

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

III. THE TEXT.

THE second of the two readings on which the charge of partiality brought against the Revisers was based, belongs to the class that may be called dogmatic. "They [the Revisers] introduce *υιου Θεου*, in Mark i. 1, into the text, against Tischendorf's quite unanswerable arguments, and only remark in the margin: 'Some ancient authorities omit *the Son of God.*' I should think so. The interpolation of the words in the Sinaitic MS., and their omission in numerous Fathers from Irenæus onwards, who make a point of the brevity with which the Evangelist passes from 'the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ' to the following words, 'as it is written,' leave no doubt as to their being a later addition. Besides, as Tischendorf well points out, a *pietas male sedula* would be likely enough to introduce them, and even a *modica fides* unlikely to leave them out."¹ The severest punishment that I should wish for the author of this criticism would be that he should read through Dr. Hort's Introduction and Appendix. He will, indeed, find to his satisfaction that Dr. Hort also decides for the omission of the words, though adding that "neither reading can be safely rejected;" but he will at the same time learn a little of what textual criticism really is, and he will be confronted with the work of two at least of those whom with such "light heart" he has been accusing. I am not sure,

¹ *The Modern Review*, July, 1881, p. 616.

too, that in other ways he may not be led to see that there are more things in heaven and earth than his facile philosophy has hitherto dreamt of.

The same reading has, as it happens, been criticised from a different quarter, and to an opposite effect. Archdeacon Norris, if I remember rightly, objected that the omission of the words in question was too weakly attested to deserve even a marginal note. Does not this shew that the Revisers have really hit the reasonable mean? It would have been almost impossible for them to place the reading in their text, with the reluctance which they have everywhere shewn to accept the authority of a single uncial. The reading is one which only critics with such imperfect apprehension of principle as Tischendorf, or with such consummate experience in dealing with exceptional cases as Drs. Westcott and Hort, would venture to adopt. But I should be tempted to ask whether even they have allowed quite enough for the tendency in the Fathers to compendious quotation. The evidence of Irenæus seems to me to be very precarious, especially considering that in two places out of three he undoubtedly has the words. I very much suspect that posterity will ratify the judgment of the Revisers. In any case it is clear that they were not influenced by bias. For, if they have accepted a certain number of readings which either heighten or maintain at the same level as before the supernatural element in the Gospels, they have accepted quite as many by which that element may seem to be lowered. I am speaking now of the Gospels, though in the other books I believe that the balance would be found to be substantially the same. There will probably be about an equal number of instances on each side. It is true that the Revisers have banished the word "firstborn" from Matthew i. 25, "till she brought forth her firstborn son," where some have supposed that the omission was due to the wish to avoid the suggestion

that Mary was the mother of other children. The hypothesis, however, lies just as near that the common text is an assimilation to the parallel passage Luke ii. 7, "and she brought forth her firstborn son," where the word "firstborn" is unquestioned. And the scale is decisively turned by the fact that the authorities for omission in St. Matthew (\aleph B Z) represent a text which was in existence long before any controversy arose as to the perpetual virginity of Mary. Nor does it only represent this. The same group of authorities with rare, if, indeed, with any, exceptions over the space which the mutilated Dublin MS. covers, mark the line of genuine transmission. So long, however, as the word is left standing in the text of St. Luke (and this it must needs be), the question of doctrine is not really affected. The same applies to the reading, "Why askest thou me concerning the good?" for "Why callest thou me good?" in Matthew xix. 17. The parallels in the other Gospels (Mark x. 18; Luke xviii. 19) are left unchanged, so that the question concerns the exegesis of St. Matthew's Gospel alone. In John vii. 8 the Revisers have adopted what may be called the "apologetic" reading: "I go not up yet unto this feast," *i.e.*, the Feast of Tabernacles to which our Lord is said to have subsequently gone up. As far back as Porphyry, the heathen assailant of Christianity in the third century A.D., the other reading "I go not up," has been open to the sneers of carping critics. "Porphyry barks," says Jerome, "and accuses of vacillation and change of purpose." It is, indeed, strange how the very same Gospel brings together and places almost side by side the expressions which indicate the highest divinity and the traits which depict the truest humanity. He who is "God," "the Only-begotten," "in the bosom of the Father," at the same time hungers, and thirsts, and weeps, and groans, or is "moved with indignation," and his soul is "troubled," or shaken with deep emotion. If the external evidence had

compelled us to accept the reading "I go not up" (and if it had done so there can be no question that the Revisers would have admitted it without hesitation), it would still mean no more than "I am not going up" with this caravan. The Greek would by no means exclude different action in the future. "Perhaps, however," as Dr. Westcott says, "it is better to give a fuller force to the 'going up,' and to suppose that the thought of the next paschal journey, when the 'time was fulfilled,' already shapes the words. The true reading 'not yet' (followed by A. V.), and also the exact phrase 'this feast,' give force to this interpretation." In that case the meaning will be, "This is not" [or "is not yet"] "*the Anabasis—that great going up—to which I am looking forward.*" Dr. Westcott speaks with authority on the subject of the reading, which he does not discuss more explicitly. The authorities are: for "not," \aleph D K M II; for "not yet," B L T X Δ and others. Of these the latter combination is the more trustworthy. The former would represent a Western reading introduced at an early date, and in its origin probably nothing more than an instance of careless copying.

These may be quoted as instances in which the Revisers have adopted readings which favour the apologetic or high dogmatic view; but there are others which have a reverse tendency. One of the most conspicuous of these is the reading in Matthew xxiv. 36, "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven," where the Revisers insert in their text "neither the Son," after \aleph^* B D, Old Latin and other Versions, and several Fathers. Here, again, the words are unquestioned in Mark xiii. 32. Dr. Hort remarks on their omission in St. Matthew: "The words must have been absent from many of the current texts of Matthew by the beginning of Cent. IV.; but the documentary evidence in their favour is overwhelming. Although assimilation to Mark would account for their

presence if the attestation were unsatisfactory, their omission can be no less easily explained by the doctrinal difficulty which they seemed to contain. The corruption was more like to arise in the most freely used Gospel than in Mark, and having once arisen it could not fail to be readily welcomed.”¹ It is curious to observe how exactly this reading seems to invert the conditions of the reading which omits “firstborn” in Matthew i. 25. In each case internal considerations are balanced—dogmatic prepossession against the tendency to assimilate parallel texts—and in each case the scale is turned by the weight and character of the external evidence. Another reading still more important is John i. 18, where the Revisers have retained “the only begotten Son,” as in the Old Version, noting in the margin that “many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten*.” If any instance was to be given of partiality on the part of the Revisers, this was the one; for here they have clearly departed from the principles by which they have been guided elsewhere. But, if so, the partiality is not on the side on which it has been alleged to be. It is not in favour of Trinitarian doctrine, but against it. I shall not, however, for a moment accuse them of partiality of any kind. I am convinced that their work has been done in perfect good faith. It was no prepossession which induced them to resist the very preponderant weight of the external evidence—a preponderance of which the marginal note shews them to have been conscious. It was not this but the apparent strangeness of the phrase which proved a stumbling-block in the way. When scholars like the Dean of Peterborough declare their invincible repugnance to the reading of the oldest MSS., it is not surprising that a two-thirds majority could not be obtained for it. And yet the reading is not really so strange and unexampled as it looks. “Though startling at first,” it “simply combines in a single

¹ *N. T. in Greek*. Appendix, p. 17 f.

phrase the two attributes of the Logos marked before (*Θεός*, ver. 1; *μονογενής*, ver. 14): its sense is 'One who was both *Θεός* and *μονογενής*.'¹ This seems, to me, to be a sufficient defence of the reading, and to allow the external evidence to come into play. If we follow this (though the common reading has also a high antiquity), there can be little doubt that we are on the line of genuine transmission. The marginal reading here, with the reading "his daughter Herodias," in Mark vi. 22, may be paired together as instances in which intrinsic difficulties have led to the rejection of readings which would otherwise have been accepted.

In a different category must be placed the two readings John 11, and 19, though their tendency is similar—to give less prominence to the supernatural. The exclusion of the passage which describes the moving of the waters of Bethesda by angelic agency, and of the words which heighten the miraculous effect of the withdrawal of Jesus from the assault made upon Him in the temple, rests in each case upon strictly objective grounds. The evidence demands it, and the Revisers had no choice in the matter.

Passing to another class of readings, where no one will suspect the Revisers of bias, we may note that the two (Matt. 16, 119) which seem to have a bearing upon the guilt of adultery, are really nothing more than rather intricate and doubtful cases of assimilation of parallel passages, and their interest is almost purely text-critical. Those, however, who are interested in the momentous, if insoluble, question of the eternity of punishment, will be glad to know that in more than one instance the stern language of St. Mark's Gospel receives an appreciable mitigation. In Mark iii. 29, for the Old Version, "is in danger of eternal damnation," we now read on unquestionable authority, and with the consent of all the editors, "is guilty

¹ *N. T. in Greek*, p. 74.

of an eternal sin"—an enigmatical expression which at least shifts the ground from the retributive Divine justice to the conscience of the sinner. Twice over, too, in the verses Mark ix. 44-46, the terrible sentence, "where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched," is omitted on authority equally unquestionable. And the briefer clause, "into the fire that never shall be quenched," is also omitted in Verse 45. It is, however, rather the stern reiterating of the doom, than the doom itself, that disappears, for the impugned clauses remain standing in Verses 43 and 48.

A more complete removal of imported matter is effected in the place in which prayer is combined with fasting. Not only is the whole verse omitted, "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting," Matthew xvii. 21, but in the parallel passage in St. Mark (ix. 29) the words "and fasting" are relegated to the margin; and in 1 Corinthians vii. 5, the Revisers read "that ye may give yourselves unto prayer," without any addition. This is, I believe, a complete excision of the passages where fasting is directly inculcated, though it is frequently assumed as a Christian practice. The insertion seems to have been made in the text of St. Mark first, in that of St. Matthew subsequently, and at an altogether later date in the Epistle to the Corinthians.

On the whole subject of dogmatic influence on the text of the Greek Testament, there is an interesting and important passage in Dr. Hort's *Introduction*.¹ "It will not be out of place to add here a distinct expression of our belief that even among the numerous unquestionably spurious readings of the New Testament *there are no signs of deliberate falsification of the text for dogmatic purposes*. The licence of paraphrase occasionally assumes the appearance of wilful corruption. . . . But readings answering to this descrip-

tion cannot be judged rightly without taking into account the general characteristics of other readings exhibited by the same or allied documents. The comparison leaves little room for doubt that they belong to an extreme type of paraphrastic alteration, and are not essentially different from readings which betray an equally lax conception of transcription, and yet are transparently guiltless of any fraudulent intention. In a word, they bear witness to rashness, not to bad faith. *It is true that dogmatic preferences to a great extent determined theologians, and probably scribes, in their choice between rival readings already in existence.* Scientific criticism was virtually unknown, and in its absence the temptation was strong to believe and assert that a reading used by theological opponents had also been invented by them. Accusations of wilful tampering with the text are accordingly not infrequent in Christian antiquity; but, with a single exception, wherever they can be verified they prove to be groundless, being in fact hasty and unjust inferences from mere diversities of inherited text. The one known exception is the case of Marcion's dogmatic mutilation of the books accepted by him; and his was, strictly speaking, an adaptation for the use of his followers; nor had it apparently any influence outside the sect. Other readings of his, which he was equally accused of introducing, belonged manifestly to the texts of the copies which came into his hands, and had no exceptional character or origin. The evidence which has recently come to light as to his disciple Tatian's Diatessaron, has shewn that Tatian habitually abridged the language of the passages which he combined; so that the very few known omissions which might be referred to a dogmatic purpose, can as easily receive another explanation. The absence of perceptible fraud in the origination of any of the various readings now extant, may, we believe, be maintained with equal confidence for the text antecedent to the earliest extant variations, in

other words, for the purest transmitted text. . . . *The books of the New Testament, as preserved in extant documents, assuredly speak to us in every important respect in language identical with that in which they spoke to those for whom they were originally written.*" These reassuring words derive additional weight at once from the writer's unrivalled knowledge of early Christian literature, and from his rigorously scientific method, a method no less rigorously scientific than that of a Helmholtz or a Darwin.

I must hurry on over the intervening subjects, merely noticing in passing how (under the head *Appellations*) the Revised Version frequently strikes out reverential titles and adjuncts which had been interpolated into the simpler text; how (under the head *Names*): Lebbæus is now banished for "Thaddæus," "Simon the Canaanite" for "Simon the Cananæan," *i.e.*, Zealot, Peter is described alternately as the "son of Jonah" and the "son of John," and the father of Judas the traitor himself also set down as a native of Kerioth, implying that the family had settled there for at least two generations; how (under the head *Chronology*) the perplexing "second-first sabbath" of Luke vi. 1, is simply eliminated as probably a marginal calculation that had got admitted into the text, while two new notes of time are given in St. John (John 21 marginal reading, and 24), and the unnamed "feast" of John v. 1, is still left open instead of being tied down, as Tischendorf would tie it down, to the Feast of Tabernacles; how again (under the head *Geography*), in addition to points already noticed, a new direction is given to the circuit which was signaled by the healing of the Syro-Phœnician woman's daughter, making it appear that our Lord turned northwards "through Sidon" and so arrived at the sea of Galilee from the north-east (by Cæsarea Philippi?), and how a play on words is introduced with perhaps a more definite

topographical allusion in the name "brook or watertorrent of the cedars," for "brook Kidron." I must hurry over all these and come to the *omissions* and *changes* in the historical narrative. Especially the former; for it is here that the problems of textual criticism present themselves most conspicuously and most forcibly. I shall not, however, debate again such much controverted subjects as the omission of the last twelve verses from St. Mark, or the section of the Adulteress from St. John. Suffice it to say that the Revisers have in both cases followed in the steps of the best editors, and those who wish to see the reasons by which the editors have been influenced will find them nowhere so well stated as in Dr. Hort's *Appendix*. These two lengthy sections stand at the head of a group of five passages which Drs. Westcott and Hort class together as "Western interpolations," but which are yet of such importance as to demand some kind of recognition. The remaining three they have placed in their text within double brackets. These are the two verses Matthew xvi. 2, 3, the Signs of fine and rough Weather; Luke xxii. 43, 44, the Agony in the Garden; and Luke xxiii. 34, the First of the Seven Last Words, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The Revisers have not dealt uniformly with all the five. The Weather-signs and the Agony they have admitted into their text, but noted the omission in the margin. The two longer sections they have printed with breaks—to that from St. John adding also brackets—and the saying upon the Cross they have placed in the margin. This difference of treatment corresponds roughly to a difference in the evidence. Against the section of the Adulteress the evidence is overwhelming; and, in spite of Mr. McClellan's protest, we may regard its absence from the original text as a point upon which critics are pretty well agreed. On the other hand, the gist of the case against the last twelve verses of St. Mark rests upon the combina-

tion \aleph B. The same combination with some support is ranged against the Weather-signs. In the description of the Agony \aleph^* secedes, but is replaced by the first corrector, while A and two good fragmentary MSS. ally themselves to B. This is a strong group. The Revisers would, however, ground their case upon \aleph^* D coupled with the early patristic evidence, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Hippolytus, etc. Yet these authorities are not seldom found on the side of readings that are certainly Western and cannot be trusted to mark a pure descent. For the omission of the words of forgiveness the authorities are \aleph (first corrector) B D*, where the accession of D, with some codices of the Old Latin shews that even from some Western texts the words were absent. "Few verses of the Gospels," as Dr. Hort remarks,¹ "bear in themselves a surer witness to the truth of what they record than the first of the Words from the Cross: but it need not, therefore, have belonged originally to the book in which it is now included. We cannot doubt that it comes from an extraneous source." The same is doubtless true in greater or less degree of the other passages in question. We need not lose them or the truths which they contain because they were not actually penned by the Evangelist. St. John exclaims at the end of his Gospel, "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself would not contain the books that should be written." Other volumes besides the canonical Gospels we do not possess, and so much of them as we do possess is for the most part of inferior quality; but here and there a fragment carried down by oral or written tradition has been preserved by pious hands, and placed for safety in a framework which was not likely to be violated. There are still a few authentic sayings which have not enjoyed such protection. But the re-

¹ Appendix, p. 68.

cognition of this fact does not deprive them of their value. A jewel is still a jewel, whatever its setting.

Besides these five "Western interpolations," there are eight other passages, with one exception, of much less importance, which, in the opinion of Drs. Westcott and Hort, possess a precisely converse character. They are found in the non-Western and omitted from the Western texts, and omitted, as these editors think, with good reason. Seven out of the eight or (if we add the passage previously discussed—Matt. 189) nine passages are found in the last chapter of St. Luke. In all these cases the authority is slender; D and the Old Latin, occasionally reinforced by **N**. In other words, the omission is purely Western. But then we are met by this remarkable fact, that as a rule the tendency of the Western text is much more to insert than to omit. The scribes to whom it owes its origin seem to have laid their hands upon all that they could get, and were far from willing to relinquish that which they had. This alone would rouse suspicion. And when the series of passages comes to be examined, the Cambridge Editors think they can see an adventitious character about them. It is certainly true that when they are taken away the narrative does not seem to have lost any essential feature. The additions have the appearance of being either made up from the parallel narrative of St. John, or else merely epexegetic; and the mention of such a detail as the piece of "honeycomb" looks as if it were apocryphal. On these grounds the Cambridge Editors enclose them all in double brackets, and the Revisers, with more caution, have taken note of the omissions in the margin. For this very moderate measure they cannot be blamed.¹

¹ It is important to note, in view of the use which has been made of these omissions, that the question in regard to them lies quite upon the outskirts of textual criticism, and does not affect the main principle. The point is one upon which even Drs. Westcott and Hort would hardly speak with entire confidence.

The one passage which has just been described as of exceptional importance brings us to a topic to which it is surprising more attention should not have been paid—the four parallel accounts of the Institution of the Lord's Supper. In order to shew the maximum amount of possible divergence, I will quote St. Luke's account in the form in which it appears in the margin.

MATT. xxvi. 26-28.	MARK xiv. 22-24.	LUKE xxii. 17-20.	1 Cor. xi. 23-26.
TEXT.	TEXT.	MARGIN.	TEXT.
And as they were eating, Jesus took ¹ bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took ² a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of ³ the ⁴ covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins.	And as they were eating, he took ¹ bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave to them, and said, Take ye: this is my body. And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave to them: and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of ² the ³ covenant, which is shed for many.	And he received a cup, and when he had given thanks, he said, Take this, and divide it among yourselves . . . And he took bread [<i>or, a loaf</i>], and when he had given thanks he brake it, and gave to them, saying, This is my body.	. . . the Lord Jesus . . . took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which ¹ is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new ² covenant in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.
MARGIN. ¹ Or, a loaf. ² Some authorities read THE CUP. ³ Or, the testament. ⁴ Many ancient authorities insert new.	MARGIN. ¹ Or, a loaf. ² Or, the testament. ³ Some ancient authorities insert new.	TEXT adds, 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 covenant [<i>or, testament</i>] in my blood even that which is poured out for you.	MARGIN. ¹ Many ancient authorities read is broken for you. ² Or, testament.

This may be said to be almost a typical example of the

large majority of changes, while it is thrown into special relief by the deep interest of the narrative in which it is contained. The many omissions in the old familiar text will seem at first sight of more importance than they really are. The words and phrases which disappear from one of the records are in every case retained in another, so that there is no substantial loss. It is only that the testimony becomes single instead of double or threefold. If St. Matthew and St. Mark now speak indefinitely of "a cup," and no longer of "*the* (special) cup"—probably the third of the Paschal cups which came after the eating of the lamb, and was called by the Jews "the cup of blessing," and even though St. Luke should be deprived of the same definite allusion, it would still be found in St. Paul. Though in the words of administration St. Mark has "Take" only, and not "Take, eat," both words still have a place in the text of St. Matthew. And though "new" is dropped before "covenant" in the first two Synoptic Gospels, it remains possibly in the third, and certainly in the narrative of St. Paul. The most difficult question is that which is presented by the relation of this latter narrative to that in the Gospel of St. Luke. Is the apparent resemblance of the two in the common texts natural or artificial? Have we the words that St. Luke originally wrote? Or are we to regard the passage which approaches most closely to the language of St. Paul as an early interpolation, added—as so many others were—to make the narrative more complete? An idea got abroad at a very early date that when St. Paul spoke of "my Gospel," he meant the written record which has come down to us under the name of his companion, St. Luke. But if so, what more natural than to supplement the seemingly imperfect account of the Evangelist from the fuller narrative of the Apostle? This might well be done with a very innocent intention at first. The early

Christians were poor and many of them could probably not afford to possess more than the copy of a single Gospel. And the owner of such a single Gospel would be glad to enrich his MS. with marginal notes borrowed from elsewhere. Then the next copyist inserted the marginal matter bodily into the text, and there it became established. On the whole, it would seem that some such hypothesis presents a more probable explanation of the facts than that which assumes an accidental omission.

There is a difficulty in the longer reading arising from the apparent division of the institution of the Cup into two parts, separated from each other by the institution of the Bread. The direct evidence for the omission of the passage is purely Western—D, some forms of the Old Latin, and the Old Syriac in part. Westcott and Hort, however, observe that, as before remarked, the Western authorities are especially trustworthy in omissions. And this, coupled with the strength of the internal considerations, has led them to place the disputed words in double brackets, and so practically to deny them a place in the text. The other editors accept them as genuine. And the Revisers have followed the middle course of keeping them in the text but noting the omission in the margin. The point is one upon which it will perhaps never be possible to pronounce quite confidently.

With one more conspicuous example of the changes introduced by textual criticism, I will conclude. The parallel columns which follow represent the revised form of the Lord's Prayer as it appears in the two Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke.

MATT. vi. 9-13.

Our Father which art in heaven,
Hallowed be thy name. Thy
kingdom come. Thy will be done
as in heaven, so on earth. Give

LUKE xi. 2-4.

¹ Father, Hallowed be thy name.
Thy kingdom come.² Give us day
by day ³ our daily bread. And
forgive us our sins; for we our-

us this day¹ our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors. And bring us not into temptation, but deliver us from² the evil one.³

MARGIN. ¹ Gr. *our bread for the coming day.*

² Or, *evil.*

³ Many authorities, some ancient, but with variations, add *For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. Amen.*

selves also forgive every one that is indebted to us. And bring us not into temptation.⁴

MARGIN. ¹ Many ancient authorities read *Our Father which art in heaven.*

² Many ancient authorities add *Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.*

³ Gr. *our bread for the coming day.*

⁴ Many ancient authorities add *but deliver us from the evil one (or, from evil).*

With the weighty questions of translation which these two passages raise I am not at present concerned; and the reader will find an exceptionally full and exhaustive discussion of these elsewhere.¹ From the point of view of textual criticism the problem is comparatively clear and simple. It was only natural that there should be a certain amount of protest from lay critics, but it will have been seen that among the editors who have given a close and continuous study to the text of the New Testament the consent is all but complete in favour of the Revisers. The true reading in Matthew vi. 12 is undoubtedly not the present ἀφίεμεν, but the aorist ἀφήκαμεν—which, strange to say, two distinguished members of the Revision Committee² seem at one time to have regarded as a perfect—though the rendering “have forgiven” may be more open to question. Nor, when the lines of descent of the two readings are studied, can there be any real doubt as to the omission of

¹ On the translation “our daily bread,” see especially the elaborate discussions of Bishop Lightfoot, *On Revision*, Appendix I., and Mr. McClellan, *N. T.*, vol. i., p. 632 ff. For the rendering “bring” for “lead” see Bishop Lightfoot, *Letter in the Guardian*, Sept. 14th, 1881; and for the question between “evil” and “the evil one,” see a pamphlet by Canon F. C. Cook, the editor of the *Speaker's Commentary*, entitled, *Deliver us from Evil: A Protest*, etc. London, 1881; Three letters by Bishop Lightfoot, in the *Guardian* of Sept. 7th, 14th, and 21st, and a reply by Canon Cook, in the *Guardian* of Sept. 28th.

² Bishop Ellicott, *On Revision*, p. 146 (1st edition), and Prof. Milligan, *EXPOSITOR*, First Series, vol. vii., p. 130.

the Doxology.¹ The evidence for the omissions in St. Luke is less abundant; but it is very good in quality, and it is supported by the obvious consideration that if the words were originally wanting it is much more natural that they should have been supplied than it is that they should have been originally present and afterwards lost.

These remarks are all that space allows me to make at present. But the text of the Revised Version is a subject that has its ramifications in every chapter and, to a greater or less degree, in every paragraph of the New Testament. It will constantly affect the exegesis; and the student must be as much upon his guard for variations arising from this source as from those which arise from variations of rendering. All that it has been possible to do has been to ascertain some of the principles on which the Revisers have worked, and to bring out a few of the more salient results of their labours.

W. SANDAY.

POSTSCRIPT.—Since the preceding article was set up in type, there has appeared at the head of the current number of the *Quarterly Review* a root and branch attack upon the principles of textual criticism adopted not only by the Revisers, but also by the succession of recent editors, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, and Westcott and Hort. I rejoice to see it, because there is no means of getting at truth like discussion, especially searching discussion such as this criticism seems to promise. Its author possesses all the qualifications for his task, but one. His learning is great, his scholarship finished, his confidence in his cause absolute, his style vivacious and telling to an extraordinary degree. The one thing wanting is grasp on the central conditions of the problem, and a real understanding of his

¹ I have discussed this point at length in a letter to *Public Opinion*, June 18th, 1881, p. 793.

opponents' position. I believe I am to have an opportunity, in the forthcoming number of the *Contemporary Review*, of doing my own part to shew where the fallacy lies.

In the meantime I will ask the readers of the *Quarterly Review* to suspend their judgment, and not to be carried away by the torrent of desultory reasoning and invective, until they have heard what there is to be said on the other side. They may be assured that there is much in reserve besides what I shall be able to urge.

W. S.

CHRIST AND THE ANGELS.

III. HEBREWS ii. 10.

IN Chapter ii. Verse 9, the Apostle has overstepped the limits of the thesis that the Mediator of the new dispensation is superior to the angels, and that the new world is freed from angelic rule; for, in speaking of the glorification of Jesus, he has introduced a reference to the specific value of his passion not merely as the antecedent and reason of his glorification ("crowned with glory and honour on account of the suffering of death"), but as the means of salvation to men ("that by the grace of God He should taste death for every man"). Now the ultimate source of all doubt whether the new dispensation is superior to the old is nothing else than want of clear insight into the work of Christ, and especially into the significance of his passion, which, to the Jews, from whom the Hebrew Christians of our Epistle were drawn, was the chief stumbling-block in Christianity. Here, therefore, the Writer has at length got into the heart of his subject; and, leaving the contrast between Christ and the angels, urges the positive doctrine of the identification of Jesus with those that are