

www.bibletranslation.ws/shop.html

DLIN
BS
2325
W45
1892a
+
v.1

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

The Robert M. and Laura Lee Lintz
Book Endowment for the Humanities

Class of 1924

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 091 301 113



The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924091301113>

THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT

Vol. 1

THE
REVISERS' GREEK TEXT

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN READINGS, TEXTUAL
AND MARGINAL, IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT ADOPTED BY THE LATE
ANGLO-AMERICAN REVISERS

Volume I

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

Πάντα δοκιμάζετε, τὸ καλὸν κατέχετε
PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD



BOSTON
SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
1892

PREFACE.

COPYRIGHT, 1892,
By SILVER, BURDETT & CO.

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.

TYPOGRAPHY BY J. S. CUSHING & Co., BOSTON.
PRESSWORK BY BERWICK & SMITH, BOSTON.

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.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
PREFACE	3
THE UNCIAL MANUSCRIPTS.	9
PATRISTIC WRITERS AND WRITINGS REFERRED TO . . .	12
INTRODUCTION	15
READINGS EXAMINED:	
From Matthew	55
From Mark	171
From Luke	261
APPENDICES:	
I. At what hour was Jesus crucified? . . .	353
II. When did Mary come to the sepulchre? . .	359

"If we be incompetent to devise theories on a grand or imposing scale, a more modest and safer course is open. Men of the present generation may be disqualified for taking a general survey of the whole domain of this branch of divine learning, who may yet be employed, serviceably and with honor, in cultivating each for himself some limited and humble field of special research to which his taste, his abilities, or opportunities have attached him: those persons may usefully improve a farm, who cannot hope to conquer a kingdom." — F. H. A. SCRIVENER, LL.D.

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.

Α (*i.e.* Aleph, first letter of the Hebrew alphabet). Codex Sinaiticus, now at St. Petersburg; discovered by Tischendorf in 1844 in the Convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai, but not secured by him till early in 1859, and published in 1862. Contains a large part of the Septuagint and the whole New Testament. Written, in Tischendorf's judgment, about the middle of the 4th century A.D., probably at Alexandria. "From the number of its *homoioteleuta*," or omissions made in consequence of likeness of endings in successive words or clauses, "and other errors, one cannot affirm that it is very carefully written." — *Scrivener*.

Α Codex Alexandrinus, in the British Museum; presented to Charles I. in 1628 by Cyril Lucar, Patriarch first of Alexandria, then of Constantinople. Contains the Septuagint almost complete, the whole new Testament, except Matthew i.-xxv. 6, and John vi. 50-viii. 52. Dated from the middle of the 5th century or earlier; is 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*.

Β Codex Vaticanus, in the Vatican Library at Rome. Published in 1868. "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, 1 and 2 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.

Β (Revelation). Also in the Vatican. Contains Revelation. About 800 A.D.

Γ 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 hands, of the 6th century, apparently Syrian or Egyptian, and of 9th century, Constantinopolitan.

Δ (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.

Δ (Epistles). Codex Claromontanus. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the Epistles of Paul in Greek and Latin. Written in the 6th century in North Africa by a Greek of Alexandria, Tischendorf thinks; meant for the use of a Latin church. Corrected by later hands, both Greek, of the 7th century, and early in the 9th.

Ε (Gospels). Codex Basileensis, in the Public Library at Basle, apparently brought thither from Constantinople. Contains the Gospels, except a few verses of Luke. 8th century.

E (Acts). Codex Laudianus, now at Oxford; presented to the University by Archbishop Laud in 1636. Contains the Acts in Greek and Latin, except about two chapters. Date, about 600 A.D. Apparently written in Sardinia, for use in a Latin church.

E (Epistles). Codex Sangermanensis, now at St. Petersburg. An inexact copy of D Claromontanus, 9th century.

F (Gospels). Codex Boreeli, in the Public Library at Utrecht. Contains the Gospels with many defects. Some of these have been made since the collation published by Wetstein. Hence this Codex is sometimes cited on his authority as **F^w**. Referred by different ones to the 8th, 9th, and 10th century.

F (Epistles). Codex Augiensis; in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. Contains the Pauline Epistles, in Greek and Latin, except a few passages; the Greek text of the Epistle to the Hebrews is also missing. 9th century.

G (Gospels). Codex Harleian 5684, in the British Museum. Much mutilated. Assigned to the 10th century.

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 Andr. Seidelii, now at Hamburg. Contains the Gospels, with many omissions. 9th century.

H (Acts). Codex Mutinensis; in the Grand Ducal Library at Modena. Contains part of the Acts. 9th century.

H (Epistles). Codex Coislinianus Parisiensis. Part now at Paris, part at St. Petersburg. Contains fragments of five of the Pauline Epistles. 6th century.

I Codex Tischendorfianus 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*.

K (Gospels). Codex Cyprinus Parisiensis. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the Gospels complete. 9th century.

K (Epistles). Codex Mosquensis. At Moscow. Contains the Epistles, except about 12 chapters. 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*.

L (Acts and Epistles). Codex Angelicus Romanus, belonging to the Augustinian monks at Rome. Contains Acts from viii. to, and Epistles, except a few verses. Of 9th century.

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 (Gospels). Codex Guelpherbytanus A. Only fragments of the four Gospels. Of the 6th century.

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

Q (Fragments of Luke and John). Codex Guelpherbytanus B. Of the 5th century. These two codices (**P** and **Q**) are in the Ducal Library of Wolfenbüttel.

R Codex Nitriensis Rescriptus. An important palimpsest, containing fragments of Luke. In the British Museum. Of the 6th century. Out of the 908 readings cited from it by Tischendorf (8th edition), **R** sides with **A** 356 times, and with **B** 157 times, where **A** and **B** differ.

S (Gospels). Codex Vaticanus 354, in the Vatican Library at Rome. Contains the four Gospels complete. Belongs to the middle of the 10th century.

T Codex Borgianus. In the Propaganda at Rome. Fragments of Luke and John, with a Thebaic Version. Of the 6th or 7th century.

T^{wo}. A few leaves of Luke and John in Greek and Thebaic, once belonging to Woide.

T^b, **T^c** Fragments of John and Matthew; at St. Petersburg. 6th century.

T^d Among the Borgian MSS. at Rome. A fragment of a Greek and Thebaic Lectionary of the 7th century. Contains small portions of Matthew, Mark, and John.

T^e A fragment, in the University Library at Cambridge, Eng. Contains only Matthew iii. 13-26. Of the 6th century. From Upper Egypt.

U (Gospels). Codex Naniannus. Contains the four Gospels entire. Now in the Library of St. Mark's, Venice. Of the 9th or 10th century.

V (Gospels). Codex Mosquensis. Of the 8th century.

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

X Codex Monacensis, in the University Library at Munich. Contains the four Gospels, with many defects. Of the 9th or 10th century.

Y Codex Barberini, at Rome. A fragment, of the 8th century, containing John xvi. 3-xix. 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.

Γ (*i.e.* Gamma). Part at Oxford, part at St. Petersburg. Contains the Gospels nearly entire. 9th 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.

Λ (*i.e.* Lambda). Codex Oxoniensis, in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. Contains Luke and John complete. Of the 9th century.

Ξ (*i.e.* Xi). Codex Zacynthius. In the Library of the British and Foreign Bible Society, London. Contains considerable portions of Luke. Like **Z**, a palimpsest, the original hand being probably of the 8th century.

Π (*i.e.* Pi). Codex Petropolitannus. Contains the Gospels, except about forty-five verses in Matthew, and thirty-four in John. Of the 9th century.

Σ (*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.

	A.D.		A.D.
<i>Ambrose</i> , Bp. of Milan	397	Clement of Rome	102
<i>Ambrosiaster</i> (i.e. Hilary the Deacon)	3d century.	Clement of Alexandria	194
Ammonius of Alexandria	fl. 220	Cosmas Indicopleustes of Alexandria	535
Anastasius	401	<i>Cyprian</i> , Bp. of Carthage	258
Andreas of Cæsarea in Cappadocia	5th century.	Cyril, Bp. of Jerusalem	386
Andreas of Crete	635	Cyril, Bp. of Alexandria	444
Antiochus	7th century.	<i>De Promissionibus, etc.</i> , 4th century.	
Aphraates the Persian, a Syrian Bp.	345	<i>De Vocatione Gentium</i> , 4th century.	
Apostolic Constitution,	3d and 4th century.	Didymus of Alexandria	395
Arethas, Bp. of Cæsarea in Cappadocia	10th century.	Dionysius, Bp. of Corinth, 170-180	
Arius	336	Dionysius, Bp. of Alexandria, 265	
<i>Arnobius</i>	306	Ephraem Syrus	378
Athanasius, Bp. of Alexandria, 373		Epiphanius, Bp. of Cyprus	403
<i>Augustine</i> , Bp. of Hippo	430	Eulogius of Alexandria	581
Basil the Great, of Cæsarea in Cappadocia	379	Eusebius, Bp. of Cæsarea	340
Basil of Seleucia	460	Eusebius of Emisa	360
<i>Bede</i> , the Venerable	735	Eustathius, Bp. of Antioch	337
Cæsarius of Constantinople	368	Euthalius, Bp. of Sulca	458
<i>Cassiodorus</i> , a monk of Italy, about 565		Eutharius of Tyana	419
Chrysostom, Bp. of Constantinople	407	Euthymius Zigabenus	1119
		<i>Fulgentius</i> , Bp. of Ruspe	533
		Germanus, Abp. of Constantinople	715
		Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bp. of Neocæsarea	270
		Gregory, Bp. of Nazianzus	389
		Gregory, Bp. of Nyssa	396

	A.D.		A.D.
<i>Haymo</i> , Bp. of Halberstadt	853	Porphyry	233-305
Heigesippus	about 180	<i>Primasius</i> , Bp. of Adrumetum, fl. 550	
<i>Hilary</i> , Bp. of Poitiers	367	Proclus, Patriarch of Constantinople	485
<i>Hippolytus</i> , Bp. of Portus (Romanus)	237	Procopius	about 565
Ignatius, Bp. of Antioch	107	Pseudo-Cæsarius	7th century.
Irenæus, Bp. of Lyons	192	Ptolemæus, the Gnostic, 2d century.	
Isidore of Pelusium	432	<i>Questiones ex utroque Testamento</i>	370
<i>Jerome</i>	420	<i>Rufinus</i> of Aquileia	410
John Damascene	750	<i>Sedulius</i>	5th century.
Justin Martyr	165	Severianus, a Syrian Bp.	409
<i>Lactantius</i>	about 325	Severus of Antioch	520
<i>Lucifer</i> , Bp. of Cagliari	371	Syrian "Acts of the Apostles," 4th century.	
Macarius Magnes	391	Tatian of Antioch	172
Methodius Patarensis	311	Tertullian	220
Naassenus	2d century.	Theodore, Bp. of Mopsuestia in Cilicia	428
Nonnus	410	Theodoret, Bp. of Cyrrhus in Syria	458
<i>Novation</i> of Rome	about 275	Theodotus of Ancyra	430
(Ecumenius, Bp. of Tricca, in Thrace	10th century.	Theophylact, Abp. of Bulgaria, 1108	
Origen	254	The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles	about 120
Papias, Bp. of Hierapolis in Phrygia	163	Tichonius, the Donatist	fl. 390
Paschal Chronicle of Alexandria	6th century.	Titus, Bp. of Bostra	about 375
<i>Paulinus Nolanus</i>	431	Victor of Antioch	430
Paulus, Bp. of Emisa	280	Victor, Bp. of Tunis	565
<i>Paulus Orosius</i>	415	<i>Victorinus</i> , Bp. of Petau in Austria	304
Pelagius	about 425		
Photius, Bp. of Constantinople, 891			
Polycarp, Bp. of Smyrna, about 166			

"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 depravations 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 depravations 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 Irenæus, 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 As was to be expected,

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."¹ 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.

correcting hands in our manuscripts show that the latter were often compared with others and corrected by them, so that many errors caused by carelessness were removed. How many of our manuscripts rest upon such corrected copies is shown by the mixed readings and half alterations which they contain. It was not until the seventh and eighth centuries, when Constantinople became the chief seat of transcribers, that a more equable and correct but much emended text was restored to the younger manuscripts."¹ Scrivener, too, after referring to the complaints of Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, and Origen respecting the discordant readings already prevalent in their days—A.D. 150 to 250—through the tamperings of those "who desired to be more knowing than the apostles," adds: "It cannot easily be denied that the various readings of the New Testament current from the middle of the second to the middle of the third century were neither fewer nor less considerable than such language would lead us to anticipate. Though no [one of the] surviving manuscripts of the Old Latin Version dates before the fourth century, and most of them belong to a still later age, yet the general correspondence of their text with that used by the first Latin Fathers is a sufficient voucher for its high antiquity. The connection subsisting between this Latin version, the Curetonian Syriac and Codex Bezae [or D] proves that the text of these documents is considerably older than the vellum on which they are written; the Peshito Syriac also, most probably the very earliest of all translations, though approaching far nearer to the received text than they, sufficiently resembles these authorities in many peculiar readings to exhibit the general tone and character of one class of manuscripts extant in the second century two hundred years anterior to Codices \aleph , B [*i.e.* to the two oldest extant Greek manuscripts]. Now it may be said without extravagance that no set of Scriptural records affords a text less probable in itself

¹ *Introduction to the New Testament*, American edition, Vol. ii., pp. 405, 406.

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

¹ *Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament*, Third edition, pp. 510, 511.

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 *ὁ βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ κηρύσσων*, adopted by Westcott

and Hort in Mark i. 4, in place of the common reading βαπτίζων ἐν τῇ ἑρήμῳ καὶ κηρύσσων, must be accepted as the true reading, although the presence of the article is favored by only five uncials (the two oldest being among the number), and by two cursives and one version, while the omission of καὶ 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 *homoteleuton* [*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 *καυχῶμαι* for *καθηῶμαι* 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 αὐτοῦ, "his," in connection with "kinsmen," in Acts x. 24, into αὐτούς, "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 αὐτούς) 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 copyist. 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 through 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 (Σ) 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 disce 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.

¹ *Introduction*, etc., Vol. ii., pp. 406, 407.

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.

A FEW READINGS PECULIAR TO THE SINAITIC CODEX, Σ, AS ORIGINALLY WRITTEN.¹

ADDITIONS.

- Mark vi. 36. "Buy themselves *victuals*, something to eat."
- viii. 4. "Answered him *and said*, Whence " etc.
- xii. 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 Joseph 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.

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 ἑτεραι* = (?) *αἱ ἕτεραι*] for "Many other women" [*ἄλλαι*].

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 *Κύριε* is inserted before *ἔτι* (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 *b*.
- iv. 16. "These . . . are they that are sown upon the rocky ledges, [who,] when they have heard the word, straightway receive it" etc., — the *οἱ*, "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 xii. 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. *ἑαυτοῦ*, "taketh from itself," for *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*, "taketh from it."
- iii. 9. Plural for the singular: "little boats," for "a little boat."
- viii. 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."

x. 30. *Alōnian* for *alōnion*, — carelessly or ignorantly changed as if necessary to make the word correspond in gender with *ζῶην*. The scribe of B commits the same error elsewhere, as in Acts xiii. 48 and 1 John ii. 25.

xiii. 7. *Ἀκούητε*, a blunder in spelling *ἀκούσῃτε*, "ye shall hear"; or possibly meant for *ἀκούετε*, "ye hear," which is an unwarranted reading.

xiii. 32. The singular without the definite article, "an angel," for the plural with the article, "the angels."

xiii. 34. *Ἐαυτοῦ* for *αὐτοῦ* twice, — reading, "his own house" and "his own servants" instead of "his house" and "his servants."

xiv. 49. The imperfect, third person singular, *ἐκράτει*, "he took me," instead of the aorist, second person plural, *ἐκπατήσατε*, "ye took me"; or possibly meant for the imperfect second person plural, *ἐκπατεῖτε*, a false reading, and left unfinished. At best, a "hard" reading.

SUBSTITUTIONS.

iv. 15. "Who" for "and," — "*who* when they had heard" etc. — A sufficiently "hard" reading to suit any one who sees in such readings proofs of genuineness.

vi. 39. *Ἐν* for *ἐπὶ*, — "by companies *in* the green grass" instead of "by companies *upon* the green grass."

vii. 15. *τὸ κοινοῦν αὐτόν*, "*which defileth him*," for *ὃ δύναται αὐτὸν κοινῶσαι*, "*that can defile him*."

xv. 45. *Ἰωσή*, "Joses," for *Ἰωσήφ*, "Joseph." The two names are altogether distinct. The ignorant or careless scribe succeeded in giving Joseph his right name in verse 43, though he failed here.

A FEW READINGS PECULIAR TO CODEX EPHRAEMI, 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."

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.

ix. 29. The accusative *οὐδέν* erroneously written for the dative *οὐδενί* after *ἐν*, — making an impossible construction.

xvi. 3. The masculine *ἐαυτοῦς* for the feminine *ἐαυτάς*, "themselves," — as if the reference were to *men* instead of to women.

SUBSTITUTIONS.

v. 23. "My little daughter is at the point of death. *Come, touch her with thy hands*, that she may" etc.

vi. 6. "Because of their *faith*" for "Because of their unbelief."

viii. 10. "Melegada" for "Dalmanutha."

viii. 26. "And saith unto him," in place of "saying."

xiii. 26. "Upon the clouds" for "in clouds."

xv. 43. "And asked for the *corpse* of Jesus."

A FEW READINGS PECULIAR TO CODEX REGIUS, L.

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 sware [unto her], Whatsoever thou shalt ask" etc.

MODIFICATIONS.

- xv. 22. "Gotha" for "Golgotha."

SUBSTITUTIONS.

- vi. 25. ~~Βαπτιστο~~ς, as in verse 24, and in i. 4, for βαπτιστοῦ, the Baptizer or Baptist.
 vii. 12. "Ὅτι," in place of *καί*, employed Hebraistically for ὅτι before οἰκέτι, and improperly omitted by the Revisers.
 vii. 30. "She found the child laid (ὑπὸ) *under the bed*" instead of "*upon* (ἐπὶ) the bed."
 xv. 40. "The *blessed* Magdalene" for "Mary the Magdalene."

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 baptized; and he baptized him.*"
 v. 12. "For so did *your fathers* persecute the prophets" etc.

- vii. 22. "Lord, Lord, did we not *eat and drink in thy name, and prophesy in thy name,*" etc.
 xii. 1. "Began to pluck the ears of corn, *and to rub them in their hands, and to eat.*"
 xiii. 16. "Blessed are your eyes, for they see; and *again your ears, for they hear.*"
 xiii. 33. "Which a *wise* woman took, and hid" etc.
 xviii. 30. "And he, *his fellow servant*, would not."
 xix. 14. "Suffer the little children *to come unto me*, and forbid them not to come unto me."
 xix. 21. "Thou shalt have treasure in heaven; *and take up thy cross* and come, follow me."
 xix. 29. "And *in the world to come* shall inherit eternal life."
 xx. 12. "The burden and the heat of the *whole* day."
 xx. 33. "Lord, that our eyes may be opened, *and we may see thee.*"
 xxi. 9. "Hosanna in the highest. *And many went forth to meet him, and rejoiced and praised God for all that they had seen.*"
 xxi. 31. "Which of the two, *as it seems to you*, did the will of his father?"
 xxii. 36. "Master, which is the great *and first* commandment in the law?"

OMISSIONS.

- vi. 5. ["Verily] I say unto you," etc.
 vi. 16. "When ye fast, be not as the hypocrites, [of a sad countenance;] for" etc.
 vi. 20. "Where *no* moth [nor rust] destroyeth."
 vi. 32. "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of [all] these things."
 xx. 30. "And [behold,] two blind men" etc.
 xxi. 28. ["And coming] to the first he said," etc.
 xxiii. 8. "And [all] ye are brethren."
 xxiii. 18. "Whosoever shall swear [by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear] by the gift that is upon *the altar*, he is a debtor."

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?*"

xxiii. 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.

ADDITIONS.

i. 10. "Descending *and remaining* upon him." Found in \aleph , 33, 262, and ten or twelve other cursives, six copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, one copy of the Memphitic, and the Ethiopic.

i. 13. "Forty days *and forty nights*." L, M, six or seven cursives, four codices of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac.

iii. 11. "Thou art *the Christ*, the Son of God." C, M, P, 16, 121, and the Philoxenian Syriac.

iii. 12. "That they should not make him known, *because they knew him to be the Christ*." C, two cursives, and α of the Old Latin Version.

iii. 32. "Behold, thy mother, and thy brethren, *and thy sisters*, without seek for thee." A, D, E, F, H, M, S, U, V, P, more than a hundred cursives, eight or nine copies of the Old Latin, the Gothic, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac. Adopted, however, by Tischendorf as genuine because *not* found in Matthew's (xii. 47) and Luke's (viii. 20) records!

iv. 1. $\tau\theta$, "the," before $\pi\lambda\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu$, "boat." A, B second hand, D, E, F, G, H, S, U, V, Δ , most of the cursives, and the Memphitic Version. It is hardly credible that the Evangelist should have inserted the article here. The whole context forbids it.

v. 33. "Trembling *because she had done it secretly*." D, four cursives, four copies of the Old Latin, and the Armenian.

v. 42. "*About* twelve years old." \aleph , C, Δ , half a dozen cursives, and the Armenian Version.

vii. 35. "And *straightway* the bond of his tongue was loosed." \aleph , L, Δ ,—in which manuscripts the same word is omitted at the beginning of the verse. The Ethiopic Version, however, has the word in both places: "And *straightway* his ears were opened, and *straightway* the bond of his tongue" etc. The error arose from the omission of the word at the opening of the verse, but on being subsequently restored to the text was put in the wrong place. Yet Tischendorf gives it here as the true reading, omitting it earlier in the verse.

vii. 37. "He doeth all things well, *inasmuch as* he maketh both the deaf to hear," etc. B, and the Memphitic Version. Inserted by Westcott and Hort in the margin.

viii. 17. "Why reason ye *in your hearts*, because" etc. D, U, seven or eight cursives, seven or eight copies of the Old Latin, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic.

viii. 29. "Thou art the Christ, *the Son of God*." \aleph , L, the lost uncial

represented by Ferrar's group of cursives (13, 69, 124, 346), 157, *b*, of the Old Latin, and the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac Versions.

ix. 11. "Saying, *the Pharisees and the Scribes say.*" \aleph , L, four copies of the Old Latin, and the Vulgate. Added also by Tischendorf.

ix. 22. "And help us, *Lord.*" D, G, 473, six copies of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version.

x. 28. "And have followed thee. *What then shall we have?*" \aleph , two cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, and one of the Vulgate.

x. 35. "The *two* sons of Zebedee." B, C, and the Memphitic Version. Adopted by Westcott and Hort, but bracketed.

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

xii. 40. "Who devour widows' and *orphans'* houses." D, the lost uncial just referred to, 28, 473, seven copies of the Old Latin Version, and the Jerusalem Syriac.

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

xiv. 31. "But *Peter* spake." A, C, G, M, N, S, U, about thirty-five cursives, the Thebaic, Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions.

xv. 13. "They cried out again, *saying*, Crucify him." A, D, K, M, P, about twenty-five cursives, four or five copies of the Old Latin, one edition of the Thebaic, and the Ethiopic Version.

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 cursives, the Curetonian and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, and Armenian Versions.

OMISSIONS.

i. 11. "Came." \aleph first hand, D, and two codices of the Old Latin Version. Omitted also by Tischendorf.

i. 16. *'Αμφιβληστρον*, "a net." \aleph , 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 *ἀμφιβληστρον*, "nets," supposing that to be the proper form of the word.

i. 19. "Thence." B, D, L, a few cursives, 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 Sinaitic Codex, instead of omitting "thence," omitted "a little."

i. 21. "Having entered." \aleph , C, L, Δ , less than ten cursives, the Peshito Syriac, some editions of the Memphitic Version, and Origen twice. At the same time, *ἐδίδασκεν*, "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." \aleph 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 cursives, 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." \aleph , A, D, L, Δ , our lost uncial, 33, etc.

i. 45. *Ἦν*, "was." B, 102, and *b* and *e* 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 cursives, 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 *g*¹. Probably dropped as unnecessary.

ii. 16. "And drinketh." \aleph , 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, 1, 33, and five other cursives, six or seven copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, Ethiopic, and some later versions.

ii. 26. "How." Omitted by B, D, and 102 only.

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 *ἐν τῇ Ἀβιδθάρ ἀρχιερέως*, "when Abiathar was high priest," which was so common then, is historically incorrect. The restoration of the article after *Ἀβιδθάρ* removes the whole difficulty.

iii. 1. "The" before "synagogue." \aleph , 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 cursives, 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 cursives, seven copies of the Old Latin, Cyprian of course, and Athanasius.

iii. 35. "For." B, δ , ϵ , 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 cursives, 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 α , d , e , f ², i of the Old Latin, while D, d , e omit also the following words, "seeing him."

vi. 27, 28. "And he went, and beheaded him in the prison, and brought his head." \aleph , 33. Omitted by *homoioteleuton*.

vii. 25. The *αὐτῆς*, "her," after *θυγάτριον*, "little daughter." \aleph , D, Δ , our lost uncials, 1, 28, and nine or ten other cursives. Omitted as needless.

viii. 4. "Here." D, H, 69, six copies of the Old Latin, and the Gothic Version. Dropped as redundant.

viii. 12. "Unto you." B, L, only. Yet Westcott and Hort omit it from the text.

viii. 20. "And" at the beginning of the verse. B, L, 473. Relegated by Westcott and Hort to the margin.

ix. 18. "Him" after "teareth" or "dasheth." \aleph , D, and the Old Latin manuscript k . Omitted also by Tischendorf.

ix. 34. "In the way." A, D, Δ , six copies of the Old Latin, and the Gothic Version. Probably omitted as unnecessary, because of its use in the preceding verse.

x. 2. "The Pharisees came unto him and." D and α , b , k of the Old Latin Version.

x. 19. "Do not bear false witness." B first hand, K, Δ , II, twenty cursives, and the Armenian Version.

x. 47. "Jesus" before "thou son of David." L, fifteen cursives, two or three copies of the Latin Version, and Origen.

xi. 4. The article before *θύραν*, "door." B, L, Δ , 473, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Gothic, and Armenian Versions, and Origen. Omitted also by Westcott and Hort.

xi. 17. "Unto them." B, 28, 124, four codices of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version. Omitted also from the text by Westcott and Hort.

xii. 9. "Therefore." B, L, one copy of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic. Westcott and Hort, of course, omit the word. Tischendorf does the same, but for a very different reason; namely, because Luke's report of this parable (xx. 15) contains the word! Lachmann and the Revisers retain it, as it undoubtedly should be retained.

xii. 17. "Unto them." Though this is a frequent omission with B, it is enough to satisfy Westcott and Hort that it is no part of the text because B and D, and no others, omit it here.

xii. 26, 27. The article before *θεός*, "God"; twice in verse 26, and once in verse 27. B, D, and Origen omit it in verse 26; and B, D, K, L, the margin of M, X, Δ , II, more than twenty cursives, and Origen, in verse 27. It is omitted in none of these places by Tischendorf, but in all of them by Lachmann and Westcott and Hort; and by the Revisers, too, in their Greek text, though their English Version indicates the contrary.

xii. 30. "And with all thy mind." D, II, two cursives, four copies of the Old Latin, the Jerusalem Syriac, Justin Martyr (who also omits "and with all thy soul"), and Cyprian several times. Tertullian, in his "Answer to the Jews," omits this expression, as well as that following it, "and with all thy strength." But these Fathers apparently quoted from memory.

xii. 34. *αὐτόν*, "him," after *ιδών*, "seeing." \aleph , D, L, Δ , fifteen cursives, and Chrysostom. Omitted in order to blend the two clauses into one, as in our English versions.

xii. 34. "Thou art." \aleph , L, only.

xii. 34. "After that." D, 433, and six other cursives, a few Latin codices, and the two Egyptian Versions.

xiii. 6, 7, 9. "For." In verse 6, omitted by \aleph , B, L, the Ethiopic, and the Persic of Walton's Polyglot; in verse 7, by \aleph 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. Οὐκέτι , "no more,"—reading "I will not drink" etc. \aleph , 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." \aleph , C first hand, D, two cursives, 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 \aleph , 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 \aleph , L, ϵ , and another copy of the Old Latin, and the latter by \aleph , 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 \aleph and ϵ .

xiv. 31. $\Delta\epsilon$, "and" or "also," near the end of the verse. B, 1, 209, a few other cursives, and a , ϵ , ff^2 , k . Bracketed by Westcott and Hort, as if the omission might be genuine!

xiv. 39. "Saying the same words." D, a , ϵ , ff^2 , k . Again bracketed by Westcott and Hort.

xiv. 47. "A certain." \aleph , A, L, M, ten or twelve cursives, 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.

xiv. 65. "And to cover his face." D, and a , f .

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

xv. 4. "Saying." \aleph 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 in connection with $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\omega\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$, "to ask."

xv. 10. "The chief priests." B, 1, two lectionaries, and the Memphitic Version.

xv. 20. "Him" after "crucify." Omitted by \aleph , D, 1, 122 second hand, two copies of the Old Latin,—apparently as unnecessary. Followed by Tischendorf.

xv. 36. καί , "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.

xv. 41. "And ministered unto him." C, D, Δ , nine cursives, and n of the Old Latin omit.

xvi. 6. "Of Nazareth." \aleph first hand, and D, only.

xvi. 9–20. These twelve verses are omitted by \aleph 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 Lauræ, 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." \aleph , a few cursives, the Memphitic Version, and Origen in one place.

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

i. 8. Present, "baptize," for the aorist, "baptized." D, a few cursives, and six copies of the Old Latin.

i. 24. Σί, "thou," for σοί, "to thee." A, B, Γ, Δ, and other ancient manuscripts. A not uncommon clerical error among the older manuscripts.

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

iii. 2. Present, "he heals," for the future, "he will heal." Ν, 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.) Ν, D, L, Δ, less than ten cursives, 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.

v. 1. Singular, "he came," for the plural, "they came." C, G, L, M, Δ, more than thirty cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian, two editions of the Memphitic, and the Armenian. Changed because of what follows and what immediately precedes.

vi. 14. Plural, "they said," for the singular, "he said." B, D, two cursives, 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. Ν, D, only; yet adopted by Tischendorf.

vii. 14. Present, "he saith," for the imperfect, "he said." B, 59, only.

vii. 17. Plural, "they had entered," for the singular, "he had entered." Ν, U, about a dozen cursives, 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." Ν, B, L, Δ, & 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.

x. 36. Future indicative, first person singular, με ποιήσω, "What do ye wish *me* I shall do for you?" instead of the aorist infinitive, ποιῆσαι με, "What do ye wish *me* to do for you?" So Ν as amended in the seventh century, B, and the Armenian Version. And so Tischendorf reads. Codex C, and ten or twelve cursives omit "me," and read, "What do ye wish (that) I shall do for you?" All of these, except two cursives, are without ἵνα, "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, θέλει με ποιήσω, is the result of a transcriber's stupidly and mechanically following the structure of the clause he had just written, αἰτήσωμεν σε ποιήσας, 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 Ν, C, X, Δ, ten cursives, 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 *these* believe," for "Neither did they believe *these*." L, ff², and Zohrab's Armenian Version.

SUBSTITUTIONS.

i. 16. "Simon's brother" for "his brother." Ν, A, B, E second hand, L, M, Δ, twenty-five or thirty cursives, 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 cursives, 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.

i. 45. ἔπ', "upon," for ἐν, "in." Ν, B, L, Δ, and half-a-dozen cursives. An obvious transcriptional error, perpetuated by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort in their editions.

ii. 4. ὅπου, "where," for ἐφ' ᾧ, "on which." Ν, B, D, L, and two copies of the Old Latin Version. It was evidently introduced because of the ὅπου 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.

ii. 14. "James" for "Levi." D, Ferrar's group, and six copies of the Old Latin.

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

iii. 26. "Casteth out Satan" for "hath risen against himself." D, and most copies of the Old Latin Version.

iv. 21. "Under" for "upon." \aleph , B first hand, Σ , Ferrar's group of cursives, 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 "Josés." \aleph , 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." \aleph , 346, only; yet adopted by Tischendorf as genuine.

vi. 36. "Nearest" for "round about." D, and the Latin Version. An early gloss. Inserted in Westcott and Hort's margin.

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. "*Loveth* me" for "*honoreth* me." D, and α , δ , ϵ , of the Old Latin Version; while the Ethiopic Version has "honor 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 *εἰσιν*, "are," had been the original reading, it is incredible that any one would ever have substituted *ἤκασιν*, "have come," in its place. This anomalous form, which appears nowhere else in the New Testament, not only gave rise to the early reading *εἰσιν*, but also to the later and more widely adopted *ἤκουσιν*, "are present." Compare Buttmann, *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, were 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.

x. 26. "Unto him" for "among themselves." \aleph , B, C, Δ , the Memphitic Version, and the Arabic of the Polyglot. Mark's expression for denoting speaking *to* any one is not *λέγειν πρὸς αὐτόν*, but *λέγειν αὐτῷ*. But to express the idea of persons speaking *one with another*, or *among themselves*, he uses the form *λέγειν πρὸς ἑαυτούς*, or *λέγειν πρὸς ἀλλήλους*. 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 *πρὸς* 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. \aleph , 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 *have*" for the second "and *leave*." 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^d, 28, and the two Egyptian Versions. Adopted by Westcott and Hort, as if genuine.

xiii. 22. "But" for "for." \aleph , C, only.

xiv. 2. "For" for "but." \aleph , 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. 55. "False witness" for "witness." A, S first hand, six cursives, *k*, and the Thebaic Version.

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

xv. 6. *Ὁν παρερωῦντο*, "whom they asked from him," for *ὃν περ ἤρωοντο*, "whomsoever they demanded." Found only in *Σ* first hand, A, and B first hand. (*Σ* 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 *ὃν· παρερωῦντο*, — 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.

xv. 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.

xv. 47. "Joseph" for "Josés." Codex A, one cursive, one copy of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the Ethiopic Version. Also "James" for "Josés." D, and several of the Old Latin codices, with variations.

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 (*Σ* 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" (Σ, B, D, L, etc.), in Mark vi. 22; "of Judea" (Σ, B, C, L, etc.), in Luke iv. 44; the omission of Jesus' petition, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they are doing" (Σ, B, D, etc.), in Luke xxiii. 34; "having saluted Festus" (Σ, A, B, L, etc.), in Acts xxv. 13; "Let us also bear the image of the heavenly" (Σ, 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 loquendi* 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: *Proclivi scriptiori præstat 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'erleaps 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 selle*," i.e. its saddle, and lands on the other side of it, is simply criticism gone mad. The true reading shows that "its selfe"—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 *Brevior lectio preferenda est verbosiori*. 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 **Σ**, 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 \aleph 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 \aleph , B, L; to Mark ix. 38, where the clause, "who would not follow us," is omitted from \aleph , B, C, L, Δ , 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 \aleph , 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 unwar-

ranted 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.

¹ *Biblical Criticism*, Vol. ii., p. 374.

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 'Αμών. The Revisers, however, set these aside for the corrupt readings of **8**, 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, Π, 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 'Αμός. 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 'Αμός for 'Αμών. Moreover, if 'Ασάφ and 'Αμός 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 'Αμός 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, Ἀμῶς 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, Ἀσάφ and Ἀμῶς are obviously false readings.

I. 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 Ἰησοῦ, "Jesus," appears in every known Greek manuscript. In the Vatican codex, it follows Χριστοῦ, so as 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 Ἰησοῦ. See Scrivener's *Introduction*, note I, 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 Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, "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 Ἰησοῦ seems to have proceeded, not from supposing the article to be inadmissible before it, but from the idea that in the evangelist's day Χριστός was not used as a surname for Jesus, but simply to denote his character as the anointed of God. And yet the phrase ὁ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, 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 δ Ἰησοῦς 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.

i. 25.

Received Text. $\xi\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma\ \tau\acute{o}\nu\ \pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu$ —till she had brought forth her firstborn son.

Revised Text. $\xi\omega\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu$ —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 $\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu$. 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

$\pi\rho\omega\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu$ 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, $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$ and $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\alpha\iota$, in Matt. xii. 46, xiii. 55, 56, mean brothers and sisters in the commonly accepted sense of the words as truly as $\mu\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\rho$ 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 $\nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu$, 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$, "her," did not), in connection with $\nu\acute{\iota}\acute{o}\nu$, 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 Thebaic 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 uncials, 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

¹ *Commentary on the Revised Version.*

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.

iv. 24.

Rec. T. *καὶ δαιμονιζομένων* — and those which were possessed with devils.

Rev. T. *δαιμονιζομένους* — possessed with devils.

The omission of *καί* here is hardly warranted. It is attested only by B, C first hand, two cursives, and the Memphitic Ver-

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 \aleph , C second hand, D, E, K, S, U, V, Γ , II, the great majority of the cursives, 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.

V. 13.

Rec. T. $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\ \beta\lambda\eta\theta\eta\eta\alpha\iota\ \xi\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ — but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot.

Rev. T. $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\ \beta\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\ \xi\omega\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ — 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 \aleph , 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-

graphical or other, in the statement that "then the question of the text was *usually not* raised."

V. 22.

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 ὀργιζόμενος, "he that is angry," were equivalent in meaning to "he that hateth," there would of course be no need of the word εἰκῆ, "without cause." But ὀργίζεσθαι is a word of very different meaning. So far from denoting the cherishing of enmity, it expresses, like its root ὀργή, "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' ὀργῆς, "with anger," being grieved at their hardness of heart. Again, the Apostle Paul, in Eph. iv. 26, says, ὀργίζεσθε, "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 ὀργιζόμενος 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. Εἰκῆ seems to have been stricken out of the text under a misapprehension of the true meaning of ὀργιζόμενος. Its absence from the text is supported only by \aleph , B, two cursives, 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, Γ, Δ, II, 1, 33, and all but two other cursives, 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 εἰκῆ, 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 ὀργιζόμενος. 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 *deliver 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 cursives (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. ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου βληθῇ εἰς γέεναν — thy whole body should be cast into hell.

Rev. T. ὅλον τὸ σῶμά σου εἰς γέεναν ἀπέλθῃ — thy whole body go into hell.

If the revised reading ἀπέλθῃ 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 βληθῇ. 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 **Σ**, B, a few cursives, 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, ἀπέλθῃ is no more deserving of a place here than in verse 29. Βληθῇ is sufficiently attested as the true reading by E, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, F, Δ, II, the great majority of the cursives, 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 ἔσται in place of ἔστω, — a reading that is doubtless due to a clerical blunder in writing αἰ for ω. 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 οὐρανῷ for ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, and τὴν ὀφειλὴν for τὰ ὀφειλήματα, and the ἀφίεμεν of the Received Text in place of the Revisers' ἀφήκαμεν. 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 Ξ 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 ἀμήν), 118, 130, 209; but 566 or h^{cr} (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 πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, but 422 τοῦ πρὸς 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 δύναμις, and some editions of the Peshito ἀμήν, which is in *at least* one manuscript), the Thebaic (omitting καὶ ἡ δόξα), 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* (quoniam 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*, *c*, *f*¹, *g*², *h*, *l*, 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 Σ 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*."¹

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 **Σ** 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 *εἰσέρχόμενοι εἰς that enter into it*; but wide and broad is the way that leadeth unto destruction, and many are they *διερχόμενοι 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 **Σ**, 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 *τασσόμενος*, "set," is a part of the genuine text. Documentary evidence is by no means decisively against it, as it is, for example, against *ιαθήτω*, "let — be healed," for *ιαθήσεται*, "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 cursives 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 cursives 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 scholiast or scribe fearing the Saviour might be understood to mean "Not even in Israel (*i.e.* in Jacob) *ἐν ποί 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.

viii. 23.

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

The rejection of *τό* by the Revisers, though called for by the sixth-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, B, C, and a number of cursives, is not supported by the weightier documentary evidence of *Σ* 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, I, Δ, Π, the majority of the cursives, 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.

Rec. T. *τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν* — of the Gergesenes.
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, L, S, U, V, X, II, nearly all the cursives, 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 **Σ** 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 Peræa 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, Gersa, 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, Gadara was the capital of Peræa, 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

¹ See *The Land and the Book*, by W. M. Thomson, D.D., Vol. ii., p. 37.

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 Peræa 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 read-

ing 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 Gergesa, 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 Keis

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 Keîs. 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 Keîs, 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 identification. 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, pronounced by Bedawîn 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; *i.e.* Gergesenes. He was from this region, and personally knew the localities. . . . Gergesa, or Gerasa, or Kersa, however 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 examinations 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."¹

viii. 29.

Rec. T. Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ; — What have we to do with thee, Jesus thou Son of God?

Rev. T. Τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, υἱὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ; — What have we to do with thee, thou Son of God?

The omission of "Jesus," though attested by **8**, B, C first-hand, L, more than twenty cursives, several copies of the Old Latin and Vulgate Versions, and the Memphitic Version, and seemingly supported by Origen, Eusebius, Cyprian, and Victorinus, can hardly be accepted as the true reading, inasmuch as the report of this outcry, as given by Mark (v. 7) and Luke (viii. 28), has Ἰησοῦ, and this reading is strongly vouched for by C's second corrector, E, K, M, S, U, V, X, Δ, Π, most of the cursives, the best and greatest number of copies of the Old Latin and Vulgate Versions, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Thebaic Versions, as well as the Gothic, Armenian, and

¹ 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, Ἰησοῦ could hardly have been taken from Mark or Luke without the transfer also of τοῦ ὑψίστου, "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 Ἰησοῦ 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. ἰδών, "seeing" or "perceiving," instead of εἰδώς, "knowing." This use of ἰδών, as referring to mental vision, is not foreign to Matthew, as a reference to xxvii. 3 and 24 will show; though the more usual word in such a connection is εἰδώς. 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 \aleph (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, Δ , Π second hand, the majority of the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, and Memphitic, and possibly some other versions. Εἰδώς is the reading of only B, E second hand, Φ , Π 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 ἰδών as well as of

εἰδώς. If the latter were the original word, it is difficult to believe that any scribe would have changed it to ἰδών; whereas if ἰδών 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. 14.

The "ancient authorities" that are referred to here as omitting "oft" are only \aleph first hand, B, and the two cursives, 27, 71, — testimony hardly sufficient to condemn a reading supported by \aleph 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 πυκνά, "oft," — the word that was actually inserted by the sixth-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex from Luke v. 33.

ix. 18.

Rec. T. ἄρχων ἐλθών — there came a certain ruler and.

Rev. T. ἄρχων εἰς ἐλθών — 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 ἄρχων 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*¹) and the Vulgate Version.

first hand, 13, 157, and some other cursives together with the Thebaic Version read ἄρχων προσελθών, "a ruler came up and." C's second corrector, G, L, U, and a large number of cursives read ἄρχων τις προσελθών, "a certain ruler came up and." Γ and a number of cursives have ἄρχων τις ἔλθων, "a certain ruler came and"; while other copies read ἄρχων εἰς εἰσελθών, "one (or a) ruler came in and," or ἄρχων τις εἰσελθών, "a certain ruler came in and." The text adopted by the Revisers is that of K, S, V, Δ, II, about forty cursives, 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 **Σ** as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, M, X, more than thirty cursives, 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 ΕΙΣΕΛΘΩΝ as two words instead of one, considered the prefix as the numeral εἰς, "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 εἰς. (**Σ**, etc.) This, however, did not suit every one; hence some, while retaining προσ-, changed εἰς to τις. (C³, etc.) Others, rejecting προσ- but retaining εἰς-, 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 cursives besides the Memphitic Version and one copy of the Old Latin Version.

ix. 32.

Rec. T. προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ ἄνθρωπον κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον — they brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil.

Rev. T. προσήνεγκαν αὐτῷ κωφὸν δαιμονιζόμενον — there was brought to him a dumb man possessed with a devil.

The omission of ἄνθρωπον 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 **Σ**, B, four cursives, 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 demoniac 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.

xi. 2.

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 **S**, 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, Γ, H, 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."

xi. 9.

Rec. T. *τί ἐξήλθετε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην*; — what went ye out to see? A prophet?

Rev. T. *τί ἐξήλθετε; ἰδεῖν 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 *Σ* first hand, B, and Z, is *τί ἐξήλθατε; προφήτην ἰδεῖν*; 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 (*Σ* amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, II), 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.¹ That is, Jesus is

¹ Only Origen, in once quoting apparently from Luke, gives the Saviour's words thus: ἀλλὰ τί ἐξεληλύθατε; προφήτην ἰδεῖν; καί, λέγω κ. τ. λ. *Works*, Vol. iii., p. 472.

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 *ἰδεῖν* 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 misreports 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 **Σ**, 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 ἑτέροις, in place of "who call unto *their fellows*," τοῖς ἑταίροις. This reading, though adopted by Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort, and perhaps plausibly 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 uncials B and D, one twelfth-century cursive, and one copy (k) 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 uncials, 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-constituted 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 century, and from different quarters of Christendom, Lachmann, Tregelles, and Alford very properly retain the word, but Tischendorf and, as might be expected, Westcott and Hort reject it. (Compare Note on xiii. 9.)

xi. 19.

Rec. T. **δικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς** — wisdom is justified of her children.

Rev. T. **δικαιώθη 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 versions of the New Testament, on coming to the word τέκνων here, misread it as τεχνῶν, 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 **Σ**, 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 τέκνων 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, II, all but one of the cursives, most copies of the Old 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 "τέκνων is undoubtedly the only true reading."

xi. 23.

Rec. T. ἡ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα, — which art exalted unto heaven.

Rev. T. μὴ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ; — 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 uncials 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, σὺ

Καπερναούμ, ἡ . . . ὑψωθείσα "thou Capernaum, which hast been exalted," by the doubling of the final letter of "Capernaum," were made to read Καπερναούμ, μὴ, 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 μὴ 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, ὑψωθήσῃ, "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 **Σ**, B first hand, C, three cursives, 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, Γ, Π second hand), about fifty cursives, and some codices known to Jerome, take the article as a relative, and, changing the false reading ὑψωθήσῃ into ὑψώθῃς, 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, Π first hand), most of the cursives, 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

effected 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.¹ 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 ἐπι in Mark iv. 21; namely, "MSS. ὑπὸ Ἀρ." 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 ὑπὸ is virtually the reading of only *four* manuscripts, — to which Σ should now be added as a fifth, — the expression "MSS. ὑπὸ" naturally, if not necessarily, implies that the manuscripts generally, or to a large extent at least, read ὑπὸ. But, when one comes to learn that, in the eyes of Westcott and Hort, **Σ** 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 **Σ**, 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. ὑπὸ," which means simply **Σ** and B read ὑπὸ; 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 Σ , B, and 569, and seems to be an alteration, perhaps inadvertently made from ϵ to σ because of the context. And yet the preceding $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu$, "*he* entered," as well as $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\ \phi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$, "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 $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$, "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, $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$ was changed to δ , meaning "something which" it was not lawful for him to eat. Mark and Luke show the true reading to be $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$, referring directly to $\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, "loaves."

xii. 31.

The only "ancient authorities" that support the marginal reading "unto *you* men" are B, r, and Athanasius, who may have been acquainted with, if not in possession of, Codex B

itself. The presence of $\epsilon\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$, "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 $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma$, "unto men," at the end of the verse, is unquestionably a mistake. The word is omitted by Σ , B, about ten cursives, 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$, "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, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Π , the great body of the cursives, four copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and several of the Fathers.

xii. 46.

Rec. T. $\eta\ \mu\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\rho\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\ \xi\acute{\omega}$ — his mother and his brethren stood without.

Rev. T. $\eta\ \mu\acute{\eta}\tau\eta\rho\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \omicron\iota\ \alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\kappa\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\ \xi\acute{\omega}$ — his mother and his brethren stood without.

The omission of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$, "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 emendator of the Sinaitic Codex, by Z, three cursives, 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, Γ , Δ , Π , and all the other cursives, 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.

xii. 47.

A marginal note says that "some ancient authorities" omit this verse. These authorities are **Σ** first hand, B, L, Γ, 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 αὐτοῦ 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 αὐτοῦ from verse 46, and omitted verse 47, could very well afford to continue, in verse 48, the presence of μοῦ 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 ἀποκριθεὶς, "answered," and τῷ ἐπόντι αὐτῷ, "him that told him," of verse 48, make an uncomfortably suspicious and unaccountable reading if this verse is omitted.

xiii. 9.

Rec. T. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκούτω — Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

Rev. T. ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούτω — He that hath ears, let him hear.

This omission is called for by only **Σ**, B, L, and four copies of the Old Latin Version, — evidence only a little stronger than that which calls for the omission of ἀκούειν in xi. 15, and alto-

gether 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 conceited 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, Γ, Δ, Η, all the cursives, and all the versions except the four copies (*α, ε, ς, κ*) of the Old Latin Version just referred to. The same may be said concerning the omission of ἀκούειν, in verse 43, which is supported, as here, by not a single cursive, but only by **Σ** 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 *κ* 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 ἀκούειν 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 *κόσμον*, "of the world," noted in the margin, is supported by the sixth-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex, by B, two cursives (1, 22), two copies (c, 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. lxxviii. 2*, whence the quotation is made, and where, in the Septuagint, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, "from the beginning," takes the place of the phrase "from the foundation of the world." Having written ἀπὸ καταβολῆς, and taking it in the sense of "from the beginning," it is but natural that the scribe should have passed on without adding *κόσμον*, 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, L, 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. Φράσον ἡμῖν — Declare to us.

Rev. T. Διασάφησον ἡμῖν — Explain to us.

The latter reading is attested only by **Σ** 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 subse-

quent 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 φράσον, "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 διασάφησον, even if this is a most insufficiently attested reading!

xiii. 43.

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

xiii. 55.

Rec. T. Ἰωσῆς — Joses.

Rev. T. Ἰωσήφ — 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 cursives, 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 IWCHC. This, some ignorant reader either mistook for, or considered an erroneous or imperfectly written form of, the more familiar name IWCHΦ. He merely changed the final C into Φ.

xiv. 12.

Rec. T. ἦραν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτό·—took up the body, and buried it.

Rev. T. ἦραν τὸ πτώμα, καὶ ἔθαψαν αὐτόν·—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 αὐτόν, which is supported only by \aleph first hand, B, Θ , and two copies (a , f^1) 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 \aleph first hand and f^1 have the reading τὸ πτώμα αὐτοῦ, "his corpse"; and this might very readily have led to the introduction of the unemphatic "him" in place of "it." Codex Θ and the Old Latin Version a support the reading σῶμα. 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 αὐτόν might have been introduced by one whose mind was still dwelling on the previous αὐτοῦ,—"And *his* disciples came, and took up *his* corpse, and buried *him*." On the whole, the evidence is decidedly in favor of the common reading, which is attested by \aleph 's sixth-century emendator, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Π , the entire body of the cursives, and all the versions but the two copies just mentioned of the Old Latin Version.

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, carelessly written manuscripts with some very unusual readings), which practically constitute but one witness, 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 distant from the land in the midst of the sea"; while one cursive (238) has simply "was many furlongs distant"; and the Memphitic and Arabic Versions read "was *about twenty-five* furlongs distant from the land," apparently from John vi. 19. The expression 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.

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 Sinaitic manuscript, to make sure of having the right word, wrote ἐλθεῖν ἦλθεν οὖν; *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 striking 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 *ἔκραξε*, "shouted" to him. From this, it is obvious that the object of the evangelist, in the word *ἔλθεῖν*, 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 *ἔλθεῖν*, "to go."

xiv. 30.

Rec. T. *βλέπων δὲ τὸν ἄνεμον ἰσχυρόν* — But when he saw the wind boisterous.

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

The latter is the reading of *Σ*, B first hand, 33, and the Memphitic Version only. It may seem very proper to conclude that, because *ἰσχυρόν*, "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 infallible. 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, *Σ* first hand unites with C first hand and two versions in omitting "straightway" (verse 27); with D, T^c, one cursive and four versions in omitting "Jesus"; and (verse 35) with T^c 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 *Σ* 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, E, F, G, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, II, 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.

xiv. 34.

Rec. T. ἦλθον εἰς τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ. — they came into the land of Gennesaret.

Rev. T. ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν εἰς Γεννησαρέτ. — they came to the land, unto Gennesaret.

The latter reading as a whole is supported by **Σ**, B, D, T^c, Δ, 33, and the Curetonian Syriac Version; the former, by C, E, F, G, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Ethiopic Version, and Origen again and again. A is defective here, but supports the corresponding reading in Mark vi. 53. But what are we to understand by the revised reading — "When they had crossed over, they came to the land"? Where else should they come? Had they not "come to the land" by crossing over? And would the evangelist be likely to assume that his readers would not know this, and that he must needs inform them of the fact? Perhaps, however, the meaning is that, when they had crossed over the lake, they went ashore, they landed. But why should one need to be told this, unless they were not in the habit of landing when they crossed the lake, or unless it was to say that they went ashore at some particular spot? But the R. V. mentions no place in particular, no town or village. "They came to the land, unto Gennesaret." The pertinence of this last phrase is not altogether clear, unless we supply "having come" from the foregoing verb. The propriety of doing this, however, is more than questionable. The supplying of such a supposed ellipsis cannot be justified unless the context clearly calls for it. It is not in accordance with the evangelist's usual plain and simple way of stating things. If he had meant that when they crossed over they landed, having come unto Gennesaret, he would undoubtedly have said so. Even then, why should he have said they "landed," they "went ashore"? The reader would naturally infer that they did this. But the evangelist neither says "they went ashore," nor adds

"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 λίμνην, "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 **Σ** in Luke v. 1, considered Gennesaret as the name of a village instead of a district, on coming to the words ἦλθον εἰς τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ, would very naturally conclude that a preposition had been omitted from his exemplar after γῆν; and so, in order to correct what he considered the error, insert εἰς, "at,"¹ and change the preposition preceding τὴν γῆν into ἐπὶ, 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,

¹ This is the sense in which this preposition is employed in iv. 13; xii. 41; Luke ix. 61; xi. 32; Acts viii. 40; xx. 14, 15, 16; etc.

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. ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς ἐνετείλατο λέγων — For God commanded saying.

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

The former of these readings is vouched for by \aleph first hand, and afterwards by the later seventh-century corrector, C, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Θ , Π , nearly all the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin and the Philoxenian Syriac Version; while the latter is attested by \aleph as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, B, D, T^c , 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, *Μωσῆς 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 *ἐνετείλατο λέγων* because of the *τὴν ἐντολήν*, "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.

XV. 6.

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

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

The conjunction *καί* 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 \aleph , B, C, D, T^c , five cursives, 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*, *καί* 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 *καί* and the words following it constitutes the apodosis of the sentence, while the words between *λέγετε* and

καί 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, Γ, Δ, Θ, Π, 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 **Σ**, 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 (-τέρα αὐτοῦ) 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 (vii. 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. ὁδηγοὶ εἰσι τυφλοὶ τυφλῶν — they be blind leaders of the blind.

Rev. T. ὁδηγοὶ εἰσι τυφλοὶ — they are blind guides.

The evidence in support of the omission here made, — namely, **Σ** 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 τυφλῶν, "of the blind," which includes **Σ** 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 τυφλός following immediately after, just as K omits τυφλοὶ because of the presence of τυφλῶν, 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 τυφλῶν 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 τυφλῶν.

XV. 15.

Rec. T. Φράσον ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην — Declare unto us this parable.

Rev. T. Φράσον ἡμῖν τὴν παραβολήν — Declare unto us the parable.

The mere fact that the latter is the reading of \aleph , B, Z, 1, and the Memphitic Version is by no means sufficient proof that ταύτην, "this," is not a part of the original text. On the contrary, its omission seems to be owing to the fact that the request sounds rather better without the word than with it, while its absence is sanctioned by the reading in Mark vii. 17. Peter's request for an explanation of the parable was not made so soon after the parable was uttered as to demand the presence of the word "this"; hence there would be no temptation to a copyist to introduce it. We must therefore consider it a part of the true text. And we need have no misgivings in reference to this, when we find it attested by C, D, E, F, G, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ , Θ , Π (Δ has αὐτήν instead), nearly every cursive, all the Syriac Versions, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, — manuscripts and versions from all quarters of ancient Christendom.

XV. 39.

Rec. T. Μαγδαλά — of Magdala.

Rev. T. Μαγαδάν — of Magadan.

Another proper name about which the old manuscripts are divided. \aleph , B, D, the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, and Persic Versions, most copies of the Old Latin Version, and the Vulgate support the reading "Magadan" or "Magedan." C, M, 33, and eight or ten other cursives, one copy (φ) of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version read "Magdalan"; while E, F, G, H, K, L, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Π , most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions read "Magdala." Mark (viii. 10), in his account of this crossing of the lake, speaks of Jesus and his disciples as coming "into the parts of Dalmanutha." Magdala was a place

on the western shore of the sea of Galilee, the modern El-Mejdel, about three miles north of Tiberias; and Dalmanutha adjoined Magdala. But where Magadan was seems to be a mystery. It is obvious that ΜΑΓΔΑΛΛΑ by a slight change in the last four letters might very easily be converted into ΜΑΓΔΑΔΑΝ , — 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 oldest 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 documents when in agreement, however unreasonable, absurd, or palpably false they might be.¹ A scribe who would *intention-*

¹ To 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 \aleph , B, C first hand, Δ , half a dozen cursives, and the Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, supported by Epiphanius, Jerome, and the Septuagint of the Alexandrine Codex, read Ἰωβήδ, "Jobed," for "Obed." (The writer of cursive 33, mistaking the final Δ for Λ , gives Ἰωβήλ, "Jobel.") And, since this reading is found in these old documents, it is adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, 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 Ἰωβήδ here as well as Ἀσάφ in verses 7, 8, and Ἀμώς 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 *ff*², calls Barabbas in John xviii. 40, "Rabbi Barabas." See Note on John i. 42.

In Acts xviii. 7, two or three old witnesses say that "Titius 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, *Σ* first hand, 15, 180, and the Memphitic and Armenian Versions read "Apelles" instead of "Apollon"; while D reads "Apolonius." *Σ* 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 *Errare 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 *Σ*, B, V, X, T, fifteen cursives, 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 cursives, and into all the versions but two.

xvi. 8.

Rec. T. ἄρτους οὐκ ἐλάβετε — ye have brought no bread.

Rev. T. ἄρτους οὐκ ἔχετε — ye have no bread.

The latter reading is found in *Σ*, B, D, three cursives (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 (*f*) 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 ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;—
Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?

Rev. T. τίνα λέγουσι οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου;—
Who do men say that the Son of man is?

The omission of the emphatic personal pronoun here is supported by **Σ**, 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 vouched for by C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, 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 εἶναι. 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 μέ 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 **Σ** first hand, B first hand, and the Memphitic Version. In both these Greek Codices it was early detected and corrected as an erroneous reading.

xvii. 4.

Rec. T. *εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσωμεν* — If thou wilt, let us make.

Rev. T. *εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσω* — if thou wilt, I will make.

The only witnesses in support of the latter reading are **Σ**, B, C first hand, and two copies (*δ*, *ff*¹) 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 *ποιήσωμεν*, which may have been taken for the particle *μέν*, "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.

xvii. 11.

Rec. T. *Ἐλίας μὲν ἔρχεται πρῶτον* — Elias truly shall first come.

Rev. T. *Ἐλίας μὲν ἔρχεται* — Elijah indeed cometh.

The omission of "first" is supported by **Σ**, B, D, five cursives, most copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Curetonian Syriac, Armenian, and Arabic Versions. Its presence as a part of the original text is attested by C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Z, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, two copies (*f*, *q*) of the Old Latin Version, and the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Ethiopic Versions. There are reasons for thinking that the omission is an error. In the question just asked by the disciples — "Why then say the scribes that Elijah must come first?" — the word is emphatic. Whatever may have been their reference in its use, its position shows it to be the word in which the point of their inquiry lay. Now, it is not at all probable that, in replying to such a question, Jesus should have overlooked or ignored the very substance of their inquiry. By referring to Mark ix. 12, we find Jesus there reported as having used the word. Why then should Matthew, in his report of the reply, have omitted the one word that gives significance and point to the clause? Textual critics generally seem to think that, because Mark has the word, and the witnesses are divided as to its genuineness in Matthew, its presence in the latter must be due to importation from Mark, — overlooking the fact that both are giving, not their own words, but a statement made by another, in the giving of which it ought to be expected that they would agree rather than differ. In fact, the use of the word *μέν*, "truly" or "indeed," seems to call for *πρῶτον*, indicating that Jesus' response, so far from overlooking, emphasizes the special point of the disciples' inquiry. The omission was early made, probably from pure oversight.

xvii. 20.

Rec. T. Διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν ὑμῶν — Because of your unbelief.

Rev. T. Διὰ τὴν ὀλιγοπιστίαν 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, Γ, 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, 1, 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 ὀλιγόπιστος, "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 ὀλιγοπιστία, "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*¹) 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, Γ, 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 ἐκβάλλεται, "is cast out," and several cursives that have ἐξέρχεται, "goes out," in place of ἐκπορεύεται, "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 offensiveness. 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 *συστρεφόμενων*, is the peculiar reading of \aleph , B, and the cursive 1, — a reading which is absolutely nonsensical, unless we look at it through the Latin *conversantibus*, — the word by which *ἀναστρεφόμενων* 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 *συστρεφόμενων* was substituted for *ἀναστρεφόμενων* 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, — \aleph , B, L first hand, — three cursives, two copies (*e*, *f*¹) 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, Γ , about twenty-five cursives, 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.

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 \aleph , B, three cursives, 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 *πλανηθῇ*, "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 cursives, 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 ὃ τι ὀφείλεις — Pay me that thou owest.

Rev. T. Ἀπόδος εἰ τι ὀφείλεις — Pay what thou owest.

The readings ὃ τι and εἰ τι both have the appearance of being the results of an early clerical error for μοι τί, which by the accidental omission of μ became ΟΙΤΙ, and afterwards ΕΙΤΙ in the unconditional sense of ὃ 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 ὃ τι, while μοί was retained and transmitted from earlier manuscripts. As Meyer says, "where εἰ τι, like *siquid*, is used in the sense of *quicquid* (or *whatever*), εἰ 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."

xix. 3.

Rec. T. *Εἰ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπῳ ἀπολῦσαι τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ*—Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?

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

The presence of *ἀνθρώπῳ*, "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 **Σ** as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Δ, Π, all but three or four cursives, 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 *ἀνδρί*, "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 (**Σ** first hand, B, L, Γ), three cursives, 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.

xix. 9.

Here, as the marginal note prepares the reader for believing, a few ancient documents, namely, B, N, two cursives, one or two copies of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version read, Whosoever shall put away his wife, "saving for the cause of fornication, *maketh her an adulteress*," instead of "except for fornication, *and shall marry another committeth adultery*." This reading is also supported by Origen and one or two Latin Fathers. Though an ancient reading, it seems to have been introduced from chapter v. 32. In the latter part of the verse, a *man* is pronounced to be guilty of adultery in marrying a woman who may have been put away without cause. And this change seems to have been made in order to show when a *woman* is guilty of the same offence. But the reading has no claim to acceptance. The last clause of the verse, as the second marginal note states, is omitted by some copies. But this was undoubtedly due to its being overlooked in copying because of its being a short clause ending with the same word as the clause just preceding. It is strongly attested as a genuine reading, and should be retained, as it is by Lachmann and Tregelles, though rejected by Tischendorf, and relegated to the margin as a questionable reading by Westcott and Hort.

xix. 10.

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 **Σ**, B, two cursives, 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, Γ, 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, Irenæus, 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 uncials **Σ**, B, D, L, three cursives, 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, Γ (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 cursives including 33, 69, five copies (*f*, *g*¹, *h*, *m*, *q*,) of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, Ethiopic, and Arabic Versions, and Justin Martyr. Irenæus, 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 **Σ**, B, D (this last omitting the article before both *ἀγαθοῦ* and *ἀγαθός*, while the cursive 1 omits it before the latter only), L, only three cursives (1, 22, 604,), nine copies (*a*, *b*, *c*, *e*, *ff*^{1, 2}, *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*, *ff*^{1, 2}, *l*, the Vulgate, and the Curetonian Syriac Version add *ὁ Θεός*, "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 *ff*², 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 inappositeness 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.

xix. 20.

Rec. T. ἐκ νεότητός μου — from my youth up.

Rev. T. Omits.

The omission of these words is made on the authority of **Σ** 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, **Σ** as amended by the later seventh-century corrector, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, all but two cursives 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 — νεανίσκος, a youth — should speak of doing something *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.

xix. 29.

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 **Σ**, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, 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.

xx. 15.

Rec. T. ἡ οὐκ ἔστι — Is it not lawful?

Rev. T. οὐκ ἔστι — Is it not lawful?

The omission of **ἡ**, "eh?" the sign of a question, equivalent to the Latin *an*, 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 **Σ**, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, all the cursives, 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. πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσι κλητοὶ, ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί — for many be called, but few chosen.

Rev. T. Omits.

This clause is set aside as spurious because it is wanting in **Σ**, B, L, Z, 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, Γ, Δ, Π, all the cursives but one (even 1, 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. τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν — All this was done.

Rev. T. τοῦτο δὲ γέγονεν — Now this is come to pass.

The omission of ὅλον, "all," though it does not affect the sense, is hardly justified. The word does not appear in **Σ**, C first hand, D, L, Z, 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 ὅλον 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, F, 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 Ⲛ, 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 ἐπάνω, "on," in verse 7, was not also changed to ἐπ', "upon," which is much more strongly attested there than συνέταξεν 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 ἱερόν τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the temple *of God*," is something unusual, nowhere else to be found in the New Testament, though ὁ ναὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, "the sanctuary of God," occurs several times. It is simply on this account, and because the phrase "of God" was considered an impertinence in connection with τὸ ἱερόν, that it was dropped, and is wanting in Ⲛ, B, L, 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, F, 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. ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτὸν ἐποιήσατε σπήλαιον ληστῶν — but ye have made it a den of thieves.

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

This change from the past to the present is supported by Ⲛ, B, L, 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 παῖδας κράζοντας — the children crying.

Rev. T. τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς κράζοντας — 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 **Σ**, B, D, L, 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, P, Δ, II, the entire body of the cursives, Origen, and Methodius.

xxi. 44.

"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 ommitter, 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.

xxi. 46.

Rec. T. ὡς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον — they took him for a prophet.

Rev. T. εἰς προφήτην αὐτὸν εἶχον — they took him for a prophet.

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 Ⲛ, B, L, two cursives, and Origen in four other places. But, as Matthew elsewhere (verse 26, and xiv. 5) writes ὡς, "as," in connection

with this verb used in this sense, it is less likely that he should have adopted the Hebraism ἔχειν αὐτὸν εἰς προφήτην here than that some early copyist familiar with the language of the Septuagint should have mistaken WC for EIC. 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 A. V. is concerned.

xxii. 1.

Rec. T. εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ἐν παραβολαῖς — he spake unto them by parables.

Rev. T. εἶπεν ἐν παραβολαῖς αὐτοῖς — he spake in parables unto them.

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 Curetonian and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions; the latter by Ⲛ, B, D, L, 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 ὁ μὲν, "one," and ὁ δέ, "another," B, L, 1, 22, 69, 124, 238, 346, and one or two other cursives, and Origen twice, read ὁ μὲν and ὁ δέ; while Ⲛ and C first hand read ὁ μὲν and ὁ δέ;

and D, followed by several copies of the Old Latin Version; reads *οἱ μὲν*, "some," and *οἱ δέ*, "others." The cursive 33, which is partly defective here, reads *μὲν* and *ὅς δέ*. 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 αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας, ἄρατε αὐτὸν καὶ ἐκβάλετε εἰς* — Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast *him* into.

Rev. T. *Δήσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας ἐκβάλετε αὐτὸν 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 αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας* is changed to *ἄρατε αὐτὸν ποδῶν 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 αὐτοῦ πόδας καὶ χεῖρας*, the words *ἄρατε αὐτὸν καὶ* were dropped, probably from being considered unnecessary, and hence are wanting in *Σ*, B, L, four cursives, 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, *αὐτόν* is inserted after *ἐκβάλετε*. If the reading thus presented had been the original reading, there would have been no temptation to insert *ἄρατε αὐτὸν 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 *ἄρατε*, 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 cursives, 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 *Σ*, B, D, M, S, Z, II first hand, about fifty cursives, 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 is 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 *οι*, — the last syllable of the Greek for "Sadducees," — and some very early but careless transcriber evidently mistook this *ΟΙΟΙ* 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, **Σ** omits *αἱ* after *μακάριοι*; the scribe of B omits, in Mark iv. 16, *οἱ* after *σπειρόμενοι*, and in Mark xii. 36, *ἐν* after *εἶπεν*; D, M first hand, in Matt. xiii. 16, omit *οἱ* after *μακάριοι*; and D, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Π, and a majority of the cursives, in Mark iii. 28, omit *αἱ* after *καί*, as may be seen in the Received Text. Such omissions 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 **Σ** as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, E, F, G, H, K, L, U, V, Π second hand, most cursives, the Old Latin and Vulgate, the two Egyptian, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions.

xxii. 27.

Rec. T. ἀπέθανε καὶ ἡ γυνή — the woman died also.

Rev. T. ἀπέθανεν ἡ γυνή — the woman died.

This language of the Sadducees is reported also by Mark (xii. 22) and Luke (xx. 32), and both have *καί*, "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, Γ, Π second hand, nearly all the cursives, all but one copy of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, Georgian, and other versions, and by Chrysostom; while the omission has the support of only **Σ**, B, L, U, Δ, Π first hand, six cursives, one copy of the Old Latin, the Curetonian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions. C is defective.

xxii. 30.

Rec. T. ὡς ἄγγελοι τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν οὐρανῷ — as the angels of God in heaven.

Rev. T. ὡς ἄγγελοι ἐν οὐρανῷ — 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 is 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 Θεοῦ (either with or without the article) is vouched for by **Σ**, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Θ^b, Π, 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. οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς Θεὸς νεκρῶν — God is not the God of the dead.

Rev. T. οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς νεκρῶν — 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 Θεός 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 οὐκ ἔστιν ὁ Θεὸς νεκρῶν and Luke's Θεὸς δὲ οὐκ ἔστι 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 **Σ**, B, D, L, Δ, about ten cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, two Egyptian, Peshito and Curetonian Syriac, Arabic (in the Paris Polyglot), and Persic Versions, Origen, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Irenæus, 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^b, Π, most of the cursives, 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 **Σ** (which also reads μεγάλα βαρέα, "great, heavy," as an apparent substitute for "heavy and burdensome"), L, two cursives, five copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Curetonian Syriac, Memphitic, Arabic, and Persic (Polyglot) Versions, and Irenæus,—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, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Θ^b, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 δυσβάστακτα, "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 cursives, 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 *δυσβάστακτα*, "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.

xxiii. 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, *Σ*, 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 Münster), the Armenian, and certain codices of the Memphitic Version, and Origen. The verse appears in E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Θ^b, Π, 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.

xxiii. 17.

Rec. T. *ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἀγιάζων τὸν χρυσόν* — the temple that sanctifieth the gold.

Rev. T. *ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἀγιάσας τὸν χρυσόν* — the temple that hath sanctified the gold.

The common reading is that of C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, and all the cursives, supported by the Peshito Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, and other versions; while the Revisers' is found only in *Σ*, B, D, Z, and *ι*, 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. $\mu\omega\rho\omicron\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\iota$ — Ye fools and blind.

Rev. T. $\tau\upsilon\phi\lambda\omicron\iota$ — 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 \aleph , D, L, Z, 1, 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 cursives, two or three copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, 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 relegate $\xi\rho\eta\mu\omicron\varsigma$, "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. 35.)

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, $\phi\omega\eta\varsigma$, "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 cursives, 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 \aleph , 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 $\phi\omega\eta\varsigma$, 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 οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μου μόνος — knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only.

Rev. T. οὐδὲς οἶδεν, οὐδὲ οἱ ἄγγελοι τῶν οὐρανῶν, οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, εἰ μὴ ὁ πατήρ μόνος — 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 \aleph first hand, as well as the later seventh-century corrector, B, D, three cursives, eleven copies of the Old Latin

¹ Thus, υἱοῦ Βαραχίου, in Matt. xxiii. 35, being considered a mistake for υἱοῦ τοῦ Ἰωδαί, "the son of Jehoiada," is omitted by \aleph , in which the scribe is supported by Eusebius and four lectionaries. In a similar manner, from sheer perplexity, δευτεροπρώτῳ, in Luke vi. 1, is omitted by \aleph , B, L, and a number of cursives and versions, while other manuscripts vary the expression. See Note on Luke vi. 1.

Version, several copies of the Vulgate, the Jerusalem Syriac, Ethiopic, and Armenian Versions, Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, Hilary, and others. *Against* them are the earlier seventh-century corrector of \aleph , E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ , Δ , II, nearly all the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, two copies of the Old Latin, six of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, Thebaic, and other later versions, and Basil, Didymus of Alexandria, John Damascene, Euthymius Zigabenus, and others. Viewed with reference to the internal evidence, all that can be said *against* the words is that they might have been introduced from Mark, — a mere supposition. *In favor* of them is the fact that they were undoubtedly uttered by Christ, and are of such a character that a writer like Matthew, in reporting his language, would not be at all likely to have omitted so important and memorable a statement, while some of his early readers, on doctrinal grounds, would be tempted to have the words removed. This reading is also favored by the absence of "my," in connection with "Father," — a reading even more strongly attested than are the three added words, "neither the Son." If "my" were a part of the text, the other three words would seem more like an interpolation; but as it is, they come in very naturally. Compare Matt. xi. 27, "the Son . . . the Father; the Father . . . the Son"; not *the* Son . . . *my* Father." On the question why these three words should have been removed in some copies from Matthew and not from Mark, the reader is referred to the Note on i. 25.

xxiv. 38.

Rec. T. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταῖς — in the days that.

Rev. T. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ταῖς — in those days which.

That is, "which were before the flood." The only authority for the Revisers' reading is B and one cursive (511). D and three cursives have a similar reading; namely, ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις πρὸ κ.τ.λ., that is, "in those days before the flood," which

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 *ἐκεῖναις*. 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 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 **Σ**, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, **Γ**, **Δ**, **Π**, and almost the entire body of the cursives. Didymus of Alexandria among the Fathers also supports it.

¹ *Introduction*, etc., pp. 150, 171.

XXIV. 42.

Rec. T. οὐκ οἴδατε ποῦ ὥρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται — ye know not what hour your Lord doth come.

Rev. T. οὐκ οἴδατε ποῦ ἡμέρα ὁ κύριος ὑμῶν ἔρχεται — 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 *ἡμέρα*, "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, **Γ**, **Π**, most of the cursives, 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 **Σ**, B, D, I, **Δ**, five cursives (*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, Irenæus, 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. *Χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου ἔλθειν* — My Lord delayeth his coming.

Rev. T. *Χρονίζει ὁ κύριός μου* — My Lord tarrieth.

The omission here made in the Revisers' Text is one of those abbreviations occurring from time to time in *Σ* 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 cursives, the Memphitic, Thebaic, and Arabic Versions, and by Irenæus and Ephraem the Syrian. In place of the omitted *ἐλθεῖν*, "to come," Luke (xii. 45) has *ἔρχεσθαι*. This shows that the omitted word was not taken from Luke. It also shows that Jesus in all probability supplemented the verb *χρονίζει*, "delayeth," with an infinitive. If he did not, Luke would hardly 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 cursives *1*, *157*, *209*, and Basil, and Origen in one instance, have, — that is, had they handed down to us Luke's form *χρονίζει ἔρχεσθαι*, — it might be said, in view of the abbreviated reading of *Σ*, *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 *ἔρχεσθαι*. This reading is attested by *C*, *D*, *E*, *F*, *G*, *H*, *I*, *K*, *M*, *S*, *U*, *V*, *Γ*, *Δ*, *Π*, all but two cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Ethiopic, Armenian, and other versions, and Origen, Chrysostom, and John Damascene.

XXV. 2.

Rec. T. *πέντε δὲ ἦσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν φρόνιμοι, καὶ αἱ πέντε μωροί.* — And five of them were wise, and five were foolish.

Rev. T. *πέντε δὲ ἦσαν ἐξ αὐτῶν μωροί, καὶ πέντε φρόνιμοι.* — 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*, *X*, *Γ*, *Δ*, *Π*, nearly all the cursives, 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 *Σ*, *B*, *C*, *D*, *L*, *Z*, six cursives, 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" (xiii. 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 δέ. The two cursives 1, 209, read λαβοῦσαι δὲ αἱ instead. D and one copy of the Old Latin give us αἱ οὖν. But six of them — **Σ**, 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 αἵτινες 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 αἵπερ, "as many as were," by a simple change of ΠΕ to ΓΑ, — somewhat as the seemingly true reading ὅνπερ ἠτοῦντο, "whomsoever they desired," in Mark xv. 6, became early changed in a few copies to ὃν παρητοῦντο, "whom they asked for." If this is so, then the two readings, αἵτινες and αἱ γάρ, though neither of them the true reading, substantially represent a common lost reading αἵπερ, 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 δούς 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 **Σ**, 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,

ἐδίδον. This latter, the true reading, is found in A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, II, most of the cursives, and Basil, as well as supported by the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions; while Origen and the Thebaic Version read "and gave to the disciples, saying." The aorist implies that Jesus spake to the disciples *after* he had given them the bread; the imperfect, that he said "Take, eat," as he *proceeded to give* it to them; which seems to be just what the evangelist meant. It is certainly the more probable reading.

xxvi. 53.

Rec. T. οὐ δύναμαι ἄρτι παρακαλέσαι . . . καὶ παραστήσει μοι πλείους — [Thinkest thou that] I cannot now pray to [my Father,] and he shall presently give me more [than twelve legions of angels?]

Rev. T. οὐ δύναμαι παρακαλέσαι . . . καὶ παραστήσει μοι ἄρτι πλείους — [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 **Σ** 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 ὧδε ἄρτι, "here now," while Origen in commenting on the passage, Basil, and two cursives read ὧδε, instead of ἄρτι after μοί, "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, II, 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 παρακαλέσαι, thought to improve the reading by transfer-

ring it towards the close of the verse. Others, to make it still more emphatic, introduced ὧδε along with it, making the expression equivalent to our "here and now." If the latter had been its original position, there is no apparent reason why it should have been disturbed and given the place it occupies in the great majority of the documents. Rightly viewed, its force, as well as that of the negative οὐ, extends over the rest of the verse; as if Jesus had said, "Dost thou suppose I cannot even now pray to my Father and be provided by him with more than twelve legions of angels?"

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 ἀθῶν, "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 ναόν — 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, II, nearly all the cursives, the Syriac, Old Latin, and Vulgate Versions, and Cyril; — that of the Revisers, by **Σ**, 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 ἐν with the dative as unsuitable after a word meaning "having cast," and who held that only εἰς with the accusative was admissible, as in Luke iv. 35 and xvii. 2. But Matthew everywhere (ix. 36, xv. 30, and here) uses ῥίπτω in the sense of "cast down," and would therefore naturally follow it with ἐν τῷ ναῷ, "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, D, 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 τοῦ δικαίου 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 ἐνδύσαντες, 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 (ἐνέδυσαν) being used for the putting on of these as is used in the other case, — supposing ἐνδύσαντες to be the genuine reading. It assumes also that the plural form τὰ ἱμάτια (verse 31) of necessity means upper garments, whereas it denotes any and, as in verse 35, all garments sometimes. But, because ἐνδύσαντες, 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 **S** as changed by the earlier seventh-century corrector, B, D, 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 **S** 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, Γ, Δ, II, 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 **Σ**, B, C, L, U, F, the cursives 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 cursives 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 ἄλλος δὲ λαβὼν λόγχην ἔνυξεν αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὕδωρ καὶ αἷμα, while John's words are ἀλλ' εἰς τῶν στρατιωτῶν λόγχῃ αὐτοῦ τὴν πλευράν ἔνυξε, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εὐθὺς 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 **Σ**, 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

¹ Hort's *Introduction*, p. 283.

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 see¹ 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,

¹ See Note on the rendering of this verse in *The Revisers' English Text*.

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

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 ἀπῆλθεν, "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 ἐκέλευσεν ἀποδοθῆναι τὸ σῶμα — Pilate commanded the body to be delivered.

Rev. T. ὁ Πιλάτος ἐκέλευσεν ἀποδοθῆναι — 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 \aleph , B, L, about fifteen cursives, 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 αὐτό instead as some did.

xxviii. 2.

Rec. T. ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας, καὶ ἐκάθητο — rolled back the stone from the door, and sat.

Rev. T. ἀπεκύλισε τὸν λίθον, καὶ ἐκάθητο — rolled away the stone, and sat.

The omission of "from the door" appears only in \aleph , 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 , Π , 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 νυκτός, "by night," in certain manuscripts proves the spuriousness of ἐλθόντες, 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 **Σ**, 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 cursives, 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 expressions. 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.

i. 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 (**Σ**), and that corrected by a contemporary of the copyist, two cursives, and not a single version. The note is uncalled for, as the reading of the text is above suspicion.

i. 2.

The reading "the prophets," of the Received Text, is placed by the Revisers in the margin, in deference to the testimony of **Σ**, B, D, L, Δ, 33, and twenty-five other cursives, 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 common reading, "the prophets," is attested by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, Π, most of the cursives, 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 distinctively Syrian reading, though preserved in **Σ**, B, L, 33, Origen, etc. The genuine reading, as found in the Received Text, comes down to us in later uncials and other documents.

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 βαπτίζων, "baptizing," in accordance with **Σ**, B, L, T^a, Δ, 33, 570, and the Memphitic Version. To complete the correction of the text, they should have omitted, with Westcott and Hort, the καί, "and," preceding κηρύσσων, "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 καί. In other words, it is incredible that Mark should speak of John as one "who baptized in the wilderness," then in the very next breath say that *all* they of Judea and Jerusalem went out to him and "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, "John the Baptist appeared in the wilderness,

preaching the baptism of repentance" etc. Ὁ βαπτίζων, instead of being equivalent to ὁς ἐβάπτισε, "who baptized," as the Revisers make it, or even to ὁς ἐβάπτιζε, "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*, ὁς ἐβάπτιζε, "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 κηρύσσων 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.

i. 8.

Rec. T. ἐγὼ μὲν ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς — I indeed have baptized you.

Rev. T. ἐγὼ ἐβάπτισα ὑμᾶς — 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 cursives 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 manuscripts 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 ἐβάπτισα, 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 manuscripts of the New Testament. The presence of μὲν, the genuineness 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 cursives, — 69 and 124, which omit the word, being but transcripts of the lost uncial Φ. C is defective here.

i. 13.

Rec. T. ἦν ἐκεῖ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ — he was there in the wilderness.

Rev. T. ἦν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ — 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. X, A, B, D, L, 33, 102, two (13, 346) of Ferrar's group and a few other cursives, together with the Old Latin, Vulgate, Memphitic, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions sustain the revised reading. Origen and Eusebius also quote the passage in a similar manner; but their quotations can hardly be relied on as furnishing the real text even of their own manuscripts. K, Π first hand, about a dozen and a half cursives 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 clipping 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, H, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π second hand, most of the cursives, 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 on 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.

i. 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 **Σ**, 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, Γ, 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.

i. 23.

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

Rev. T. εὐθὺς ἦν ἐν 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 foregoing witnesses with singular uniformity give *καὶ εὐθὺς* in preference to the common reading *καὶ εὐθέως*, — 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 *ἐγένετο*; 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 **Σ**, 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 cursives, 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. ἦν κηρύσσων—he preached.

Rev. T. ἦλθε κηρύσσων—he went . . . preaching.

The Revisers' reading is supported only by Σ, 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^f, Π, the entire body of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Old Latin, Vulgate, Armenian, and Gothic Versions. ἦλθε was probably introduced on account of its being considered a more appropriate word than ἦν to follow ἄγωμεν, "let us go,"—the change being also favored by the εἰς coming immediately after. It is preferred by Tischendorf, not because it has the support of preponderating documentary evidence, but because Luke (iv. 44,) has ἦν,—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 αὐτόν) 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 cursives;

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 Σ, 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. εἰσελθὼν πάλιν εἰς Καπερναούμ—when he entered again into Capernaum.

The Revisers' reading is attested by Σ, B, D, L, half-a-dozen cursives, 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 cursives. But the substitution of εἰσελθὼν for εἰσῆλθεν and the following καί, "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^f, Π, the greater part of

the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Vulgate, and Gothic Versions, and most copies of the Old Latin, including *α*, the Latin Version of D.

ii. 2.

Rec. T. εὐθέως συνήχθησαν πολλοί — straightway many were gathered together.

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

The vividness of Mark's descriptions is strikingly illustrated by the use of εὐθέως 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 εὐθέως in this connection. But *Σ*, B, L, two cursives, 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, Γ, Δ, Θ^ε, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions, and in most copies of the Old Latin.

ii. 3.

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

Rev. T. ἔρχονται φέροντες πρὸς αὐτὸν παραλυτικόν — they come, bringing unto him a man sick of the palsy.

The reading of the Revisers is attested only by *Σ*, B, L, two cursives, 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, Γ, Δ, Θ^ε, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 παραλυτικόν after instead of before φέροντες, — 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" (προσενέγκαι αὐτῷ, not ἐνέγκαι πρὸς αὐτόν). 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, *Σ*,

B, L, less than half a dozen cursives, two copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Philoxenian Syriac, Ethiopic, 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, F, Δ, Θ', Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 *προσεγγίσαι*, "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 *προσενέγκαι* 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. ἡγέρθη εὐθέως, καὶ ἄρας τὸν κράββατον — immediately he arose, took up the bed, and.

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

The Revisers' reading is that of **Σ**, 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 *εὐθέως* 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 *εὐθέως* 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^c, F, Δ, Θ', Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 **Σ**, 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^c, 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 καί, "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 καί. 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 ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει; — How is it that he eateth and drinketh with publicans and sinners?

Rev. T. ὅτι Μετὰ τῶν τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει. — 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 αὐτόν 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 ὅτι by a subsequent corrector. The Sinaitic Codex and D alone read διὰ τί; while τί ὅτι 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 ὅ,τι — in the sense of διὰ τί (or Mark's occasional εἰς τί), "wherefore" or "why." Mark uses the word thus in ix. 11 and 28. B and a single cursive (570) also read ὅ,τι 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 — διὰ τί and τί ὅτι — 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."

ii. 22.

Rec. T. ὁ οἶνος ἐκχέεται, καὶ οἱ ἀσκοὶ ἀπολοῦνται — the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred.

Rev. T. ὁ οἶνος ἀπόλλυται καὶ οἱ ἀσκοί — the wine perisheth, and the skins.

The rendering of the Memphitic Version — “the wine perishes *with* the leathern bottles” — may be considered by some as supporting the revised reading here. But this is a version without a known text from which it can be legitimately obtained. The only known Greek manuscript that has the reading of the Revisers is B. But this ought not to be considered sufficient for displacing the common text, which is attested by **Σ**, A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly every cursive, six copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions. The Peshito Syriac also contains the reading, but with the clauses reversed, — “lest the wine burst the sacks, and the sacks be spoiled, and the wine spilled.” The reading of D, followed by half a dozen copies of the Old Latin Version, is, “the wine and the leathern bottles will perish”; that is, it corresponds with the Received Text, except that it omits “is spilled” after “wine.” On the other hand, L and a single cursive (102) read “the wine is spilled and the leathern bottles”; which is the Received Text without “will perish,” — presenting an incomplete and nonsensical reading. B’s reading (adopted by the Revisers) corresponds with L’s only in being unfinished; but it rejects after “wine” its proper verb “is spilled,” and not only inserts instead the word “perish,” which in **Σ**, A, C, D, and the great body of witnesses stands after “leathern bottles,” but changes it from the third person *plural* of the *future* to the third person *singular* of the *present*. With B’s known tendency to abbreviate, and without a scrap of documentary or other support from any quarter, we do not understand how this can be regarded as the true reading. Tischendorf adopts it because it differs, in the omission of “will perish,” from the reading in Luke v.

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 **Σ** 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 **Σ**, 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, **Σ** 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, Γ, Δ, Π, 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.

iii. 14, 16.

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 \aleph , 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 cursives 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.

iii. 15.

Rec. T. ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν θεραπεύειν τὰς νόσους καὶ ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια—to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils.

Rev. T. ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια—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 \aleph , 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 cursives, 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.

iii. 25.

Rec. T. οὐ δύναται σταθῆναι—cannot stand.

Rev. T. οὐ δυνήσεται σταθῆναι—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 mere 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 \aleph , 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 cursives, 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. *Δυνήσεται* 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 μεμέρισται, — and he divided.

Rev. T. καὶ ἐμερίσθη, — and is divided.

The propriety of this change is doubtful. It makes no difference in the meaning. The reading is attested only by \aleph , B, C first hand, L, 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, Γ , Π , 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 ἐμερίσθη 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 μεμέρισται 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' ἐνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου κρίσεως. — but is in danger of eternal damnation.

Rev. T. ἀλλ' ἐνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος. — 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, Γ , Π , 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 \aleph , B, L, Δ , and three cursives; while C first hand, D, three of the four cursives of Ferrar's group, and Athanasius read ἁμαρτίας instead of ἁμαρτήματος. 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 ἁμαρτήματος and ἁμαρτίας 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: "Whosoever 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-sequitur*. 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 *ἐνοχος*, 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."¹ But some early reader of Mark, not being able to take *ἐνοχος* in any other than this sense before a genitive, seems to have thought it necessary to place *ἁμαρτήματος* in the margin from verse 28, as a gloss, or a presumably more suitable word to be employed than *κρίσεως*, 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 *ἁμαρτίας*, 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. *ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν . . . τὴν παραβολήν*. — asked of him the parable.

Rcv. T. *ἠρώτων αὐτὸν . . . τὰς παραβολὰς*. — asked of him the parables.

This plural form, "the parables," is attested by *Σ*, B, C, L, Δ, one copy (*g*²) 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, Π, the great majority of the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, Petræus' 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. ἀκούσασα περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, — When she had heard of Jesus.

Rev. T. ἀκούσασα τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, — having heard the things concerning Jesus.

The revised text is supported only by **Σ** 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 τὰ 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 *τά* 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 **Σ** and B. But the common reading is overwhelmingly attested by **Σ** 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 τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον — heard the word that was spoken.

Rev. T. παρακούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον — 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 (*e*) of the Old Latin are the only ones that have it, while they also omit *εὐθέως*, “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 Persic 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 cursives, 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 Ἰησοῦς ἀκούσας τὸν λόγον λαλούμενον. 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 λαλούμενον 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 οἱ πολλοί, "the many," are B, L, 28, and three of the four cursives 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 ἐλέγσαν instead of ἔλεγον), two cursives, 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 ἄλλοι ἔλεγον, or οἱ δὲ 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 ἐποίη, — he did many things.

Rev. T. πολλὰ ἠπόρει, — 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 **Σ**, 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 ἐποίη a clerical error, he undertook to rectify the supposed mistake by substituting ἠπόρει for it, taking his cue from Luke ix. 7, where διηπόρει, "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 cursives, is that Herod revered 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 ἐποίη), and heard him with pleasure. This use of ἐποίη, "he did it," in place of ἤκουεν 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 **Σ**, B, D, L, **Δ**, 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. ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν πολλοί, — many knew him.

Rev. T. ἐπέγνωσαν πολλοί, — many knew *them*.

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

¹ See Matt. xxi. 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 cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, and the Vulgate. There is a third reading, — *ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτοὺς πολλοί*, "many knew them," — which is vouched for by **Σ**, A, K, L, M, U, Δ, Π, about seventy cursives, 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 *εἰς ὃν* [*τόπον* being understood], as John (vi. 21) wrote *εἰς ἣν*, meaning "whither," and referring back to "the desert place" mentioned in the previous verse, we have a pertinent reading. Of course *τὸν τόπον*, "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 *αὐτόν*. Another, considering this improper, since more than one are supposed to be spoken of, changed it to *αὐτούς*. And still another, sensible of the impropriety of both *αὐτόν* and *αὐτούς*, omitted the word altogether. Taking *εἰς ὃν* 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 outwent 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. *ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν Γεννησαρέτ*, — they came into the land of Gennesaret.

Rev. T. *ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἣλθον εἰς Γεννησαρέτ*, — they came to the land unto Gennesaret.

The revised reading here, which is supported by **Σ**, B, L, Δ, and three cursives 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, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 **Σ**, B, and nine or ten cursives. 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. βαπτισμοὺς . . . χαλκίων καὶ κλινῶν. — The washing of . . . brazen vessels, and of tables.

Rev. T. βαπτισμοὺς . . . χαλκίων. — 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 \aleph , 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.

vii. 12.

The omission of καί (= ὅτι, "that") at the beginning of this verse is supported by \aleph , 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 ὅτι, which of course is an interpretation, but it points to καί as the original reading. Instead of there being an aposiopesis or suppression of the conclusion after ὠφεληθῆς, 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 ἀφίετε, "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 \aleph , 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 xxi. 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 xxi. 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 *καθαρίζον* (which makes the word refer to *ἀφεδρῶνα*), 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 πάντα τὰ βρώματα* by "*This he said, making all meats clean.*" But, in the first place, *βρώμα* 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 **Σ**, 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 *καθαρίζων* 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. 30, 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 *ἐκπορεύεται* 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 *ἐκπορεύειν* means "to cause to go forth."

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, L, 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 **Σ**, A, B, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 **Σ**, B, D, L, Δ, two cursives, all the copies of the Old Latin but one, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Jerusalem Syriac, and the Ethiopic. 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 Phenicia, evidently mistook the conjunction **ΚΑΙ** connecting the names "Tyre" and "Sidon" for the preposition **ΔΙΑ**, — a mistake by no means unnatural. A subsequent copyist, thinking it more suitable to have the verb **ἦλθεν** 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 **Σ**, B, the Memphitic, and a few other versions were taken, does not appear in these documents, though it does in their later allies, D, L, Δ, etc. This is the obvious genesis 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 A (C is defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, W^d, X, Γ, Π, nearly all the cursives, one copy (q) 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 Phenicia, 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 \aleph , B, H, Δ , ten cursives 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, Γ , Π , the great majority of the cursives, 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 Ναί, "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 γάρ. Several of the documents that support this reading, — notably \aleph , Δ , 13, 28, 69, — for a similar reason omit αὐτῆς 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 γάρ, "for," and attempt to change the meaning and intent of the clause following.

vii. 30.

Rec. T. εὗρε τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός, καὶ τὴν θυγατέρα βεβλημένην ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης. — she found the devil gone out, and her daughter laid upon the bed.

Rev. T. εὗρε τὸ παιδίον βεβλημένον ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην, καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐξεληλυθός. — found the child laid upon the bed, and the devil gone out.

The revised reading is supported by \aleph , B, L, W^d, Δ , 1, 28, 33, 209, 473, and ten other cursives (except that 1, 33, and a few others have τῆς κλίνης instead of τὴν κλίνην, and L gives the preposition erroneously as ὑπό, "under," instead of ἐπί, "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, Γ , Π , the great majority of the cursives, 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 is 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 composedly upon the bed," as the Received 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. εὐθέως διηνοίχθησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί, — straightway his ears were opened.

Rev. T. διηνοίχθησαν αὐτοῦ αἱ ἀκοαί, — his ears were opened.

The omission of "straightway" is supported by **Σ**, B, D, L, W^d first hand, Δ, 33, 102 (of course), six copies of the Old Latin, and the Memphitic Version. But **Σ**, 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 cursives, 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, W^d second hand, X, Γ, Π, all but two cursives, 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 ἀλάλους λαλεῖν. — the dumb to speak.

Rev. T. ἀλάλους λαλεῖν. — the dumb to speak.

The omission of the article is an obvious error, though attested by **Σ**, B, L, Δ, and 33. If Mark had omitted the article before κωφούς, "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 κωφούς, but sufficiently attested by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, W^d, X, Γ, Π, and the whole body of the cursives, 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 εἶχαν, "they had"; while only B, 1, 28 (after B), 209, and 473 read ἔχουσι, "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 uncials and cursives; 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 ἔχουσι. 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. ἔτι πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; — Have ye your heart yet hardened?

Rev. T. πεπωρωμένην ἔχετε τὴν καρδίαν ὑμῶν; — have ye your heart hardened?

The omission of "yet" is supported by \aleph , 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 -ετε, 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 οὐπω, "not yet." The reference in both οὐπω and ἔτι 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 οὐπω and ἔτι 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 ἔτι should have originated with some later hand.

viii. 20.

Rec. T. οἱ δὲ εἶπον, Ἑπτὰ. — And they said, Seven.

Rev. T. καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ, Ἑπτὰ. — And they say unto him, Seven.

There may be good ground for changing οἱ δὲ εἶπον to καὶ λέγουσιν; but the addition of αὐτῷ 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 αὐτῷ of the preceding verse. It does not appear here in \aleph , 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. ἐπηρώτα αὐτὸν εἰ τι βλέπει. — he asked him if he saw aught.

Rev. T. ἐπηρώτα αὐτόν, 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 εἰ 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 *ei* 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.

Rec. T. *Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσελθῆς, μηδὲ εἰπῆς τι εἰς τὴν κώμην.* — Neither go into the town, nor tell it to any in the town.

Rev. T. *Μηδὲ εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσελθῆς.* — Do not even 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 *μή* instead of *μηδέ*. Tischendorf, who also omits the latter clause, consistently reads *μή* and not *μηδέ*, which last really 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 superfluity 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 *μή*, "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 *g*. 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 Revisers' 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 ἐν, "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.

viii. 37.

Rec. T. ἡ τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος — Or what shall a man give?

Rev. T. τί γὰρ δοῖ ἄνθρωπος — For what should a man give?

The latter reading is that of \aleph , B, and L, though Codex L and the earlier seventh-century corrector of the Sinaitic Codex have the common form δοῦ instead of δοῖ. 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 cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, all the rest of the Versions, and Origen.

ix. 1.

Rec. T. ἐστὶ τινὲς τῶν ὧδε ἑστηκότων, — there be some of them that stand here.

Rev. T. ἐστὶ τινὲς ὧδε τῶν 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*² 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 ἐστήκα 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 **Σ**, A, C, D second hand, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, all the cursives except one (which places ὦδε after instead of before ἐστηκότων, and writes it ὀδε), 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 ἐστηκότων ὦδε. — Now, it may be interesting to some to know that the scribe of D, one of the two uncials that attest the revised reading ὦδε τῶν, felt the same necessity that the Revisers felt, of having some modifying word after "stand," and so added μετ' ἐμοῦ, "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 ὅτι Λέγουσιν, which the Revisers give instead of the commonly edited reading, λέγοντες, Ὅτι λέγουσιν, as Westcott and Hort have it, should rather be λέγοντες · Ὅ,τι 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 ὅ,τι, equivalent to the interrogative διότι or διὰ τί, "wherefore?" or "why?" and sufficiently justifies his departure from the common mode of writing the word. (See Note on ii. 16.)

ix. 12, 13.

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?"¹ 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."² 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."

² Humphry, *Commentary on the Revised Version of the New Testament*.

that the passage does not read just as Mark wrote it. This may account in part, if not wholly, for the various readings given in the ancient documents. Apparently, the difficulty lies in the words *καὶ πῶς*, "and how." Yet this reading is attested by **Σ**, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, L, N, S, U, V, X, **Γ**, by far the greater part of the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Memphitic, Ethiopic, Gothic, and Armenian Versions. Instead of this, A, K, M, Δ, II, between twenty and thirty cursives, and the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac Version read *καθώς*, "as." But this reading, even if it were overwhelmingly attested and accepted as genuine, would not give a clearly satisfactory reading. The only apparent clue we have to guide us through this labyrinth is the reading of the Peshito Syriac Version, — a version at least two hundred years older than the oldest known Greek manuscript: "Elijah [truly] first cometh, to prepare all things; and, as it is written of the Son of man, he will suffer much, and be rejected. But I say unto you that Elijah hath come; and they have done unto him all that they desired, as it was written of him." This is a distinct and coherent utterance. Nor can it be said to be taken from Matt. xvii. 12. But, while it may not be accepted as giving a literally exact translation of the original reading of the two verses, it shows conclusively that the Greek text from which it was taken must have read *καὶ καθώς* (or *καὶ ὥς*), "and as," instead of *καὶ πῶς*, "and how." The attestation of Codex A and its associates indicates that it was *καὶ καθώς*, not *καὶ ὥς*. Now, if this was the original reading, it is easy enough to see that it might have become corrupted at an early day into *καὶ πῶς*, as we now have it. *Καθώς* was first changed to *ὥς*, just as it was in Luke xxii. 24, and in Acts vii. 48, in Codex D; in Acts vii. 17, in Codex A; and by others in other places; after which, some copyist changed *ὥς* to *πῶς*, as was done in Luke vi. 4 (**Σ**, L, R, X, and a number of cursives and versions); xxiv. 35 (E first hand); 1 Thess. ii. 11 (F, G), and elsewhere. Hence the phrasing *καὶ πῶς*, making the passage read, "And how is it

written concerning the Son of man, that he must suffer?" Others, however, as we have seen, omitted *καί* before *καθώς*; 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 cursives, in Rom. iii. 8; A first hand, and eight or ten cursives, in 1 Cor. xi. 2; A, the Thebaic 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 *καὶ καθώς* should be considered the true reading in place of *καὶ πῶς*. The clause introduced by *ἵνα* is to be connected, not with "it is written," as if *ἵνα* were equivalent to *ὅτι*, but with *ἐλθὼν* to be supplied after *καί* from the *ἐλθὼν* 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;" — *καὶ . . . καί*, in this last sentence, being best translated perhaps by "not only . . . but also."

ix. 23.

Rec. T. *Τὸ εἰ δύνασαι πιστεῖν* — If thou canst believe.

Rev. T. *Τὸ εἰ δύνασαι* — If thou canst!

The revised reading is that of *Σ*, 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, II, the great body of the cursives, 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."¹ 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.² 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 *τὸ* 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 cumbrously over-translated, be given in English."³ 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."⁴

¹ *Companion to the Revised Version of the New Testament*, p. 32.

² *Companion to the Greek Testament and English Version*, p. 220.

³ Humphry, *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; xxii. 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 ἐγὼ τι δύναμαι*; "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. 24.

Rec. T. *κράξας ὁ πατήρ τοῦ παιδίου μετὰ δακρύων ἔλεγε*,—the father of the child cried out, and said with tears.

Rev. T. *κράξας ὁ πατήρ τοῦ παιδίου ἔλεγε*,—the father of the child cried out, and said.

Having omitted from the text the words *μετὰ δακρύων*, the Revisers say in the margin, "many ancient authorities add *with tears*." Whether this was designed as a sort of compensation for the loss of the phrase from the text or not, is not for us to say. The "authorities" referred to are A second hand, C third hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, nearly all the cursives, every copy but one of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, and a comparatively recently corrected copy of the Memphitic Version. The documents that support the omission are **Σ**, A first hand, B, C first hand, L, Δ, a single cursive (28), and a single copy (*κ*) of the Old Latin, together with the Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions. It is easier to account for the omission of the expression than for its presence if not genuine. It might very easily have dropped out through inattention on the scribe's part. Nothing easier, nothing more common. And as its omission does not affect the construction, it would not readily be missed except on comparison with other manuscripts. This accounts for its after-insertion in A, C, and the Memphitic Version. It is a touch of nature which Mark alone of all the evangelists would be the one to give. The circumstances of the case are such as to add strongly to the probability that the father was brought to tears on the occasion; and, if so, Mark assuredly would not have failed to note it. If the phrase is not a part of Mark's language, it is difficult to conceive why any one else should have inserted it here, and not, for example, in x. 51, or in other places. The entire evidence in favor of the genuineness of the words is too strong to warrant their omission.

ix. 26.

Rec. T. κράξαν καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξαν αὐτόν, ἐξῆλθε. — *the spirit* cried, and rent him sore, and came out of him.

Rev. T. κράξας καὶ πολλὰ σπαράξας, ἐξῆλθε. — having cried out, and torn him much, he came out.

Aside from the improper omission of αὐτόν (see verse 20), the difference here is simply that the Received Text gives the participles in the neuter as agreeing with πνεῦμα, "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, Γ, Π, and nearly every cursive. The latter is the reading of **Σ**, B, C first hand, D, L; while Δ supports both in part, — reading σπαράξαν with the Received Text, but κράξας 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 αὐτό, "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. εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ καὶ νηστείᾳ. — but by prayer and fasting.

Rev. T. εἰ μὴ ἐν προσευχῇ. — save by prayer.

After having rejected καὶ νηστεία 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 **Σ** as amended by a seventh-century corrector, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, the entire body of the cursives, 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 **Σ** first hand, B, and one copy (k) 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 **Σ**, B, C, D, K, L, M, **Ξ**, **Π**, more than twenty-five cursives, 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 **Σ**, A, X, **Δ**, and some cursives read "against *you* is for *us*"; while a few other cursives 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 **Σ**, E, F, G, H, S, U, V, **Γ**, **Δ**, and most of the cursives. 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, **Γ**, **Π**, about seventy cursives, 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 **Σ**, B, C, the majority of the cursives, one copy (**κ**) 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 cursives read "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 *ὑμῶν* for *ἡμῶν*,—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.

X. 7.

The "ancient authorities" to which the marginal note refers as omitting the clause, "and shall cleave to his wife," are only **Σ**, 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 **Σ**, B, should be accepted as true readings until strong internal evidence is adduced to the contrary.

X. 24.

Here another marginal note says, "Some ancient authorities omit *for them that trust in riches*." These "authorities" are **Σ**, B, Δ, *k* of the Old Latin Version, and Peträus' 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 A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, **Γ**, **Π**, 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.

X. 43.

Rec. T. οὐχ οὕτω δι' ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν. — But so shall it not be among you.

Rev. T. οὐχ οὕτω δι' ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν. — But it is not so among you.

The change from "shall be" to "is" is a mistake. It is supported by **Σ**, B, C first hand, D, L, Δ, most copies of the Old Latin, of course, and the Vulgate. But three of these documents, namely, **Σ**, C, Δ, also read *ἔστω*, "let (him) be," instead of *ἔσται*, "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, Γ, Π, the whole body of the cursives, one copy (γ) 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 εἶπεν αὐτὸν φωνηθῆναι. — Jesus . . . commanded him to be called.

Rev. T. ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε, Φωνήσατε αὐτόν — Jesus . . . said, Call ye him.

The Revisers' reading here is supported only by X, B, C, L, Δ, eleven or twelve cursives, k 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,¹ 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," \aleph , 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 $\tau\acute{o}$ 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 $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\rho\alpha\kappa\alpha$ for $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon$. 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.

xi. 3.

Rec. T. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon$. — and straightway he will send him hither.

Rev. T. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu\ \acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon$. — 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 **Σ**, B, C, D, E, F, H, K, L, M, S, V, X, Γ, Δ, and more than a hundred cursives, is a clerical error for the future, ἀποστελεῖ, which differs from the present in having but one λ instead of two, and which has a comparatively feeble 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 cursives; yet the future, ἀποστελεῖ, 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.¹ The adverb

¹ Compare Matt. xii. 18, where D reads ἀπαγγέλλει, and several cursives ἀναγγέλλει instead of ἀπαγγελεῖ; xiii. 42 and 50, where **Σ** first hand, D, X, and a few cursives read βάλλουσιν for βαλοῦσιν; xiii. 48, where **Σ** first hand, V, Δ, and several cursives read ἔβαλλον instead of ἔβαλον; xxv. 38, where D and a few cursives read περιεβάλλομεν for περιεβάλομεν; Mark x. 50, where Δ reads ἀποβάλλων in place of ἀποβαλῶν; xiii. 27, where H, L, Δ, and a few cursives read ἀποστέλλει instead of ἀποστελεῖ; Luke ix. 62, where A, D, L, 513, and Clement of Alexandria read ἐπιβάλλων for ἐπιβαλῶν; xi. 49, where D, followed by two copies of the Old Latin and Lucifer, reads ἀποστέλλω for ἀποστελῶ; xii. 5, where **Σ** reads ἐμβάλλειν in place of ἐμβαλεῖν; John iv. 25, where **Σ** first hand, D, read ἀναγγέλλει instead of ἀναγγελεῖ; xii. 6, where E, F, G, H, K, S, U, X, Γ, and a large number of cursives read ἔμελλεν, "was about to," for ἔμελεν, "it concerned," — a very frequent error, as Matt. xxii. 16, Mark iv. 38, xii. 14, Luke x. 40, John x. 13, etc., testify; John xvi. 25, where **Σ** reads

πάλιν, "back" or "again," is less strongly supported. It is attested by **Σ**, B, C first hand, D, L, Δ, about a dozen cursives, and Origen twice; while its omission is called for by A, C second hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, the great body of the cursives, all but three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, and Origen in two other places. Thus we find Origen's testimony in favor of the word is rendered nugatory by his own omissions; while it is a strong point against the genuineness of the word that among all the versions only three copies of the Old Latin recognize it in any manner, — one of these (c) reading *remittit*, "sendeth back," and two (a, q) *remittet*, "will send back." Besides, the supporters of πάλιν are not agreed as to where it belongs. **Σ**, D, L, most of the cursives, and Origen, on both occasions on which he uses it, read αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε; B reads ἀποστέλλει πάλιν αὐτὸν ὧδε; C, αὐτὸν πάλιν ἀποστέλλει ὧδε; Δ, ἀποστέλλει πάλιν ὧδε, without αὐτόν; while the lectionary 257 reads αὐτὸν ἀποστέλλει πάλιν, without ὧδε. All this gives the reading a very suspicious look. In fact, it could hardly be

ἀπαγγέλλω for ἀπαγγελῶ; Acts xix. 16, where **Σ** as changed by its seventh-century corrector, E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, and Chrysostom, in common with the Received Text, read ἐφαλλόμενος, while D has ἐναλλόμενος instead of ἐφαλλόμενος; xix. 33, where D, L, a large number of cursives, and Theophylact read προβαλλόντων instead of προβαλόντων; xviii. 27, where A, D, two or three cursives, and Theophylact read συνεβάλλετο in place of συνεβάλετο; xxii. 21, where D, 513, and Athanasius read ἐξαποστέλλω for ἐξαποστελῶ; xxviii. 6, where **Σ**, H, L, a large number of cursives, and Chrysostom read, as do the Received Text and some modern editors, μεταβαλλόμενοι, while the true reading is μεταβαλόμενοι; Rev. iii. 5, where C has περιβάλλεται instead of περιβαλεῖται; iii. 18, where B and half a dozen cursives read περιβάλλη (present subjunctive passive) instead of περιβάλῃ (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 παρηγγέλομεν for παρηγγέλλομεν.

otherwise. The word was evidently inserted by some early reader, who, referring the two verbs *ἔχει* and *ἀποστελεῖ* 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 στοιβάδας ἔκοπτον ἐκ τῶν δένδρων, καὶ ἐστρώννουν εἰς τὴν ὁδόν.* — and others cut down branches of the trees, and strewed them in the way.

Rev. T. *ἄλλοι δὲ στιβάδας, κόψαντες ἐκ 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 *κόψαντες*, "having cut," is attested by only *Σ*, B, L, Δ. The change from the personal form *ἔκοπτον*, "they cut," to this participial form became necessary in consequence of making the preceding word *στοιβάδας* dependent on the foregoing *ἔστρωσαν*, "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 *Σ*, B, C, L, 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 *στοιβάδας*, "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 *στοιβάδας* is a word equivalent in meaning to Matthew's (xxi. 8) *κλάδους*, "branches," and John's (xii. 13) *βαῖα*, "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 *στοιβάδας*. 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 *ἔκοπτον* and its object in the two Gospels shows. The final clause, which is rejected by the Revisers, is abundantly attested as genuine by A, C, D, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, the whole body of the cursives, 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. *καὶ αὐτὸν λιθοβολήσαντες ἐκεφαλῶσαν, καὶ ἀπέστειλαν ἡτιμωμένον.* — and at him they cast stones, and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled.

Rev. T. *καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκεφαλῶσαν, καὶ ἡτίμασαν.* — 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, *ἐκεφαλίωσαν* and *ἡτίμασαν*, whose English renderings are the same precisely as those of *ἐκεφαλαίωσαν* and *ἡτιμωμένον*, 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. *Ἐκεφαλίωσαν* is the reading of three uncials only, — **Σ**, B, L. One of the Revisers says that "the discovery of **Σ** 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 **Σ** was the scribe of B? Dr. Hort admits that at least six leaves of **Σ**, 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 *κεφαλιάω* 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 *ἐκεφαλαίωσαν* being used elsewhere in the sense of "wounding in the head," and supposing that the word was

¹ Dr. Riddle, Notes on *Meyer's Mark*, Amer. ed., p. 158.

² *Introduction*, p. 213.

³ *Introduction*, pp. 92, 111, and 113.

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 *ἐκεφαλίσαν*, which, though an unknown word to him, might naturally enough, as he conjectured, have been coined by Mark from *κεφάλιον*, "a little head." Hence the form that appears in these manuscripts. And yet, if the adjective *κεφάλαιος*, "pertaining to the head," can be derived from *κεφαλή*, "a head," why should not *κεφαλαίω* also not only be derived from *κεφαλή*, but be 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 cursives, — an unaccountable fact if the form is a false one. *Ἡτιμωμένον*, 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.

xii. 21.

Rec. T. καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφήκε σπέρμα · — neither left he any seed.

Rev. T. μὴ καταλιπὼν σπέρμα · — leaving no seed behind him.

The latter reading is supported by **Σ**, B, C, L, Δ, 33, ε, of the Old Latin, the two Egyptian Versions, and the Ethiopic. But it has every appearance of being an emendation and simplification of the other, owing to what was doubtless considered an undue emphasis given by the phrasing καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἀφήκε, "and not even he left any." A corrector of the text would not write like this. Yet there is no reason why Mark should not have so expressed himself. If μὴ καταλιπὼν had been Mark's words, there would have been no temptation to change

¹ See *κεφαλαίω*, in Thayer's *Lexicon of the New Testament*.

them, unless to conform them to what goes before and what follows. In that case, they would have been changed simply to καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκε. 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 οὗτος in place of αὐτός.

xiii. 8.

Rec. T. ἔσονται λιμοὶ καὶ ταραχαί·—there shall be famines, and troubles.

Rev. T. ἔσονται λιμοί·—there shall be famines.

The omission of "and troubles" is supported by **Σ**, 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, Γ, Δ, Π, 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. Ταραχαί 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 προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε μηδὲ μελετᾶτε·—take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate.

Rev. T. μὴ προμεριμνᾶτε τί λαλήσητε·—be not anxious beforehand what ye shall speak.

The omission of "neither do ye premeditate" is called for by **Σ**, 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 (*a*, *n*) 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 ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν, καὶ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς.—to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect.

Rev. T. πρὸς τὸ ἀποπλανᾶν, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς.—that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect.

The genuineness of the omitted καί here is attested by A, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, W^b, 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 **Σ**, 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.

xiii. 27.

Rec. T. τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ, — his angels.

Rev. T. τοὺς ἀγγέλους, — the angels.

The omission of "his" is according to B, D, L, six copies of the Old Latin Version, and Petræus' 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 **Σ**, A, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, W^b, X, Γ, Δ, Π, 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.

xiii. 33.

The marginal note informs the reader that "some ancient authorities omit *and pray*." These authorities are B, D, 122, three copies (*a, c, k*) of the Old Latin Version, and one of the Vulgate, which is corrected by a subsequent hand. All other witnesses, including **Σ**, L, Δ, the Syriac Versions, both Egyptian, and most Latin, support the text. Lachmann, Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and others reject the words. They appear in xiv. 38, but in a very different connection, and without the preceding words, "take heed, be wakeful"; so that they can hardly be considered as having been brought in from that passage. Besides, if Mark had not added "*and pray*," he would naturally have written, "Take heed *and* be

wakeful; for" etc. The words "and pray" are not to be found in the parallel passage in Matthew (xxiv. 42). But this does not militate against their genuineness here, but rather favors it; for the language throughout the two passages is by no means identical, though the thought is virtually the same. The omission seems to be the result of a feeling on the part of some critical reader that the injunction to pray was uncalled for, especially as it is not added to the command to watch as given in verses 35 and 37.

xiv. 3.

Rec. T. καὶ συντρίψασα τὸ ἀλάβαστρον — and she brake the box.

Rev. T. συντρίψασα τὸ ἀλάβαστρον — *and* she brake the cruse.

The omission of καί, "and," is found only in **Σ**, 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.

xiv. 51.

Rec. T. εἰς τις νεανίσκος ἠκολούθει αὐτῷ — there followed him a certain young man.

Rev. T. νεανίσκος τις συνεκολούθει αὐτῷ — a certain young man followed with him.

The first of these readings is attested by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, N, P, S, U, V, W^b, X, Γ, Δ, Π, the cursives generally, and possibly some of the versions, though the testimony of these cannot be relied on with certainty in support of either reading

as distinguished from the other. The Revisers' text presents three changes,—the omission of εἰς, the transposition of τῖς, and the substitution of *συνηκολούθει* for the simple *ἡκολούθει*; no one of which, unless it be the last, in any way affects the meaning. Each of these changes is attested by **Σ**, B, C, L; while D, in omitting εἰς, reads *νεανίσκος δέ τις* instead of *καὶ νεανίσκος 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 τῖς is omitted for the same reason in **Σ**, A, L, M, etc. On rejecting εἰς, the emendator transposed τῖς, and presented the words in the usual order, *νεανίσκος τις*. The compound form of the verb seems to have been taken from v. 37, the only place in which it appears in Mark, and there it is accompanied not by αὐτῷ, but by μετ' αὐτοῦ, 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 *ἡκολούθει* to be the word he employed in accordance with his usual mode of expressing himself, and not *συνηκολούθει*. His invariable method is to employ the dative to denote the object followed in connection with ἀκολουθεῖν; while in the only instance in which he employs *συνακολουθεῖν*, 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 **Σ**, 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, Γ, Δ, Π, 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 **Σ**, 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, **Σ**, L, and c omit the phrase "the second time" in verse 72; and **Σ** 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—δύς, "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 **Σ** 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 ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε. — the second time the cock crew.

Rev. T. εὐθὺς ἐκ δευτέρου ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε. — straightway the second time the cock crew.

The insertion of "straightway" is supported by **Σ**, 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,

U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, most of the cursives, the Memphitic, Thebaic, Philoxenian 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 αἰεὶ ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. — as he had ever done unto them.

Rev. T. καθὼς ἐποίει αὐτοῖς. — as he was wont to do unto them.

The revised reading is that of **Σ**, B, 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 cursives, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Gothic. (F and L are defective here.) The word αἰεὶ, "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 A.D. 27, and gave Jesus up to be crucified apparently A.D. 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 *c* and *k*. 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 αἰεὶ 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 αἰεὶ 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 **Σ**, B, 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 θέλετε ποιήσω — What will ye then that I shall do.

Rev. T. τί οὖν ποιήσω — What then shall I do.

The received reading is that of A, D, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, V, X, Γ, Π, most of the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Ethiopic, and Gothic Versions. The other is that of **Σ**, B, C, Δ, half a dozen cursives, 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. 22, — several of its supporters also omitting the words ὃν λέγετε, "whom ye call," which follow immediately after, while B, by omitting only the ὃν, gives a highly improbable reading, — τί οὖν ποιήσω λέγετε τὸν βασιλέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων; "What then shall I do, say ye, with the King of the Jews?" — a reading which Westcott and Hort correct, by placing ὃν in brackets!

XV. 39.

Rec. T. ὅτι οὕτω κράζας ἐξέπνευσεν, — that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost.

Rev. T. ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν, — 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 **Σ**, 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, Γ, Δ, Π, 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 *ἐξέπνευσεν* 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.

XV. 45.

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

Rev. T. *ἔδωρήσατο τὸ πτώμα τῷ Ἰωσήφ.* — he granted the corpse to Joseph.

"The corpse" is the reading of **Σ**, 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 Ἰωσή, 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, Γ, Π, 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 \aleph , 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. xiii. 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 one other 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 fontal 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

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 X* — viz., Eusebius, Macarius Magnes (A.D. 300–350, whose disputation 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 X, 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 ἐφοβοῦντο 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, inasmuch 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 com-*

pany. 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.¹ 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."²

Nothing short of absolute servile deference to the negative testimony of N 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.³

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 unfaltering 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.

i. 78.

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

Rev. T. ἐπισκέπεται ἡμᾶς ἀνατολὴ 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 **Σ** as amended by the earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, W^c, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ξ, all the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Philoxenian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, the Armenian Version edited by Bishop Usan, Irenæus, Gregory of Nyssa, and the Paschal Chronicle of Alexandria. The future, which the Revisers have adopted, is the reading of **Σ** 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, ἐπεσκέψαιται, 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 uncials 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 ἐπεσκέψατο *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 day-spring 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 ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη, ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία. — and on earth, peace, good will towards men.

Rev. T. καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας. — 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 ἀνθρώποις 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 **Σ** 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 **Σ** 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 O^d of the seventh century, P, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Ξ, 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 Irenæus 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 καταλλαγὴ, "reconciliation," Cyril of Alexandria at least fourteen times, Theodoret four times, Theodotus of Ancyra 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 *ἐν*, "among," in the copy from which the first Latin Version was made,—the preposition having been absorbed in the first syllable of *ἀνθρώποις*. The preposition being lost, it was necessary to put some meaning into *εὐδοκία* before it could be translated. The only feasible way to do this was to consider it an error for *εὐδοκίας*. In proof of this, we find that the Latin Versions all read *pax hominibus bonæ 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 *ἐν* before *ἀνθρώποις* 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 *δεδομένον ἀνθρώποις*, *datum hominibus*, "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 *ἐν* absorbed by *ἀνθρώποις* 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 *εὐδοκία*, 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 *ἐν*, "among," he would undoubtedly have restored the preposition, and left *εὐδοκία* 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."

the best he could; and a certain class of modern editors think they must accept his false reading as the veritable language of an inspired evangelist!

ii. 15.

Rec. T. *καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι οἱ ποιμένες εἶπον* — the shepherds said.

Rev. T. *οἱ ποιμένες εἶπον* — the shepherds said.

The omitted words are not found in *Σ*, B, L, *Ξ*, and a few cursives. Neither are their equivalents found in most copies of the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, or in Eusebius, the Latin of Origen, and Augustine. But the fact that the Latin texts and the versions generally have nothing corresponding to these words is no necessary proof that they were not in the Greek copies from which those versions were taken, any more than that their lack of representatives in our A. V. (as above) is a proof that they were not in the text from which this version was made. They are attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, *Γ*, *Δ*, *Λ*, most of the cursives, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Ethiopic Version, and *g* of the Old Latin; while *c* reads *et illi pastores*, which indicates that this rendering is from a Greek archetype corresponding to the received text. The truth is, *οἱ ἄνθρωποι* is superfluous, and was dropped on that account; and with the omission of these words, the Hebraistic *καί*, not being understood, went too. If not genuine, no second hand would ever have inserted them. Not only should they be retained as a part of the original text, but *καί*, which is equivalent here to *ὅτι*, and is by no means superfluous, should be represented in English by "that" in order to complete the rendering.

ii. 51.

Rec. T. *διεθήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα* — kept all these sayings.

Rev. T. *διεθήρει πάντα τὰ ῥήματα* — kept all these sayings.

The omission of *ταῦτα*, "these," is attested only by *Σ* first hand, B, D, M, two copies (*a*, *c*) of the Old Latin, and the

Armenian Version. Its presence, as a part of the text, is called for by Σ 's earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C, E, G, H, K, L, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , all the cursives, 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 *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 πάντα τὰ ῥήματα even in this connection. It would require the addition of αὐτοῦ. Ταῦτα 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. καὶ διακαθαριεῖ τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συνάξει τὸν σῖτον — and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and will gather the wheat.

Rev. T. διακαθάραι τὴν ἄλωνα αὐτοῦ, καὶ συναγαγεῖν τὸν σῖτον — thoroughly to cleanse his threshing-floor, and to gather the wheat.

These infinitives of the Revised Text are supported, the former by Σ first hand, B, two copies (*a*, *e*) of the Old Latin Version, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Irenæus as represented by his translator's Latin version; and the latter by Σ 's original scribe, B, *e*, 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 Σ 's contemporary reviser and seventh-century corrector, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , all the cursives, 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. καὶ κατέκλεισε τὸν Ἰωάννην — that he shut up John.

Rev. T. κατέκλεισε τὸν Ἰωάννην — that he shut up John.

The Revisers omit καί, yet give its English equivalent "that," just as the A. V. does, without italicizing it. This is hardly fair. It is the Hebraistic καί for 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 Σ first hand, B, D, Ξ , and two copies (*b*, *e*) of the Old Latin Version. But it is given by Σ 's earlier seventh-century corrector, A, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , all the cursives, 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. καὶ ἦγετο . . . εἰς τὴν ἔρημον — and was led . . . into the wilderness.

Rev. T. καὶ ἦγετο . . . ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ — 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 Σ , 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^b, Γ , Δ , Λ , Ξ , Π , all the cursives, 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 εἰς τὴν ἔρημον 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 τῇ ἐρήμῳ instead of εἰς τὴν ἔρημον, and passed on. Elsewhere in the New Testament the verb ἄγεσθαι is used in speaking of one's being led, not *in*, but *into*, a place; *i.e.* not with ἐν, but with εἰς 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 εἰς, 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 περιήγετο . . . 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. ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι Θεοῦ. — but by every word of God.
Rev. T. Omits.

The only evidence in support of this omission is the testimony of \aleph , 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, W^b, X, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , all the cursives, 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. ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον — when he had opened the book.
Rev. T. ἀνοίξας τὸ βιβλίον — he opened the book, and.

The latter reading is supported by A, B, L, Ξ , two cursives, 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 \aleph , D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, W^b, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , nearly all the cursives, 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 Σ in retaining ἀναπτύξας, "having unrolled," as Westcott and Hort probably were by their reverence for B in adopting ἀνοίξας instead. He must have been convinced that it is the true reading from verse 20, where πτύξας 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 Σ , B, C, L, Q, R, nearly twenty-five cursives, 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 Γαλιλαίας in the margin as one of their so-called "Western" readings. Γαλιλαίας, however, is adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and Tregelles in his text, it being attested as the true reading by A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursives, 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 pre-

ceding 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 **Σ**, in Mark i. 28, and Luke i. 26, commits the same error as here, giving 'Ιουδαίας, "Judea," when the genuine reading as given by all but one or two other manuscripts is Γαλιλαίας, "Galilee." In John vii. 3, D, on the other hand, has Γαλιλαίαν, "Galilee," for 'Ιουδαίαν, "Judea." In Matt. xxvi. 69, C, two cursives, the Peshito Syriac, and Persic of Walton's Polyglot have Ναζωραίου, "Nazarene," for Γαλιλαίου, "Galilean"; while in John iv. 47, the Curetonian Syriac Version reads, "Jesus was come out of *Galilee* into *Judea*," 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. i.

Rec. T. ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ τοῦ ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον — as the people pressed upon him to hear the word.

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

The latter reading is that of **Σ**, A, B, L, X, 1, 131, c 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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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. ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Σίμων εἶπεν αὐτῷ, — Simon answering, said unto him.

Rev. T. ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Σίμων εἶπεν, — Simon answered and said.

The omission of αὐτῷ here is attested by **Σ**, B, c 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, αὐτῇ, αὐτοῖς, or πρὸς αὐτόν, πρὸς αὐτούς, 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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, every copy but one of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions.

V. 9.

Rec. T. τῇ ἄγρα τῶν ἰχθύων ἢ συνέλαβον, — the draft of the fishes which they had taken.

Rev. T. τῇ ἄγρα τῶν ἰχθύων ὧν 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 \aleph , A, C, E, F, H, K, L, M, S; U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , all the cursives, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic. The latter is the reading of only B, D, Ξ , and the Gothic Version. If ὧν had been the original reading, there is no probability that it would ever have been changed to ἢ, 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 ἢ to ὧν 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 ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτούς. — the power of the Lord was *present* to heal them.

Rev. T. δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν. — 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, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, Vulgate, Peshito, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Gothic;

while the Revisers' αὐτόν is vouched for by only six witnesses; namely, \aleph , B, L, Ξ , 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 αὐτόν was changed to αὐτούς under the idea that ἰᾶσθαι needed an object. If any change had been made for this purpose, πολλούς, "many," or ὄχλους, "multitudes," would have been the more probable word, — certainly not αὐτούς. The change, on the contrary, was the other way, in order to obviate the seeming reference of αὐτούς 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 αὐτούς, some well-intentioned early reader changed it to αὐτόν; 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. Διατί οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσι — Why do the disciples of John fast?

Rev. T. Οἱ μαθηταὶ Ἰωάννου νηστεύουσι — 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 \aleph , B, etc., explain αὐτούς by respectively substituting for it πάντας and ἀσθενοῦντας.

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 **Σ**'s correctors, B, L, **Ξ**, two cursives, 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 **Σ**, A, C, D, E, F, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, X, **Γ**, **Δ**, **Λ**, **Π**, nearly all the cursives, 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. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν σαββάτῳ δευτεροπρώτῳ — And it came to pass on the second Sabbath after the first.

Rev. T. Ἐγένετο 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, **Δ**, **Λ**, **Π**, most of the cursives, 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, **Γ**, 117, 235, and two (13, 124 first hand) of Ferrar's group read δευτέρῳ πρώτῳ, which is probably the true reading. The unusual word is omitted from the text in **Σ**, 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 difficultatem*,¹ "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 δευτέρῳ, 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 **Σ**, 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 δευτέρῳ πρώτῳ 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 *μεγάλα* or *πρῶτα σάββατα*, notable or principal sabbaths, their three chief national feast-days. The *δεύτερον πρῶτον* (or *δευτερόπρωτον*) *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 *δευτεροπρώτῳ* or *δευτέρῳ πρώτῳ* 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. Ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ — And it came to pass also on another Sabbath.

Rev. T. Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ — And it came to pass on another sabbath.

Καί 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, *Σ*, B, L, X, about fifteen cursives, 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. *Καί* is attested, however, by A, E, H, K, M, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Philoxenian Syriac, and possibly the Gothic. It refers, in connection with *ἐγένετο*, 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 *δέ* and *ἑτέρῳ*, some early critical reader rejected it as superfluous or inconsistent with due conciseness.

vi. 23.

Rec. T. κατὰ ταῦτα γὰρ ἐποιοῦν . . . οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν. — for in the like manner did their fathers.

Rev. T. κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποιοῦν . . . οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν. — for in the same manner did their fathers.

The revised reading *τὰ αὐτά* 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 *Σ*, A, E, H, K, L, M, P, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, 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 *εὖ οἶδα*, or by such particles as *μέν* and *τε*, that cannot stand first. In that case, it stands third in the clause. If, however, *μέν* or *τε* 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 ταῦτα 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 ταῦτά γάρ*, and is altogether unlike Luke, compels us to believe that the true reading is that of the Received Text properly accentuated, — *ταῦτά*, not *ταῦτα*. 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 *γάρ*, 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 TAYTA might not be mistaken for *ταῦτα*; to make sure of which, he expanded it into *τὰ αὐτά*, without realizing that *γάρ* 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' ὧν ἐλπίζετε ἀπολαβεῖν*, — of whom ye hope to receive.

Rev. T. *παρ' ὧν 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, F, Δ, Λ, and nearly every cursive; the latter by *Σ*, B, L, Ξ, 237, and Justin Martyr, *Apol.* i. 15. But Justin evidently quotes from memory, as follows: *εἰ γὰρ δανείζετε παρ' ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, τί καινὸν ποιεῖτε; τοῦτο καὶ οἱ τελῶναι ποιοῦσιν*. 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 fulfil 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 read-

ing 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 *Σ*, Ξ, Π 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, *μηδέν* 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 *ἀπό* in composition with *ἐλπίζειν*, as the words *παρ' ὧν 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 *ἀπό 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 *ἀπεσθίειν* for *ἀπό τινος ἐσθίειν*, "to eat of something"; and *ἀπογεύσασθαι* for *ἀπό τινος γεύσασθαι*, "to taste of something."¹

vi. 48.

Rec. T. *τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν*. — for it was founded upon a rock.

Rev. T. *διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομήσθαι 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, F, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old

¹ See Liddell and Scott, Robinson, and Thayer on these compounds, — *ἀπολαμβάνειν*, etc., as well as Pickering's Lexicon under *ἀπό*, viii. (17) (18).

Latin, Vulgate, Peshito Syriac, Philoxenian Syriac, Gothic, and Armenian. The revised is vouched for by **Σ**, B, L, **Ξ**, 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 *οικοδομήσθαι*, 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 built, 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,

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. ἐπορεύετο εἰς πόλιν — he went into a city.

Rev. T. ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν — he went to a city.

The aorist of the Revised Text is supported only by **Σ**, B, R, and the lost uncial represented by Ferrar's group; while the imperfect of the Received Text is attested by A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, all the cursives 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

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. αὐ λέγει, — which say.

The Revisers' reading, which is found only in **Σ** as left by its original scribe, B, and the cursive **ι**, is far too feebly attested to be allowed to supersede the common reading, which is supported by A, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, five copies of the old Latin, the Vulgate, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions. D, L, the four cursives 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, **Σ** 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 **Σ**, 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 A and the cursive 262 prefer the plural form οἱ λέγουσιν, which differs from the original only in taking λέγουσιν as a third person plural instead of a participle, and substituting οἱ for καί. The original construction, which is followed by Lachmann, is obviously the simple, natural reading of the Received Text, — λέγουσιν being, of course, a present parti-

ciple like the preceding ones, with which it is connected by καί. If this word had invariably been taken as a participial form, there would have been no rival readings.

vii. 33.

Rec. T. μῆτε ἄρτον ἐσθίων μῆτε οἶνον πίνων, — neither eating bread, nor drinking wine.

Rev. T. μὴ ἄρτον ἐσθίων μῆτε 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 **Σ**, B, **Ξ**, 157, and *f* of the Old Latin, which Orosius partially quotes as follows: *Venit Johannes non manducans neque bibans*, without the additional words *panem* and *vinum*. The common reading is overwhelmingly attested by A (C is defective), D, E, G, H, K, L, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, A, Π, 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” . . . μῆτε, “nor,” when his usual manner of negatively coupling two similar phrases or expressions is μῆτε, “neither” . . . μῆτε, “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. αὐτὶνες διηκόνουν αὐτῷ — which ministered unto him.

Rev. T. αὐτὶνες διηκόνουν αὐτοῖς — which ministered unto them.

The “many ancient authorities” to which the marginal note refers as supporting the received reading are **Σ**, A, L, M, X, Π, **ι**, 33, and a multitude of other cursives, 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, Γ, Δ, Λ, about ninety cursives, 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 αὐτῶ 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. ἕτερον ἔπεσεν — some fell.

Rev. T. ἕτερον κατέπεσεν — other fell.

On seeing this new reading, one instinctively asks why *Luke*, within the compass of four successive verses (5-8), in express-

ing one and the same idea, should three times have written ἔπεσεν, "fell," and once κατέπεσεν, "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 depravations 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 ἔπεσεν 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 ⚭, A (C is defective), D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, and every known cursive.

viii. 12.

Rec. T. οἱ ἀκούοντες — they that hear.

Rev. T. οἱ ἀκούσαντες — they that have heard.

This is another false reading, supported by ⚭, B, L, U, Ξ, and half a dozen cursives only. It is an early alteration of the genuine text to make the reading correspond with that in verses 14, 15. If ἀκούσαντες 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 ἀκολουθοῦντες, — a blunder), E, G, H, K, M, R, S, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 ἀνὴρ τις — And when he went forth to land, there met him a certain man.

Rev. T. ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν ἀνὴρ 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 **Σ**, B, E, **Ξ**, about a dozen cursives, 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 cursives. 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 Winer'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.

viii. 35.

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

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

The Revisers have here adopted a reading found in no Greek manuscript except **Σ** and B. 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, *ἐδαπάνησε τὰ παρ' αὐτῆς πάντα εἰς τοὺς ἰατρούς*, "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 **Σ**, A, C, E, F^v, G, H, K, L, M, P, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ξ, 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 **Σ**, A, C, D, E, G, H, K, L, M, P, R, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ξ, all the cursives, and every version except the three above mentioned. Some of the Greek manuscripts, however, represent "with him" by *μετ' αὐτοῦ*, others by *σὺν αὐτῷ*.

viii. 45.

Rec. T. *καὶ λέγεις, Τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου;*—and sayest thou, Who touched me?

Rev. T. Omits.

The omission is supported by **Σ**, 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, Λ, 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 documents, 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 **Σ** 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 certainly not much later."¹ Codex C is assigned to the middle of the fifth century,—being perhaps a hundred years or so later than **Σ** 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 *ἥψατο*, 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 *ἥψατο* 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, *τις ἥψατό μου*, *Some one touched me*; for" etc.,—without the special emphasis of "*did* touch," implied in the position given by him to *ἥψατο*. 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 ἀσθενοῦντας*, and others *τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς*. 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. *ὑπεχώρησε κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς τόπον ἔρημον πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαϊδά*.—he went aside privately into a desert place, belonging to the city called Bethsaida.

Rev. T. *ὑπεχώρησε κατ' ἰδίαν εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά*.—he withdrew apart to a city called Bethsaida.

The revised reading is that given by the earlier seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, B, L, X, *Ξ*, 33, the Memphitic, The-

baic, and Erpenius' Arabic Version. D alone reads κώμην, "a village," instead of πόλιν, "a city." The received reading is attested by A, C, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, Armenian, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, except that A and five or six cursives read ἔρημον τόπον instead of τόπον ἔρημον, 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 **Σ**, 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 **Σ**, 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 Βηθσαϊδά, "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 καλούμενον, making it read, "to a desert place *called* Bethsaida." But some one, not satisfied with either of these readings, changed the expression to πόλεως καλουμένης Βηθσαϊδά, "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 ἔρημον, and instead wrote πόλιν (which still another changed to κώμην) καλουμένην Βηθσαϊδά, "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. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός· — This is my beloved Son.

Rev. T. Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλεκτός· — 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, Α, Η, nearly all the cursives, 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 Σ, 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. 17.) 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 Σ, B, L, Ξ, two cursives, 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, Α, Η, most of the cursives, 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 Σ, 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 **Σ**, A, B, C, E, F, G, H, L, S, V, X, Δ, Ξ, 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 D, F*, K, M, U, Γ, Λ, Π, 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 *δύο* 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 B, D, M, R, 1, 42, *a*, *c*, *e*, *g*¹, *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 **Σ**, A, C, E, G, H, K, L, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Ξ, Π, all but two cursives, *b*, *f*, *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 ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα*, — thou, Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven.

Rev. T. *σύ, Καπερναούμ, μὴ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ*; — thou, Capernaum, shalt thou be exalted unto heaven?

The former is the reading of A, C, E, G, K, M, R, S, U, V, W*, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, all the cursives, *c*, *f*, *g*¹, *q* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Armenian, and Augustine; the latter, that of **Σ**, B, D, L,

Ξ, α, β, ε, ι, λ 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 "Caper-naum," making μή out of ή, which subsequently required the changing of ὑψωθείσα into the personal form ὑψωθήση. (See Note on Matt. xi. 23.)

X. 21.

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

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

The words τῷ Ἁγίῳ, "the Holy," though attested by Σ, B, C, D, K, L, X, Ξ, Π, ι, 33, and five other cursives, 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 cursives, two copies of the Old Latin, the Gothic, Clement of Alexandria, and Basil.

X. 32.

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

Rev. T. καὶ Λευΐτης κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν — 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 Σ, who in fact supplies the whole verse omitted through oversight by the original scribe, also by B, L, X, Ξ, ι, 33, ι18, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and apparently the Ethiopic Version. But the word was evidently dropped as

redundant in connection with ἐλθὼν. 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 cursives, γ of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions. The omission of the superfluous τυγχάνοντα 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 πορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς καὶ — Now it came to pass, as they went, that.

Rev. T. Ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι αὐτοὺς — 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 Σ, B, L, Ξ, 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 καί. 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, c, ff², i, l*, and Ambrose, who of course followed his Old Latin Version. The Old Latin manuscript *c* 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 *Σ*, B, C's sixth-century emendator, L, 1, 33,

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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives 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 (*ff², 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 λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν ὁ ὀφθαλμός. — The light of the body is the eye.

Rev. T. ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματος ἐστὶν 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 σοῦ, "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, **Σ** 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 σοῦ, "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 **Σ**, 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 **Σ** 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 ἓνα; — one cubit.

Rev. T. πῆχυν; — a cubit.

The omission of ἓνα is supported by **Σ** 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 **Σ**, A, E, G, H, K, L, M, Q, S, T^{woi}, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, 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," ἓνα 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 ἓνα being corrected in **Σ** 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, *ε* 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^{woi}, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, *c, f, q* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the printed Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Basil, 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 ὁ δούλος in verse 45 should be from verse 43, or τοῦ δούλου ἐκείνου (for which D, *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 Sinaitic Codex, first hand, omits the whole expression "those servants," as do *b, ff², 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.

xiii. 27.

Rec. T. οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς πόθεν ἐστέ· — I know you not whence you are.

Rev. T. οὐκ οἶδα πόθεν ἐστέ· — I know not whence ye are.

The omission of *ὑμᾶς*, "you," is in accordance with B, L, R, T^{woi}, 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 *Σ*, 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. ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος· — your house is left unto you desolate.

Rev. T. ἀφίεται 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 *Σ*, A, B, K, L, R, S, V, Γ, Δ, 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 *ἐρημος* 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 *ὄνος*, "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 cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic Version, the younger Cyril as cited in different catenas, Titus of Bostra, Euthymius, and Theopylact. 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 *Σ*, 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

¹ Wars, VII. i. 1.

other cursives, 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

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 ONOC and OYIOC (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 ὁ υἱός, "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. ἤδη ἔτοιμά ἐστι πάντα. — all things are now ready.

Rev. T. ἤδη ἔτοιμά ἐστι. — all things are now ready.

The presence of πάντα, "all things," is called for by Σ as amended probably by the scribe's "proof-reader," A, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, ΙΙ, the whole body of the cursives, 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 Σ 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 ἔτοιμα, "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. ἐπεθύμει γεμίσαι τὴν κοιλίαν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν κερατίων — he would fain have filled his belly with the husks.

Rev. T. ἐπεθύμει χορτασθῆναι ἐκ τῶν κερατίων — he would fain have been filled with the husks.

The revised reading is supported by Σ, B, D, L, R, 1, 94, 131, 251, and the four cursives 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 Tregelles 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, ΙΙ, 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. ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῶ ἀπόλλυμαι; — and I perish with hunger?

Rev. T. ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῶ ὧδε 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, ΙΙ, all the cursives but

ten or twelve, the Thebaic and Gothic Versions. The other is the reading of **Σ**, B, L, *c* of the Old Latin and the Philoxenian Syriac Version. The reading, ἐγὼ δὲ ὦδε λιμῶ ἀπόλλυμαι, 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 ὦδε, "here," in the last three letters of ἐγὼ δέ, it being considered a mere repetition of these letters; while the revised reading seems to be a critic's device for saving ὦδε to the text by placing it after λιμῶ. The absorption of ὦδε in ἐγὼ δέ is much more probable than that ὦδε should have grown out of ἐγὼ δέ 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 ὦδε, "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 **Σ**, B, D, U, X, about twenty cursives, 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, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the

cursives, 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. ἀνέζησε — is alive again.

Rev. T. ἔζησε — is alive again.

The Revisers' reading follows **Σ** first hand, B, L, R, Δ, 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 ἀνέζησε is the genuine reading in verse 24, that is just the reason why it should reappear here; while a sensitive critical reader would naturally seek to change it to the simple form in both places. Besides, if ζήσε 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 \aleph 's earlier seventh-century corrector, A, D, E, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , the whole body of the cursives, 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 ἐμόν, "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 ν for an η , — some careless copyist having written ἡμέτερον for ὑμέτερον, — 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. $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\ \gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ — whosoever marrieth.

Rev. T. $\delta\ \gamma\alpha\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ — he that marrieth.

The common reading is that of \aleph , A, E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, X, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , most of the cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Gothic Versions. The Revisers' is that of B, D, L, five cursives, 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 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta$ in the beginning of the verse. It is more probable that a reviser of Luke's text changed the phraseology by omitting $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, for variety's sake, than that the word was mechanically repeated in transcribing.

xvii. 3.

Rec. T. $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\ \delta\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$, — If thy brother trespass against thee.

Rev. T. $\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\ \delta\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\acute{o}\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon$, — 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 , Λ , Π , nearly all the cursives, three manuscripts of the Old Latin, the printed Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac according to the Codex of Barsalibi, Bishop of Amida, the Armenian of Usan, and Antiochus; the latter, by \aleph , A, B, L, six cursives, 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 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}$, 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, *ἐς 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, F, Δ, A, 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. *Σ*, 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 φαρισαῖον*, "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 *ἀντ' ἐκεῖνου*, or *ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνου*. 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 *ὑπὲρ ἐκεῖνου*, "instead of the other," is the true reading, from which all the other readings have sprung.

xix. 18.

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

Rev. T. Ἡ μνᾶ σου, Κύριε, — Thy pound, Lord.

This change in the order of the words is vouched for only by **Σ**, 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. ἕτερος ἦλθε — another came.

Rev. T. ὁ ἕτερος ἦλθε — another came.

The insertion of ὁ, “the,” though supported by **Σ** 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.

Rev. 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 **Σ**, 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**, **Λ**, **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. ἀπέστειλε δύο τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ εἰπών — he sent two of his disciples, Saying.

Rev. T. ἀπέστειλε δύο τῶν μαθητῶν εἰπών — he sent two of the disciples, saying.

We do not understand why αὐτοῦ should be omitted, and εἰπών, immediately following, not be changed to λέγων. The manuscript evidence in favor of reading αὐτοῦ is certainly stronger than in favor of retaining εἰπών, though the meaning remains unchanged whether in the one case we omit αὐτοῦ or not, or in the other read εἰπών or (with Westcott and Hort) λέγων. No doubt, αὐτοῦ 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**, **Λ**, **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 **Σ**, 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 αὐτόν, — come, let us kill him.

Rev. T. ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, — 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 **Σ**, C, D, E, G, H, L, R, S, U, V, **Γ**, **Δ**, **Λ**, 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 *δεῦρο*, "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 *δεῦτε*, 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 πειράζετε; ἐπιδείξατέ μοι δηνάριον*. — Why tempt ye me? Shew me a penny.

Rev. T. *Δείξατέ μοι δηνάριον*. — Shew me a penny.

The question "Why tempt ye me?" does not appear in *Σ*, B, L, six cursives, one copy of the old Latin, the Memphitic, and the Armenian Version. Hence Tregelles, 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, F, 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. xxii. 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. *οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος* — they could not take hold of his words.

Rev. T. *οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι τοῦ ῥήματος* — they were not able to take hold of the saying.

The only witnesses in support of the Revisers' reading here are *Σ*, 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 *αὐτοῦ* or *αὐτῆς* 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 *αὐτοῦ* 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 αὐτοῦ to τοῦ. The reverse could hardly be expected. In verse 20, Luke wrote ἵνα ἐπιλάβωνται αὐτοῦ 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 ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ, — there shall not be left one stone upon another.

Rev. T. οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λίθος ἐπὶ λίθῳ ὧδε, — there shall not be left here one stone upon another.

The Revisers' reading is that of **Σ**, B, L, Ferrar's group of cursives, 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 cursives, 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 α 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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 αἰφνίδιος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐπιστῇ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη· ὥς παγίς γὰρ ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ πάντας — and that day come upon you unawares. For as a snare shall it come on all.

Rev. T. καὶ αἰφνίδιος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἐπιστῇ ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη ὥς παγίς· ἐπεισελεύσεται γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντας — and that day come on you suddenly as a snare: for so shall it come upon all.

The Revisers follow **Σ**, 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, Α, 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 παγίς, 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 **Σ**, B, L, and the Memphitic Version, whatever other documents may be produced against them

xxi. 36.

Rec. T. ἀγρυπνεῖτε οὖν — Watch ye therefore.

Rev. T. ἀγρυπνεῖτε δέ — But watch ye.

We have here another questionable reading supported only by **N**, B, D, two copies of the Old Latin Version, and one of Petreus' 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 οὖν, "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.

xxi. 36.

Rec. T. ἵνα καταξιώθῃτε ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα — that ye may be accounted worthy to escape all these things.

Rev. T. ἵνα κατισχύσητε ἐκφυγεῖν ταῦτα πάντα — that ye may prevail to escape all these things.

The revised reading is supported by **N**, 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 A, 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 κατισχύειν, "to prevail," but once (xxiii. 23), "And their voices prevailed." But he uses it without an infinitive, and in its ordinary acceptance 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 ισχύειν. 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 ισχύειν in accordance with his *usus loquendi* 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. $\delta\tau\iota\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ — I will not any more eat.

Rev. T. $\delta\tau\iota\ \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \phi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ — I will not eat.

The omission of "any more" is according to \aleph , A, B, H, L, and apparently the original text of C, four or five cursives, α 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 , Δ , Λ , Π , the rest of the cursives, 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 pass-over with you.*" Then, if $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$ 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 $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$ 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 c , 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. *Εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος· Σίμων, Σίμων*, — And the Lord said, Simon, Simon.

Rev. T. *Σίμων, Σίμων*, — 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 *Σ*, A (C is defective), D, E, F, G, H, K, M, Q, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the entire body of the cursives, 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 *Σ*, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, Q, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π (a few of these marked with an asterisk, denoting that the words are wanting in some copies), all the cursives 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 uncials, 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 Irenæus of the second century; Hippolytus and Dionysius of Alexandria, in the third century; Eusebius, Arius, Athanasius, Ephraem 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 controversialists 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 impeccability 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. ὅστις ἦν . . . βεβλημένος εἰς φυλακὴν. — who . . . was cast into prison.

Rev. T. ὅστις ἦν . . . βληθείς ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ. — one who . . . was cast into prison.

The revised reading is supported only by B, L, T. The other is that of **Σ** as amended by its fourth-century corrector, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, and all the cursives. **Σ** 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 βληθείς here, for the use of an aorist participle without the article in connection with the verb εἶναι, "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 Π 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 εἶναι, to which it does not belong, as in D at Acts viii. 13. The New-Testament mode of expressing periphrastically with εἶναι the English "was cast," or rather "had been cast," is ἦν βεβλημένος, as the Received Text has it. But this has every appearance of being a correction of the older but false reading, ἦν βληθείς. The true reading, beyond a doubt, is that of the original transcriber of **Σ**, ὅστις ἦν . . . 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 φυλακὴν, "into prison," the form of expression which would naturally follow βάλλειν, "to cast," and which does follow it in every other instance in which the word is used in the New Testament in connection with φυλακή. But the scribe who introduced the aorist participle βληθείς 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. ὅτε ἀπῆλθον — when they were come.

Rev. T. ὅτε ἦλθον — when they came.

The common reading is attested by A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, and John Damascene. The latter is that of **Σ**, 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 ἀπήγαγον 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) ἐξέρχόμενοι, "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 ἀπήγαγον (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 ἀπήλθον should have been employed by the writer here instead of Matthew's word ἦλθον.

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 **S**, A, C, D second hand, E, F, G, H, K, L (which usually sides with B), M, Q, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, 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 [**S**, B, 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 ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκλεκτός. — Let him save himself, if he be Christ; the chosen of God.

Rev. T. σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, εἰ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ ἐκλεκτός. — 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, Λ, Π, 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 **S**, B, L, and three cursives only. The passage has evidently been

much tampered with. Not merely has ἐκλεκτός been transposed, making the words read ὁ ἐκλεκτός 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 υἱός, “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 *c* 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 *begun* 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 υἱός (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 υἱός, “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 εἰ ΟΥΤΟC [οὗτος] ἐστὶν might very easily and naturally have arisen, through the carelessness of an early scribe, from εἰ ΟΥΙΟC [ὁ υἱός] ἐστὶν, 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 υἱός 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. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ γεγραμμένη ἐπ’ αὐτῷ γράμμασιν Ἑλληνικοῖς καὶ Ῥωμαϊκοῖς καὶ Ἑβραϊκοῖς, Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς 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. ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπιγραφὴ ἐπ’ 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 \aleph , B, L, and the Egyptian Versions; (2) in the omission of the words “in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew,” is according to \aleph 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 ἐστὶν and the transferring of οὗτος to the end of the verse, is according to \aleph , B, L, and *a*. Codex

D, 124, and *c*, *ff*² of the Old Latin transfer both words, while C and *c* omit both. In other words, the Revisers' reading is supported *throughout* only by B and L. On the other hand, the Received Text, in reading *γεγραμμένη*, is supported by C, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, most of the cursives and Old Latin Versions, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic, while A, D, Q, one lectionary, and a few Latin manuscripts have *ἐπιγεγραμμένη* instead. In the reading "in letters of Greek, and Latin, and Hebrew," it is supported by *Σ* as originally transcribed, and as afterward amended by its later seventh-century corrector, A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, Q, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, the whole body of the cursives, most manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Eusebius, and Cyril of Alexandria. In reading *οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων*, it is supported by A, E, G, H, K, M, Q, R, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, most cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Curetonian, Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Origen, Eusebius, and Gregory of Nyssa. That is to say, the received reading as a whole is that of A and thirteen other uncials, most of the cursives, at least three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions. The preponderance of evidence is therefore decidedly in support of the common reading. Since, however, the statement that the inscription was written in three different languages is wanting in a few of the older documents, it is supposed that it was introduced from John xix. 20. But, if this had been the case, the phraseology would have been more like John's, especially in the order in which the three languages are mentioned. While John, as a convert from Judaism, naturally mentions first that the inscription was "in Hebrew," Luke, as a converted Greek writing for Greeks, very naturally begins with speaking of the inscription as being "in letters of *Greek*." It is not at all

likely that the words would have been arranged as they are here if they had been introduced from John's Gospel. In fact, the testimony in favor of the common reading as a whole is so far superior to that supporting the other reading, it seems hardly possible to question its genuineness. If omissions and transpositions similar to those here given in the Revised Text were not constantly and everywhere occurring in the old manuscripts, it might be a matter of surprise that they are found in a passage like this, where from one point of view there seems to be no reason for any such changes. But, if the truth were really known, the cause and reason of these changes would be a matter of no surprise whatever, but one of the simplest and most natural things possible. Indeed, they may be merely specimens of mutilations of the text that have come down to us from Tatian's *Diatessaron*; or, if not from that, from some of the equally ancient altered forms of the text common in the second and third centuries.

xxiii. 42.

The marginal reading *εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου*, "into thy kingdom," is supported only by B, L, a few copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Origen as represented by his Latin interpreter (though his own Greek at least twice elsewhere agrees with the common reading), and Hilary. But the reading is an obvious alteration, having arisen from a misapprehension of the meaning of *βασιλεία* here. This being taken in its secondary though common signification of kingdom, it is but natural that some should have regarded *ἐν*, "in," with the dative an error, and so changed the reading as to make it mean "when thou comest *into* thy kingdom," *i.e.* reachest thy royal dominions. Whereas, the word has its primary sense of royal estate, kingdom; and the true meaning of the penitent petitioner is "when thou comest *in* thy royalty." He viewed Jesus now as a captive, undergoing suffering. But by faith he recognized him as

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 ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος*, — And the sun was darkened.

Rev. 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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives 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. **Σ**, C first hand apparently, L, and a dozen lectionaries read *ἐκλιπόντος*, "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,"

¹ Works, iii. 922.

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. *ἐδόξασε τὸν Θεόν* — he glorified God.

Rev. T. *ἐδόξαζε 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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, 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

Σ, B, D, L, R, four or five copies of the Old Latin, two editions of the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Cyril of Alexandria. As a rule, the writers of the New Testament preserve the established grammatical distinction between the aorist as expressive of a momentary past act or state, and the imperfect as representing something continuous or contemporaneous. Especially true is this of Luke. In this entire Gospel (if we except λέγε, which, instead of meaning was saying or proceeded to say, sometimes seems to be used interchangeably with εἶπε, "said"), the imperfect, as found in the Received Text, can nowhere properly be said to be employed as an aorist. In xxiv. 27, διηρμήνευεν, which has been set aside by the Revisers for the aorist, denotes Christ's proceeding *at the same time* to interpret. And this, the context indicates to be the evangelist's meaning — not Christ's act of interpreting considered as completed. In the verse before us, as well as in other places, where the aorist of the Received Text has been set aside by the Revisers for the imperfect, the latter, though attested by some of the older manuscripts, is hardly warranted by the evangelist's *usus loquendi* elsewhere. Nor are these changes altogether favored by other modern editors. The act of the centurion here, as far as the record intimates, was but the single and momentary one of saying "Certainly this was a righteous man." To record this as the evangelist does, calls for the aorist, not the imperfect. The act differs from those recorded by the same word in v. 26, vii. 16, xiii. 13, where the imperfect denotes a continuance of the act in distinction from the momentary acts expressed by the aorists in the immediate contexts. The aorist being the best attested reading here, and the one really demanded by the context and the evangelist's manner of employing the tenses, it ought to be considered the true reading, — especially since the imperfect here, as well as in viii. 29, ix. 49, and x. 40, where it has been adopted by the Revisers in place of the aorist, though altogether unsuitable for expressing the evangelist's obvious

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 ἐπέστρεφον in (48) the next verse, representing the continuous act of the multitudes turning back one by one from the cross and retracing their steps to their homes, — something very different from the single momentary exclamation of the centurion.

xxiii. 49.

Rec. T. γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθήσασαι αὐτῷ — the women that followed him.

Rev. T. γυναῖκες αἱ συνακολουθοῦσαι αὐτῷ — the women that followed with him.

The present participle adopted by the Revisers is the reading of Σ, 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, Δ, Π, nearly all the cursives, and every ancient version. The aorist infinitive συνακολουθῆσαι 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

reference to Matt. viii. 10, xxi. 9; Mark xi. 9; and Luke vii. 9 will show the legitimate and general New-Testament use of a present participle preceded by the article in connection with a verb in a past tense. In all these instances, the participle with its article is truly rendered only by "that were following," — a rendering which cannot be given the present participle here.

xxiv. 3, 6, 9, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52.

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*, *ff*², *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 uncials and versions, all the cursives, 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 \aleph 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. *καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς, αἱ ἔλεγον . . . ταῦτα.* — and other women that were with them, which told these things.

Rev. T. *καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ σὺν αὐταῖς ἔλεγον . . . ταῦτα.* — and the other women with them told these things.

The received reading is attested by \aleph as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, K, S, U, V, X, Δ , most of the cursives, *a*, *c*, *f*, 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 *αἱ* is according to \aleph first hand, A, B, D, E, F, G, H, L, M, Γ , Δ , Π , nearly fifty cursives, four copies (*b*, *e*, *ff*², *q*) 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 αἱταὶ δὲ ἡσαν, "And *these* were" instead of the unemphatic ἡσαν δέ, "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 αἱ, A, D, F, about forty cursives, the Curetonian Syriac and Ethiopic Versions omit ἡσαν δέ 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 \aleph , 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 αὐτῶν, — 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, F, Δ, Λ, Π, 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 \aleph , 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 αὐτῶν, 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 *l* of the Old Latin. A third, omitting ἐνώπιον, 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 uncials 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 αὐταῖς, 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 αὐταῖς, 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.

XXIV. 17.

Rec. T. *περιπατοῦντες, καὶ ἔστε σκυθρωποί*; — as ye walk, and are sad?

Rev. T. *περιπατοῦντες; καὶ ἐστάθησαν 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, Λ, Π, the entire body of the cursives, 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 *ἐστάθησαν*, the aorist passive. The testimony of Origen, who quotes the verse only as far as *περιπατοῦντες*, 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 *ἔστε* rather than the participle *ὄντες*. This personal form shows that the connection made by the conjunction is not with *περιπατοῦντες*, 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' ὧν*, "because of which," in connection with *ἔστε*, though it is substantially implied in the preceding words, *ἔστε* was changed to *ἐστάθησαν*, and the question made to stop with the preceding participle. The reading is the transparent emendation of some stupid critic.

XXIV. 21.

Rec. T. *τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει σήμερον* — to-day is the third day.

Rev. T. *τρίτην ταύτην 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, Λ, Π, most of the cursives, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and the Ethiopic Version. Codex D, five cursives, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Augustine have *σήμερον*, but omit *ταύτην*. The Revisers' reading, which retains *ταύτην* but omits *σήμερον*, is attested by **Σ**, B,

L, 1, and the Curetonian, Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, as well as the Memphitic and Armenian. — The Revisers' rendering would do very well for *τρίτην αὐτὴν ἡμέραν ἄγει*, if this were the Greek corresponding to it. But how it is to be obtained from their Greek is a mystery to us, unless ἄγει 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 *τοῦτο τρίτον θέρος ἄγω ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ*, 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 ἄγει, 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 *ταύτην* and *ἡμέραν* together. But the absence of the article forbids this. The Greek for "this day," in such a connection as this, is not *ταύτην ἡμέραν*, but *ταύτην τὴν ἡμέραν* or *τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην*. 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 *σήμερον* 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 *ἀφ' οὗ*, "from which," — an expression in which the relative *οὗ* is evidently in the neuter, referring to *σήμερον*. If this pronoun referred to *ἡμέραν*, the expression would be *ἀφ' ἧς*, 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. *Σήμερον*, "to-day," seems to have been omitted in a few copies from having been supposed to be superfluous in connection with the preceding *ταύτην*, just as *ταύτην* was omitted, for a similar reason, in other copies that retained *σήμερον*. 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 **Σ**, 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. *αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν*. — praising and blessing God.

Rev. T. *εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν*. — blessing God.

The revised reading, which is that of Westcott and Hort, is attested by only four uncials and one version, — **Σ**, B, C first hand, L, and the Jerusalem Syriac. That adopted by Tischendorf, namely, *αἰνοῦντες τὸν Θεόν*, "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 αἰνεῖν τὸν Θεόν, "to praise God," is used at least twice as often by Luke as the phrase εὐλογεῖν τὸν Θεόν, "to bless God." And in view of Luke's coupling praising God with glorifying him in ii. 13, and with rejoicing in xix. 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 αἰνοῦντες 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 αἰνοῦντες and εὐλογεῖν, 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 — Σ according to its earlier seventh-century corrector, D as supplied by a later hand, L, X, Δ, — and four cursives 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 γεστία for ἐστία, 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 ἕκτη, "sixth," instead of τρίτη, "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 time 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."¹ 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,¹ 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 ἀνατείλωντος, "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, . . . ἀνατέλλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου, 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*, *n*, *q*) 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 παρήγγειλε, "he commanded," the Revisers read the present παραγγέλλει, "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^d, X, I, II, all the cursives, 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 \aleph , B, D, L, and Δ only. In a simi-

lar manner, in Mark viii. 15, where the true reading is the imperfect διεστέλλετο, "he *charged* them," *i.e.* proceeded to charge them, E, F, the representatives of the lost uncial Φ , 28, 131, and a few other cursives, have the aorist διεστείλατο, he "charged" them, — the act being represented as one, and past and finished. This is precisely the error, the writing of -ελλα- for -ελλο-, committed by one of the earliest of transcribers on Mark's word ἀνατέλλοντος, — a word denoting that the sun was in the act of coming up to the horizon, and applicable to its position at any time of the early morning, from the first appearance of dawn till sunrise. Another instance of the same error occurs in Mark xi. 1, where F, H, Codex 1, and five other cursives, *a*, *b*, *c*, *f*, *g*², and *k* second hand, the Peshito Syriac, Gothic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions have the aorist ἀπέστειλεν, "he sent," for the present "he sendeth." Again, in Acts xiii. 5, Codex D, and a few cursives have the aorist instead of the imperfect, — the same error having been committed in spelling here as was early committed in Mark xvi. 2. The same error was also committed in Acts xiv. 27, in writing the aorist of the Received Text ἀνήγγειλαν, "they rehearsed," *i.e.* once for all, for the imperfect of the Revisers' Text ἀνήγγελλον, which denotes a renewed or repeated rehearsing of what God had done. In view of the frequency of errors of this kind, it is not just to the evangelist to think that he could have contradicted himself in xvi. 2, even though nearly all the ancient documents agree in presenting as his work the obvious blunder of some copyist of his Gospel. We make no question that Mark wrote, "very early on the first day of the week, . . . as the sun was rising"; and that his text should read accordingly, even though Codex D and the Old Latin Version are not the best of "authorities," generally speaking. In this instance, however, they clearly give Mark's language as he must have penned it.



HECKMAN
BINDERY INC.



MAY 99

Bound-To-Please® N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46992

CORNELL
UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

The Robert M. and Laura Lee Lintz
Book Endowment for the Humanities

Class of 1924

CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY



3 1924 091 301 121



The original of this book is in
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924091301121>

THE REVISERS' GREEK TEXT
Vol. 2

THE
REVISERS' GREEK TEXT

A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN READINGS, TEXTUAL
AND MARGINAL, IN THE ORIGINAL GREEK OF THE
NEW TESTAMENT ADOPTED BY THE LATE
ANGLO-AMERICAN REVISERS

Volume II

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

Πάντα δοκιμάετε, τὸ καλὸν κατεχετε
PROVE ALL THINGS; HOLD FAST THAT WHICH IS GOOD



BOSTON
SILVER, BURDETT & COMPANY
1892

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 Generally speaking, it

¹ See *Lectures on Bible Revision*, pp. 119, 120, by Samuel Newth, D.D. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1881.

NT 24.211
W 616
V.2

COPYRIGHT, 1892,

By SILVER, BURDETT & CO.

PRINTED BY

TYPOGRAPHY BY J. S. CUSHING & CO., BOSTON.

PRESSWORK BY BERWICK & SMITH, BOSTON.

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 "exerted 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

¹ Introduction to Amer. edition of *Westcott and Hort's New Testament in Greek*, p. ix.

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 neutrality [*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 **N**! Westcott and Hort's belief is that, except in a very few instances, "the readings of **N** and **B** should be accepted as the true readings until strong internal evidence is found to the contrary, and that no readings of **N** and **B** can safely be rejected absolutely";¹ 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 **N**, 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,

more harmonious, more self-evidencing than it is now. But the means of detecting these errors are not peculiar to any one manuscript or set of manuscripts, however excellent may be its general character; for the true text of the New Testament is the possession of no one ancient document or set of documents, but is more or less held as a common possession among them. Hence, if we would know what that text really is, we should not limit our observations, as some do, to the readings of a few documents, but extend our views and researches to all the various sources of evidence within our reach. Here, then, is a field of investigation and labor deserving of profound attention, and worthy of the most consecrated energies of the Christian student. It is one that calls for earnest, loving, patient, persevering labor. If thus entered upon and explored with wisdom, freedom from bias, and an eye ever open for the truth, the results can hardly fail to be welcomed by all sincere lovers and genuine students of God's Word.

CONTENTS — VOL. II.

	PAGE
PROLEGOMENON	3
READINGS EXAMINED:	
From John	11
From Acts	81
From Romans	140
From 1 Corinthians	177
From 2 Corinthians	192
From Galatians	202
From Ephesians	211
From Philippians	218
From Colossians	221
From 1 Thessalonians	230
From 2 Thessalonians	237
From 1 Timothy	239
From 2 Timothy	245
From Titus	249
From Philemon	251
From Hebrews	254
From James	272
From 1 Peter	278
From 1 John	283
From 2 John	294
From Jude	295
From Revelation	298
GENERAL INDEX	329
INDEX OF CITATIONS FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT	344

JOHN.

i. 15.

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 **Σ** 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 **Σ**, "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 **Σ** as amended by a seventh-century corrector, A, B as amended by a sixth-century corrector (C third hand reads *ελεγον* instead of *ειπον*), D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, 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 **Σ**, 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 *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, we feel safe in concluding that for once Codices **Σ**, 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 Ἰωνᾶ* — Simon the son of Jona.

Rev. T. *Σίμων ὁ υἱὸς Ἰωάννου* — Simon the son of John.

The reading "son of John" is supported by **Σ**, 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, Γ, Δ, Α, II, every cursive but one, *c* and *q* 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 *e*, 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 Sinaitic manuscripts and their allies

here any more than in many other places. The reading *Ἰωάννου* (or, as B and the Revisers have it, *Ἰωάνου*) originated in a double error. In the first place *Ἰωνᾶ*, "Jonah," was mistaken or misread as *Ἰωανᾶ*, another form for *Ἰωάνου* or *Ἰωάννου*, from the nominative *Ἰωανᾶς*, as many manuscripts read in Luke iii. 27. Codex 69 has this very form *Ἰωανᾶ* at xxi. 17; and Codex 91 has *Ἰωανᾶ* 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. xii. 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 "Barjohn." 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 *ὁψη* in verse 50, which is overwhelmingly supported, instead of *ὁψε*. 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 questionably 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 king art 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, *Σ* (C and D are defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Α, 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. ἀπ' ἄρτι ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφώτα, — hereafter ye shall see heaven open.

Rev. T. ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεφώτα, — 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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, all the

cursives, *ε*, *q* of the Old Latin, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Augustine. On the other hand, ἀπ' ἄρτι is wanting in *Σ*, 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 applicableness. The word means not "after this" or "hereafter," as the A. 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. 11.

Rec. T. ταύτην ἐποίησεν τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς. — This beginning of miracles did Jesus.

Rev. T. ταύτην 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, T^b, Α, 1, 33, 262, Origen, Eusebius according to some codices, Chrysostom in one place, and the Paschal Chronicle. But its presence is called for by *Σ*, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Π, all but three cursives, 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 his meaning had been "Jesus wrought this as a beginning of miracles," he might have

written τοῦτο ἐποίησεν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰησοῦς. But the only legitimate Greek for "this beginning" is either τὴν ἀρχὴν ταύτην or the Greek of the Received Text. And yet that Greek must needs be revised to have a correct basis for a proper English version!

ii. 12.

Rec. T. οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ, — his brethren.

Rev. T. οἱ ἀδελφοί, — *his* brethren.

"A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work," again. So says the Revisers' Preface. But a literal translation of the text here would make the corresponding revised English rendering read "his mother, and the brethren, and his disciples"; or rather, as the reading was probably meant to be taken, "his mother and the brethren, even his disciples." The reading "the brethren" is supported by B, L, T^b, three copies of the Old Latin, and Origen in four different places. But L, T^b, and Origen in three of those places also read "and the disciples," — making the consistent reading "his mother, and brethren, and disciples"; while **Σ**, six cursives, two of those three Old Latin manuscripts in common with four others, and the Armenian Version omit "and his disciples" altogether. The pronoun ("his") in connection with "brethren," is vouched for by **Σ**, A, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, the entire body of the cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and Cyril of Alexandria. It is not at all probable that Luke, in writing three nouns in succession coupled together as here, should have limited only the first and the last of the three with "his," when the intermediate one required that limitation just as truly as the last of the trio. The absence of the pronoun is due, not to its non-insertion by Luke, but to its being dropped by some one to whom the idea of Jesus'

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.

ii. 15.

Rec. T. ἐξέχεε τὸ κέρμα — poured out the money.

Rev. T. ἐξέχεε τὰ κέρματα — 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 **Σ**, A (C and D defective), E, F, G, H, K, M, P, S, U, V, Γ, 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^b, X, 33, δ, γ 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 ἀνέστρεψεν at the end of the verse, — a reading which no modern editors, however, except Westcott and Hort, adopt as genuine instead of ἀνέστρεψεν, 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 ἐξέχεε, "*poured out*."

iii. 13.

The "many ancient authorities" that "omit *which is in heaven*" from the end of this verse are **Σ**, B, L, T^b, 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, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, ΙΙ, 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 ὁ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν . . . ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — whosoever believeth in him should . . . have eternal life.

Rev. T. πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐν αὐτῷ ἔχῃ 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 ἐν αὐτῷ are B and T^b. These are seconded, however, by three copies of the Old Latin, and seven manuscripts of the Vulgate. The common reading is attested by Ⲛ (A has ἐπ' αὐτόν instead), E, F, G, H, K (L has ἐπ' αὐτῷ), M, S, U, V, Γ, Δ, Α, ΙΙ, 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 ἐχῃ as the Revisers in the text take "in him," are in support of the common reading, — "whosoever believeth on him." This form of words (πιστεύειν 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 υἱὸν αὐτοῦ — his Son.

Rev. T. τὸν υἱόν — 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 Ⲛ first hand and B. Here it is favored by two additional uncials, L, T^b, 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, Ⲛ 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 \aleph 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 \aleph as amended by the original scribe or his "proof-reader," A, B, C, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, T^b, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ , Π , all the cursives, five copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and all the other ancient versions. It is consequently retained by Lachmann, Tregelles, and modern editors generally.

v. 3.

Rec. T. πλήθος πολὺ — a great multitude.

Rev. T. πλήθος — a multitude.

The omission of "great" is according to \aleph , B, C, D, L, 33, 68, five copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Ethiopic, and Chrysostom twice. But the word may have been early dropped on account of the apparent extravagance of speaking of the sick who occupied the five porches as "a great multitude." Whatever might have been done elsewhere, it seems altogether improbable that any one would ever have been tempted to insert the word here if not genuine. It is evidently used to denote a comparatively great number, a large number for the place, or in comparison with the number usually there. In this sense, it appears to be a part of the original text, and is attested as such by A, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ , 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. ἐκδεχομένων . . . 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 \aleph , B, C first hand, 157, 314, 7 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 , Π (this last having asterisks attached, to denote omission by some), nearly all the cursives, 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, E, F, G, H, I, K, L, M, S with asterisks, U, V, Γ , Δ , Λ with obeli hinting suspicion, Π as before with asterisks, most of the cursives, 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 (xxviii. 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 *abc*

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 $\mu\acute{o}\nu\omicron\nu\ \Theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \omicron\upsilon$ read MONOYΘYΟΥ 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?

probably very faint, or obliterated, or altogether omitted; and the Θ being mistaken for an O, ΘΥ, *i.e.* Θεού, 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^s 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. ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — He that believeth on me, hath everlasting life.

Rev. T. ὁ πιστεύων ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον. — He that believeth hath eternal life.

The latter reading is supported by \aleph , 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 , II, the

whole body of the cursives, the Old Latin Version, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, Usan's Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Cyril of Alexandria, and Hilary. The Curetonian 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 murmurings 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 ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἢ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ἣν ἐγὼ δώσω ὑπὲρ 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 ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἢ σὰρξ μου ἐστίν, ὑπὲρ 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, **Σ** 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 **Σ** 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 Curetonian 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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, 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 Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτην. — Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.

Rev. T. τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου. — 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 Kerioth. 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 xii. 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 Münster'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, Γ, Δ, Α, Π 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 **Σ**, B, C, I^b, L, M, X, Π 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, Γ, Δ, A, II first hand, nearly all the cursives, the printed Vulgate, the Gothic, and Cyril. (A is defective here.) D and several Old Latin manuscripts read "Judas Scarioth [son] of Simon," or "Judas Simon Iscariot." The Sinaitic Codex first hand, the lost uncial represented 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 **Σ**'s earlier seventh-century emendator, B, C, G, L, II 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 "Iscariot" 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 apparent 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 Iscariot, son of Simon" and "Judas, son of Simon Iscariot" is a difference of only two letters in the Greek; and, when we consider the position of the words, the Revisers' reading is easily accounted for. In the original, in documents in which the word "Simon" appears, that word generally stands between "Judas" and the surname "Iscariot." But, as already seen, some manuscripts read "Judas Simon Iscariot"; that is, the word "Simon," instead of being in the genitive, is put in the same case with "Iscariot," and in apposition with "Judas." Thus, in xii. 4, F, G, H, U, some cursives, two or

three copies of the Old Latin, and Wilkins' Memphitic read "Judas Simon Iscariot," and in xiii. 26, Codices 13, 101, 346, four copies of the Old Latin and two of the Vulgate read "Judas Simon Iscariot." That is, "Simon" is conformed in case to "Iscariot." These, however, are discarded on all hands as false readings. In other instances, "Iscariot" is put in apposition with "Simon," which immediately precedes it, and is therefore conformed in case to it. Hence "Iscariot," in some manuscripts, appears divorced from "Judas," and is not unnaturally, yet improperly, made a surname of Simon instead; as in I, M, one copy of the Old Latin, and the Armenian, — reading "Judas (son of) Simon Iscariot," in xiii. 2; also in **Σ**, B, C, I^b, L, and other documents, as already shown, in xiii. 26; and in **Σ** 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 **Σ**, D, K, M, II, 17 second hand, 389, 570, 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, A, nearly all the cursives, 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 Syrophenician 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

¹ *Introduction*, p. 26.

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 Sinaitic 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 οὕτω, "thus," instead of οὕτω, "not yet." In John viii. 57, D changes οὕτω to οὐδέπω, though without changing the meaning. In John xi. 30, it changes οὕτω to οὐ, 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 οὕτω be changed to οὐκ 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 οὐκ instead of οὕτω while the influence of the preceding negatives still lingered upon the mind, or to mistake ΟΥΤΩ, standing at the end of a line, for ΟΥΚ, 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;

I am not yet going to this feast, for my time [for going] is not yet fully come." "Ye" and "I" are emphatic, — the two clauses being in strong contrast, indicating that the statement was made to satisfy his brethren that, while their time for going to the feast had come, his had not. Omit "yet," and Jesus is made to say that he is not going at all to that feast. Οὕτω therefore is obviously needed to express his meaning. When this is taken in connection with what has already been presented, it seems impossible to do otherwise than to reject the simple "not" as a false reading. And so Lachmann has done, as well as Westcott and Hort, who stand by the Received Text in this instance, we presume because of their partiality for B, especially as it is supported by L, rather than for other reasons, though they improperly place "not" in the margin, just as the Canterbury Revisers do.

vii. 42.

Rec. T. ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται; — Christ cometh.

Rev. T. ἔρχεται ὁ Χριστός; — the Christ cometh.

The order of the words in the Greek has no effect on the meaning or the rendering. The Received Text, which presents the words in the same order in which they occur in the end of the preceding verse as vouched for by all Greek manuscripts, gives the words in the order in which they appear in **Σ**, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Η, nearly every cursive, five copies of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Origen. The Revisers' Text follows the arrangement of B, L, T, 33, *c* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Jerusalem Syriac, and Cyril. The Peshito Syriac, the Clementine Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and two copies of the Old Latin, both here and at the close of the preceding verse, have the words in the order in which they stand in the Revisers' Text, — "cometh the Christ." No argument therefore can be drawn from them as to the true order,

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 *ὁ 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 *ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται*, they place the words in other parts of the verse, that is, away from *Δαβίδ*, while the Old Latin Version *ε* omits *ὁ 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. Οὐδέποτε οὕτως ἐλάλησεν ἄνθρωπος ὡς οὗτος ὁ ἄνθρωπος. — Never man spake like this man.

Rev. T. Οὐδέποτε ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος. — Never man so spake.

The position given to *οὕτως*, "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 *Σ* 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 *Σ* first hand, D (omitting *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* at the end of the clause), E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, 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, *c*, *e*, *ff*², *g*, *j*, the margin of *l*, 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 Johannean, 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. More-

¹ *Introduction*, p. 610.

² A. C. Kendrick, D.D., *Amer. Ed. of Meyer's Gospel of John*, pp. 294, 295.

over, 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, ὁ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ μου, λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν, ὁ ἑώρακατε παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ ὑμῶν, ποιεῖτε. — I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father.

Rev. T. ἄ ἐγὼ ἑώρακα παρὰ τῷ πατρὶ, λαλῶ· καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν ἃ ἤκούσατε παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς, ποιεῖτε. — 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 **Σ**, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Α, the entire body of the cursives, 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 **Σ**, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, 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 *μου*, 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 *ὑμῶν*, 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 πατρὶ, or τοῦ πατρὸς 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 *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 ($\mu\omicron\upsilon$ and $\psi\mu\omega\nu$), 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 $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ and $\psi\mu\omega\nu$, that text is plainly at fault.

viii. 39.

Rec. T. $\text{Εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἦτε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ποιεῖτε ἅν.}$

—If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham.

Rev. T. $\text{Εἰ τέκνα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ἐστε, τὰ ἔργα τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ ποιεῖτε.}$

—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 $\eta\tau\epsilon$ is attested by C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ , 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, $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$), Eusebius three times, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Didymus, Basil, Cyril of Alexandria, Hilary, and other Latin Fathers. (A is defective here.) The Revisers' reading $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$ (which they found it necessary to abandon when they came to translate) is supported by \aleph , B, D, L, T, one lectionary, \mathfrak{f}^2 of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Origen ten times, it being followed in each instance by the imperative $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ (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 $\acute{\alpha}\nu$. Codex B first hand, and, as just seen, \mathfrak{f}^2 , 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 $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$, 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 $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (which would naturally accompany $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$, just as it accompanies $\eta\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon$, "ye would love," in verse 42), became lost or absorbed in the following $\nu\upsilon\nu$, leaving $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ in place of $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu$. The manuscript that contained this reading, falling into the hands of some one else, was afterwards "corrected" by changing $\eta\tau\epsilon$ to $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$,—giving the plausible reading, "If ye *are* Abraham's children, *do* the works of Abraham." But the copyists of \aleph , 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 $\epsilon\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$, but retained $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}$. 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 xvii. 6, presents a similar case of false reading, where the revised reading ἔχετε, "ye have," is simply an early attempt at improving the Saviour's statement, or possibly a transcriptional error for εἶχετε, "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 ἔστηκεν, "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 ἔστηκεν, "stood not." This last is apparently the reading of \aleph , B first hand, D, L, X, Δ , A second hand, and six cursives; while the former, which is adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf (though he very inconsistently reads οὐκ ἔστηκεν), and other modern editors, is that of B third hand, C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, T, A first hand, Π , and nearly all the cursives, — A being defective. ἔστηκεν is supposed to be the imperfect of στήκειν, "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 ἔστηκεν 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," 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 ἔστηκεν, "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 εὗρισκον (Mark xiv. 55), in B first hand, L, Δ ; οὐκ εὗρον (Luke xxiv. 3), and οὐκ ὑπάρχει (Acts iii. 6) in \aleph , C; οὐκ ὅτι (John vii. 22) in B first hand; and οὐκ ἔνεκεν (2 Cor. vii. 12) in \aleph , C, D, E, 17, etc. On the other hand, οὐχ sometimes usurps the place of οὐκ; as, οὐχ, ἰδοὺ (Acts ii. 7) in \aleph , D, E, 61; οὐχ ὁ λόγος (Acts xii. 18) in \aleph , A, and (xvii. 4) in B first hand, and (xix. 23) in \aleph , A, D; and even οὐχ Ἰουδαϊκῶς (Gal. ii. 14) in \aleph first hand, A, C, P, 17, 37; while \aleph as amended by its earlier seventh-century corrector, B, D first hand, and a few cursives have οὐχί 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 himself may have pronounced ἔστηκεν 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 ὁψεται, because D, Δ , A, so represent him; in vi. 42, οὐχὶ οὗτος, because B, T give this as his language; in vii. 22, οὐκ ὅτι, because the copyist of B represents him as having so written instead of οὐχ ὅτι; in x. 28, οὐ μὴ ἀρπάσῃ, because \aleph , D, L, X, 71, 157, and a few other cursives read thus instead of οὐχ ἀρπάσει; in xvi. 7, οὐ μὴ ἔλθῃ (as Westcott and Hort do), because B, L, and Chrysostom give us these as his words instead of οὐκ ἐλεύσεται; or in xix. 6, οὐκ εὗρίσκω, because L, Δ say so.¹

¹ 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. Ἐπεὶ δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός με — I must work the works of him that sent me.

Rev. T. ἡμᾶς δεῖ ἐργάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα τοῦ πέμψαντός 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 *δεῖ ἡμᾶς* etc., instead of *ἡμᾶς δεῖ* etc. It is, of course, adopted by Westcott and Hort, and is given as a primary reading by Tregelles. **§** first hand, L, 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 **§**'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 cursives, 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, *ὅτε ἦμεν μετ' αὐτῶν* etc. "While *we were* with them, I kept them" etc.

ix. 6.

Rec. T. ἐπέχρισεν τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ, — he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay.

Rev. T. ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, — 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 ἐξ αὐτοῦ. Neither can αὐτοῦ be referred to the blind man, so as to be translated with ὀφθαλμούς "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 **Σ**, L, 1, 33. Codex B differs from them by having ἐπέθηκεν, "placed," instead of ἐπέχρισεν, "smeared" or "spread." A, C second hand, four or five other cursives, and Cyril of Alexandria, like the foregoing documents, read αὐτοῦ; but, unlike them, these as well as C first hand, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, A, II, 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 αὐτῷ for αὐτοῦ, and αὐτοῦ in place of τοῦ τυφλοῦ. The Old Latin Version and the Vulgate also testify, by somewhat similar readings, to ἐπέχρισεν αὐτοῦ τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς τοῦ τυφλοῦ as the true text, — "He spread his moistened clay upon the eyes of the blind man." But αὐτοῦ, 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 *taketh* it away," are only **Σ** 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. Buttmann¹ 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 χειμὼν ἦν · — and it was winter.

Rev. T. χειμὼν ἦν · — 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 δέ to τότε 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

¹ *Grammar of N. T. Greek*, American edition, pp. 202, 203.

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 **Σ**, B, 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.

x. 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 **ὁ**, *quod*, and *μεῖζον*, *majus*, where most documents read **ὅς**, *qui*, and *μεῖζων*, *major*, in the sentence **ὁ** πατήρ μου **ὃς** δέδωκέ μοι πάντων μεῖζόν ἐστι. The only Greek manuscript that reads **ὁ** . . . *μεῖζον* is the Vatican Codex as penned by its original scribe. His contemporary "proof-reader," however, changed the **ὁ** to **ὃς**, but left the other word unchanged, as the uncials A and X also read. The Sinaitic Codex and L, on the other hand, read **ὁ**, but have *μεῖζων*. All this shows that the transcribers of these manuscripts were at a loss about the text, and left it in obvious error; for neither **ὁ** . . . *μεῖζόν ἐστι* nor **ὃς** . . . *μεῖζόν ἐστι* 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 B,—"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 **ὃς** and

μεῖζων in the text should have deliberately changed them into **ὁ** 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 **ὃς** . . . *μεῖζον* and **ὁ** . . . *μεῖζων* declare plainly that the former crept in through the very common mistake of writing an **ο** for an **ω** in *μεῖζων*, or else that the latter arose from the unconscious introduction of **ὁ** as the article, but without any breathing, in place of **ὃς** through the influence of the preceding **ὁ** 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 **ὁ** to **ὃς** 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."

x. 39.

Rec. T. **Ἐζήτουν οὖν πάλιν αὐτὸν πιάσαι**.—Therefore they sought again to take him.

Rev. T. **ἐζήτουν πάλιν αὐτὸν πιάσαι**.—They sought again to take him.

οὖν is wanting in B, E, G, H, M, S, U, **Γ**, **Λ**, about forty cursives, the Memphitic, Armenian, and Gothic Versions. D, the Peshito, and Jerusalem Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions read "And they sought" etc. But **Σ**, A, K, L, X, **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 ἐξήτουν, — the copyist not observing that the letters OYN 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 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκώς, — And he that was dead came forth.

Rev. T. ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκώς, — He that was dead came forth.

This omission of the conjunction is found in B, C first hand, L, 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 **Σ**, A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly every cursive, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. It is true that D, *f* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and Andreas of Crete insert εὐθύς, or εὐθέως, "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 ἐκραξεν (in C) and ἐκραύασεν (in L) for ἐκραύγασεν, in the preceding verse, — false.

xi. 45.

Rec. T. θεασάμενοι ἃ ἐποίησεν, — had seen the things which he did.

Rev. T. θεασάμενοι ὃ ἐποίησεν, — beheld that which he did.

The plural ἃ is set aside for the singular ὃ, with the marginal note that "many ancient authorities read *the things which he*

did." This "many" must be a misprint for "most"; for the "ancient authorities" referred to are **Σ**, A first hand, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives (three of them reading ὅσα instead of ἃ), 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 cursives, *e* of the Old Latin, the Thebaic, Gothic, and Ethiopic Versions, — C second or third hand adding σημεῖον, 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 cursives, 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. ἐβουλεύσαντο — they took counsel.

In support of the latter reading, we have the testimony of **Σ**, 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, Α, Π, all the cursives 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* ἐβουλεύσαντο 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 "counselled together," in order to effect their purpose.

xi. 54.

Rec. T. *κακεὶ διέτριβε* — and there continued.

Rev. T. *κακεὶ ἔμεινε* — and there he tarried.

There seems to be no special difference between the meanings of these verbs. The latter is used by John about forty times, but the former only once elsewhere (iii. 22), — a circumstance which rather indicates its genuineness here, the other word looking as if it had been substituted instead, on account of John's known use of it elsewhere, as in i. 38, 39, ii. 12, iv. 40, x. 10, and xi. 6. The common reading, which is that adopted by Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others, is attested by A, D, E, G, H, I, K, M, S, U, X, F, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac Versions, and the Paschal Chronicle. The revised reading, which is preferred by Tregelles, and adopted by Westcott and Hort, is that of *Σ*, B, L, 249, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and Origen three times. Indeed, the reading may have originated with Origen through his familiarity with John's vocabulary. However this may be, it was a current reading in his day.

xii. 7.

Rec. T. *Ἄφες αὐτήν · ἐς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τετήρηκεν αὐτό.* — Let her alone; against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

Rev. T. *Ἄφες αὐτήν ἵνα ἐς τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ ἐνταφιασμοῦ μου τηρήσῃ αὐτό.* — 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, F, Δ, Λ, most of the cursives, one copy of the Old Latin,

the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Gothic. The revised is attested by *Σ*, B, D, K, L, 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, inasmuch 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 *ἵνα*, "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 disciple (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 *ἵνα* 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 *ἵνα . . . τηρήσῃ* 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

¹ A. C. Kendrick, D.D., in Meyer’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, American edition, p. 383.

united again and again, and united with other documents, too, in presenting false readings. The mere fact that **Σ** 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 depraved it 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. ἀπεκρίνατο — answered.

Rev. T. ἀποκρίνεται — answereth.

The latter reading is attested by **Σ**, B, L, X, 33; the former by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, 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. ἀπολέσει αὐτήν — shall lose it.

Rev. T. ἀπολλύει αὐτήν — loseth it.

It is hardly safe to trust to **Σ**, B, L, 33, and *ff*² 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 *φυλάξει*, "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, *φυλάσσει*, *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 *ἀπολέσει*, "shall lose," which the Revisers have rejected. It is attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Α, 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.

xiii. 18.

Rec. T. 'Ο τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον — He that eateth bread with me.
 Rev. T. 'Ο τρώγων μου τὸν ἄρτον — He that eateth my bread.

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 αὐτοῦ, "his," after ἄρτον, just as he inserted it after *πέρναν* 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 **Σ**, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, 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 cursives, 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 those of the Septuagint in Psa. xl. 10 (xli. 9), ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου. The other is unquestionably the genuine reading.

xiii. 22.

Rec. T. Ἐβλεπον οὖν εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταί, — Then the disciples looked one on another.

Rev. T. ἔβλεπον εἰς ἀλλήλους οἱ μαθηταί, — The disciples looked one on another.

Οὖν is wanting in **Σ** as changed by its earlier seventh-century emendator, B, C, three cursives of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, *ε* of the Old Latin, and the Armenian Version. Origen, in one place, inserts δέ instead; but, two pages further on, he quotes the verse without δέ or οὖν. 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 *οὐν* 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 *Σ* first hand, A, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, most of the cursives, all but two manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Cyril. A few cursives and versions, like Origen in one instance, insert *δέ* instead.

xiii. 23.

Rec. T. Ἦν δὲ ἀνακείμενος — Now there was leaning.

Rev. T. ἦν ἀνακείμενος — There was at the table reclining.

The conjunction is wanting in B, C first hand, L, four cursives of the eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries, the Philoxenian Syriac Version, and Origen twice. It is found in *Σ*, A, C second hand, D, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, the rest of the cursives, 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. πυνθῆσθαι τίς αὐ ἐπὶ περὶ οὗ λέγει. — that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake.

Rev. T. καὶ λέγει αὐτῷ, Εἰπέ τίς ἐστι 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 cursives, *c* 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.

ⲙⲓⲓⲓ. 32.

Rec. T. **Εἰ ὁ Θεὸς ἐδοξάσθη ἐν αὐτῷ**, — If God be glorified in him.

Rev. T. Omits.

This clause is found in Ⲛ as corrected by its earlier seventh-century emendator, A, C as changed by its sixth-century reviser, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, Γ, Δ, A, most of the cursives, four copies of the Old Latin, most manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito and Jerusalem Syriac, the Memphitic, Münster's Thebaic, the Gothic, the Armenian, and the printed Ethiopic. Origen gives it twice, Cyril and Nonnus each once, and Hilary four times. It is wanting in Ⲛ first hand, B, C first hand, D,

I., X, II, twelve or more cursives, several copies of the Old Latin and of the Vulgate, in the Philoxenian Syriac, some manuscripts of the Ethiopic, and in Ambrose. But the clause would not have found its way into the text, if it were not genuine. It may have been dropped as superfluous; but it is more probable that it was unconsciously omitted by some copyist on account of its likeness to the preceding clause, the copyist supposing that he had transcribed it, when he had given only what preceded.

ⲙⲓⲓⲓ. 32.

Rec. T. **δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ**, — shall glorify him in himself.

Rev. T. **δοξάσει αὐτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ**, — shall glorify him in himself.

Though the Revisers set aside the common reading in the Greek, it will be observed that they find it necessary to follow it in translating. In support of the received reading, we have Ⲛ as corrected by its earlier seventh-century reviser, A, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, II, nearly all the cursives, most copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and other versions, Chrysostom, Cyril, and Tertullian. The revised is supported by Ⲛ first hand, and again as changed by its later seventh-century emendator, 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 *αυτου* as their spelling of *ἑαυτοῦ*. Thus in John ii. 24, Ⲛ first hand, A first hand, B, L, give *αυτου* (Westcott and Hort, *αὐτόν*) for *ἑαυτόν*; in viii. 22, D first hand, Γ, A, a few cursives, and Origen read *αυτου* for *ἑαυτόν*; in xx. 10, Ⲛ first hand, B, L, have *αυτους* (Westcott and Hort, *αὐτούς*) instead of *ἑαυτούς*; 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, — *αὐτῷ*.

xiv. 4.

Rec. T. Καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε, καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν οἴδατε. — And whither I go ye know, and the way ye know.

Rev. T. καὶ ὅπου ἐγὼ ὑπάγω οἴδατε τὴν ὁδόν. — And whither I go, ye know the way.

The latter reading is that of **Σ**, B, C first hand, L, Q, X, a few cursives, *a* of the Old Latin, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, and the Persic of Walton's Polyglot. The former is the text presented by A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin with the exception of a single manuscript, the Vulgate, the Peshito, Philoxenian and Jerusalem Syriac, the Gothic, Chrysostom, and Cyril. The difference between these readings cannot be regarded as due to accident. Nothing short of a deliberate purpose could have effected the change, whichever way it was made. The two oldest extant manuscripts have the shorter reading; and, if these were trustworthy, we should be compelled to accept it as the genuine reading. By looking forward, however, into verse 5, where the same hand has evidently been at work, we find that B, C first hand, *a*, and the Ethiopic Version, omitting the connective "and," read πῶς οἶδαμεν τὴν ὁδόν, "How know we the way?" while D, *δ*, *ε*, *μ*, and Tertullian, some of them retaining "and," others omitting it, read πῶς τὴν ὁδὸν οἶδμεν, where the Received Text has καὶ πῶς δυνάμεθα τὴν ὁδὸν εἰδέναι; "and how can we know the way?" This last reading is supported by **Σ** (except that it places δυνάμεθα after ὁδόν), A, C second hand, E, G, H, K, L (omitting καί), M, N, Q, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, the entire body of the cursives, all but four manuscripts of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the three Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Gothic, and Chrysostom. That is to say, most of the supporters of the shorter reading in verse 4 (or **Σ**, L, Q, X, all the cursives, and the Memphitic Version), are found parting company with their allies, and uniting in verse 5 with the supporters of the longer and commonly

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" thither. 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. ἐγνώκετε ἂν · — ye should have known.

Rev. T. ἂν ᾗδετε · — 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, P second hand, E, G, H, K, M, N, S, U, Γ, Δ, Λ, II, nearly all the cursives, Athanasius, Pseudo-Athanasius twice according to the codices, and Chrysostom. The revised reading is that of B, C first hand, Q (and, if εἰδῆτε, the perfect subjunctive, can be considered the same reading, of L and X also), four cursives, 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* (ᾔδατε) me, ye *would know* (ἤδατε ἄν) 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. Ἐάν τι αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, — If ye shall ask anything in my name.

Rev. T. ἐάν τι αἰτήσητέ με ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί 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 **Σ**, B, E, H, U, F, 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 xv. 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 xv. 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. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἣ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν μένῃ, — that my joy might remain in you.

Rev. T. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἣ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν ᾖ, — that my joy may be in you.

The former is the reading of **Σ**, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X; F, 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 *ι* was often written *ει* (and *vice versa*), as we still find it in later ones. Thus ὑμῖν appears in D, at Mark xi. 29, xiii. 37, etc., for ὑμῖν; μικρότερος in the same Codex at Luke vii. 28, for μικρότερος; γεινομένης in A and B, at John xxi. 4, for γινομένης; and, not to refer to numberless other instances, the familiar forms Δαυίδ, Πιλάτος, Χωραζίν or Χωραζίν appear in very many manuscripts as Δαυείδ, Πιλάτος, and Χωραζείν or Χωραζείν. Now the ὑμῖν in this clause was undoubtedly written in early manuscripts ὑμῖν. But, in copying the words YM€INME€INH, some transcriber inadvertently overlooked and omitted the second ME€IN, and the two words became reduced to YM€INH, afterwards ὑμῖν ᾖ. Hence

the few Greek manuscripts and the various versions with this reading. The fewness of Greek manuscripts in support of ἡ is not the only thing, however, that naturally awakens suspicion. It is the unusual combination of uncials, — A, B, D. Besides this, the sense which yields is tame in comparison with that thrown into the words by μέν. 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 he seems to have intended to express; and this calls for the common reading.

xvi. 4.

Rec. T. ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα, μνημονεύετε αὐτῶν, — that when the time shall come, ye may remember . . . them.

Rev. T. ἵνα ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἡ ὥρα αὐτῶν, μνημονεύετε αὐτῶν, — that when their hour is come, ye may remember them.

There is much confusion here among the manuscripts. In some, αὐτῶν stands both before and after μνημονεύετε; in some, only before; in some, only after; and in still others it is entirely wanting. We believe with Tischendorf that the original reading is that of the Received Text, which is attested by Ⲛ, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, Y, Γ, Δ, A, most of the cursives, the Memphitic, the Jerusalem Syriac, the Ethiopic Version, Chrysostom, and Cyril, — giving αὐτῶν as the object of μνημονεύετε, and placing it where it should be, after the governing verb. But some early critical reader, desirous of making it clear *what* hour the Saviour meant, inserted the word αὐτῶν after ὥρα, thereby converting “the hour” into “their hour,” as a brief way of saying “the hour for remembering what he had told them.” Hence the Revisers’ reading, which is found in A, B, Π as originally written, four cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Gothic Versions. Others, as the lost

uncial represented by Ferrar’s group, L, Π second hand, five cursives, eight copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, Augustine, and Cyprian twice, retaining the pronoun after ὥρα, reject the other as unnecessary, and read “that, when their hour shall come, ye may remember that I told you [of them].” Finally, D, one cursive, α 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. ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃτε τὸν Πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, δώσει ὑμῖν.
— Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.

Rev. T. ἂν τι αἰτήσῃτε τὸν πατέρα, δώσει ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι 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, A, Π, the whole body of the cursives, 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 Ⲛ, B, C first hand, L, X, Y, Δ, Münster’s Fragments of the Thebaic Version, Origen twice, and Cyril once, on a different occasion. It will be seen from the foregoing, that all the ancient versions, except Münster’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

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, of ME ye will 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 ὑμῖν, "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 ME 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 this is life eternal, that they might (or should) know [ἵνα γινώσκωσι] 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 γινώσκουσιν, the indicative, "they know." This is attested by A, D, G, L, Y, Δ, Λ, 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 ἵνα,—and, once introduced, it was naturally accepted. But the construction of ἵνα 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 *ἵνα*, 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 γινώσκουσιν*, literally 'that they know'] thee" etc. Tregelles, Tischendorf, Alford, Davidson, and others adopt this as the true reading.

xvii. 4.

Rec. T. τὸ ἔργον ἐτελείωσα — I have finished the work.

Rev. T. τὸ ἔργον τελειώσας — 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.

¹ Buttmann, *Gram. of New Test. Greek*, p. 235, American edition.

xvii. 11, 12.

Rec. T. τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, οὓς δέδωκάς μοι · — keep through thine own name those whom thou hast given me. ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου · οὓς δέδωκάς μοι ἐφύλαξα, — I kept them in thy name: those that thou gavest me I have kept.

Rev. T. τήρησον αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι, — keep them in thy name which thou hast given me. ἐγὼ ἐτήρουν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι · καὶ ἐφύλαξα, — I kept them in thy name which thou hast given me: and I guarded them.

The received reading, in verse 11, is attested by D second hand, 69, a few cursives, three copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and Epiphanius twice; in verse 12, by A, C third hand, D, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, Y, F, Δ, Α, Π, nearly all the cursives, the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Peshito, and Philoxenian Syriac, the Gothic, the Ethiopic, and Origen. The revised reading, in verse 11, is supported by **Σ**, A, B, C, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, Y, F, Δ, Α, Π, most of the cursives, the Peshito, Philoxenian, and Jerusalem Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, Athanasius, and Cyril, — and seemingly by D first hand, U, X, and ten or twelve cursives, which read *ὁ* instead of *ᾧ*. In verse 12, *ᾧ* is supported by B, C first hand, L, 33, 64, and Cyril three times, — and *ὁ* by the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ** (the original transcriber having omitted the clause), the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Jerusalem Syriac, and the Armenian Version. It will be observed that the testimony in support of *ᾧ* in verse 12 is far less weighty than in verse 11. It will also be observed that the attestation of *οὓς* in verse 11 is very feeble, but not so in verse 12. In view of this, Dr. Broadus says, "How [shall we] explain the fact that so very many authorities have *whom* here [in verse 12], and *which* in the immediately preceding and exactly similar sentence? Are not the phenomena best accounted for by supposing that in verse 12 the Saviour's language returns to the expression of verses 6 and 9, and that so the true reading is *which* in verse 11, and *whom* in verse

12?"¹ 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 $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$, "all that thou hast given him." Note the words; not merely the singular relative, but the singular antecedent $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$, which calls for a relative in the singular. Just so in vi. 37, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \psi \delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\sigma\iota$, and in vi. 39, $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu \delta \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$, 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 $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma \omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma$, "to the *men* whom thou hast given"; and in verse 9 [$\pi\epsilon\rho\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$. . .] $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota \omega\upsilon\upsilon \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\alpha\varsigma$, "for *those* whom thou hast given." So, too, in xviii. 9, $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \mu\omicron\iota$. . . $\epsilon\acute{\xi} \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon$, "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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ would be a standing protest against his work, changed $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ to δ . Hence the reading of D first hand, U, X, etc. But others, not being able to refer δ to $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, and mistaking its intended reference, instead of changing it back to $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, as D second hand really did, regarded it as an erroneous transcription of ψ , referring it to $\delta\acute{\nu}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, "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.

changed in the next verse. But the critic, instead of changing the word in verse 12, cut the knot by omitting the entire clause in which the word appears, as we actually find it omitted in the Sinaitic Codex, which reads, "I kept them in thy name; I guarded them," etc. Copyists who transcribed from this and like manuscripts, in supplying from other sources the omitted words, would be likely to obtain a correct reading. All transcripts from exemplars thus prepared would then contain ψ in verse 11, and $\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in verse 12. This will easily account for the inequality of the evidence in support of ψ in the two verses. Whatever may be said in favor of the reading, "Keep them in *thy name which thou hast given me*," this language is neither clear nor like any other utterance of Christ's. The expression, "thy name," as used in verse 6, as every intelligent Bible reader ought to know, is only an oriental synonym of "thee," as "his name" is a synonym of "him," and "my name" of "me." In 1 Cor. x. 2, the apostle Paul expresses himself according to English idiom: "and were all baptized [professedly bound] unto Moses." But elsewhere, as in 1 Cor. i. 13, 15, he employs the oriental form of speech: "Were ye baptized in [or rather unto] *the name of* Paul?" and "in [unto] my name?" instead of "Were ye baptized unto Paul?" and "unto me?" In like manner, the words "baptizing in [unto] the name of the Father," etc., in plain English mean "baptizing unto the Father," etc. Just so, to believe on or in one's name is to believe on or in the one named. To believe, for example, in the name of the Lord is to believe in the Lord. To glorify God's name is to glorify God. To manifest or make known God's name to men is to manifest God, to make him known to men. The lame man at Jerusalem (Acts iv. 10) was healed in or by "the name of Jesus Christ," or, as is immediately added, "even in" or "by him." It was through power received from Jesus. In Acts iv. 12 we read that there is "none other name," *i.e.* no other one, by whom we must be saved. Any attempt to attach an intelligible scriptural meaning to the words "thy name which

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. ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ᾤσιν· — that they also may be one in us.

Rev. T. ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ᾤσιν· — that they also may be in us.

The Received Text here is overwhelmingly supported by **Σ**, A, C third hand, E, G, H, K, L, M, S, U, X, Y, Γ, Δ, Α, 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 ἑσμεν, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ᾤσιν*, "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. οὓς δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα . . . κάκεινοι ὥσι μετ' ἐμοῦ· — I will that they also whom thou hast given me, be with me.

Rev. T. ὁ δέδωκάς μοι, θέλω ἵνα . . . κάκεινοι ὥσι 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, Δ, Α, Π, all the cursives, 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 **Σ**, 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.

xix. 7.

Rec. T. κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἡμῶν ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, — by our law he ought to die.

Rev. T. κατὰ τὸν νόμον ὀφείλει ἀποθανεῖν, — 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, Δ, 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 Σ, 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. Ημῶν 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 ἑώρακε τὸν Κύριον, — that she had seen the Lord.

Rev. T. ὅτι ἑώρακα 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 Σ, B, X, 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 ἑώρακα for ἑώρακε. 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.

xxi. 23.

Rec. T. καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς, — yet Jesus said not.

Rev. T. οὐκ εἶπεν δὲ . . . ὁ Ἰησοῦς, — yet Jesus said not.

The common text, which Lachmann, Tischendorf, and others follow, is attested by A, D, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, X, Γ, Δ, Λ, Π, nearly all the cursives, seven copies of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. The revised reading is that of **Σ**, 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 δέ was introduced to give a more pronounced adversative character to the conjunction than καί was supposed to have. John, however, often uses the latter as equivalent to δέ. For the purpose of revising the English version, the change was wholly unnecessary, even if δέ could be considered the evangelist's word.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

i. 19.

Rec. T. τῇ ἰδίᾳ 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, — **Σ**, B first hand, D. But the Received Text is supported by A, B third hand, C, E, all the cursives 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 ἅπαντες ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. — they were all with one accord in one place.

Rev. T. ἦσαν πάντες ὁμοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. — they were all together in one place.

The common reading ὁμοθυμαδόν is vouched for by C third hand, E, most of the cursives, the manuscripts of Athanasius'

writings, as well as by Chrysostom, Theophylact, and Augustine in his treatise against the Manicheans. The revised $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ is supported by \aleph , A, B, C first hand, two cursives (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, $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ 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 $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ is a word that Luke nowhere uses, — unless here, in this needless, superfluous way.¹ On the other hand, $\delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδ\acute{\omicron}\nu$, "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 $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\delta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}$, "in one place," which occurs several times elsewhere is each time rendered "together."² The only apparent reason why it is not so translated here is the palpable

¹ John is the only one of all the New-Testament writers who employs $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$; — 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$, as in chapters v. 14 and xi. 24 he wrote $\tau\tilde{\omega}\ \text{Κυρίῳ}$, "to the Lord."

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 $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\delta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}$, 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 $\delta\mu\omega\upsilon$ instead of $\delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδ\acute{\omicron}\nu$. 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.¹ 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 If the reader considers this explanation unsatisfactory, and still holds that the manuscripts that support the Revisers' reading must present the original text, let him look at the following, and see what he thinks of the correctness of some of those manuscripts: — In Acts i. 14, the original scribe of the Sinaitic Codex wrote $\etaσαν\ \delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδ\acute{\omicron}\nu\ \pi\rho\sigma\kappa\alpha\rho\tau\epsilon\rho\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\sigma\iota\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδ\acute{\omicron}\nu$, *i.e.* They all "were with one accord continuing with one accord" in prayer. And this lay uncorrected till the seventh century. In i. 18, Codex A, Gaudentius and Theophylact omit $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$, reading "and — his bowels gushed out." In ii. 9, A has "Cappadocia," while C has "Pappadocia," for "Cappadocia." In ii. 17, B, the Thebaic and Ethiopic Versions, and Cyril of Jerusalem read $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, "After these things," in accordance with the Septuagint, instead of Peter's words "In the last days"; while C and one cursive combine the two, and read, "After these things, in the last days." In viii. 6, D reads $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ (the letters preceding $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ being obliterated) $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron$ instead of $\delta\muοθ\upsilon\mu\alphaδ\acute{\omicron}\nu$, which can mean only that they did something "and washed"; — or, to give D's reading of the whole verse, "And when they heard of it all, the multitudes gave heed to the words spoken by Philip," and did something "and washed themselves ($\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$?) on hearing him and seeing the miracles that he wrought." — But enough of this.

ii. 47.

Rec. T. ὁ Κύριος προσετίθει . . . καθ' ἡμέραν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. — the Lord added to the church daily.

Rev. T. ὁ Κύριος προσετίθει . . . 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 **S**, A, B, C, G, 61, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and by Cyril of Alexandria, and Lucifer. D reads ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, then begins the next chapter with Ἐν 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 ἐν, "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. ἔγειραι καὶ περιπάτει. — rise up and walk.

Rev. T. περιπάτει. — walk.

The Revisers' Text, omitting the two words "arise and," is in accordance with **S**, B, D, and the Thebaic Version. The other represents the reading found in A, C, E, G, P, all the cursives, one manuscript (Hort's *h*) 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, Euthérius 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 \aleph , 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. δ διὰ στόματος Δαβὶδ τοῦ παιδὸς σου εἰπών, — Who by the mouth of thy servant David hast said.

Rev. T. δ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου στόματος Δαβὶδ παιδὸς σου εἰπών, — 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 \aleph , 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 (δ s διὰ) the Holy Spirit, *speaking by* (λαλήσας διὰ) 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 δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ πόλεων εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ,
— There came also a multitude *out* of the cities round about unto Jerusalem.

Rev. T. συνήρχετο δὲ καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν περὶ πόλεων Ἱερουσαλήμ,
— 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 cursives, the Demidovian codex of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and Chrysostom. It is omitted by **Σ**, 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 περὶ πόλεων forbids the taking of περὶ as a preposition governing Ἱερουσαλήμ. 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 Ἱερουσαλήμ, 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 περὶ as 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 περὶ Ἱερουσαλήμ; but, if he wrote τῶν περὶ πόλεων Ἱερουσαλήμ, his only meaning could be, "of the surrounding cities of Jerusalem." But this is a transparently false reading.

V. 28.

Rec. T. Οὐ παραγγέλια παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν—Did not we straitly command you?

Rev. T. Παραγγέλια παρηγγείλαμεν ὑμῖν—We straitly charged you.

The received reading here is supported by **Σ** as corrected by its earlier seventh-century emendator, the Greek text of Codex D, E, P, all the cursives, 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 **Σ** 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. 33.

Rec. T. ἐβουλευόντο — took counsel.

Rev. T. ἐβούλοντο — were minded.

The common reading is supported by **Σ**, D, H, P, most of the cursives, the Latin Version of E, the Vulgate, the two Syriac Versions, and Lucifer. The other is that of A, B, E, about fifteen cursives, the two Egyptian, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions, and Chrysostom twice. But the writing of ἐβούλοντο for ἐβουλευόντο was an error of frequent occurrence among ancient scribes; and this error seems to have been committed here. Not only is the Revisers' a feebler word than the other, but it fails to meet the apparent requirements of the context. Ἐβουλευόντο, on the other hand, expresses all that ἐβούλοντο 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 Sanhedrim, 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 ἐβουλευόντο; 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.

V. 39.

Rec. T. οὐ δύνασθε καταλῦσαι αὐτό· — ye cannot overthrow it.

Rev. T. οὐ δυνήσεσθε καταλῦσαι αὐτούς· — ye will not be able to overthrow them.

The present, δύνασθε, of the Received Text is attested by A, H, P, most of the cursives, 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 **Σ**, B, C, D, E, about thirty-five cursives, 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 αὐτό or αὐτούς, there also seems to be a question. The common reading is that of C first hand, H, P, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine 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 **Σ**, A, B, C second hand, D, E, less than fifteen cursives, 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 emendator, 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 αὐτό to αὐτούς. 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, αὐτούς, which is plainly out of harmony with the context, is also spurious.

vi. 13.

Rec. T. οὐ παύεται ῥήματα βλάσφημα λαλῶν κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου. — ceaseth not to speak blasphemous words against this holy place.

Rev. T. οὐ παύεται ῥήματα λαλῶν 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 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, δουλεύσωσι, "they may be in bondage," is far more strongly supported by the documents than δουλεύουσιν, "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 γῇ Αἰγύπτου, — in the land of Egypt.

Rev. T. ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ, — 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 Philoxenian 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 Thebaic Version, while four other cursives read simply *ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ*. But probably no one of these is the original reading. *Αἴγυπτος* 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 *ἐν τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ* in Van Ess's edition. But this is a misprint or a clerical error for *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*. It is true, also, that in Acts vii. 11 Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, and Westcott and Hort, as well as the Revisers, read *ὅλην τὴν Αἴγυπτον*, "all Egypt." But this, though supported by *Σ*, A, B, C, and 81, is unquestionably a clerical error, which originated in writing T for Γ, or τὴν for γῇ, and *Αἴγυπτον* for *Αἰγύπτου*, — the original reading there being *ὅλην γῇν Αἰγύπτου*. Compare the Septuagint at Gen. xli. 19, 46. *Γῇ Αἴγυπτος*, *γῆς Αἰγύπτου*, and *γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ* are all legitimate expressions; but not *γῇν Αἴγυπτον*, nor yet *τὴν Αἴγυπτον*. — In the verse before us, the true reading is plainly *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*, as Tischendorf reads, following *Σ*, A, E, H, P, 61, and nearly fifty other cursives, the first hand of the Latin Version of Codex E, and Chrysostom. This, too, is probably the correct reading in Acts xiii. 17, given by C, D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, Chrysostom, and Theophylact, and followed by Tischendorf, — a form occurring again and again in the Septuagint.¹ *Σ*, A, B, and less than twenty cursives, however, here (xiii. 17) read *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου*, — which is adopted by Lachmann, Westcott 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; Ps. lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 12; Jer. xliv. 26, 27, 28.

viii. 18.

The ancient documents to which the marginal note refers as omitting the word "Holy" from the clause "the Holy Ghost was given," are *Σ*, B, the Thebaic Version, and the Apostolic Constitutions. The two words *τὸ ἅγιον*, could not have been accidentally lost; nor could their presence, if they were not already in the text, have been considered such a necessity as to tempt any one to insert them. The expression was apparently omitted on account of the occurrence of *ἅγιον* in the preceding as well as the following verse, by which a reader or scribe was very easily led to think the retention of the word here unnecessary, and its removal a decided improvement. Its presence as a part of the text is attested by all the other uncials (including A, C, D, L) and versions, and by all the cursives, besides Basil the Great, Chrysostom in two different places, John Damascene, and others.

viii. 37.

This verse is omitted by the Revisers, with the marginal note, "Some ancient authorities insert wholly or in part, verse 37, *And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.*" This passage, though quoted by Irenæus in both Greek and Latin, and known to Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine and others, is not found in any extant Greek manuscript earlier than the seventh century. It is wanting in *Σ*, A, B, C (D is defective here), H, L, P, more than eighty cursives, some copies of the Old Latin, the Peshito Syriac, and the text of the Philoxenian Syriac, the two Egyptian Versions, and the Ethiopic, and in Chrysostom's and Theophylact's notices of the context. Besides this, the documents that have the verse differ considerably in their readings, — a circumstance that always awakens a suspicion of spuriousness. Though perfectly in harmony with the context, it seems as if it can

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. λαβόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταί — Then the disciples took him.
Rev. T. λαβόντες δὲ 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 **N**, A, B, C, F^a, 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 ΑΥΤΟΥ, "his," for ΑΥΤΟΝ, "him," the object of the participle λαβόντες. 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. ὥσπερ ὥραν ἐννάτην — about the ninth hour.
Rev. T. ὥσπερ περὶ ὥραν ἐννάτην — 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 **N**, 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 ὥσπερ, 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 loquendi* 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 περὶ, "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 *ὥσεί* in the sense of "as it were," he would assuredly have inserted it before *φανερῶς*, 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. 11.

Rec. T. *τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς δεδεμένον, καὶ καθιέμενον*—knit at the four corners, and let down.

Rev. T. *τέσσαρσιν ἀρχαῖς καθιέμενον*—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 *Σ*, A, B, C second hand, E, 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 *Σ*, 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 O for an E, 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 ὥρας ἤμην νηστεύων, καὶ τὴν ἐννάτην ὥραν προσευχόμενος*—Four days ago, I was fasting until this hour, and at the ninth hour I prayed.

Rev. T. *Ἀπὸ τετάρτης ἡμέρας μέχρι ταύτης τῆς ὥρας ἤμην τὴν ἐννάτην προσευχόμενος*—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 *Σ*, 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 *νηστεύων*, "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.

xi. 12.

Rec. T. *μηδὲν διακρινόμενον*—nothing doubting.
 Rev. T. *μηδὲν διακρίναντα*—making no distinction.

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 *Σ*, A, B, 61, and five other cursives; while, instead of this, *Σ* first hand, E, and four or five cursives have the *present* participle *διακρίνοντα*. D and the Philoxenian Syriac Version omit the words. The variation in reading between A, B and *Σ*, 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.

xi. 21.

Rec. T. *πολὺς τε ἀριθμὸς πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεφεν*—and a great number believed, and turned.

Rev. T. *πολὺς τε ἀριθμὸς ὁ πιστεύσας ἐπέστρεφεν*—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 *Σ*, A, B, 36, 61, 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. ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν διελθεῖν ἕως Ἀντιοχείας — they sent forth Barnabas that he should go as far as Antioch.

Rev. T. ἐξαπέστειλαν Βαρνάβαν ἕως Ἀντιοχείας — they sent forth Barnabas as far as Antioch.

The common reading is that of D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Thebaic and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, and Chrysostom. The other is supported by \aleph , A, B, 61, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and the Ethiopic. But evidently διελθεῖν 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," — ἕως 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 ἐν 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 προσμένειν. 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. προσευχή δὲ ἣν ἐκτενῆς γινομένη — but prayer was made without ceasing. [In the margin, these words are more properly rendered, "but instant and earnest prayer was made."]

Rev. T. προσευχή δὲ ἣν ἐκτενῶς γινομένη — 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 cursives, a catena, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, and Severianus. The Revised adopts that of \aleph , B, and what seems to be the original reading of A, three cursives, the Latin Version *e*, the Vulgate, and Lucifer. But these Latin "authorities," as well as D, which reads ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ, 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 \aleph , B, H, L, P, 61, and about thirty-five other cursives, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, the Roman Ethiopic, the Arabic of the Paris Polyglot, some manuscripts of Chrysostom, and Theophylact. A few cursives 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 ἀπό, "from," instead of ἐξ, "from." Then again, between twenty and thirty of these documents that read "from" (embracing some that read ἐξ and some that read ἀπό), 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 τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ πληρώσαντες διακονίαν," — adding that "the article is more liable than other words to careless transposition."¹ 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 τὴν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ διακονίαν, or πληρώσαντες τὴν διακονίαν εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *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 ἐξ, 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

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 94.

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 Judea, 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 Judea visiting the brethren, till after the death of Herod, when they "returned *to* Jerusalem," having fulfilled their ministry *in Judea*, to aid them in which they had taken Mark along with them. This will account at once for the introduction of εἰς in place of ἐξ, — the latter having been naturally considered an erroneous reading. Hence, too, the appearance of εἰς in so many of the uncials. Instead of going through Judea, 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, ἐτροποφόρησεν, "he suffered their manners," the margins of both the Authorized and

the Revised New Testament give *ἐτροφοφόρησεν*, "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 *Σ*, 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, ὥς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα, ἔδωκε κριτὰς* — he divided to 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, ὥς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἔδωκε κριτὰς* — 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 *Σ*, 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."¹ 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,

¹ *Commentary on the R. V.*, p. 219.

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."¹ 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.

xiii. 25.

Rec. T. Τίνα με ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ ἐγώ. — Whom think ye that I am? I am not *he*.

Rev. T. Τί ἐμὲ ὑπονοεῖτε εἶναι; οὐκ εἰμὶ 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 cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. The latter follows S, 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 αὐτός 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 ὃντινα, "the one whom," τίνα με seems to have been considered a transcriptional error for τί ἐμέ, 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

¹ *Commentary on the Acts*.

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. ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε τοῖς τέκνοις αὐτῶν ἡμῖν, — God hath fulfilled the same unto us their children.

Rev. T. ταύτην ὁ Θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκε 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 ἡμῖν, "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, ἡμῖν was early thought to be a transcriptional error, and so became changed to ἡμῶν. 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 ἡμῶν is a primitive corruption of ἡμῖν, — τοὺς 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. ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, λέγοντες περιτέμνεσθαι καὶ τηρεῖν τὸν νόμον, οἷς οὐ διεσπειλάμεθα · — subverting your souls, saying, *Ye must* be circumcised, and keep the law; to whom we gave no *such* commandment.

Rev. T. ἀνασκευάζοντες τὰς ψυχὰς ὑμῶν, οἷς οὐ διεσπειλάμεθα · — 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 ὁμῶν, the last syllable before the omission, and νόμον, 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

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 95.

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 οἷς οὐ διεστείλάμεθα, 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*.

XV. 34.

Rec. T. ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλα ἐπιμείναι αὐτοῦ. — 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 Σ , A, B, E, H, L, P, 61, and about sixty other cursives. 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 cursives, 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, αὐτοῦ, "there," which seems to be a later reading, C and D have αὐτούς, "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 εἰδοξε 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 αὐτοῦς instead of αὐτοῦ 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 προσευχῇ εἶναι, — where prayer was wont to be made.

Rev. T. οὐ ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι, — where we supposed there was a place of prayer.

The documents are greatly at variance here. The Received Text follows the reading of E, H, L, P, nearly all the cursives, two catenæ, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. Codex D and the Old Latin and Vulgate read: "where there seemed (εἰδόκει) 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 C, 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. οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς — this Jesus . . . is Christ.

Rev. T. οὗτός ἐστιν 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 cursives, and Theophylact; while that of E, a few cursives, 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 οὗτος, — "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 οὗτος, 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 ὡς ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν · — to go as it were to the sea.
 Rev. T. πορεύεσθαι ἕως ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν · — to go as far as to the sea.

The common reading ὡς is supported by H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, and Chrysostom. The revised is that of **Σ**, A, B, E,

61, and seven or eight other cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, and the Memphitic. Codex D, about ten cursives, the Thebaic and Ethiopic Versions omit the word. The truth is, ὡς was misunderstood; hence it was early changed in some copies, as if to make its meaning sure, to ἕως, "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 ἐπί, εἰς, 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, ἀπέπλεον μετὰ τῆς Σαλαμινίας ἐκ τῆς Σικελίας ὡς εἰς Ἀθήνας, '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."¹ 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. ἐποίησέ τε ἐνὸς αἵματος πᾶν ἔθνος — and hath made of one blood all nations.

Rev. T. ἐποίησέ τε ἐνὸς πᾶν ἔθνος — and he made of one every nation.

The Received Text follows D, E, H, L, P, most of the cursives, a catena, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac and Armenian Versions, Irenæus, Theodoret twice, Chrysostom repeatedly, Cosmas of Alexandria, Theophylact, and Bede. The Revisers' reading is that of **Σ**, A, B, 61, and seven or eight other cursives, the Vulgate, the two Egyptian Versions, Platt's Ethiopic, and

¹ Buttmann's *Greek Grammar*, § 149, m. 1.

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.

xviii. 3.

Rec. T. ἐμενε παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἐργάζετο — he abode with them, and wrought.

Rev. T. ἐμενε παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἠργάζοντο — he abode with them, and they wrought.

The singular is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, A (C is defective here), D, E, H, L, P, all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Thebaic, the Armenian, and Chrysostom. The plural is the reading given by the original scribe of **Σ**, 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, ἐργάζετο 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.

xviii. 7.

Rec. T. ὀνόματι Ἰούστου, — named Justus.

Rev. T. ὀνόματι Τίτου Ἰούστου, — 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 cursives, the Latin Version of Codex D, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary. The revised follows **Σ**, E, four cursives, 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 "Titius" instead of "Titus." The Peshito Syriac and Thebaic Versions read "Titus" instead of "Justus." Bede, commenting on the name *Titi Justī*, which appeared in his Latin New Testament, says, "In Greek, the name is written *Justus*," 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 ὀνόματι Τίτου Ἰούστου out of ὀνομαΤΙΙΟΥστου, the second Ι requiring only a horizontal mark at the top to change it to a Τ; and this the scribe may indeed have found there, or thought was there. This Τίτου became changed in B, and two other documents, to Τιτίου; while in two versions it superseded the original "Justus." In cursive 98, τοῦ Τίτου is written over Ἰούστου; 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· Δεῖ με πάντως τὴν ἑορτὴν τὴν ἐρχομένην ποιῆσαι ἐν Ἱεροσόλυμα· 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 cursives, 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 **Σ**, A, B, E, less than ten cursives, 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 cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and the Armenian. It is wanting in **Σ**, A, B, seven cursives, 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 one Sceva . . . *doing* this"; unless ἦσαν, 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 υἱοί, 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. κατακυριεύσας αὐτῶν, — overcame them.

Rev. T. κατακυριεύσας 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." Ἀμφοτέρων is supported by \aleph , A, B, D, about fifteen cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, 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 ἀμφοτέρων 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 ἀμφοτέρων that, of those seven sons, but *two* on this occasion were active, *whom Luke has already conceived to himself in* [the foregoing] αὐτοῦς." This is not in accordance with Luke's mode of expressing himself. He speaks as truly of the seven in αὐτοῦς as he does in the preceding αὐτοῖς, or his words are meaningless. It is this misunderstanding of Luke's meaning which has led not only to the substitution of αὐτῶν for ἀμφοτέρων, but to several other changes, such as the omission of καί after ἀμφοτέρων, the writing of κυριεύσας and κατεκυρίενσεν for κατακυριεύσας, to say nothing of still other variations, which have also led to a mistranslation of his words. Indeed, κατακυριεύσας is not above suspicion. Codex A reads κατεκυρίενσαν ἀμφοτέρων, "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 \aleph , B, D, etc. And this, we believe, gives us the original reading, κατεκυρίενσαν ἀμφοτέρων, καὶ ἵσχυσε 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 ἐπιγινόντες, 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.¹ 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, I., 1.

xx. 3.

Rec. T. ἐγένετο γνώμη τοῦ ὑποστρέφειν — he purposed to return.

Rev. T. ἐγένετο γνώμης 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 **Σ**, 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 γνώμη, 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 γνώμη instead of γνώμης. The latter would indicate that the decision was Paul's alone.

xx. 5.

Rec. T. οὗτοι προελθόντες — These going before.

Rev. T. οὗτοι δὲ προελθόντες — But these had gone before.

The "but" of the Revised Text is found in **Σ**, 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. — Προελθόντες, "having come unto," which is referred to in the margin as found instead of προελθόντες 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 δεῖ πλῆθος συνελθεῖν· ἀκούσονται γὰρ ὅτι ἐλήλυθας. — the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come.

Rev. T. πάντως ἀκούσονται ὅτι ἐλήλυθας. — they will certainly hear that thou art come.

The common reading here is attested by **Σ**, A, C second hand, D, E, H, L, 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 ξυρήσωνται τὴν κεφαλὴν*, — that they may shave their heads.

Rev. T. *ἵνα ξυρήσονται 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 *ξυρωνται*), H, L, nearly all the cursives, a catena, Chrysostom, and Theophylact. The future indicative, of the Revised Text, — which is improperly translated “*may shave*,” — is the reading of *Σ*, B first hand, D as afterwards amended, E, P, and half a dozen cursives. It is simply an early change from the subjunctive to bring the word into conformity with the following *γνώσονται*, “*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 *γνώσονται* to the subjunctive to make it correspond with *ξυρήσωνται*. Hence the reading *γνώσι*, of the Received Text, which the Revisers have justly rejected.

xxiii. 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. 30.

The “*many ancient authorities*” that add the rejected word, “*Farewell*,” are *Σ*, E, H, L, P, all the cursives 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. *ἀσπασόμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*. — to salute Festus.

Rev. T. *ἀσπασάμενοι τὸν Φῆστον*. — 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 cursives, 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 *Σ*, A, B, the Greek Text of E, H, L, P, about twenty cursives, 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 ἀσπασάμενοι, preceded as it is by a verb—κατήντησαν. It is only a makeshift. Dr. Hort, in his note on the word, says, "The authority for -άμενοι is absolutely overwhelming; and, as a matter of transmission, -όμενοι 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 cursives, and Theophylact in one form of his commentary, read τὰ συναντήσαντα, "which have befallen," in place of τὰ συναντήσοντα, "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 cursives, the Philoxenian Syriac, and Chrysostom read τοῦ σπείραντος, "him that sowed,"—the true reading in verse 24,—instead of τοῦ σπείροντος, "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.

ciples of them,—contrary to all apostolic practice. In Acts viii. 32, *Σ*, A, C, E, H, L, some twenty cursives, a catena, Chrysostom, and the Paschal Chronicle also read τοῦ κείραντος αὐτόν, "the one that sheared him," instead of τοῦ κείροντος αὐτόν, "the one shearing him," or "his shearer." In Acts xxviii. 23, *Σ* has διαμαρτυράμενος, "having testified," for διαμαρτυρόμενος, "testifying"; and B repeatedly has δύνουμαι and δυνόμενος for δύναμαι and δυνάμενος,—which presents the reverse error of writing ο for α. All this shows that we cannot be governed altogether by manuscript "authority," even if it is "overwhelming"; especially when that authority is, in all probability, if not obviously, an early transcriptional error.

xxvi. 16.

Rec. T. ὧν τε εἶδες — both of these things which thou hast seen.

Rev. T. ὧν τε εἶδες με — both of the things wherein thou hast seen me.

Appended to this, in the Revisers' margin, is the note, "Many ancient authorities read *which thou hast seen*." This of course is the common reading. It is attested by *Σ*, A, C second hand (D is defective), E, H, I, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, and the Ethiopic Versions. Augustine adds *a me*, "from me." The Revisers' reading is that of B, C first hand, 105, 137, a few lectionaries, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, and Ambrose. This reading appears to have originated in a desire to render the two relative clauses symmetrical, and alike in construction: "those things *in which* thou hast seen me, and those *in which* I shall appear unto thee";—*i.e.* in which thou shalt yet see me. Besides being thus open to suspicion, its attestation seems hardly sufficient to demand a displacement of what is apparently the genuine text, and one that is abundantly vouched for. The ὧν in both instances is equivalent to ἐκείνων *α*,—the relative in the latter instance being without the governing κατά, which is a not

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."

xxvi. 20.

Rec. T. εἰς πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν — and throughout all the coasts.

Rev. T. πᾶσάν τε τὴν χώραν — and throughout all the country.

The presence of εἰς, "through," as in the Received Text, is attested by E, H, L, P, all the cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, and Chrysostom. Codices C and D are defective. The preposition 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, — Ἱεροσολύμοις, as they appear in uncial letters, — the latter being overlooked after the copying of the former. Hence its absence from **S**, 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.

xxvi. 28.

Rec. T. με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι. — thou persuadest me to be a Christian.

Rev. T. με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. — thou wouldst fain make me a Christian.

The common reading γενέσθαι is supported by E, H, I, P, most cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The Revisers' ποιῆσαι is attested by **S**, 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 ποιῆσαι has every appearance of being a genuine reading. It could not have been intentionally introduced in place of γενέσθαι; nor could it easily have got in otherwise if it were not genuine.

Γενέσθαι 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 ποιῆσαι 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 persuadest me *to become* a Christian." Ποιῆσαι, however, is used simply to prevent the repetition of the preceding verb πιστεύειν, "to believe," just as "to do" is often used in English, and *facere* in Latin; and the words are to be rendered, "Thou persuadest 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 ποιεῖν 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 Χριστιανόν, 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 Χριστιανόν, 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*.

xxvii. 16.

Rec. T. καλούμενον Κλαύδην, — which is called Claudia.

Rev. T. καλούμενον Καῦδα, — called Cauda.

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 **S**, 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 **Σ** 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. 19.

Rec. T. αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἔρριψαμεν. — we cast out with our own hands the tackling of the ship.

Rev. T. αὐτόχειρες τὴν σκευὴν τοῦ πλοίου ἔρριψαν. — 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 **Σ**, 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* do 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 λοιπόν, "at last," when speaking of all hope as taken away. Another (A), in verse 21, improperly omits "then" before "Paul stood forth." A third (**Σ**), in verse 27, speaks of the shipmen as deeming that some country "extended before" them, προαγαγεῖν, instead of "was drawing near," προσάγειν, 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,

— 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 $\omega\varsigma$, "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 $\tau\hat{\omega}$ $\pi\lambda\omicron\iota\upsilon$, "the ship," stood immediately before the numeral, as it does in \aleph , A, B, C, and a number of cursives, and not before $\alpha\iota$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\iota$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\iota$, "all the souls," as in the Received and Revised Texts. On coming to $\sigma\omicron\zeta'$, the abridged Greek form of writing "two-hundred and seventy-six," corresponding to our 276, he evidently connected the σ of $\sigma\omicron\zeta'$ with the last letter of the preceding word, which was inadvertently repeated by him, as was common; and so he changed the reading to $\omega\varsigma$ $\omicron\zeta'$, *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.

xxvii. 39.

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 $\epsilon\kappa\omega\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota$ instead of $\epsilon\acute{\xi}\omega\sigma\alpha\iota$, — 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. $\text{ὑπὸ τῆς βίας τῶν κυμάτων}$, — with the violence of the waves.

Rev. T. ὑπὸ τῆς βίας , — by the violence of the waves.

Though the Revisers omit $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$, in accordance with the reading of \aleph 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 $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$ 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 $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ immediately after $\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$, "violence," some early scribe unquestionably lost himself. Having written the first $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$, 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, $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu$. If the reading which the Revisers have adopted had been the reading of Luke, a glossarist, as Meyer forcibly remarks, would more

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 **S** 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 *Militene*; Jerome has either *Militine* or *Miletene*; the Memphitic Version, *Meletine*; 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 νῆσος, or rather ΜΕΛΙΤΗΗΗΗCOC, 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 Μιτυλήνη (Mitylene), annexed the first syllable of νῆσος to Μελίτη, and wrote instead ΜΕΛΙΤΗΗΗΗΗCOC, or Μελιτήνη ἡ νῆσος. 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 **S**, 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 **S** first hand, and B read thus. If περιελόντες 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 Putcoli, through the Strait of Messina, on the east side of which Rhegium lay, is northerly. From the use of καταχθέντες, "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, *περιελθόντες*; 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 cursives, and all the ancient versions. It is adopted, too, by all modern editors except Westcott and Hort. The other reading, which properly means "having taken 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 applicableness of *περιελθόντες*, 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 cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Erpenius' Arabic, or Chrysostom. They appear, however, in H, L, P, 137, and nearly all the other cursives, 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 narrative. 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 interpolated passages. And perhaps a still stronger evidence of genuineness is the presence of the article (*τῷ*) in connection with *στρατοπεδάρχῃ*, "*the* commander of the prætorian 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 continued 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 responsibilities 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.

ROMANS.

i. 24.

Rec. T. *ἑαυτοῖς* — themselves.Rev. T. *αὐτοῖς* — themselves.

The manuscripts that support the shorter form of this word are *Σ*, A, B, C, D first hand, and ten cursives. The common form is given by D third hand, E, G, K, L, 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.

ii. 14.

Rec. T. *ποιῇ* — do.Rev. T. *ποιῶσιν* — do.

The change from the singular to the plural is in accordance with the reading of *Σ*, A, 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;¹ and these futures are all in the plural. But they are quoted from the Septuagint.² 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 *Σ*, B, C, K, L, twelve or more cursives, and several Fathers, *τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν*, 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.³ 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 *εἰ γὰρ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς αὐτῶν ἐκοινῶνησαν τὰ ἔθνη, ὀφείλουσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς λειτουργῆσαι αὐτοῖς*, "If the Gentiles have been made partakers of their [Hebrew Christians'] spiritual things, they [Gentile Christians] ought also to minister to them in carnal things." In 1 Cor. x. 6, the other instance in which the apostle employs the aorist in the plural, *ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ὑμῶν ἐγενήθησαν*, "Now these things were our examples," — taking this to be the true construction, — the verb is similarly drawn into the plural by the plural predicate nominative *τύποι*. But we are inclined to think that the true construction here requires us to take *ταῦτα* adverbially, and not as a nominative. In that case, the real subject of this, as of the preceding, verb is *αὐτοί* understood; and the meaning is, "And in these respects (*i.e.* the two points mentioned in the preceding verse) they became examples (of warning)

¹ Rom. xv. 12; Gal. iii. 8; Heb. i. 12.² Isa. xlii. 4; Gen. xviii. 18; xxii. 18; Ps. (ci. 28, or) cii. 27.³ See Note on 1 Cor. x. 11.

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 \aleph , A, C, D, E, F, G, P, 17, and ten other cursives, read *ακούσωσιν*. 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 *οἱτοί*, following on immediately after the verb, and at the same time representing the more remote *ἔθνη*, may have caused the apostle to use the plural *ποιῶσιν* instead of the common singular form. It may be added that in no other instance, unless it be Gal. v. 17, *ταῦτα ἀλλήλοις ἀντίκειται*, "these things are contrary to each other," where L, from fifteen to twenty cursives, 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. *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν* — chiefly, because that unto them were committed.

Rev. T. *πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι ἐπιστεύθησαν* — first of all, that they were entrusted with.

The Revisers, in omitting *γάρ*, have followed B, D first hand, E, G, five cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Mem-

phitic, 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 \aleph , A, D third hand, K, L, nearly all the cursives, 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 *πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ τὸ περισσὸν ἐστὶν ὅτι 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, *ὅτι* does not need to be translated, as *γάρ* itself often does not after *ἀλλά*, "but," when the clause which the latter impliedly introduces is unexpressed.¹

iii. 22.

Rec. T. *εἰς πάντας καὶ ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας* — unto all and upon all them that believe.

Rev. T. *εἰς πάντας τοὺς πιστεύοντας* — unto all them that believe.

The omission of the words rendered "and upon all" is supported by \aleph 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 *Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ περὶ νυνὶ ἡδὴ ὥρα*, "But it is now high time to conclude." 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 cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, one manuscript of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Ambrosiaster, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. 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 ἐπὶ

¹ *Introduction to New Testament in Greek*, p. 7.

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.

iv. 19.

Rec. T. οὐ κατένόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα—he considered not his own body.

Rev. T. κατένόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα—he considered his own body.

The common reading is attested by D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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, Œcumenius, and Ambrosiaster. It is what Dr. Hort is pleased to call "a Western reading."¹ The Revisers omit οὐ 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 ἀσθενεῖν does not mean "to be weakened," but "to be weak." By giving ἀσθενήσας, "being weak," its proper

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 *μέν* 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 *μέν* 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 *μέν* 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. εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν — we have peace with God.

Rev. T. εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν 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 *Σ*'s contemporary "proof reader," B third hand, F, G, P, most of the cursives, and a few of the Fathers. The Canterbury Revisers' reading is that of the scribe of *Σ*, A, B first hand, C, D, E, K, L, between thirty and forty cursives, 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 capa-

ble 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 \omicron for ω , an error of common occurrence among ancient manuscripts. The same itacism appears among several of them in 1 Cor. xv. 49, making the apostle say, "*Let us bear* the image of the heavenly."¹ 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 \omicron for ω is also occasionally found in the best manuscripts. Thus, in Rom. xiv. 19, $\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ appears in \aleph , A, B, F, G, L, P, etc., instead of $\delta\acute{\iota}\omega\kappa\omega\mu\epsilon\nu$.² Yet the Re-

¹ The following are a few other instances. In Rom. v. 10, Codex L and a few cursives have $\sigma\omega\theta\eta\sigma\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, "we should be saved," for $\sigma\omega\theta\eta\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$, "we shall be saved," though in the preceding verse they give the word correctly, in the future indicative. In 1 Cor. xiv. 15, where the Received Text reads, with B, K, L, 17, 37, and the great body of the cursives, $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \tau\acute{\omicron}\ \pi\nu\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, "I will pray with the spirit, and will pray," etc., A, D, E, F, G, P, and three cursives read $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$. . . $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\mu\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, "Let me pray with the spirit, and let me pray," etc., while the Sinaitic Codex reads $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omega\mu\alpha\iota$. . . $\pi\rho\sigma\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, "Let me pray with the spirit, and I will pray," etc. On this, Principal Edwards says (*Commentary on 1 Corinthians*), "The future indicative yields a meaning so much more satisfactory that it must be accepted. . . . The best manuscripts often confound \omicron with ω . If it were hortatory, we should have expected the plural." But he says nothing of the peculiar reading of the Sinaitic Codex, which virtually makes the apostle say, "If I can only pray with the spirit, I will pray with the understanding also."

² In the first verse of chapter vi. \aleph , K, P, a number of cursives, and the

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.

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 Σ first hand, C, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Platt's Ethiopic, Origen in two other

Memphitic Version read the present indicative *ἐπιμένωμεν*, "we continue," for the present subjunctive *ἐπιμένωμεν*, "let us continue." In viii. 26, D, K, L, P, more than seventy cursives, and several of the Fathers, including Origen, have the future indicative *προσευξόμεθα*, "we shall pray," instead of the aorist subjunctive *προσευξώμεθα*, "we should pray." Also, in Heb. xii. 28, Σ , K, P, 31, and many other cursives have *ἔχομεν*, "we have," for *ἔχωμεν*, "let us have."

instances, Chrysostom once, Euthalius, Cyril, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others; as well as by the reading, *ἐν τῇ πίστει* (in Σ 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 *ἐσχάτη* EN 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 καιρόν* — in due time.

Rev. T. *ἔτι κατὰ καιρόν* — in due season.

By adopting this reading, the Revisers repeat *ἔτι*, but do not translate it. Nor can it be translated without letting *ἔτι* in the beginning of the verse go untranslated. The word is repeated in Σ , A, C, D first hand, two cursives, Epiphanius, and John Damascene. But it was evidently introduced here by some early scribe, who, having associated it with *ἀσθενῶν*, 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 Σ , 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 *ἔτι*. 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 *ἔτι γάρ*, in the beginning of the verse, to *εἰ γάρ*, "if indeed," a reading found elsewhere only in Westcott and Hort, to

which Dr. Hort, for himself, adds the note, "But εἰ περ [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 γάρ somewhat differently. The Peshito Syriac Version transformed it to εἰ δέ, "and if." One cursive, the original text of the Codex Fuldensis of the Vulgate, Isidore of Pelusium, and Augustine read εἰ γάρ, "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 τί γάρ, *ut quid enim*, "for why." "The misplacement of the εἰ [i.e. its insertion after ἀσθενῶν] came to predominate because a church-lesson began with Χριστός."—*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

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 108.

"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 δωρεᾶς, 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 δωρεᾶς 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 ὁ Θεός in verse 8, of χριστοῦ after Ἰησοῦ in verse 11, and of καί, "also," after οὕτω, "so," in verse 15. In all these instances of omission in B, except that of ὁ 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 ὁ 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. αἰχμαλωτίζοντά με τῷ νόμῳ — bringing me into captivity to the law.

Rev. T. αἰχμαλωτίζοντά 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*)

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 νοός, "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, *σε* for *με*, *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 cursives, 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 cursives, the Memphitic, Woide's Thebaic, the Armenian, both Ethiopic Versions, Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus of Portus, Athanasius, Didymus, Basil, Epiphanius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrys-

ostom, 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 cursives, 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. $\delta \gamma\alpha\rho \beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota \tau\iota\varsigma, \tau\acute{\iota} \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$; — for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for?

Rev. T. $\delta \gamma\alpha\rho \beta\lambda\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota, \tau\iota\varsigma \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$; — 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 $\tau\acute{\iota}$ after $\tau\iota\varsigma$. $\tau\acute{\iota}$ was evidently dropped as superfluous, because the apostle's words were misunderstood, — $\tau\iota\varsigma$ 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 \aleph and 47. But $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 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 $\tau\acute{\iota} \kappa\alpha\iota$. But, while $\kappa\alpha\iota$ was thought by many to be needless, $\tau\acute{\iota}$ 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 $\kappa\alpha\iota$. The true reading is, no doubt, that of the Received Text, which is attested by \aleph '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 $\tau\acute{\iota}$, though they omit $\kappa\alpha\iota$, — 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 cursives, 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 \aleph , B, can safely be rejected absolutely.

viii. 38.

Rec. T. οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε δυνάμεις οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα — nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come.

Rev. T. οὔτε ἀρχαί οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα οὔτε μέλλοντα οὔτε δυνάμεις — nor 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 οὔτε by *homoioteleuton*. Some one, afterwards observing the omission, probably placed οὔτε 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 ἐξουσία, "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 ἐξουσία and δύναμις. 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. τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην ζητοῦντες στήσαι — going about to establish their own righteousness.

Rev. T. τὴν ἰδίαν ζητοῦντες στήσαι — 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 **Σ**, 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. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ ποιήσας αὐτὰ ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται 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. Μωσῆς γὰρ γράφει ὅτι τὴν δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐκ νόμου ὁ ποιήσας ἄνθρωπος ζήσεται 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 αὐτά; 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 ὅτι, 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, 71, 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 ῥίζης καὶ τῆς πύκνότητος — of the root and fatness.

Rev. T. τῆς ῥίζης τῆς πύκνότητος — of the root of the fatness.

The only evidence in support of the Revisers' reading is the testimony of **Σ** 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 ῥίζης καί. But, no doubt, καί was accidentally omitted by some early transcriber from whose copy these manuscripts are descended, while **Σ**'s seventh-century emendator, A, D as afterwards corrected, E, L, P, all the cursives, 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 ῥίζα, "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 "κυρίῳ is certainly the oldest and most diffused reading," says "if it were original, we cannot well see why καιρῷ 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 [κυρίῳ] for ΚΡΩ [καιρῷ], 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 κυρίῳ 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. ὥρα ἡμᾶς ἦδη ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι — now it is high time to awake out of sleep; *i.e.* for us to awake, etc.

Rev. T. ὥρα ἦδη ὑμᾶς ἐξ ὕπνου ἐγερθῆναι — now it is high time for you to awake out of sleep.

The common reading, ἡμᾶς, is attested by S'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 S 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 εἰδότες, "since ye know." Or it may have been thought to be the only proper word to follow the passive verb, ἐγερθῆναι, taken in the sense of *being roused*, rather than in its later intransitive and more common New-Testament sense of *awaking*; 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 ἡμᾶς instead of ὑμᾶς 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 ἐγγύτερον ἡμῶν ἢ 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*." Ὑμᾶς 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 uncials, 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 κύριος. 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 cursives, 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 οὐ 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-

sented 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 *homoiototeuton*, to which it may possibly be owing. But, whatever may be the reason of the non-appearance of this clause in most of the uncials, 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, Photius, and other Fathers, attest the words as genuine, as well as C third hand, L, P, most of the cursives, 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 Sinaitic Codex, supported by A, B, F, G, L, P, and half a dozen cursives. 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 *o* for an *ω*. Such transparent errors, as common as they are transparent, however respectably 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 *διώκωμεν*, "let us follow"; but they are supported by the context, by all the versions, by nearly all the cursives, and approved generally by commentators and editors, even by Westcott and Hort.

xiv. 22.

Rec. T. *οὐ πιστὶν ἔχεις*; — Hast thou faith?

Rev. T. *οὐ πιστὶν ἣν ἔχεις* — The faith which thou hast.

The Revisers' reading is attested by the four oldest manuscripts *Σ*, 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 ἣν, "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 ἣν makes σὺ, "thou," the subject not of ἔχεις but of the more remote ἔχε; 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 ἣν for τὴν πίστιν ἣν, 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 ΠΙCΤΙΝΤΙΝΕΧΕΙC out of the two words πίστιν and ἔχεις. But a subsequent copyist, naturally considering the second TI a mistake for H, changed the reading to ΠΙCΤΙΝΗΝΕΧΕΙC, *i.e.* πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις.

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 Matthæi 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.

ΣΤ. 15.

Rec. T. τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ—the grace that is given to me of God.

Rev. T. τὴν χάριν τὴν δοθεῖσάν μοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ—the grace that was given me of God.

There is no difference here made in the rendering of ὑπό and ἀπό. 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 Σ, 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 ἀπό 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 ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ rather than by the unqualified phrase ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Hence, apparently, the change from ὑπό to ἀπό.

ΣΤ. 17.

Rec. T. ἔχω οὖν καύχησιν—I have therefore whereof I may glory.

Rev. T. ἔχω οὖν τὴν καύχησιν—I have therefore my glorying.

The latter reading is attested by B, C apparently, D, E, F, G, and the single cursive 37; the former, by Σ, 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 ἔχω shows that special emphasis is to be given to “I have.” Accordingly, the Revised Text must mean, I *have* therefore the glorying (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 glorying. 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 glorying in Christ. Why, then, should he draw the conclusion, “Therefore I have my glorying 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 glorying, and makes it the apostle’s. But remove the article, and a different meaning presents itself: “I have therefore a glorying—a subject or ground of glorying”; or, “I have therefore whereof I may glory.” It will not do to say that καύχησης does not admit this meaning. Both here and in 2 Cor. i. 12, to say nothing of Rom. iii. 27, the apostle uses καύχησης as equivalent to καύχημα, 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 καύχημα where we might naturally expect to see καύχησης. 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 glorying 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 dare¹ 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 *πεποιθήσιν*, "confidence," in place of *καύχῃσιν*, 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 cursives (33, 72), the Peshito Syriac, the Latin Version of F, and Origen; while two other

¹ That is, reading *τολμῶ*, the present, with *ℵ*'s seventh-century emendator, B, the Peshito Syriac, *d, e, f, g*, the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, Origen, and others of the Fathers, — a form which Westcott and Hort have placed in their margin, but which really seems to be the true reading.

cursives read *εἰη δόξα*, "be glory," in place of *ᾧ ἡ δόξα*, "to whom the glory." The preponderance of external evidence, therefore, is very greatly in favor of the retention of *ᾧ*, "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 *ᾧ* 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 *ᾧ* 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 *ᾧ* 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 uncials, 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 ϕ 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 Σ , A, D, E, the Vulgate, the Armenian, the Ethiopic Version, and other witnesses for this reading add the $\tau\omega\nu\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omega\nu$, "and ever," of those verses; while B, C, and other documents are without this additional phrase. Codices P, 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.

I CORINTHIANS.

i. 15.

Rec. T. $\text{ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβάπτισα.}$ — Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.

Rev. T. $\text{ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε.}$ — 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 Σ , A, B, C 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 *ἐβαπτίσθη*, "he was baptized." This is the reading of Euthalius, and of the cursives 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 τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Θεοῦ*. — declaring unto you the testimony of God.

Rev. T. *καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον 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 cursives, the Vulgate, the Thebaic, the Philoxenian Syriac, both Ethiopic Versions, the Armenian, Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, John Damascene, Pelagius, and others. The revised is supported by **Σ** first hand, A, C, seven or eight cursives, 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 *μυστήριον*, 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 *μυστήριον*; and Westcott and Hort adopt it, placing *μαρτύριον* in the margin as a secondary reading.

iii. 12.

Rec. T. *εἰ δὲ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον τούτων* — Now if any man build upon this foundation.

Rev. T. *εἰ δὲ τις ἐποικοδομεῖ ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον* — But if any man buildeth on the foundation.

The presence of *τούτων* is attested by **Σ**'s seventh-century emendator, C third hand, D, E, L, P, all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Origen, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, 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 *τούτων* 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.

iv. 2.

Rec. T. $\delta\delta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu$, — Moreover.

Rev. T. $\omega\delta\epsilon$, $\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu$, — Here, moreover.

The received reading is found in D as corrected by a later hand, E, L, most of the cursives, Origen three times, Didymus, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Photius, and others. The revised is that of Σ , A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, P, six cursives, 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 $\omega\delta\epsilon$; 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 $\delta\delta\epsilon$, made in consequence of the scribe's writing from dictation, and misapprehending the true expression. Taking $\delta\delta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\pi\acute{o}\nu$, "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.

vii. 37, 38.

Rec. T. $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\acute{\rho}\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota$. — doeth well . . . doeth well . . . doeth better.

Rev. T. $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\acute{\rho}\epsilon\iota\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu\ \pi\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\iota$. — shall do well . . . doeth well . . . shall do better.

The common reading is supported in the first of these instances by D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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 Σ , 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 Euthalius. 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, $\omicron\upsilon\chi\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha\rho\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota$, "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.

viii. 4.

Rec. T. $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$. — there is none other God but one.

Rev. T. $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$. — there is no God but one.

The former of these is the reading of Σ as amended early in the seventh century, K, L, most of the cursives, the Peshito

and Philoxenian Syriac Versions, Chrysostom twice, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The latter is attested by **Σ** first hand, A, B, D, E, F, G, P, eight cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Basil, Euthalius, Cyril, Irenæus 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 *ἕτερος* has the appearance of being superfluous; and, in copying from different exemplars, one or more of which were without *ἕτερος*, 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 *ἕτερος* 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. *τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδῶλου ἕως ἄρτι* — for some with conscience of the idol unto this hour.

Rev. T. *τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδῶλου* — but some, being used until now to the idol.

The common reading, *συνειδήσει*, is that of the seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, D, E, F, G, L, nearly all the cursives, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Tertullian, Augustine, Ambrosiaster, and others. The Revisers' *συνηθείᾳ* is found in **Σ** first hand, A, B, P, five cursives, 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 *συνηθείᾳ*, 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 *συνειδήσει*, 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 *συνήθεια* 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 *συνήθεια*, the revised reading here, instead of restoring the original text, has only set it aside.

viii. 8.

Rec. T. *Βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παρίσθησι τῷ Θεῷ · οὔτε γὰρ ἐὰν φάγωμεν, περισσεύομεν · οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν, ὑστερούμεθα.* — 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. *Βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ Θεῷ · οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσευνόμεθα.* — 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 *παρίσθησι* of the Received Text is displaced by the future *παραστήσει*. This is the reading of **Σ** first hand, A, B, eight cursives, 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 **Σ**, D, E, L, P (as well as by F and G, which read *συνίστησιν* instead), most of the cursives, 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

day as to another, as is evident from the expansion which the apostle gives to the thought: If we eat, we *are* no better; if we eat not, we *are* no worse. This calls for the present, *παρίστανει*, which the apostle no doubt wrote. But some early reader, perhaps governed by Rom. xiv. 10, considered the statement as having reference to man's standing before God in the final day of accounts; and so, by way of correcting the reading, changed it by two slight alterations to the future,—a form, however, which apparently obtained but little currency. Our second-century critic having made this change, his next step was to drop *γάρ* from the text, and set the last two clauses over against the first as an additional argument for indifference to meats. As the verse reads without *γάρ*, the first *οὔτε* means not simply "neither," but "neither on the other hand,"—the form of the negative implying a reference back to the negative of the preceding clause, as well as forward to the corresponding negative following. The verse is thus made to mean, now, food will not affect our standing before God in the final day of judgment. Neither, on the other hand, if we abstain from eating are we the worse now; nor, if we eat, are we the better. This, however, gives the language a forced and artificial appearance. But, if we return to the received reading, the argument becomes natural, forcible, and Paul-like: "Now, food does not affect our standing before God: for neither, if we eat, are we the better; nor, if we eat not, are we the worse." The *γάρ* is omitted by *Σ*, A, B, four cursives, two copies of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Bashmuri, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Origen once, where he begins his citation with *οὔτε*, and would naturally omit *γάρ* 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, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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

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 Bashmuri, the Armenian, and Basil once. The order of the Received Text is that of *Σ*, D, E, F, G, L, P, about all the cursives, 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 Revisers' reading, *περισσεύομεθα*, in place of *περισσεύομεν* which Westcott and Hort retain, is found only in B, and in Origen once. It is simply an attempt to make the two verbs correspond in form.

ix. 15.

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 *ἵνα τις κενώσῃ* to *οὐδεὶς 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 were good for me to die rather than — My glorying, no one shall make void." Some take *ἢ* to mean "or" instead of "than": — "It were 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 ἢ* 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 were 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. *ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις*. — Now all these things happened unto them for ensamples.

Rev. T. *ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις*. — Now these things happened unto them by way of example.

Πάντα, as given in the Received Text, is attested by C, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D and E, the

Vulgate, both Syriac Versions, the Memphitic, the Armenian, Irenæus, Origen several times, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. It also appears in the transposed reading *πάντα δὲ ταῦτα*, in **Σ**, 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 *τύποι* 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 Damascene, and others. The revised reading *τυπικῶς*, on the other hand, is attested by **Σ**, 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 *τύποι* to correspond with the reading of verse 6. After this change, owing to the harshness of the reading *ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον*, 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 Damascene, and others. But the singular is attested by **Σ**, B, C, K, L, twelve or more cursives, Marcion twice, Origen four times, and the rest of the witnesses that read *τυπικῶς*. As the singular verb *ἐγράφη* 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."

xii. 9.

Rec. T. ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ Πνεύματι, — by the same Spirit.

Rev. T. ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ Πνεύματι, — in the one Spirit.

The former is the reading of **Σ**, C third hand (the original scribe omitted the whole phrase), D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, Clement, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others. The latter is the reading of A, B, six cursives, the Vulgate, Didymus, Euthalius, Basil, John Damascene, Hilary, Ambrosiaster, Augustine, and other Latin Fathers. The former is apparently the true reading. 'Ενὶ 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 ἐνὶ 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.

xiii. 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, **Σ**, A, B, the eleventh-century cursive 17, whose text resembles B's more closely than any other known cursive's, the Memphitic, the Thebaic, the Roman Ethiopic, and Ephraem Syrus. 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. 38.

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, ἀγνοεῖτω. 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 — **Σ** 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 ἀγνοήσεται as ἀγνοεῖται. Besides, if this had been his meaning, he would hardly have abstained from inserting the emphatic αὐτός, — 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 cursives, the Thebaic, Bashmuri, and Gothic Versions, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Epiphanius, Cyril, Œcumenius, 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. — *Εἰκών*, "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 cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, and the Gothic, Origen repeatedly, Methodius, Cæsarius of Constantinople, Basil, Macarius, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Euthalius, Cyril, John Damascene, 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 cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, and the Arabic Version, Origen in some editions, Cyril, Theodoret, Photius, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. (Compare Note on Rom. v. 1.)

2 CORINTHIANS.

i. 1.

Rec. T. ἀπόστολος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—an apostle of Jesus Christ.

Rev. T. ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ—an apostle of Christ Jesus.

The latter is a well-known favorite order with Codex B,¹ which is supported here by the few additional witnesses, **S**, M, P, 17 of course, an eleventh-century manuscript of the Vulgate, the Philoxenian Syriac, Euthalius, and Theodoret. It is hardly safe to follow the leading of B in a case like this, though the meaning is not affected in the least by so doing, when the received reading is attested by A, D, E, G, K, L, nearly all the cursives, a fifth-century fragment of the Old Latin Version, the Peshito Syriac, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Gothic, Chrysostom, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others,—reaching back at least a century and a half, possibly two centuries, earlier than the date of Codex B.

i. 10.

Rec. T. καὶ ῥύεται.—and doth deliver.

Rev. T. καὶ ῥύσεται.—and will deliver.

The whole verse reads, A. V., "Who delivered us from so great a death, and doth deliver: in whom we trust that he will yet deliver us"; R. V., "Who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver: on whom we have set our hope that he will also still deliver us." The present, of the Received

Text, is attested by D third hand, E, F, G, K, L, M, most of the cursives, 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, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Jerome, and Ambrosiaster. The future of the Revised Text is the reading of **S**, B, C, P, 17, and four other cursives, 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 ῥύεται 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 confounded it with ῥύσεται in the line below, while others replaced the genuine ῥύεται. 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 consciousness 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.

¹ See Rom. i. 1; ii. 16; 1 Cor. i. 1; Gal. ii. 16, both times; Eph. i. 1, both times; i. 5; Phil. i. 1, both times; i. 6, etc.

iii. 3.

Rec. T. ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίας σαρκίναῖς. — in fleshly tables of the heart.

Rev. T. ἐν πλαξὶ καρδίαις σαρκίναῖς. — 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, Irenæus, 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 **Σ**, 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 καρδίαις 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 σαρκίναῖς "fleshly" or "of flesh," belongs to πλαξί, "tables" or "tablets," as truly as λιθίναῖς, "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 πλαξὶ ταῖς καρδίαις σαρκίναῖς.

iii. 9.

The marginal reading, "For if there is glory in the ministry of condemnation," is attested by **Σ**, 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 λάμψαι — light to shine.

Rev. T. φῶς λάμψει — light shall shine.

The former is attested by the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, 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 **Σ** 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 ὅτι, 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 λάμψαι with λάμψει 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, 71, 73, 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 Ἰησοῦ immediately following. None but a believer in the infallibility of Codex B would really think of omitting it.

v. 17.

Rec. T. γέγονε καινὰ τὰ πάντα. — all things are become new.

Rev. T. γέγονε καινά. — 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 Ethiopic, 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 **Σ**, B, C, D first hand, F, G, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Memphitic, an early edition of the Armenian Version, the Roman Ethiopic, 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 τὰ πάντα an erroneous reproduction of the τὰ πάντα immediately following, omitted it, and made what seemed to him the more natural subject, implied in τὰ ἀρχαῖα, 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 revelator had said (Rev. xxi. 4, 5), "The former things are passed away; behold, I make *them* new."

xi. 4.

Rec. T. καλῶς ἡνείχεσθε. — ye might well bear with *him*.

Rev. T. καλῶς ἀνείχεσθε. — 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 **Σ**, D third hand, E, F virtually, G, H, K, L, M, P, most of the cursives, Chrysostom, Euthalius, and John Damascene, — namely, ἀνείχεσθε, the reading adopted by Griesbach, Tregelles, 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 ἀνείχεσθε 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 ἀνείχεσθε 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 *κηρύσσει*, "preacheth," and *λαμβάνετε*, "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. *φανερωθέντες* — we have been made manifest.

Rev. T. *φανερώσαντες* — we have made *it* manifest.

The former is the reading of the earlier seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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 **Σ** first hand, B, F, G, and 17. But it is obviously a part of the gloss *φανερώσαντες ἑαυτούς*, "having manifested ourselves," originally written on the margin of an early manuscript to explain the meaning of *φανερωθέντες*. This gloss actually appears in full in M, two cursives, the Gothic and Armenian Versions; while, in 67, it appears as *φανερῶσαι ἑαυτούς*. 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 cursives 1, 108, give it in the dative singular, as agreeing with *παντί*. 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."¹ 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 *ἀλλ'*.

xi. 32.

Rec. T. *πιάσαι με θέλων* — desirous to apprehend me.

Rev. T. *πιάσαι με* — in order to take me.

The presence of *θέλων* is attested by **Σ**, 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 πιάσαι 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.

xii. 7.

Rec. T. *ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι*, — lest I should be exalted above measure.

Rev. T. *διὸ ἵνα μὴ ὑπεραίρωμαι*, — 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 cursives, 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 S, A, B, F, G, 17, and Euthalius. Codex 67 strikes out *ἵνα*, and inserts *διὸ* instead. Dr. Hort says, "The documentary and transcriptional evidence place the genuineness of *διὸ* 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 *διὸ*: "*Wherefore*, lest I should be exalted overmuch, there was given me," etc. This very con-

struction appears in the Ethiopic Version. Lachmann, in like manner, places a full stop after *ἀποκαλύψεων*, "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.

GALATIANS.

iii. 10.

Rec. T. γέγραπται γάρ Ἐπικατάρατος — for it is written, Cursed.

Rev. T. γέγραπται γάρ ὅτι Ἐπικατάρατος — for it is written, Cursed.

The difference here relates solely to the text; the import of the readings is one and the same. The former is attested by K, L, most of the cursives, the Vulgate, Origen, Theodoret, and others; the latter by **N**, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, P, six cursives, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, and Armenian Versions, Euthalius, Cyril, and John Damascene. This reading is strongly supported by uncial testimony, but it is not in accordance with the apostle's habitual mode of expressing himself. Not another instance can be found in all his writings in which he employs ὅτι as a mere sign of quotation after the words γέγραπται γάρ. In iv. 22, where the language is indirect, giving the substance but not the exact phraseology of what is quoted, of course ὅτι appears, just as its corresponding English word "that" appears in the rendering. But, in every instance of direct quotation, γάρ is followed by the citation without an intervening ὅτι. Just so where he employs the formula, λέγει γάρ ἡ γραφή, "For the Scripture saith." The only apparent exception to this is in Rom. ix. 17, where τῷ Φαραώ follows γραφή. This, however, is simply to mark just where the quotation begins. The same change (of inserting ὅτι after γάρ) was attempted by some early critic, on the apostle's language as reported by Luke in Acts xxiii. 5. This, however, was very properly disregarded by the Revisers, though it is attested as genuine by **N**, A, B, three cursives, and one form of Theophylact's Commentary, and is

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 cursives, 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 **N**, D and E as afterwards corrected, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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. εἰς τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν — into your hearts.

Rev. T. εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἡμῶν — into our hearts.

The latter reading is attested by **N**, A, B, C, D first hand, F, G, P, fifteen cursives, 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 cursives, 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 ἐστέ, "*ye* are." But ἡμῶν 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 ἡμῶν 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 ἡμῶν 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 X'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 X 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 Θεόν, *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 Θεοῦ; another, διὰ Θεοῦ; another, διὰ Θεόν; another, Θεοῦ διὰ Χριστόν; another, simply διὰ Χριστοῦ; another, διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; another, taking the apostle's words from Rom. viii. 17, μὲν Θεοῦ συγκληρονόμος δὲ Χριστοῦ; 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. διὰ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας. — by promise.

Rev. T. δι' ἐπαγγελίας. — through promise.

The presence of the article is attested by B, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, most of the cursives, Origen four times, Theodoret, and others. It is wanting in **Σ**, 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 σάρκα in the previous clause, with which the phraseology here was made to correspond in this respect.

iv. 25.

Rec. T. τὸ γὰρ Ἀγαρ — For this Agar.

Rev. T. τὸ δὲ Ἀγαρ — Now this Hagar.

The Revisers' δὲ 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 γὰρ is that of **Σ**, C, F, G, most of the cursives, 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, Œcumenius, Victorinus, Augustine, and others. It was originally overlooked and omitted probably in consequence of the juxtaposition of the syllables γὰρ Ἀγαρ, — the eye of the transcriber passing unconsciously from the one to the other before his pen had completed its work. After the omission, δὲ was inserted as a connecting link. Westcott and Hort adopt the latter; but Lachmann, Tregelles, Tischendorf, Lightfoot, and others, adopt γὰρ. It is no doubt the true reading.

v. 1.

Rec. T. Τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ οὖν, ἣ Χριστὸς ἡμᾶς ἠλευθέρωσε, στήκετε, — Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free.

Rev. T. τῇ ἐλευθερίᾳ ἡμᾶς Χριστὸς ἠλευθέρωσε· στήκετε οὖν, — With freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore.

In attestation of the *ῆ* 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 Œcumenius. Its omission is according to **Σ**, 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, ἡμᾶς Χριστός, is attested by **Σ** 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 *ῆ* was early dropped by an inattentive scribe on account of its being followed by ἡμᾶς, 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.¹ If we restore η , 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. $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$, $\phi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\iota$, — envyings, murders, drunkenness.

Rev. T. $\phi\theta\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota$, $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\theta\alpha\iota$, — 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 \aleph , B, five cursives, the twelfth-century Demidovian manuscript of the Vulgate, Clement of Alexandria, Euthalius, Chrysostom in one place, Augustine, and Irenæus 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 *homoioleuton*. Its omission in this way is far more probable than that it was

¹ As examples of this, witness the omission of ν in $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in Matt. i. 18, by \aleph , B, C, P, S, Z, Δ , and other documents, originating, perhaps, in the influence of $\gamma\epsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\sigma\omega\varsigma$ in i. 1; also in $\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ in Matt. i. 20, by K, Δ ; in $\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ in Matt. xii. 34, by Δ and a few cursives; in $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\eta$ in Mark xiv. 21, by A, L, Δ , 69, and other cursives; and in $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\upsilon$ 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 η , "may be," after $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\eta\mu\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$. In Matt. vii. 14, L omits the article η after $\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\eta$. The omission of λ is of frequent occurrence. In like manner, in Matt. xiii. 16, D, M omit the article $\alpha\lambda$ after $\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\iota$, "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.

introduced from Rom. i. 29. The fact that it appears in all the ancient versions, which would hardly be the case if it were a spurious reading, confirms this view.

vi. 2.

We must unite with Lachmann, Tischendorf, Meyer, Ellicott, and others, in regarding the future indicative $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$, "ye shall fulfil," as the true reading here, instead of the aorist imperative $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$, "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 \aleph , A, C, the Greek texts of D and E, K, L, N, 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. $\epsilon\acute{\nu}$ γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὔτε περιτομή — For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision.

Rev. T. οὔτε γὰρ περιτομή — For neither circumcision.

The received reading here is attested by \aleph , 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 cursives, 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."

EPHESIANS.

i. 1.

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 \aleph 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 cursives, 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 \aleph 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 Laodiceans 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 Laodicean Church, calls it the Epistle to the Laodiceans. 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 legitimately 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.

i. 14.

Rec. T. τῷ Πνεύματι . . . τῷ Ἀγίῳ, ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν — that Holy Spirit . . . which is the earnest.

Rev. T. τῷ Πνεύματι . . . τῷ Ἀγίῳ, ὃ ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν — the Holy Spirit . . . which is an earnest.

The received reading ὅς has the support of \aleph , D, E, K, most of the cursives, Didymus, Chrysostom in his comment, Theodoret, John Damascene, Photius, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Victorinus, and others. The Revisers' ὃ is the reading of A, B, F, G, L, fifteen cursives, Athanasius, Euthalius, Chrysostom in the text, and Cyril. Lachmann, like the Revisers, adopts this as the true reading. Tischendorf adopts ὅς. Tregelles also reads ὅς, but places ὃ in the margin; while Westcott and Hort place ὃ in the text, and ὅς in the margin. Ὅς is probably the original and true reading, early set aside by some critical hand for ὃ, on account of the gender of the antecedent, Πνεῦμα, "Spirit." The apostle, in employing the masculine, conforms the gender of the relative to that of the predicate noun in its own clause, namely, ἀρραβὼν, "an earnest," or pledge. In ii. 13, the relative represents a plural noun, θλίψεις, "tribulations"; but, inasmuch as the predicate nominative is in the singular, the relative ἥτις is in the singular also, to agree in *number* with δόξα, "glory." In vi. 17, the noun following in the predicate is a neuter, ῥῆμα, "a word"; hence the relative is neuter, though it refers back to the feminine μακαίρα, "sword." In 1 Tim. iii. 15, the noun in the predicate of the relative clause is a feminine, ἐκκλησία, "the church," and the relative is accordingly ἥτις, though the antecedent is a masculine, οἷκω. On the same principle, in Gal. iii. 16, the relative is ὅς, "who,"—the following noun being Χριστός, "Christ," though the antecedent is a neuter, σπέρμα, "seed." The same is true in 1 Tim. iii. 16, where the relative (which appears in some documents as ὃ and in others as Θεός), though representing the neuter noun, μυστήριον, "mystery," immediately preceding, is

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 *ὁ* is the work of another, who thought he had discovered an error, and desired to correct it.

i. 15.

Rec. T. *καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν εἰς πάντας*—and love unto all.

Rev. T. *καὶ τὴν εἰς πάντας*—and which *ye shew* toward all.

The common reading, *τὴν ἀγάπην*, is vouched for by the seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, 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 *Σ* 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.

v. 2.

Rec. T. *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*—as Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us.

Rev. T. *καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ὑμᾶς, καὶ παρέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*—even as Christ also loved you, and gave himself up for us.

It is altogether improbable that the apostle Paul ever dictated or penned words according to this revised reading. There was no call for such writing on his part. And it is unjust to represent him as having thus expressed himself,—especially when the source of such incoherence is obvious. The apostle wrote, "Be followers of God as beloved children; and walk in love, even as Christ loved us, and gave himself up for us." But some copyist, governed by the person of the preceding verbs, carelessly wrote *ὑμᾶς*, "you," for *ἡμᾶς*, "us," leaving the second "us" unchanged. And so it passed into a number of copies, giving this reading more or less currency. Afterwards, some corrector tried his pen. But, instead of changing the "you" back to "us," he altered the second "us" to "you." Thus, at least three different classes of manuscripts came into use;—the original reading "us . . . us"; the first departure therefrom reading "you . . . us"; and the second departure "you . . . you." This accounts for the preponderance of documentary attestation in support of the second "us"; while the manuscripts, versions, and Fathers are nearly equally divided between "us" and "you" after "loved."

v. 30.

Rec. T. *μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ, ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ*.—we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.

Rev. T. *μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ*.—we are members of his body.

The entire reading, as given in the Received Text, is attested by *Σ*'s seventh-century corrector, D, E, F, G, L, P, nearly

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 \times 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 *ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ*, 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

us by prefixing the words, "even as Christ also [nourisheth and cherisheth] the church"; and adding immediately after, "This is a great mystery (or hidden truth); but I am speaking concerning Christ and the church." (Verse 32.) The words, properly rendered, would read, "We are [so to speak] members of his body, out of his flesh and out of his bones." The language, of course, is figurative, and must be so interpreted, without subjecting it to tension or violence.

PHILIPPIANS.

ii. 1.

THE change made by the Revisers in this verse from *τινά* 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, — **Σ**, A, B, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, more than fifty cursives, Euthalius, Chrysostom, John Damascene, and Œcumenius; 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 *τὶ* to *τις* before *παραμύθιον*, "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 cursives, and in Theodoret and Theophylact. Though *τις 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 with it 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 *at* 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 at." The Greek word *δινάζειν* 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 at," 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. *ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὐ λογίζομαι κατεληφέναι*. — I count not myself to have apprehended.

Rev. T. *ἐγὼ ἑμαυτὸν οὕτω λογίζομαι κατεληφέναι*. — 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 cursives, 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. *Οὕτω* is vouched for by **Σ**, A, the Greek text of D, P, 17, and

about forty other cursives, the Memphitic, the Ethiopic, the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, Clement of Alexandria, Basil, Euthalius, Chrysostom in one place, in another οὐδέπω, and in yet another οὐ 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 λογίζομαι, but κατειληφέναι. 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 οὐπω forbids it. This, however, is to be expected, as the word is merely a modification of οὐ, which belongs to λογίζομαι.

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, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. The omission is found only in B, F, G, one cursive, 47, the Thebaic, the only version except the Latin versions of F and G, Chrysostom, Euthalius, and Victorinus. We do not understand why the word should be omitted here, yet retained at the close of 1 Cor. xvi. 24, when the testimony, for and against, in the two instances is as nearly identical as can well be.

COLOSSIANS.

i. 7.

Rec. T. πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, — for you a faithful minister of Christ.

Rev. T. πιστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν διάκονος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, — a faithful minister of Christ on our behalf.

The ὑμῶν of the Received Text and the Revisers' margin is attested by the seventh-century corrector of **Σ**, C, D second hand, E, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Latin versions of D and F as well as that of E, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Gothic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, the Arabic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, Sedulius, Ambrosiaster, and others. The ἡμῶν, of the Revised Text, is less strongly attested by **Σ** first hand, A, B, the Greek text of F, and of D according to the original scribe, G, ten cursives, and only the Latin translation of G among all the versions. It was carelessly introduced in place of ὑμῶν in consequence of following so closely after the preceding ἡμῶν. That it is a false reading is obvious from iv. 12, 13: "Epaphras, who is one of you . . . always striving for you (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, as here), in his prayers, etc. . . . he hath much labor for you" (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 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 laboring with him in his imprisonment.

i. 12.

The marginal reading, ὑμᾶς, "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 **Σ**, B, half a dozen cursives, 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 ἀποκατηλλάγητε, "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, ἀποκαταλλαγέντες, "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 νυνί, 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, ἀποκαταλλάξαι, "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 unreprouvable in his [Christ's] presence." (Compare 2 Cor. v. 18, 19; iv. 14; xi. 2; Eph. v. 25–27; Jude 24, 25.)

i. 27.

Rec. T. ὃς ἐστι Χριστός — which is Christ.

Rev. T. ὃ ἐστι Χριστός — which is Christ.

The first of these readings is attested by **Σ**, C, D, E, K, L, most of the cursives, 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 σώματος ὃ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐκκλησία in verse 24. But the apostle's usual mode of writing calls for the masculine, because 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 ὃ (though the latter place ὃς 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 αὐτῇ ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. — abounding therein with thanksgiving.

Rev. T. περισσεύοντες ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ. — abounding in thanksgiving.

The words ἐν αὐτῇ 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 αὐτῇ may have sprung. On the contrary, the presence of ἐν αὐτῇ tends indirectly to prove that ἐν αὐτῇ is a part of the original

text, set aside for what was incorrectly considered the true reading. Others, while retaining ἐν αὐτῇ, omitted ἐν εὐχαριστίᾳ, — a reading preserved to us in Codex P, which constitutes an additional witness in favor of ἐν αὐτῇ. 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 βεβαλούμενοι, "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. ἀ μὴ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, — intruding into those things which he hath not seen.

Rev. T. ἀ ἐώρακεν ἐμβατεύων, — 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 according to one edition, Augustine, and Jerome. The μὴ 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, *Questiones 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 μὴ is really due to transcriptional 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. Ἐμβατεύων, 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 Ἐμβατεύων instead of εἰσελθών; or if it were, as the Revisers have it, "dwelling in," that he would have used this word instead of ἐνοικῶν. Besides this, the employment by the apostle of the simple ὥρακεν 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 Ἐμβατεύω, says, "If we expunge μὴ, 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.

iii. 6.

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 οἷς, 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 οἷς, 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' οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν. — the church which is in his house.

Rev. T. τὴν κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίαν. — 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 **Σ**, 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 αὐτοῦ 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 Νυμφαν represents the Doric feminine Νύμφα. But an early reader, taking it as a feminine name, considered αὐτοῦ 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 if 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.

i. 2.

Rec. T. *μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμενοι* — making mention of you.

Rev. T. *μνείαν ποιοῦμενοι* — making mention of you.

The pronoun, as in the Received Text, is found in **Σ** corrected by its seventh-century emendator, C, D, E, F, G, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, a fragment of a seventh-century copy of the Old Latin Version, the Clementine Vulgate, three copies of Jerome's, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, the Bashmuric, the Ethiopic, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, Ambrosiaster, and others. It is wanting in **Σ** first hand, A, B, 17, 67 second hand, 122 first hand, a few copies of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and Euthalius; and was probably inconsiderately regarded by an early scribe as an improper repetition of the word employed just before, — *περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν μνείαν ὑμῶν ποιοῦμενοι*, — the remaining words being understood to mean, "making mention of you all," by considering *περὶ* equivalent to our "of," "spake of him," as in Luke ii. 38, and elsewhere frequently. To one taking this view of the words, the second *ὑμῶν* would of course appear simply as a previous transcriber's error that ought to be corrected. Hence its omission. The same thing was undoubtedly done in Eph. i. 16, where the apostle's language is very similar, and where the witnesses are in like manner divided in regard to the reading, though somewhat more strongly arrayed in favor of the omission than here. Yet in both instances a proper understanding of the apostle's meaning and construction calls for *ὑμῶν* after as well as before *μνείαν*, as the Revisers' rendering shows.

i. 10.

Rec. T. *ὃν ἤγειρεν ἐκ νεκρῶν*, — whom he raised from the dead.

Rev. T. *ὃν ἤγειρεν 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 cursives, the Armenian Version, Eusebius, and Œcumenius. Its presence is attested by **Σ**, B, D, E, F, G, L, P, most of the cursives, 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 *νεκροί*, "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 *νεκροί* 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 *νεκροί* denotes the dead in general, but *οἱ νεκροί* those who have united themselves by faith to a crucified Saviour, and with him are dead to sin, to the world, etc.

who follow **Σ**, 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 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 cursives, and Eusebius insert the article. In Phil. iii. 11, the Received Text incorrectly reads, with K, L, most of the cursives, the Memphitic and Armenian Versions, Theodoret, and Theophylact, ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν instead of ἐκ νεκρῶν. And again, in Col. ii. 12, B, D, E, F, G, 17, and most of the other cursives, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others have the same reading instead of the apostle's anarthrous 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.

ii. 12.

Rec. T. Θεοῦ τοῦ καλέσαντος ὑμᾶς — God, who hath called you.

Rev. T. Θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος ὑμᾶς — God, who calleth you.

The aorist participle of the Received Text, which the Revisers have thrown into the margin, is attested by **Σ**, A, six cursives, 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 cursives, 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 εἰς 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." \aleph , A, P, the margin of 67, three other cursives, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Bashmuric, Gothic, Philoxenian Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, Basil, Euthalius, and Pelagius substitute "minister" for "colaborer," 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 cursives, the Peshito Syriac, Chrysostom, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others, read "a minister of God, and our fellow-laborer."

iv. 8.

Rec. T. τὸν καὶ δόντα — who hath also given.

Rev. T. τὸν διδόντα — who giveth.

The καὶ is attested by \aleph , D first hand, F, G, K, L, most of the cursives, 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, E, ten cursives, 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 \aleph , A, K, L, most of the cursives, Clement, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, John Damascene, and others. The present of the Revised Text, has the support of \aleph first hand, B, D, E, F, G, seven or eight cursives, 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, ἀθετοῦν, "rejecting," and ἀθετεῖ, "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 ἐκάλεισεν, "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 κλέπτας, "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 Σ , 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 cursives, 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 cursives and Theophylact. The original scribe of **Σ**, however, reads "that strengtheneth," omitting "me," — the only known "authority" for this reading. Tischendorf, who frequently follows **Σ** 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. μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· Θεὸς ἐφανερώθη — great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest.

Rev. T. μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον· ὃς 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 δ , *quod*, instead of $\delta\varsigma$, *qui*. The received reading is attested by a twelfth-century corrector of \aleph , a modern emendator of A, C third hand, D third hand, K, L, P, most of the cursives, the Georgian and Slavonic Versions, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzus, Didymus, Chrysostom, Pseudo-Athanasius, Euthalius, Theodoret, Severus of Antioch, John of Damascus, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and others. The revised reading is that of \aleph 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, Eutharius, Cyril, and others. The Revisers' marginal reading, δ , 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 $\delta\varsigma$ or the neuter δ , 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 δ is not genuine. It is a variation of $\delta\varsigma$, due to the difficulty of making the latter refer back to the neuter noun *μυστήριον*. As such, it supports the reading $\delta\varsigma$. The same grammatical difficulty probably led to the changing of OC, the uncial form of $\delta\varsigma$, into $\overline{\Theta}\overline{C}$, the usual abbreviated form of $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ as it appears in the earlier uncials. 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 $\delta\varsigma$ 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 $\Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$ or δ 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 $\delta\varsigma$ in this connection, this construction, as we have already seen, is exactly after his manner of writing.¹ The wording, *μυστηρίου . . . ὃς ἐστὶ 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 ὀνειδίζομεθα*, — we labor, and suffer reproach.

Rev. T. *κοπιῶμεν καὶ ἀγωνίζομεθα*, — we labor and strive.

The common reading here is attested by the seventh-century corrector of \aleph , D, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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 \aleph , who is noted for his innumerable careless readings, by A, C, K, the Greek texts of F and G, less than ten cursives, 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 *ΟΝΕΙΔΙΖΟΜΕΘΑ* to be the familiar *ΑΓΩΝΙΖΟΜΕΘΑ*, 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 godliness 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 considered 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 *λοιδορεῖσθαι*, "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. ἀφίστασο 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 *Σ*, 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 appearance 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 connection. 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. δῆλον ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα. — and it is certain we can carry nothing out.

Rev. T. ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα. — for neither can we carry anything out.

The first of these readings is supported by *Σ*'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, Theodoret, and John of Damascus. Codex D first hand, has a similar reading, — ἀληθὲς ὅτι οὐδέ, "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 *Σ* 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 ὅτι. Polycarp, in writing to the Philippians, has ἀλλ' οἶδέ instead of ὅτι οὐδέ, — "*but* neither have we anything to carry out." Cyprian three times gives the same reading, employing *verum* in place of ἀλλά, — "*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 *οτι* arose, in transcribing, out of "an accidental repetition of the last two letters of [the preceding] κόσμον," by reading -ον as οτι, *i.e.* by *not* repeating ον, he is wide of the mark; and Dr. Westcott wisely withholds his assent. The truth evidently is that *οτι* is a very early transcriptional error for *ετι*, made possibly in taking a copy from the autograph itself. Nothing would be easier than to mistake *ΕΤΙ* for *ΟΤΙ*; and the error once made at such a time, the true reading would naturally be lost. It is like printing "selfe" for "selle" 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 Revisers; or giving "He" in Matt. xxiii. 39, in the Anglo-American Revisers' "Parallel New Testament," for the "Ye" which their manuscript called for. Restoring *ετι* here for *οτι*, we have the very natural and proper reading, even though it be a *proclivior scriptio*, "For we brought nothing into the world; nor yet can we carry anything out." The apostle employs *ετι* 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. xi. 32, 36.)

¹ *Notes on Select Readings*, p. 134.

TIMOTHY.

i. 11.

Rec. T. ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος ἐθνῶν. — an apostle, and a teacher of the Gentiles.

Rev. T. ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος. — an apostle, and a teacher.

The Revisers' reading is found in only two Greek manuscripts, — *Σ* first hand, and A; yet this is viewed by Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort as authoritative testimony. Codex 17, which usually sides with these documents, omits ἐθνῶν; but, as it reads διάκονος, "a minister," instead of διδάσκαλος, its testimony respecting ἐθνῶν is of but little weight. The received reading, which is accepted as genuine by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, Alford, Ellicott, and modern editors generally, is strongly attested by the early seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, 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 ἐθνῶν 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 ἐθνῶν 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."¹ 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.² It is hardly possible that ἐθνῶν, 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 \aleph , F, G, and 17. The omission of the article is a palpable error, rendering the clause meaningless;

¹ Herzog's *Encyclopedia*, article, "Bibel-Text:—the N. T."

² Schaff-Herzog, *Encycl.* (3d ed.), Vol. i., p. 278.

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 ἀκούσασιν was not adopted here in place of ἀκούσῃ, "might hear." It is true, the change would not have affected the rendering in the least. But the plural is attested by \aleph , 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 Damascene, and possibly one or two others. It is true that the

singular is in accordance with the apostle's usual mode of writing, 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.

iii. 1.

Rec. T. ἀρχαῖς καὶ ἐξουσίαις — to principalities and powers.

Rev. T. ἀρχαῖς ἐξουσίαις — to rulers, to authorities.

The conjunction is preserved in D third hand, E second hand, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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, Ambrosiaster, and others. It is wanting in **Σ**, 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 ἀρχή and ἐξουσία 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 καί was an early error, evidently introduced in consequence of the preceding ἀρχαῖς, leaving the impression upon the careless scribe that he had penned the word when he had not; and though the error is preserved 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 καί, 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 \aleph , 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, Œcumenius, 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 *ὑμῖν*, is a transcriptional error for *ἡμῖν*, "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.

Verse 10.

Rec. T. *ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου*, — in my bonds.

Rev. T. *ἐν τοῖς δεσμοῖς* — in my bonds.

We see no good reason for omitting the pronoun from the text here. Its presence is attested by the early seventh-century corrector of *Σ*, C, D third hand, E, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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 *Σ* first hand, A, D first hand, F, G, 17, and three other cursives, 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 *Σ*, 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 \aleph 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 \aleph , 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.

i. 12.

Rec. T. ὥσει περιβόλαιον ἔλξεις αὐτούς, — as a vesture shalt thou fold them up.

Rev. T. ὥσει περιβόλαιον ἔλξεις αὐτούς, ὡς ἱμάτιον, — as a mantle shalt thou roll them up, as a garment.

The received reading (without addition) is according to D second hand, K, L, M, P, all the cursives, the Latin version of F, the Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Chrysostom, Euthalius, Theodoret, and others. The revised is the reading of \aleph , A, B, D first hand, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Armenian and Ethiopic Versions. Lachmann adopts the latter reading; Tregelles gives it the preference, still admitting that the other may be the true reading; while Westcott and Hort, in adopting it, connect ὡς ἱμάτιον with what follows, and read, "As a mantle shalt thou roll them together; as a garment they shall also be changed." That it is a false reading is obvious. The phrase "as a garment" comes in very appropriately in verse 11: "They all shall wax old *as doth a garment*." But here, in verse 12, it is out of place, so that editors hardly know what to do with it. The Revisers connect it with the preceding clause. But it is a bungling, superfluous addition there. Westcott and Hort connect it with the following verb, but not as the scribe of E did, by placing it after καί, for he saw that otherwise the conjunction would be misplaced and the words rendered meaningless; for nothing is previously spoken of as being "changed." If the verb were "shall wax old," — the word that is used in verse 11, — there might be some propriety in having καί follow ὡς ἱμάτιον, and reading, "As a garment they shall *also grow old*." But what settles the whole question is the fact that the writer is quoting from Psa. cii. 25–27, closely following the Septuagint Version here as elsewhere; and in that connection the phrase appears only as it is given here in verse 11. The expression was, no doubt, transferred by some early reader from the preceding

verse to the margin as a possible explanation of the meaning of the phrase *ὥσει περιβόλαιον*; 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 **S**, 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 *τίνες*, "who?" instead of the indefinite pronoun *τινές*, "some;" and consequently place an interrogation point, instead of a colon or a semicolon, after the word "provoke." This either makes the *γάρ* that introduces the verse meaningless and useless, or compels us to take it as a mere emphatic expletive, equivalent to "why," "forsooth," 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. *μὴ συγκεκραμένους* — not being mixed.

Rev. T. *μὴ συγκεκρασμένους* — because they were not united.

The first of these readings is attested by **S**, 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 cursives, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Euthalius, Macarius, Chrysostom, Photius, Theophylact, Œcumenius, 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, -ους, of the Revisers' word should be a transcriptional blunder for -ος? What would the "overwhelming critical evidence" be worth? Simply nothing. Yet this is just what that reading is,—an error to which the preceding *ἐκείνους* 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

¹ Roberts: *Companion of the R. V.*, p. 35.

of justice. The reading of the Received Text here, testified to by *Σ*, and by the Peshito Syriac, the most ancient of all our witnesses, is, no doubt, the genuine reading. The words *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, 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 συγκεκραμένος 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 *τοῖς ἀκούσασιν*, 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 *καταβαλλόμενοι*,—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.”¹ 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 backsliding 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 *θεμέλιον* 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 βαπτισμῶν διδαχὴν 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 διδαχὴν into the text on the sole documentary evidence of B and *Δ*. 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 cursives, 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 cursives, 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 . . . οὐδέποτε δύναται — the law . . . can never.

Rev. T. ὁ νόμος . . . οὐδέποτε δύνανται — 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 cursives, the Latin versions of D, E, and F, the Vulgate, the Memphitic and Bashmuric Versions, Origen, Chrysostom giving the text, Theodoret, and Œcumenius, who adds, “That is, *the law* can never.” The plural, which the Revisers have adopted, is found in *Σ*, A,¹ C, D second hand, P, 17, and between thirty and forty other cursives, Chrysostom in two other instances, Euthalius, John Damascene, and Theophylact. Dr.

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 a later hand.

Hort very strangely says,¹ "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 δύνανται." 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 δύνανται 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, δύναιται, 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 δύνανται. It is too plainly erroneous,—occasioned by the foregoing προσφέρουσιν, "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.

X. 34.

Rec. T. γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς — knowing in yourselves that ye have.

Rev. T. γινώσκοντες ἔχειν ἑαυτοῦς — knowing that ye yourselves have.

The marginal reading, "that ye have for yourselves," is to be preferred here to that of the text, either the Received or the Revised. The received reading, indeed, is unsupported except by a few cursives. It is an obvious interpretation of ἑαυτοῖς, the marginal reading, and is of comparatively recent date. The Revisers' ἑαυτοῦς is attested by **Σ**, A, H, five cursives, the Memphitic Version, Clement of Alexandria, and Euthalius. The Latin versions of D, E, F, and the Vulgate read *vos*, though this does not properly represent the reflexive of the Greek. In like manner, the Paschal Chronicle substitutes ὑμᾶς for ἑαυτοῦς. These readings clearly indicate that, on the part of those who made them, there was a sense of the unfitness of *vosmet*, *vos ipsos*, or ἑαυτοῦς in this connection. And so there is. There is nothing in the context to call for the emphatic reading, "Knowing that ye *yourselves* have a better possession." But, as the writer had just addressed his readers as having joyfully submitted to being robbed of their goods, he very naturally added that they did this under the consciousness that they had *for themselves*, or still remaining to *themselves*, a better possession, and one that would abide by them. It was simply because the force of the dative here was not perceived that it was early changed to the accusative. And this reading, by having been transmitted to us in the two oldest extant Greek manuscripts, is thrust into the text as the true one. The simple dative ἑαυτοῖς is attested as genuine by D, E, K, L, about seventy cursives, Chrysostom, Isidore, Theodoret, John Damascene, and Theophylact. It is adopted by Griesbach, Matthæi, Delitzsch, Alford, and others. Instead of standing in the margin, it ought to have its rightful place in the text, as it has in editions embodying the readings and renderings preferred by the American Committee of Revisers.

xii. 3.

Rec. T. ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀντιλογίαν, — contradiction of sinners against himself.

Rev. T. ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ἀντιλογίαν, — 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 *αὐτόν*, *αὐτόν*, and *ἑαυτόν* (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 *ἑαυτοὺς* and *αὐτοὺς*, is supported by *Σ*, 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 censurers 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 *ἑαυτοὺς* 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 so 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 παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε, — If ye endure chastening.

Rev. T. εἰς παιδεῖαν ὑπομένετε. — It is for chastening that ye endure.

The common reading, *εἰ*, is attested only by a large number of cursives, Euthalius, and Theophylact. The other (*εἰς*) is attested by all the uncials, more than fifty cursives, the Vulgate, and virtually the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, and Armenian Versions. Codex D, however, connects *εἰς παιδεῖαν* with the preceding words: "But he scourgeth every son whom he *receiveth for chastening*"; then puts the following *ὑπομένετε* in the aorist imperative, *ὑπομείνατε*, "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 *ei* 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 *ei* or *eis* 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 *ὑπομένετε*. This word literally means to remain under, then to continue patiently or without chafing under, to remain under and be submissive to. Now, by giving this rendering to *ὑπομένετε*, and reading *ei* 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 chasten 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. *ψηλαφωμένῳ ὄρει, καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ*, — unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire.

Rev. T. *ψηλαφωμένῳ καὶ κεκαυμένῳ πυρὶ*, — unto *a mount* that might be touched, and that burned with fire.

The presence of *ὄρει*, as a part of the text, is attested by D, K, L, nearly all the cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Armenian Version, Chrysostom twice, Athanasius, Theodoret,

John Damascene, Œcumenius, and others. But the word is wanting in S, 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, Euthalius, 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 *ὄρος*, 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 *ὄρει* 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 *ὄρει* 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.

xiii. 21.

Rec. T. ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ — in every good work.

Rev. T. ἐν παντὶ ἀγαθῷ — in every good thing

The received reading here is well attested by C, D third hand, K, M, P, the whole body of the cursives, 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 ἔργῳ is according to **Σ**, 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 **Σ**. 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.

Rev. T. ποιῶν ἐν ἡμῖν — 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 cursives, 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 **Σ**, the Greek text of D, K, M, about twenty-five cursives, the Armenian Version, Œcumenius 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 **Σ** and a few other kindred documents.

JAMES.

i. 12.

Rec. T. *ὃν ἐπηγγεῖλατο ὁ Κύριος τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.* — which the Lord hath promised to them that love him.

Rev. T. *ὃν ἐπηγγεῖλατο τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν.* — which *the Lord* promised to them that love him.

The omission of *ὁ Κύριος* appears only in *Σ*, 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 independently, 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 observations respecting persons of one kind and another, — the double-minded, the lowly, the rich, the patient man. In speaking 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 *ΟΚC*, 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 mechanically 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 *ἀποσκίασματος* for *ἀποσκίασμα*, "shadow," in verse 17, a reading which is utterly unmeaning, and yet appears in *Σ* and B, — and only in those two manuscripts.

ii. 20.

Rec. T. *ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν.* — faith without works is dead.

Rev. T. *ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων ἀργή ἐστίν.* — faith apart from works is barren.

The common reading here is supported by *Σ*, A, C second hand, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito and Philoxenian Syriac, the Memphitic, Usan's Armenian, the Ethiopic Version, Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, Æcumenius, and others. The revised reading, *ἀργή*, 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 ἀργή 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. χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων — without works.

Rev. T. χωρὶς ἔργων — without works.

The presence of the article is attested by A, C, K, L, P, nearly every cursive, a catena, Theophylact and Œcumenius. It is wanting in **Σ**, 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 ἔργων 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.*

iii. 3.

Rec. T. ἰδοὺ — Behold.

Rev. T. εἰ δέ — Now if.

The revised reading is attested by **Σ**, A, B, K, L, twenty-five cursives, *ff* of the Old Latin, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, John Damascene, and Œcumenius. That of the Received Text is supported by C, P, a large number of cursives, 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 δέ 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 ἡμεῖν for ἡμῖν, and ὑμεῖν for ὑμῖν. In Acts xxvi. 5, for example, **Σ**, C, E, have θρησκία, while A, B, H, L, P, and others have θρησκεία; in Col. ii. 18, C, D, E, F, G, P, and others adopt the former spelling, while **Σ**, 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 **Σ**, while the second is generally adopted by other manuscripts. Again, in Acts i. 15, Codex E has εἴκοσι for εἴκοσι, "twenty"; and in the next verse, **Σ**, B, D, have Δαυείδ 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 εἰδέ may be only another way of spelling ἰδε, which may be said to be but another form of ἰδοῦ. (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 ἰδοὺ καὶ τὰ πλοῖα (where Codex 24 reads εἰδέ 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 ἰδοὺ (or ἰδε) 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. ὀλίγον πῦρ — a little fire.

Rev. T. ἡλίκον πῦρ — how small a fire!

The received reading is attested by A first hand, C second hand, K, L, all the cursives, 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 **Σ**, A second hand, B, C first hand, P, the Vulgate, Antiochus, and Œcumenius, — 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 ἡλίκην, a scribe, writing from dictation, might very naturally have become confused in regard to the word, and, taking ὀλίγον to be ἡλίκον, have written the latter instead of the former. One might infer this from the documentary evidence, which preponderates so strongly in favor of ὀλίγον, — 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: ἡλίκος 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 ἡλίκον and ἡλίκην 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 ἡλίκον 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, γινώσκετε, "know ye," alluded to in the margin as read by some in place of γινωσκέτω, "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, ἀδελφοί, "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.

I PETER.

iii. 21.

Rec. T. ψ . . . ἀντίτυπον — the like figure whereunto.

Rev. T. δ . . . ἀντίτυπον — which . . . after a true likeness.

The only documentary evidence in support of the first of these readings is a large number of cursives, among which is 104, a carefully written manuscript of the eleventh century, containing the whole New Testament. The δ of the Revised Text is attested by the seventh-century corrector of \aleph , A, B, C, K, L, P, between fifty and sixty cursives, a catena, the Vulgate and Armenian Versions, Didymus, Cyril, John Damascene, Theophylact, Eusebius, Cyprian, and others. The original scribe of \aleph , Codex 73, and the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions omit the relative. Constrained by documentary testimony, modern editors generally read δ instead of ψ . Yet internal evidence compels us to believe, with Dr. Hort, that the former is "a primitive error for ψ , the force of which might be hidden by the interposition of καὶ ὑμᾶς 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. "O is evidently designed to refer to the preceding word, ὕδατος, "water"; whereas the original ψ , 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

¹ *Select Readings*, p. 102.

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." Εἰς 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. xv. 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 ψ 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.

iv. 1.

Rec. T. παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκί — hath suffered for us in the flesh.

Rev. T. παθόντος σαρκί — suffered in the flesh.

In support of the received reading, we have \aleph (its seventh-century corrector simply changing ὑμῶν to ἡμῶν), A, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, 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 \aleph first hand, 31, and a few other cursives, the Peshito Syriac, Theophylact, and Eusebius, which have ὑμῶν, "you," instead of ἡμῶν, "us," — a reading which was probably introduced as an intended correction of ἡμῶν, 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, Œcumenius 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, — παθόντος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σαρκὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς, 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 ἀμαρτίας, "unto sins," in place of ἀμαρτίας, "sin," appears in **Σ** 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 πέπανται, 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 **Σ**, 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 Œcumenius. 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 *εται*, the last four letters of ἀναπαύ-εται, 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 δοξάζ-εται to begin the third line below the first *εται*. Now, in copying, the eye of the scribe, after he had written ἀναπαυ, on returning to the exemplar, might very easily have rested on the lower instead of the upper *εται*, 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 μὲν, "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.

V. 2.

Rec. T. *ἐκουσίως, μηδὲ αἰσχροκερδῶς* — willingly; not for filthy lucre.

Rev. T. *ἐκουσίως 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 cursives, a catena, the Peshito Syriac, Mai's Extracts, Œcumenius, and others. Its presence is attested by *Σ*, A, P, about twenty cursives, 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 *ἐκουσίως*, — 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 *προθύμως*, "cheerfully," or, "of a ready mind." Others inserted other words, also, in connection with it, at the close of the verse.

Ἐπισκοποῦντες, "exercising the oversight," which is referred to in the marginal note, is omitted by *Σ*, B, two cursives, 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 ἡ χαρὰ ὑμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη.* — these things write we unto you, that your joy may be full.

Rev. T. *ταῦτα γράφομεν ἡμεῖς, ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡμῶν ᾗ πεπληρωμένη.* — these things we write, that our joy may be fulfilled.

In support of the Revisers' emphatic *ἡμεῖς*, we have *Σ*, 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 Œcumenius. 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 YMEN for HMEIC. 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 cursives, the Clementine Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Philoxenian Syriac, the Armenian,

the Ethiopic, Augustine, and Theophylact and Œcumenius in their citations of the text. The reading "*our* joy" is attested by **S**, B, L, less than thirty cursives, four manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic, Erpenius' Arabic, and Theophylact and Œcumenius in commenting on the passage. (The Peshito Syriac and Erpenius' Arabic also add ἐν ὑμῖν, 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 ἵνα, 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. ἵνα τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν ἄρῃ, — to take away our sins.

Rev. T. ἵνα τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἄρῃ, — to take away sins.

The reading of the Received Text is attested by **S**, C, K, L, nearly all the cursives, a catena, the Clementine Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, the Thebaic, Athanasius, Theophylact, and Œcumenius. 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.

iii. 14.

Rec. T. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν τὸν ἀδελφὸν μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. — He that loveth not his brother abideth in death.

Rev. T. ὁ μὴ ἀγαπῶν μένει ἐν τῷ θανάτῳ. — He that loveth not abideth in death.

The received reading is attested by C, K, L, P, nearly all the cursives, the Memphitic, Woide's Thebaic, both Syriac Versions, the Ethiopic, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and Cassiodorus. The revised is vouched for by **Σ**, A, B, three cursives, the Vulgate, Münster's Thebaic, the Armenian, Didymus, Lucifer, and Augustine. Instead of τὸν ἀδελφόν being a later addition, as some suppose, its absence looks more like an early omission. If the apostle really meant that one who does not love a true Christian abides in death, he must have written, "He that loveth not his brother." But, if he meant to say in general terms that he who has no spiritual love, — no love either for God, or for men as Christians or beings for whom Christ died, — is still in a state of spiritual death, he must have omitted the words that follow in the next verse. The testimony of the documents being contradictory and nearly equally balanced, we are left to appeal to the text for additional evidence, if there is any. Here, in only the preceding sentence, we find the apostle saying, "We know that we have passed from death to life because we *love the brethren*." Now, after having written this, it is hardly possible for him to have said, "He that doth not love, abideth in death," and then to have added in the very next breath, "Every one that *hateth his brother*, is a murderer." After having written, "He that *loveth not*, abideth in death," he would naturally, if not of necessity, have written, "He *that hateth*, is a murderer," — a truth, no doubt; but not just the truth to which he gave utterance. The context evidently enough calls for "He that *loveth not his brother*, abideth in death." But some critical reader of the second century, under the impression that the apostle had drawn the lines a

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* [ἐαυτοῦ instead of αὐτοῦ, "his"] brother, 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. πῶς 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 cursives, a catena, the Vulgate, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, John Damascene, Theophylact, Œcumenius, Cyril, and Augustine. The second is attested by **Σ**, B, six cursives (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.

v. 18.

Rec. T. ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τηρεῖ ἑαυτόν, — he that is begotten of God keepeth himself.

Rev. T. ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ τηρεῖ αὐτόν, — he that was begotten of God keepeth him.

The former of these readings is attested by **Σ**, A (the original scribe, after having written αὐτόν, finding that he had erred, at once wrote a small uncial ε over the α of αὐτόν, and so changed the word to ἑαυτόν),¹ K, L, P, every cursive but one, a catena, the Peshito Syriac, Memphitic, Thebaic, Armenian, and Ethiopic Versions, Origen three times, Ephraem Syrus twice, Didymus four times, Severus, Theophylact, Œcumenius, and others. It is favored even by the rendering of the Vulgate, *sed generatio Dei servat eum*, "but a divine birth (or, his being begotten of God) keeps him." The other reading is attested only by B and one cursive. And even B's testimony is questionable. Its reading may be either αὐτόν, "him," or αὐτόν, "himself." In Matt. vi. 34, where all other witnesses, including the sixth or seventh century corrector of B, read ἐαυτῆς, B as given by its scribe, together with L and Δ, reads αὐτης, the breathing and accent being wanting. But with the rough breathing, αὐτῆς, it is only another mode of spelling ἐαυτῆς, as Westcott and Hort regard it. So in Luke xii. 17, B and L first hand read ἐν αὐτῷ, where all other manuscripts have ἐν ἐαυτῷ; and Westcott and Hort give it as ἐν αὐτῷ, "in himself." In verse 21 of the same chapter, **Σ** first hand, B, L, and a single lectionary read αὐτῷ (Westcott and Hort, αὐτῷ), where all others read ἐαυτῷ. In Luke xxiii. 2, B, G, T, and a single cursive read αὐτόν, where all other documents have ἑαυτόν, which

¹ Scrivener, after speaking of "the fact that αὐτόν is corrected into ἑαυτόν 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 *αἰρούς* (with the rough breathing), following the spelling of **Σ**, B, L, T, and a few cursives. (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 *αυτον* (Westcott and Hort *αὐτόν*), where all others read *ἐαυτόν*. 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 **Σ** third hand, and A second hand, read *ἐαυτόν αὐτοῖς*, *i.e.* Jesus did not trust "himself to them," **Σ** first hand, B, L, one cursive, Origen once, and Cyril once, read *αυτον* (which Westcott and Hort make *αὐτόν*) *αὐτοῖς*, but A and Codex 253 read *αὐτόν ἐαυτοῖς*, *i.e.* "him to themselves," — completely reversing things. In John xx. 10, **Σ** first hand, B, L, read *αυτους* (Westcott and Hort *αὐρούς*), where all the other fifteen uncials, together with **Σ** as corrected early in the seventh century, every cursive, Chrysostom, and Cyril read *ἐαυτούς*. (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 *αυτω*, *αυτον*, *αυτης*, 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' αυτον*, *μεθ' αυτου*, 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 *αὐτῷ*, as Westcott and Hort give it, in the tenth verse of this chapter, which the Revisers write *αὐτῷ*, and translate "him." It is simply the shorter form of writing the *ἐαυτῷ* 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 *αὐτόν*, but *αὐτόν*. The reading *ἐαυτόν*, 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; *xcvii.* 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.

12), "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 $\delta \gammaεννηθείς$ here denotes the Son of God is an unwarranted one. It is the term $\delta \muονογενής$, "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 $\delta \muονογενής υἱός$, "the only-begotten Son." In Gal. iv. 29, $\delta \gammaεννηθείς$, "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, $\delta γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ$, "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 $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$. 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 enforces and confirms the same truth. Hence $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ 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 ἀπολέσωμεν τὰ ἐργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ . . . ἀπολάβωμεν. — that we lose not those things which we have wrought, but that we receive [a full reward].

Rev. T. ἵνα μὴ ἀπολέσῃτε τὰ ἐργασάμεθα, ἀλλὰ . . . ἀπολάβῃτε. — 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 Œcumenius 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 ye lose not what ye have wrought out (or obtained by working), but that ye receive a full reward.” This is attested by **Σ**, 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 Œcumenius 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.

JUDE.

Verse 22.

Rec. T. καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεεῖτε διακρινόμενοι, — And of some have compassion, making a difference.

Rev. T. καὶ οὓς μὲν ἐλεᾶτε διακρινόμενους, — 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 Œcumenius, each in citing the text. The accusative of the Revised Text is the reading of **Σ**, A, B, C, nearly twenty cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Versions, Clement, Ephraem Syrus, Jerome of course, Cassiodorus, and Theophylact and Œcumenius 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 ἀρπάζοντες, “snatching,” or “pulling,” and μισοῦντες, “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, ἐλεεῖτε, or, as the Revised Text has it, ἐλεᾶτε, 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, ἐλέγχετε appears instead of ἐλεεῖτε in A, C first hand, nearly twenty cursives, the Vulgate, the Memphitic, the Armenian, the Ethiopic, Ephraem Syrus, Cassiodorus, Theophylact and (Ecumenius 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 ἐλεεῖτε in the next verse as well as here, some early corrector of the text may be supposed to have substituted ἐλέγχετε for it in this place, while some other corrector, retaining ἐλεεῖτε here, omitted it in verse 23. But this is only an objection in appearance. Let us assume that ἐλέγχετε is the original reading here, and ἐλεεῖτε or ἐλεᾶτε 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 ἐλε-, the first part of ἐλέγχετε, 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 εῖτε or ᾶτε, instead of γχετε; then, returning to his proper place without observing his error, he would have gone on with

the next word, διακρινόμενοι. This will account for the omission of ἐλέγχετε, and the appearance in its place of ἐλεεῖτε. 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 ἐλέγχετε 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 οὓς μὲν ἐλέγχετε διακρινόμενοι, 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, abhorring 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 *λούσαντι*, "washed," is set aside by the Revisers, and *λύσαντι*, "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 *Σ*, A, C, ten or more cursives, the Syriac and Armenian Versions, and Primasius. 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 1 John i. 7, took the preposition *ἐν* in its primary sense of "in," instead of considering it the accompaniment of an instrumental dative, in the sense of "by" or "with," and naturally enough considered *λύσαντι*, "loosed," an error for *λούσαντι*, "washed," and so changed the original reading. But the revised reading is in perfect accord with Acts xx. 28, Eph. i. 7, ii. 13, 1 Pet. i. 18, 19, and other passages.

i. 15.

Rec. T. *πεπυρωμένοι* — they burned.

Rev. T. *πεπυρωμένης* — it had been refined.

The former is the reading of B, P, most of the cursives, Andreas, and Arethas. It cannot be the true reading, for *feet burning* in a furnace could hardly be represented as glowing like burnished brass. They would very soon be consumed. The other reading is attested by A, C, only. It is an unmeaning reading, out of all grammatical harmony with the context, and utterly untranslatable. The true reading seems to be that adopted by Tischendorf, — *πεπυρωμένῳ*, "burning," referring to *χαλκολιβάνῳ*, "burnished brass." It is attested by *Σ*, at least four cursives, the Vulgate, Memphitic, Thebaic, Syriac, and Ethiopic Versions, Irenæus according to his Latin interpreter, Cyprian, Victorinus, Primasius, and others. The conjecture of Dürstiedick, in his critical note on the passage, that *πεπυρωμένης* is a clerical error for *πεπυρωμένη*, a form in support of which there is not the least documentary evidence, is of no weight whatever. It proceeds on the assumption that *χαλκολιβάνῳ*, a word used nowhere but here and in ii. 18, is feminine; while John doubtless viewed it as a masculine, like *χαλκός*, "brass," and *λίβανος*, "frankincense," out of which he probably coined the word, though it is commonly regarded as a neuter.

ii. 1.

Rec. T. *Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῆς Ἐφεισίνης ἐκκλησίας* — Unto the angel of the church of Ephesus.

Rev. T. *Τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐκκλησίας* — 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.

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 **Σ**, B, P, all the cursives, 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.

ii. 13.

Rec. T. *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐν αἷς Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτυς μου ὁ πιστός*, — in those days wherein Antipas was my faithful martyr.

Rev. T. *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἀντίπας ὁ μάρτυς μου, ὁ 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 **Σ**, P, eight or ten cursives, the Armenian Version, Andreas, and Arethas. It is also favored by the reading *αἷς* without the preposition, found in B, more than forty cursives, one manuscript of the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, both forms of the Ethiopic, and the fourth-century treatise, *Questiones ex utroque Testamento*. The *ἐν αἷς*, or possibly the simple *αἷς*, 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 Haymo, 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 *αἷς*, 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 *μου* after *πιστός*, which, though found in A, C, and two cursives, is wanting in **Σ**, 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," *πεπυρωμένης*, 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.

ii. 17.

Here, in place of *τῷ νικῶντι*, "to him that overcometh," A and C have *τῷ νικούντι*, a false form, as if from a verb in *-έω* instead of from one in *-άω*. Yet Tischendorf adopts it. The same false spelling appears also in A at verse 7, which Lachmann adopts; and again in C at xv. 2, where we find *νικούντας* for *νικῶντας*, "those that are victorious." These forms can be attributed only to the ignorance of scribes; and they show that the old manuscripts especially, since they are more confided in than later ones, need to be closely and continually scrutinized.

iii. 2.

Rec. T. *οὐ . . . εὗρηκά σου τὰ ἔργα* — I have not found thy works.

Rev. T. *οὐ . . . εὗρηκά 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 1, 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 σου 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, ἔχον, 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 φωνή, ζῶον, ἀρνίον, ζῶα, etc. Whereas, the readings, λέγων, ἔχων, 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, ἄξιος . . . τὸ ἀρνίον (Tischendorf, and Westcott

and Hort in the margin, but not the Revisers, after Codex A) ; xi. 4, λυχνίαι . . . ἑστῶτες, symbolizing the teachers and the receivers of the truth ; xi. 15, φωναὶ . . . λέγοντες, the "voices" representing the angelic hosts of heaven ; xiv. 19, τὴν ληνὸν . . . 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 τεῖχος . . . 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 θηρίῳ (neuter) ὅς, "the beast *who*," xiii. 14, — that beast symbolizing a body of tyrannical rulers.

v. 9.

Rec. T. ἡγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἡμᾶς ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου — thou hast redeemed us to God by thy blood.

Rev. T. ἡγόρασας τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ αἵματι σου — thou didst purchase unto God with 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 αὐτοῦς, "them," in the next verse, with which "us" was supposed to be inconsistent; and at the same time, βασιλεύσομεν, "we shall reign," in verse 10, which is demanded both by ἡμᾶς here, and by the closing words of iv. 1, was changed to βασιλεύσουσιν, "they shall reign," which Griesbach, Tischendorf, and others adopt, and afterwards to βασιλεύουσιν, "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 καὶ 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 φωνή, — 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 γῇ in Matt. ii. 6. The earliest known manuscript of the New Testament that contains an 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 αὐτοῦ, — the great day of his 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 **Σ**, 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*,¹ 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 αὐτοὺς θέλη ἀδικῆσαι, — if any man will hurt them.

Rev. T. εἰ τις θελήσῃ αὐτοὺς ἀδικῆσαι, — if any man shall desire to hurt them.

The common reading *θέλη* is almost without support. The revised *θελήσῃ* is the reading of **Σ** and A only. The true reading seems to be *θέλει*, the reading of B, C, P, nearly all the cursives, Andreas, Arethas, and Primasius. It is the true reading 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. *Θέλει* should be read in both clauses of the verse, with its corresponding English, "purposeth," or "desireth." Then, if *καὶ* 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. τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν . . . τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν . . . τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν — their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies . . . their dead bodies.

Rev. T. τὸ πτώμα αὐτῶν . . . τὸ πτώμα αὐτῶν . . . τὰ 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 τὸ σῶμα, "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 **Σ**, P, ten or twelve cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Andreas, Victorinus, Primasius, and others; in the second instance, by the same witnesses except **Σ**, 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, Armenian, and Egyptian Versions, Arethas, and others; in the second, by the same witnesses, together with **Σ** and one manuscript 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 τὸ πτώμα αὐτῶν 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 πτώμα 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. βλέψουσιν, shall see . . . ἀφήσουσι, shall suffer . . . χαροῦσιν, shall rejoice . . . εὐφρανθήσονται, shall make merry . . . πέμψουσιν, shall send.

Rev. T. βλέπουσιν, do look . . . ἀφίλουσι, suffer . . . χαίρουσιν, rejoice . . . εὐφραίνονται, make merry . . . πέμψουσιν, 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 cursives, a few manuscripts of the Vulgate, the Armenian Version, and two manuscripts of Andreas, adopts the present *πέμπουσιν*, "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 cursives, 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 cursives, 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. τοῖς μικροῖς καὶ τοῖς μεγάλαις, — small and great.
 Rev. T. τοὺς μικροὺς καὶ τοὺς μεγάλους, — the small and the great.

These words are supposed to belong to the preceding expression *τοῖς φοβουμένοις*, 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 cursives, 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

τοὺς ἀγίους καὶ τοὺς φοβουμένους, an obvious transcriptional error for *τοῖς ἀγίοις καὶ τοῖς φοβουμένοις*. 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 (Psa. cxv. 13), *εὐλόγησε τοὺς φοβουμένους τὸν Κύριον, τοὺς μικροὺς 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 ἐστάθην ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμμον τῆς θαλάσσης. — And I stood upon the sand of the sea.

Rev. T. καὶ ἐστάθη 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 cursives, 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 *ἐστράθη* 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. *ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὰ ὀνόματα* — 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 ὀνόματα*. But the relative *ὧν*, referring back to *πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες*, "all who dwell," has been improperly changed to *οὗ*. The former is attested by *Σ*, 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 *οὐαί*, — a clerical blunder, of course, but perhaps for *οὗ οὐ*. 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 ὦν to οὗ, were led by this seeming impropriety to substitute the plural τὰ ὀνόματα, of the Received Text, for the singular τὸ ὄνομα, 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 **Σ**, P, 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 τις αἰχμαλωσίαν συνάγει, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν ὑπάγει.** — He that leadeth into captivity, shall go into captivity.

Rev. T. **εἰ τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν, εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν 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 αἰχμαλωσίαν, 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 uncials, **Σ**, B, C, P, and four of the best cursives, 28, 38, 79, 95, read simply εἰ (though C has ἡ here) τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν 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 αἰχμαλωσίαν 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 τις εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν συνάγει (or ἀπάγει, as several documents read), εἰς αἰχμαλωσίαν 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 A (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 ἀποκτενεῖ, "shall kill." This present is attested by **Σ**, 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 those 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."

xiii. 15.

Rec. T. ἐδόθη αὐτῷ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι — he had power to give life unto the image.

Rev. T. ἐδόθη αὐτῇ δοῦναι πνεῦμα τῇ εἰκόνι — it was given *unto him* to give breath to it, *even* to the image.

The received reading is attested by **X**, B, P second hand, all the cursives, 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 (ἐδόθη) 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 αὐτῇ 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 ἐδόθη, 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 αὐτῇ] as a corruption of αὐτῷ, or to interpret it as it stands."¹ 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.

xiv. 13.

Rec. T. τὰ δὲ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ — and their works do follow.

Rev. T. τὰ γὰρ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἀκολουθεῖ — for their works follow.

The received reading here is attested by B, most of the cursives, Andreas, and Arethas; while the older manuscripts **X**, A, C, P, four cursives, 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 γὰρ as the genuine reading. But this word has the suspicious appearance of being a gloss; while the true meaning of the passage demands δέ. 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 γὰρ 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. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἁγίων. — thou King of saints.

Rev. T. ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν αἰώνων. — thou King of the ages.

The reading, ἁγίων, of the Received Text, is virtually without support. The revised reading is attested by **X** 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, ὁ βασιλεὺς 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 **X**'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 vari-

ations 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. ἐνδεδυμένοι λίνον καθαρὸν καὶ λαμπρὸν, — clothed in pure and white linen.

Rev. T. ἐνδεδυμένοι λίθον καθαρὸν λαμπρὸν, — arrayed with *precious* stone, pure and bright.

The common reading λίνον 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 λίθον, but because there are seven angels spoken of as "clothed") gives the *plural*, καθαρὸς λίνους, "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 λίθον, 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 λίνον, with the Received Text. It is true that λίνον 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-

lated, "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 χρῆστον*) 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 *λίθον* 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.

xvii. 3.

Rec. T. *θηρίον κόκκινον, γέμον ὀνομάτων βλασφημίας*,—a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy.

Rev. T. *θηρίον κόκκινον, γέμοντα ὀνόματα βλασφημίας*,—a scarlet-colored beast, full of names of blasphemy.

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, *γέμοντα ὀνόματα*, is attested possibly by *Σ* first hand, A, 13, and 19, certainly by P; while *Σ* as afterwards corrected, B, and twenty-five or thirty cursives read *γέμον ὀνόματα*; and three or four cursives read *γέμων ὀνόματα*. The word with which *γέμον* (or *γέμοντα*) is to be construed is the neuter *θηρίον* just preceding. And as the neuter *ἔχον* follows immediately after, and belongs to the same neuter noun, it is better with Lachmann, Tregelles, Düsterdieck, and others, to take the *γέμοντα* of *Σ* and A as two words, *γέμον τά*. This gives three neuter adjuncts in succession limiting the neuter *θηρίον*,—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 *κόκκινον*, 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 *γέμον* is concerned, it will be observed, is that of *Σ* 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 *γέμοντα . . . ἔχοντα* is the true reading rather than *γέμοντα . . . ἔχον*, 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 *γέμοντα*, should return to a neuter adjunct in *ἔχον* is incredible.

xviii. 3.

Rec. T. *ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου . . . πέπωκε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, — for all nations have drunk of the wine.

Rev. T. *ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ οἴνου . . . πέπτωκαν πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, — for by the wine . . . all the nations are fallen.

The received reading, *πέπωκε*, 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 *πέπτωκαν*, is that of A, C, from ten to fifteen cursives, the Memphitic and Ethiopic Versions; while *Σ*, B, read the regular third person plural *πεπτόκασιν* instead of the Alexandrian. Four cursives read *πεπότικε* "have become drunk," — taken probably from xiv. 8. The difference in spelling between *πέπωκαν* and *πέπτωκαν* 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 *ἔπεσεν*, "is fallen, is fallen," in the preceding verse. Just so in John vii. 6, the scribe of B was betrayed by the preceding *πάρεστιν* into writing this word for *ἐστίν* at the close of the verse, and, in giving John xiv. 16, the scribe of *Σ* wrote *τηρήσω*, "I will keep," for *ἐρωτήσω*, "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. *ἐδόξασεν ἑαυτήν* — she hath glorified herself.

Rev. T. *ἐδόξασεν αὐτήν* — she glorified herself.

The Revisers have here set aside the Greek reflexive, and substituted the personal pronoun, because the uncials, with the exception of *Σ* 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. ἔκραζον — cried.

Rev. T. ἔκραξαν — 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 **Σ**, B, P, all the cursives but one, and by Andreas and Arethas. It is similarly vouched 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 ἐβαλον, "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. ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι — a vesture dipped in blood.

Rev. T. ἱμάτιον ρεραντισμένον αἵματι — a garment sprinkled with blood.

The received reading βεβαμμένον 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 ἐρραντισμένον; and a late corrector of **Σ** gives περιρεραντισμένον, which is adopted by Tischendorf; and still others read ἐρραμένον. 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 differ-

ent 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 **Σ**, 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 **S**, P, 7, and a number of other cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, and Jerome; as well as the three cursives, 1, 17, 19, and one manuscript of Andreas, which have ἀπό, "from," instead of ἐκ, "out of," heaven. The shorter reading of the Revisers' Text is attested by A, three cursives, 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, *a Deo*, "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 cursives, 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."

xxi. 3.

"Some ancient authorities omit, and be *their God*," says the marginal note. That is, these two words are wanting in **S**, B, 1, 7, 8, 29, 39, 92, and twenty-five or more cursives, 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 cursives, the Vulgate, the Syriac Version, Irenæus in another place, Ambrose, the other two manuscripts of Andreas, and Tichonius.

xxii. 16.

The Revisers have done well in leaving unchanged, and without any alternative marginal reading, the words ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις; 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 ἐπὶ with the dative means "for" sometimes, as truly as "over" at other times. Griesbach and Westcott and Hort place ἐν, "in," or "among," in their margins as a possibly genuine reading instead of ἐπὶ. 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 ἐπί, and from perplexity in regard to the meaning of that 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 ἐπὶ ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, which is attested by S, 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.
- "Amen," genuineness of, considered, ii. 220, 253.
- 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, ii. 15, 50, 74, 77, 123, 124, 127, 174, 218, 228, 299, 300, 302, 313.
- Aorist (Luke vii. 11), i. 283; improperly rejected, i. 341, 360, ii. 57, 232, 235.
- Apocalypse, early treatment of, i. 18; use of aorist in, ii. 316.
- Aquila, occupation of, ii. 118.
- Article, Greek, improperly omitted, i. 75, 143, 184, 213, ii. 14, 15, 121, 206, 247, 274, 301, 325; introducing indirect interrogative clauses, i. 225, and n. 4; improperly inserted, i. 138, 194, 197, 320, ii. 101, 116, 173, 231; with demonstrative pronoun, i. 350, ii. 15; falsely rendered, ii. 78; improperly used in Septuagint, ii. 94; improper form of, ii. 299.
- Augustine cited, i. 315, ii. 40.
- ἀγαπητός (Luke ix. 35), i. 296.
- ἀγρών, a false use of, i. 241.
- ἀδελφοί, use of, i. 59, 98.
- ἀελ (Mark xv. 8), i. 250.
- ἀθῶον (Matt. xxvii. 4), i. 161.
- αἶ, an omission of, considered, i. 305.
- Ἀγυπτος, always without the article, ii. 94.
- ἀκούειν, omission of, i. 90, 98.
- ἀκούσαντες (Luke viii. 12), i. 287.

ἀκούσας (Mark v. 36), i. 196.
 ἀκούσῃ, uncorrected, ii. 247.
 ἀμαρτήματος for κρῖσεως, considered, i. 191.
 ἀμαρτήσῃ (Matt. xviii. 15), i. 124.
 ἀμφίβληστρον, omission of, considered, i. 34.
 ἀμφοτέρων (Acts xix. 16), ii. 122; reference of, ii. 123.
 ἀναπτύξας (Luke iv. 17), i. 269.
 ἀνθρώπων (Matt. ix. 32), i. 85.
 ἀνθρώπῳ (Matt. xix. 3), i. 126.
 ἀνολίξας (Luke iv. 17), i. 269.
 ἀπήγαγον (Luke xxiii. 33), i. 334.
 ἀποστέλλει, a clerical error, illustrated, i. 238 n.
 ἀρτι (Matt. xxvi. 53), i. 160; (John i. 51), ii. 15.
 ἀρχαί, a frequent use of, ii. 158.
 αὐτοῖς (Luke viii. 3), i. 286.
 αὐτόν (Matt. xiv. 12), i. 102; (Mark ix. 26), i. 228.
 αὐτοῦ, changed in B to αὐτοῦς, i. 22; (Matt. xii. 46), i. 97; (Mark xiii. 27), i. 246; (Luke xix. 29), i. 321; a false reading for αὐτοῦς, ii. 113.
 αὐτῷ (Mark viii. 20), i. 215; (Luke v. 5), i. 273; (Rev. xiii. 15), ii. 316.

"Baptisms, the teaching of," ii. 259.
 Basle, Codex E (Gospels) in Public Library of, i. 9.
 Bede, the Venerable, cited, ii. 96, 119.
 Bengel, J. A., prime canon of, noted and illustrated, i. 48, 235, ii. 180.
 "Bethsaida" (Luke ix. 10), i. 295.
 Beza, Theodore, Codex D presented to Cambridge by, i. 9.

Biblical facts, a knowledge of, necessary, i. 4.
 Bloomfield, S. T., D.D., cited, i. 221.
 Bornemann, 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.
 Broadus, J. A., D.D., on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 254; quoted, ii. 73.
 Burgon, Dean J. W., on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 254; quoted, i. 255, 256, ii. 40; headings in volume on Mark xvi. 9-20, cited, i. 259 n.
 Burrus Afranius, ii. 139.
 Buttmann, Professor Alexander, cited, i. 42, 288 n., ii. 49, 72, 123, 146, 257, 259 n.
 Buttmann, Philip, cited, ii. 117.
 βαπτίζων (Mark i. 4), i. 173.
 βλέπεις (Mark viii. 23), i. 216.
 βληθῆς, unwarranted use of, i. 332.
 βληθῆ (Matt. v. 30), i. 66.

Cambridge, Codex D in University Library, i. 9; F (Epistles) in Library of Trinity College, i. 10; T* in University Library, i. 11.
 Changes, early made in one Gospel and not in another, i. 60.
 "Clauda," ii. 131.
 Claudius, Emperor, reign of, noted, ii. 139.

Clement V., Pope, decision of, at Council of Vienna, i. 165.
 Codices, account of, N, A, B, C, D, D (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; T^b, to Z, Γ, Δ, Θ, Α, Ξ, 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, Conflated."
 Constantinople, chief seat of transcribers, i. 19.
 Constructio ad sensum, examples of, ii. 213, 223, 239, 302, 303.
 Copyists, errors of, noted, i. 84, 99, 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.
 Criticism. See "Textual Criticism."
 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 conatu, 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.
 Dialessaron, 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, *pro* 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.
 Dusterdieck, Dr. Friedrich, conjecture of, ii. 299; readings adopted by, ii. 310, 321, 324; opinion of, ii. 327.
 Dwight, President Timothy, D.D., quoted, i. 234, 359.
 δέ, i. 326, ii. 60, 80, 124, 180, 206, 317.
 δεῦτε (Luke xx. 14), i. 322.
 δευτεροπρώτῳ (Luke vi. 1), force of, i. 278.
 διασάφισον (Matt. xiii. 36), i. 100.
 δυνάμεις (Rom. viii. 38), i. 23; proper place of, ii. 158.
 δυνάστακτα (Matt. xxiii. 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.
 Ellicott, Bishop C. J., 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.
 ἔζησε (Luke xv. 32), a false reading, i. 316.
 ἐκῆ (Matt. v. 22), i. 65.
 εἰς, 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 εἰ, ii. 267; meaning of, in 1 Pet. iii. 21, ii. 279.
 εἰς σε (Luke xvii. 3), i. 317.
 εἰ τι (Matt. xviii. 28), i. 125.
 εἰχαν and ἔχουσι for ἔχομεν (Mark viii. 16), i. 213.
 ἐκεῖ (Mark i. 13), i. 175.
 ἐκλεπόντος (Luke xxiii. 45), i. 340.
 ἔκραξε (Matt. xiv. 30), i. 104.
 ἐλθεῖν (Matt. xiv. 29), i. 103.
 ἐμόν (Luke xvi. 12), i. 316.
 ἐν (Luke iv. 1), i. 267; (Luke xxiii. 42), i. 339; (Acts xi. 23), ii. 102.
 ἐνα (Luke xii. 25), i. 306.
 ἐν' Ἐφῆσῳ (Eph. i. 1), ii. 211.
 ἐνὸς αἵματος (Acts xvii. 26), ii. 118.
 ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ (Acts xii. 25), ii. 104.
 ἐπερώτημα, meaning of, ii. 279.
 ἔργων for τεχνῶν, i. 91.
 ἔρημος (Matt. xxiii. 38), i. 151; (Luke xiii. 35), i. 309.
 ἔτι (Mark viii. 17), i. 214; (Rom.

v. 6), ii. 151; (1 Tim. vi. 7), ii. 244.
 εὐθὺς (Mark i. 23), i. 177; (Mark ii. 2), i. 180; (Mark vii. 35), i. 212.
 ἔχετε (Matt. xvi. 8), i. 115.
 ἔχωμεν (Rom. v. 1), ii. 147.
 ἔως, a common use of, ii. 102.
 ἡ ἐκεῖνος (Luke xviii. 14), i. 318.
 ἦλθε (Mark i. 39), i. 178.
 ἡμέρα (Matt. xxiv. 42), i. 155.
 ἡμέτερον (Luke xvi. 12), i. 316.
 ἡμῶν (John xix. 7), ii. 78.
 ἦν (Rom. xiv. 22), ii. 170.
 ἦτε (John viii. 39), ii. 43.
 ἦψατο (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, ii. 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, 245, 327; use of false text by, ii. 171.
 Γαλιλαίας, as a "Western" reading, examined, i. 270.
 γάρ, omission of, considered, i. 210, 320, ii. 143; position of, considered, i. 279, 325; spurious use of, i. 158, 303, ii. 317; falsely followed by ὅτι, ii. 202; not to be supplanted by δέ, ii. 206.
 γενέσθαι (Acts xxvi. 28), ii. 131.
 γενόμενος (Luke x. 32), i. 300.
 γνωμή (Acts xx. 3), ii. 124.
 Hackett, H. B., D.D., quoted, ii. 108.
 Hamburg, Codex H (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. 313.
 Helvidius denies the perpetual virginity of Mary, i. 58.
 Heresies, Irenæus against, i. 17, 18.
 Heretics, work of, in corrupting the text, i. 17.
 Hesychius, the grammarian, cited, i. 358.
 Ἠμοιοτελευταί, 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.

Itacism, defined, i. 22; illustrated, i. 40, 90, 316, ii. 48, 149, 149 n. 1, 2, 169, 195, 271, 284.

ι, often written ε in the old Mss., ii. 67, 275.

λαθῆτω (Luke vii. 7), i. 74.

Ἰδιᾶ (Acts i. 19), ii. 81.

Ἰδοῦ (James iii. 3), ii. 275.

Ἰδών (Matt. ix. 4), i. 82.

ἰσχυρόν (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 of, on 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, ii. 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 "Josés," 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.

καθαρίζων (Mark vii. 19), construction of, i. 204.

καί, Hebraistic 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.

καὶ νηστεία, on the omission of (Mark ix. 29), i. 228.

καὶ πῶς (Mark ix. 12), i. 223.

καταβαλλόμενοι, meaning of (Heb. vi. 1), ii. 261.

κατέπεσεν (Luke viii. 6), i. 287.

κατισχύειν, Luke's use of, i. 327.

καύχησης, use of, considered, ii. 173.

κάσμου, on the omission of (Matt. xiii. 35), i. 100.

κράζας (Mark ix. 26), i. 228; (Mark xv. 39), i. 252.

κυρίῳ, abbreviated form of, noted, ii. 164.

Lachmann, Carl, adherence to received readings by, i. 37, 38, 91, 92, 103, 127, 152, 188, 198, 216, 220, 233, 262, 270, 277, 284, 287, 313, 316, 322, 327, 329, 330, ii. 17, 18, 20, 37, 44, 46, 54, 59, 66, 69, 77, 80, 81, 165, 179, 206, 207, 237, 245, 266, 270, 306, 321, 324; rejection of received readings by, i. 37, 56, 66, 69, 74, 77, 83, 85,

95, 96, 108, 113 n., 116, 122, 151, 191, 214, 246, 288, 319, ii. 142, 186, 189, 190, 209, 213, 224, 234, 235, 255, 262, 282, 296, 302, 304, 318, 319, 324; inconsistency of, i. 96; false construction by, ii. 180.

Laodiceans, Epistle to the, ii. 212.

Laud, Archbishop William, Codex Laudianus (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 *hy*, ii. 88, 124.

λέγετε, construction of (Matt. xv. 5; Mark vii. 12), i. 109.

λίθον (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.

Mss., 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 vitiated, 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, 122, 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, 319, 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, i. 88; authority of, insufficient, i. 309, ii. 129; later, disregarded by the Revisers, ii. 5; 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, 303, ii. 254; improper, i. 252; omitted by American Revisers, ii. 134.

Marginal reading, unsupported by Greek Mss., i. 56; conflate, i. 188; of John v. 3, 4, considered, ii. 21.

Marginal readings, false, i. 56, 96, 102, 117, 162, 199, 213, 270, 299, 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, 246, 249, 289, 290, 293, 297, 298, 329, 330, 334, 344, ii. 17, 20, 21, 33, 44, 95, 105, 113, 138, 150, 154, 211, 227, 234, 265, 282, 313, 326; emendations, i. 67, 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, 231, 312, 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. 256; 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.

Matthæi, 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. 225, ii. 185; quoted, ii. 122, 152, 167; readings adopted by, ii. 165, 167; cited, ii. 252.

Modena, Codex H (Acts) in Grand Ducal 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.

Ματθαῖον, i. 112.

μαρτύριον (1 Cor. ii. 1), considered, ii. 178.

μέν, improperly omitted, i. 174.

μή, omission of, considered, ii. 225.

μηδένα, false use of, noted, i. 281.

μοῦ, improper omission of, ii. 41.

Naasenus, misquotation by, i. 72.

Name, my, thy, his, etc., import of, ii. 75.

New Testament, differences between earlier and later Mss. of, considered, i. 16; method of copying Mss. of, i. 16; depravations 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 text 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.

νεκρά (James ii. 20), ii. 273.

νεκροί, Paul's use of, considered, ii. 231.

Omission, examples of, in early Mss., i. 34-39, 58, 61, 64, 65, 68, 81, 85, 90, 98, 104, 109, 110, 111, 112, 115, 116, 119, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 132, 133, 134, 135, 140, 143, 144, 145, 147, 148, 150, 151, 153, 156, 164, 168, 169, 170, 175, 176, 178, 180, 187, 188, 202, 203, 207, 210, 212, 213, 214, 216, 224, 227, 228, 231, 232, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 265, 267, 268, 272, 275, 276, 278, 288, 289, 290, 291, 293, 297, 298, 301, 306, 307, 308, 312, 313, 317, 321, 322, 328, 330, 334, 337, 345, 349, 351, ii. 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 33, 38, 39, 41, 49, 51, 52, 59, 60, 62, 76, 78, 81, 85, 88, 89, 92, 95, 98, 99, 102, 111, 113, 117, 120, 121, 125, 126, 130, 135, 138, 142, 143, 145, 150, 152, 156, 160, 162, 167, 179, 181, 187, 196, 199, 206, 207, 208, 210, 211, 214, 215, 220, 224, 225, 227, 230, 234, 242, 245, 249, 253, 269, 270, 272, 274, 280, 285, 286, 297, 300, 302, 303, 313, 314, 325, 326.

Origen, complaints of, i. 17, 19; testimony of, i. 79, 88, 100, 101, 246, ii. 54; quoted, i. 340, ii. 118; misquotation from, noted, ii. 11 n.; rendering of a Hebrew verb by, ii. 106.

Orosius, quoted, i. 285.

Oxford, Codex E (Acts) presented to University of, by Abp. Laud, i. 10; Codex F in part, and Co-

dex A, in Bodleian Library at, i. 11.
 δ βαπτίζων without καί (Mark i. 4), the true reading, i. 21, 173.
 δ γεννηθεῖς, unwarranted use of, ii. 292.
 δ Θεός, improperly set aside, ii. 166.
 οἱ ἄνθρωποι (Luke ii. 15), why omitted, i. 265.
 οἱ δοῦλοι, improper omission of, i. 307.
 δ κύριος, improper omission of, i. 170, ii. 272.
 διτιγοπιστίαν, improper use of, considered, i. 120.
 δλον, Matthew's use of, i. 135.
 δ . . . μείζον (John x. 29), ii. 50.
 δ μονογενής, use of, referred to, ii. 292.
 ὁμοῦ (Acts ii. 1), ii. 82.
 δρος (Luke xiv. 5), i. 310.
 ἐργιζόμενος, meaning of, examined, i. 64.
 δρεῖ (Heb. xii. 18), ii. 269.
 δς (Eph. i. 14), ii. 213; (Col. i. 27), ii. 223; (1 Tim. iii. 16), ii. 240; (Rev. xiii. 14), ii. 303.
 δτι, as a sign of quotation, ii. 202; (1 Tim. vi. 7), ii. 244.
 οὐ (Acts v. 28), ii. 89; (Rom. iv. 19), ii. 145; (Phil. iii. 13), ii. 219.
 οὐκέτι (Luke xxii. 16), i. 328.
 οὐν, ii. 51, 59.
 οὐπω (John vii. 8), ii. 33; (Phil. iii. 13), ii. 219.
 ὁ Χριστός (John vii. 42), ii. 37.
 ὦ (Rom. xvi. 27), ii. 174; (1 Pet. iii. 21), ii. 278.
 ὦδε (Matt. xxvi. 53), i. 160; (Mark ix. 1), i. 219; (Luke xv. 17), i. 314; (1 Cor. iv. 2), ii. 180.

ὡς (Acts xvii. 14), significance of, ii. 117.
 ὡσεῖ, Luke's 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, ii. 118; use of language by, ii. 140, 163, 164, 173, 202, 210, 212, 241, 244, 249; style of, ii. 168, 170, 177; not illogical, ii. 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, i. 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.
 πάλιν (Mark xi. 3), i. 239; (Heb. vi. 1), ii. 261.
 πάντα (Luke xiv. 17), i. 312.
 πᾶς (Luke xvi. 18), i. 317.
 πλοῖον, without the article (Matt. xiv. 22), i. 104.
 ποιεῖν, used to save repetition of other verbs, i. 199, ii. 131.
 ποιεῖτε (Matt. xxi. 13), insufficiently attested, i. 137.

ποιῆσαι (Acts xxvi. 28), a genuine reading, ii. 130.
 ποιήσωμεν (Matt. xvii. 4), i. 118.
 πολύ (John v. 3), ii. 21.
 πρὸς interchanged with εἰς, i. 85.
 πρῶτον, omission of (Matt. xvii. 11), i. 119.
 πτώμα (Matt. xiv. 12), i. 102; for σῶμα (Mark xv. 45), i. 253.
 πῶς (Mark ix. 12), i. 223.
 φράσον (Matt. xiii. 36), i. 100.
 φωνή, use of (Rev. vi. 1), ii. 304.
 φωνῆς (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; conflate, 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,

ii. 14, 63, 121, 123, 127, 135, 140, 186, 306, 307, 323; incorrect renderings of, i. 55, 106, 143, 201, 204, 237, 262, 304, 320, 340, 343, 349, ii. 41, 42, 47, 78, 84, 88, 121, 126, 127, 145, 153, 186, 194, 219, 225, 227, 241, 269, 276, 299, 300, 304, 316, 323; not textual critics, ii. 3; failure of, to make a needed correction, ii. 71.
 Revisers' Greek Text, defined, i. 15; plea in behalf of alterations found in, i. 15; unwarranted omissions in, i. 34, 97, 156, 168, 227, 244, 253, 330, ii. 28, 38, 62, 92, 111, 113, 162, 304; inconsistent with English version, i. 37, 143, 238, 343, ii. 82 n. 2, 316; not identical with Westcott and Hort's, i. 48; needless changes in, i. 55, 63, 83, 85, 97, 126, 133, 140, 141, 159, 247, 265, 274, 280, 286, 288, 289, 307, 332, 341, ii. 16, 17, 37, 63, 65, 80, 130, 135, 140, 151, 186, 192, 202, 206, 223, 230, 231, 253, 268, 272, 274, 299, 307, 323; false or questionable readings of, considered, i. 84, 86, 109, 143, 153, 157, 171, 182, 184, 186, 189, 195, 198, 199, 216, 219, 224, 228, 234, 237, 240, 242, 249, 251, 262, 266, 267, 276, 281, 284, 285, 294, 304, 325, 340, 348, 349, 360, ii. 46, 53, 57, 64, 73, 76, 82, 86, 101, 162, 228, 243, 257, 263, 266, 299, 307, 311, 316, 319, 321, 325; anti-Johannean readings of, ii. 15, 79, 284, 285, 288; false construction in, ii. 84; omission of Acts viii. 37 and xv. 34 in, considered, ii. 95, 113; readings of, supported

- 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, i. 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 T^a and Y at, i. 11; Christians of, referred to, ii. 165.
- Rossano, Codex Σ in Archbishop's Library at, i. 11.
- ῥήματος, a Hebraistic use of, i. 323.
- ῥύεται (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. 356.
- Scrivener, F. H. A., LL.D., account of uncial Mss. from, i. 9; testimony of, concerning early documents, i. 19; on the doxology in the Lord's prayer, i. 69; on τέκνων (Matt. xi. 19), i. 93; on Mark xvi. 9-20, i. 254; quoted, i. 242, 263, 291, ii. 12, 39, 40, 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 Ⲭ at, i. 9; Codices E (Epistles), H (Epistles) in part, I, and P (Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse) at, i. 10; Codices T^b, T^c, Γ in part, Θ, II, at, i. 11.
- "Strain at" (Matt. xxiii. 24), an illustration of perpetuated blunders, ii. 219, 244.
- Tunica, reference to Mss. 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 Mss. by, i. 20.
- "Syrian readings," examples of, i. 86, 91, 173, 351, ii. 166, 210.
- στιβάδας, κόψαντες (Mark xi. 8), i. 240.
- συνέλαβον, meaning of, considered, i. 274.

- συνήθεια, Paul's use of, ii. 183.
- συστρεφόμενων (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, 283, 289, 332, 341, 361, ii. 42, 48, 55, 57, 58, 91, 126, 127, 181, 183, 192, 197, 232, 235, 239, 306, 309, 323.
- Tertullian, *memoriter* 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), i. 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, 187, 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, 69, 93, 94, 141, 142, 165, 189, 190, 209, 228, 237, 245, 247, 270, 282, 296, 304, 318, 325, 326; er-

roneous citation by, i. 56 n.; adoption of a *verbosior lectio* 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.

Tregelles, S. P., LL.D., rejection of received readings by, i. 56, 69, 76, 90, 96, 103, 108, 113 n., 122, 191, 214, 220, 277, 288, 322, 326, ii. 17, 46, 69, 141, 190, 206, 282, 314, 318; adherence to received readings by, i. 91, 116, 127, 151, 152, 188, 216, 233, 270, 329, 330, ii. 18, 20, 44, 142, 165, 179, 207, 213, 224, 245, 266, 270, 306, 321, 324.

Tyre and Sidon (Mark vii. 24), i. 207.

θέλῃ (Rev. xi. 5), ii. 306.

θεμέλιον (Heb. vi. 1), reference of, ii. 261.

Θεός, omission of (Matt. xxii. 32), i. 145.

Θεοῦ, omission of (John v. 44), ii. 26.

τὰ δίκτυα, reading of, considered, i. 35.

ταῦτα, overlooked by copyists, i. 265; use of, in Luke xxiv. 11, i. 346; for ταῦτά, i. 279, 280.

ταύτην, omission of (Matt. xv. 15), i. 112.

τέκνων, mistaken for τεχνῶν (Matt. xi. 19), i. 91.

τῆς, improperly read for τῆς (Rom. viii. 24), ii. 156.

τὸ, introducing an indirect interrogative clause, i. 225 and n. 4.

τὸ ἱερὸν (Matt. xxi. 12), i. 137.

τολμῶ, ii. 174 n.

τὸ δνομα (Rev. xiii. 8), ii. 313.

τὸ πνεῦμα (Mark i. 26), omitted only in B, i. 35.

τοῦτον, omission of (1 Cor. iii. 12), ii. 179.

τοῦ τυφλοῦ (John ix. 6), ii. 48.

τυπικῶς (1 Cor. x. 11), ii. 187.

τῶν ἔργων (James ii. 26), ii. 274.

Uncial Mss., described, i. 9.

Utrecht, Codex F (Gospels) in Public Library of, i. 10.

υἱός for δνος, i. 310; meaning a disciple, ii. 13.

ὕμῳ, omission of, noted, ii. 41.

ὕπὲρ ἐκεῖνου, a probably lost reading, i. 319.

ὕπὸ for ἐπὶ, 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, 239, 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; *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 *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 **Σ**, B in Acts vii. 7, ii. 93; quoted, ii. 104, 111, 244; adhere to received reading in Rom. xiv. 19, ii. 169.

Wetstein, J. J., Codex F (Gospels) collated by, i. 10.

Winer, Geo. B., 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, Anabasis of, referred to, i. 279; cited, ii. 143 n.

Χριστός (Matt. xvi. 21), i. 117.

Ψ, or Codex *Athous 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.]

MATTHEW.	MATTHEW.	MATTHEW.
i. 5, 7, 8, 10.....i. 113 n.	ix. 32.....i. 85	xiv. 34.....i. 106
i. 7, 8, 10.....i. 55*	x. 11.....i. 236†	xv. 4.....i. 108
i. 18.....i. 56*	xi. 2.....i. 86	xv. 6.....i. 109, 110*
i. 25.....i. 58	xi. 9.....i. 88	xv. 14.....i. 111
ii. 6.....ii. 305†	xi. 15.....i. 90*	xv. 15.....i. 112
iv. 24.....i. 61	xi. 16.....i. 90†	xv. 39.....i. 22†, 112
v. 4.....i. 62*	xi. 19.....i. 60†, 91	xvi. 2, 3.....i. 115*
v. 13.....i. 63	xi. 23.....i. 93, 95*	xvi. 8.....i. 115
v. 22.....i. 64*	xii. 4.....i. 96*	xvi. 13.....i. 116
v. 25.....i. 66*	xii. 31.....i. 96*	xvi. 21.....i. 117*
v. 30.....i. 66	xii. 46.....i. 59†, 97	xvii. 4.....i. 118
v. 37.....i. 67*	xii. 47.....i. 98*	xvii. 11.....i. 119
vi. 8.....i. 67*	xiii. 9.....i. 98	xvii. 20.....i. 120
vi. 13.....i. 68	xiii. 16.....i. 144†	xvii. 21.....i. 121
vi. 34.....ii. 280†	xiii. 18.....ii. 128†	xvii. 22.....i. 122*
vii. 13.....i. 72*	xiii. 35.....i. 100*	xviii. 11.....i. 123
viii. 9.....i. 72*	xiii. 36.....i. 100	xviii. 14.....i. 123*
viii. 10.....i. 74*	xiii. 43.....i. 99*, 101	xviii. 15.....i. 124*
viii. 23.....i. 75	xiii. 55.....i. 101	xviii. 28.....i. 125
viii. 28.....i. 75, 113 n.	xiii. 55, 56.....i. 59†	xix. 3.....i. 126
viii. 29.....i. 81	xiv. 12.....i. 102	xix. 9.....i. 127*
ix. 4.....i. 82*	xiv. 24.....i. 102*	xix. 10.....i. 127
ix. 14.....i. 83*	xiv. 29.....i. 103*	xix. 16, 17.....i. 128*
ix. 18.....i. 83	xiv. 30.....i. 104	xix. 20.....i. 132

MATTHEW.	MATTHEW.	MARK.
xix. 29.....i. 132*	xxviii. 6.....i. 170*	v. 2.....i. 36†
xx. 15.....i. 133		v. 27.....i. 194
xx. 16.....i. 134	MARK.	v. 36.....i. 195
xxi. 4.....i. 135	i. 1.....i. 171*	vi. 2.....i. 197*
xxi. 6.....i. 136	i. 2.....i. 171*	vi. 14.....i. 40†, 197*
xxi. 7.....i. 136†	i. 4.....i. 21, 173	vi. 20.....i. 198
xxi. 12.....i. 137*	i. 8.....i. 174	vi. 22.....i. 199*
xxi. 13.....i. 137	i. 13.....i. 175	vi. 27, 28.....i. 36†
xxi. 15.....i. 138	i. 14.....i. 176	vi. 29, 56.....i. 42†
xxi. 44.....i. 140*	i. 16.....i. 34, 41	vi. 33.....i. 199
xxi. 46.....i. 140	i. 19, 21.....i. 35†	vi. 35.....i. 40†
xxii. 1.....i. 141	i. 23.....i. 177	vi. 53.....i. 201
xxii. 5.....i. 141†	i. 28.....i. 272†	vii. 4.....i. 201*, 202
xxii. 13.....i. 142	i. 39.....i. 178	vii. 12. { i. 109†, 110†,
xxii. 23.....i. 143	i. 40.....i. 178	203
xxii. 27.....i. 144	i. 45.....i. 35†, 41†	vii. 16.....i. 203*
xxii. 30.....i. 145	ii. 1.....i. 179	vii. 19.....i. 22†, 204
xxii. 32.....i. 145	ii. 2.....i. 180	vii. 24.....i. 207*
xxiii. 4.....i. 147*	ii. 3.....i. 180	vii. 28.....i. 210
xxiii. 14.....i. 148	ii. 4.....i. 35†, 41†, 181*	vii. 30.....i. 210
xxiii. 17.....i. 149	ii. 8.....i. 35†	vii. 31.....i. 208†, 212
xxiii. 19.....i. 150	ii. 12.....i. 182	vii. 35.....i. 33†, 212
xxiii. 35.....i. 152 n.	ii. 15.....i. 184	vii. 37.....i. 213
xxiii. 38.....i. 151*, 309†	ii. 16.....i. 184	viii. 3.....i. 42†
xxiv. 31.....i. 151*	ii. 22.....i. 186	viii. 6.....i. 360
xxiv. 36.....i. 152	ii. 26.....i. 36†	viii. 7.....i. 26†
xxiv. 38.....i. 153	iii. 1.....i. 36†	viii. 10.....i. 112†
xxiv. 42.....i. 155	iii. 14, 16.....i. 188*	viii. 15.....i. 361
xxiv. 48.....i. 156	iii. 15.....i. 188	viii. 16.....i. 213*
xxv. 2.....i. 157	iii. 21.....i. 42†	viii. 17.....i. 214
xxvi. 26.....i. 159	iii. 25.....i. 189	viii. 20.....i. 215
xxvi. 53.....i. 160	iii. 26.....i. 190	viii. 22.....i. 42†
xxvi. 69.....i. 272†	iii. 28.....i. 144†	viii. 23.....i. 215, 236†
xxvii. 4.....i. 161*	iii. 29.....i. 190	viii. 26.....i. 216
xxvii. 5.....i. 161	iii. 30.....i. 207†	viii. 37.....i. 218
xxvii. 24.....i. 162*	iii. 32.....i. 33†	ix. 1.....i. 219
xxvii. 28.....i. 162*	iv. 1.....i. 33†	ix. 11.....i. 221
xxvii. 49.....i. 164*	iv. 10.....i. 193, 236†	ix. 12, 13.....i. 222
xxvii. 58.....i. 168	iv. 16.....i. 27†, 144†	ix. 14.....i. 40†
xxviii. 2.....i. 169	iv. 21.....i. 95 n.	ix. 23.....i. 224

MARK.	MARK.	LUKE.	LUKE.	JOHN.	JOHN.
ix. 24.....i. 227	xv. 44.....i. 236†	viii. 35.....i. 289	xix. 29, 30.....i. 321	i. 42.....i. 114 n., ii. 12	xi. 44.....ii. 52
ix. 26.....i. 228	xv. 45.....i. 28†, 253	viii. 43.....i. 289*	xx. 14.....i. 321	i. 49.....ii. 14	xi. 45.....ii. 52
ix. 29.....i. 228	xvi. 2.....i. 359	viii. 45.....i. 290*, 291	xx. 23.....i. 322	i. 51.....ii. 14	xi. 53.....ii. 53
ix. 40.....i. 229	xvi. 9-20.....i. 39†, 253	ix. 2.....i. 293*	xx. 26.....i. 323	ii. 11.....ii. 15	xi. 54.....ii. 54
x. 7.....i. 231*		ix. 10.....i. 51†, 293	xxi. 6.....i. 324	ii. 12.....ii. 16	xii. 7.....ii. 54
x. 24.....i. 232*	LUKE.	ix. 35.....i. 296	xxi. 34, 35.....i. 325	ii. 15.....ii. 17	xii. 23.....ii. 57
x. 26.....i. 43†	i. 26.....i. 272†	ix. 50.....i. 229	xxi. 36.....i. 326, <i>bis</i>	iii. 13.....ii. 17*	xii. 25.....ii. 57
x. 36.....i. 41†	i. 78.....i. 261	ix. 54.....i. 297*	xxii. 16.....i. 328	iii. 16.....ii. 18	xiii. 2.....ii. 31†
x. 43.....i. 233	i. 14.....i. 262	ix. 55.....i. 298	xxii. 19, 20.....i. 329*	iii. 17.....ii. 19	xiii. 18.....ii. 59
x. 49.....i. 234	ii. 15.....i. 265	ix. 56.....i. 299†	xxii. 31.....i. 330	iii. 31.....ii. 19*	xiii. 22.....ii. 59
xi. 3.....i. 237	ii. 51.....i. 265	x. 1, 17.....i. 299*	xxii. 43, 44.....i. 330	iv. 6.....i. 354†	xiii. 23.....ii. 60
xi. 8.....i. 240	iii. 17.....i. 266	x. 15.....i. 93†, 95†, 299	xxiii. 19.....i. 332	iv. 9.....ii. 20*	xiii. 24.....ii. 60
xi. 22, 23.....i. 43†	iii. 20.....i. 267	x. 21.....i. 300	xxiii. 26.....i. 334†	iv. 47.....i. 272†	xiii. 26.....ii. 31†
xii. 4.....i. 241	iv. 1.....i. 267	x. 30.....i. 301†	xxiii. 29.....i. 144†	iv. 52.....i. 354†	xiii. 32.....ii. 62, 63
xii. 9, 17, 26, }.....i. 37†	iv. 4.....i. 268	x. 32.....i. 300	xxiii. 32.....i. 335†	v. 3.....ii. 21	xiv. 4, 5.....ii. 64
27, 30, 34 }.....i. 37†	iv. 17.....i. 269	x. 38.....i. 301	xxiii. 33.....i. 333	v. 3, 4.....ii. 21	xiv. 7.....ii. 65
xii. 21.....i. 243	iv. 44.....i. 114 n, 270*	x. 41, 42.....i. 302*	xxiii. 34.....i. 332†, 334*	v. 44.....ii. 26*	xiv. 14.....ii. 66
xii. 36.....i. 144†	v. 1.....i. 272	xi. 11.....i. 303*	xxiii. 35.....i. 335	vi. 14.....ii. 27*	xiv. 22.....ii. 31†
xiii. 6, 7, 9, 22, 23.....i. 38†	v. 5.....i. 273	xi. 34.....i. 304	xxiii. 38.....i. 337	vi. 37, 39.....ii. 74†	xv. 11.....ii. 67
xiii. 8.....i. 244	v. 9.....i. 274	xii. 25.....i. 306	xxiii. 42.....i. 339*	vi. 47.....ii. 27	xvi. 4.....ii. 68
xiii. 11.....i. 244	v. 17.....i. 274	xii. 38.....i. 307	xxiii. 43.....i. 32†	vi. 51.....ii. 28	xvi. 23.....ii. 69
xiii. 22.....i. 245	v. 33.....i. 275	xiii. 25.....i. 308†	xxiii. 45.....i. 340	vi. 63.....ii. 155 n. 2†	xvii. 2.....ii. 74†
xiii. 27.....i. 246	vi. 1.....i. 152 n., 276	xiii. 27.....i. 308	xxiii. 47.....i. 341	vi. 71.....ii. 30	xvii. 3.....ii. 71
xiii. 33.....i. 246*	vi. 6.....i. 278	xiii. 35.....i. 308	xxiii. 49.....i. 343	vii. 3.....i. 272†	xvii. 4.....ii. 72
xiv. 2.....i. 43†	vi. 23.....i. 279	xiv. 5.....i. 310*	xxiv. 3, 6, 9.....i. 344*	vii. 8.....ii. 33*	xvii. 6, 9.....ii. 74†
xiv. 3.....i. 247	vi. 26.....i. 279†	xiv. 17.....i. 312	xxiv. 10.....i. 345	vii. 42.....ii. 37	xvii. 11, 12.....ii. 73
xiv. 5, 30, 31.....i. 38†	vi. 34.....i. 280	xv. 16.....i. 313	xxiv. 11.....i. 346	vii. 46.....ii. 38	xvii. 21.....ii. 76
xiv. 18.....i. 41†	vi. 35.....i. 281*	xv. 17.....i. 313	xxiv. 12.....i. 344*	vii. 53-viii. 11.....ii. 39*	xvii. 24.....ii. 77
xiv. 51.....i. 247	vi. 48.....i. 281	xv. 21.....i. 314	xxiv. 17.....i. 348	viii. 38.....ii. 41	xviii. 9.....ii. 74†
xiv. 52.....i. 248	vii. 7.....i. 74†	xv. 24.....i. 315†	xxiv. 21.....i. 349	viii. 39.....ii. 42	xviii. 40.....i. 114 n.
xiv. 68.....i. 249*	vii. 9.....i. 74†	xv. 32.....i. 315	xxiv. 27.....i. 342†	viii. 44.....ii. 44*	xix. 7.....ii. 78
xiv. 72.....i. 249	vii. 11.....i. 283	xvi. 12.....i. 316*	xxiv. 36, 40.....i. 344*	ix. 4.....ii. 46	xix. 14.....i. 353, 354
xv. 1.....i. 44†	vii. 32.....i. 284	xvi. 18.....i. 317	xxiv. 47.....i. 207†, 351*	ix. 6.....ii. 47	xix. 31-37.....i. 166†
xv. 4, 20, 36.....i. 39†	vii. 33.....i. 285	xvii. 3.....i. 317	xxiv. 51, 52.....i. 344*	ix. 15.....i. 237†	xix. 34.....i. 165†
xv. 6.....i. 44†, 159†	viii. 3.....i. 285	xvii. 6.....ii. 44†	xxiv. 53.....i. 351	x. 18.....ii. 48*	xx. 1.....i. 359
xv. 8.....i. 250	viii. 6.....i. 286	xvii. 30.....i. 280†		x. 22.....ii. 49*, 49	xx. 18.....i. 237†, ii. 79
xv. 12.....i. 251	viii. 9.....i. 237†	xviii. 14.....i. 318		x. 25.....i. 190†	xxi. 15, 16, 17.....ii. 13†
xv. 25.....i. 44†, 353	viii. 12.....i. 287	xix. 18.....i. 320	JOHN.	x. 29.....ii. 50*	xxi. 23.....ii. 80
xv. 34.....i. 27†	viii. 26, 37.....i. 288	xix. 20.....i. 320	i. 15.....ii. 11*	x. 39.....ii. 51	
xv. 39.....i. 251	viii. 27.....i. 288	xix. 26.....i. 320	i. 18.....ii. 12*	xi. 9.....i. 354†	
			i. 39.....i. 354†		

<p>ACTS.</p> <p>i. 19.....ii. 81 ii. 1.....ii. 81 ii. 47.....ii. 84 iii. 6.....ii. 85 iii. 10.....i. 308† iv. 1.....ii. 86* iv. 12.....i. 264† iv. 25.....ii. 87 v. 16.....ii. 88 v. 28.....ii. 89 v. 33.....ii. 90 v. 39.....ii. 91 vi. 13.....ii. 92 vii. 7.....ii. 93 vii. 11.....ii. 94† vii. 36.....ii. 93 viii. 18.....ii. 95* viii. 32.....ii. 129† viii. 37.....ii. 95 ix. 25.....ii. 96 x. 3.....ii. 96 x. 11.....ii. 98 x. 20.....ii. 100† x. 24.....i. 22†, ii. 98* x. 30.....ii. 99 xi. 12.....ii. 100 xi. 21.....ii. 101 xi. 22.....ii. 102 xi. 23.....ii. 102* xii. 5.....ii. 103 xii. 25.....ii. 103* xiii. 17.....ii. 94† xiii. 18.....ii. 105* xiii. 19, 20.....ii. 107 xiii. 25.....ii. 109 xiii. 33.....ii. 110 xiv. 27.....i. 361† xv. 24.....ii. 111 xv. 34.....ii. 113 xvi. 3.....i. 308†</p>	<p>ACTS.</p> <p>xvi. 13.....ii. 114 xvii. 3.....ii. 115 xvii. 14.....ii. 116 xvii. 26.....ii. 117 xvii. 28.....i. 279† xviii. 3.....ii. 118 xviii. 7.....ii. 119 xviii. 7, 24.....i. 114 n. xviii. 21.....ii. 120 xix. 14.....ii. 121 xix. 16.....ii. 121 xix. 34.....ii. 123 xx. 3.....ii. 124 xx. 5.....ii. 124 xx. 5.....ii. 125* xxi. 22.....ii. 125 xxi. 24.....ii. 126 xxiii. 5.....ii. 202† xxiii. 28.....ii. 126* xxiii. 30.....ii. 127* xxiii. 34.....i. 237† xxv. 13.....ii. 127 xxvi. 16.i. 279†, ii. 129 xxvi. 20.....ii. 130 xxvi. 28.....ii. 130 xxvii. 16.....ii. 131 xxvii. 19.....ii. 132 xxvii. 37.....ii. 133* xxvii. 39.....ii. 134* xxvii. 41.....ii. 135 xxviii. 1..... { i. 114 n., ii. 136* xxviii. 13.....ii. 137* xxviii. 16.....ii. 138*</p>	<p>ROMANS.</p> <p>i. 24.....ii. 140 ii. 14.....ii. 140 iii. 2.....ii. 142 iii. 22.....ii. 143</p>	<p>ROMANS.</p> <p>iv. 17.....ii. 231 n. iv. 19.....ii. 145 v. 1.....ii. 147 v. 2.....ii. 150* v. 6.....ii. 151 v. 17.....ii. 152* vii. 23.....ii. 153 viii. 2.....ii. 154† viii. 11.....ii. 154* viii. 24.....ii. 156 viii. 35.....ii. 157* viii. 38.....ii. 158 x. 3.....ii. 160 x. 5.....ii. 160 x. 9.....ii. 161* xi. 17.....ii. 162 xii. 11.....ii. 164 xiii. 11.....ii. 165 xiv. 4.....ii. 166 xiv. 6.....ii. 167 xiv. 19.....ii. 169* xiv. 22.....ii. 169 xiv. 23.....ii. 171* xv. 15.....ii. 172 xv. 17.....ii. 172 xv. 27.....ii. 141† xvi. 27.....ii. 174</p>	<p>1 CORINTHIANS.</p> <p>i. 15.....ii. 177 ii. 1.....ii. 178 iii. 12.....ii. 179 iv. 2.....ii. 180 vii. 37, 38.....ii. 181 viii. 4.....ii. 181 viii. 7.....ii. 182 viii. 8.....ii. 183 ix. 15.....ii. 185 x. 6.....ii. 141† x. 11.....ii. 186</p>	<p>1 CORINTHIANS.</p> <p>xii. 9.....ii. 188 xiii. 3.....ii. 188* xiv. 15.....ii. 149 n. i xiv. 38.....ii. 189* xv. 14.....ii. 190* xv. 15, 20.....ii. 232† xv. 29, 35, 42, 52, ii. 231 n. xv. 49.....ii. 190*</p>	<p>2 CORINTHIANS.</p> <p>i. 1.....ii. 192 i. 9.....ii. 231 n. i. 10.....ii. 192 iii. 3.....ii. 194 iii. 9.....ii. 194* iv. 6.....ii. 195 iv. 14.....ii. 196* v. 17.....ii. 196 xi. 4.....ii. 197 xi. 6.....ii. 198 xi. 32.....ii. 199 xii. 7.....ii. 200</p>	<p>GALATIANS.</p> <p>iii. 10.....ii. 202 iii. 13.....ii. 203† iii. 16.....ii. 213† iv. 6.....ii. 203 iv. 7.....ii. 204 iv. 23.....ii. 206 iv. 25.....ii. 206 v. 1.....ii. 207 v. 21.....ii. 208 vi. 2.....ii. 209 vi. 15.....ii. 209</p>	<p>EPHESIANS.</p> <p>i. 1.....ii. 211* i. 14.....ii. 213</p>	<p>EPHESIANS.</p> <p>i. 15.....ii. 214 i. 16.....ii. 230† ii. 13.....ii. 213† v. 2.....ii. 215 v. 14.....ii. 231 n. v. 30.....ii. 215 vi. 17.....ii. 213†</p>	<p>1 TIMOTHY.</p> <p>i. 12.....ii. 239* iii. 15, 16.....ii. 213† iii. 16.....ii. 239 iv. 10.....ii. 241 vi. 5.....ii. 242 vi. 7.....ii. 243</p>	<p>2 TIMOTHY.</p> <p>i. 11.....ii. 245 ii. 18.....ii. 246* iv. 17.....ii. 247</p>	<p>TITUS.</p> <p>iii. 1.....ii. 249</p>	<p>PHILEMON.</p> <p>6.....ii. 251* 10.....ii. 253 25.....ii. 253*</p>	<p>HEBREWS.</p> <p>i. 8.....ii. 254* i. 12.....ii. 255 iii. 16.....ii. 256 iv. 2.....ii. 257 vi. 2.....ii. 259* viii. 8.....ii. 262 x. 1.....ii. 263 x. 34.....ii. 265 xii. 3.....ii. 266 xii. 7.....ii. 267 xii. 18.....ii. 268 xiii. 21.....ii. 270</p>	<p>JAMES.</p> <p>i. 12.....ii. 272 i. 17.....ii. 273† ii. 20.....ii. 273 ii. 26.....ii. 274</p>
---	--	---	---	--	---	--	---	--	--	---	--	--	--	---	---

JAMES.	2 JOHN.	REVELATION.
iii. 3. ii. 275	8 ii. 294	xi. 9, 10. ii. 309
iii. 5. ii. 276		xi. 18. ii. 310
v. 20. ii. 277*	JUDE.	xiii. 1. ii. 311
	22 ii. 295	xiii. 7. ii. 313*
I PETER.		xiii. 8. ii. 313
iii. 21. ii. 278	REVELATION.	xiii. 10. ii. 314
iv. 1. ii. 279	i. 5. ii. 298*	xiii. 14. ii. 303†
iv. 1. ii. 280*	i. 15. ii. 299	xiii. 15. ii. 316
iv. 14. ii. 280	ii. 1. ii. 299	xiv. 13. ii. 317
v. 2. ii. 282	ii. 13. ii. 300	xv. 3. ii. 318
	ii. 17. ii. 301	xv. 6. ii. 319
I JOHN.	iii. 2. ii. 301	xvii. 3. ii. 321
i. 4. ii. 283	iv. 1, 7, 8. ii. 302	xviii. 3. ii. 322
iii. 5. ii. 285	v. 6. ii. 302	xviii. 7. ii. 323
iii. 14. ii. 286	v. 9. ii. 303	xviii. 19. ii. 324
iv. 20. ii. 287	vi. 1. ii. 304	xix. 13. ii. 324
v. 7. ii. 288	vi. 17. ii. 305	xx. 6. ii. 325*
v. 10. ii. 290†	xi. 5. ii. 306	xx. 9. ii. 325
v. 18. ii. 289	xi. 8, 9. ii. 307	xxi. 3. ii. 327*
		xxii. 16. ii. 327

<http://www.bibletranslation.ws/shop.html>