

τυγχάνειν is unfortunately rather rare in the New Testament, and it is not therefore possible to produce another passage in it, which would shew us the regular 'African' rendering of this verb. The omission from *h* of a rendering for the words ἀχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης of the Greek is only one of many instances of the same kind in these later chapters.

A. SOUTER.

SOME POINTS IN THE HISTORY OF THE *TEXTUS RECEPTUS* OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

(1) IN his *Canon and Text of the Greek Testament* (Clark, Edinburgh, 1907), C. R. GREGORY writes (p. 444):—

'The text which has been considered the Received Text by theologians of different places and different years has not always been the same. One general distinction to be mentioned is *that between England and the Continent*, inasmuch as the text of Estienne of the Regia edition of 1550 has for the most part prevailed in England, whereas on the Continent the text of Elzevir, 1624, has held the chief place. *But then the handy editions of the British and Foreign Bible Society have done much to bring the English form into use in other countries.*'

Two years later Gregory repeated the same statement in German in his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, dedicated to A. Harnack (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1909, p. 557):—

'Doch haben die handlichen Ausgaben der Britischen und Ausländischen Bibelgesellschaft viel getan, um die englische Form auch in andern Ländern in Gebrauch zu bringen.'

That the contrary is true, I shortly pointed out in the new edition of my *Einführung in das Griechische Neue Testament* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1909, pp. 15, 44): the editions of the B. F. B. S. did not bring the English form to the Continent, but the Continental form into England.¹

It is now just a hundred years since the B. F. B. S. first published a Greek text of the N. T.: 'Ἡ Καινὴ Διαθήκη . . . δὲ γλωττος (J. Tilling, Chelsea, 1810). This edition was a repetition of the Diglott of Halle, 1710, which derived its ancient Greek from the seventh edition of Elzevir of 1678. Later on, in the separate editions of the Ancient Greek, since 1843, the B. F. B. S. adopted the text of the first Elzevir edition of 1624 (with few and unimportant variations).

¹ It is worth while to mention that Fell 1675 makes an exception among his countrymen as not following Stephen of 1550, but Elzevir of 1633.

(2) As the *second* edition of the Elzevir of 1633 has in the Preface the famous statement:—‘Textum ergo habes nunc ab omnibus receptum’, and boasts that ‘vel minutissimae mendae’ were removed, which might have been left in the first edition, this latter edition of 1633 has sometimes been taken as standard, and it is therefore desirable to have the facts about the differences between the two editions cleared up. In Scrivener’s *Plain Introduction* (third edition, 1883, p. 442) this had been done in the following way:—

‘Although some of the worst misprints of the edition of 1624 are amended in that of 1633 [follow eight passages among which “John v 2”], others just as gross are retained [follow twelve passages], to which must be added a few peculiar to itself [follow nine passages, among which “John v 2 *secundo loco*”]. Of real various readings between the two Elzevirs we marked but eight instances (in six of which that of 1633 follows the Complutensian) [follow eight passages, among which “Heb. ix 12”].’

In 1890 one of the most conscientious workers in this field, H. C. Hoskier, devoted not less than twenty-six pages to a ‘Collation of Elzevir 1624 with Elzevir 1633’ in the Appendix C to his *Full Collation, &c.*

After giving a list of not less than 450 differences between the texts of the two editions, he begins to discuss the statements of Scrivener, just quoted, and says:—

‘In “John v 2 (*secundo loco*)” and “Heb. ix 12” (the latter in the list of real divergences), *I can see no discrepancy whatever.*’

With reference to another statement of Scrivener (who believed that he read in his copy of 1633 in John iv 51 οἱ δοῦλος instead of οἱ δούλοι), Hoskier tell us that he examined, besides his own copy of 1633, three in the library of the B. F. B. S., three in the British Museum, one at Oxford, and one at the Bib. Nationale at Paris; and yet in Heb. ix 12 he could not see any discrepancy whatsoever.

A copy of 1633 I have had several years, one of 1624 I acquired but recently, both from England; now my copies read:—

| | 1624 | 1633 |
|------------|-----------|------------|
| Heb. ix 12 | εὐρόμενος | εὐράμενος. |

Was Hoskier struck with blindness, when he could see no discrepancy whatsoever, and Scrivener with him and after him? For in the fourth edition of his *Introduction* (1894, vol. ii, 194 sq.), which takes account of the examinations of Hoskier, Scrivener not only struck out ‘John v 2 *secundo loco*’ from his third list, but also Heb. ix 12 from the list of the ‘real divergences’, heading it with ‘we marked but *seven or eight*

instances'.¹ Or—and this is the question, which justifies the publication of these lines—are there copies, which yield no variation: i. e. copies of 1624 with δ or copies of 1633 with δ ? After it has thus been shewn, in which letter the discrepancy must be looked for, it will be easy for those who have access to these rare editions to verify this question. The word is the last in the verse, and the verse is not quite short, therefore it is possible that Hoskier's attention did not keep up to the last.²

(3) That there are differences between various copies of the edition of 1624 has been long known, at least as regards the title-page. Hoskier distinguishes not less than four or five varieties:—

He first quotes from Willems, *Les Elzévier*, 1880, p. 61:—

'Il existe des exemplaires avec un titre en rouge et en noir, qui portent pour le nom de ville *Lugduni* (qu'on pouvait prendre pour Lyon); ce sont les exemplaires destinés aux pays *Catholiques*; les autres ont un titre en noir seulement et portent *Lugduni Batavorum*.'

Then he goes on to say:—

'So that already we have apparently three different issues of the edition of 1624, but my copy has three words on the title-page in red—*διαθήκη*, Testamentum, and Elzeviriana, which thus makes a fourth, and further, Mr Omont, of Paris, writing of the Bibl. Nationale copy, says its title-page has *διαθήκη*, Testamentum and *Ex off. Elzev.* in red, which would make a fifth. This is an interesting point to clear up, but the book is very rarely met with now, even in public libraries. It is not at Bâle, nor in the Mazarine, nor Ste Geneviève at Paris, and there is only one I believe in all Oxford.'

In the forthcoming *Historical Catalogue of the printed editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of the B.F.B.S.*, Darlow and Moule quote the same passage from Willems, and add:—

'G. Berghman, however, in his *Supplément à l'ouvrage sur les Elzévier* (1897, p. 60), records a third variety, which has the title in red and black, but gives the place as *Lugduni Batavorum*: a copy of this variety, which may be called C, is in the B.M.'

¹ The addition of 'iv 51' in this edition crept in in the wrong place after 2 Tim. i 12; it ought to have been inserted after 'John iii 6', but it must be struck out. Hoskier is quite right, when he says 'the type is rather faulty, that is all'.

² Is it necessary to say, that I do not wish to deprecate in the least the painstaking accuracy of Hoskier? There can be no greater admirer of his patience than I. Subsequently I notice that the difference between *εὐράμενος* and *εὐράμενος* is marked in Scrivener's Greek Testament. Now the fact is still stranger. Hoskier knew this edition, of course, and yet he saw no discrepancy whatsoever in Heb. ix 12, and Scrivener who had noted the passage in the 3rd edition of his Introduction and has given the variant in all editions of his Testament, removed the passage from his list in his 4th edition, as convinced by Hoskier, that there was no variety there!

The variation A (entirely in black, with *Lugd. Bat.*), and B (*διαθ.*, Test., Ex. Off. Elz., red, and *Lugduni*) are in the library of the B. F. B. S. I cannot settle this point, I note only that my (black) title writes 'Officina', while Hoskier gives 'Officiná'. This seems to be a further difference. Hoskier does not mention that the *Signet* (device on the title-page: a man plucking grapes from a vine encircling the trunk of a tree with a scroll bearing the words *Non solus*) is not quite the same in the two editions, 1624 and 1633.

But there seem to be differences also in the *text* between various copies of the year 1624. Hoskier at least says (p. 13) on 1 Peter iii 19:—

'In 1624, p. 775, ends with *πνεύ-μασι* sic. but the catch-word *μασι* is not transferred to the next page as usual.'

In my copy it is; the first line of p. 776 runs in my copy:—

μασι πορευθεὶς ἐκήρυξεν, Ἀπειθήσασί 20.

It would be interesting to learn how it runs in copies, in which *μασι* is missing. But are there such copies? H. F. Moule examined for me the five copies in the British Museum, the two of the B.F.B.S., and one in his own possession; Prof. Schmiedel of Zürich that of the town library there; all are in order and begin p. 776 with the syllables *μασι*.

But further: in Romans, Hoskier registers not less than a dozen readings of the edition of 1624 which are not found in the Zürich copy, nor in my own; most touch only the punctuation (i 22, 26; iii 1; v 18; vi 8; vii 7, 9, 12, 16; viii 24, 26, 28); but at vi 4 he gives for 1624 *εἰς θάνατον*, 1633 *εἰς τὸν θάνατον*.¹ Was he mistaken in all these passages? Is there no chance of finding the copy which he used?

For Rom. viii 5 Hoskier marks another fault, the catch-word p. 531 being *ἀμαρ-* instead of *ἡμεν*, the beginning of the next page. In my copy the letters *ἀ* and *αρ* have been erased apparently by the printers, to whom I might ascribe also the correction of the spiritus lenis of *ηρετσα* in Matt. xii 18 into spiritus asper.

About 'John v 2 *secundo loco*' in Scrivener's third list, I am at a loss as well as Hoskier. I suspect some confusion with the quotation of this verse in the first list, i.e. between the variation *κολυμβήθρα* (nominative, 1624), and *κολυμβήθρα* (dative, 1633). That it was 'hardly fair' of Scrivener, as Hoskier expressed himself, to classify the nominative *κολυμβήθρα* which was the reading of Erasmus, Colinaeus, Stephanus, Beza, and is the reading of all modern editors, among the worst misprints of the edition of 1624, while the dative of 1633 only found a place on the margin of Tregelles with a query, has been acknowledged by Scrivener himself in his fourth edition, inasmuch as he removed the

¹ My copy of 1624 and that in Zürich have the article.

passage from his first list. On the general value of both editions the estimate of Hoskier will hold good.

Unimportant as these questions are, the last has a more general bearing. It has been but recently recognized that in the earliest times of book-printing, when the printing went on at a slow speed, each copy of an edition must be taken, so as to say, as an individual, there being time to bring in corrections between the striking off of the sheets. The examples quoted seem to shew that this took place occasionally as late as the seventeenth century.

EB. NESTLE.

PSALM CXX 3^m.

IN the A.V. of 1611 the marginal note on Psalm cxx 3 stands thus: 'Or, what shall *the deceitfull tongue* giue vnto thee? or what shall it profit thee?' The words 'the deceitfull tongue' are printed in a different type, thus indicating that they are not found in the original. I venture to think that this is a mistake, and that the whole note should be in the same type, as being the alternative rendering to that given in the text: 'What shall be giuen vnto thee? or what shalbe done vnto thee, thou false tongue?'

It is not substantially different from the Geneva Bible of 1560:

'What doeth thy deceitful tongue bring vnto thee? or what doeth it auaille thee?'

Or from the Bishops of 1568:

'What doth a deceitfull tongue vnto thee? What good bryngeth it thee?'

The A.V. reverts almost to Coverdale.

It seems strange that this error should have been perpetuated in all copies of the A.V. which have been printed since, and even that it has been augmented, for Scrivener prints the latter part of the marginal note thus: 'or, What shall it profit thee?' as if it were an alternative rendering of what precedes.

WILLIAM ALDIS WRIGHT.