

June (14th) Elisha \*Luke iv 22-30: 24th *εἰς τὸ γενέσιον τοῦ Προδρόμου* || Luke i 1-25, 57 . . ., 76, 80: 29th Peter and Paul || Matt. xvi 13-19.

July 20th Elijah Luke iv 22-30: 30th *εἰς προσκύνησιν τοῦ τιμίου ξίλου* Matt. xxvii 27-32 overlaps Passion-week lessons (July 31st usually).

August 6th ἡ μεταμόρφωσις †Luke ix 28-36 and || Matt. xvii 1-9: 29th ἡ ἀποστομὴ τοῦ Προδρόμου || Mark vi 14-30.

Miscellaneous lessons, *εἰς ἐγκαίνια* \*Jno. x 22-38—*εἰς ἀνομβρίαν* †Luke iv 23-30—*εἰς ἐπινίκια βασιλέων* †Mark xi 22-26 Matt. vii 7, 8. *ἐπι τῶν ζ' πρεσβυτέρων* †Mark vi 7-13, *εἰς μάρτυρας* || Mark xiii 9-13 and †Jno. xv 17-xvi 2.

In conclusion I may note a few cases where the *a*-lessons throw light on the origin of various readings. For Matt. xxv 13 see note at end of tables:—the omission in some authorities of *καὶ διληψήθησαν σφόδρα* in Matt. xvii 23 and of *καὶ προσωρμίσθησαν* in Mark vi 53 is explained by *a*'s omission of the words in the lesson *κνρ. δ'* Matt. and the 13th Five-day lesson in Mark. In Luke x 22 the added words *καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἶπε* found in the mass of authorities are not due to lectionary usage, for Luke x 22-24 was only read in the Five-day series, and *a*, which preserves a primitive form of this, contains the added words in the text but rubricates the lection *εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς*. In Luke vi 31, on the other hand, *a* omits from the text the TR addition *εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος*, but the Five-day rubric begins *εἶπεν ὁ κ.* which no doubt originated the addition. In *a* the added refrain *ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνησε κτέ* is rubricated with slight variations at end of Five-day lesson Matt. xiii 23, *κνρ. ις'* Matt. xxv 30 (in *β* at end of *v. 29*), *κνρ. θ'* Luke viii 15 (in *a*'s text), *κνρ. θ'* Luke xii 21, *σαβ. ις'* Luke xxi 4 (only the two last in *κ*-system) and in all five cases some authorities under lectionary influence put the words in the text. The same may be said of the rubricated addition to the Five-day lesson ending Mark xi 26 and of the addition in *a*'s text at end of *κνρ. ια'* Luke xiv 24 (neither of which is in the *κ*-system).

W. C. BRAITHWAITE.

## THE PRESENT GREEK TESTAMENTS OF THE CLARENDON PRESS, OXFORD.

THE Clarendon Press announces in its lists under the heading *The Holy Scriptures in Greek, &c.* only the following two editions of the Greek Testament:—

*Lloyd's Greek Testament.*—Novum Testamentum Græce. Accedunt parallela S. Scripturæ loca, necnon vetus capitulorum notatio et canones Eusebii. Edidit CAROLUS LLOYD, S.T.P.R. 18mo. 3s. With Appendices by W. SANDAY, D.D., cloth, 6s.

*Lloyd's Greek Testament, Critical Appendices* (separately), by  
W. SANDAY, D.D. 18mo. 3s. 6d.

*Mill's Greek Testament*.—Novum Testamentum Graece juxta exemplar Millianum. 18mo. 2s. 6d., or on writing-paper, 7s. 6d.

No account is taken in the following paper of special editions as *Palmer's* Greek Testament with the Readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version or *Cardwell's* New Testament in Greek and English. When we wish to study the Greek Testaments of the Clarendon Press, only these two can come under consideration. Now it seems high time to say a word on them :

First of all, both titles are not correctly given. The title of 'Lloyd's Testament' as it is published at present runs

H KAINH  
ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ  
NOVUM  
TESTAMENTUM  
accedunt

*Parallela S. Scripturae loca  
vetus capitulorum notatio  
Canones Eusebii*

©ionii

e typographeo Clarendoniano

M DCCC XCIV

xx. 653 pages.

The 'necnon' and 'et' in the Press-list is retained from earlier impressions, as 1828, 1836. The title of 'Mill's Testament' is at present

H KAINH  
ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ  
NOVUM  
TESTAMENTUM  
©ionii

e typographeo Clarendoniano

M DCCCC

562 pages.

On the back of this title is stated :

SECUNDUM EXEMPLAR OXONIENSE  
ANNO M. DCC. XLII. EDITUM.

Beside this remark this edition contains no clue whatever about its text. Now both these editions have a strange history.

Lloyd has a *Monitum* signed

CAR. OXON.

Dabamus ex Æde Christi,  
20<sup>mo</sup> Dec<sup>ris</sup> 1827.

This Monitum begins in the present impressions :

Damus tibi in manus, L.B., Novum Testamentum idem fere, quod ad textum attinet cum editione Milliana, cum divisione Pericoparum et Interpunctura J. A. Bengelii.

To the word Milliana in square brackets a footnote is added :

[Millius, quod ipse testatur, textum Stephanicum anni 1550 in editione sua repraesentandum curavit.]

And at the end of the Monitum a similar footnote is given :

[Textus noster, ut supra diximus, Stephanicus est. Accentus spiritus iota subscriptum interpuncturam Millius Car. Oxon. alii immutaverunt.]

Now if we compare this Monitum with that of the original edition of Lloyd's, which has the year MDCCCXXVIII on its title, and '*necnon*' and '*et*' as above mentioned, we find in the very first sentence one important difference. Instead of '*idem fere*' Lloyd had written '*idem profecto*'. No doubt *fere* is more correct, but the original reading ought to have been retained or mentioned in the margin : when Lloyd published his edition, he believed that he was repeating the text of Mill, but it was not his. For there can be no doubt, that Lloyd gave to the printer the Oxford edition of 1742 mentioned above from the back of the title of what is now called 'Mill's Testament'.

Its title is

H KAINH  
ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ,  
NOVUM  
TESTAMENTUM  
GRÆCUM.

Textu per omnia Milliano, cum Divisione Pericoparum & Interpunctura  
J. A. Bengelii.

[Signet of the Theatrum Sheldonianum]  
*Oxonii*

E Theatro Sheldoniano

Impensis E. Broughton Bibliop. MDCCXLII.

557 pages.

Already Eduard Reuss has shown in his *Bibliotheca Novi Testamenti Graeci* 1872 that the Editor, who is said to have been bishop Gambold of the Moravians, did not follow Mill, but an edition published at Edinburgh in 1740, whose text differed in not a few particulars from that of Mill. These variations came over into Lloyd. This must have been recognized rather early. For I possess an edition of 1836, which is, strange to say, unknown to Reuss and his followers *Schaff-Hall*<sup>1</sup> and not mentioned in the Bible Catalogue of the British Museum.

<sup>1</sup> Reuss describes, p. 155, no. 73 : Oxonii e typographeo academico, 1836. 12. Editio Milliana puro duci suo fidissima. Textus binis columnis expressus, versiculis

It has 'Academico' on its title instead of 'Clarendoniano' and M DCCC XXXVI, and 712 pages instead of 696, and is a much improved reprint of Lloyd's. This is already shewn by the references of the first page. For Lloyd had quoted in Matt. i 2, 1828: Gen. xxv 24, 1836 has xxv 26, v. 7. 1828 i Reg. xv 3, 1836 has 8, &c.

The last revision of Lloyd's seems to have taken place in 1888-9, for the 'Appendices ad Novum Testamentum Stephanicum, iam inde a Millii temporibus Oxoniensium manibus tritum, Curante GUL<sup>mo</sup> SANDAY, A.M., S.T.P., LL.D.' M DCCCLXXXIX say in a 'Monitum Textui Graeco Novi Testamenti Praemissum' (rather: Praemittendum?): 'Visum est igitur preli academici delegatis textum illum Millianum sive Stephanicum, qui iamdiu Oxoniensium manibus teritur, ad exemplar editionis Stephanicae anni MDL denuo castigatum, typis iterum mandare.'

Now it seems worth while to exhibit these several stages of the history of this Greek Text by parallel columns. In the first is placed Stephanus of 1550, in the second Mill of 1707, in the third (Gambold) 1742, in the fourth Lloyd 1828, in the fifth Lloyd 1836, in the sixth Lloyd 1889 (from a copy, which has M DCCC XCIV on its title), in the last 'Mill' 1900 (= 1742).

	Stephanus	Mill	Gambold	'Lloyd'			'Mill'
	1550	1707	1742	1828	1836	1889	1900
	a	m	b				
1. Matt. xxvi 9	πτωχοῖς	a	τοῖς πτ.	b	b	a	b
2. Mark i 21	εἰς τὴν σ.	a	εἰς συν.	b	a	a	a
3. " iv 18	σπειρόμενοι οὗτοί εἰσιν	a	οἱ οὗτοί εἰσιν	b	a	a	a
4. " vi 29	τῷ μνημ.	a	μνημείῳ	b	a	a	a
5. " viii 3	ἤκασι	a	ἤκουσι	b	a	a	a
6. " xi 22	Ἰησοῦς	δ' Ἰησοῦς	m	m	m	a	m
7. " xvi 20	ἀμήν	'Αμήν	omitt.	b	m	m	m
8. John xviii 24	ἀπέστειλαν	a	ἀ. οὖν	b	a	a	a
9. 1 Cor. xv 33	χρησθ'	a	χρηστὰ	b	a	χρησθ'	a
10. 1 Thess. i 9	ἔχομεν	a	ἔσχομεν	b	a	a	a
11. 2 Tim. i 5	Εὐνείκη	a	Εὐνίκη	b	a	a	b
12. Apoc. xi 2	ἔσωθεν	a	ἔξωθεν	b	a	a	b

That is to say: in all passages (eleven out of twelve) in which Gambold 1742 deviated from Mill, he was followed by Lloyd 1828; in all, except the first, the true reading of Mill has been restored already in 1836; in the twelfth passage (6=Mark xi 22) where Mill himself

distinctis. Praefatio adest nulla. My edition has no columns nor verses, and has Lloyd's preface.

deviated from Stephanus, Mill was followed up to the last revision of 1889; while that edition, which is now called 'Mill's' 'secundum 1742', sticks to 1742 still three times (1 and 11 and 12).

Add

13. Acts xxvii 3	πρὸς φίλους	a	πρ. τοὺς φ.	b	a	b	a
14. 2 Cor. v 12	διδ. ὑμῖν	a	a	a	a	δ. ἡμῶν <sup>1</sup>	a
15. Eph. i 3	Χριστῷ	a	ἐν Χρ.	b	b	a	b

But this is the least point which is to be urged against these editions, that the impressions were no accurate repetitions of Mill. When the last reprint was made in 1889, it was felt that it was not quite up to date to repeat a text of 1707 or rather 1550. Therefore the Monitum goes on: 'Nolebant tamen (Delegati preli academici) Textum abhinc annos trecentos constitutum ita lectoribus proponere ut recentiorum omnium iudicia dissimularent. Itaque libro bene noto placuit appendices subicere.' The first of these contains therefore

*Collatio Textus Westcottio-Hortiani cum Textu Stephanico anni MDL.*

It is a very solid piece of work, of ninety-two pages, done for the greatest part by H. J. White e Societate S. Andreae Sarisburiensi and Fredericus A. Overton e Coll. Exon. It shews already by its extent to what degree a modern text differs from the old; but I wonder whether it is much used<sup>2</sup>. And then the so-called 'Mill' has no such

<sup>1</sup> A mere misprint of 1889 (apparently).

<sup>2</sup> The present writer has had occasion to check the collation from the end of Luke onward, and may be permitted to offer here some corrections and additions (minor matters, as wrong numbering of verses, are omitted).

Matt. v 4, 5	The transposition of these verses, proposed by WH. on the margin, is not mentioned.
Luke xix 31	WH. ὅτι 'Ο pro 'Οσι δ (Mill).
Acts i 15	,, ἀδελφῶν pro μαθητῶν.
xx 4	,, Σέκουδος (different accent).
xxiii 10	,, γινομένης pro γεν.
xxv 10	,, ἡδίκηκα pro ἡδίκησα.
1 Cor. xii 15, 16	different punctuation. Stephen, Mill and 1836 had ; at the end of both verses: 1828 v. 15; v. 16.: WH. both verses.: Lloyd 1889 both verses a full stop.
xiv 26	WH. γινίσθω pro γεν.
Col. iv 15	,, Νύμφαν (= fem.) pro Νυμφᾶν (= masc.).
1 Thess. ii 12	,, μαρτυρούμενοι pro -ρούμενοι.
Hebr. viii 6	,, τέτυχεν pro τέτευχε.
xii 17	,, ἀπεδοκιμάσθη, : different punctuation; αὐτήν in this case referring to εὐλογία, not to μετανοίας.
James ii 22	,, , at the end of verse, not ; .
1 John ii 24	,, om. οὖν.
Apoc. ii 24	,, βαθία pro βάθη.
iii 5	,, ἱματίοις (no difference between WH. and Mill).
xviii 23	,, φάνη pro φανῆ.

appendix. And now think that the text of Mill or Stephen is principally that of Erasmus's first edition of 1516, containing in the Apocalypse such grammatical and lexical monsters as xvii 5 ἀκαθάρτητος, 8 καίπερ ἐστίν, and at the end of the book, because his codex was defective, his retranslation from the Latin, where in six verses he missed the original thirty times, closing the Apocalypse and the whole Greek Testament with a word, which has no attestation at all in any Greek document, nor even in the better documents of the Latin, μετὰ πάντων ὑμῶν.

It must be asked, Whether it is worthy of a University Press like that of Oxford to go on printing such a text merely because the name of Mill is attached to it. Mill's edition was indeed a splendid piece of work, but *not its text*, merely its apparatus. The fame which is justly due to the apparatus has been attached to the text without any reason, as every one agrees.

The British and Foreign Bible Society has resolved no longer to circulate the *textus receptus*. Surely it is high time that the Delegates of the Clarendon Press should follow their example. Things like ἀκαθάρτητος, καίπερ ἐστίν were a blot in the time of Erasmus, but are a disgrace in the twentieth century.

EB. NESTLE.

[We are indebted to Dr. Nestle for the characteristically minute care which he has bestowed upon the examination of some of our Oxford books. I believe the facts are in the main as he has stated them. It is perhaps just worth while to note that in the collation of MSS where Dr. Nestle thinks that the transposition of the verses St Matt. v 4, 5 has been overlooked by us, the omission was really deliberate. The marks attached to the marginal reading indicate that it is not a true variant; on this ground we passed it over.

While recognizing the general correctness of Dr. Nestle's facts, I cannot help a little wondering why, under the heading 'Present Greek Testaments of the Clarendon Press', he begins by ruling out the one book which has some real connexion with the Oxford of the present day, and devotes all his accounts to two texts, which as texts were never of any real importance, the one published in 1828, and the other in 1707 (or, more strictly, 1742).

The book known as *Palmer's Greek Testament with the Revisers' Readings*, is prescribed for use in the Examinations of the University, and either it or Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament is usually recommended by tutors to their pupils. The 'Mill' texts (for Bishop Lloyd,

as Dr. Nestle truly says, intended to reproduce Mill) are just the survival of an old book which is only still issued because there is still some demand for it. This means that in the whole of the area covered by English scholarship the use of the Textus Receptus, and of the texts closely allied to it, has not as yet entirely died out. In like manner the Cambridge Press, I believe, still issues the text of Stephanus, though the text most in favour at Cambridge is naturally that of Westcott and Hort.

The Clarendon Press has the special right of printing 'The Greek Testament with the readings adopted by the Revisers of the Authorized Version'. This was edited by the late Archdeacon Palmer, who gave the readings implied in the Authorized Version as variants at the foot of the page. Cambridge prints the Stephanus text of 1550 with the Revisers' readings as variants. It is of course true that the real credit for the text belongs neither to Oxford nor to Cambridge, but to the Revisers. The University Presses send out their books in accordance with the law of supply and demand, as trading corporations. They do not propose to dictate to their public; if they did, it would be useless, as the public would go elsewhere. But in the end there is sure to be 'a survival of the fittest'; scholarship tells by degrees in the easiest and most natural way.

For these reasons I rather demur to the title Dr. Nestle has given to his study, which might seem to give to the editions criticized an importance they do not possess. But all facts have their value, and the standard of accuracy is constantly rising. This is not the only field in which Dr. Nestle's minute investigations have done real service. He treads worthily in the steps of the American scholar, the late Dr. Isaac H. Hall; and when a new edition is brought out of Reuss's *Bibliotheca* he will be one of those who have contributed most to it.

W. S.]