

## ARTICLE VI.

PAUL'S PANEGYRIC OF LOVE. — A NEW CRITICAL TEXT,  
TRANSLATION, AND DIGEST.

BY A. W. TYLER, A.M., NEW YORK.

## NO. I.—INTRODUCTIONS AND TRANSLATION.

IN May, 1870, the Convocation of Canterbury, by a unanimous vote in the Upper House, and by a large majority in the Lower, declared, "That it is desirable that a revision of the Authorized Version of the Holy Scriptures be undertaken." This was the first of a series of resolutions which were proposed by a committee of eight bishops, the late Dean Alford, Dean Stanley, and other dignitaries of the Church of England. That church is justly proud of having formed our present incomparable version, and nothing is more fitting than that with her should originate the steps looking toward bringing it into accordance with what is rightly demanded by the present state of biblical science. A new *translation* is neither proposed nor needed; but what is wanted is a *revision* of the present version, which shall be worthy of the scholarship and Christianity of to-day, and which shall therefore most fully avail itself of the latest researches among the rich stores of manuscript treasures which have been recovered during the present century, and which shall embody the results of the most mature and discerning criticism which can be brought to bear upon the manuscripts, versions, and Fathers, for the restoration of the *ipsissima verba*, as nearly as may be, of the sacred text.

The Convocation also appointed a committee of eight bishops and eight presbyters to take the requisite steps for carrying out the resolutions. The Committee of Revision, as finally constituted, consisted of some thirty-six members, divided into two companies—one for the revision of the New Testament, and the other for that of the Old. Authority

was given to the committee, by the Convocation, "to invite the co-operation of any eminent for scholarship, to whatever nation or religious body they may belong."

Especial interest was felt in this country, when it was found that, under the authority thus granted, the British committee had invited Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff, of New York, to form an associate committee of competent American scholars, who should join in the execution of the great work proposed. The American committee is also divided into an Old Testament company of eleven members, and a New Testament company of fifteen. Eight denominations are represented in their ranks, and many of their number are of acknowledged ability and tried skill in biblical criticism or exegesis. They have now fully entered upon the prosecution of their work.

As no building which is not founded upon rock can withstand the tempest, so no translation can bear searching criticism unless the text it renders be grounded upon all attainable evidence which is of a character worthy of confidence. In the opinion of the writer, the sources from which the primitive text is to be sought are the oldest uncials (with such secondary aid as the later uncials and the cursive manuscripts can render), the ancient versions, and the early ecclesiastical writers, whether Greeks, Latins, or Syrians. It must not be denied that many and serious difficulties beset the use of citations from the ecclesiastical writers; but these difficulties render it none the less imperative that we should sift the wheat from the chaff, and avail ourselves of whatever the Fathers, so called, have preserved for us. (This subject will be discussed more fully in the Introduction to the second part of this Article, which will appear in the April Number.)

It ought to be an axiom in the criticism of the text of the Greek Testament, as it is in that of the classics, that the nearer we can get to the age in which a work was written, the more likely are we to obtain a pure text, and the less probably shall we find it corrupted by accident, carelessness, or design. Holding this to be the case, the writer sets the

highest value upon the uncial manuscripts of the fourth and fifth centuries, which have been so largely given to the Christian world through the indefatigable and painstaking researches of the master critic, Tischendorf. (It must not be forgotten that it is to him we owe it that we have at last a trustworthy edition of the great Vatican manuscript; for had he not shamed the pope into permitting the publication of the *fac-simile* edition of 1868, we should still have had to be satisfied with the very imperfect and faulty editions of Cardinal Mai, supplemented by such corrections as Tischendorf, Alford, and others were enabled, from time to time, to obtain by stealth from the manuscript itself.) The manuscripts of the sixth century, whether of the Gospels or Epistles, are of scarcely less value than the earlier. Still, a slight deterioration begins to make its appearance. Below the sixth century, we notice a very decided change for the worse in the character of text presented in what we may style the secondary uncials. These were copied from exemplars which greatly varied in the excellence and purity of their text. Occasionally, indeed, they may preserve a reading in its purity which has suffered change even in its transmission to the oldest manuscripts now extant. But this was by no means always, or even ordinarily, the case. Besides the frailties which beset all copyists, those of the later uncials were prone to attempt to assimilate or "correct" the text of the exemplar which they were copying into an accordance with that with which they were familiar, in their church lectionaries, or service-books, or in their daily work. This assimilation was often unintentional, and was caused by the habits of thought of the scribe; as, for example, when he would look at a passage with which he was verbally familiar, and then heedlessly fail to notice its differences from the text which he had in his mind. (Any one who has collated texts of ancient writers, or even corrected proof-sheets "by copy," need scarcely be reminded how easy it is to fall into this error, or rather how great exertion it requires to keep out of it). The later scribe was

also more likely to incorporate marginal notes, or *scholia*, into his text, ignorantly supposing them to be omissions which should be inserted in their proper place. It would be pleasing to believe that most of the variations found in the manuscripts and versions arose from these causes, or from other inadvertence, especially could there be any ground whatever for thinking that the famous interpolation, ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ . . . ἐν τῇ γῆ, in 1 John v. 7, 8, had any such innocent origin for the Greek form found in the Textus Receptus. But the phenomena of the manuscripts force us to the conclusion that many changes were those of design; some of them caused by a desire to harmonize or assimilate parallel passages; others to enforce some doctrinal opinion which was at the time occupying a prominent place in the discussions of the councils, or in the controversies of the bishops and heretics; yet others to remove difficulties, real or supposed, in the text itself, (and this last will amply account for the corruption of *καυχῆσθαι* into *καυθήσθαι*, in vs. 8 of our passage); and still others arose, where the copyist did not, or could not, comprehend the passage as written, and attempted to form a smooth, grammatical reading from his own conception of what ought to be read in the passage before him.

Even better than most of the secondary uncials are some cursives, which possess a text retaining in a great degree its pristine purity and excellence. Such are 1. 33. 69. of the Gospels (which are, unfortunately, designated by other numbers in the other divisions of the New Testament); notably 61 of the Acts; and 38 of the Apocalypse. In important passages, these cursives nearly always join the ranks of the earlier uncials, rather than those of the later.

In manuscript authorities we finally come to the mass of cursives, numbered by hundreds, and the lectionaries or service-books of the Greek-speaking churches. These are to be trusted only so far as they approve themselves worthy of confidence. As auxiliaries, rare instances will occur where their testimony may be valuable; for example, in 1 John v. 7, 8, where every Greek manuscript of any char-

acter fails to furnish any evidence whatever for the spurious addition. The conservative critics, if they may be so styled, in a case where the truest conservatism is radicalism, protest against this sweeping condemnation of the mass of MSS., and urge that we may yet find cursives which were transcribed from exemplars older in text, if not in vellum, than our most venerable uncials. It is a sufficient reply to this, that no cursive manuscript has yet been produced for which any such origin can be claimed.

Upon investigation, we find the cursives agreeing, to a remarkable degree, with the later Fathers, — notably with Oecumenius and Theophylact, — and the uncials with the earlier Fathers and versions, where the text of the latter can be depended upon. This state of affairs is utterly irreconcilable with the claim of antiquity set up for the text of the Receptus and of the mass of cursive manuscripts.

The next source from which we must seek the primitive text is in the oldest versions. Not a few of these were executed long anterior to the oldest Greek codices now extant. As now existing in printed editions, the text of but few of the versions is in a condition to satisfy the reasonable demands of the critical student of the originals of the New Testament. We need thoroughly critical editions, of the Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Aethiopic versions. Even in their present unscholarly and unworthy condition, the testimony of these versions is frequently of the greatest moment, and in many cases can be cited with some degree of confidence. The editions of the works of the Fathers, which are our last source of evidence, are in nearly as bad a condition as the text of the versions. But this will be spoken of elsewhere.

The *final edition* of the Greek Testament cannot be produced while so many of our sources of evidence are in the confused and chaotic condition in which they now exist. For the present, at least, we must be satisfied with provisional texts and provisional translations. But it is the high privilege of each generation, and every biblical scholar, to make a fair

contribution toward the recovery of the text of our Scriptures, in the state in which it was delivered to man.

The translation published herewith is in no sense a popular one, but aims to present in English the shades of thought in this matchless passage, more nearly than is possible in such a version, and to note the force of the original as closely as may be. In some cases the literal rendering of the Greek will hardly be as clear as is desirable, and, therefore, in such places, brief notes of explanation have been appended.

The uncial manuscripts containing the Pauline Epistles, and that to the Hebrews are:

α. The Codex Sinaiticus, Century IV, now in the Imperial Library at St. Petersburg. Most probably it was written about the middle of the fourth Century, by *four* scribes, one of whom (Tischendorf's D) revised the work when completed. His corrections are of the highest value, frequently exceeding that of the text itself. In our digest he is cited, as well as in Tischendorf and Tregelles, as α°. A corrector of Century VII, is α°, who touched the manuscript very frequently. We cite from Tischendorf's fac-simile edition of 1862. A. The Codex Alexandrinus, Century V, now in the British Museum. Cited from Woide's folio edition of 1786. B. The Codex Vaticanus, Century IV, now in the Vatican Library at Rome. B<sup>a</sup> a corrector contemporary with the original scribe. B<sup>b</sup> a corrector of Century X or XI, who retouched the whole manuscript, where the original writing was fading out, and made many corrections. Cited from the Roman fac-simile edition of 1868. C. The Codex Ephraemi, Century V, now in the Bibliothèque Nationale (sometime Impériale and Royale), at Paris. A most valuable palimpsest, having many sad hiatuses, one of which occurs at verse 8 of our passage. C<sup>a</sup> a corrector of Century VI; and C<sup>b</sup> one of Century IX. Cited from Tischendorf's edition of 1843. D. The Codex Claromontanus, Century VI, now in the same library with Codex C. A highly important Graeco-Latin manuscript, having the Greek and Latin in parallel columns. It is blemished with a vast number of corrections, the work of many hands, only two of which we need notice here: D<sup>b</sup> of Century VII, and D<sup>c</sup> of Century IX or X. Cited from Tischendorf's edition of 1852. E. The Codex

San-Germanensis, Century IX or X. A Graeco-Latin manuscript copied from D, *after* it had received many of its corrections, and abounding in absurd readings resulting from the attempt to blend text and corrections. Cited from Tischendorf's digest. F. The Codex Augiensis, Century VIII, now in the library of Trinity College, Cambridge, England. Despite the inaccuracy of its spelling its readings are ancient and most valuable. (G is almost identical with it in this particular.) Cited from Scrivener's edition of 1859. G. The Codex Boernerianus, Century IX, now in the Royal Library at Dresden. This manuscript and F are copies of the same exemplar, though perhaps not directly, and their united testimony to its readings is of importance. They rarely differ from each other sufficiently to make a new reading. In G the Latin is written *over* the Greek, while in F it is in a column parallel with it. G is cited from Matthaei's edition of 1791. H. Fragmenta Coisliniana, Century VI, now in the same library with C. They do not contain our passage. I. Fragmenta Palimpsesta Tischendorfiana, Centuries V to VII, now at St. Petersburg. They do not contain our passage. K. Codex Mosquensis, Century IX, now in the Library of the Holy Synod, at Moscow. Matthaei's collation does not contain all the information desired by editors of to-day, and so it must be cited as agreeing with the Receptus where he is *silent*. In such cases it is marked *Ks*. Cited from the digests of Tischendorf and Tregelles. L. The Codex Angelicus Romanus, or Passionei, Century IX, now in the Angelican Library at Rome. Cited from Tischendorf and Tregelles. M. The Codex Uffenbachianus, Century X. Fragments in the British Museum and at Hamburg. They do not contain our passage. P. The Codex Porfirianus, Century VIII or IX. This highly important palimpsest now belongs to Bishop Porfiri, at Moscow. Cited from vol. v. of Tischendorf's *Monumenta Sacra Inedita, nova collectio*, 1865.

Certain cursive manuscripts, having texts of especial excellence, are: 17. The Codex Colbertinus, Century XI. It is in the same Library with Codex C, and is known as "the Queen of the Cursives." (Cited as 33. in the Gospels; and as 13. in the Acts and Catholic Epistles). 37. The Codex Leicestrensis, Century XIV. Now in the Town Library at Leicester, England. (Cited as 69. in the Gospels; and 31. in the Acts and Catholic Epistles). 47. A *ms.* designated Roe 2, in the Bodleian Library, at Oxford. The readings of these three Cursives are cited from Tregelles's digest, he

having collated them very thoroughly. 2<sup>b</sup>. An Apostolus, or Lec-  
tionary, in Cabinet K. 1, at the Harvard University Library, Cam-  
bridge, Mass. "Perhaps of the XIIth Century. Procured at  
Constantinople, in 1819, by the Hon. Edward Everett, then Eliot  
Professor of Greek Literature, through Mr. Cartwright, the British  
Consul-General." This beautiful ms. has two columns to the page,  
and averages twenty-three lines to the column, though it sometimes  
has a line less or one more. It was kindly collated for this Article,  
by Mr. E. A. Guy. The other cursives which are cited, are de-  
scribed in the prolegomena to Tischendorf's Seventh edition, and  
in Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*; those collated by the latter  
gentleman are described at length in the introduction to his edition  
of the Codex Augiensis.

The ancient Versions are cited as follows: *Vulg.* The Vulgate,  
as formed by Jerome at the close of the IVth Century, which is  
generally cited in this Article from the Codex Amiatinus, at Flor-  
ence, written about A.D. 541, as published by Tischendorf in 1850.  
The other codices cited are: *Demid.* Demidovianus, XIIth Century;  
*Fuld.* Fuldensis, VIth Century; *Flor.* Floriacensis; *Harl.* Harle-  
ianus; *Lux.* Luxoviensis; *Tolet.* Toletanus, at Toledo, VIIIth  
Century; *f.* The Latin column of F. These MSS., except *Am.* and  
*f.*, are cited from the digests of Tischendorf and Tregelles. *Am.*  
includes *Demid.*, *Fuld.*, *Harl.*, and *Tolet.*, as well as the Clementine  
edition (*Vulg.-Clem.*) unless they are expressly cited. The *Old*  
*Latin* is cited from: *d.* The Latin column of D; *e.* that of E; *g.*  
the interlinear translation of G; *m.* Readings found in the *Specu-  
lum* ascribed to Augustine, and published by Mai, in vol. i. of his  
*Nova Bibliotheca Patrum*. The figures attached to *m* denote the  
page of the *Speculum*. The other Versions are: *Pst.* The Peshito  
Syriac, supposed to have been made in the II<sup>d</sup> Century. Its MSS.,  
however, are of much later date, and its text is in a very un-  
satisfactory condition. *Hcl.* The Harclean Syriac, made in the Vth  
Century, and revised, A.D. 616, by Thomas of Harkel. *Memph.*  
The Memphitic, or Coptic, probably of the III<sup>d</sup> Century. *Theb.*  
The Thebaic, or Sahidic, an older and ruder version than the  
Memphitic. *Bash.* The Bashmuric fragments of a third Egyptian  
version. From the *Rudimenta Linguae Coptae sive Aegyptiacae*,  
published at Rome, 1778, by the college of the Propaganda, im-  
portant readings of *Memph.* and *Theb.*, which have appeared in no  
Greek Testament, are cited under the designation of *Memph.-Bom.*

and *Theb.-Rom. Aeth.* The Aethiopic, perhaps of the IVth Century. *Aeth.-Platt.* Pell Platt's edition, 1826-30. *Aeth.-Rom.* That printed in the Roman Polyglott, 1548-49. *Aeth.-Platt* is by far the more accurate; *Aeth.-Rom.* being little more than a paraphrase in difficult passages. The Aethiopic of Walton's Polyglott is identical with that of the Roman. *Goth.* The Gothic, executed by Ulphilas in the IVth Century. *Arm.* The Armenian of the IVth Century. The Versions are cited from Tregelles's digest, sometimes from Tischendorf's.

In the list of Fathers below, the abbreviation given is that usually employed in the digest, and from which the others will be readily understood. The Fathers are cited as nearly chronologically as is practicable, in the order of the list. The first time, in each verse, that a Father is cited, full reference is made to treatise, book, chapter, section, volume, and page, so that the citation may be readily found in any edition of his works. Afterwards, in *that verse*, a new reference, to a citation already given, is made only by volume and page. However, as the works of Origen and Chrysostom are so frequently cited, and the standard editions are so easily accessible, (Migne's reprints also giving the paging of the originals,) they are referred to only by volume and page. Wherever errors of Tischendorf and Tregelles have been corrected, it is done in no carping spirit (for in the midst of so many minutiae, absolute accuracy is well nigh unattainable), but that the actual facts may be known for future use. In every such case reference is made to the very editions used by those accomplished critics. The dates are generally taken from Darling's *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, London, 1854, and are those of the birth and death of each writer, unless something else be stated.

The Greek Fathers are cited as follows: *Olem.-Rom.* Clement of Rome, flourished A.D. 91-101. From vol. i. of Gallandi's *Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*. Ignatius of Antioch, died A.D. 107 or 116. From the second edition of Cotelier's *Apostolic Fathers*, Amsterdam, 1724. Justin Martyr, fl. A.D. 140-164. From Otto's second edition, Jena, 1849. *Iren.* Irenaeus, fl. 167-200. From Massuet, Venice, 1734. Phileas Martyr, second century. From Routh's *Reliquiae Sacrae*, Oxford 1846, and from Eusebius. *Olem.* Clement of Alexandria, fl. 192-215. From Potter, Oxford, 1715. *Orig.* Origen. 185-254. From the Benedictine edition of De la Bue, Paris, 1733-59. *Archel.* Archelaus, fl. about 278. From

vol. iii. of Gallandi. *Meth.* Methodius of Patara, fl. 290–312. From vol. iii. of Gallandi; and from Jahn, as cited by Tregelles. *Eus.* Eusebius of Caesarea, fl. 313–338. From Viger, Paris, 1628; and in the Psalms, from Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova Patrum*, Paris, 1706. *Eph.-Syr.* Ephraem Syrus, fl. 363–379. From the Benedictine edition, Rome, 1732–1746. *Athanas.* Athanasius of Alexandria, fl. 326–373. From the Benedictine edition, Padua, 1777. Aphaates, “the Persian Sage,” fl. about 337. From vol. v. of Gallandi; and from the Syriac of his Homilies, as published by Prof. Wm. Wright, LL.D., London, 1869. (By an error as old as the time of Jerome, his writings have been credited to Jacob of Nisibis. Dr. Wright has now cleared up the matter, and published the Syriac originals of his Homilies, which are said to be of great importance and value). *Cyrl.-Hier.* Cyril of Jerusalem, 315–386. From Toultée, Paris, 1720. *Macar.-Aegypt.* Macarius of Egypt, 301–391. From vol. vii. of Gallandi. *Amphil.* Amphilochius of Iconium, fl. 370–385. From Combefis, Paris, 1644. *Didym.-Alex.* Didymus of Alexandria, fl. 370–394. From Mingarelli, as reprinted in vol. xxxix. of Migne's *Patrologiae Cursus Completus*; and from vol. vii. of Mai's *Nova Patrologia Graeca*. *Nazian.* Gregory of Nazianzus, fl. about 370. From Morel, Paris, 1615. *Nyssen.* Gregory of Nyssa, fl. about 370. From Morel, Paris 1609–11. *Basil.* Basil the Great, 326–379. From Garnier, Paris, 1721, as reprinted by Gaume, Paris, 1839. The original edition has been frequently referred to. The Egyptian Fathers, Antonius Abbas, 356, and Isaias Abbas, 372, are cited from vol. xl. of Migne. *Epiph.* Epiphanius of Constantia, 320–403. From Dionysius Petavius (Petau), Paris, 1622. *Marcus Eremita*, fl. about 395. From vol. viii. of Gallandi. *Chr.* Chrysostom of Constantinople, 354–407. From the Benedictine edition of Bernard Montfaucon, Paris, 1718–38, as reprinted by Gaume, Paris, 1839. The original edition has been referred to whenever advisable. (Tischendorf's method of citing Basil and Chrysostom is confusing, if not fully understood. He has used Gaume's reprints of both, but cites Basil by the pages of Garnier, which are given in the centre column of the reprint; but in the precisely similar edition of Chrysostom he cites by Gaume's pages, ignoring the original pages of the centre column. Where he has done so in this passage, the pages of the reprint are given in parentheses, after those of the original). *Theodor.-Mops.* Theodore of Mopsuestia, fl. 399–429. From

Cramer's *Catena*. Severian of Gabala, fl. 401. From Cramer's *Catena*. Philo Carpasius, fl. about 400. From vol. ix. of Gallandi. *Cyriil. or Cyril-Alex.* Cyril of Alexandria, fl. 412-444. From Aubert, Paris, 1638, as reprinted by Migne, vols. lxxviii.-lxxvii. *Apophthegmata Patrum*, about 420. From vol. lxxv. of Migne. *Theodoret.* Theodoret of Cyrus, 393-457. From J. L. Schultze, Halle, 1769-74, as reprinted in Migne, vols. lxxx.-lxxxiv. Proclus of Constantinople, fl. 438. From vol. ix. of Gallandi. Basil of Selucia, fl. 448. From Migne, vol. lxxxv. *Isid.-Pelusiot.* Isidore of Pelusium, d. about 440. From P. Possin, as reprinted by Migne, vol. lxxxviii. Nilus Asceta, fl. 440-451. From Migne, vol. lxxxix. Marcus Diadochus, of Photice in Epirus, fl. 400 or 450. From Migne, vol. lxxv. Euthalius, fl. 460. Cited as *Euthal.-cod.* i.e. the ms. of Euthalius, which was written *over* the text of the Codex Porfirianus. Its readings are cited from the Eighth edition of Tischendorf's Greek Testament. Johannes Carpathius, middle of fifth century according to Migne; seventh century according to Darling; eighth century (701) according to Cave. From Migne lxxxv. *Ps.-Dion. Areop.* By this is meant the spurious writings at one time accredited to Dionysius the Areopagite. See McClintock and Strong's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*, vol. ii., for a good account of these writings, which were probably written about 500. From B. Cordier, as reprinted by Migne, vols. iii., iv. Andreas of Caesarea, of the last half of the fifth century, according to Delitzsch and other good authorities. From Sylburg, Heidelberg, 1596, as reprinted by Migne, vol. cvi. Procopius of Gaza, fl. 520. From Migne, vol. lxxxvii. Cosmas Indicopleustes, fl. about 535. From Montfaucon's *Collectio Nova*, vol. ii. *Hesych.-Hier.* Hesychius of Jerusalem, fl. 601. From Migne, vol. xciii. Joannes Maxentius, fl. 520. From Migne, vol. lxxxvi. Leontius Byzantinus, fl. 590 or 610. From Migne, vol. lxxxvi. Barsanuphius Gazaeus, fl. 548. From Gallandi, vol. xi. *Eus.-Alex.* Eusebius of Alexandria, fl. 259 according to Cave; 400 according to Darling; 600-610 according to Migne, from whose vol. lxxxvi. he is cited. *Thalas.-Abbas.* Thalassius Abbas, fl. 640. From Migne, vol. xci. *Max.-Confess.* Maximus Confessor, 580-662. From Combefis, Paris, 1675, as reprinted by Migne, vols. xc., xci. *Damascen.* John of Damascus, 676-760. From Le Quien, Paris, 1712. *Theod.-Studi.* Theodore of Studium, fl. 813-826. From vol. v. Jacob Sirmond's works, Venice, 1728. Photius of Constantinople, fl.

858-886. From Migne, vols. ci.-civ. *Oecumen.* Oecumenius of Trica, fl. latter part of the tenth century. From the Paris edition of 1631. *Theophyl.* Theophylact of Bulgaria, fl. 1077. From De' Rossi and Finetti, Venice, 1754-63. During the years 1838 to 1844, J. A. Cramer, of Oxford, England, published a series of *Catenae* upon the whole Greek Testament. They are cited by volume and page; e.g. Severian Cat. Cor. 243, Orig. Cat. in 1 Joan. 115, etc.

The Latin Fathers cited are as follows: *Tertul.* Tertullian of Carthage, fl. 192-200. From Semler, as cited by Roensch, Leipsic, 1871. Cyprian of Carthage, 200-258. From Baluze, Paris, 1726. *Auctor Libri de Rebaptismate*, about 254. From vol. iii. of Gallandi. Found also bound up with Cyprian. *Hil.* Hilary of Poitiers, fl. 350-368. From the Benedictine edition, Paris, 1693. Zeno of Verona, fl. 360-380. From vol. v. of Gallandi. Optatus of Milevia in Numidia. Wrote his treatise on the Schism of the Donatists about 370. From vol. v. of Gallandi. *Ambros.* Ambrose of Milan, 340-397. From the Benedictine edition, Paris, 1686-90. *Ambrosiast.* Ambrosiaster, or Hilary the Deacon, fl. 354. Bound up with the second volume of the works of Ambrose, but separately paged. *Hier.* Hieronymus, or Jerome, of Stridon, 331-422. From Domenico Vallarsi, Venice, 1766-1772. *Aug.* Augustine the Great, 354-430. From the Benedictine edition, Venice, 1729-1739. Gaudentius of Brescia, d. 410 or 427. From vol. v. of Despont's *Bibliotheca Maxima Patrum*, Lyons, 1577. *Epistola ad Demetriadem Virginem.* Cited from the copy bound and paged with the works of Prosper of Aquitaine. Written about 440. Prosper of Aquitaine, 403-463. From the edition printed at Bassano, 1782. Julian of Pomeria, fl. 494-98. Bound with works of Prosper, but separately paged.

The critical Greek Testaments referred to are the following: *Tisch.* The Eighth edition of Tischendorf, Leipsic, 1871. *Tv.* His Seventh edition, 1859. *Tyf.* His Second, 1849. *Tv.* and *Tyf.* concur with *Tisch.* except when the contrary is stated. *Tr.* Tregelles's 1869. *Alf.* Alford's Sixth edition 1871. *Alf*<sup>2</sup>. His Second edition, 1855. Cited to show how his valuation of MSS. evidence changed with the advancement of his studies. *Ln.* Lachmann's *editio major*, 1842. *Wd.* Wordsworth's Sixth edition, 1868. *Eras*<sup>1</sup>. Erasmus's First edition, 1516. *Eras*<sup>2</sup>. His Second, 1519. *Eras*<sup>3</sup>. His Third, 1522. *Eras.* includes the three, except the contrary be

stated. 5. Stephens's edition of 1550. (The so-called *Textus Receptus* of America and England.) 5<sup>a</sup>. The Elzevir edition of 1624. (The *Textus Receptus* of the Continent.) 5<sup>c</sup>. The Complutensian, dated 1514, but not issued till 1522. Mill is sometimes cited as 5<sup>m</sup>. The sign 5 includes these four editions except the contrary be stated. The following abbreviations require explanation: An asterisk, (\*), after the notation of a codex signifies that the *original reading*, thus noted, has suffered correction by a later hand. Throughout this Article, the abbreviation MSS. refers to uncial manuscripts, and mss. to those written in cursive letters. *Int.* with the name of Father refers to the Latin *interpretation* of his works where the Greek is not extant. *Ps.* or *Pseud.* denotes the *spurious* writings attributed to the Father to whose name it is attached. Migne's reprints are noted by *M.*, and the page in parentheses. In the *text* an asterisk (\*) refers to the digest, where a reading of *equal value* with that adopted will be found. A reading slightly inferior, but strongly supported, is noted by a dagger (†) in the digest, but not in the text. Readings adopted which differ from those in the *Textus Receptus*, are *spaced*; e.g. μείζονα.

## 1 CORINTHIANS XII. 27—XIII. 13.

- 27 Ἔμεῖς δὲ ἐστε σῶμα χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρουσ·  
 28 Καὶ οὐδὲ μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, πρῶτον ἀπο-  
 στόλους, δεύτερον προφήτας, τρίτον διδασκάλους, ἔπειτα  
 29 δυνάμεις, ἔπειτα χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, ἀντιλήψεις,  
 κυβερνήσεις, γένη γλωσσῶν. μὴ πάντες ἀπόστολοι; μὴ  
 πάντες προφῆται; μὴ πάντες διδάσκαλοι; μὴ πάντες  
 30 δυνάμεις; μὴ πάντες χαρίσματα ἔχουσιν ἰαμάτων; μὴ  
 πάντες γλώσσαις λαλοῦσιν; μὴ πάντες διερμηνεύουσιν;  
 31 Ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα· καὶ ἔτι καθ'  
 1 ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι. ἐὰν ταῖς γλώσσαις τῶν ἀν-  
 θρώπων λαλῶ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, γέγονα·  
 2 χαλκὸς ἡχῶν ἢ κύμβαλον ἀλαλάζον. καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω προφη-  
 τεῖαν καὶ εἰδῶ τὰ μυστήρια πάντα καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γνῶσιν,  
 \*καὶ ἐὰν ἔχω πᾶσαν τὴν πίστιν, ὥστε ὄρη μεθιστάναι,  
 3 ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐθέν εἰμι. \*καὶ ἐὰν ψωμίσω πάντα τὰ  
 ὑπάρχοντά μου, \*καὶ ἐὰν παραδῶ τὸ σῶμά μου ἵνα \*καυχῆ-  
 4 σωμαι, ἀγάπην δὲ μὴ ἔχω, \*οὐθὲν ὠφελοῦμαι. ἡ ἀγάπη  
 μακροθυμεῖ, χρηστεύεται· ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ ζηλοῖ· ἡ ἀγάπη οὐ

- 5 περπερεύεται, οὐ φυσιοῦται, οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ, οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ  
 6 ἑαυτῆς, οὐ παροξύνεται, οὐ λογιζεται τὸ κακόν, οὐ χαίρει  
 7 ἐπὶ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, συγχαίρει δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ· πάντα στέγει,  
 πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει.  
 8 Ἡ ἀγάπη οὐδέποτε πίπτει· εἴτε δὲ προφητεῖαι, κα-  
 9 ταργηθήσονται· εἴτε γλῶσσαι, παύσονται· εἴτε \*γνώσεις,  
 10 καταργηθήσονται. ἐκ μέρους γὰρ γινώσκομεν καὶ ἐκ  
 11 μέρους προφητεύομεν· ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον τὸ ἐκ μέ-  
 12 ρους καταργηθήσεται. ὅτε ἤμην νῆπιος, ἐλάλουν ὡς  
 13 νῆπιος, ἐφρόνουν ὡς νῆπιος, ἐλογιζόμην ὡς  
 14 νῆπιος· ὅτε γέγονα ἀνὴρ κατήργηκα τὰ τοῦ νηπίου.  
 15 βλέπομεν γὰρ ἄρτι δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι, τότε δὲ πρό-  
 16 σωπον πρὸς πρόσωπον· ἄρτι γινώσκω ἐκ μέρους, τότε δὲ  
 17 ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην. νυνὶ δὲ μένει πίστις  
 18 ἐλπίς ἀγάπη, τὰ τρία ταῦτα· μείζων δὲ τούτων ἡ ἀγάπη·  
 19 διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην.

## A LITERAL TRANSLATION.

- 27 Now are ye the body of Christ, and members individually.  
 28 And God placed some in the church, first apostles, secondly  
 29 prophets, thirdly teachers, then powers, then gifts of healing,  
 30 assistants, governings, diversities of tongues. Are all apostles?  
 Are all prophets? Are all teachers? Are all *possessors of*  
 powers? Have all gifts of healing? Do all speak with tongues?  
 Do all interpret?  
 31 But earnestly desire the greater gifts; and moreover I am  
 1 showing you a supereminently excellent way to *them*. If I speak  
 with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love,  
 2 I have become *as* sounding brass or a clanging cymbal. And  
 even though I have the gift of prophecy, and comprehend all  
 the mysteries and all knowledge, and even though I have all  
 faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing.  
 3 And even though I dole out all my goods to *feed the poor*, and  
 even though I deliver over my body that I may glory, but have  
 4 not love, I am in no wise advantaged. Love suffereth long, is  
 kind; Love envieth not; Love vaunteth not herself, is not self-  
 5 inflated, doth not behave herself unbecomingly, seeketh not her  
 6 own, is not easily provoked, reckoneth not the evil, rejoiceth not  
 Vol. XXX. No. 117.

7 at iniquity, but rejoiceth together with the Truth; beareth all things, trusteth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.  
 8 Love never faileth; but whether there be gifts of prophecy, they will be brought to naught; whether there be tongues, they will be silenced; whether there be knowledges, they will be brought  
 9 to naught. For we know in part, and we prophesy in part;  
 10 but when the perfect is come that which is in part will be brought  
 11 to naught. While I was a child I spake as a child, I thought as a child, I reasoned as a child; since I have become a man I  
 12 have laid aside the things of the child. For now we are seeing in a mirror obscurely, but then face to face; now I know in part, but then will I fully know even as *here* I was fully known.  
 13 And now there is abiding Faith, Hope, Love, these three, but the greater of these is Love: pursue after Love.

## NOTES.

Verse 27. *ἐκ μέρους* may here mean "in part" (as in verses 9, 10 of Chapter xiii.), referring to the Corinthian church. So Bengel, *Gnomon*, ed. Edinburg, 1859, vol. iii. p. 299.

Ver. 28. *δυνάμεις* "powers," (Latin, *virtutes*), i.e. possessors of powers to perform "mighty works." See Trench, *Synonyms*, seventh edition, London, 1871, pp. 320-325. For usage of the word compare Acts x. 38; 1 Cor. ii. 4; 2 Thess. ii. 9; and as referring to the "mighty works" wrought, Matt. vii. 22; Mark vi. 2, 5; Luke x. 13; Acts ii. 22; viii. 13; xix. 11; 1 Cor. xii. 10; 2 Cor. xii. 12; Gal. iii. 5; Heb. ii. 4, and elsewhere repeatedly throughout, the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. *ἀντιλήμψισ* "assistants," the deacons and deaconesses of the early church.

Ver. 1. *ἀγάπη*. It need hardly be said that the rendering "charity" is, in the words of Hodge, "peculiarly unhappy." Compare his admirable note upon this word, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, N. Y., 1857, p. 265. *ἤχων* would be better "resounding," but the "sounding brass" of the Authorized Version, is now proverbial. *ἀλαλάζον* is not "tinkling" but, as a cymbal is struck with a sharp clang, the onomatopoeia "clanging" alone appears to represent the original.

Ver. 3. *ψωμίζω* signifies to break into morsels and distribute. "Dole out" seems to represent the action pretty nearly. Some phrase must be supplied to complete the sense, as above. The Latin supplies, *in cibos pauperum*. After "body" must be supplied "to

death," or something similar. Is not this a strong point in favor of *καυχῆσμαι*? Copyists seeing that with this word the sense was incomplete, would readily light upon *καυθήσμαι*, which would at once remove the difficulty, and at the same time make a smooth reading. *καυχῆσμαι* is supported by *AB. 17.*, and the two *Egyptian versions*, *Memph.* and *Theb.-Rom.* (sic) made in the third century. See digest for a full statement of the evidence. The change, whichever way made, was a very early one.

Ver. 5. *οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ*, perhaps "doth not thrust herself forward," i.e. *scheme*, which has its root in the four letters *σχημ*. οὐ ζητεῖ τὸ μὴ αὐτῆς. If this very probable reading be preferred, render: "seeketh not that which is not her own." λογίζεται, "reckoneth not the evil," i.e. doth not remember evils suffered, in order to avenge them.

Ver. 6. "Truth" must be personified, or the force of the preposition in *συναίρει* is lost. So Meyer and Alford.

Ver. 8. *γνώσεω*. The word "knowledges" was formerly in good usage, and, as Sir Wm. Hamilton says, "ought not to be discarded." It renders exactly the *γνώσεω* of the text, and the *scientias* of Tertullian.

Ver. 9. τὸ τέλειον, "the perfect," or, if preferred, as A.V., "that which is perfect."

Ver. 11. ὅτε γέγονα ἀνὴρ. It should be remembered that the "since" by which ὅτε is rendered, is temporal and not causal. It is unfortunate that our word "since" can translate such entirely different conjunctions as ὅτε and ὅτι. We must mentally distinguish its use, even if it be not apparent to the ear.

Ver. 12. δι' ἐσόπτρου ἐν αἰνίγματι. The metallic mirrors of the ancients gave very obscure images, quite unlike those of our own glasses.

Ver. 13. μείζων, "greater" not "greatest." De Wette beautifully remarks, "The greater, because it contains in itself the root of the other two: we believe only one whom we love, we hope only that which we love." "Pursue after Love." See digest for reason for joining these words to this passage.

[To be continued.]