony respecting ἔθνων is of but little weight.
The received reading, which is accepted as genuine by Gries-
bach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, Ellicott, and modern editors
generally, is strongly attested by the early seventh-century
corrector of N, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, every cursive but one,
all the Latin Versions, both Syriac Versions, both Egyptian, the
Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic,— in fact, all the ancient
versions as well as Fathers who quote or refer to the passage.
Yet, because the apostle in his first epistle to Timothy speaks
of himself as "an apostle and a teacher of the Gentiles," some
modern editors think that, in view of the testimony of the two
oldest known Greek manuscripts, the testimony of all the other
documents should pass for nothing, and the additional word be
regarded as having been introduced from the apostle's first
epistle. Thus, Tischendorf, in assigning his reason for omitting
the word, says, "In view of this testimony, it seems clear that
the additional word should not be retained, since it was so easy
to transfer it hither from 1 Tim. ii. 7, when Paul's epistles were
first brought out together. It is also to be considered," he adds, "that, as the apostle progressed in his writing, there was no need of adding ἐκατονταυτών in the same way in both places." This idea of an easy transference of language from one place to another by scribes or critical readers governed Tischendorf's judgment in too many instances, and led to the frequent vitiation of his text. It is far safer to regard the absence of ἐκατονταυτών from the three manuscripts in which it is wanting as due to misjudgment, ignorance, or carelessness on the part of some early reader or scribe than to consider the word a spurious reading. Its presence is certainly needed to express the apostle's meaning. And the fact that he employed it in one epistle is the very reason why we might expect him to employ it again in precisely similar circumstances in a subsequent epistle. This really seems to be one of those instances in which we need to bear in mind Tischendorf's wiser words as elsewhere expressed: "In spite of the great preference to be given to our oldest Greek manuscripts, we must not overlook the fact that sometimes those opposed to them, and centuries later, have at the same time the authority of much older versions and Fathers."  

In other words, as Dr. Ezra Abbot says, "though the presumption is in favor of the oldest manuscripts, mere antiquity cannot prove the excellence of a copy," or of a reading.  

It is hardly possible that ἐκατονταυτών, if spurious, should not have been omitted in some one, at least, of the ancient versions or early Fathers.

ii. 18.

The only ancient witnesses in support of the marginal reading, "a resurrection," — "saying that there has already been a resurrection," — are Σ, F, G, and 17. The omission of the article is a palpable error, rendering the clause meaningless; for, in the first place, the apostle did not preach a resurrection, as an indefinite, or local and partial affair. He preached the resurrection of all. Acts xvii. 18; xxiv. 15. Then again, it is incredible that he meant to represent Hymenæus and Philetus as being such simpletons as to claim that an occurrence had taken place, like a general resurrection of the dead, which of necessity would be universally known because of its wide-spread character, and yet was one that nobody had heard of. Much less can it be supposed that, if the apostle wrote "a resurrection," he meant a resurrection of certain individuals, — a circumstance which no one denies, and which there is no harm or heresy in saying. But he doubtless did represent Hymenæus and Philetus as claiming that the resurrection had already passed, — meaning thereby, all the resurrection that there was to be, — the alleged and generally supposed future resurrection. Their heresy was the same as that to which the apostle refers in 1 Cor. xv. 12. And to express this thought affirmatively, the article is a necessary part of the text. So that its omission is plainly not to be referred to the apostle. Yet this omission is regarded and accepted by Tischendorf as presenting the genuine reading; it is also preferred by Tregelles and Westcott and Hort as more likely to be the true reading than that of the text because it is the more difficult of the two, while the article is given a place in their margins, as only a possibly genuine reading.

iv. 17.

It must have been through oversight that the plural ἄκουσματα was not adopted here in place of ἄκουσμα, "might hear." It is true, the change would not have affected the rendering in the least. But the plural is attested by Σ, A, C, D, E, F, G, P, 17, and about ten other cursives, Eusebius, Euthalius, and others; while the singular is supported by K, L, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, a manuscript of Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascus, and possibly one or two others. It is true that the

1 Herzog's Encyclopaedia, article, "Bibel-Text: — the N. T."
singular is in accordance with the apostle's usual mode of
text, and is probably what he wrote. But then, what becomes of the "authorities"? and where is the consistency of
changing Rom. ii. 14, and not changing 1 Tim. v. 25, or 2 Tim.
iv. 17?—See Note on Rom. ii. 14.

TITUS.

Rec. T. ἀρχαὶ καὶ ξονοσίαι— to principalities and powers.
Rev. T. ἀρχαὶ ξονοσίαι— to rulers, to authorities.

The conjunction is preserved in D third hand, E second
hand, K, Λ, P, nearly all the cursive, the Latin versions of D,
E, F, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the
Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Basil twice, Chrysostom,
Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Lucifer, Jerome, Ambro-
siaster, and others. It is wanting in Κ, A, C, the Greek of
D by its first hand, the Greek texts of E and F, both texts
of G, 17, 31, and 67. The use of ἀρχαὶ and ξονοσίαι together is
one of frequent occurrence in the apostle's letters; but nowhere
else does he use them connectedly without a conjunction,
except in Eph. vi. 12, where in his deliberate and emphatic
manner he repeats, instead, the previous preposition before
the second of these and two other nouns. It was not his way
to employ these words as the Revised Text represents him to
have done. The omission of καὶ was an early error, evidently
introduced in consequence of the preceding ἀρχαί, leaving
the impression upon the careless scribe that he had penned
the word when he had not; and though the error is pre-
served in the oldest extant manuscripts, it was afterwards
corrected in some of them, and it vitiates none of the versions
except that of G, which is only what might be expected. As
long as we have abundant authority for retaining καὶ, it seems
hardly worth while to misrepresent the apostle's manner of
speaking because a few evidently vitiated manuscripts do it.
The revised rendering does not do justice to the corresponding Greek. It should rather be, "— be in subjection to rulers, authorities," without the repetition of "to," which implies a corresponding preposition where there is none in the Greek, and greatly relieves the asperity of the new reading.

**PHILEMON.**

**Verse 6.**

This verse, as rendered by the Revisers, reads, "That the fellowship of thy faith may become effectual, in the knowledge of every good thing which is in you, unto Christ." The ancient documents are nearly equally divided here between "you," of the text, and the marginal reading, "us." The former is supported by $\mathfrak{N}$, F, G, P, a large number of cursives, perhaps the majority of them, the Clementine Vulgate, two or three copies of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Theophylact, and Primasius. The latter is attested by A, C, D, E, K, L, about fifty cursives, most of the manuscripts of the Vulgate, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Zohrab's Armenian Version, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Cæsarius, Ambrosiaster, and Pelagius. Most modern editors adopt or give the preference to the latter; among whom may be mentioned Griesbach, Lachmann, Ellicott, and Alford, as adopting it; while Tregelles and Westcott and Hort insert it in the text, but place "you" in the margin as a secondary reading. Tischendorf, in his last edition, adopts "you" in accordance with the accepted reading and the Revisers' Text. But most editors are against him. The true reading, however, is not to be decided by the testimony of documents. It can be decided only by knowing, if possible, the apostle's meaning. In the midst of a context where a single individual is addressed, and "thou," "thy," "thee," is the word employed, it seems hardly probable at first sight that the apostle would introduce the plural "you" instead. Hence, Meyer and others decide
for “us,” denoting Christians generally; and conclude that “you,” or rather ἐμοῦ, is a transcriptional error for ἐμνῦ, “us,” the more easily made because of the scribe’s remembering that in verse 2 the apostle had mentioned others besides Philemon, and in verse 3 addressed them as “you,”—“Grace to you, and peace,” etc. That Meyer’s interpretation of the passage is a failure in several respects, there can be no doubt. Hence, his judgment concerning the true reading, as between “you” and “us,” is of little worth. Our own belief at first was that “us” is the true reading; but the more we consider the passage, and the better we understand what seems to be the apostle’s aim in verses 4-7, the more we are convinced that “you” is, after all, the right word. That aim is evidently to prepare the way for introducing the subject of Onesimus’ return, and for pleading with Philemon on his behalf. The meaning of these verses, as it presents itself to us, without going into details, may be briefly given as follows: “I thank my God (always making mention of thee in my prayers when I hear of the faith which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus, and of thy love for all the saints), that the communication [the sharing of what thou hast with others, which is but one of the fruits] of thy faith should become effective for Christ in a hearty recognition [on thy part] of every good thing [whether person, or deed, or word, or undertaking] among you. For I have had much joy and comfort in consequence of [literally, based upon] thy love, because the hearts of the saints have been refreshed through thee, brother.” This commendation of Philemon for exercising an unselfish benevolence towards the saints and in behalf of every Christian effort among them, with which the apostle closes this introductory paragraph of his letter, seems to call unmistakably for “among you” at the close of verse 6. For the apostle would very naturally, in addressing Philemon, speak of his fellow Christians at Colosse, or wherever Philemon lived, under the term “you,” from the fact that Philemon was one of them.

We see no good reason for omitting the pronoun from the text here. Its presence is attested by the early seventh-century corrector of N, C, D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, —in short, all the ancient versions except the Latin,—Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and other Greek Fathers. It is wanting in N first hand, A, D first hand, F, G, 17, and three other cursive, the Vulgate, and of course Jerome, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, and other Latin Fathers. It is not essential to expressing the thought in the Greek; and for this very reason it may have been dropped by some early scribe. At all events, its retention in the text would not have interfered in the least with the Revisers’ legitimate work; and, in fact, the reading of the R. V. implies that it is retained.

Verse 25.

The “many ancient authorities” that read “the Lord,” or rather, that omit “our,” are N: P, 17, 31, 47, 116, and the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions. The fact is scarcely worthy of being noted, and probably would not have been, but that Westcott and Hort remove the word from the text, and consign it to the margin. — The note on the omission, by some, of “Amen,” at the end of the verse, is also made for a similar reason, and is equally needless. It is true, the word does not even appear in Westcott and Hort, in either margin or text, though it is quite as strongly attested as the other.
HEBREWS.

i. 8.

In the marginal note, the reader is told that the two oldest manuscripts read "his kingdom," where all other documents have "thy kingdom." But this does not tell half the story. If we were asked why these manuscripts read thus, we should be constrained to say, because some scribe either misunderstood, or sought to pervert, the writer's meaning. Instead of reading ὁ Θεός as a compellative, "O God," he read the verse thus: "But as to the Son he saith, God is thy throne for ever and ever; the sceptre of his kingdom is a sceptre of righteousness." This reading, which has no support but that of the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts, Westcott and Hort adopt. It is not the reading of the Septuagint (Psa. xlv. 6), whose readings the writer of this epistle so closely followed throughout, nor is it in harmony with, or up to the level of, his argument, which is to set forth the superiority and supremacy of the Son of God over the highest of created intelligences. The principle with Westcott and Hort, which evidently led to the introduction of this marginal note, is that, aside from the palpably false readings of Ν and B in Mark iv. 21, Gal. ii. 12, Jas. i. 17, Rev. xviii. 21, and possibly a few "indecisive coincidences" between these manuscripts, no readings of Ν, B, can safely be rejected absolutely, —a principle which no one can adhere to without presenting a more or less vitiated text. It absurdly assumes that the scribes of these texts were all but infallible, and that every other manuscript, every ancient version, every patristic writer that quotes the passage, errs in giving the reading of the text.
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verse to the margin as a possible explanation of the meaning of the phrase ὄρει περιβάλλων; and some one, afterwards copying from this, and supposing the words to be a part of the text, inserted them as best he could. And so it comes down to us in a few old manuscripts, while the genuine text is preserved in earlier versions and later manuscripts. Notwithstanding the testimony of the oldest known manuscripts, Tischendorf, with all his partiality for \( \Delta \), adheres to the received reading, as do Meyer and others.

iii. 16.

The Revisers, as well as a number of modern editors and commentators, take the first word of this verse as the interrogative πῶς, "who?" instead of the indefinite pronoun πῶς, "some;" and consequently place an interrogation point, instead of a colon or a semicolon, after the word "provoke." This either makes the \( \gamma \) that introduces the verse meaningless and useless, or compels us to take it as a mere emphatic expletive, equivalent to "why," "forsworn," or some such word,—""Why, who did provoke?" But, by so doing, we obtain a harsh, unnatural construction, altogether unlike anything else in the epistle. Besides, there is no need of it. On the contrary, the common reading, properly understood, seems to present the writer's thoughts connectedly and clearly, giving the following forcible, conclusive, and apparently satisfactory argument: We are made partakers of Christ, if we really hold the beginning of our confidence firm unto the end, while it is said, To-day if ye hear his voice, harden not your hearts as was done in the provocation. That is, we have become partakers through Christ of an inheritance in heaven if we firmly maintain from first to last our confidence and trust in him as long as we are privileged to hear God's warning voice, and do not harden our hearts and provoke him by distrusting him, as the Israelites did in the wilderness. For some of them, when they heard, did provoke him. Yea, did not all who came out of Egypt by Moses do this? Yes, nearly all. And with whom was he displeased during those forty years? Was it not with them that had sinned? — and so on to verse 19, where we find that those who failed to enter into rest, failed "because of unbelief" as we read in Num. xiv. They were not, so to speak, "made partakers of Christ," because they did not "hold the beginning of their confidence firm unto the end," as they might have done. The argument in its course passes from the affirmative declaration of verse 14 to the negative statement with which it concludes in verse 19. And this it does without harshness, without a break, and as far as we can see, without any real ground of perplexity.

iv. 2.

Rec. T. \( \mu \) συγκεκριμένος — not being mixed.

Rev. T. \( \mu \) συγκεκριμένους — because they were not united.

The first of these readings is attested by \( \Delta, 13, 31, 37, 41, 114 \), the Latin versions of D and E, the Clementine Vulgate, three copies of Jerome's, the Peshito Syriac, Erpenius' Arabic, Cyril of Alexandria, Theodoret, and Lucifer. The other, in one of its varying forms with uniform ending, is supported by A, B, C, D, E, K, L, M, P, most of the cursive, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Euthalius, Macarius, Chrysostom, Photius, Theophylact, Jerome, and others. The entire clause, according to the Canterbury Revisers' rendering, reads thus: "But the word of hearing did not profit them, because they were not united by faith with them that heard." This, the younger Buttmann calls a "hermeneutically difficult" reading. It is rejected by Tischendorf, the American Revisers, and some of the ablest of modern commentators, as an impossible reading. One of the English Revisers, in attempting to explain it, says, "Its meaning appears to be, The word of the message did not profit those to whom it was preached, because they were not united by faith (not made one in heart) with those who heard the message (viz. Moses and the Prophets [or, as others have
it, Joshua and Caleb)], and preached it." Another of them says, in reference to the passage, "Overwhelming critical evidence compels us to accept the somewhat strange rendering of the R. V. Many critics of high name have been tempted to abide by the apparently far simpler and more satisfactory reading which is represented in the A. V.; but faithfulness to the laws of evidence and grammar will not permit of such a course." 1 But he does not venture on an explanation of the meaning of this overwhelmingly attested reading. There certainly is nothing in the laws of grammar that will not permit our accepting the reading of the Received Text; neither is there in the laws of evidence, or in our faithfulness to those laws. In the first place, our intuitive discernment, or what some might call common sense, assures us that the reading represented by the A. V. is not only a "more satisfactory reading," but, apart from all documentary evidence, one that commends itself as more probably the true reading than the other. In the next place, it is not a reading without any external evidence to support it. It is not a conjectural reading. So far, then, we are not unfaithful to the laws of evidence. "No; but the evidence is insufficient." Are we sure of that? What if the last syllable, -ous, of the Revisers' word should be a transcriptional blunder for -os? What would the "overwhelming critical evidence" be worth? Simply nothing. Yet this is just what that reading is,—an error to which the preceding ἔκεινος probably gave rise; one of a class of errors abounding in all the manuscripts more or less. If faithfulness to the laws of evidence requires us to adopt such readings when they occur mainly or wholly in the older manuscripts, why not be consistent and faithful in following all false readings found in those manuscripts? We are not to stultify ourselves when judging of the value of documentary evidence, any more than when we are in the jury-box, weighing the evidence presented to us in a court of justice. The reading of the Received Text here, testified to by Ν, and by the Peshito Syriac, the most ancient of all our witnesses, is, no doubt, the genuine reading. The words τῶν ἀκοῦσαν, however, should be rendered, "upon their hearing it," or, "when they heard it"; for, according to classic rather than general New-Testament usage, these words are temporally subordinate to the clause, μὴ συγκεκριμένοι τῇ πίστει, "not having been mixed with (or, accompanied by) faith." 1 Taking the words thus, they afford a plain and conclusive reason why the word preached proved unprofitable: "The word addressed to the ear did not profit them [i.e. those just referred to], as it was not mixed with faith when they heard it." Dr. Hort's objection to this reading, that it identifies "them" with τῶν ἀκοῦσαν, which thus, he says, "becomes a superfluous and at the same time ambiguous repetition," is by no means transparent. Where the ambiguity lies, it is hard to see. And how it can be called a superfluous repetition, if properly understood, it is equally difficult to discover. As already indicated, the American Revisers did not unite with their British co-laborers in this change. They stand by the Received Text.

vi. 2.

A marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities read the teaching of" in place of "of the teaching of." That is, B and d, the Latin Version of D, make "teaching," like "foundation," the object of the participle translated "laying." The Latin Version e, accompanying Codex E, instead of doctrinam, the reading of d, has the ablative, doctrina, meaning "with the teaching of baptisms." All other manuscripts and versions have the reading of the text,—"of the teaching (or doctrine) of baptisms." It seems hardly proper to suppose that the true reading of any ordinary passage could have been preserved in

1 Compare Heb. vi. 6, vii. 1, etc., and Buttmann, Gram. of N. T. Greek, § 144, 1, 2.
a single Greek manuscript and a single copy of an old version; and yet in this instance it may be. Some genuine readings, no doubt, have disappeared altogether from manuscripts, versions, and patristic writings, as far as known and examined. The passage before us is a peculiar one. The Greek manuscript in which the marginal reading appears is the oldest New-Testament manuscript known. This manuscript is supported in this reading by a copy of one of the very oldest versions, which, in this rendering, forsakes not only every other copy of that version, but the Greek manuscript itself, of which it professes to be a translation. These facts mean something. The reading cannot be accounted for on the score of its being a blunder. In a long sentence like this, bristling with genitives, there is not the least probability that a transcriber should make such a blunder as to write an accusative for a genitive; though the contrary might easily have been done. Nor is there a shadow of a possibility that an interpreter should translate a genitive by an unmeaning accusative. Neither can the two—the Greek accusative and the Latin accusative—fairly be regarded as coming from the same source, if that source is a false reading, especially as the Greek text (D) of which this Latin reading (d) professes to be a version gives no countenance to this latter reading. It may be said that the accusative in B is the result of an early tampering with the text,—a result preserved elsewhere only in d. This is the only rational way of accounting for it, if it is a false reading. And yet, such is its nature that, but for the overwhelming documentary evidence against it, it would be hardly possible to question its genuineness. Let us look at it as related to the context. In construction, as already observed, this accusative is to be taken as a second object of the participle καταβαλλόμενος,—unless, as the marginal note intimates, it should be regarded as in apposition with "foundation,"—"not laying again the foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God, even the teaching of baptisms," etc. But this construction is neither allowable nor plausible. If this were the best that could be done, we might be led to reject the accusative as an unaccountably strange and false reading. But we go back to καταβαλλόμενοι. We question it as to its meaning and use. It appears elsewhere in the New Testament only twice; namely, in 2 Cor. iv. 9, and Rev. xii. 10. In both these passages it is rendered "cast down." This is really its true meaning here, of which it has been deprived in consequence of the presence of πάλιν, "again." The latter word, however, is not to be taken in the sense of "once more," or "a second time," as it evidently is by both King James’s and the Canterbury Revisers. It has reference to a former condition of things, and denotes, with its verb, a return, a coming back to that previous state, though that coming back may not be a second return, but the first. Its use here, as in verse 6, is no doubt somewhat pleonastic. Properly translated, the writer’s words mean, "Not casting down again the foundation principles of repentance from dead works and of faith in God [i.e. not subverting and renouncing them, and being again without any ground to build on], or the teaching of baptisms, and of the laying on of hands, and of the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." This makes "teaching" the object of "casting down," used figuratively for "rejecting," and gives what seems to be the very thought of the writer, who, as the whole context shows, is warning his readers against back-sliding and its consequences. The only apparent objection to this reading and rendering seems to be the want of the conjunction ἢ, "or," in connection with this accusative,—which, however, may very easily have been lost from the text through a misunderstanding of the writer’s meaning. Another thing that gives strong color to this as the true reading is the fact that θειλακὼν is thereby made to refer only to repentance and

1 In Rev. xii. 10, the Revisers have followed the majority of other modern editors, and adopted the simple instead of the compound verb in their Greek text, though in their Version they retain “cast down,” the rendering of the rejected compound verb.
faith as the fundamentals of the Christian life, while the other four things are made subjects of needful instruction,—the first two of them being matters of practice to a greater or less extent in the apostolic church; and the other two being truths of cardinal importance to men as believers in Christ. On both of these classes of subjects there was more or less questioning and doubt in that early day; and believers needed to be taught the truth respecting them.

If βαπτίσμων διδαχήν is, as it appears to be, the true reading, it settles at once the question whether the writer means "the doctrine (or teaching) of baptisms," or whether, as some infer from the order of the words, the only meaning that his language will allow is "baptisms of doctrine," i.e. baptisms consequent upon teaching, baptisms administered after due instruction,—though it must be confessed it is difficult to get the latter meaning out of the two genitives. With an accusative, however, for the second word of the combination, the difficulty disappears; the only possible rendering to be given to the words is, "teaching of baptisms," instruction respecting baptisms. It decides, also, the government and construction of the three leading genitives that follow, all being dependent upon this accusative, as already shown. In a word, it clears up the whole passage,—which is one of the best evidences of its being a genuine reading. The accusative early became changed to a genitive through the influence of the successive pairs of genitives with which it stands connected,—Lachmann, as well as Westcott and Hort, admits διδαχήν into the text on the sole documentary evidence of B and d. It is strongly supported, however, by internal evidence.

viii. 8.

The American Revisers here very properly call attention to what seems to be a false reading in the Received Text, which the Canterbury Revisers retain, namely, "finding fault with them." Instead of this, the American Committee suggest as a marginal reading, "finding fault with it"; i.e. with the first covenant, which is spoken of in the preceding verse as not faultless. This reading is supported by the early seventh-century corrector of Σ, B, D third hand, E, L, nearly all the cursive, John of Damascus, and other Greek Fathers. The reading of the text, which represents God as censuring his people, rather than expressing dissatisfaction with the Old Covenant, is supported by Σ first hand, A, D first hand, K, P, four cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, and Peshito Syriac Versions, Euthalius, Theodoret, and Chrysostom in one place, though elsewhere he favors the other reading. The correspondence between "faultless" in verse 7 and "finding fault" in verse 8, as well as the entire subsequent context, seems to leave no doubt that the true reading is the marginal reading suggested by the American Revisers.

X. 1.

Rec. T. ὁ νόμος ... οὐδὲντες δύναται — the law ... can never.
Rev. T. ὁ νόμος ... οὐδὲντες δύναται — the law ... they can never.

The English Revisers have banished the verb of the Received Text to the margin, with the note that some ancient authorities read "it can"; i.e. "the law can never." The witnesses for this reading are D first and third hands (the latter correcting the change made by the second hand), E, H, K, L, the majority of the cursive, the Latin versions of D, E, and F, the Vulgate, the Memphitic and Bashmuric Versions, Origen, Chrysostom giving the text, Theodoret, and OEcumenius, who adds, "That is, the law can never." The plural, which the Revisers have adopted, is found in Σ, A, C, D second hand, P, 17, and between thirty and forty other cursive, Chrysostom in two other instances, Euthalius, John Damascene, and Theophylact.

1 Codex B is defective in the rest of this epistle, as well as in the epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, and in the Apocalypse. The B of the Apocalypse is a manuscript by the later hand.
Hort very strangely says, "The analogies of ix. 9, x. 11 (the sacrifices) and x. 10 (the Levitical priest, answering to the true High Priest) are in favor of διαναρτα." But, finding it "difficult to think that we have the text quite complete," he proceeds to give several changes, in order, if possible, to make διαναρτα a suitable reading. In all this, Dr. Westcott is unable to agree with him. And justly; for these passages represent the sacrifices, not the priests, as unable to make the worshippers perfect, just as the singular, διαναρτα, does here: "The law . . . can never, with the same sacrifices year after year, . . . make perfect," etc. But, with the plural, it is not the sacrifices but the Levitical priests that are represented as unable to accomplish the work: "The law having a shadow of the good things to come, . . . they [i.e. the priests] can never with the same sacrifices . . . make perfect them that draw nigh." This reading not only shows Dr. Hort's remarks to be somewhat inconsiderate, but makes the writer speak entirely out of harmony with his teachings elsewhere. Nor is this all. It renders purposeless and unmeaning the clause preceding. Why this reference to the law as a shadow of good things to come, if it is not the observance and work of the law that is about to be spoken of? According to this reading, however, the Levitical priests ought to have been referred to as shadows, rather than the law and its rites.—Still other considerations might be urged to show that the Received Text presents the original reading. But these are not necessary. There can hardly be a question in the mind of any impartial judge respecting the plural διαναρτα. It is too plainly erroneous, — occasioned by the foregoing προσφέροντος, "they offer." The fact that it is attested by the three oldest known manuscripts ought not, in view of all the circumstances, to have a feather's weight. And so Tischendorf, the American Revisers, and others who adopt the singular are forced to conclude.

1 Select Readings, p. 131.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

xii. 3.

Rec. T. ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐς αὐτῶν ἀντιλογικαὶ — contradiction of sinners against himself.

Rev. T. ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐς ταύτῳ ἀντιλογικαὶ — gainsaying of sinners against themselves.

We have here another change in the text for which the English Revisers alone are responsible.—The first of these varying readings, under the different forms of αὐτῶν, αὑτῶν, and ταύτων (for the manuscripts present the reflexive under all these forms), is attested by A, D third hand, E second hand, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, the Latin version of F, the Clementine Vulgate, several copies of Jerome's, the Memphitic Version, Chrysostom, John Damascene, and others. The Revisers' reading, under the forms of ταύτων and αὑτῶν, is supported by N, D first hand, E first hand, 17, four copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, Euthalius, and Theodoret. The Syriac Version translates very freely, "Consider how much he suffered from sinners, those who were enemies of their own life;" i.e. their own enemies. While the received reading is perfectly appropriate, and harmonizes with the preceding line of thought, this revised reading introduces an idea altogether out of harmony with the context. It carries upon its face the stamp not merely of improbability but of counterfeit currency. On this ground, and only on this, it is rejected by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, the American Committee of Revisers, and others. But Westcott and Hort cling to it because of its apparent antiquity; and through them it appears in the Revised Text. Another of the English Revisers tries to explain the expression "against themselves" by saying, "Sinners against their own souls," as we read in Num. xvi. 38." But this is not a parallel passage; for here the meaning is that the censers of "the two hundred and fifty men that offered incense" were "hallowed," consecrated to the Lord, and became a witness against them, a standing memorial in the presence

of the Israelites of the sin by which they perished. The reading adopted by the Revisers did not originate in carelessness, as some may suppose, but in a misinterpretation, through ignorance, of the writer's meaning. This is evident from the rendering in vobis, which appears in the Latin versions accompanying D and E. This tells the whole story. It shows that the reading ταύτων arose from connecting that word with "ye," the subject of the verb "consider," and of "become weary," following immediately after. And the meaning thus intended to be given to the verse was, "Consider among yourselves him that endured such contradiction of sinners, lest ye become wearied in your souls unto fainting." But it was not generally understood. And very properly, because such a distortion of the apostle's language as this construction calls for is by no means admissible. The order of his words forbids it.

xii. 7.

Rec. T. εἰ παρεδέθαν ὑπομενεῖτε — If ye endure chastening.

Rev. T. εἰς παρεδέθαν ὑπομενεῖτε — It is for chastening that ye endure.

The common reading, εἰς, is attested only by a large number of cursive, Euthalius, and Theophylact. The other (εἰ) is attested by all the uncials, more than fifty cursive, the Vulgate, and virtually the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions. Codex D, however, connects εἰς παρεδέθαν with the preceding words: "But he scourgeth every son whom he receiveth for chastening"; then puts the following ὑπομενεῖτε in the aorist imperative, ὑπομενεῖτε, "endure." Some of the Latin versions translate the words in disciplina; some, in disciplinam; and one at least, in doctrinam. The reading evidently troubled the ancients, as it does our modern critics and interpreters. Let us, then, look at the other reading for a moment or two. It is true, the documentary evidence in favor of this is comparatively weak. But it is not quite so feeble relatively as that calling for "strain out a gnat," in our English
Version, in which the documentary evidence — authorized, too, at that — in support of “strain at a gnat,” is of the most voluminously overwhelming character. But let us suppose that ει may be the true reading. How does it fit in? It makes verse 7 begin (A.V.), “If ye endure chastening”; while verse 8 begins, “But if ye be without chastening,” etc. That is to say, If, on one supposition, ye are chastened, ye may infer thus and so; but if, on the other hand, ye are not chastened, ye may come to another and very different conclusion. So far, then, as to whether ει or εις be the true reading, the writer’s argument leaves us very little room to doubt. The word “endure,” however, is not the best word by which to bring out his meaning in ἐποιεῖντε. This word literally means to remain under, then to continue patiently or without chaffing under, to remain under and be submissive to. Now, by giving this rendering to ἐποιεῖντε, and reading ει in connection with it, we have what we may consider, without doubt, the writer’s thought as well as his words. To show this the more clearly, we give the two verses together: “If ye continue submissive under chastening, God is dealing with you as with sons. For what son is there whose father does not chaste him? But if ye are [i.e. if ye continue, or are left] without chastening, ye are not dealt with as sons,—ye are not sons, ye are not genuine children.” The internal evidence thus makes it conclusively clear that “if” is the true reading. The other is an early transcriber’s error.

xii. 18.

Rec. T. ἡλαφομένως ὧς, καὶ κεκαυμένως πυρί,—unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire.

Rev. T. ἡλαφομένως καὶ κεκαυμένως πυρί,—unto a mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire.

The presence of ὧς, as a part of the text, is attested by D, K, L, nearly all the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, the Armenian Version, Chrysostom twice, Athanasius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ecumenius, and others. But the word is wanting in K, A, C, 17, 47, the Latin versions accompanying D and F, several manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Ethiopic, Erpenius' Arabic, Origen in one place, but not in two others afterwards, Euchelius, Primasius, and others. If the Revisers’ Greek presents the genuine reading here, then the translation which they have given to it in the text is an improper one. The Greek words do not call for the inserting of “a mount” in the rendering. The insertion of this expression obviously indicates a want of confidence on the part of a majority of the body of Revisers in their own text, the only legitimate meaning of which is, “unto a palpable and kindled fire,” as the Revisers give it in the margin. But this reveals a suspicious reading; for the kindling or burning of a fire naturally precedes the feeling of it, not only in fact, but in the expression of the fact. It is true that a previous mention of ὧς, or of some locality, is implied, in verse 19, in the words, “which voice they that heard intreated,” etc. This language, as well as what follows, shows that the preceding statements are not of a general, indefinite nature without any local reference, as the language of the revised Greek text up to that point indicates. Hence it is impossible to resist the conclusion that ὧς is a part of the genuine text. And this consideration may have led to the insertion of “a mount” into the R. V. But the idea does not inhere in, nor is it implied by, the revised Greek text. The conviction that ὧς is necessary in order to express the writer’s thought simply indicates that the word has been omitted in those documents in which it is wanting. It ought to be restored to the text in accordance with the demands of external and internal evidence, its presence being essential to express the obvious meaning of the writer,—a tangible mountain, as opposed to the intangible, spiritual Mount Zion of verse 22.
Rec. T. ἐν παντὶ ἐργεῖ ἄγαθο - in every good work.
Rec. T. ἐν παντὶ ἄγαθο - in every good thing

The received reading here is well attested by C, D third hand, K, M, P, the whole body of the cursive, the Peshito Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Chrysostom twice, Theodoret twice, John Damascene, and others. Codex A reads, “in every good work and word,” — the addition of “and word” having been made, apparently, from 2 Thess. ii. 17. The omission of ἐργεῖ is according to ᾿S, D first hand, the Latin versions of D and F, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Euthalius, Primasius, and others. Tischendorf (in accordance with his principle of rejecting the one of two rival readings that corresponds more or less with a genuine reading elsewhere) omits “work,” under the idea that it must have been introduced from 2 Thess. ii. 17, because it is wanting in ᾿S. Westcott and Hort also omit the word. But Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, and others generally retain it as genuine, as in fact the documentary evidence demands, and as the connection, — “making you perfect in doing his will in every good work” or endeavor, — seems to require.

Rec. T. ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν - working in you.
Rec. T. ποιῶν ἐν ὑμῖν - working in us.

This clause, following on immediately after the above, speaks for itself. The documentary testimony in regard to the reading is as follows: In favor of the received reading, A, C, P, most of the cursive, the Latin versions accompanying D and F, the Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, and Ethiopic Versions, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret in citing the passage, John Damascene, and Theophylact. In favor of the revised, are ᾿S, the Greek text of D, K, M, about twenty-five cursive, the Armenian Version, Ecumenius in both text and comment, and Theodoret in commenting on the passage. But this reading,

even if the documentary evidence preponderated in its favor instead of inclining strongly the other way, ought to be set aside as an obvious itacism originating in carelessness. The very connection shows that “you,” not “us,” is the proper and undoubtedly genuine reading: “Make you perfect in every good work to do his will, working in you that which is well-pleasing in his sight.” The original scribe of D presents us with the reading “make us perfect” instead of “make you perfect,” as well as with the reading “working in us”; and it is possible that both these erroneous readings originated in the exemplar from which Codex D was taken. The former, however, is now found only in the Greek text of D, while the latter has been preserved not only in D, but in ᾿S and a few other kindred documents.
JAMES.

i. 12.

Rec. T. ὅ ἵππηγιλατο ὁ Κύριος τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτῶν. — which the
Lord hath promised to them that love him.

Rev. T. ὅ ἵππηγιλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτῶν. — which the Lord
promised to them that love him.

The omission of ὁ Κύριος appears only in Κ, A, B, one cursive,
one manuscript of the Old Latin, and in most editions of
the Armenian Version. The reading of the Received Text is
supported by C, K, L, P, almost every cursive, the Vulgate, the
Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic,
the Venetian edition of the Armenian, and John Damascene
twice, though some of these versions, and four or five cursives,
read “God” instead of “the Lord.” There are those who
speak of God as “He” and “Him,” using the word inde-
pendently, without reference to an antecedent, and generally
spelling it with a capital initial. But that was not the Apostle
James’s way of speaking. The Revisers’ Greek, in fact, leaves
the verb without any subject, not even a pronoun expressed.
In the preceding context after verse 7, the apostle makes no
reference to the Lord. In that verse, he assures his readers
that a man of wavering, doubtful mind need not think that he
shall receive anything of the Lord. Then follow various ob-
servations respecting persons of one kind and another,—the
double-minded, the lowly, the rich, the patient man. In speak-
ing of the last, the apostle pronounces him blessed in enduring
temptation. Now it is incredible that, after speaking thus of
men, he should proceed and say, “For, being approved, he
shall receive the crown of life which he promised to them that
love him,” — the second “he” of this sentence being only
implied, and yet meaning the Lord. It is far more credible
that some careless copyist overlooked the OKC, standing in
his exemplar for ὁ Κύριος, and passed on without it. If such
omissions were not common among transcribers, the case
would be very different. But knowing that they are of frequent
occurrence, and, after being once made, are too often mechani-
cally repeated, we have every reason for concluding that this
is what must have occurred here. Let us not, then, do the
apostle the injustice of attributing to him an error that he could
hardly have committed, and that can so easily be accounted
for in the few documents in which it appears, especially as we
find it necessary, in translating his mutilated words, to supply
what he himself, beyond all reasonable doubt, wrote. The
error of omitting “the Lord” here is certainly not as great as
that of writing ἄποσκιάσματος for ἄποσκίασμα, “shadow,” in
verse 17, a reading which is utterly unmeaning, and yet appears
in Κ and B, — and only in those two manuscripts.

ii. 20.

Rec. T. ἡ πίστις χαρίς τῶν ἐργῶν περί ζωῆς. — faith without works
is dead.

Rev. T. ἡ πίστις χαρίς τῶν ἐργῶν ἐργῆ ἔστιν. — faith apart from
works is barren.

The common reading here is supported by Κ, A, C second
hand, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine
Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic,
Uscan’s Armenian, the Ethiopic Version, Origen, Cyril of
Alexandria, Òcumenius, and others. The revised reading,
ἐργῆ, is that of B, C first hand, 27, 29, one manuscript of the
Old Latin Version, three of the Vulgate, the Thebaic, and
Zohrab’s Armenian. It is obviously an early scholiast’s work,
intended to show the apostle’s meaning in the word “dead.”
First written in the margin, it afterwards crept into the text,
and so appears in a few documents. It is an unmeaning platitude in comparison with the apostle’s word, which appears also in verse 17, where ἰδόν would be, if possible, still more inapt, and in verse 26, which forbids its use. The idea that faith without its fruits or resultant works is barren, is one which the apostle would hardly think of presenting. But that faith, if it produce no results, is dead, — virtually no faith at all, is a truth which many need to have taught them before they can realize it. Νεκρά is too strongly attested, and too expressive of the apostle’s thought, to be set aside.

ii. 26.
Rec. T. χωρίς τῶν ἑργῶν — without works.
Rev. T. χωρίς ἑργῶν — without works.

The presence of the article is attested by A, C, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, a catena, Theophylact and Ócumenius. It is wanting in Η, B, 69, 182, and Origen, who may have cited the words from memory, or without any regard to the article. The article is used by the apostle in verses 18 and 20, the only other places where he speaks of “faith without works.” And in all these passages, — as much here as in the others, — it seems to be necessary in order to the real expression of his meaning. These are among the places where the true force of the article is, perhaps, best expressed in English by the personal pronoun. Thus, in verse 18, we should render the words, “Show me thy faith without its works, and I will show thee my faith by its works.” So, too, in verse 20, as well as here, “Faith without its works is dead.” In each of these instances, τῶν ἑργῶν means the works of faith, its necessary results. Without the article, the meaning, though nearly the same, is less expressive: “Faith without results is dead.” But as faith is particularized, — “the faith,” i.e. the faith of the Christian as such, the faith that lays hold on Christ, so the works need to be particularized to denote the works which such a faith produces, and not works in general.

The revised reading is attested by Η, A, B, K, L, twenty-five cursive, f of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, John Damascene, and Ócumenius. That of the Received Text is supported by C, P, a large number of cursive, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, Platt’s Ethiopic, and Theophylact. Other readings are “Moreover,” and “Why then?” but they are evident departures from the original. Of the two given above, εἰ δὲ may be the more difficult; but it does not follow from this that, with all its attestation, it is the true reading. As we have already observed, the old manuscripts do not always distinguish between εἰ and ι, as later manuscripts do. Hence we find such spellings as ἱμέων for ἱμὼν, and ἱμών for ἱμῶν. In Acts xxvi. 5, for example, Η, C, E, have θησίκα, while A, B, H, L, P, and others have θεσίκα; in Col. ii. 18, C, D, E, F, G, P, and others adopt the former spelling, while Η, A, B, L, and others adopt the latter; and in Jas. i. 26, 27, the first of these modes of writing the word is followed by Η, while the second is generally adopted by other manuscripts. Again, in Acts i. 15, Codex E has εἰκοσι for εἰκοσί, “twenty”; and in the next verse, Η, B, D, have δασιόδ for the more common Δαβίδ, “David.” There is, in fact, much irregularity among the manuscripts on this as on many other orthographical points. So that here εἰ δὲ may be only another way of spelling ἰδέ, which may be said to be but another form of ἰδόν. (Compare Mark xiii. 21; John xix. 4; Gal. v. 2, etc.) In fact, the context seems to require us so to regard it. In the next verse, we read ἰδόν καὶ τὰ πλοία (where Codex 24 reads εἰ δέ κ.τ.λ.), “Behold also the ships.” And in the verse following, we read, “Behold how great,” etc. Just so, in chapter v., the apostle uses “Behold” for calling attention in verses 4, 7, 9, 11, successively, — showing that this was a peculiarity
of his. But what seems to indicate that ἤδον (or ἤδη) is the true reading here is the καί in verse 4, "Behold also the ships," — the "also," which connects the two similitudes, implying that attention had previously been called to something else, and now is called to ships that are guided by a small rudder. Hence, in view of the questionable testimony of the three oldest manuscripts and their associates, and the strong internal evidence against it, we believe the Received Text gives us the apostle's real meaning and form of expression.

iii. 5.

Rec. T. ἤδηγον πῶρ — a little fire.
Rev. T. ἤλικον πῶρ — how small a fire!

The received reading is attested by A first hand, C second hand, K, L, all the cursive, a catena, ff of the Old Latin Version, Mai's Extracts, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, John Damascene, and Theophylact. The revised is supported by X, A second hand, B, C first hand, P, the Vulgate, Antiochus, and Oecumenius,—respectively seventh and tenth century writers. A reading like this, so hard and yet so easily accounted for, one might suppose would make believers in hard readings as such pause some time before adopting it. In the close connection in which it stands to ἤλικον, a scribe, writing from dictation, might very naturally have become confused in regard to the word, and, taking ἤδηγον to be ἤλικον, have written the latter instead of the former. One might infer this from the documentary evidence, which preponderates so strongly in favor of ἤδηγον,—including every cursive, and every ancient version but one, as well as one of the four oldest Greek manuscripts. But the reading speaks for itself: ἤλικος properly means "how great," "how much," "how large," — like quantus in Latin. In the language of irony, it may be employed, as many another word may be, to denote its opposite, and so mean "how small,"

"how little," as the satirist Lucian uses it in a single instance. But the Apostle James is not dealing in irony. Besides, it would hardly be possible for him to use ἤλικον and ἤλικον in opposite senses with only one word between the two, even if he were speaking ironically; much less could he do it while uttering plain, sober truth. If ἤλικον is the apostle's word, those who believe in "translating as far as possible the same Greek word by the same English word," should adhere to principle, and "faithfully" translate, "How much wood (or rather, How great a forest) is kindled by how much fire!" It is just as possible to render the words thus in English as it was for the Apostle James to have written the corresponding words in Greek. But he never wrote thus,—the two oldest Greek manuscripts to the contrary notwithstanding.

v. 20.

The reading, γνωσκετε, "know ye," alluded to in the margin as read by some in place of γνωσκετω, "let him know," is supported only by B, 31, 184, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions. The verb seems to have been changed to the second person plural in order to refer back to the introductory word of the previous verse, ὁδηγοῖ, "brethren," because of an apparent doubt about its reference as a verb in the third person singular,—whether to the one converted or to the one converting him. It has every appearance of being an altered reading. If it had been genuine, there is no probability that the third person would ever have been introduced or would have supplanted it. Though adopted by Westcott and Hort, it is really entitled to no notice.
The only documentary evidence in support of the first of these readings is a large number of cursive, among which is contained the whole New Testament. The δ of the Revised Text is attested by the seventh-century corrector of S, A, B, C, K, L, P, between fifty and sixty cursive s, a catena, the Vulgate and Armenian Versions, Didymus, Cyril, John Damascene, Theophylact, Ecumenius, Cyprian, and others. The original scribe of S, Codex 73, and the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions omit the relative. Constrained by documentary testimony, modern editors generally read δ instead of δ. Yet internal evidence compels us to believe, with Dr. Hort, that the former is a primitive error for δ, the force of which might be hidden by the interposition of καὶ ἕμας before ἀντίτυπον. . . . Both by sight and by sound the interchange of letters would be easy. 1 We cannot, however, regard the change as accidental. It seems, rather, to have originated as a correction, under a misapprehension of the reference intended by the relative. δ is evidently designed to refer to the preceding word, υδάς, "water"; whereas the original δ, as we understand it, relates to the preceding statement concerning the salvation of Noah and his family in the ark by means of water. After making

that statement, the apostle goes on to say, "Whose counterpart (literally, The antitype to which), baptism, doth now save you also, — not the putting away of filth from the flesh, but the request of a good conscience on God's behalf, — through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Eἰς Θεόν is not to be taken in the sense of "toward God," as is commonly done. It denotes the motive under which the ἐπερώτημα, the request to be baptized, is supposed to be made, — literally, "for God," i.e. on God's behalf, or on God's account, the sense in which the preposition is used in Rom. xvi. 26; 2 Cor. ii. 12; etc. It is done to obey and honor God. The last six words of the verse, of course, are to be taken with the first clause, as showing how baptism saves, — through faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which is symbolized and confessed in the act of baptism. The reading δ gives a strained and unnatural construction to ἀντίτυπον and βάπτισμα, as well as makes water indirectly a saving means; whereas δ makes a God-honoring desire to receive a divinely instituted ordinance in the exercise of faith in a buried and risen Saviour, which that ordinance symbolizes, the means of salvation.

1 Select Readings, p. 102.
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I PETER.

iii. 21.

Rec. T. δ ... ἀντίτυπον — the like figure whereunto.  
Rev. T. δ ... ἀντίτυπον — which ... after a true likeness.

In support of the received reading, we have S (its seventh-century corrector simply changing ἕμιν to Ἥμιν). A, K, L, P, nearly all the cursive s, the Memphitic Version, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, Didymus, Epiphanius twice, Athanasius four times, Basil, Cyril twice, Theodoret, Ps.-Athanasius, Augustine, and Jerome. This reading is confirmed by S first hand, 31, and a few other cursive s, the Peshito Syriac, Theophylact, and Ecumenius, which have ἅμιν, "you," instead of Ἥμιν, "us," — a reading which was probably introduced as an intended correction of Ἥμιν, because of the use of the
pronoun of the second person in the closely related clause that follows. The omission of "for us" appears in B, C, three cursives (one of them calling for the omission in the margin), the Vulgate, the Thebaic, Athanasius according to some manuscripts, Theodoret after having once given the full reading, John Damascene, ÓEcumenius in commenting on the passage, Augustine in other places than the fore-mentioned, Ambrose, and Fulgentius. This omission, however, is plainly due in part to what was considered the needlessness of the phrase, as it is not found in connection with the same words in the next clause, but more especially because of what was deemed the seeming impropriety of connecting pronouns of the first and second persons in the manner in which they are brought together here, — παθὸν τὸ ὑπὸ ἡμῶν σαρκὶ καὶ ἰμεῖς, Forasmuch as Christ "suffered for us in the flesh, do ye also," etc. If the expression were not genuine, it could hardly have got into the text in that shape, and become so generally accepted. The readings that differ from this plainly indicate a desire to rid the text, in one way or another, of an obnoxious phrase.

The marginal reading here, of ἄμαρτίας, "unto sins," in place of ἄμαρτες, "sin," appears in N as changed early in the seventh century, B, one cursive, and the Ethiopic Version. It is a very natural transcriptional error, resulting from the position of the word after πέσαυται, the writing of which seems to have left an impression that misled the scribe in writing this word. As far as we are aware, this false reading is adopted only by Westcott and Hort, among modern editors.

iv. 14.

The Revised Text and Version omit the closing words of this verse: "on their part indeed he is evil spoken of, but on your part he is glorified." This omission is favored by N, A, B, less than twenty cursives, some copies of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Erpenius' Arabic, and Tertullian. But the words are attested by K, L, P, by far the greater part of the cursives, three copies of the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Cyprian, Theophylact, and ÓEcumenius. The language is, to say the least, in perfect harmony with the context. It may even be said to be the necessary complement of the thought introduced in the former part of the verse. The words might very easily have been omitted by homoioteleuton. They form just three of the ordinary lines of an uncial manuscript, counting fourteen letters to a line. Let us suppose that a line began with ἔηα, the last four letters of ἀνάπαυ-ἐηα, which precedes this sentence. If the omitted words followed, they would fill out just three lines, and leave the same four letters, the last of the word δοξηζ-ἐηα to begin the third line below the first ἔηα. Now, in copying, the eye of the scribe, after he had written ἀνάπαυ, on returning to the exemplar, might very easily have rested on the lower instead of the upper ἔηα, and gone on from that, and so lost the intervening three lines. Such omissions appear again and again in all the old manuscripts. And this certainly looks very much like one of them. The words, however, have been widely preserved; and, instead of continuing to omit them, we should hold to them all the more firmly. Let us see how the verse reads with this clause attached: "If ye are reproached for the name of Christ (i.e. on the score of being Christians), ye are happy (i.e. ye are fortunate, it is a good thing, a blessed thing for you); for the spirit of glory and of God resteth upon you. On their part, it is true, he is blasphemed; but, as far as ye are concerned, he is glorified" by it. The particle μή, "indeed," should not be overlooked. It is equivalent to our concessive phrase, "it is true," — admitting the force of the statement with which it is connected, and at the same time adding weight by the contrast to the statement that follows. The sentence is just in the line of the apostle's argument, and cannot be omitted without detriment.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

V. 2.

Rec. T. ἐκονώς, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς — willingly; not for filthy lucre.  
Rev. T. ἐκονώς κατὰ Θεόν, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς — willingly, according unto God; nor yet for filthy lucre.

The omission of κατὰ Θεόν in the Received Text is according to B, K, L, most of the cursive, a catena, the Peshito Syriac, Mai's Extracts, Ecumenius, and others. Its presence is attested by Ξ, A, P, about twenty cursive, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Antiochus, and Theophylact. The former reading is followed by Griesbach, Alford, Westcott and Hort, and others; the latter, by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and the Revisers. But κατὰ Θεόν is a transparent gloss, originally written on the margin, in explanation of ἐκονώς, — showing that this was understood to mean "according to God's will." Afterwards, it was introduced into the text, generally as the Revisers have it. Some, however, placed it after προθυμοῖς, "cheerfully," or, "of a ready mind." Others inserted other words also, in connection with it, at the close of the verse.

Ἐπισκοπῆτες, "exercising the oversight," which is referred to in the marginal note, is omitted by Ξ, B, two cursive, and three or four Fathers only. Of these, the testimony of the two uncials is all that carries any weight; and of these two witnesses, B omits verse 3 also. Until we can see some good reason for this latter omission, in which B stands alone, we can have very little confidence in the testimony of that document here, even though attended by half a dozen other witnesses, against a word which is all but overwhelmingly attested, if not plainly demanded by the context.

I JOHN.

i. 4.

Rec. T. ταῦτα γράφομεν ὑμῖν, ἵνα ἥ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ἡ πιπληρωμενή. —  
these things we write we unto you, that your joy may be full.

Rev. T. ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμῖν, ἵνα ἥ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ἡ πιπληρωμενή. —  
these things we write, that our joy may be fulfilled.

In support of the Revisers' emphatic ἡμῖν, we have Ξ, A first hand, B, P, 13, one manuscript of the Vulgate (though this is afterwards changed), and the Thebaic Version. The corresponding ὑμῖν of the Received Text is attested by A as afterwards corrected, C, K, L, every cursive save one, a catena, the Vulgate, both Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Theophylact, and Ecumenius. No doubt, the former is the harder of these readings; but its hardness is of an unreasonable kind. For there is no call whatever for an emphatic "we" here, as if some one else, whose words, perhaps, needed confuting or confirming, had been writing to those to whom the epistle was addressed. This pronoun is not introduced in any of the preceding verses, not even in connection with the verbs in the first verse, where the writer might appropriately have said, "which we ourselves have heard," if no more. The reading, doubtless, resulted from carelessly mistaking ἙΜΕΙΝ for ἙΜΕΙC. This would readily, and, if there had been any indistinctness in the copy, all the more readily, have occurred just after the scribe had written γράφομεν, we "write," — the word being taken as the subject of that verb. — In the other case, the common reading, "your joy," is attested by A, C, K, P, most of the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian,
the Ethiopic, Augustine, and Theophylact and Óecumenius in their citations of the text. The reading “our joy” is attested by Ξ, B, L, less than thirty cursives, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the ‘Thebaic, Erpenius’ Arabic, and Theophylact and Óecumenius in commenting on the passage. (The Peshito Syriac and Erpenius’ Arabic also add ἐν ἡμῖν, making the apostle say “that our joy in you may be full.”) This reading is simply an itacism, naturally resulting from the previous verb, “we write,”—some having afterwards thought it necessary, in order to make the meaning clear, to supplement it by adding “in you.” Such a reading misrepresents the true end the writer had in view as indicated by the clause introduced by ἢνα, however true it might be that his own joy would be increased as a result of his writing. Indeed, such an utterance as “that our (my) joy may be full” could hardly have proceeded from the pen of one who thought more of imparting joy to others than of being filled with joy himself,—a lesson which he had many years before, according to his own record, learned from the lips of his blessed Master: “These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full.” John xv. 11. That “your joy” is the true reading here, appears from the fact that the clause in which it stands follows on naturally as a fuller statement of the apostle’s meaning in verse 3: “What we have seen and heard, declare we unto you, that ye also may have fellowship with us”; “and these things we write unto you, that your joy may be full.” It corresponds with the whole tenor of the epistle: “These things write I unto you, that ye sin not”; ii. 1. “I write unto you, fathers, because ye have known him ... unto you, young men, because ye have overcome ... unto you, little children, because ye have known” etc. ii. 13, 14, 21. “These things have I written unto you ... that ye may know” etc. It is on their account, for their benefit, for their rejoicing, not on his own account or for his own greater joy, that he writes. The obvious purpose of the epistle was to impart a fulness of joy to its readers. When the apostle himself assures us of this, we do him great injustice to give heed to fallible and fallacious documents, however innocent they may be in their misrepresentations, rather than to his own repeated declarations and the necessary conclusions that follow from them.

iii. 5.

Rec. T. ἢνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἀφίη — to take away our sins.
Rev. T. ἢνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀφίη — to take away sins.

The reading of the Received Text is attested by Ξ, C, K, L, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the ‘Thebaic, Athanasius, Theophylact, and Óecumenius. The other is the reading of A, B, P, five or six cursives, five manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Tertullian, Fulgentius, and other Latin Fathers. If the reading were “to take away sin,” we should expect the omission of the pronoun. And so Augustine writes the word here — peccatum — without the pronoun. But it is not John’s habit to use the plural “sins” without a limiting word. See John viii. 24, xx. 23, 1 John i. 9, ii. 2, 12, iv. 10, Rev. i. 5, xviii. 4, 5. Aside from the present verse, these are all the passages, except John ix. 34, in which he uses the word in the plural; and in this last, the language is not his, but that of others. The documentary evidence for the pronoun leads us to believe it to be genuine; and when we couple with this the fact that the apostle again and again employs this pronoun to denote believers in general, we need not hesitate about accepting it as such. It is in perfect accordance with his usual mode of speaking, while the phrasing, “to take away sins,” without any limiting adjunct, is not his way of expressing himself at all. The omission seems to be due, if not to oversight, to a desire to generalize the thought, as if the pronoun limited the meaning of “sins” to the apostle and his readers.
little too taut, and that very possibly he had brought the matter too near home for his own satisfaction, desired to tone down the thought. Hence the offensive expression was erased, and a comparatively pointless but orthodox generality made to take its place. That such was actually the case, we are satisfied by a reference to the next sentence as it reads in B, one of the witnesses in favor of this depraved reading. That sentence, in only that one manuscript, reads, “Every one that hateth his own [ἀνήρ οὗτος] is a murderer.” To retain the expression as the apostle wrote it seemed to our ancient critic to be too comprehensive. But to cut out the words “his brother” here, — “He that hateth, is a murderer,” — would make the sentence still more sweeping. Hence the substitution of “his own” for “his,” — making the apostle say, “Every one that hateth his own brother, his own mother’s son, is a murderer,” — leaving the reader to console himself with the thought that he may possibly hate some brother Christian, and yet not be a murderer. The omission of “his brother” in verse 14, and this change in B, of “his” to “his own,” in verse 15, are evidently the work of the same hand, though the former was less palpable, and so became a comparatively widespread reading, while the latter scarcely went beyond its originator.

iv. 20.

Rec. T. πώς δύναται ἀγαπᾶν; — how can he love?
Rev. T. οὐ δύναται ἀγαπᾶν. — cannot love.

The first of these readings is supported by A, K, L, nearly all the cursive, a catena, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, John Damascus, Theophylact, Ecumenius, Cyril, and Augustine. The second is attested by N, B, six cursive (one of them by a second hand), the Thebaic and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and Lucifer. We see no reason why this should supersede the common reading. It is simply an early attempt to improve
upon the apostle's way of expressing himself. In iii. 17, he shows how he prefers to word his own thoughts: "Whoso hath this world's goods, etc., . . . how dwelleth the love of God in him?" Instead of this last clause, he might have said, "the love of God dwelleth not in him." But he did not. In his Gospel also this interrogative form of speech appears about ten times instead of a simple negative declaration. And, though it occurs in language attributed to others, it was one of John's peculiar ways of writing. Hence, though he might have written "he cannot love God," his usus loquendi leads us to believe that he did not do it, but that he expressed himself more forcibly, and said, "how can he love God?"—leaving the question to answer itself. If the Revisers' reading had been the original reading, probably no one would have thought of changing it.

v. 7.

This verse is omitted by the Revisers without comment. It is now generally regarded by critical scholars as an interpolation. The only Greek manuscripts in which it is found are Codices 34 of the Acts and Catholic Epistles, a fifteenth or sixteenth century cursive; 110, a sixteenth-century manuscript of the whole New Testament, but of no authority whatever, it being merely a copy of the Greek text of the Complutensian Polyglot; and 162 (of the Acts) of the fifteenth century. Besides these, 173 (Acts), an eleventh-century manuscript, has the omitted passage in the margin by a recent hand. The only versions that really support it are the Latin; and these are by no means united. The words seem to have been placed originally in the margin of an African copy of the Latin Version as a gloss on verse 8, whence they afterward crept into the text of other copies, and from them into two or three of the latest of the Greek manuscripts. They cannot be successfully defended as a part of the original text.

1 Scrivener, after speaking of "the fact that autov is corrected into ev autov by the original scribe," — Introduction, p. 655, — adds in a footnote, "So it seems to me after careful inspection of Codex A." This statement, from one so thoroughly versed in the reading of New-Testament manuscripts, may be regarded as altogether trustworthy.
is also Westcott and Hort's reading. But in verse 12, these editors read αὐρως (with the rough breathing), following the spelling of Ν, B, L, T, and a few cursive. (It might be said in passing, that Codex L, as well as Δ, is very much given to writing the word in this abridged form, often standing alone in doing it.) In Luke xxiv. 12, B, L read αὐρων (Westcott and Hort αὐρων), where all others read εαυρων. In John ii. 24, there is a strange confusion, and intermixture of readings. While the great majority of witnesses, including Origen twice, and Cyril, as well as Ν third hand, and A second hand, read εαυρων εαυρως, i.e. Jesus did not trust “himself to them,” Ν first hand, B, L, one cursive, Origen once, and Cyril once, read αυρων (which Westcott and Hort make αυρων) αυρως, but A and Codex 253 read αυρων εαυρως, i.e. “him to themselves,” — completely reversing things. In John xx. 10, Ν first hand, B, L, read αυρων (Westcott and Hort αυρως), where all the other fifteen uncial, together with Ν as corrected early in the seventh century, every cursive, Chrysostom, and Cyril read εαυρως. (Compare Note on John xiii. 32.) We might fill pages with additional examples from the older manuscripts of these departures from general later usage. But, we presume, we have already given enough to satisfy any candid reader that, though the scribes of B and other ancient manuscripts may have written αυρων, αυρων, αυρως, etc., we are not necessarily to understand them as having written the personal pronoun. The earlier manuscripts are generally without accents and breathings. And these forms, from being often written ἐφ' αυρων, μεθ' αυρων, etc., as well as from the connection in which they stand, indicate clearly that they were pronounced with the aspirate, and employed as the abbreviated forms of the reflexive. This is true of the reading αυρων, as Westcott and Hort give it, in the tenth verse of this chapter, which the Revisers write αυρων, and translate “him.” It is simply the shorter form of writing the εαυρων which they have rejected, though the latter is well attested, especially by ancient versions, which render it by the reflexive "himself." So in the verse before us; the word is not αυρων, but αυρων. The reading εαυρων, the testimony for which far exceeds that in favor of the abbreviated form, is no doubt the true reading, and should be retained, as it is by the American portion of the Revisers. This reading harmonizes perfectly with Scripture teachings elsewhere. With this reading, all the supposed difficulties, as well as the fanciful and contradictory interpretations of the verse disappear. These interpretations; at best, are mere expedients by which to explain and bolster up, if possible, a false text, and are all unsatisfactory because not founded on the truth. One of these fanciful readings is, “Whosoever is born of God sinneth not; but the begotten (i.e. the only-begotten Son) of God keepeth him; and the evil one toucheth him not.” Another is, “He that hath been begotten of God, it keepeth him”; i.e. the fact that one has been born of God preserves him that is regenerated. This, in substance, is the rendering of the Vulgate, and the interpretation of the Latin Fathers. But the Greek text gives no countenance to such a view. Another interpretation is, “He that has been begotten of God (i.e. a regenerate person) keepeth him (i.e. keepeth God, keeps him in constant, living union with himself); and the evil one toucheth him not”; i.e. does not touch God, and by not being able to touch God, does not touch his children. Another view, differing from this last only in the latter part of the verse, is, that the evil one toucheth not the regenerate person,—the “him” after “toucheth” being referred, not to God, but to the person who keeps God in union with himself. But the idea of our keeping God is hardly scriptural. On the contrary, it is God that keeps us, not we that keep him. (Compare Psa. xli. 1, 2; xcvi. 10; cxxi. 3-8; Prov. xxiv. 12; Isa. xxvii. 3; John xvii. 11, 15.) Of himself, the Saviour says (John x. 11), “I am the good Shepherd”; and a shepherd, we all know, is a keeper of sheep,—those whom the good Shepherd keeps being the sheep of God's pasture. The Saviour himself says of his disciples (John xvii.
I kept them in thy name.” But, however true it is that the Saviour is, in the highest sense of the word, the keeper, the guardian, the preserver of the redeemed, the idea that ὁ γεννηθεὶς here denotes the Son of God is an unwarranted one. It is the term ὁ μονογενὴς, “the only-begotten,” that is so often applied to Christ. John uses it in only the preceding chapter, verse 9; and, if his reference here had been to Christ, he would unquestionably have used the words ὁ μονογενὴς πῶς, “the only-begotten Son.” In Gal. iv. 29, ὁ γεννηθεὶς, “he that was born,” is used in connection with the phrase “after the flesh,” concerning Ishmael. Here, in connection with the phrase “of God,” it is used, plainly enough, of a regenerate person, one “born of God,” as in iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1, 4, and in this very verse, in the words, ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ, “he that hath been born of God.” The only difference between the two is that, in the original, the one participle is in the perfect, and as such refers to the life of the regenerate person subsequent to his regeneration; while the other, the aorist participle, points more especially back to the time of his regeneration. No such distinction, however, can be made in the English rendering. Nor is it essential, as the two mean the same thing. What we need in order to see the apostle’s real meaning, is to translate the verse correctly, if possible, in every particular. We will offer first a translation, then say a few words in regard to certain points connected with it. “We know that no one that is born of God sinneth; yea, he that hath been born of God keepeth himself, and the evil one harmeth him not.” The verse consists of two parts. The first is a general statement: “We know that no one that is born of God sinneth.” This is only repeating what the apostle had already said in iii. 9. His reference is solely to the new man, the divine nature implanted in man at his regeneration. This, being a nature begotten of God, is holy; in its bent, desires, purposes, aims, and acts, it sinneth not. It is a principle of holiness as well as life. The rest of the verse presents only another phase of the same thought. It is introduced by ἀλλά. This, however, is not adversative in meaning here. There is no opposition in thought between the sentence it introduces and the one preceding. On the contrary, it enfoces and confirms the same truth. Hence ἀλλά needs to be translated “yea,” as in John xvi. 2, 2 Cor. iii. 15, Phil. ii. 17, and a number of other places: “Yea, he keepeth himself,” i.e. from sin. This holy principle, the new and divine nature in the regenerate, has no affinity for sin; on the contrary, it repels it, and so keeps the evil one at a distance. In verse 4 of this very chapter, the apostle speaks of the offspring of this divine birth, not as a person, but as a principle, a thing: “Whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world.” This includes not only the germ of holiness implanted and quickened into being by the Spirit through the truth, but the faith, the love for divine things, the new hope in reference to God and eternal objects, the spirit of forgiveness, of patient endurance of wrong, and every spiritual grace conferred upon the regenerate. These constitute the new man, the Christ that is formed in us; and this new creation keepeth itself. But the apostle, viewing the man himself as under the dominant power of this holy principle, very naturally speaks of him as “keeping himself.” The Apostle Paul expresses the same truth in 1 Tim. v. 22, in a hortatory form, “Keep thyself pure.” The Apostle James also (i. 27) speaks of the child of God as “keeping himself unspotted from the world.” Jude, too (verse 21), says, “Keep yourselves in the love of God.” And John himself concludes his epistle with saying, “Little children, keep yourselves from idols.”
2 JOHN.

Verse 8.

Rec. T. ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσητε ἡ ἑργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ . . . ἀπολάβωμεν. — that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive [a full reward].

Rev. T. ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τε ἡ ἑργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ . . . ἀπολάβητε. — that ye lose not the things which we have wrought, but that ye receive [a full reward].

In support of the first of these readings, we have K, L, P, 31, most of the other cursives, and Theophylact and ÓCumenius in their quotations from the text. The second is the reading attested by B and the Thebaic Version only,— that adopted by Westcott and Hort. There is also a third reading, with all the verbs in the second person; namely, See “that we lose not what ye have wrought out (or obtained by working), but that ye receive a full reward.” This is attested by Ν, A, ten cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, Lucifer, Isidore of Pelusium, John Damascene, and others; while Theophylact and ÓCumenius in their commentaries refer to it as the reading of some. The weight of evidence, both internal and external, is decidedly against both the common and the revised reading, and calls for this third reading, which is that of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles in his text, the Revisers in their margin, and which is adopted by the best modern commentators.

J U D E.

Verse 22.

Rec. T. καὶ οὗς μὲν ἔλεητε διακρινόμενοι, — And of some have compassion, making a difference.

Rev. T. καὶ οὗς μὲν ἔλητε διακρινόμενοι, — And on some have mercy, who are in doubt.

The text of this and the following verse in the old manuscripts is in a sad state of confusion, so that it is by no means easy to determine what the true reading is. It seems clear, however, that there are three classes of persons spoken of in these verses, as the R. V. indicates, and not two only, as the A. V. would lead one to suppose. The presenting of but two classes by the latter is due, as will soon be seen, to the omission of certain words in verse 23. In attestation of the nominative διακρινόμενοι, in the verse before us, we have K, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, Theophylact and ÓCumenius, each in citing the text. The accusative of the Revised Text is the reading of Ν, A, B, C, nearly twenty cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, Clement, Ephraem Syrus, Jerome of course, Cassiodorus, and Theophylact and ÓCumenius in their comments on the passage. The nominative, therefore, has no support from external evidence of the earliest date. It will be observed, however, that in verse 23 the adjuncts ἀφτάωντες, “snatching,” or “pulling,” and μυτοῦντες, “hating,” are in the nominative, and refer, not to the objects, but to the subjects, of the preceding verbs. This leads us to conclude that the author of the epistle probably wrote the nominative here, as in the following instances, giving direction thereby how those whom he is addressing should per-
form the duty enjoined upon them. On account of the early corruption of the text, it is not to be wondered at if, in the ignorance or uncertainty that existed concerning the writer's meaning, a false reading became more prevalent than the true one. — Now, respecting the other word, ἐκκεῖτε, or, as the Revised Text has it, ἐκκατεῖτε, it is very questionable whether this is really the right word here. The American Revisers say, in a marginal note, “Some ancient authorities read, And some refute,” instead of, “And on some have compassion.” That is, ἐκκατεῖτε appears instead of ἐκκεῖτε in A, C first hand, nearly twenty cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Ephraem Syrus, Cassiodorus, Theophylact and Eusebius in their commentaries, as well as in Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, and an early scholiast. Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Alford adopt this as the true reading, as does Huther also; and Tregelles gives it the preference. The objection to it is that, on account of the presence of ἐκκεῖτε in the next verse as well as here, some early corrector of the text may be supposed to have substituted ἐκκατεῖτε for it in this place, while some other corrector, retaining ἐκκεῖτε here, omitted it in verse 23. But this is only an objection in appearance. Let us assume that ἐκκατεῖτε is the original reading here, and ἐκκεῖτε or ἐκκατεῖτε in the next verse, and only there. Let us now suppose, what is perfectly supposable, and by no means improbable, that, in an early exemplar from which a scribe was copying, a line ended with ἐκκεῖτε, the first part of ἐκκατεῖτε, and that the fourth line after this also ended with the same letters, being in this case the first three letters of the other word. (The intermediate fifty-five letters would make just four lines.) A copyist, having reached the end of the first of these lines, on returning to his exemplar, might have glanced at the lower line, then hastily passed to the left side of the page or column he was copying from for the rest of the word, and carelessly finished it off with ἐκκεῖτε or ἐκκατεῖτε, instead of γεῖτε; then, returning to his proper place without observing his error, he would have gone on with the next word, διακρινόμενον. This will account for the omission of ἐκκατεῖτε, and the appearance in its place of ἐκκεῖτε. After the latter word had obtained currency, some one, naturally objecting to its two-fold appearance, omitted it, with two or three other words, from the next verse, and so gave rise to the reading of the Received Text. The reading ἐκκατεῖτε is certainly well supported, especially by early versions and patristic testimony. It is also clearly called for on internal grounds. It presents to us not only three different classes of persons to be dealt with, but three different modes of dealing with them. Adopting it, therefore, in place of either the received or the revised reading, and reading instead καὶ οὐς μὲν ἐκκατεῖτε διακρινόμενον, we have what seems to be, as far as we can ascertain from the confused state of the documents, the writer's thought in these two verses. He is exhorting his readers respecting the course they should pursue in reference to those members of the church who had been and still were more or less under the influence of false teachers. And he says: “And some put to shame by confuting them; but others save by plucking them out of the fire; and others deal compassionately with, in fear, abhoring even the garment contaminated by the flesh.”
REVELATION.

i. 5.

In the familiar clause, "and washed us from our sins in his own blood," the word λοίςαντι, "washed," is set aside by the Revisers, and λυσαντι, "loosed," inserted instead, with the marginal note, that many authorities, some ancient, read, "washed." This familiar reading is attested by B, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, both forms of the Ethiopic, Andreas, and Arethas. The other is the reading of A, C, ten or more cursives, the Syriac and Armenian Versions, and Prima
tius. The Revisers are doubtless right in making the change. When we consider that "the blood of Christ" is only another way of saying "the death of Christ," there is no difficulty in seeing that the apostle must have written "and loosed us from our sins by his blood." i.e. set us free, or opened the way for our deliverance, from sin by laying down his life. The same idea in a slightly varied form is presented in v. 9: "Thou wast slain, and didst redeem us unto God with thy blood out of every tribe," etc. But some early reader, probably having vii. 14 in mind, and possibly i. John i. 7, took the preposition in its primary sense of "in," instead of considering it the accompa
niment of an instrumental dative, in the sense of "by" or "with," and naturally enough considered λυσαντι, "loosed," an error for λοίςαντι, "washed," and so changed the original reading. But the revised reading is in perfect accord with Acts xx. 28, Eph. i. 7, ii. 13, i. Pet. i. 18, 19, and other passages.
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ii. 1.

Rec. T. Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς Ἐφεσίως ἐκκλησίας — Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus.

Rev. T. Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίᾳ — To the angel of the church in Ephesus.

The Revisers' reading of the second article, though attested by A and C, — and these are the only known ancient witnesses for it, — is simply a stupid mechanical repetition of the dative form preceding. If it means anything, it is not what the R. V.
THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT.

gives us, but "Unto the angel that is in Ephesus, concerning the church," write. The true reading is τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας, "of the church in Ephesus," — corresponding to the addresses to the other churches, and attested by N, B, P, all the cursive, the Armenian Version, Andreas, and Arethas. The same blundering scribe probably changed the text in the same way in verse 8, — "To the angel that is in Smyrna." The same change was also attempted in verse 18, and is preserved to us in Codex A, the leading "authority" that we have for this false reading in this first verse, and the only one for it in verse 8. The Revelator's form of address was one and the same to all the seven churches. And so, Tischendorf and others give it.

Rec. T. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐν αἷς Ἀντίπας ἐδέματε μου ἀ πιστός, — in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr.

Rev. T. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας ἐδέματε μου ἀ πιστός μου, — in the days of Antipas, my witness, my faithful one.

The reading, ἐν αἷς, of the Received Text, is attested by the earlier seventh-century emendator of N, P, eight or ten cursive, the Armenian Version, Andreas, and Arethas. It is also favored by the reading ἀῖς without the preposition, found in B, more than forty cursive, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Syrac Version, both forms of the Ethiopic, and the fourth-century treatise, Questiones ex utroque Testamento. The ἐν αἷς, or possibly the simple ἀῖς, was early lost from some copies in consequence of the preceding ἡμέραις, having the same ending, — a case of homoioteleuton. The revised reading is that of A, C, the Vulgate, the Memphitic Version, and Bishop Haymio, of the ninth century. The Clementine Vulgate, two of the three Leipsic copies of the Apocalypse in Latin, and Primasius, read "in those days," without in quibus, "in which," following. The Revisers say in the margin that the Greek text here "is somewhat uncertain." That is, if we understand the note, they

are themselves in doubt whether the revised text is the true text. And no wonder; for, after having omitted αῖς, which is essential to the construction and is also well attested, they found it necessary to represent the nominative Ἀντίπας in English as a genitive by translating it "of Antipas," — to say nothing of the insertion of μοῦ after πιστός, which, though found in A, C, and two cursive, is wanting in Ν, the oldest of all the manuscripts, as well as in B, P, nearly every cursive, the Vulgate, Memphitic, and Ethiopic Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Primasius, and others. A and C certainly are not infallible, as we have already seen from their attestation of "the meaningless error," πεποιθησθεῖσι, in i. 15. Not only is the received reading the correct one here, but it is sufficiently attested as such to be more safely accepted than rejected, especially when, by rejecting it, we make an incoherent text, which it is impossible to believe to be genuine, or to translate.

Rec. T. οὐ . . . εὐρηκά σου τὰ ἔργα — I have not found thy works.

Rev. T. οὐ . . . εὐρηκά σου ἔργα — I have found no works of thine.

In connection with this revised rendering is the note that many ancient authorities read, "I have not found thy works."
That is, they present the received reading, adopted by Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others. This commonly accepted reading is attested by Σ, B, P, nearly every cursive, the versions generally, Andreas, and Arethas. The other, which is adopted by Lachmann and Westcott and Hort, as well as the Revisers, is the reading of A, C, and the margin of Codex I, a twelfth-century cursive. It is plainly an attempt to make the apostle's language more definite. The phrase σου τὰ ἔργα, "thy works," which appears, also, in the preceding verse, and wherever else in the Apocalypse σοῦ is coupled with ἔργα, was considered too general an expression, and forming an unsuitable subject for the accompanying predication. Hence the omission of τὰ to render the statement more explicit. But the omission is too feebly attested to be allowed to set aside what is well known to be a genuine form of speech with the apostle.

iv. 1, 7, 8; v. 6.

The received readings, λέγουσα, ἔχων, λέγοντα, etc., found in these verses and elsewhere, are undoubtedly critical emendations to make the participle correspond in gender with the nouns with which they are construed, as φωνήν, ἔχων, ἀρνίων, ἔσω, etc. Whereas, the readings, λέγων, ἕχων, λέγοντες, etc., which the Revisers have substituted instead, while not in grammatical accord with the nouns with which they are to be taken, are the genuine readings, given in the masculine rather than the feminine or the neuter, on account of their being referred by the writer himself to the intelligences symbolized by the feminine or neuter nouns employed,—their hidden meaning rather than their grammatical character governing the writer's thought and pen. This is the only way of accounting for these apparently anomalous forms, which cannot reasonably be attributed to error on the part of transcribers, or to emendation on the part of critics. The following are also examples of the same nature. Chapter v. 12, δόξος . . . τὸ ἄρνιον (Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort in the margin, but not the Revisers, after Codex A); xi. 4, λυχνίας . . . ἐστῶτες, symbolizing the teachers and the receivers of the truth; xi. 15, φωναὶ . . . λέγοντες, the "voices" representing the angelic hosts of heaven; xiv. 19, τὴν λαμπάν . . . τὸν μέγαν (Tischendorf, Lachmann, Tregelles in the text, and Westcott and Hort, after A, B, C, P, more than twenty cursives, and Arethas, but not adopted by the Revisers), symbolizing those whom God employs as instruments in carrying out his purpose; xxi. 14, τὸ τείχος . . . ἔχων, the wall being a part of the holy city symbolizing the bride, the Lamb's wife, or the risen and glorified saints. Quite analogous to these, and to be accounted for in the same way, is the combination τῷ θερίῳ (neuter) δὲ, "the beast who," xiii. 14,—that beast symbolizing a body of tyrannical rulers.

v. 9.

Rec. T. ἡγοράσας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἰματι σου—thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.

Rev. T. ἡγοράσας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἰματι σου—thou didst purchase unto God by thy blood men.

The former reading is attested by Σ, B, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions, Hippolytus, Cyprian, Augustine, Fulgentius, Andreas, Haymo, Arethas, Primasius, and others. In some of these, however, τῷ Θεῷ follows ἡμᾶς instead of preceding it, while in others it is altogether wanting. This is simply due to the fact that τῷ Θεῷ was omitted by one of the ancient scribes in copying, as several documents still attest, and that in restoring it to the text it was misplaced,—having been inserted after instead of before ἡμᾶς. This, however, does not militate in the least against the genuineness of ἡμᾶς. The Revisers' reading, which omits ἡμᾶς, is attested only by A and the Ethiopic Version; while the eleventh-century cursive 44 has ἡμῶν ("to our God") in place of ἡμᾶς. (This, however, may be merely a transcrip-
tional error.) The word was no doubt omitted on account of the αιτοῦν, “them,” in the next verse, with which “us” was supposed to be inconsistent; and at the same time, βασιλεύουντι, “we shall reign,” in verse 10, which is demanded both by ημᾶς here, and by the closing words of iv. 1, was changed to βασιλεύουντι, “they shall reign,” which Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others adopt, and afterwards to βασιλεύουντι, “they reign,” which Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, and the Revisers adopt. That “us” is a proper reading is seen in the fact that the song in which it occurs was shared by “the four-and-twenty elders,” who represent redeemed and glorified saints; while “them,” in the tenth verse, is not inappropriate as referring to the same persons, after they have been spoken of as redeemed “out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation,” — the words “and madest them” being equivalent to “whom thou didst make,” if expressed in idiomatic English. This would perhaps be the best rendering for και αὐτοῦς here, as the Revisers themselves have translated these words in Mark i. 19. (Compare, also, Note on Mark i. 19, in The Revisers’ English Text.) The two verses would then read, “And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art thou to take the book, and to open its seals, for thou wast slain, and didst redeem us unto God by thy blood out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation; whom thou didst make to be to our God kings and priests; and they shall reign upon the earth.”

vi. 1.

The Revisers’ rendering, “as with a voice of thunder,” does not indicate that the corresponding Greek word in their text is φωνῇ, — a nominative. This rendering of the nominative is justifiable in Acts xix. 34; but here “with a voice” can only be a legitimate rendering for the dative φωνῇ, — there being nothing in the context to make it an allowable rendering for the nominative. Some of the later documents give the form φωνῇ; but the older ones are without either accents, or the iota whether ascript or subscript. Even the cursive manuscripts generally either omit this iota entirely, or pay but little attention to its insertion, far more frequently omitting it than inserting it. This may account for the want of “authority” not only for φωνῇ here, but for γῆ in Matt. ii. 6. The earliest known manuscript of the New Testament that contains an ι subscript dates from the latter half of the twelfth century. In view of all which, it seems to us perfectly justifiable, because demanded by the context, to write φωνῇ here. (Compare viii. 13.)

vi. 17.

Rec. T. ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν, — the great day of their wrath.

Rev. T. ἡ ἡμέρα ἡ μεγάλη τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτῶν, — the great day of their wrath.

The singular form of the pronoun in this verse is vouched for by A, B, P, every known cursive but one, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, the four forms of Andreas’ Commentary, Arethas, and Primasius. The plural, adopted by the Revisers, is given by N, C, one cursive, the Vulgate and Syriac Versions, the author of the fourth-century work De Promissionibus Dimid. Temporis, Fulgentius, Haymo, and some others. The documentary evidence is thus divided, with an apparent preponderance in favor of the common reading. The expression “their wrath” of course means the wrath of “him that sitteth upon the throne,” as well as that of the Lamb, just mentioned. But the reference of the writer seems to be to the immediately preceding statement concerning “the wrath of the Lamb” only. It looks as if some early reviser had changed “his” to “their,” because the general New-Testament phraseology speaks of the divine wrath as the wrath of God; which

1 John iii. 36; Rom. i. 18, ix. 22, xii. 19, impliedly; Eph. v. 6; Col. iii. 6; Heb. iii. 11, iv. 3; Rev. xi. 18, xvi. 19, xix. 15.
he would include with the wrath of the Lamb here. In verse
16, however, men are represented as crying to be hidden from
the face of God and from the wrath of the Lamb, as two
distinct things. Then, as a reason why they desire to escape
from the latter, it is added, "because the great day of his
wrath is come." This is natural, and just what the author
might be supposed to have written. It is also favored by the
documentary evidence, and is accepted as the true reading
by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf in his seventh edition
(though in his eighth he abandons it for the reading of his
favorite Sinaitic Codex), and by most modern commentators.

xi. 5.

Rec. T. εἰ τις αὐτοῦς θλη ἀδικήσαι, — if any man will hurt them.
Rev. T. εἰ τις θελήσῃ αὐτοῦς ἀδικήσαι, — if any man shall desire to
hurt them.

The common reading θλη is almost without support. The
revised θελήσῃ is the reading of Χ and A only. The true
reading seems to be θλες, the reading of B, C, P, nearly all the
cursives, Andreas, Arethas, and Primasius. It is the true read-
ing in the first clause of the verse, as admitted by the Revisers;
and there is no reason why they should not have employed the
same form here. It would have been unnatural for the apostle to
have framed the two clauses differently for no apparent reason.
Some critical reader or careless copyist must have mistaken the
meaning, and changed the language. But the original text is
abundantly supported. θλες should be read in both clauses
of the verse, with its corresponding English, "purposeth," or
"desireth." Then, if καί is, as it seems to be, intended to
emphasize what follows, it should be rendered "yea," as the
Revisers have rendered it, for example, in John xvi. 32. The
verse, properly translated, would then be, "And if any one
desireth to hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and
devoureth their enemies; yea, if any one desireth to hurt them,
thus must he be destroyed;" i.e. not in any ordinary way, but
by their fearless, truthful utterances. The language is symbolic.

xi. 8, 9.

Rec. T. τα πτώματα αὐτῶν . . . τα πτώματα αὐτῶν . . . τα πτώ-
ματα αὐτῶν — their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies . . . their
dead bodies.

Rev. T. τα πτώμα αὐτῶν . . . τα πτώμα αὐτῶν . . . τα πτώματα
αὐτῶν — their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies . . . their
dead bodies.

To the first two of these renderings in the Revised Version
is attached the marginal note "Gr. carcase"; that is to say,
the corresponding Greek in the Revisers' Text in those two
instances is in the singular, and denotes a corpse, a dead body,
not corpses or dead bodies. In the third instance, it will be
observed, their reading corresponds with that of the received
text. It is in the plural. This plural is attested as genuine by
all the documents, with the single exception of Cursive 14,
which reads τῶν σῶματα, "body," and one manuscript of Andreas,
which has τὰ σῶματα, "bodies" (probably a transcriptional
error), while all his other manuscripts read τὰ πτώματα. The
received reading, aside from this, is attested, in the first instance
in which the word occurs, by Χ, P, ten or twelve cursives, the
Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Andreas, Victorinus, Primasius,
and others; in the second instance, by the same witnesses
except Χ, one manuscript of Andreas, and Victorinus. The
singular form, given in the Revised Text, is attested, in the first
instance, by A, B, C, thirty-five cursives, the Memphitic, Arme-
nian, and Egyptian Versions, Arethas, and others; in the
second, by the same witnesses, together with Χ and one manu-
script of Andreas. But this reading is palpably false, and by
no means inexplicable. We say palpably false; for no sane
person, speaking of the remains of these or any other witnesses,
in penning only forty-five words, would twice mention those
remains as a corpse, and immediately after as corpses. The
Revisers themselves find it impossible to do it. Notwithstand-
ing their Greek text, which is supposed to present the original, God-given language of the Revelator, they reject it, and say successively, with King James's Revisers, "their dead bodies." Why, then, should they have adopted that text? Simply because of devotion to manuscript "authority" on the part of a few of their number. It was not because that text was essential to a revision of the English text. It was not because it is incredible that John could have done otherwise than twice speak of two (or more) dead bodies as one, then the third time express himself in regard to them as the rest of mankind would; as their English Version plainly indicates. It was not because the Greek singular το πτώμα αυτών means "their dead bodies," as if it could be taken collectively, with De Wette, to mean "that which has fallen of them"; i.e. their corpses—a use of the word altogether unwarranted and unwarrantable. It was not that the plural form might be interpreted as meaning that each of the witnesses had more than one body or one corpse, as one would naturally interpret the words "their ears" in the clause "Their ears are dull of hearing"; any more than one might possibly interpret in a similar manner the expression "their consciences" in such a phrase as "being convicted by their consciences." Nor was it because there is no evidence that John wrote the plural in each of these three instances. It was simply owing to undue deference to the testimony of fallible and depraved documents. Textual critics have been too ready to say that the correction of the singular into the plural shows that offence was taken at the singular. But the truth is, strange as it may seem, no such offence was ever taken. The "correction" so-called, that is, the change which the genuine text has undergone, has been wholly the other way: offence was taken at the plural. The witnesses, whose dead bodies are spoken of, are represented in verse 4 as olive-trees and candlesticks. To some ancient critic, who took πτωμα in its primary sense of "a fall," the sense in which the word is perhaps most commonly used by classical writers, the thought of "the corpses" of olive-
trees and candlesticks, no doubt, seemed absurd, the obvious result of a misunderstanding of the apostle's meaning. Then, in order to restore what he considered the original text, he changed the plural to the singular, making the apostle say, "And their fall shall be on (or in) the street of the great city," etc., and . . . "nations shall witness (or behold) their fall (or defeat) for three days and a half." But, the third time the word occurs, he was under the absolute necessity of leaving it in the plural, because of the absurdity of saying that men shall not suffer "their fall to be deposited in a tomb." Not only does this show how the revised text arose, but it reveals the untrustworthy character of some of those to whom we are indebted for the Greek text of the New Testament, and to whom many in our day defer, even with profound reverence.

xi. 9, 10.

Rec. T. βλέψων, shall see . . . ἀφησών, shall suffer . . . χαρών, shall rejoice . . . τύφρασσονται, shall make merry . . . πίπτον, shall send.

Rev. T. βλέπον, do look . . . ἀφίησιν, suffer . . . χαίρον, rejoice . . . τύφρασσονται, make merry . . . πίπτον, shall send.

In verse 7, as presented by both the Received and the Revised Text, we find three futures,—"shall make," "shall overcome," and "shall kill." Then follow the above verbs; the last of which, as given in both texts, is also a future. In regard to the other four verbs, there is an obvious difference in the time expressed,—the Received Text giving them in the future, and the Revised Text in the present. Yet there is no apparent reason why there should be this change from the future to the present on the part of four, or indeed of any, of these eight verbs. The context seems to call for the future in every instance, and no more in the last one and the first three than in the intermediate four. But the documents do not furnish as strong evidence in support of the future in the case of those
four as in that of the others. Tischendorf, on the testimony of S first hand, P, four cursive, a few manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and two manuscripts of Andreas, adopts the present πέμπονοισίν, “send,” in verse 10, instead of the future, “will send,” consistently with the four preceding presents, all of which he adopts, as do the Revisers. The future, however, is far more strongly attested than the present. It is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of S, A, C, most of the cursive, the Clementine Vulgate, most copies of Jerome’s, the Memphitic and Syriac Versions, Primasius, and others. It is supported, also, as far as the tense is concerned, by B, thirty or more cursive, the other two manuscripts of Andreas, and Arethas’ Commentary, all of which read, “will give,” instead of “will send,” gifts. The other four futures, of the Received Text, though not as strongly attested as the presents of the Revised, are no doubt genuine. It is by no means improbable that an early reader changed the five futures in these two verses into the historical present with a view to enliven the discourse. It certainly has that appearance. There is not a shadow of probability that the apostle varied his tenses as the Revised Text varies them. The internal evidence is wholly to the contrary.

xi. 18.

Rec. T. τοὶς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις, — small and great.
Rev. T. τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλοις, — the small and the great.

These words are supposed to belong to the preceding expression τοῖς φοβομένοις, and should properly be in the same case with it. The received reading here is that of a seventh-century corrector of S, B, P, all the cursive, the Vulgate, Andreas, Arethas, Cyprian, Primasius, and others. Tischendorf, Düsterdieck, and others unhesitatingly adopt it as the genuine reading. The revised reading is that of S first hand, A, and C only. But A reads the accusative here because of its previous reading τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοῖς φοβομένοις, an obvious transcriptional error for τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ τοῖς φοβομένοις. Through inattention on the part of scribes, the other two uncials unwittingly fell into the same error as far as the words cited above are concerned. To suppose the Apostle John to have been capable of committing this error is to entertain a most humiliating opinion of his ability as a writer of Greek, and an unwarranted estimate of the power of transcribers to keep from slips. The reading has really no claim to serious consideration. It is barely possible, but not very probable, that it originated in an attempt to make the language correspond, in part at least, with the reading of the Septuagint (Ps. cxv. 13), ευλαγήσει τοῖς φοβομένοις τῶν Κύριον, τοῖς µικροῖς µετὰ τῶν µεγάλων, “He will bless them that fear the Lord, the small with the great.” Still, a recollection of this passage may have had some influence on the transcriber, and have been the means of leading him astray. But, whatever may have been its origin, it is obviously a false reading.

xiii. 1.

Rec. T. Καὶ ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης. — And I stood upon the sand of the sea.
Rev. T. καὶ ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης. — and he stood upon the sand of the sea.

The first of these readings is attested by B, P, nearly all the cursive, the Memphitic Version, Erpenius’ Arabic, Andreas, and Arethas; the second, by S, A, C, 87, 92, the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and Bishop Haymo. Those who hold to this reading regard the dragon as taking his stand by the sea in order to call forth the seven-headed beast, and to equip him with power. But this is being wise above what is written; for, while verse 2 shows that the dragon gave position, power and authority to the beast, he is not represented as having called the beast up out of the sea, or as being stationed on the shore for that purpose. The last that we read of the
dragon, previous to this verse, is that he departed to make war with the woman's seed (xii. 17). But, according to this reading, in the very next breath, before he has had time to do any fighting, he is standing upon the sand of the sea. This certainly does not give assurance of the genuineness of the reading. And when we consider that a scribe, who has just recorded a statement respecting the dragon, and finds no other subject introduced, on coming to ἑστάθην would very naturally refer it to the dragon, and without due attention write it in the third person singular, — simply omitting the last letter of the word, — we can very easily see how this reading should have crept in. This makes the apostle say, "And the dragon waxed wroth with the woman, and departed to make war with the rest of her seed (such as keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus), and stood upon the sand of the sea." Thus no time is allowed the dragon to do any warring before he is on the seashore. And if he is there to bestow power and government upon the seven-headed beast, it is difficult to see when he wages the warfare he is said to have gone forth to wage. We are told, however, that he is to employ the beast as his instrument in the conflict he has undertaken. But is there anything to warrant this interpretation? All that we are apparently justified in concluding from the text is that the beast derived its power and authority from the dragon; i.e., it inherited the same spirit, and was empowered to accomplish the same unhallowed ends. As a consequence, similar homage and worship were given to both the beast and the dragon. Now if we understand, with the Received Text, Tischendorf, and others, that John instead of the dragon stood on the sand of the shore, we allow an indefinite period of time between the departing of the dragon (xii. 17) and the coming up of the beast mentioned in xiii. 1. And not only this; we also see the significance of John's standing by the sea; namely, that he might have a full view of the beast coming up out of the water. The obvious intent of the former statement is to show that the apostle is in a proper position to witness and report the next scene presented to him.

xiii. 7.

The omission of the first half of this verse, referred to in the marginal note, occurs in A, C, P, four cursives, Zohrab's Armenian Version, two manuscripts of Andreas, and Irenæus as represented by his Latin interpreter. It is not, however, because the clause is spurious, or of questionable genuineness in any degree. The omission is due simply to the ever-recurring transcriptional error of homoioteleuton, the transcriber's eye, in copying, having passed unconsciously from καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτῷ, "and it was given to him," at the beginning of the clause, to the same words at the beginning of the next clause, causing him to leave the intermediate words unwritten. And from one copy the omission passed into others,—thus indicating a kind of relationship between certain manuscripts.

xiii. 8.

Rec. T. ὅν οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὄνομα—whose names are not written.
Rev. T. οὗ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ—every one whose name hath not been written.

The τὸ ὄνομα, of the Revised Text (without the Hebraistic αὐτοῦ following it, which is found only in A, C) seems to be the true reading, and not τὰ ὄνομα. But the relative ὅν, referring back to πάνες οἱ κατοκοῦντες, "all who dwell," has been improperly changed to οὗ. The former is attested by Ν, B, P, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Primasius, and others. The latter is attested only by C, and the Latin interpreter of Irenæus. A reads ὅν οὗ,—a clerical blunder, of course, but perhaps for οὗ οὗ. The singular form (οὗ) of the relative grew out of the singular τὸ ὄνομα limited by it, — the expression, "all persons whose name is not written," appearing inappro-
priate, or, at all events, less appropriate than "every one whose name is not written." Others, instead of changing οὐ to οὖ, were led by this seeming impropriety to substitute the plural τὰ ὀνόματα, of the Received Text, for the singular τὸ ὀνόμα, which the Revisers read, according to A, B, C, forty or more cursives, the Memphitic and Syriac Versions, three manuscripts of Andreas, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, and Augustine. The plural appears in Ν, Ρ, four cursives, the Vulgate, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Arethas, Primasius, Haymo, and one manuscript of Andreas. The singular, however, is the more strongly attested, and must be regarded as the true reading. (Compare xvii. 8.)

xiii. 10.

Rec. T. εἰ τοὺς αἱμαλωσίαν συνάγει, εἰς αἱμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει — He that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity.

Rev. T. εἰ τοὺς εἰς αἱμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἱμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει — If any man is for captivity, into captivity he goeth.

The received reading here is unsupported by any known Greek manuscript. Codex 33 omits the preposition before the first αἱμαλωσίαν, but reads ἀπάγει instead of συνάγει immediately after; while 35, and one manuscript of Andreas give very nearly the same reading. The revised reading is that of A, three copies of the Vulgate, and a Slavonic manuscript, which of course is of comparatively recent date. The uncial, Ν, Β, C, Ρ, and four of the best cursives, 28, 38, 79, 95, read simply εἰ (though C has ἦ here) τοὺς εἰς αἱμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει (B alone reading ὑπάγη). But, as far as we are aware, only Tregelles among modern editors ventures to accept this as the true reading. It is generally thought that the second αঈμαλωσίαν with its accompanying preposition is omitted in these manuscripts by homoioteleuton; which is possible, and by no means improbable. This is the position taken by nearly all modern editors. But why limit the omission to these two words? If, as there is

ground for believing, the original reading was εἰ τοὺς εἰς αঈμαλωσίαν συνάγει (or ἀπάγει, as several documents read), εἰς αঈμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει, we see no reason why the absence of συνάγει (or ἀπάγει) from the leading manuscripts may not be accounted for in this way just as well as that of the remaining two words. By restoring this word as well as the other two, and taking the verb as a present used de conatu as in John x. 32, xiii. 6, and elsewhere, we obtain this as the meaning of the clause: "If any one would lead (or would lead away) into captivity, into captivity he goeth"; that is, as a necessary consequence. It will be observed that this reading obviates the necessity, which the Revisers found themselves under, of giving the preposition εἰς two different meanings in identical and close connections. The reading of Α (adopted by the Revisers) seems to be this reading only partially restored. It is a significant fact that it is found in no other Greek manuscript.

In the second clause of the verse, Westcott and Hort give the present ἀποκτείνει in the margin as a secondary and possibly genuine reading in place of the future ἀποκτεῖναι, "shall kill." This present is attested by Ν, 28, 79, while B, 26, 87, though spelling the word as a future, accent it as a present, as if it were considered such by the scribes of these manuscripts. Taken as a present again used de conatu, it yields an excellent meaning: "If any one would kill with the sword, with the sword must he be killed." And this, we are inclined to think, is the original reading. It puts this clause in harmony with the preceding, and makes the two yield not only an intelligible, but what seems to be in every respect a satisfactory sense: "If any one would lead into captivity, into captivity he goeth; if any one would kill with the sword, with the sword must he be killed." That is, if, in times of persecution and bloodshed, one would resist his oppressors, and seek to lead them with himself (or, would attempt to subdue them and carry them away) into captivity, he but places himself in a position to be led into captivity; or if, in other words, he would take the
sword in hand to resist them, he must expect to perish by the sword. In meekly continuing to fulfil their duties as Christians, and in calmly yielding if necessary rather than resisting when thus tried, the saints show their patience and the faith they have in God. "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints."

---

The received reading is attested by S, B, P second hand, all the cursive, Hippolytus, Andreas, and Arethas; the Revisers', by A, C, P first hand. This reading seems to have been adopted, not because it is more strongly attested than the other, but because it is a more difficult reading, and probably the Revisers as a body could not withstand Dr. Hort's arguments in its favor. Not another instance can be found in the Apocalypse in which the apostle uses this aorist passive (ἐδοθή) without giving also in close connection with it the dative denoting the receiver of the thing given. This shows the apostle's manner of using the word; and we may safely infer from it how he expressed himself here. It is vain to think for a moment that ἀφή may denote the receiver but that the Revisers have mistaken the construction. The only true rendering for the words — "It was given to her [or, to it] to give life to the image," — is meaningless. There is nothing in the preceding context to which the word can possibly be referred as an antecedent, notwithstanding Dr. Hort's vague surmisings concerning the earth. It is scarcely possible that the apostle could have so far departed from his ordinary usus loquendi as not only to omit giving the dative denoting the recipient, but to give in its place a word that is absolutely uncalled-for and purposeless. By turning to the context, we discover the probable origin of this strange reading. We find that the careless copyist had just written ἐδοθή, and the impression which the last letter of this word made on his mind led him, as he wrote the succeeding word, to finish this, too, with the same letter. Yet Dr. Hort says: "It is impossible either to account for the text [i.e., for ἀφή] as a corruption of ἀφη, or to interpret it as it stands."

Still, though a confessedly impossible reading, it must be admitted in the face of an appropriate and even better attested reading to be a part of the genuine text! Thus these blunders are introduced, one after another, under false principles, or rather under principles of criticism which within reasonable limits may be perfectly just and safe, but, when pressed to extremes, end in giving us spurious readings and gross absurdities.

---

The received reading here is attested by B, most of the cursive, Andreas, and Arethas; while the older manuscripts S, A, C, P, four cursive, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Augustine, Primasius, and others support the revised reading. If we were left to be governed simply by documentary evidence, we should be compelled to adopt γάρ as the genuine reading. But this word has the suspicious appearance of being a gloss; while the true meaning of the passage demands δε. The latter was apparently set aside in consequence of a misapprehension of the real import of the words, resulting from a false view of scriptural truth; namely, that one's good deeds are the ground or source of future blessedness: for the object of γάρ is evidently to introduce a reason for the blessedness of those who die in the Lord,—namely, because their works follow with them; i.e. as De Wette expresses it, "the memory of their deeds."

---

1 See Select Readings, p. 138.
This virtually makes their future reward consist in their past works rather than in their continued faithfulness, obedience, and activity in the service of God. In contrast with this, the apostle was commanded to write, “Blessed henceforth are the dead who die in the Lord; yea, saith the Spirit, [who die] so as to rest from their labors; but their works follow with them.” Their toils, their tears, their sorrows, their sufferings are over; they rest from these. But their works of obedience, holy ministry, love, and gratitude continue; they follow, and flow from them continually. They that die in the Lord, so far from resting from these, are blest; they cease not from their service or worship day or night. Rev. iv. 8; vii. 15. Their blessedness consists in part in cessation from toils and trouble, but mainly in the perfect service of God as his loyal, loving, redeemed subjects.

XV. 3.
Rec. T. Ὅ βασιλεύς τῶν ἄγιων.—thou King of saints.
Rev. T. Ὅ βασιλεύς τῶν αἰώνων.—thou King of the ages.

The reading, ἄγιων, of the Received Text, is virtually without support. The revised reading is attested by Ν first hand, C, two cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, a few copies of Jerome’s, the Syriac Version, Erpenius’ Arabic, the margin of Usan’s Armenian, Haymo, and others. This is the title which the Apostle Paul assigns to God in 1 Tim. i. 17,—“the King eternal.” It is adopted by Westcott and Hort as the true reading here. And yet the marginal reading, Ὅ βασιλεύς τῶν ἐθνῶν, “Thou King of nations,” which is adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and placed by Westcott and Hort in the margin as a secondary reading, is more probably the original reading. It is well attested by Ν’s seventh-century corrector, A, B, P, nearly fifty cursives, the Memphitic, Ethiopic, and Armenian Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Primasius. It harmonizes, also, with what follows: . . . “all nations shall come and worship before thee.” These variations seem to be due to the partial obliteration of the original word in some early manuscript, in trying to restore which, one gave one word, another another.

XV. 6.
Rec. T. ἐκδεδυμένοι λίνων καθάρον καὶ λαμπρόν,—clothed in pure and white linen.
Rev. T. ἐκδεδυμένοι λίθων καθάρον λαμπρόν,—arrayed with precious stone, pure and bright.

The common reading λίνων is supported by B, P, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Syriac and Armenian Versions, Andreas, Arethas, Primasius, and others. The Revisers’ is the reading of A, C, three cursives and the margin of a fourth, and several manuscripts of the Vulgate. The Sinaitic Codex (not, as some suppose, on account of the difficulty presented by λίθων, but because there are seven angels spoken of as “clothed”) gives the plural, καθάρον λίνων, “clean linen garments,”—in which reading it is accompanied by the Memphitic Version. The Ethiopic Version and Erpenius’ Arabic are without any corresponding word. It is plain that λίθων, presenting us with angels clothed in stone, is an impossible reading; but the weight of the testimony in support of it is thought by some to be too great to be set aside. Hence, Lachmann, Westcott and Hort, and others adopt it. Tregelles does not venture to reject it, but accepts it hesitatingly. Tischendorf, Alford, and others, however, read λίνων, with the Received Text. It is true that λίνων is nowhere else in the New Testament used in the sense of linen. Aside from this passage, it is found only in Matt. xii. 20; and there it denotes the raw material, flax. But is “stone” mentioned in any other passage of the New Testament, or indeed in any other writing, as clothing material, even for human beings, to say nothing of angels? The Revisers virtually repudiate their own reading; for, instead of faithfully translating it as it should be trans-
labeled, "clothed in clean, bright stone," they render it "arrayed with precious stone, pure and bright," interpolating the words "precious" and "and." (The former word is a part of the text in xvii. 4, xviii. 12, 16, xxi. 19, and is employed with "stone" in speaking of ornaments and ornamentation.) Then, to give the word still more plausibility, the Revisers change the simple word "clothed" to the ambiguous vocable "arrayed," which includes the idea of decking and adorning as well as of clothing. (Compare Matt. vi. 29; Acts xii. 21; Rev. xvii. 4; xviii. 16. Also Rev. xi. 3, where "arrayed" would be altogether inappropriate.) The reading they have adopted finds no justification in the Septuagint rendering of Ezek. xxviii. 13. The two cases are altogether different. The prophet refers to the manner in which the king and people of Tyre displayed their pride and ostentation. But the apostle is speaking of the dress of angels. There is no similarity between the characters, the circumstances, or the expressions employed in reference to them. In the one case, mention is made of the extravagant adornment of the person with all manner of costly stones: "With every precious stone (πᾶν λίθον χρύστον) hast thou been attired,—with the sardius, the topaz, and the diamond, the beryl, the onyx, and the jasper," etc., —language that is neither unnatural nor unreasonable. In the other, it is the material in which angels are clothed that is spoken of, which, according to this reading, is "clean, bright stone," —material seemingly altogether unsuitable for angels' apparel. If nothing else convinced us that λίθων was a transcriptional error,—probably the result of carrying the next word along with this in the mind at the time,—the combination "clean stone," as clothing material, would be enough. The word "clean" is not only redundant, but an altogether unsuitable epithet for "stone" thus employed.

The reading ὀνομάτων, of the Received Text, is but feebly supported, being attested by only twelve or fifteen cursives, Hippolytus, Andreas, and Arethas. That of the Revised Text, γῆμον ὀνόματα, is attested possibly by Ν first hand, A, 13, and 19, certainly by P; while Ν as afterwards corrected, B, and twenty-five or thirty cursives read γῆμον ὀνόματα; and three or four cursives read γῆμον ὀνόματα. The word with which γῆμον (or γῆμοντα) is to be construed is the neuter θηρίων just preceding. And as the neuter ἠχον follows immediately after, and belongs to the same neuter noun, it is better with Lachmann, Tregelles, Düsterdieck, and others, to take the γῆμοντα of Ν and A as two words, γῆμον τά. This gives three neuter adjuncts in succession limiting the neuter θηρίων,—a reading which is perfectly natural, and commends itself as genuine. It is by no means probable that the apostle wrote first a neuter adjective ἄκκυκνον, then a masculine, then a neuter again, as the Revised Text makes it appear that he wrote. The reading of Lachmann and Tregelles, as far as γῆμον is concerned, it will be observed, is that of Ν corrected, B, and twenty-five or more cursives; but these witnesses all omit the article τά following. This article seems necessary to indicate a reference to the names of blasphemy mentioned in xiii. 1, where this beast first appears. If, however, the reading with three neuter adjuncts is not the original reading, we should say with Tischendorf that γῆμοντα ... ἠχοντα is the true reading rather than γῆμοντα ... ἠχον, as the Revisers have it. In that case, the two masculine adjuncts would be accounted for on the principle mentioned in our note on iv. 7. But that the apostle, after having introduced the masculine adjective γῆμοντα, should return to a neuter adjunct in ἠχον is incredible.
xviii. 3.

Rec. T. ἐστὶν τοῦ οἴνου... πιαυκε πάντα τα ἀδνη— for all nations have drunk of the wine.
Rev. T. ἐστὶν τοῦ οἴνου... πιπτωκαν πάντα τα ἀδνη— for by the wine... all the nations are fallen.

The received reading, πιαυκε, adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and others, is attested by P, twenty-five or more cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac, the Armenian, Hippolytus, Andreas, Arethas, Haymo, and others. The other reading πιπτωκαν, is that of A, C, from ten to fifteen cursives, the Memphis and Ethiopic Versions; while ι, B, read the regular third person plural πιπτωκαν instead of the Alexandrian. Four cursives read πιπτωκε "have become drunk,"—taken probably from xiv. 8. The difference in spelling between πιπτωκαν and πιπτωκαν is but slight, the one having a letter which the other is without. But the difference in meaning is greater. It is not because the weight of manuscript authority is in favor of the former that Tischendorf and others adopt it, but because internal evidence calls for it. On turning to xiv. 8, we find it said that Babylon has fallen because she has "made all nations drink of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." The same sacred penman would naturally say here, "Babylon is fallen, because all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication." However natural it might be to say, "have fallen from drunkenness," one could scarcely say, "have fallen from wine." The simple truth is that the revised reading is an erroneous one. It was unconsciously introduced by some early scribe in consequence of the impression made on his mind by the twice-used word ἐπιτευγν, "is fallen, is fallen," in the preceding verse. Just so in John vii. 6, the scribe of B was betrayed by the preceding πέριστον into writing this word for ἵπτον at the close of the verse, and, in giving John xiv. 16, the scribe of ι wrote τηρήσω, "I will keep," for ἵπτον, "I will ask," because of the impression that τηρήσετε, the last word of the preceding verse, made on his mind. This is by no means an uncommon source of error in transcribing. The writer of these pages himself many years ago, in transcribing a sentence from Macaulay, wrote it as follows: "The history of Charles V. is both a less valuable and a less interesting both than the Lives of the Poets." A few years afterwards, on reverting to his manuscript, he observed the error, but could not correct it without turning to the volume from which he had taken the sentence. By going thither, however, he saw at once that the undue prominence given in his thoughts to the point he was aiming to illustrate had caused him unwittingly to write "both," for "book." So here; the impression made by "has fallen, has fallen," in verse 2, on the copyist's mind probably led him unconsciously to write "have fallen," in place of "have drunk"; and the fact that the error comes down to us through our oldest extant manuscripts makes it no less an error, and should have no weight in deciding upon the true reading.

xviii. 7.

Rec. T. ἵδεξαν ταυτὴν — she hath glorified herself.
Rev. T. ἵδεξαν αὐτὴν — she glorified herself.

The Revisers have here set aside the Greek reflexive, and substituted the personal pronoun, because the uncials, with the exception of ι as written by its earlier seventh-century emendator, give the abbreviated spelling. If this is the true spelling of the word here, we insist, either that it should have the rough breathing, as Westcott and Hort give it, or that it be properly rendered "her," and not as if it were the reflexive. To reject the Greek reflexive, and give the Greek personal pronoun for the purpose of preparing the way for a faithful English rendering, then mistranslate it as a reflexive, looks very much like revision work that is not merely unnecessary, but sadly in need of re-revision.
xviii. 19.

Rec. T. ἰκραῖον — cried.
Rev. T. ἰκραῖον — cried.

The imperfect of the Received Text is adopted by Tischendorf, Düsterdieck, and others, both here and in verse 18. Here it is attested by Ν, B, P, all the cursives but one, and by Andreas and Arethas. It is similarly vouches for as the true reading in verse 18. The aorist of the Revised Text is attested by A, C, 35, and Hippolytus. This is the form adopted by Lachmann and by Westcott and Hort. But the verb has the appearance of having been changed to the aorist to correspond in tense with ἐβαλείν, “they cast”; while the imperfect is apparently the original form, employed to denote an action contemporaneous with that expressed by the preceding verb, while the “crying” denoted by it was also in all probability prolonged and repeated. All this would naturally require the imperfect, the form found in the Received Text. Nothing but a less probably genuine reading is gained by adopting the aorist.

xix. 13.

Rec. T. ἵματιον βεβαμίνον αἷματι — a vesture dipped in blood.
Rev. T. ἵματιον βεβαμίνον αἷματι — a garment sprinkled with blood.

The received reading βεβαμίνον is that of A, B, most of the cursives, three manuscripts of Andreas, and Arethas. The revised reading is that of P, 36; while four other cursives, Hippolytus, Origen, and one manuscript of Andreas read ἐραμίσμον; and a late corrector of Ν gives περιεραμίσμον, which is adopted by Tischendorf; and still others read ἑραμίνον. The Latin versions and Fathers generally read aspersa, conspersa, or spersa; but just what Greek word any one of these represents, it is impossible to say. The mere fact that the idea of a garment “sprinkled” with blood appears in so many different forms affords good reason for suspecting and rejecting the readings that embody it. The other reading, however, is unique and well attested. It is accepted, also, as the true reading by Lachmann, Tregelles, Düsterdieck, and modern editors and commentators generally, as far as we know.

xx. 6.

A marginal note says, “Some ancient authorities read the”; i.e. “the thousand years,” as in verse 7, instead of “a thousand years,” as in verse 4, where the expression first appears in connection with these souls. The reading of the text, without the article, is attested by A, most of the cursives, the Armenian Version, Andreas, and Arethas. That of the margin, calling for the article, is supported by Ν, B, 14, 18, 38, 47, 92, and the Syriac Version. It is also what might be expected from the writer of the Apocalypse. In verse 2 of this chapter, in first giving the time during which he represents Satan as being bound, he says “a thousand years.” But, in referring to that period in the next verse, his words are “until the thousand years” should be completed. So here, in first mentioning the time that the souls lived and reigned, the apostle says “a thousand years.” But in verses 5 and 7 the same time is referred to as “the thousand years.” It is hardly to be supposed that, as he employed the article just before and just after, in this connection, he would have omitted it here in speaking of the same period of time. In view of all the evidence presented to us, we should be disposed, with Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and others, to insert the article as clearly a part of the original text.

xx. 9.

Rec. T. ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, — from God out of heaven.
Rev. T. ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, — out of heaven.

The Revisers reject from the text the phrase “from God,” then add the marginal note, “Some ancient authorities insert
from God." The witnesses in support of the received reading are the early seventh-century corrector of $\xi$, $P$, 7, and a number of other cursive, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, and Jerome; as well as the three cursive, 1, 17, 19, and one manuscript of Andreas, which have $\alpha \varphi \omicron$, "from," instead of $\epsilon \kappa$, "out of," heaven. The shorter reading of the Revisers' Text is attested by A, three cursive, the three Leipsic Latin copies (4, 5, 6) of the Apocalypse, another manuscript of Andreas, Tichonius the Donatist once, and Primasius. This reading, however, appears to be a clipping down of the original, under the idea that the phrase "from God" was superfluous in connection with the expression "out of heaven." The Demidovian manuscript of the Vulgate, on the other hand, rejects "out of heaven," and reads only, $\alpha \Delta e \alpha$, "from God." This manuscript of the twelfth century, as far as we are aware, is the only extant representative of this old reading, which originated, like the Revisers', in the supposition that the use of both expressions was pleonastic, — only it omits the latter instead of the former of the two phrases. The reading of B, twenty-five or more cursive, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and Erpenius' Arabic Version, the other two manuscripts of Andreas, Arethas, Victorinus, Augustine, and Tichonius in another place only indicates an early attempt to give the two phrases in the order found in xxi. 2, 10. Similar work of omission and of transposition of the terms to make them correspond with the reading here was attempted by some in xxi. 2, 10; but it was not followed to the same extent as it was in trying to bring this reading into conformity with that. There can be but little if any doubt that the original reading embraces both phrases as given in the Received Text, while their collocation indicates that the reading was not borrowed from chapter xxi. The former expression represents the origin or source of the fire, as "from God"; and the latter, the place whence it proceeded, — "out of heaven."

"Some ancient authorities omit, and be their God," says the marginal note. That is, these two words are wanting in $\xi$, $B$, 1, 7, 8, 29, 39, 92, and twenty-five or more cursive, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Erpenius' Arabic Version, Irenæus, two manuscripts of Andreas, Arethas, Augustine, Primasius, and Haymo. Hence, Tischendorf rejects them, and Westcott and Hort consign them to the margin. But evidently they were early dropped as superfluous or inappropriate. So far, however, from being really superfluous or inappropriate, they need to have a special stress laid upon them, — God himself will be with them as their God, — denoting the intimately close, tender, hallowed and unchanging relation that is to subsist between him and them, — a relation even more tender and hallowed than the same phrase implies in the Old Testament in reference to the Israelites under Moses and his successors. A failure to recognize the true force of the term led to its omission from some early manuscript. But its genuineness is sufficiently attested by A, P, 79, and a number of other cursive, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Irenæus in another place, Ambrose, the other two manuscripts of Andreas, and Tichonius.

The Revisers have done well in leaving unchanged, and without any alternative marginal reading, the words $\epsilon \nu \tau \alpha \varsigma \epsilon \kappa \lambda \lambda \rho \omicron \varpi \iota \sigma \iota \alpha \varsigma$; and in translating them "for the churches," by which they have corrected the false rendering of Tyndale and the A. V., — "in the churches." The marginal note, "Gr. over," might, however, much better have been omitted, as well as many other similar ones; for $\epsilon \nu \tau$ with the dative means "for" sometimes, as truly as "over" at other times. Griesbach and Westcott and Hort place $\epsilon \nu$, "in," or "among," in their margins as a possibly genuine reading instead of $\epsilon \nu \tau$. This
reading is found in A, four cursives, the Vulgate, Athanasius, and two manuscripts of Andreas. But it has no claim to acceptance. It evidently arose from a misunderstanding of ἐν, and from perplexity in regard to the meaning of this preposition. Düsterdieck and others consider the true reading to be ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, without any preposition,—a reading that is attested by seven or eight cursives, the Armenian Version, Arethas, and two other manuscripts of Andreas. But if this, which can mean only, "for the churches," had been the original reading, the other forms would never have been suggested, especially the form ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, which is attested by B, most of the cursives, the Syriac Version, and one manuscript of Andreas. In the proper application of the rule that a difficult reading is more likely to be genuine than an easy one, this is "the harder reading" as compared with either of the other two. That the clause is correctly rendered, "I, Jesus, have sent mine angel to testify unto you these things for the churches," i.e. on account of, or on behalf of, the churches, is evident from a reference to chapter i. 1, 4, 11.

I. GENERAL INDEX.

[The numbers i. and ii. denote the volume; the letter n. refers to the foot-notes.]

Abbot, Ezra, LL.D., Critical Essays of, noted, ii. 12, 45 n.; quoted, ii. 246.
Abbreviations, incorrect reading of, i. 23, 356, ii. 164.
"Abiathar," readings in connection with, i. 36.
Address, use of direct versus indirect, i. 236, ii. 79.
Agrippa, words of, ii. 131.
Alford, Dean Henry, D.D., adherence of, to received readings, i. 83, 91, 92, 95, 116, ii. 46, 90, 179, 237, 245, 266, 270, 282, 319; received readings rejected by, i. 76, 84, 319, 322, 326, 329, ii. 72, 165, 234, 265, 296; quoted, i. 271.
American Committee of N. T. Revisers, adherence of, to Textus Receptus, i. 143, 313, ii. 44, 66, 147, 201, 214, 259, 264, 266, 291; marginal readings adopted into text by, ii. 33, 106, 265; marginal note omitted by, ii. 134; marginal readings suggested by, ii. 262, 296.
Angel, troubling of water by, considered, ii. 22.
Anomalous Readings, i. 332, 350.
Biblical facts, a knowledge of, necessary, i. 4.
Bloomfield, S. T., D.D., cited, i. 221.
Bornebius, F. A., cited, ii. 111.
Breathings, often misrepresented by copyists, ii. 45; generally omitted in the old MSS., ii. 63, 140, 290, 304.
British and Foreign Bible Society, London, Codex Z in Library of, i. 11.
British Museum, London, Codex A in, i. 9; Codices G (Gospels), N in part, and R, in i. 10.
Burgon, Dean J. W., on Mark xvi. 9–20, i. 254; quoted, ii. 73.

Clement V., Pope, decision of, at Council of Vienna, i. 165.
Codices, account of, N, A, B, C, D, E (Epistles), E (Gospels), i. 9; E (Acts), E (Epistles), F (Gospels), F (Epistles), G (Gospels), G (Epistles), H (Gospels), H (Acts), H (Epistles), I, K (Gospels and Epistles), L (Gospels, Acts, and Epistles), M, N, P, Q, R, S, T, i. 10; Tριντα to Z, Γ, Θ, Α, Ε, Π, Σ, i. 11; Ψ, i. 39.
Codex D, evidence respecting, i. 20; compared with older MSS., i. 20 n. 2; Latin version of, not always in agreement with Greek text of, i. 57, 180, ii. 259.
Conflations. See "Readings, Conflate."
Constantinople, chief seat of transcribers, i. 19.

Construe ad sensum, examples of, ii. 213, 223, 239, 302, 303.
Copyists, errors of, noted, i. 84, 99; cited, ii. 93; illustrated, ii. 82, 83 n. 1, 208 n. 235, 316; ignorance of, illustrated, ii. 301.
Cornelius, fasting of, ii. 99.
Cowper, William, quoted, i. 235.
Cyril of Alexandria quoted, ii. 53.

Damascus, disciples at, not Paul's, ii. 96.
Dative, a common N. T. use of, ii. 112.
Davidson, Dr. Samuel, on internal evidence, i. 53.
De conatus, verbs used, ii. 315.
Demonstrative pronoun and article, i. 350, ii. 15.

De Wette, W. M. L., opinion of, i. 225, ii. 308; quoted, ii. 317.
Diatessaron, Tatian's, omissions adopted from, i. 165, 334, 339.
Digamma, as a symbol, i. 356, 358; often mistaken for gamma, i. 357, 358.

Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, respecting early corrupters of the text, i. 17.
Documents commonly deemed most trustworthy, i. 24; their character illustrated, i. 25–32, 33–44.
Doxology, authorities, ρρε and con, i. 68; appropriateness of, i. 71.
Dresden, Codex G (Epistles), in Royal Library of, i. 10.
Dublin, Codex Z in Library of Trinity College, i. 11.

Dusenstieck, Dr. Friedrich, conjecture of, ii. 299; readings adopted by, ii. 310, 321, 324; opinion of, ii. 377.
Dwight, President Timothy, D.D., quoted, i. 234, 359.
St, i. 326, ii. 60, 80, 124, 180, 206, 317.

Σπέρα (Luke xx. 14), i. 322.
Σαραπάν (Luke vi. 1), force of, i. 278.
Σαραφήνος (Matt. xiii. 36), i. 100.
Σαμέν (Rom. viii. 38), i. 23; proper place of, ii. 158.
Σαμοσακτόνα (Matt. xxii. 4), i. 147.

Edwards, Principal T. C., quoted, ii. 149 n. 1, 180.
Egypt, Codex B referred to, i. 9.
Elijah (Luke ix. 54), i. 298.
Elliott, Bishop C. F., on omissions.
in Codex B, i. 66; reading of Gal. vi. 2 by, ii. 209.
Epaphras, character of, ii. 221.
Epistles, early treatment of, i. 18.
Eusebius, omission by, in quoting Matt. iv. 24, i. 62; a false reading in, i. 67; on Mark xvi. 9–20, i. 256.
Eve, relation of, to Adam, ii. 216.
εκάθεν (Luke xv. 32), a false reading, i. 316.
ελευθερία (Matt. v. 22), i. 65.
ελα, use of, in Mark i. 21, noted, i. 35; various readings from misapprehensions concerning, i. 84; improper omission of, ii. 88, 130; transcriptional error for ελ, ii. 267; meaning of, in 1 Pet. iii. 21, ii. 279.
ελ δέ (Luke xvii. 3), i. 317.
ελ τι (Matt. xviii. 28), i. 125.
ελεκτορος (Luke xxii. 45), i. 340.
εικασία (Matt. xiv. 30), i. 104.
ελθειν (Matt. xiv. 29), i. 103.
ελθὼν (Luke xii. 12), i. 316.
ελ (Luke iv. 1), i. 267; (Luke xxii. 42), i. 339; (Acts xi. 23), i. 102.
ελα (Luke xii. 25), i. 306.
ελ' Ἐφεσίως (Eph. i. 1), ii. 211.
εἰς Ἀφρικήν (Acts xvii. 26), ii. 118.
εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ (Acts xii. 25), ii. 104.
εἰσερχόμεναι, meaning of, i. 279.
εἰκόνα for τεκνών, i. 91.
εἰκόνας (Matt. xxiii. 38), i. 151; (Luke xiii. 35), i. 309.
εἰς (Mark viii. 17), i. 214; (Rom. v. 6), ii. 151; (1 Tim. vi. 7), ii. 244.
εὑρήκας (Mark i. 23), i. 177; (Mark ii. 2), i. 180; (Mark vii. 35), i. 212.
εὐχέρει (Matt. xvi. 8), i. 115.
εὐχημέρον (Rom. v. 1), i. 147.
εὕ, a common use of, ii. 102.
ἐ ὡς (Luke xviii. 14), i. 318.
ἐκλέξεις (Luke i. 39), i. 178.
ἐκπέμπετο (Matt. xxiv. 42), i. 155.
ἐκπρεπον (Luke xvi. 12), i. 316.
ἐμ早晚 (John xix. 7), ii. 78.
ἐμ (John iv. 22), ii. 170.
ἐρε (John vii. 39), ii. 43.
ἐπαρατ (Luke viii. 45), what implied by position of, i. 292.
False readings, why, in Revisers' Text, ii. 3; how perpetuated in ancient documents, ii. 219.
"Farewell" (Acts xxiii. 30), ii. 127.
Farrar, Archdeacon F. W., D.D., quoted, i. 47.
"Fathers of the Church," complaints of, i. 17; Latin texts used by, i. 19; African and Western use of inferior MSS. by, i. 20; an interpretation of, ii. 291; words employed by, ii. 324.
Ferrar's group of cursive MSS., i. 34; representing a lost uncial, i. 120.
Gamaliel, real utterance and meaning of, i. 92.
"Gennesaret," blind use of, i. 106; use of, elsewhere, i. 107, 201.
"Gergesenes" and kindred names examined, i. 76, 288; testimony of MSS., i. 76.

Gnostics, early corrupters of the text, i. 17.
Greek text, a form of, unsupported by MSS., i. 88; present state of, of N. T., ii. 7; a fourth-century, of the N. T., ii. 8; errors in, yet to be discovered, ii. 8; the true, of the N. T. in no one ancient document, ii. 9.
Greek Texts, common name for, i. 15; after the fifth century, i. 16; worst corruptions of, when, i. 17; nature of errors in, i. 22.
Gregory of Nyssa, misquotation from, noted, i. 256.
Griesbach, J. J., his leading canon of textual criticism, i. 51; misapplication of, i. 60; readings adopted by, i. 77, 330, ii. 69, 224, 215, 327; use of false text by, i. 171.
Γαλαται, as a "Western" reading, examined, i. 270.
γέρο, omission of, considered, i. 210, 320, i. 143; position of, considered, i. 279, 325; spurious use of, i. 158, 303, ii. 317; falsely followed by δι', ii. 202; not to be supplanted by δι', ii. 206.
γενεσία (Acts xxvi. 28), ii. 131.
γενέμενος (Luke x. 32), i. 300.
γραμμή (Acts xx. 3), i. 144.
Hackett, H. B., D.D., quoted, i. 108.
Hamburg, Codex II (Gospels) at, i. 10.
Hammond, C. E., on Textual Criticism, i. 254; quoted, i. 257.
Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, a reading of, ii. 311.
Hearing ears, i. 99.

Hebraisms cited, i. 109, 141, 184, 265, 267, 323, ii. 319.
Helvidius denies the perpetual virginity of Mary, i. 58.
Heresies, Irenaeus against, i. 17, 18.
Hercetics, work of, in corrupting the text, i. 17.
Hesychius, the grammarian, cited, i. 358.
Homoioleuta, defined, i. 9, 22; examples of, i. 27, 352, ii. 113, 144, 158, 179, 207, 208, 281, 300, 313, 314.
Hort, F. J. A., D.D., later texts, how designated by, i. 16; testimony of, respecting early textual corruptions, i. 17; statement of, considered, i. 17 n.; on the office of textual criticism, i. 46; on early modifications of the Greek text, i. 61; quoted, i. 331, 332, ii. 5, 6, 35, 111, 128, 144, 145, 152, 154, 189, 200, 259, 278, 317; opinion of, noted, i. 154, 242, ii. 244, 317; argument of, for false readings, i. 290, ii. 264.
Hour of Christ's crucifixion considered, i. 353.
Hovey, Alvah, D.D., quoted, i. 359.
Hug on origin of Codex B, i. 9; on Mark xvi. 9–20, i. 257.
Humphry, W. G., B.D., opinion of, on MS. authority for Matt. i. 25, i. 60; comments of, i. 222, 225, ii. 108, 150, 162, 199, 205, 226.

Internal evidence, principles of, i. 48.
Interrogative versus indefinite pronoun, ii. 256.
"In thy name," ii. 75.
Iota subscript, earliest use of, in N. T. Mss., ii. 305.

Irenæus, complaint of, i. 17, 18; differences in texts noted by, i. 17; use of inferior Mss. by, i. 20; a reading defended by, ii. 216; error adopted by, ii. 313.

"Iscariot," a surname of whom? ii. 30.

Itaicism, defined, i. 22; illustrated, i. 40, 90, 316, ii. 48, 149, 149 n. 1, 2, 169, 195, 271, 284.

i, often written « in the old Mss., ii. 67, 275.

Iaδήσα (Luke vii. 7), i. 74.

Ibîq (Acts i. 19), ii. 81.

Ibou (James iii. 3), ii. 275.

Ibôv (Matt. ix. 4), i. 82.

Iç junto (Matt. xiv. 30), i. 105.

Jerome, complaint of, i. 18; a believer in the perpetual virginity, i. 58; readings adopted by, i. 58, 173; ii. 41; comment on, of Matt. xi. 19, i. 92; an opinion of, i. 172; translations of, noted, i. 256, ii. 189; quoted, i. 277, 358.

John the Evangelist, invariable formula of, ii. 19; use of connectives a peculiarity of, ii. 60; certain uses of language by, noted, ii. 285, 286, 288, 302; versus the Revisers' Text, ii. 311, 316.

"Jona" and "John" distinct names, i. 13.

Joseph, words of the angel to, i. 59; the father of other children of Mary, i. 60.

"Joseph," misapplied by the Revisers, i. 101; and "Joses," distinct names, i. 101.

Josephus, quoted; i. 310, ii. 108.

Judas, objection raised by, ii. 55.

Jude, reading of verse 22 considered, ii. 294.

Justin Martyr, readings from, i. 37, 87, 280.

Kendrick, A. C., D.D., quoted, ii. 40, 55.

καθαρίσων (Mark vii. 19), construction of, i. 204.

καλ, Hebrew use of, i. 30, 109, 184, 203, 265, 267, 301; improper omission of, i. 109, 144, 247, 267, 278, ii. 249; improper retention of, i. 173.

καλ φρεσκό, on the omission of (Mark ix. 29), i. 228.

καλ πίστει, (Mark ix. 12), i. 223.

καταθαλάμενοι, meaning of (Heb. vi. 1), ii. 261.

κατέστρεφε (Luke viii. 6), i. 287.

κατασχέναι, Luke's use of, i. 327.

κακοσκευαστή, use of, considered, ii. 173.

καθώς, on the omission of (Matt. xiii. 35), i. 100.

καραγασ (Mark ix. 26), i. 228; (Mark xv. 39), i. 252.

κωρίφα, abbreviated form of, noted, i. 164.


Laodiceans, Epistle to the, ii. 212.

Laud, Archbishop William, Codex Laudanianus (E Acts) presented by, to Oxford University, i. 10.

Lectionaries, a false reading due to, ii. 171.

Lightfoot, J. B., D.D., adherence of, to certain readings of the Received Text, ii. 206, 207.

Lucian, Presbyter of Alexandria, referred to, i. 18.

Luke, Curetonian Syriac reading of (xxiii. 43), i. 22; misrepresented by scribes, i. 285, ii. 101; prominent thought of, considered, i. 286; style of, illustrated, i. 301, ii. 97; words of, perverted, ii. 83; use of Greek by, ii. 88, 124.

Λέγετε, construction of (Matt. xv. 5; Mark vii. 12), i. 109.

Λθον (Rev. xv. 6), ii. 319.

Macaulay, T. B., error in quoting, noted, ii. 322.

Magdala, how transformed into Magadan, i. 113; parallel cases cited, i. 113 n.

Mai, Cardinal Angelo, extracts by, from the Speculum, ii. 155 n. 1.

Mai, the oldest Greek, a reading found only in, i. 22.

Mss., methods of copyists of, compared, i. 16; later, compared with and corrected by older texts, i. 19; earliest date of, of the Old Latin Version, i. 19; character of, in second century, i. 19; two oldest Greek, i. 19; earliest Greek, not necessarily the best, i. 20; how to use, i. 21, 45; earliest, contain early corruptions, i. 21; additions in early, i. 33; omissions in early, i. 34 (see also "Omissions"); many errors of, from second and third centuries, i. 36; modifications in early, i. 39; substitutions in early, i. 41; more or less vitiates, i. 45; often at variance, i. 45, ii. 155; cause of the preservation of, i. 45; untrustworthiness of early, illustrated, i. 55, 76, 84, 92, 107, 113 and n., 129, 139, 144, 152, 163, 186, 191, 196, 198, 200, 209, 220, 223, 224, 230, 238, 263, 270, 277, 282, 295, 298, 305, 311, 319, 325, 332, 346, 349, 357, 360, ii. 33, 36, 43, 45, 50, 55, 61, 69, 73, 83 n., 87, 107, 110, 113, 119, 125, 128, 145, 147, 149 n. 1 and 2, 158, 169, 175, 180, 186, 190, 194, 200, 211, 215, 218, 222, 225, 227, 234, 236, 240, 244, 249, 255, 258, 263, 265, 267, 272, 275, 278, 282, 289, 301, 309, 313, 314, 310, 322; early collections of, few and costly, i. 61; confusion and variations of, noted, i. 83, 96, ii. 50; Greek, against revised reading noted, i. 88; a reading of the two oldest, noted, ii. 88; authority of, insufficient, i. 309, ii. 129; later, disregarded by the Revisers, ii. 51; the earliest, without accents and breathings, ii. 63, 140, 290, 304.
Marginal notes, needless, i. 56, 62, 66, 67, 74, 82, 83, 98, 122, 161, 163, 171, 179, 188, 197, 231, 232, 249, 316, 335, ii. 152, 161, 169, 172, 211, 235; harmful, i. 68; ii. 171; misleading, i. 95, 128, 203, ii. 254; improper, ii. 252; omitted by American Revisers, ii. 134.

Marginal reading, unsupported by Greek Mss., i. 66; confute, i. 188; of John v. 3, 4, considered, ii. 21.

Marginal readings, false, i. 56, 96, 102, 117, 162, 199, 215, 279, 231, 303, 310, ii. 12, 103, 137, 174; genuine, i. 64, 82, 83, 90, 95, 98, 100, 115, 128, 132, 151, 164, 172, 178, 207, 231, 232, 234, 246, 249, 289, 290, 293, 297, 298, 329, 330, 334, ii. 17, 20, 21, 33, 44, 95, 105, 113, 138, 150, 154, 211, 227, 234, 265, 282, 313, 326; emendations, i. 57, 74, 103, 122, 123, 124, 127, 162, 170, 181, 197, 202, 299, 302, 339, ii. 11, 19, 27, 86, 102, 137, 152, 157, 161, 222, 237, 239, 254, 277, 298, 326; probably genuine, i. 72, 110, 203, ii. 127, 196, 260; not internally sustained, i. 314, ii. 194, 246; transcriptional errors, i. 163, 178, 238, 314, 316; ii. 26, 48, 50, 98, 126, 133, 134, 136, 164, 188, 190, 191, 222, 235, 253. Mark, Gospel of, five Mss. of, well preserved, i. 24 n. 2; readings from, peculiar to Sinaitic Codex, i. 25, 26; readings from, peculiar to Codex A, i. 26; readings from, peculiar to Codex B, i. 27, 28; readings from, peculiar to Codex C, i. 28, 29; chapter vii. of, wanting in Codex C, i. 28; chapter xvi. of, in full in Codex C, i. 28; readings from, peculiar to Codex D, i. 29; readings from, peculiar to Codex L, i. 30; Curetonian Syriac Version defective in, i. 30; readings from, by various ancient documents, i. 33-44; the evangelist, a Jew, i. 172; in harmony with Matthew, i. 174; xvi. 9-20, testimony in support of, i. 236; misrepresented by copyists, i. 353, 360; apparently not in harmony with John, i. 353, 359; on the hour of the crucifixion, i. 356; xv. 25, true reading of, i. 358; xvi. 2, true reading of, i. 360, 361.

Mary, perpetual virginity of, referred to, i. 58; other children of, i. 59; prophecy concerning, i. 59.

Mary the Magdalene, when at the sepulchre, i. 359.

Matthei, C. F., a false reading of, ii. 171; a genuine reading adopted by, ii. 265.

Matthew, Gospel of, peculiar readings from, in the Curetonian Syriac Version, i. 30-32; Hebrew Gospel of, ii. 13.

Meyer, H. A. W., opinion of, i. 125, ii. 185; quoted, ii. 122, 154, 167; readings adopted by, ii. 165, 167; cited, ii. 252.

Modena, Codex H (Acts) in Grand Dacial Library, i. 10.

Moscow, Codex K (Epistles) at, i. 10; V (Gospels) at, i. 11.

Moses, improperly quoted, ii. 161.

Munich, Codex X in University Library, i. 11.

Nasenhus, misquotation by, i. 72.

Name, my, thy, his, etc., import of, ii. 75.

New Testament, differences between earlier and later Mss., considered, i. 16; method of copying Mss., of, i. 16; deprivations of, i. 17; copies of, early tampered with, i. 17; date of the worst corruptions of, i. 17, 19; various readings of, referred to, i. 19; views of critics of, i. 20; value of oldest Mss. of, considered, i. 20; as to the genuine Mss. of, i. 21, ii. 7, 9; when readings of Mss. of, may be set aside, i. 21; purpose of the writings of, i. 21; parallel readings of, frequently altered, i. 23; documents generally relied on for the text of, i. 24; character of the ancient documents of, i. 24; an anomalous Greek form in, i. 42; views of early editors of, i. 45; disagreement of oldest Mss. of, i. 45; conflicting use of general principles of criticism by editors of, i. 48; books of, originally separate, i. 61; the canon of, slowly and progressively made, i. 61; source of false readings in, i. 87; Greek, first written in uncials, i. 93.

Nominative absolute, rare use of, ii. 123, 124.
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... (Acts xxvii. 14), significance of, ii. 117.

... (Acts xvii. 14), use of, ii. 97.

Paris, National Library of Codices C and D (Epistles) in, i. 9; Codices K (Gospels), L (Gospels), M (Gospels) in, i. 10.

Patristic writings, early date of, i. 17.

Paul, occupation of, i. 118; use of language by, ii. 140, 163, 164, 173, 202, 210, 212, 241, 244, 249; style of, ii. 168, 170, 177; not illogical, i. 166, 204; versus copyists and Revisers' readings, ii. 148, 212, 215, 218.

Peshito Syriac Version, resemblance of, in peculiar readings, to oldest Mss., i. 19; one of a few witnesses to a genuine reading, i. 22; glosses frequent in, ii. 166.

Philippi, a place of prayer near, ii. 115.

Pilate, use of "righteous" by, i. 162; question of, i. 251; Christ brought before, iii. 355; Christ delivered by, to be crucified, when, i. 356.

Proper names, spelling of, i. 51, 75, 112.

Psalms i. and ii., reference to, ii. 107.

... (Mark ii. 3), i. 239; (Heb. vi. 1), i. 261.

... (Luke xiv. 17), i. 312.

... (Luke xvi. 18), i. 317.

... without the article (Matt. xiv. 22), i. 104.

... used to save repetition of other verbs, i. 199, ii. 131.

... (Matt. xxi. 13), insufficiently attested, i. 137.

... (Acts xxvi. 28), a genuine reading, ii. 130.

... (Matt. xvii. 4), i. 118.

... (John v. 3), ii. 21.

... interchanged with ... i. 85.

... omission of (Matt. xvii. 11), i. 119.

... (Matt. xiv. 12), i. 102; for ... (Mark xv. 45), i. 253.

... (Mark ix. 12), i. 223.

... (Matt. xiii. 36), i. 100.

... use of (Rev. vi. 1), ii. 304.

... (Matt. xxiv. 31), i. 151.

Reading, a form of, unsupported by Ms. authority, i. 88; original, probably lost, i. 159, 200, 223, 319, ii. 244; true, of Mark ix. 12 considered, i. 222; probably genuine, supported by a single Greek Ms., ii. 110, 260, 315.

Readings, peculiar to single documents, value of, i. 32; evidence respecting, to be duly weighed, i. 53; confute, defined and illustrated, i. 171, 175, 188, ii. 87, 222; Revisers', adopted by vote, ii. 3; preference given by the Revisers to, of oldest Mss., ii. 4: "Alexandrian," "Syrian,"" Western," ii. 5; various, in Rev. xv. 3, noted, ii. 318.

Relative, Greek, questionable form of, i. 96; uses of, noted, i. 125; ii. 74, 213, 223; questionable uses of, ii. 74, 77, 170, 175.

Rendering of Hebrew verb (Deut. i. 31), cited, ii. 106.

Revised Version, Preface of, quoted from, i. 63, 242, ii. 16.

Revisers, inconsistency of, i. 38, 96,
by a single Greek Ms., ii. 115, 300, 303, 313, 314; reading of Rev. xiii. 1 and 10 in, considered, ii. 311, 314.
Riddle, M. B., D.D., quoted, i. 242.
Roberts, Alexander, D.D., on similarities and diversities of readings in the Gospels, i. 73; opinion of, ii. 225, 226; answered by Dean Burgon, i. 256; quoted, ii. 258.
Rome, Codices L (Acts and Epistles), N in part, S (Gospels), and T, at, i. 10; Codices T4 and Y at, i. 11; Christians of, referred to, ii. 165.
Rossano, Codex Σ in Archbishop's Library at, i. 11.
βήματα, a Hebraistic use of, i. 323.
βήματα (2 Cor. i. 10), ii. 192.
Sabbath, words spoken with reference to, i. 310, ii. 46.
Sceva, sons of, worsted, ii. 123.
Schaefer, critical note by, i. 192 n.
Schaff, Philip, D.D., opinion of, i. 225.
Scott, Thomas, quoted, i. 336.
Scrivener, F. H. A., L.L.D., account of uncial Mss. from, i. 9; estimate of Codex M by, i. 10; testimony of, concerning early documents, i. 19; on the doxology in the Lord's prayer, i. 69; on τέκνον (Matt. xi. 19), i. 93; on Mark xvi. 9–20, i. 254; quoted, i. 242, 253, 291, ii. 12, 39, 49, 289 n.
Severus on Mark xvi. 9–20, only a copyist, i. 256.
Septuagint, rendering of Isa. xiv. 15, in, i. 95; results of copyist's familiarity with, i. 141, ii. 59, 311; cited, ii. 83 n., 94, 106, 161, 320.
Shakespeare, a misprint from Ms. of, noted, i. 49, ii. 244.
"Sidon," omission of (Mark vii. 24), i. 207; construction of, in Mark vii. 31, i. 208.
Silas at Antioch, ii. 113.
"Son of God" (Mark i. 1), i. 171.
"Son of John," ii. 12.
"Spirit," reference of (John vi. 63), ii. 155 n. 2.
Statements designed to prepare the way for subsequent statements, ii. 24.
Stephen, Robert, referred to, i. 20.
St. Gall, Switzerland, Codex Δ in monastery of, i. 11.
St. Petersburg, Codex Σ at, i. 9; Codices E (Epistles), H (Epistles) in part, I, and P (Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse) at, i. 10; Codices T1, T5, T8, part, O, II, at, i. 11.
"Strain at" (Matt. xxiii. 24), an illustration of perpetuated blunders, ii. 219, 244.
Stunica, reference to Ms. used by, i. 20.
Symbols, errors from mistaking, i. 356, 357, ii. 26.
Syriac Version, Curetonian, character of, i. 20.
Syrian Church, use of inferior Ms. by, i. 20.
"Syrian readings," examples of, i. 86, 91, 173, 351, ii. 166, 210.
σωτήτα, Paul's use of, ii. 183.
σωτρεφομένων (Matt. xvii. 22), i. 122.
σῶμα (Matt. xxvii. 58), i. 168.
Tatian, given to abridging, i. 165.
Diatessaron of, referred to, i. 164, 173.
"Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," date of, i. 68; testimony of, for the doxology, i. 68.
Tenses, changes of, noted, i. 118, 137, 190, 261, ii. 72, 93; improper use of, noted, i. 149, 159, 189, 218, 233, 238, 282, 289, 322, 341, 361, ii. 42, 48, 55, 57, 58, 91, 126, 127, 181, 183, 192, 197, 212, 235, 239, 306, 309, 323.
Tertullian, "mentor" quotation by, i. 37.
Texts, the "best," ii. 6.
Textual criticism, Bengel canon of, cited and illustrated, i. 48; Griesbach's canon of, cited and illustrated, i. 51; calls for two classes of evidence, i. 53; science of, supposed by some to be matured, ii. 7; presents a field of future labor, ii. 9; principles of, carried to extremes, ii. 316.
Textual critics, work of, when needed, i. 46; considerations not to be overlooked by, i. 47; agree on general principles, but differ on their application, i. 47; necessary qualifications of, of the N. T., i. 52; infatuation of some, ii. 236, 317.
Textus Receptus, defined, i. 15; Stephen's work on, referred to, i. 20; omission of "neither the Son," from Matt. xxiv. 36 in, considered, i. 152; an important omission from Matt. xxvii. 49 in, considered, i. 164.
Thayer's Grimm's Lexicon, referred to, i. 243 n., ii. 226.
Theophylact, opinion of, i. 78.
Thomson, W. M., D.D., quoted, i. 79.
Thucydides, cited, ii. 117.
Tichonius the Donatist, testimony of, on Mark xvi. 2, i. 360.
Time, John's mode of reckoning, i. 354; compared with that of the other evangelists, i. 354.
Tischendorf, Constantine, account of Mss. from, i. 9; opinion of, concerning Codex D (Epistles), ii. 9; citations of, from Codex R, i. 10; certain erroneous readings adopted by, i. 26, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41, 42, 44; reason of, for omitting certain words, i. 36, ii. 270; adherence to received readings by, i. 37, 83, 85, 95, 97, 103, 108, 116, 151, 154, 188, 214, 216, 262, 270, 277, 313, 329, ii. 17, 18, 38, 44, 54, 59, 68, 80, 81, 90, 132, 179, 206, 207, 213, 224, 251, 256, 257, 264, 266, 302, 306, 310, 312, 319, 321, 323; rejection of received readings by, i. 56, 66, 69, 76, 84, 90, 91, 92, 96, 103, 113 n., 123, 127, 147, 151, 178, 182, 186, 189, 188, 191, 195, 197, 210, 216, 220, 231, 232, 234, 245, 246, 284, 288, 293, 307, 318, 322, 326, 344, 351, ii. 20, 28, 29, 47, 99, 93, 94, 141, 142, 165, 189, 190, 209, 228, 237, 245, 247, 270, 282, 296, 304, 318, 325, 326; en-
roneous citation by, i. 56 n.; adoption of a \textit{verbisort leito} by, i. 85; inconsistency of, i. 234; opinion of, i. 242; quoted, ii. 38, 245, 246; genuine reading adopted by, ii. 299.

"Titus" (Acts xviii. 7), a false reading, ii. 119.

Transcribers, mistakes of, i. 16, 22, ii. 311.


Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 24), i. 207.

\textit{Thl} (Rev. vi. 5), ii. 306.

\textit{Thml} (Heb. vi. 1), reference of, ii. 261.

\textit{The}, omission of (Matt. xxii. 32), i. 145.

\textit{The}, omission of (John v. 44), ii. 26.

\textit{Ta diav}, reading of, considered, i. 35.

\textit{Taipr}, overlooked by copyists, i. 265; use of, in Luke xxiv. 11, i. 346; for \textit{taip}, i. 279, 280.

\textit{Taip}, omission of (Matt. xv. 15), i. 112.

\textit{Tep}, mistaken for \textit{ti} (Matt. xi. 19), i. 91.

\textit{Ti}, improperly read for \textit{tir} (Rom. viii. 24), ii. 156.

\textit{To}, introducing an indirect interrogative clause, i. 225 and n. 4.

\textit{Top}, (Matt. xxi. 12), i. 137.

\textit{Tolvo}, ii. 174 n.

\textit{Top dyma} (Rev. xiii. 8), ii. 313.

\textit{To pevngma} (Mark i. 26), omitted only in B, ii. 35.

\textit{Tranov}, omission of (1 Cor. iii. 12), ii. 179.

\textit{Top topl}, (John ix. 6), ii. 48.

\textit{Tupx}, (1 Cor. x. 11), ii. 187.

\textit{Top dyrw} (James ii. 26), ii. 274.

Uncial Mss., described, i. 9.

Utrecht, Codex F (Gospels) in Public Library of, i. 10.

\textit{Ol} for \textit{os}, i. 310; meaning a disciple, ii. 13.

\textit{Owv}, omission of, noted, ii. 41.

\textit{UpoKelvo}, a probably lost reading, i. 319.

\textit{Uto} for \textit{ti}, i. 30, 95 n., 211.

Vatican Codex, certain readings peculiar to, i. 27, 28.

Venice, Codex U in Library of St. Mark's, i. 11.

Versions, oldest, referred to, i. 17; connection between Codex D and the Old Latin and Curetonian Syriac, i. 19; agreement among, an argument for a reading, i. 60, 62, 65, 69, 83, 90, 102, 105, 163, 178, 188, 190, 202, 204, 208, 229, 230, 241, 253, 268, 274, 287, 315, 343, ii. 11, 16, 57, 58, 69, 138, 169, 170, 194, 209, 220, 221, 233, 242, 245, 246, 254, 276.

Victor of Antioch on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 256.

Vienna, two leaves of Codex N at, i. 10.

Vulgate, quoted from, ii. 289.

Weiss, Bernhard, D.D., testimony of, concerning early textual corruptions, i. 18; quoted, i. 18, 22.

Westcott, Canon B. F., D.D., opinion of, concerning Codex 102 (Gospels), i. 35; \textit{versus} Hort, ii. 244, 264.

Westcott and Hort, adherence to one Ms., i. 16; their reading of Mark i. 4, i. 21; certain additions to the text by, i. 33, 34; certain omissions from the text by, i. 36, 37, 38, 39, 66, 291, 293; certain modifications adopted by, i. 40, 41; a few readings substituted by, for those of the \textit{Textus Receptus}, i. 41, 42, 43, 44; false reading of Matt. viii. 10 adopted by, i. 74; their estimate of the two oldest Greek Mss., i. 95 n., 154, ii. 5, 6; consistency of, i. 96; their manner of writing the contracted reflexive, ii. 63, 289, 290, 323; reject the testimony of N. B in Acts vii. 7, ii. 93; quoted, ii. 104, 111, 244; adhere to received reading in Rom. xiv. 19, ii. 169.

Wetsstein, J. J., Codex F (Gospels) collated by, i. 10.

Winer, Geo. II., D.D., cited, i. 192 n., 288 n., ii. 112.

Wolfenbüttel, Codices P (Gospels) and Q in Ducal Library of, i. 10.

Wordsworth, Bishop Christopher, quoted, ii. 188.

Xenophon, \textit{Anabasis} of, referred to, i. 279; cited, ii. 143 n.

\textit{Xpndov}, (Matt. xvi. 21), i. 117.

\textit{Psi}, or Codex \textit{Athens Laura}, reference to, i. 39.
## II. INDEX OF CITATIONS FROM THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

[Figures without any accompanying mark or letter denote passages or readings from the Text proper, more or less fully examined. Those with an asterisk (*) denote marginal readings noticed. Those with an obelisk (†), passages only briefly noted. Those followed by n., passages cited or noticed in footnotes.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 5, 7, 8, 10</td>
<td>i. 55*</td>
<td>xix. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 7, 8, 10</td>
<td>i. 57</td>
<td>xx. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 18</td>
<td>i. 56*</td>
<td>xx. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 25</td>
<td>i. 58</td>
<td>xx. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 30</td>
<td>i. 30*</td>
<td>xx. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 24</td>
<td>i. 61</td>
<td>xx. 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 4</td>
<td>i. 62*</td>
<td>xx. 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 13</td>
<td>i. 63</td>
<td>xx. 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 22</td>
<td>i. 64*</td>
<td>xxii. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 25</td>
<td>i. 66*</td>
<td>xxii. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 30</td>
<td>i. 66</td>
<td>xxii. 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 37</td>
<td>i. 67*</td>
<td>xxii. 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 8</td>
<td>i. 67*</td>
<td>xxii. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 13</td>
<td>i. 68</td>
<td>xxiv. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 34</td>
<td>ii. 29*</td>
<td>xxiv. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 13</td>
<td>ii. 72</td>
<td>xxvii. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 9</td>
<td>ii. 72*</td>
<td>xxvii. 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 10</td>
<td>ii. 74*</td>
<td>xxviii. 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 23</td>
<td>i. 75</td>
<td>xxix. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viii. 28</td>
<td>i. 75, 113 n.</td>
<td>xxx. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 29</td>
<td>i. 81</td>
<td>xxxi. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 4</td>
<td>i. 82*</td>
<td>xxxii. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 14</td>
<td>i. 83*</td>
<td>xxxiii. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 18</td>
<td>i. 83</td>
<td>xxxvi. 13, ii. 128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>John</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24:1</td>
<td>1:289</td>
<td>8:53</td>
<td>2:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>11:2</td>
<td>1:47</td>
</tr>
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<td>35:1</td>
<td>2:89</td>
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- Mark: 24:1, 289
- Luke: 1:286, 236, 35:1, 2:89
- Acts: 8:53
- John: 4:45, 11:2, 21:2, 1:47
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Romans</th>
<th>Romans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 19</td>
<td>ii. 81</td>
<td>i. 19</td>
<td>ii. 231 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 1</td>
<td>ii. 81</td>
<td>xvi. 13</td>
<td>ii. 114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 47</td>
<td>ii. 84</td>
<td>xviii. 3</td>
<td>ii. 115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 6</td>
<td>ii. 85</td>
<td>xvii. 14</td>
<td>ii. 116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 10</td>
<td>i. 308†</td>
<td>xvi. 26</td>
<td>ii. 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 1</td>
<td>ii. 86*</td>
<td>xvi. 28</td>
<td>ii. 279†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 12</td>
<td>ii. 264†</td>
<td>xvii. 3</td>
<td>ii. 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 25</td>
<td>ii. 87</td>
<td>xvii. 7</td>
<td>ii. 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 16</td>
<td>ii. 88</td>
<td>xvii. 7, 24</td>
<td>ii. 114 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 28</td>
<td>ii. 89</td>
<td>xvii. 21</td>
<td>ii. 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 33</td>
<td>ii. 90</td>
<td>x. 14</td>
<td>ii. 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 39</td>
<td>ii. 91</td>
<td>x. 16</td>
<td>ii. 121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. 13</td>
<td>ii. 92</td>
<td>x. 34</td>
<td>ii. 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 7</td>
<td>ii. 93</td>
<td>xx. 3</td>
<td>ii. 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 11</td>
<td>ii. 94†</td>
<td>xx. 5</td>
<td>ii. 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. 36</td>
<td>ii. 98</td>
<td>xx. 5</td>
<td>ii. 125*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xliii. 18</td>
<td>ii. 95*</td>
<td>xx. 5</td>
<td>ii. 125*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xliii. 32</td>
<td>ii. 129†</td>
<td>xx. 5</td>
<td>ii. 125*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xliii. 37</td>
<td>ii. 95</td>
<td>xvii. 22</td>
<td>ii. 125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ix. 25</td>
<td>ii. 96</td>
<td>xii. 24</td>
<td>ii. 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 3</td>
<td>ii. 96</td>
<td>x. 11</td>
<td>ii. 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 20</td>
<td>ii. 100†</td>
<td>x. 24</td>
<td>ii. 222, ii. 98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x. 24</td>
<td>ii. 222, ii. 98*</td>
<td>x. 30</td>
<td>ii. 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 12</td>
<td>ii. 100</td>
<td>xi. 21</td>
<td>ii. 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 21</td>
<td>ii. 101</td>
<td>xi. 23</td>
<td>ii. 102*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xi. 23</td>
<td>ii. 102*</td>
<td>xii. 5</td>
<td>ii. 103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 5</td>
<td>ii. 103</td>
<td>xii. 25</td>
<td>ii. 103*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 17</td>
<td>ii. 94†</td>
<td>xxvii. 1</td>
<td>ii. 114 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 18</td>
<td>ii. 105*</td>
<td>xxvii. 1</td>
<td>ii. 114 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 19, 20</td>
<td>ii. 107</td>
<td>xxvii. 16</td>
<td>ii. 138*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 25</td>
<td>ii. 109</td>
<td>xxvii. 19</td>
<td>ii. 132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xii. 33</td>
<td>ii. 110</td>
<td>xxvii. 37</td>
<td>ii. 133*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 27</td>
<td>i. 361†</td>
<td>xxvii. 39</td>
<td>ii. 134*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 24</td>
<td>ii. 111</td>
<td>xxvii. 41</td>
<td>ii. 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xv. 34</td>
<td>ii. 113</td>
<td>xxvii. 41</td>
<td>i. 114 n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 3</td>
<td>i. 308†</td>
<td>xxvii. 41</td>
<td>i. 114 n.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1 Corinthians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romans</th>
<th>Romans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 24</td>
<td>ii. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td>ii. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 2</td>
<td>ii. 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 3</td>
<td>i. 308†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td>ii. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 2</td>
<td>ii. 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 3</td>
<td>i. 308†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Romans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romans</th>
<th>Romans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 24</td>
<td>ii. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td>ii. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 2</td>
<td>ii. 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 3</td>
<td>i. 308†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. 14</td>
<td>ii. 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 2</td>
<td>ii. 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xvi. 3</td>
<td>i. 308†</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ephesians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Romans</th>
<th>Romans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. 1</td>
<td>ii. 211*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 14</td>
<td>ii. 213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>2 John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 3</td>
<td>ii. 275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 5</td>
<td>ii. 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 20</td>
<td>ii. 277*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i Peter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 21</td>
<td>ii. 278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 1</td>
<td>ii. 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 1</td>
<td>ii. 280*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 14</td>
<td>ii. 280*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 2</td>
<td>ii. 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i John</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. 4</td>
<td>ii. 283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 5</td>
<td>ii. 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. 14</td>
<td>ii. 286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. 20</td>
<td>ii. 287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 7</td>
<td>ii. 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 10</td>
<td>ii. 290*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 18</td>
<td>ii. 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates notes or comments.
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