

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 *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

THE

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA.

ARTICLE I.

PRINCIPLES OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM.

BY REV. FREDERIC GARDINER, D.D., PROFESSOR IN THE BERKELEY DIVINITY
SCHOOL, MIDDLETOWN, CONN.

FROM the earliest times there is found to have been a difference in the reading of the text of the New Testament. Quotations are made, by different Fathers of the same passage, slightly differing in language, and often under circumstances which forbid the explanation of loose citation; and, as soon as attention was directed to such matters, the earliest critics frequently mention differences of reading in different copies. The earliest versions, too, made as they were with scrupulous fidelity, show the same sort of variation. The most ancient manuscripts now extant are not perfectly agreed together, nor do any of them exactly accord with manuscripts themselves later, but perhaps copied from others of a still earlier date. Most of these variations, it is true, are of little consequence, often mere differences in spelling, or unimportant changes in the order of the words. There are other variations, however, of greater interest; and careful examination of the less important readings is the best training for the determination of the more important. It is, indeed, more than probable that some variations occurred in the very first transcription of the several books, or that, if the author himself prepared more than one copy, these did not

quite verbally agree. In such cases it is, of course, impossible to determine the true text; for both texts are equally true. Yet it is obvious that, as time rolled on, and copies were copied and re-copied again, the tendency, notwithstanding the utmost care, was to multiply errors, until, when the invention of printing came, the variations were many and sometimes considerable, and it became a matter of no small difficulty to decide among them.

The earliest printed edition of the whole Greek New Testament was in 1514, in the magnificent work of Cardinal Ximenes, known as the "Complutensian Polyglot." It was prepared from inferior MSS., and as it was not *published* until eight years later, when the ground was already occupied by the editions of Erasmus, it has never been of much importance, except in the book of the Apocalypse. Meantime the German publisher, Froben, anxious to anticipate its publication, prevailed upon Erasmus to undertake the editing of a New Testament in Greek. Erasmus was at the time fully occupied upon an edition of the works of Jerome and other literary labors, but succeeded in bringing out his first hasty edition in 1516, and his second, with more leisure and care, three years later. It was the work of a scholar of great learning and ability, but bore evident marks of a first essay upon untrodden ground. Four manuscripts were used in its preparation; but, unfortunately, the only one of great value (the cursive MS. 1) differed so much from the others that Erasmus became suspicious of it, and made comparatively little use of its readings. He was much influenced, too, by the estimation in which the Latin Vulgate was then held, and did not hesitate to translate from it into Greek, passages which he found wanting in all his MSS. This was very freely done in the Apocalypse, of which he had but one defective and inferior MS.; but there are various instances, also, in the other books, as, for example, in Acts viii. 37 and ix. 5, 6. Thus many clauses which Erasmus says he translated from the Latin because they were not in the Greek have passed into our common Greek Testaments, and through them into the

English and other modern versions. The first edition of Erasmus was soon reprinted at Venice, in connection with the Aldine Septuagint, and corrected many errors of Froben's press. Erasmus, unconscious of its origin, used it in the correction of his third edition, which differed in more than five hundred places from his first. In his fourth edition the Apocalypse was largely, but not completely, corrected from the Complutensian, which had now at last appeared; but in other respects this edition and the fifth, in 1535, differ but little from the third. These last editions became the basis of the Greek text now commonly received. As yet it rested on a narrow basis of manuscript authority, and there was little opportunity for a critical determination of the true reading. Still, a noble work had been accomplished, and it exerted a powerful influence for good.

Some ten years after the death of Erasmus, Robert Stephens began a series of editions. In the first two of these he undertook to combine the texts of the Complutensian edition and of Erasmus. Later, in 1550, he published his great edition in folio, in which he abandoned this plan, and returned very nearly to the text of Erasmus. He gave, however, in the margin nearly half of the various readings of the Complutensian, and also a selection from the readings of fifteen additional MSS. The collation was executed by his son, then at the age of eighteen, and is neither complete nor accurate; nevertheless, the advantage gained was great. His fourth edition has the same text, but is divided into verses, in which it has been most unfortunately copied by our English and many other versions. It is still referred to by some writers as the *Textus Receptus*.

Between 1565 and the close of the century Theodore Beza published five editions. Generally following the text of Stephens, he yet often mentions various readings in his annotations, and sometimes introduces changes in the text on manuscript authority. He had in his possession two valuable MSS., both marked D, one of the Gospels and Acts, the other of the Pauline Epistles, and also the Stephens' collation.

He appears, also, to have afterward made further examination of the MSS. for himself. His first edition of 1565 is likewise sometimes intended by the expression *Textus Receptus*.

After another quarter of a century the Elzevirs, famous printers of Leyden, published several convenient and beautifully-executed editions, which came rapidly into use. There was no known editor. It is supposed that the printers took the folio edition of Stephens, and corrected it partially by that of Beza; sometimes they varied from both; for what reason, or whether only accidentally, is not known. The preface of the Elzevir edition of 1624 declares that its text was then *ab omnibus receptus*. This is the origin of the name "*Textus Receptus*," which has come to be generally applied to this edition. Our own authorized version follows sometimes this and sometimes the edition of Beza; but it does not hesitate to deviate from both, as for instance, in Matt. ii. 2, where it had better manuscript authority; thus showing conclusively that this text was not then considered as a final standard. Translation, however, rather than criticism, was the business of the translators, and they generally follow with fidelity one or other of the forms of the *Textus Receptus* mentioned above.

The *Textus Receptus* thus represents a stage in the progress of effort to reproduce an accurate copy of the Greek New Testament. It was a great advance on the first crude text of Erasmus, but still it marks only an early stage when comparatively few MSS. were known, and the art of collating even these was imperfectly understood; when the text of the Vulgate was corrupt, and but little examination had been made of its earlier MSS.; when the value of the Oriental versions was unknown; and when the multitudinous quotations and discussions of the text in the Fathers had been scarcely at all considered. It is plain that a text so formed can have no critical value in our day. There are, indeed, scholars who still cling to it; and undoubtedly its readings are entitled to hold their place until other readings can be shown to be better supported. But this is simply as a matter of

convenience ; the text itself can have no higher authority than the MSS. from which it is known to have been formed, and with which it was collated. To these the labors of critics have now added more than fifty times as many MSS., and among them several far more ancient, and bearing evidence of more careful preparation, than any known to Erasmus or Stephens or Beza ; they have examined carefully the early MSS. of the Latin version ; and have investigated the readings which must have been received by the translators of the Oriental versions of the second and third centuries ; and they have studied the early Lectionaries of the church, and the writings of her scholars in days before the Papacy arose. Withal, a system of criticism, carefully elaborated by experience and thought, has been brought to bear upon this immense mass of material with such effect that, while some points remain still undetermined, there is now an agreement among the critics of different lands and different schools of thought, which, if still somewhat less close, may very well be compared with the agreement between the different forms of the so-called *Textus Receptus* itself.

For a long period after the Elzevirs their text continued to be reprinted without change, but materials for an improvement were constantly and laboriously accumulated. Walton's Polyglot, in 1657, still retained the same text, but added a valuable *Apparatus Criticus*. Sixteen fresh MSS. were collated for it under the direction of Archbishop Usher, and a few more by other persons. Several important versions were printed in parallel columns with the Greek text, and the prolegomena were a valuable aid in critical study. Bishop Fell, of Oxford, in an edition twenty years later, continued the work of collating MSS. ; and Mill, in 1707, completed his work of thirty years, reproducing, indeed, the text of Stephens, but accompanied with thirty thousand various readings, compiled from a still more extensive examination of MSS., large citations from the Fathers, and a comparison of the principal Oriental versions. Subsequently, Bentley made large preparations for a critical edition, which was never published ; but his collection of materials was of use to those who were to follow him.

Thus far the criticism of the sacred text had been chiefly carried on by English scholars; the work now passed over to the continent, and it was almost a century before it was again resumed in the mother country. On the continent, Bengel in 1725 and Wetstein in 1751, issued editions which greatly advanced the work of criticism. By this time a distinction had come to be introduced among the readings, those approved by the editor being marked in the margin. A classification of the MSS. was also introduced, and discussion began in regard to their comparative value. The notation of MSS.,—the uncials (i.e. those written in capital letters) by Roman capitals, the cursives by Arabic numerals,—which is still in use, was introduced by Wetstein. Wetstein also collected vast stores of material; but his want of critical sagacity and his devotion to erroneous theories rather retarded than advanced the work to which his life was devoted.

With Griesbach, in 1774, texts which are really critical may be said to begin. His editions extending to the year 1805, and those of his contemporaries and successors are too well known to require description in this brief historical sketch. During the last half century the textual criticism of the New Testament has been in the hands of able and, for the most part, devout scholars, both on the continent and in England. The collection of MSS. is already all that can reasonably be hoped for, and nearly all the uncials have been printed with great care. The attention given to the early Latin MSS. leaves little to be desired in that quarter, and something of importance has been accomplished in the way of critical editions of the Oriental versions. In this last respect much yet remains to be done, and also in careful editions of the Fathers. In the printed copies of their works the quotations of the New Testament have too often been made to conform to the received text of the time, and their value in criticism is thereby greatly diminished. The principles of criticism are now pretty well established, so that the facts being given, the same conclusion would generally be drawn from them by any competent critic. The exceptions to this will be spoken of presently.

Before considering these principles it is necessary to have a clear idea of the origin of differences of reading. That such differences will always arise in the copying of any manuscript is notorious, and can be abundantly substantiated by the testimony of any proof-reader. The copy of an already vitiated copy will be still more incorrect, and so with each successive rewriting the text will become more and more altered from the original. It does not follow, however, that the progress of deterioration will always be in proportion to the lateness of the date of any given manuscript; for one of the twelfth century, for example, may have been copied directly from another of the fourth, while one of the tenth may only have been copied from a contemporary. The whole number of mss. of the New Testament, or of parts of it, is above fifteen hundred, and of these no two precisely agree. Most of them have been produced in monasteries, and in earlier times by professional copyists. It has been questioned whether they were ever multiplied by *dictation*; certainly it was so seldom done, if at all, that no errors peculiar to this process need to be considered. The copy when made was always re-compared with the original and carefully revised, and sometimes was compared a second time with some other standard copy. The corrections were usually made mechanically, and with little intelligence, the spelling of the same word being corrected differently in different parts even of the Codex Vaticanus (B); but sometimes a ms. has passed into the hands of a learned person, who has compared it with other mss. and noted the difference. Thus the Codex Sinaiticus (A) bears the marks of twelve different correctors, from the fourth to the twelfth centuries. A single ms. with its corrections thus sometimes combines the testimony of two, or of several, each more ancient than itself. Often the owner of a ms. has inserted some explanation in the margin which a subsequent copyist, considering a correction, has embodied in the text. This is one of the most common of all sources of error.

The following convenient classification of these sources is given by writers on the subject. Errors of sight, of sound,

and of memory, which are all unintentional. These include the exchange of similar letters, and sometimes of words; the wrong division and connection of words which is very common in cursives copied from uncials which were written continuously without any marks of division between the words, and can be appreciated by any one who has attempted to copy the readings of an uncial; the omission of letters or words, and their careless transposition; the faulty repetition of letters or syllables, and sometimes even of words; and the assimilation of the terminations of neighboring words. The incorporation into the text of marginal glosses can scarcely be called *intentional*, being due to the ignorance of the transcriber. ✓ Among intentional errors are the following: the change of harsh or unusual forms of expression to those more familiar to the scribe, the alteration of the spelling being especially common; change in the text to bring it into supposed harmony with another passage, especially the assimilation of parallel passages in the different Gospels; changes to complete a quotation, or to clear up a supposed difficulty; and and finally, insertions from the familiar language of the Liturgy. To illustrate these, one or two instances under each head are selected from Mr. Hammond's recent convenient little manual.¹ Under errors of sight belong omissions from what is technically called *Homoioteleuton*. Thus, in Codex C, the words *τοῦτο δέ ἐστίν τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με* are omitted in John vi. 39, because the last three words had occurred immediately before, and the eye of the scribe passed on from their first to their second occurrence. This happens especially when the same words occur at the end of consecutive lines. To the same head belong the many instances, more generally in the uncial MSS., arising from the confusion of similar letters such as α, λ, Δ; or ε, c, θ. From this arose the well-known and well-disputed reading in 1 Tim. iii. 16. Similar letters or syllables are sometimes omitted and sometimes

¹ Outlines of Textual Criticism applied to the New Testament. By C. E. Hammond, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1872. From this work much of the present paper has been abridged.

inserted; thus in Matt. xxvi. 39 for ΠΡΟCEΛΘΩΝ Cod. B has ΠΡΟΕΛΘΩΝ, and in Luke ix. 49 Cod. H has ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια for ἐκβάλλοντά δαιμόνια. Letters, too, are sometimes transposed, so that in Acts xiii. 23 for ἘΠΑἸΝ (σωτήρα Ἰησοῦν), Codd. H and L read ἘΠΑΙΝ (σωτηρίαν). The number of errors from this source is very large, as the margin of any critical edition will readily show.

Under errors of sound are to be classed, not so much errors arising from actual hearing, as from the scribe mentally repeating the word to himself, and writing it as it would have sounded had it been pronounced. In this way vowels and diphthongs are frequently interchanged. One of the most common is that between *I* and *EI*, as στρατεία for στρατιά, (Acts vii. 42), in Codd. A, B, and D; so also *AI* and *E* are confused, as ὑποτάσσετε for ὑποτάσσεται (Luke x. 20), in B; and so of *A* for *E*, *I* for *H*, *O* for *Ω* (the last, later and less frequent), in many instances, in many of the best mss. An instance of confusion of sound, of a little different kind, is the καίπερ ἐστίν of many cursives in Rev. xvii. 8, for καί πάρεσται. This has been followed in the Textus Receptus. When there are several words of similar termination, a word or two among them of a not very different ending is sometimes assimilated; as in Rev. i. 1, Cod. A reads τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τοῦ δούλου αὐτοῦ for τοῦ ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ τῷ δούλῳ αὐτοῦ. One kind of error might be ranked either with errors of sight or of sound, and so belonging to both has a double chance of repetition—the confusion between double and single consonants. A good instance is found in Codd. *κ* and B in 1 Thess. ii. 7, ἐγενήθημεν ἡπίοι for ἐγενήθημεν ἡπιοι.

Errors of memory are such as might occur from the scribe looking at a whole line in his exemplar, and then writing it out in his copy without substantiating its accuracy word by word. Thus the small particles καί, δέ, τέ, came to be frequently interchanged, and sometimes omitted or inserted. So, too, synonymous words were often substituted for one another, ἔφη for εἶπεν, and either for λέγει, ὀρώω for θεωρέω, and *vice versa*, etc. To this cause is attributed the substitu-

tion of *μιμηται* for *ζηλωται* in K and L in 1 Pet. iii. 13. To this source also must be attributed many of the assimilations of the wording of one Gospel to that of another in parallel places, the familiar language of the other Gospel having a stronger hold on the memory of the scribe than the line he was actually copying.

The incorporation of marginal glosses into the text is an evidence rather of the fidelity than of the carelessness of the scribe, since he undoubtedly looked upon them as omissions in his exemplar supplied in the margin. One of the most important and most unfortunate of these is in John v., where the whole passage, *ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν. ἄγγελος γὰρ κατὰ καιρὸν κατέβαινε ἐν τῇ κολυμβήθρᾳ, καὶ ἔταρασσε τὸ ὕδωρ· ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ τὴν ταραχὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, ὑγιῆς ἐγένετο, ᾧ δὴποτε κατείχετο νοσήματι*, probably owes its place in the text to this cause. Acts xv. 34, *ἔδοξε δὲ τῷ Σίλλᾳ ἐπιμείναι αὐτοῦ*, omitted in most of the best MSS., has probably crept into the text in the same way. There is a curious instance in 2 Cor. viii. 4, at the end of which verse many of the cursives add the words (which have passed into the Text. Rec.) *δέξασθαι ἡμᾶς*; to these words there appears to have been added in the margin the note *ἐν πολλαῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων οὕτως εὔρηται*, which in one cursive is copied bodily into the text along with the *δέξασθαι ἡμᾶς*. It always seemed safer to the scribe to insert than to omit, and hence the settled canon, other things being equal, *lectio praeferatur brevior*.

There are other classes of errors which must be considered intentional on the part of the scribe; yet not intentional in the sense of his meaning to alter the text, but only of correcting what he supposed to be obvious errors. In the best and earliest MSS. are many unclassical forms of words and expressions which in the later ones are changed to conform to the classical standard. Such are the constant insertion of the *μ* in the parts of *λαμβάνω* and its derivatives, as *λήμψομαι*, etc.; the non-assimilation and retention of the *ν* in words compounded with *ἐν* and *συν*, as *συνσταυρόω*, *συνζητέω*, *ἐνγε-*

γραμμένος, etc.; the almost constant retention of the final *ς* of οὔτως, and of *ν* ἐφέλκυστικόν before consonants; peculiar spelling, as τεσσεράκοντα for τεσσαράκοντα; 2d Aorist forms with 1st Aorist terminations, called the Alexandrian Aorist, as εἶδα, ἦλθα, εἶπα, etc.; together with many harsh grammatical constructions. It was probably an effort to avoid the last which led to the transposition in Acts xiii. 20 of καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, which has occasioned so much difficulty to chronologists, and which ought to come *after*, instead of *before*, ὡς ἔτεσι τετρακοσίοις καὶ πενήκοντα.

Instances of alteration of one Gospel to make it conform to the parallel passage in another are of frequent occurrence, even in the best MSS. An unusually striking instance of this is found in Mark xiv., where all reference to the second crowing of the cock, in connection with Peter's threefold denial, is omitted; in vs. 30 δις is left out, and in vs. 68 καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε, and in vs. 72 ἐκ δευτέρου. More frequently words are supplied from a parallel passage, as in Acts ix. 5 in Ε, σκληρόν σοι πρὸς κέντρα λακτίζειν, from xxvi. 14. It is also very common to fill out quotations from the Old Testament.

As we are now accustomed in citing a passage to put with it the nominative supplied by the context, or some clause necessary to the completeness of our quotation, so in the Lectionaries of the early church—the passages selected for public reading as Lessons, or Epistles, or Gospels,—it was customary, whenever necessary, to prefix the words ὁ Ἰησοῦς, εἶπε δὲ ὁ Κύριος (Luke vii. 31), etc.; and these, becoming familiar to the scribe, he very naturally inserted them in copying the passage, although they were unnecessary when the context was there.

The same familiarity with ecclesiastical forms must be held to account for the insertion of the doxology at the close of the Lord's prayer (Matt. vi. 13); and this has also been supposed to explain the insertion of Acts viii. 37, which must, without doubt, be considered as not a part of the original text.

Of errors purposely introduced by the scribes with a doc-

trinal motive, there is really no instance in reliable MSS. Several such have from time to time been alleged (as *θεός* for *υίός*, John i. 18); but they all admit of explanation under some of the sources of error mentioned above.

There is, however, one farther remark of importance to be made in regard to the character of these errors: that while in the frequent repetition of the process of copying errors will be multiplied, yet those errors will have a certain family likeness, from the fact that they have arisen from the operation of the same causes under similar circumstances. Hence we are to look rather to the earliest MSS. for strong individual characteristics; while the later, though differing much in detail, will have, as compared with the earlier MSS., a decided family likeness among themselves.

The manuscripts of the New Testament are classified as uncials or cursives, written respectively in capital or in ordinary letters. The distinction is one of importance as broadly indicating their date. *Uncial* was the common form of writing until the middle of the tenth century, and this style was retained for service-books about a century later. The earliest *dated* New Testament MS. is an uncial of the Gospels, S, with the date 949. Cursive writing came into use towards the close of the ninth century, and from the eleventh onwards was the common style. The earliest New Testament cursive (Gospels, 14) is dated 964. As a class, therefore, the uncials are older than the cursives, and the change from the one to the other form became general in the course of the tenth century. A few of the cursives have been copied from very ancient exemplars and are therefore of much value in determining the text; but this applies to less than *one per cent* of the enormous mass of them. Almost always the authority of two or three MSS. of the fourth and fifth centuries will be found of more value than that of as many hundreds written from five to eight or ten centuries later. The first great step in the criticism of the text was made when MSS. came to be classified, and weight of authority conceded to them in proportion to their value rather than to

their number. It is obvious that a gloss in the margin of a MS. of the sixth century might easily appear in the text of a thousand cursives; but if not found in any authority of the fourth or fifth centuries it would be unhesitatingly condemned as spurious.

The uncials are designated by capital letters, first of the Roman alphabet, then by the unlike letters of the Greek, and finally the Codex Sinaiticus by the Hebrew \aleph . Cursives are designated by Arabic numerals. There are also between two and three hundred "Lectionaries," or copies of selected passages prepared for public reading in the churches. There are both uncial and cursive MSS. of these. When the selections are from the Gospels they are called *Evangelistaria* (uncial fifty-eight, cursive about one hundred and eighty); when from the Gospels and Acts, *Praxapostoli* (*πραξάποστολοι*; uncials seven, cursives sixty-five); and there are also a few from the Gospels and Epistles called *ἀποστολοευαγγέλια*. When these are cited, it is as Lectionaries, and they are not included in the system of designation of the MSS. proper.

With the single exception of \aleph , none of the uncials, and comparatively few of the cursives ("twenty-seven in all out of the vast mass of extant documents," says Scrivener) contain the whole New Testament complete. Several others, as A, B, C, etc., originally contained the whole, but have suffered more or less mutilation. Some are mere fragments of scattered verses, as F^a, composed of strips recovered from the back of the binding of a later book. A number, of which the most important are C, R, Z, Ξ , are *palimpsests*. In these the original writing was removed that the parchment might be used for the transcription of other works—a practice dating from a very early period. In the lapse of time the original writing has reappeared in faint lines below the later text, and has been read, either just as it is, or by removing the later writing with chemical appliances. There still remain a few passages in some of the palimpsests partially or wholly illegible. Other uncials originally contained only certain books of the New Testament, most frequently the

Gospels, as K and M; but occasionally the Catholic or the Pauline Epistles. It has happened that when an uncial containing only a part of the New Testament has received a certain designation, another and totally different uncial, as supplying in whole or in part the deficiency of the former, has received the same designation. Thus E in the Gospels is a MS. of the eighth century; in the Acts, it is a different MS. of the sixth century; while in the Pauline Epistles it is a mere transcript of D, of uncertain age, of no critical value, and seldom cited at all. To avoid confusion it has been proposed (and the plan will here be followed) to mark the different MSS. bearing the same letter with figures in accordance with the order of the books contained in them; thus B is the famous Vatican Codex of the fourth century, extending to Heb. ix. 14; B₂ is the Vatican MS. No. 2066, of the fifth century, containing the Apocalypse. D of the sixth century contains the Gospels, Acts, and 3 John; D₂ is a different MS., belonging to the same century, and containing the Pauline Epistles. On the other hand, some of the cursive MSS., which are really continuous have been cited under different numbers in different parts of the New Testament. Thus one of the most valuable of them is 33 in the Gospels, 13 in the Acts, and 17 in the Pauline Epistles. There are also a very few of the uncials the designation of which has been changed by the later critics. Thus the letter J is no longer used, and the several MSS. once cited under that designation have since, in part, been differently marked; in the Gospels the letter N has uniformly replaced J; but in the Acts and Catholic Epistles G₂ was for a time generally, and continues still to be sometimes used; in the Pauline Epistles L₂ has been generally accepted, and the same designation has also been used for the Acts and Catholic Epistles, while G₁ is appropriated to another small fragment of the Acts. There are several other variations between recent critical editors in regard chiefly to the smaller fragmentary MSS. The notation is uniform in regard to the more complete and important codices, but in using critical editions of the text it is important to observe

the notation adopted in regard to the lesser and more recently discovered fragments.

There is still another point to be borne in mind in connection with the citation of MSS. As soon as a MS. was completed, at least in early times, it was subjected to a careful revision. The person, or persons, by whom this was done was called *ὁ ἀντιβάλλον* or *ὁ διορθωτής*. The corrections of these contemporary examiners are of the greatest importance. Other corrections were made at various ages by various hands, so that the Codex Sinaiticus, as already mentioned, has been corrected as late as the twelfth century. The work of the various correctors is identified and their age determined by certain peculiarities. For example: in Codex B when the original writing had faded from age, it was inked over, letter by letter, accents added, and corrections made from a copy in use at the time. It is plain that this inking, the addition of the accents, and the corrections were by the same hand, because the corrector often omits to ink over letters or syllables which he thought ought to be omitted, and in such cases the accents are not inserted. Generally when he adds anything, he imitates the ancient letters; but sometimes, when pressed for room, he uses abbreviations or forms of letters belonging to the tenth and eleventh centuries; sometimes an abbreviation of this sort occurs in connection with the omission to ink over some letters. Thus Matt. xvi. 19, the original reading was *δώσω σοι τὰς κλείδας*: the scribe wished to change it to *καὶ δώσω σοὶ τὰς κλεῖς*; he accomplished it by prefixing *καὶ* in the abbreviated form *Ϟ*, neglecting to ink over the syllable *-δας* and writing *σ* above it in the late cursive instead of the uncial form. In the citation of MSS. reference is often made to these corrections. The original text is cited simply by the letter or by the letter with an asterisk (*), as D or D*. The several correctors in the order of their antiquity are marked by small figures at the right hand upper corner of the letters, as C¹, C², C³, etc. In the case of *κ*, Tischendorf has used small letters, as κ^a, κ^b, κ^c.

No MS. earlier than the tenth century bears a date, but

there are various indications by which a practised eye is able to determine with certainty, and generally within the limits of half a century, the period when they were written. Besides the broad distinction between uncials and cursives already mentioned, much may be determined from the form of the letters. In Egyptian papyri and in those found at Pompeii, which are earlier than any of the New Testament codices, we have the primitive type of Greek writing. The text is in columns, rudely divided, without punctuation or division of words; what afterwards became *iota subscript* is either *adscript* or altogether omitted; and there are no accents or breathings; the letters are upright, square, and simple. To these characteristics the earlier New Testament codices closely conform. Later, the characters became more narrow, oblong, and leaning, and were marked by more elaborateness in style. Initial letters of larger size were introduced; and punctuation marks, at first a simple dot to mark division of sentences (which was in common use before the beginning of the fifth century) gradually became more complex. The interrogation mark (;) came into use in the ninth century. The contractions in the older MSS. are confined to a few frequently recurring words, as $\overline{\Theta C}$, $\overline{I C}$, $\overline{X C}$, $\overline{K C}$, $\overline{Y C}$, $\overline{\Pi H P}$, $\overline{\Delta \Delta \Delta}$, etc. (*θεός*, *Ἰησοῦς*, *Χριστός*, *κύριος*, *υἰός*, *πατήρ*, *Δαυεὶδ*) while later these are increased in number. Iota adscript is rare in the earlier, more common in the later, uncials. Accents are not found earlier than the eighth century. The material on which the characters were written, as well as the characters themselves, underwent a gradual change. The earliest codices that have come down to us are on the thinnest and finest vellum; later, the parchment becomes thick and coarse.

Another indication of age is in the various marks of division of the books found, or not found, in the different MSS. The oldest extant system of division is found only in Codices B and Ξ , and is a division according to the sense, a fresh section commencing whenever a new subject is introduced. These paragraphs are marked in Tregelles' edition of the Greek New Testament. In the Pauline Epistles these sections are

numbered continuously throughout, as if forming one book, and it is interesting to note that according to these numbers the Epistle to the Hebrews is placed between the Epistles to the Galatians and the Ephesians. In codex B it is actually placed just after 2 Thessalonians and thus the mutilation which took away the latter part of Hebrews removed also the Pastoral Epistles; but in the numbering, the last section of Galatians is 58, the first of Hebrews 59, the end of Hebrews is lost, but the first section of Ephesians is 70, leaving, no doubt, that the numbering originally ran on continuously from Galatians through Hebrews to Ephesians. There are three systems of division of especial value in determining the date of a codex: the so-called Ammonian sections with the Eusebian canons; the *στίχοι* of Euthalius; and the *τίτλοι*, often improperly called *κεφάλαια*.

1. The Ammonian sections. Ammonius, a scholar of Alexandria of the third century, constructed a Harmony of the Gospels on the basis of Matthew, with which he grouped the parallel passages of the other Gospels. We know his system, however, only as modified by Eusebius of Caesarea (fourth century) in connection with whose "canons" the Ammonian sections are recorded. Eusebius seems to have had in mind not so much a harmony as a system of passages in the Gospels illustrative of one another, — a sort of combination of a harmony with a reference Bible; e.g. the miraculous draught of fishes after the resurrection (John. xxi. 1-6) is combined with the like miracle near the beginning of our Lord's ministry (Luke v. 4-7). Ammonius necessarily interrupted the order of the last three Gospels; Eusebius arranged tables of numbers by which the assimilated passages of the several Gospels were simply indicated. Each Gospel is divided into sections, numbered continuously throughout. Matthew has 355 sections; Mark, 233 (to xvi. 8; the last twelve verses not being included in the sections); Luke, 342; John, 232. Eusebius formed ten tables, called "Canons." The first contains a list of all the passages (seventy-one in number) contained in all four Gospels; the sections of Matthew contained in the list are set down

in one column according to the order of their numbers, and then, in separate columns — one for each of the other Gospels — are set over against these the number of the corresponding section in the Gospel to which the column belongs. The canons 2, 3, and 4, contain lists of the sections common to three of the Gospels; No. 2 grouping the first three Gospels; No. 3, the first two with the fourth; and No. 4, the last three. Canons 5–9 contain lists of the sections in which any two of the Gospels agree; while canon 10 is a list of sixty-two passages peculiar to some one of the Gospels. It was the custom to affix the numbers for the sections and canons in their proper place in the margin of the MSS., the number for the section above, and that for the canon below. Thus, in the Gospel of Matthew, $\frac{329}{4}$ indicates that the passage to which it is attached is section 329 in that Gospel, and by looking at canon 4 will be found over against that number the corresponding sections of Mark and John, viz. 207 of the former and 187 of the latter. The passages in this case are Matt. xxvii. 27–29; Mark xv. 16–19; John xix. 5. These sections and canons are given in several of the critical editions of the Greek New Testament; in Tischendorf they are marked by small Arabic numerals, inserted in the text, and in Tregelles by the old Greek letter numerals, placed in the margin. The oldest codex in which these are found is κ , and they appear to have been affixed either by the original scribe or by a contemporary hand. In the palimpsests C, R, P, Q, Z, the sections are given, but the canons, which were usually marked in vermilion (*κιννάβαρις*), if originally there, would have been wholly washed out in the preparation of the parchment for a second use, and are no longer found. Both are wanting in B. These numbers not only show that the codex containing them *a prima manu* cannot be older than Eusebius, but also have an important bearing upon the opinion of Eusebius in regard to the genuineness of some disputed passages of the Gospels.

2. The *στίχοι* of Euthalius was a device to assist in making proper pauses in the public reading of the scriptures, and consists of an arrangement of each sentence, or considerable

part of a sentence, in a separate line. The idea was suggested by the arrangement of the parallel clauses of the poetical books of the Old Testament in the LXX. The Gospels were probably divided in this way before Euthalius; he applied the plan to the Pauline Epistles in 458, and to the Acts and Catholic Epistles in 490. As the *στίχοι* were of quite unequal length, the arrangement was rather extravagant of vellum, and the fashion soon passed away.¹ The chief examples of it are D and D₂ and H₂. But the enumeration of the *στίχοι* was preserved in many MSS. after this form of writing had itself been abandoned, and helps to determine the date.

3. The third method of division mentioned above was into *τίτλοι* or *κεφάλαια*, the former term belonging more strictly to the Gospels, the latter to the remaining books. The *τίτλος* is a short descriptive heading of the first or principal subject contained in the section. It is sometimes placed in the margin, sometimes at the top or bottom of the page, and a list of these *τίτλοι*, or headings, is usually prefixed to each book. They appear to have come into general use just before the fifth century. No trace of them is found in *κ* or B, but they appear in A, C, R, and Z. The average length of the *τίτλοι* is a little more than double that of the sections in B. They are given in full from the principal uncials containing them in Tregelles' Greek New Testament, and for each of the principal parts of the volume are placed at the end of that part. The Apocalypse was divided into sections by Andreas of Caesarea about A.D. 500. The whole book was arranged in twenty-four *λόγοι*, each consisting of three *κεφάλαια*.

There are many other indications of the antiquity of MSS. quite independent of the character of their readings. In the cursives, the material, the character of the letters, and the abbreviations are especially valuable indications. Many of these are distinctly dated. In the later MSS. the corrections, as in 67 (Epp.), are often of more value than the original text. One interesting fact must not be passed over. In A.D. 331, Eusebius was ordered by the emperor Constantine

to have fifty handsome and well-written copies of the scriptures prepared for the use of the churches in his new capital, Constantinople. Eusebius (Vit. Const. iv. 36, 37) records that this was done, and that the sheets were arranged in sets of *three or four*: “cum nos in voluminibus magnifice exornatis *terniones et quaterniones* ad eum misissemus.” There are but two extant codices, *α* and B, of sufficient antiquity to have been possibly among this number; but of these B is excluded, from the fact that its sheets are arranged in sets of *five* (*quiniones*), and it remains probable that *α*, corresponding in every respect to the description, and written on the finest vellum, was one of these very copies.

While all the uncials have been collated, and nearly all published, with the utmost care, comparatively few of the cursives have been thoroughly examined by competent scholars, nor is it likely that the mass of them ever will be, since after selecting much less than one hundred of them, the rest are of exceedingly little critical value in comparison with the others. Still there remains a considerable number never yet carefully collated throughout, which might repay the labor. It is impossible to form any tolerably accurate estimate of the whole number of various readings which have already been collected. Westcott (Smith's Dict., Art. New Testament, § 30) says, “they cannot be less than one hundred and twenty thousand in all, though of these a very large proportion consist of differences of spelling and isolated aberrations of scribes, and of the remainder comparatively few alterations are sufficiently well supported to create reasonable doubt as to the final judgment. Probably there are not more than from sixteen hundred to two thousand places in which the true reading is a matter of uncertainty, even if we include in this, questions of order, inflection, and orthography. The doubtful readings by which the sense is in any way affected are very much fewer, and those of dogmatic importance can be easily numbered.”

Besides manuscripts, there are two other chief sources of information in regard to the true reading of the original text:

Versions and Patristic quotations. It will be necessary to say something of each of them. The wide spread of the Greek language and literature obviated for a little time in most countries the necessity of translations of the New Testament; but as soon as Christians not familiar with Greek began to multiply in any country, the sacred books, both of the Old and the New Testament, were at once translated into the vernacular. These translations were of necessity preserved in manuscripts in the same way as the original, and with quite as much liability to error in the process of repeated transcription, in addition to any errors of translation. Of some of the ancient versions, many and ancient mss. have been preserved, and have been carefully collated; of others there are but few remains, and those still but imperfectly investigated. While, therefore, something of critical value still remains to reward the labors of the student, very much of the highest importance has already been made accessible. Notwithstanding the common liability of the Greek mss., and of those of all versions, to error, it is in the highest degree unlikely that they would all vary in the same way in the same passages. Hence, when a reading is found in a few of the earliest Greek mss., and is confirmed by an ancient version, there is strong evidence of the early prevalence of the reading; if a second and a third of the other ancient versions also concur, the evidence in its favor is exceedingly strong.

The evidence of the versions, in the nature of the case, is of very different weight in regard to different classes of readings, and, in some points, in regard to the language of the version. Some languages are evidently capable of more fully representing the exact Greek forms than others — the Semitic tongues, e.g. being able to give but slight evidence of the tenses of the Greek verb or of the cases of the noun. In regard to the omission or insertion of words and clauses, versions may give as clear evidence as the Greek mss. themselves; and even in case of inaccuracy in the translation, the very mistake often indicates the reading from which it must have been derived. In general the very early versions slav-

ishly followed their Greek text, to the neglect not only of the vernacular idiom, but even of grammatical construction, the *Genitive* absolute, e.g. often appearing in the Latin instead of the Ablative. The earliest Latin versions, indeed, were so absolutely servile as often to show the order of the Greek words in opposition to the requirements of their own tongue. The amount of assistance to be obtained from the versions in the criticism of the text is far greater than was imagined before their careful study was entered upon, and greater than could now be supposed possible by one who has not carefully examined the evidence.

Of all the versions, at once the most important and the most carefully examined is the Latin. This was not made in Italy. The church of Rome during the first two centuries "was essentially Greek. The Roman bishops bear Greek names; the earliest Roman liturgy was Greek; the few remains of the Christian literature of Rome are Greek. The same remark holds true of Gaul." Fortunately, the need of a Latin version was first felt where the uncouth Latinity of an exceedingly literal version would not be offensive,—in Northern Africa. Of its origin no distinct knowledge has been preserved; but in the time of Tertullian, at the close of the second century, it was old enough and in sufficiently extensive use to exert a moulding influence upon the current language of Christians (adv. Prax. 5). The Latin translator of Irenaeus, probably a contemporary of Tertullian, was familiar with it, and it is old enough not to have included originally the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, and 2 Peter. It is considered settled that it had already received a definite shape soon after the middle of the second century. The Gospels are placed in it in the following order: Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. The codices of this version are cited by small Roman letters; but unfortunately there is more variation in the use of these letters than in the case of the Greek. The letters given below are those used by Tregelles and Tischendorf; except for the first three, a different designation is given by Westcott (Art. Vulgate, in Smith's Dict.). The

following are the most important, but of them the first three are of far more weight than the others.

a	Codex Vercellensis.	Cent. IV.
b	Codex Veronensis.	Cent. IV. or V.
c	Codex Colbertinus.	Cent. IX.
h	Codex Claromontanus.	Cent. IV. or V.
i	Codex Vindobonensis.	Cent. V. or VI.
k	Codex Bobbiensis.	Cent. IV. or V.
m	Codex Mai's Speculum.	Cent. VI.

This version passed over from Africa to North Italy, where the roughness of its language led in the fourth century to a revision. This new version is known as the *Itala*, and is in better Latin, and is commended by Augustine for its accuracy and clearness. The best codex is f = Codex Briscianus, but ff¹ and ff² = Codices Corbeienses, and g¹, g² = Codices Sangermanenses, are also much cited. There are also a number of MSS. of a recension of the Latin, independent of, and possibly partly prior to, the revision by Jerome. Westcott has proposed to designate these by the small Greek letters (*a-x*) and has enumerated them in the article referred to above; but as yet not much critical use has been made of them. Besides the versions enumerated, there were a multitude of private translations into Latin (August. De doctr. Christ. ii. 16 (11)), and by the close of the fourth century there was so much confusion that Jerome was requested by Pope Damasus to undertake a new revision. He at once set about the task — not of making a new *translation* of the New Testament (as he did of the Old), but of *revising* the existing translation by comparison with the best Greek MSS. to which he had access. His labor was chiefly spent upon the Gospels, where the existing texts were most variant and corrupt. It has even been questioned whether he revised the other books at all; it seems certain, however, that he did so, but hastily and imperfectly. The chief MSS. of this version, with their designations, are: am. = cod. Amiatinus. Cent. VI. This is written with such accuracy, that in value as well as age it stands at the head of the authorities — contains the whole Latin Bible except Baruch (the New Testament is printed in

the margin of Tregelles' Greek Testament); fuld. = cod. Fuldensis, containing the whole New Testament, but the Gospels in harmony — its text is of nearly equal value with the preceding (it is printed at the foot of the page in Lachmann's Greek Testament); harl. = cod. Harleianus; for. = cod. Forojuliensis; and tol. = cod. Toletanus. The first two of these are much more important than the others; there are also several others, occasionally cited under simple abbreviations. Two centuries elapsed before Jerome's version came into general use, and by the end of two more there was need of a fresh revision. This was accomplished by Alcuin, at the request of Charlemagne, and was simply a revision by a comparison of the best Latin texts without reference to the Greek. It is occasionally referred to as *Vulg. Alc.* In the following centuries various revisions were attempted. In 1590 an authoritative revision was put forth by Sixtus V., but containing so many arbitrary corrections that two years later it was superseded by the modern authorized Vulgate, put forth by Clement VIII., and hence often called the Clementine Vulgate, and sometimes quoted as *Vulg. Cl.* It is substantially Jerome's revision, but with readings gathered from various quarters.

The version next in importance to the Latin is the Syriac. There is evidence of the existence of a Syriac translation of the Gospels at least as early as the middle of the second century (Euseb. Eccl. Hist. iv. 22). The earliest Syriac versions we now have, the Curetonian and the Peshito, are supposed to stand in the same relation to each other as the *Vetus Latina* and the *Vulgate*. The former exists only in a single ms. of the fifth century, brought by Dr. Cureton in 1842 from the Nitrian monasteries. It contains only fragments of the Gospels (Matt. i.—viii. 22; x. 31—xxiii. 25; Mark xvi. 17—20; John i. 1—42; iii. 6—vii. 37; xiv. 11—29; Luke ii. 48—iii. 16; vii. 33—xv. 21; xvii. 24—xxiv. 41.) This codex has many interpolations, sometimes in common with D, sometimes unsupported by any Greek ms.; but it also preserves many characteristic readings of the most ancient type.

The First Gospel is thought by Dr. Cureton and others to have been translated, not from the Greek but, from the *Hebrew* original of Matthew. The Peshito, belonging originally to a very early period, when the canon of the New Testament was not fully settled, does not contain the four Catholic Epistles, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and Jude, nor the Apocalypse; it also wants John vii. 53—viii. 11. It is shown to be earlier than the fourth century by the fact of its use by all the sects into which the Syrian church was then divided. In the process of transmission from age to age, like the Greek mss. themselves, it has suffered not merely from the errors of the scribes, but also from the effort to correct it by a Greek text as late as the fourth century. The present Peshito is therefore looked upon as a recension of an older text, combining in itself (like the Latin Cod. Brixianus) readings of the highest antiquity with others which had begun to be current at the date of our oldest Greek mss.

In A.D. 508 a new version from the Greek into the Syriac was undertaken by Polycarp at the instance of Philoxenus, Monophysite bishop of Hierapolis, from whom it is commonly called the Philoxenian version. Of this version, in its original state, all that now remains are some quotations in Syrian writers, and perhaps one ms. of the Gospels at Florence, and one of the Acts and seven Catholic Epistles in the Bodleian library. The Catholic Epistles, wanting in the Peshito, were also published by Pococke in 1630, from a ms. in the Bodleian, which it is thought may have been a part of the original Philoxenian. These are now commonly printed with the Peshito, to which, however, they do not belong.

A century later (A.D. 616) a revision of the Philoxenian was made at Alexandria by Thomas of Harkel, also bishop of Hierapolis. This also is sometimes cited as the Philoxenian, but is more accurately called the Harclean. Of this version there are known several mss. of the Gospels, but only one (in New College Library, Oxford) of the rest of the New Testament. As it is mutilated at the end, it is not known whether it originally contained the Apocalypse or not. This

version is of especial value because of its slavish adherence to the Greek, word for word and particle for particle, in entire disregard of the Syriac idiom. It is therefore an important witness to the current Greek text of the seventh century. It also contains in the margin various readings from one or two, sometimes from three, Greek MSS. of a much earlier date. In critical editions the Harclean *text* and *margin* are therefore cited separately.

The so-called *Jerusalem-Syriac* is also cited in critical editions of the Greek New Testament. It is a lectionary of uncertain age, and is supposed by Tregelles to be only a translation of a Greek Evangelistarium. Until recently it was known only in a single MS. in the Vatican library, dated Antioch, A.D. 1031; this has never been published, but its readings have been collated. More recently another MS. of this lectionary has been published at Verona (1861-64). This lectionary has much more value for critical than for other purposes. Its dialect is not the common Syriac, its grammar is peculiar, and its forms rather Chaldee than Syriac. Its readings, however, are ancient, and Tischendorf considers that its text bears a closer resemblance to that of the best uncials than the Peshito.

There are three Egyptian versions in as many different dialects: the Sahidic (or Thebaic), the Coptic (or Memphitic), and the Basmuric. Only the first two are possessed of critical value. From the smallness of the number of scholars familiar with the Egyptian dialect, comparatively little critical labor has been bestowed upon these versions. There is some evidence to show that an Egyptian version was in existence in the second century, and this is supposed to be represented by the Sahidic, while the Coptic may constitute a later revision. They are assigned by critics to the latter part of the second and of the third centuries respectively. The Sahidic has been at various times published in fragments, in part from a MS. of the fifth century; but a complete critical edition is still a desideratum. The Coptic has been repeatedly published, and is still read in the churches of the Egyptian Christians, although their vernacular tongue is Arabic.

The Gothic version was made by Ulphilas, Arian bishop of the Goths, A.D. 348–388. It was, therefore, certainly made in the fourth century, and was in use among both the Eastern and Western Goths. Its principal ms. is the Cod. *Argentæus*, written in silver letters on purple vellum, and preserved in the University of Upsal. It is of the sixth century, but unfortunately in so fragmentary a condition as to contain but one hundred and eighty-eight out of its original three hundred and twenty folios. There are, however, six or seven other codices known, containing parts of all the New Testament except the Acts, Hebrews, Catholic Epistles, and Apocalypse. When the readings of this version confirm those of the most ancient authorities the united testimony is considered of especial value.

Christianity was introduced into Ethiopia in the fourth century, and the Ethiopic version was probably made soon after. The Ethiopic New Testament was printed at Rome 1548–49 under the editorship of three Abyssinians, and this text is reprinted in Walton's Polyglot. In 1826–30 a new edition, formed by a collation of mss., was printed by Mr. Platt. These two editions are usually separately cited.

The Armenian version was made from Greek mss. about the middle of the fifth century. It has been repeatedly published in its original language, with which none of the critical editors of the Greek New Testament appear to have been familiar. Various passages have been collated for one and another of these critics by various scholars, until at last a full collation of the text of Zohrab was made for Tregelles by Dr. Rieu of the British Museum. It seems, however, that much critical labor is still required upon the Armenian text itself before it can be appealed to as of much weight, except on certain definite points.

The third source of evidence for the text — Patristic quotations — must be confessed to be in a far less satisfactory condition than the other two. The transcribers of the writings of the Fathers have so frequently *corrected* their scriptural quotations, by altering them to conform to the text current

in their own day, that it is impossible to place much reliance upon simple citations until the writings of the Fathers themselves shall have been carefully and critically edited from the best accessible manuscripts. Often the context itself shows that a different text was followed by the Fathers cited from that which now appears in their printed works. Probably it is from this cause chiefly that different texts are now found in the same citations in different parts of the works of the same Father. This is especially the case with such voluminous writers as Origen and Chrysostom. There are, however, two kinds of citation which are free from this uncertainty, and in which the value of Patristic testimony is very great. It often happens that the Fathers quote the New Testament in a loose way, not *verbatim*, but giving the sense in words interwoven with words of their own. This is characteristic of nearly all quotations in the Apostolic Fathers, and of many of a later date. In such cases the scribe has had no chance for his alterations, and if the disputed reading is of such a nature as to be shown by a citation of this kind, the authority of such passages may be appealed to with confidence, and will sometimes give evidence as to the text earlier than that of any MS., or MS. of a version now extant. Again, we know that variations of reading in the MSS. existed as early as the time of Marcion (settled as an heretical teacher at Rome before A.D. 139). Origen and Eusebius were abundant in critical labors upon the Greek text, and Jerome upon the Latin. Now these, and other Patristic writers, frequently discuss various readings, state the division of the MSS. about them, and pronounce their own opinion, with their reasons. In such cases — and they are many — the evidence afforded is plainly of the utmost value. Sometimes even here the scribe has undertaken to alter the citation itself, but his work is betrayed by the accompanying discussion. In one or two instances he has carried his attempt at alteration to the point of making nonsense of the passage (as in the comment of Eusebius on Matt. i. 24, *δευγματίσαι*, Cramer's Catena, i. p. 12), yet still leaving it possible to see what must have been the

original reading of his author. Such discussions in the Fathers sometimes show the existence of a reading in early and excellent MSS., which no longer exists in any codex which has come down to our time; if such a reading is confirmed by the authority of the most important versions, it may even happen in rare cases that there will be preponderating evidence in its favor, in opposition to every extant Greek MS. The evidence, however, in such a case requires, of course, very searching scrutiny. In regard to the great mass of simple quotations in the Fathers, it is obvious that more reliance can be placed upon those readings which differ from, than upon those which agree with, the text most familiar to their copyists.

Having thus very briefly sketched the three chief sources for the determination of the text, — MSS., versions, and Patristic quotations, — it remains to be noted that the MSS. may be classified by certain general characteristics which aid materially in determining the weight of authority to be attached to any of them. From the time of Bengel down almost or quite to the present, many critics have attempted to carry out this classification sharply and definitely; some of them recognizing two, some three, and some four groups of MSS. After much controversy, upon full examination of the facts, the present conclusion seems to be that no sharp line of demarcation can be drawn; there being many MSS. which will present some characteristics of more than one of any groups which can be formed. Still, there is an almost universal recognition of certain general characteristics which broadly divide the MSS. into at least two classes: the *Alexandrine* or *African* group, and the *Asiatic* or *Byzantine*. Tischendorf, like many others, subdivides each of these groups into two; but it may well be questioned whether such subdivision is sufficiently definite to be of much avail for critical purposes. There is, however, a third group, sufficiently distinct from the Byzantine, which generally presents a text like the Alexandrine, but is marked by numerous interpolations. This includes D and other Graeco-Latin MSS.,

and was called *Western* by Griesbach, *Latin* by Tischendorf; but the fact that to this class unequivocally belongs the Curetonian Syriac interferes with the appropriateness of either of these names.

The following are some of the peculiarities which serve to distinguish one group of the MSS. from another :

Peculiarities of spelling. Besides those already enumerated under supposed errors in the earlier codices corrected by the later scribes, may be mentioned the substitution of the aspirate for the *tenuis* in such words as ἀφελπιζοντες, etc., and such forms as ἐχθές for χθές, etc.

Peculiarities of inflection; most frequently the Gen. Sing. of the first declension after ρ, in -ης instead of -ας, as σπειρης, πρώρης, etc., the Accus. of the third declension and of adjectives ending in ν, the neglect of the augment in some verbs beginning with a diphthong, and some instances of a future conjunctive.

Peculiarities of syntax; very commonly ἐάν for ἄν, the use of ἵνα, εἰάν, and ὅταν with the Indicative.

Peculiarities in the order of words, and omissions of certain words, and other characteristic readings which cannot be thus briefly described.

It is observable that these peculiarities are not all of them found uniformly in any codex, nor, on the other hand, are they exclusively confined to any group of codices; but they are found so often in some MSS., and so comparatively seldom in others, that their presence or absence becomes characteristic.

The groups thus marked are found each to agree within themselves in their testimony as to various readings; that is to say, in a large majority of instances, the smaller group marked by these peculiarities will be found on one side, with a very few others agreeing with them, while the mass of MSS. will be on the other side. If one will turn to the pages of any critical edition of the Greek New Testament, and simply glance over the citation of authorities, he will observe that certain letters are habitually grouped together, so that not

infrequently the citation is simply made of two or three of them, with an "etc." for the long list usually agreeing with these. The variations within each group will be found relatively much greater in the smaller than in the larger group. This foreshadows the fact, which will presently appear, that they constitute the more independent class of witnesses. It becomes, therefore, a question of much importance to ascertain which group represents the older text, that is, the text nearer to the time of the originals.

This question cannot be decided simply by the antiquity of the mss. themselves; for, as already said, it may, and sometimes does, happen that a late codex exhibits an older text, or, in other words, has been copied from an earlier ms. than one actually written centuries before it. Resort must be had, in the first instance, to unquestionably early authorities, such as express quotations in the early Fathers and versions of known antiquity. By the examination of a large number of instances of this sort, the *character* of a text may be established, and when this has been satisfactorily done that character gives or takes away our confidence generally in the readings of a codex in which it is found. A long list of such crucial passages may be found in Tregelles on the Printed Text of the Greek Testament (pp. 133-147). It is impossible to present the argument at all fairly in a very limited space; but the few following instances may be enough to show its nature. In Matt. xix. 17 the two readings are: (1) *τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός, εἰ μὴ εἰς.* (2) *τί με ἐρωτᾷς περὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ; εἰς ἐστὶν ὁ ἀγαθός.* Setting aside the mss. for the moment, the ancient testimonies are as follows:

For (1), of the Latin versions *f* and *g*; the Peshito and Harclean (text) Syriac; the Sahidic; quotations in Hilary, Optatus, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and the later Fathers generally.

For (2), seven codices of *Vetus Latina*, including all the better ones, and the Vulgate; the Curetonian and Jerusalem Syriac; the Coptic and Armenian; Origen and Augustine

expressly quote the first clause, and point out the distinction between the words as here given by Matthew and those recorded by Mark and Luke.

Farther, two MSS. of the Vetus Latina, the *margin* of the Harclean Syriac, the Ethiopic, Justin Martyr, Eusebius, and Jerome give one clause in one form and the other in the other.

It is evident that we have a strong preponderance of early testimony in favor of (2); while it is also plain that the variation was introduced at an early date. On general considerations, we can see no reason why (1) should have been altered to (2) in the first Gospel, and left in the others; while the well-known tendency of the scribes to conform parallel passages to one another fully explains the alteration of (2) to (1). Finally, the testimony of Origen and Augustine is explicit and decisive.

Now let us look at the MSS. For the early reading (2) we have \aleph , B, D (D omits $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ and δ), L, 1, 22. For the later reading (1) are C, E, F, G, H, K, M, S, U, V, Δ (Γ omits the first clause), and the great mass of the cursives. The other uncials are defective here. It will be seen that the only very ancient codex for (1) is C, while of the later L, 1, 22 agree with the early codices \aleph , B, and D.

To cite another instance more briefly: In Matt. xv. 8 is a quotation from Isa. xxix. 13. There are two readings; one giving the quotation in full, the other omitting the words in brackets: [$\epsilon\gamma\gamma\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\ \mu\omicron\iota$] $\delta\ \lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ [$\tau\omega\ \sigma\tau\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\acute{\nu}\ \kappa\alpha\iota$] $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\ \mu\epsilon\ \tau\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}$. The presumption, on general principles, is in favor of the shorter reading; Origen expressly says that Matthew varies from Isaiah; the shorter reading is given by all the Latin versions except f, by the Curetonian and Peshito Syriac, the Coptic, Armenian, and Ethiopic; it is the reading of \aleph , B, D, L, 33, 124. On the other hand, the full reading is given by f, by the Harclean Syriac, and among MSS. by C and most of the later uncials and cursives.

The arrangement of the authorities is almost exactly the same in regard to the omission of the words $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \beta\acute{\alpha}\pi\tau\iota\sigma\mu\alpha$

ὁ ἐγὼ βαπτίζομαι βαπτισθῆναι, in Matt. xx. 22, only that here we have Z, defective in the former passages, concurring with the few early MSS. in the omission.

After the examination of many score of such passages, in which the classification of the authorities and MSS. is substantially the same, the conclusion seems irresistible that the earliest text is generally to be found in the smaller group of MSS., while the later is contained in the larger mass of them.

These so-called "later readings," however, often had their origin long before the date of even our earliest MSS. Hence one and another even of these will be found at times to support a later reading. For example, in the form of the Lord's prayer as given in Luke xi. 2, \aleph inserts the clause *γενηθήτω τὸ θέλημά σου ὡς ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, against B, I. 1, and a few other MSS., against the great preponderance of the early versions, and against the express statements of Origen and Augustine, besides the quotations of Tertullian and Jerome. In very rare cases the whole, or nearly the whole, small group of codices generally containing the early text can be shown to be at fault, and by the testimony of versions and of the early Fathers the true text is shown to have been better preserved in what are usually the inferior authorities. A remarkable instance is the reading *ὁ μονογενὴς θεός*, in John i. 18, instead of *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*. In favor of the former are \aleph , B, C*, L, 33; while A, C³, the rest of the uncials, and all cursives, except 33, have *υἱός*, which is supported by the great preponderance of early versions, by the far greater number of the Greek Fathers, and was the only reading followed by the Latin Fathers. This, however, is a very exceptional case. It is comparatively seldom that the joint authority of \aleph and B can be set aside, very seldom indeed when they are supported also by D, L, Z (in Matt.), and by 1, 22, 33, and 69 among the cursives. If to these be added A and C and a few of the more important fragments, this numerically small array of authorities is of far more value than the fourteen hundred or fifteen hundred MSS. which may be on the other side.

There is not space here to trace out the historical corroboration of the facts observed in the examination of the mss. themselves; but it may be remarked in passing, that while Alexandria was once the chief centre of Christian learning and critical scholarship, it ceased to be so after the Mohammedan conquest in the seventh century. It was, therefore, to be expected that the remaining codices presenting in the most marked degree the Alexandrine type of text would be few in number and mostly of great antiquity. On the other hand, after the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the Roman empire and the foundation of Constantinople as the Eastern capital, there must have been there a great demand for copies of the scriptures, and these continued to be multiplied until the capture of the city in the middle of the fifteenth century; we should therefore expect, what we actually find, that the great mass of the later mss. would exhibit the Byzantine type of text.

It remains to present briefly a few simple rules for the determination of the text. These canons of criticism are sufficiently well settled, and commend themselves to everyone's acceptance upon thoughtful consideration. In this, however, as in most arts, simple as the principles are in themselves, it is only by practice that skill can be acquired in their application. None of them admit of being rigidly applied in every case; they are *general* rules, overruled in particular instances by other considerations. Neither does their importance admit of anything like a definite numerical expression, so that each rule and each authority be counted as so many units, and then the sum added up on each side and the balance struck. The errors in mss. are the very complex result of human action, and can only be rightly estimated by the exercise of skill and sagacity. In all cases every element of the evidence must be allowed its full weight, and if the observance of this fundamental rule sometimes occasions perplexity, it is certain that its neglect will lead into error. For the external evidence the following canons have been generally agreed upon:

1. The combined evidence of the earliest mss., the earliest versions, and undoubted quotations in the earliest Fathers, gives a certain reading. This holds good whether the mass of later mss. agree or disagree.

2. Mere numerical preponderance of witnesses of one kind, without regard to their intrinsic character, is of small value.

3. In case of conflicting evidence, great weight attaches to the combination of witnesses widely separated geographically. This applies to the versions, and to Patristic quotations, and also to the mss. in so far as they can be distinctly classified. Thus the consentient testimony of Irenaeus, of Origen, and of Jerome would be of more value than that of a much larger number of writers from a single locality.

4. The weight of each of the three classes of evidence is obviously different in regard to different kinds of readings. For example, the authority of versions generally is much greater on questions of omission or insertion than on verbal niceties; and so correspondingly of the others. It is therefore impossible to be guided always by any mechanical rule of taking two out of the three classes, or any such short and easy method. Much the same thing may also be said as to deciding what is really the collective testimony of any one of the classes; the character of each subordinate witness in view of the nature of the reading, is to be taken into the account. The testimony sometimes of a Semitic, and sometimes of a Latin version is of the higher value; on questions that have to do with geography, the reading of a Father familiar with the localities is of more importance than that of one who knew nothing of them.

5. Disagreement of the ancient authorities, when not explicable as the mere *lapsus* of the scribe, marks a variation of reading of still earlier date.

6. The more ancient reading is *generally* — not quite always — the reading of the more ancient manuscripts.

In practice there is less uncertainty in the application of the foregoing rules than might appear from the somewhat indefinite form it is necessary to give them in order to make

them general. So far as these canons of external evidence are concerned, there would be very little difference indeed in the text formed upon them by any number of experienced critics. The case, however, is otherwise in regard to the canons of internal evidence. These canons themselves are somewhat differently stated by each of the critical editors, and there is also some variety in the application of those which are generally agreed upon. The following are among those most commonly recognized, but they require to be used with so much of limitation, and have also so much of corollary, that such difference as now exists — which indeed is not very much — between the texts of the best critical editors is due almost exclusively to their varying use of the canons of internal evidence.

1. *Brevior lectio praeferenda verbosiori* (Griesbach's first canon). This "rests on the well-known tendency of transcribers, already before alluded to, to include in the text all marginal notes, glosses, etc. found in their copy; nothing, if possible, being omitted." This is a canon of wide application and of small uncertainty. Its limitations are obvious, as in the case of a *homoioteleuton*.

2. *Proclivi lectioni praestat ardua*, a canon of Bengel's, and also of wide, but of much more uncertain application. Among *lectiones arduae* are included solecisms, such grammatical peculiarities as have been already spoken of, rare or irregular usages of words, cases of apparent want of connection, etc. It was natural for the scribe to seek to correct these, which appeared to him accidental errors. The greatest caution, however, is needed in the use of this canon. It was oftentimes quite possible for an illiterate scribe to introduce solecisms, or for a provincial to introduce provincialisms. A merely mechanical copyist might inadvertently introduce an obscurity, as well as an intelligent one seek to remove one he observed. The best critics will sometimes differ, not so much as to the applicability of this canon, as in regard to the weight to which, in any case, it is entitled.

3. *Praeferatur aliis lectio cui subest sensus apparentior*

falsus, qui vero re penitus examinata verus esse deprehenditur. (Griesbach). This is sometimes considered as included in the last canon, but is of sufficient importance to stand by itself. A good instance, cited by Tregelles (Printed Text, etc., p. 203), is 1 Cor. xi. 29, where under this canon the word *ἀναξίως* must be omitted: *ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων [ἀναξίως] κρίμα ἐαυτῷ ἐσθίει καὶ πίνει, μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα.* The obscurity arises here from taking *μὴ* as a simple negative in the sense of *οὐ*; translate the *μὴ* if *not* and the obscurity vanishes. It is doubtless to remove the apparent difficulty that *ἀναξίως* was originally inserted in the margin (referring to vs. 27) as an explanation. In this case the canon of internal evidence is important, for we have in favor of the insertion the great preponderance of the versions, all Patristic quotations (though none of them can be called *express*), and the great mass of MSS. including one or two of importance. For its omission however, we have the almost irresistible authority of *æ**, A, B, C*.

4. That reading is to be preferred which will explain the origin of the variations. That is to say, when there are different readings which have each of them important evidence in its favor, the one from which the others could have been easily derived is more likely to be true than one from which they could not have been. This canon is of quite frequent, and of sufficiently well-defined application.

5. In parallel passages (whether quotations from the Old Testament, parallel passages of the Gospels, or different narratives elsewhere of the same event), other things being equal, that reading is to be preferred which gives a verbally different, rather than a verbally concordant reading. This canon is sufficiently plain, and rests on principles already considered. Its most extensive application is to the parallel passages of the Gospels.

6. Those readings are to be preferred which are characteristic of the Hellenistic idiom, or of the style of the New Testament. This canon is already partly included in 2, and, like that, is to be applied with the greatest caution. In so far

as the following out of its dicta is dependent upon subjective views, its use must vary with the idiosyncrasies of the critic.

7 (as an extension of 6). Those readings are to be preferred in the books of any particular writer which are characteristic of that writer. There is at once obvious force and obvious danger in this canon. On the one hand, the style of a writer will generally be true to itself, and will be characterized by certain idiosyncrasies; on the other hand, it is by no means to be expected of any writer that he will always express himself in precisely similar terms or forms. On the application of no other canon is a difference of opinion more likely to arise between critics. Tischendorf especially has pushed this canon very far in the determination of readings.

On the whole, it will be seen that while the canons of internal evidence are useful and important as *auxiliaries*, they are a dangerous reliance, except in connection with the balancing of divergent external testimony.

The following short collection of all the more important disputed passages shows how far there is a *consensus* of the principal critical editors in regard to them.

Mark xvi. 9-20. Griesbach "probably omit;" Lachmann retains; Tregelles and Alford give as not by St. Mark; Tischendorf omits.

John i. 18. *μονογενῆς θεός* Tregelles, (Alford, margin); *υἱός* Griesbach, Lachmann, Alford, Tischendorf.

John v. 8, 4 (*ἐκδεχομένων τὸ νοσήματι*). Griesbach "probably omit" and bracketed; Lachmann retains; Tregelles, Alford, Tischendorf, omit.

John vii. 53-viii. 1. Griesbach "in all probability omit;" all others omit.

Acts xx. 28. *θεοῦ* Alford, (Tregelles, margin); *κυρίου* Griesbach, Lachmann, Tregelles, (Alford, margin), Tischendorf.

1 Tim. iii. 16. *θεός* none; *δς* all.

1 Pet. iii. 15. *κύριον δὲ τὸν θεόν* Griesbach; *τὸν χριστόν* all others.

1 John v. 7. *ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ τὸ τῆ γῆ* all omit.

Appended is a List of all the known Greek uncials with a Table representing graphically the parts of the text of the New Testament contained in each.

THE UNCIAL MSS. OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It often happens that when several manuscripts are cited as in favor of, or against, a reading of the New Testament text, one is yet in doubt as to the proportion of ms. evidence on either side. Many mss. are not cited at all. Can the weight of their authority be added on either side, or are they silent in regard to the passage in question? When using texts as well arranged as that of Alford, or, still better, of Tregelles, this difficulty is largely removed by the notation in the margin of all the mss. containing any portion of the text upon the page. But even this case does not, as readily as might be desired, put the reader at a glance in possession of the possible manuscript authority. In the following tables an attempt is made so to represent the uncial mss. graphically, that the eye can at once take in the possible authority for or against any reading. By following horizontally across the page in any part of any chapter, it will be seen what mss. do, and what do not, contain the passage under examination. The schedule is made as nearly perfect as the necessities of the scale allow, being worked to the one hundredth of an inch. Some further points of interest in regard to the mss. and some lacunae smaller than can be marked on the schedule are noticed in the margin. Several interesting facts in regard to the New Testament uncials will also be presented to the eye by the schedule.

As there has been some difference of notation in the case of several of the mss. a list is here given with their probable date, and sufficient description for their identification.

Æ. [iv. Cent.]. Codex Sinaiticus. In the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. It contains the New Testament entire.

A. [v.] Cod. Alexandrinus. Library of the British Museum. Beginning at Matt. xxv. 6, it contains the whole New Testament with only two lacunae.

B. [iv.] Cod. Vaticanus. Vatican Library at Rome. Contains the New Testament as far as Heb. ix. 14, but wants 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Revelation. The close of Hebrews is supplied by a later hand.

B₁. [viii.] Cod. No. 2066 of the Vatican Library. (Formerly Cod. Basilianus No. 105). Revelation.

C. [v.] Cod. rescriptus Ephr. Syri. Imperial Library at Paris. Contains fragments of all the books of the New Testament except 2 Thessalonians and 2 John.

D. [vi.] Codex Bezae. Cambridge University Library. A Graeco-Latin ms. containing, with some lacunae, the four Gospels and the Acts, with 3 John 11-15 (in Latin only) before the Acts.

D₂. [vi.] Codex Claromontanus. Imperial Library at Paris. Also a Graeco-Latin ms. containing the Pauline Epistles, with a single hiatus (Rom. i. 1-7). The Latin is the *Vetus Latina*.

E. [viii.] Codex Basiliensis. Public Library at Basel. Contains the Gospels entire, except three lacunae in St. Luke.

E₂. [vi.] Codex Laudianus. Bodleian Library at Oxford. Contains Acts, with a single gap.

E₃. [x.?] Cod. Sangermanensis. Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. A transcript of D₂, of no weight. It is not included in the schedule.

F. [ix.] Cod. Boreeli. Public Library at Utrecht. The four Gospels much mutilated.

F₂. [ix.] Cod. Augiensis. Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. A Graeco-Latin ms. containing the Pauline Epistles with lacunae in the Greek, and wanting the Epistle to the Hebrews. All these are supplied in the Latin, except Rom. i. 1-iii. 19.

F^a. [vii.] Cod. Coislianus 1. Paris. A few fragments of the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles found in the margin of the Septuagint Octateuch, called Cod. Coisl. 1.

G. [ix. or x.?] Cod. Harleianus. (Formerly Seidelii I, or Wolfii A). Library of the British Museum. The Gospels much mutilated.

G₂. [vii.] A single leaf brought by Tischendorf in 1859 to St. Petersburg. Acts ii. 45-iii. 8.

G₃. [ix.] Cod. Boernerianus. Royal Library at Dresden. A Graeco-Latin ms. of the Pauline Epistles, somewhat mutilated. The Latin is interlinear and in cursive letters, altered from the *Vetus Latina* to suit the Greek. This codex once formed part of the same volume with Δ of the Gospels, and it is so like F₂, as to show them to have been copied from the same exemplar.

H. [ix. or x.] Cod. Seidelii. (Formerly Seidelii II, or Woolfi B). Public Library at Hamburg. The Gospels considerably mutilated.

H₂. [ix.] Cod. Mutinensis. Grand Ducal Library of Modena. The Acts mutilated.

H₂. [vi.] Cod. Coislianus 202. Twelve leaves in the Imperial Library at Paris, and two in that at St. Petersburg (these two were formerly cited by Tischendorf as N^o, and by others as Frag. Mosq.), with two others at Moscow. Fragments of the Pauline Epistles. Tischendorf has found at Moscow another leaf containing part of Col., iii. and three more leaves whose contents are not described.

I. A series of fragments of the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles, sometimes called "Fragmenta Palimpsesta Tischendorfiana," or Cod. Tischendorffii II. Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. I^a, I^b (Frag. Nitr.), and I^c are of Cent. v.; I^d and I^e are of Cent. vi.; while I₁ and I₂ are of Cent. vii.

K. [ix.] Cod. Cyprius. Imperial Library at Paris. Gospels complete.

K_r. [ix.] Cod. Mosquensis. Library of the Holy Synod at Moscow. The Catholic Epistles entire (sometimes formerly cited as J), and the Pauline with two lacunae.

L. [viii.] Cod. Regius Parisiensis. The Gospels with five lacunae. A ms. of peculiar value from the indications of its having been copied from a very ancient ms.

L_r. [ix.] Cod. Angelicus (or Passionei. Formerly cited as G. of the Acts and Cath. Epp., and as J of the Pauline Epp.). The Acts beginning at viii. 10, Catholic Epp., and Pauline to Heb. xiii. 10.

M. [ix.] Cod. Campianus. Imperial Library at Paris. The Gospels entire.

M_r. [ix.] Cod. Ruber. (Cod. Uffenbadianus). Two leaves in the British Museum containing fragments of 1 and 2 Cor., and two in the Johanneum at Hamburg, containing the beginning and the end of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

N. [vi.] Cod. Purpureus. Four leaves in the British Museum (formerly cited as J), six at the Vatican (formerly cited as N), two at Vienna (formerly cited as Γ), thirty-three recently found at Patmos. Fragments of the four Gospels.

N_r. [ix.] Two leaves at St. Petersburg containing a fragment of Gal. and of Heb.

O. [ix.] Cod. Mosquensis. Library of the Holy Synod. Eight leaves brought from Mt. Athos, containing fragments of St. John.

Osbedes. [vi.-ix.] Copies of the Hymns in Luke found in various Psalters.

O_r. [vi.] A double leaf at St. Petersburg, containing 2 Cor. i. 20—ii. 12.

O_s. [vi.] A single leaf seen by Tischendorf at Moscow, containing Eph. iv. 1–18, with lacunae.

P. [vi.] Cod. Guelpherbytanus. Ducal Library at Wolfenbüttel. A Palimpsest containing fragments of the four Gospels.

P_r. [ix.] Cod. Porphyrianus. Moscow. Contains the Acts, Pauline and Cath. Epp., and Rev. considerably mutilated.

Q. [vi.] Cod. Guelpherbytanus II. Like P, but containing only fragments of Luke and John.

Q_r. [v.] A Papyrus at St. Petersburg, containing fragments of 1 Cor. i. vi. vii.

R. [vi.] Cod. Nitriensis. A Palimpsest in the British Museum, containing fragments of Luke.

S. [A.D. 949]. Cod. Vaticanus 354. The four Gospels entire.

T_a. [v.] Cod. Borgianus I. Library of the Propaganda at Rome. Fragments of Luke and John.

T_b. [vi.] Fragments of St. John at St. Petersburg. Discovered recently by Tischendorf.

T_c. [vi.] Cod. Porphyrius Petropolitanus. A fragment of St. Matthew.

T_d. [vi.] Fragments of Matthew, Mark, and John, discovered by Tischendorf. These four mss. marked T are very much alike.

U. [ix. or x.] Cod. Nanianus. St. Mark's Library, Venice. Four Gospels entire.

V. [ix.] Cod. Mosquensis. Library of the Holy Synod, Moscow. The four Gospels (with two lacunae in Matt.) as far as John vii. 39, whence it is finished in cursive of 13th Century.

W_a. [viii.] Cod. Imp. Paris. No. 314. Two fragments of Luke.

W_b. [viii.] Cod. Neapolitanus rescriptus. (Frag. Neap.). Fourteen leaves. Fragments of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

W_c. [ix.] Cod. Sangallensis rescriptus. Three leaves. Fragments of Mark and Luke.

W_d. [ix.] (Frag. Cant.). Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. Fragments of Mark.

W_e. ("Frag. Ath._a" and "Frag. Ath._b"). Two fragments of St. John. These fragments are much like the Cod. Mosquensis, O, also from Mt. Athos.

X. [ix. or x.] Cod. Monacensis (formerly Ingolstadiensis). University Library, Munich. Fragments of the four Gospels.

Y. [VIII.] Cod. 225 of the Barberini Library at Rome. Contains John xvi. 3—xix. 41.

Z. [VI.] Cod. rescriptus Dublinensis. Trinity College, Dublin. St. Matthew, much mutilated.

Γ. [A.D. 844?]. Cod. Tischendorfianus IV. Bodleian Library, Oxford in part; the rest at St. Petersburg. Fragments of the two first Gospels, with the other two complete.

Δ. [IX.] Cod. Sangallensis. Monastery of St. Gall. A Graeco-Latin ms. of the Gospels, with a single hiatus.

Θ^a. [VII.] Cod. Tischendorfianus I. University of Leipsic. Fragments of Matthew, of which one leaf (xiii. 46–55) is almost illegible.

Θ^{bcd}. are fragments brought by Tischendorf from the East, now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. Θ^b. [VII.] Frag. Matt. and Mark. Θ^c. [VI.] Matt. xxi. 19–24. Also, John xviii. 29–35, found by Porfirii. Θ^d. [VIII.] Luke xi. 37–45. Θ^{efgh} are fragments from the collections of Porfirii. The three first, containing fragments of Matthew, Mark, and John, are of Cent. VI. The last, three leaves of Matthew, is of the IX. or X.

Α. [VIII. or IX.] Cod. Tischendorfianus III. Bodleian Library, Oxford. Luke and John complete.

Ξ. [VIII.] Cod. Zacynthus. Library of Brit. and For. Bible Soc., London. A Palimpsest, containing fragments of Luke.

Π. [IX.] Cod. Petropolitanus. The four Gospels, with four lacunae.

The table following is only of the uncials. It may not be amiss to add that the three most important of the cursives are the following: Codex Basiliensis (Basle K. iii. 3) of the tenth century. Uniformly cited as 1 in the Gospels, Acts, and Pauline Epistles; Codex Colbertinus, of the eleventh century (called by Tregelles the Queen of the cursives) cited in the Gospels as 33, in the Acts as 13, and in the Pauline Epistles as 17; Codex Leicestrensis, of the fourteenth century, cited in the Gospels as 69, in the Acts as 31, in the Pauline Epistles as 37, and in the Apocalypse as 14.

1875.]	UNCIALS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT—MATTHEW.	253
(Imp. =	A B C D E F F ^o G H I ^{ca} K L M N S U V W ^o X Z Γ Δ Θ Π Ω	Imp.)
18		18
19		19
20		20
21		21
22		22
23		23
24		24
25		25
26		26
27		27
28		28

O, Q, R, Y, E, and A do not contain any part of this Gospel. There is a fragment containing Matt. xx. 8-15 and Luke i. 14-20 which was formerly marked A, but which has since proved to be an Evangelistary. In D, lii. 7-16 is supplied by a later hand. The var. lect. of F, from vii. 6 onward, are given by Wetstein. G is filled out from xxviii. 18 in cursive of the thirteenth century. In Θ, xiii. 46-55 is almost illegible.

14	15	16	14	15	16
14	15	16	14	15	16

F, O, Q, R, Y, Z, A, and E do not contain any part of this Gospel. In G, i. 1-13 is supplied in cursive. In D, xvi. 15 to end is supplied by a later hand (in the Latin xvi. 6 to end). In κ and B there is no mutilation, but as the Gospel terminates in them at xvi. 8, it seems necessary so to mark them.

[Besides these uncials, there are a very few cursives which are of value in the determination of the text; indeed, of more value than most of the later uncials. The chief of these are: 1, a ms. of the tenth century, belonging to Basle, containing the entire New Test., but the text only of importance in the Gospels. 18, of the twelfth century (Küster's *Par.* 6), contains the Gospels, but defective Matt. i. 1-ii. 21; xxvi. 33-53; xxvii. 26-xxviii. 10; Mark i. 2-45; John xxi. 2 to the end. 33, the most important of all the cursives; it contains the New Test., except Rev., but is numbered 33 in the Gospels, 13 in Acts and Cath. Ep., 17 in the Pauline Ep.; it is of the twelfth century, and is the *Cod. Colbertinus* 2844 in the Imperial Library at Paris; it is defective Mark ix. 31-xi. 11; xiii. 11-xiv. 60; Luke xxii. 38-xxiii. 16; John vii. 53-viii. 12 (i.e. it does not contain the last passage). 69, of the fourteenth century, *Cod. Leicestrensis*, belonging to the town council of Leicester; it contains the entire New Test., and is numbered in the Gospels 69, in the Acts and Cath. Ep. 81, in the Pauline Ep. 37, in Rev. 14; it is defective from the beginning to Matt. xviii. 15; Acts x. 45-xiv. 17; Jude 7 to end. 124, of the twelfth century (Vienna, Theol. 188, N.), contains the Gospels, but, defective Luke xxiii. 31-xxiv. 28. 346, of the twelfth century (Milan, Ambr.), contains the Gospels, but is defective John iii. 6-viii. 52. Besides these, there is the *Cod. Tisch. Actorum*, now called 61 (the former 61 having proved to be a part of 111). It is 20,003 of the British Museum, and contains the Acts except iv. 8-vii. 17; xvii. 28-xxiii. 9. Tregelles also cites 47, a ms. of the Bodleian Library, containing the Pauline Ep., as valuable.]

Cap.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L	M	N	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	X	Γ	Δ	Π	Cap.	
12																										13
18																										18
14																										14
15																										15
16																										16
17																										17
18																										18
19																										19
20																										20
21																										21
22																										22
23																										23
24																										24

Cap. n	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	K	L	M	N	O	P	S	T	U	X	Y	Γ	Δ	Θ	Λ	Π	Cap.	
13																										13	
18																											18
14																											14
15																											15
16																											16
17																											17
18																											18
19																											19
20																											20
21																											21

Q, R, Z, and E do not contain any part of this Gospel. G has the lacuna xviii. 5-18 filled in cursive. The fragments of P are represented by a series of dots, but are too small to be indicated exactly; they are parts of the following verses: in xiii. 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27; in xvi. 7, 8, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19. V is completed in cursive of the thirteenth century. In several of the mss. (u, B, T, X,) there is no break at vii. 53; but as they do not contain the passage vii. 53-viii. 11, it seemed proper to indicate the fact by a gap in the lines representing them. L and Δ leave a space vacant, but not enough to contain the whole passage. A and C are defective; but, from the amount of space on the missing leaves, it is certain that they did not contain the passage. It may be here mentioned also, that it is not contained in the cursive 83.

Cmp. n A B C D E ₁ F ^o G ₁ H ₁ L ₁ P ₁ Cmp.						Cmp. n A B C D E ₂ F ^o H ₂ I ₁ L ₂ P ₂ Cmp.												
1						1						16						16
2						2						17						17
3						3						18						18
4						4						19						19
5						5						20						20
6						6						21						21
7						7						22						22
8						8						23						23
9						9						24						24
10						10						25						25
11						11						26						26
12						12						27						27
13						13						28						28
14						14												
15						15												

The end of H₂ is not by the original scribe, but is in uncials by an ancient corrector. P₂ contains three and a half words of ll. 9, not indicated on the schedule; it wants a few words in xvii. 20, 21, 25, also in xxviii. 22, 23, and the larger part of vs. 21.

Cap. n	A	B	C	D ₁	F ₁	G ₁	K ₁	L ₁	P ₁	Cap.
1			⌋	⌋	⌋	⌋			⌋	1
2			⌋			⌋			⌋	2
3			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	3
4			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	4
5			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	5
6			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	6
7			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	7
8			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	8
9			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋ ¹¹	9
10			⌋		⌋	⌋	⌋		⌋	10
11			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	11
12			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	12
13			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	13
14			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	14
15			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	15
16			⌋		⌋	⌋			⌋	16

There is another Uncial, marked E, which contains the Pauline Epistles; but as it is a mere transcript of D with some of its corrections, and is of no authority, it is not given.

Chp. n.	A	B	C	D ₁	F ₁	F ₂	G	H ₁	I ₁	K ₁	L ₁	M ₁	P ₁	Q ₁	Chp.
1															1
2															2
3															3
4															4
5															5
6															6
7															7
8															8
9															9
10															10
11															11
12															12
13															13
14															14
15															15
16															16

Q₁ is a Papyrus of the fifth century, containing fragments of i., vi., and vii. As no more definite description of it has yet been published, a dotted line is drawn through these chapters.

2 THESSALONIANS.

HEBREWS.

Chap. v. A B D₂ G₂ K₂ L₂ P₂ Chap.

Chap. v. A B C D, F¹ H, K₂ L₂ M₂ N₂ P₂ Chap.

1									1
2									2
3									3

1									1
2									2
3									3
4									4

1 TIMOTHY.

Chap. v. A C D₂ G₂ H₂ K₂ L₂ P₂ Chap.

1									1
2									2
3									3
4									4
5									5
6									6

5									5
6									6
7									7
8									8
9									9
10									10

2 TIMOTHY.

Chap. v. A C D₂ G₂ K₂ L₂ P₂ Chap.

1									1
2									2
3									3
4									4

11									11
12									12
13									13
14									14
15									15
16									16
17									17
18									18

JAMES.

Chap. v. A B C K₂ L₂ P₂ Chap.

1								1
2								2
3								3
4								4
5								5

TITUS.

Chap. v. A C D₂ G₂ H₂ I₂ K₂ L₂ P₂ Chap.

1									1
2									2
3									3

PHILEMON.

v. A C D₂ G₂ K₂ L₂ P₂

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

P₂ lacks only parts of verses 7, 9, 10, 11, 13 in 1 Tim. vi., and parts of 2, 3, 4, 5 in 2 Tim. i. In Jas. ii. 18-21 there is no hiatus in P₂, but it is almost illegible; it is marked by a fine line.

1 PETER.							REVELATION.					
Chap. n	A	B	C	K ₂	L ₂	P ₂	Chap. n	A	B ₂	C	P ₂	Chap.
1							1					1
2							2					2
3							3					3
4							4					4
5							5					5
2 PETER.							6					6
Chap. n	A	B	C	K ₂	L ₂	P ₂	7					7
1							8					8
2							9					9
3							10					10
							11					11
							12					12
1 JOHN.							13					13
Chap. n	A	B	C	K ₂	L ₂	P ₂	14					14
1							15					15
2							16					16
3							17					17
4							18					18
5							19					19
2 JOHN.							20					20
n	A	B	K ₂	L ₂	P ₂		21					21
							22					22
3 JOHN.												
n	A	B	C	K ₂	L ₂	P ₂						
JUDE.												
n	A	B	C	K ₂	L ₂	P ₂						

In 2 Pet. ii. there are only a few words lost in P₂ in each of verses 3, 4, 5; these are marked by a fine line. In Rev. P₂ in vi. 6, 8, 9, 10 has lost a part of each of these verses, which are marked by a fine line. It has also lost part of xi. 3, one word of xxi. 19, and part of xxii. 2.