

# BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

---

## ARTICLE I.

### A NEW BIBLE TEXT FROM SPAIN. L

BY E. S. BUCHANAN, M.A., B.SC.,  
OXFORD, ENGLAND.

WHILE engaged in copying the Fragments of the Acts from the Fleury Palimpsest in the National Library in Paris in the year 1904, I was struck by the immense disparity between that Old-Latin text and the Vulgate of Jerome. On consulting the Received Greek text I saw that the Vulgate was closely allied to the Greek, and that in all the important variants exhibited by the Palimpsest the Vulgate and the Received Greek text were combined against the Old-Latin. A reference to the Codex Bezae established the fact that the Codex Bezae occupied a midway position between the Fleury Palimpsest text and the Vulgate. In fundamental text there was the same tradition in both the Palimpsest and the Codex Bezae; but the Codex Bezae had been revised and partially brought into agreement with the Vulgate. Where the Codex Bezae was found opposing the Vulgate, it was nearly always supported by the Fleury Palimpsest. The thought then came into my mind that the Old-Latin text of the Fleury Palimpsest and the Codex Bezae contained primitive elements that had been eliminated both in the Received Greek text and in the generally consentient Vulgate.

Ten years of further study of Old-Latin MSS. has strengthened my belief that the Vulgate is the local Roman form that the New Testament writings came to assume both in Latin and Greek at the close of the fourth century. Jerome in his preface to Damasus in 382 A.D. tells of the enormous amount of variation existing at that time in the Latin texts of the New Testament. Every locality had its own MSS. and its own text. To end this confusion Jerome professed that he had gone back to the original Greek, and had prepared a Latin edition "according to the Greek truth." The Vulgate thus issued by Jerome and supported by his patron Damasus, Bishop of Rome, was declared to be the only true and authentic form, and went forth into all quarters of the civilized world, "conquering and to conquer."

If we inquire, Whence did Jerome obtain the Greek MS. or MSS. by which he revised the Latin Version that he promulgated, the answer is, From Alexandria. There is a most striking agreement (noted and commented on by Dr. Hort) between the New Testament text of the Codex Alexandrinus, now in the British Museum, and that of the Vulgate of Jerome. There is an agreement almost as striking (noted by Wordsworth and White) between the Vulgate and the revised and more localized form of this Alexandrian text exhibited by the Egyptian codices Aleph and B. The Aleph and B text has been successively canonized in editions of the Greek New Testament by Dr. Tischendorf (1869) and Dr. Hort (1881), and finally given to the world in a slavishly literal English translation in the Anglican Revised Version of 1881. But was Jerome's Greek the original Greek?

Two obvious questions occur to the mind when we read Jerome's preface to his work.

1. Why should Greek MSS. have remained immaculately

pure and wholly unaltered, while Latin MSS. underwent changes many and manifold in their different localities? Jerome's assumption that, by revising the Latin text of his day according to the Greek text of his day, he restored the evangelical truth, was an assumption for which he gives no basis. Nor do we find any support whatever for his assumption from a study of textual history.

2. Was not Jerome's adoption of the Alexandrian Greek text as his standard a most unfortunate choice? For nowhere had grammarians and editors done more to impair the pristine purity of the Biblical text than in Alexandria, where speculation was rife, and where men of Marcion's views held bishoprics in many of the churches. Egypt, we learn from Irenæus, was *fons et origo* of the Gnostic heresies of the second and third centuries; and the works of Tertullian give abundant evidence of the activity in the early Christian era of the Egyptian depravers of the Sacred Text. *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes* might well be applied to the Biblical text issuing from Egypt and North Africa. The home of the earliest and most serious corruptions of the New Testament was Egypt.

In the first hundred years after the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus Christ, there was a steady flow of soldiers and merchants westward through the Mediterranean from Rome to Gallia, Hispania, and Britannia. Now we know that Christianity was brought to Rome in the middle of the first century by St. Paul and St. Peter and their fellow workers; and the second of our Gospels was written in Italy (probably in the Latin tongue) by St. Mark, the companion of St. Peter, and must have been known to the churches in Italy (including the church in Rome) before the first century closed. We may dismiss as legendary the visit of Joseph of

Arimathæa to Britain; and perhaps St. Paul's contemplated visit to Spain (Rom. xv. 24, 28) may never have taken place. But the fact that a journey to Spain was part of St. Paul's plan of work shows us conclusively that there existed a well-worn highroad westward to Spain from Rome. "When I shall begin *my journey into Spain* [says the Apostle], I will come to you."

It is thus easy to explain the fact that MSS. of an early date were carried into the West by men of the first Christian generation. And these for many subsequent generations were sedulously guarded and faithfully copied by their converts and the descendants of their converts.

To this early establishment of Christian communities in localities remote from Rome is to be traced the fact noticed by Jerome of the great number of local Latin texts that existed in the fourth century. When the Roman Bishop Damasus conceived the plan of Roman world-wide supremacy, he saw that this could be attained only by the canonization of the fourth-century Bible text of the Roman Church, which is now known as the Vulgate. Unscrupulous controversialists on the Roman side maintained that the Apostolic Originals — all in Greek — were in the keeping of the Roman pontiff, and that the Vulgate Version was made in exact verbal agreement with these Originals. The Venerable Bede<sup>1</sup> (died 735) believed this; but ventured the shrewd suggestion just before his death, that possibly the Apostolic Originals had been revised by others than the apostles, and falsified before the Vulgate translation of them was made. He was led to make this suggestion (which he regarded as half impious) by the fact that the Vulgate differed so widely in many

<sup>1</sup> Bede's name is found in the Morgan MS. on Fol. 39 verso; but a corrector of the MS. who made his corrections in 1220 A.D. has (*more suo*) erased it and substituted the name of St. Augustine.

readings from the Old-Latin texts of the Fleury Palimpsest type that had been current from the beginning in Britain and Spain. With true insight Bede advised his fellow countrymen to follow their own local British text, and not to discard it in favor of the Roman Vulgate.

Before the death of Bede there was born in Spain a presbyter called Beatus, who, like Bede, used his ecclesiastical privileges to become versed in the Scriptures and in all the wisdom of the ancient Fathers. Beatus was, moreover, like Bede, a man of great gifts of mind and heart, but with more of the zeal of the reformer that Luther had. Having read through his Commentary on the Apocalypse, I can testify to his immense industry and learning and deep spiritual insight. The Bible text he used in his Commentary was the local Spanish text. Beatus would have nothing to do with the Vulgate text, for he was strongly anti-Roman, and declared that Rome was the woman seated on the Beast that St. John saw in the seventeenth chapter of the Apocalypse. The importance of his attitude in our inquiry is that it guarantees the Bible text of his own original writings from any suspicion of conformity to Jerome's Vulgate. If we could only find a copy of his Commentary *made under his own eyes*, we should be then able to establish the complete text of the Apocalypse as it existed in Spain before the Vulgate admixture with, and final annihilation of, all other Latin texts in Spain, except that of the Vulgate. The text of Beatus as it survives to-day in the most important extant MS. (begun in 968 and completed in 970, now in the possession of Mr. J. P. Morgan of New York) has not everywhere escaped unscathed. It is two hundred years removed from the author and his MS.; and in those years it has undergone considerable revision at the hands of successive Vulgate copyists.

The Morgan MS. of *Beatus* was acquired in October, 1910, in London by the librarian of the late Mr. J. P. Morgan for the Morgan Library. The vendor, a Spaniard, said he had purchased it from the convent of San Clemente, Toledo, where tradition said it was given to the convent by King Alfonso VI. (1030–1109). A very large sum was asked and paid for the MS., owing to its richly colored miniatures (numbering an hundred and ten) being in an almost perfect state of preservation. It is a large folio containing 184 leaves of thick vellum, each leaf measuring 21 inches by 14 inches. The binding is elaborate Spanish work of the seventeenth century. Besides the *Apocalypse*, the MS. contains the *Book of Daniel* with a *Commentary*. The MS. is complete except for the loss of three leaves. It has two perfect colophons — one by the scribe Emeterius, written 970 A.D., and one by the chief of the *Vulgate* correctors in 1220 A.D. By reason of its two colophons the MS. is an exact landmark of the highest value, not only to the textual student, but also to the student of early Spanish art. The MS. has been loaned since the middle of last March by the heirs of the late Mr. J. P. Morgan to the University of Michigan, where the present writer has been able to study its contents with less interruption than was possible in the city of New York.

The rule of *Beatus* in writing his *Commentary* was that he set down a whole section or chapter first, and then proceeded to comment thereon verse by verse. These detached Scripture verses he writes in red ink to distinguish them from the rest of his *Commentary*. Now there is constant variation between the text copied in gross and the rubricated text copied verse by verse with comment appended. Sometimes one text exhibits a *Vulgate* reading where the other text has a pre-*Vulgate* Old-Latin reading, and *vice versa*. Not

infrequently we find that the commentary appended to a now Vulgate form of text relates to an original text used by Beatus which the commentary shows to have been quite different from the Vulgate, but which we can now only guess at.

The treatment that the archetype (or archetypes) of our MS. underwent is repeated in the treatment received by our MS. itself. In the year 1220 a devout ecclesiastic and his colleagues revised with knife and pen the whole Commentary and its Bible text. Beatus was made to conform to the current ecclesiastical teaching by deleting some of his words and introducing others. The Old-Latin text he employed was in many places erased, and Vulgate readings were substituted. It is obvious that a copyist of the work of Beatus who should copy from our MS., and make his copy after 1220, would not copy the original form of the Commentary, but the corrected Vulgated form. By such a process as this following the loss of the original MS., many of the original words and sentiments of Beatus have not come down to posterity, and (worse still) sentiments and words that he never uttered have been thrust upon him.

Three or four examples of the alterations made in the Commentary by the Vulgate correctors must suffice, as our main interest is not in Beatus, but in the Bible text that he employed.

1. On Fol. 39 of the Morgan MS. we read: *Similiter et ecclesia multis gradibus consistens ad extremum presbyteris uel episcopis finitur*. Thus it was written in 968. In 1220 the original words were partially erased and the latter part of the text altered into . . . *consistens ad extremum diaconis presbyteris episcopisque*. Now Beatus had been comparing Noah's ark with the Church: "Beginning from thirty cubits," he says, "the ark came at last by degrees to finish in

one cubit. So the Church by many degrees comes in the last degree to finish in its presbyters (or bishops)." This is good logic, and intelligible. But when we read, according to the corrector: "So the Church by many degrees comes in the last degree to finish in its deacons, presbyters, and bishops," the analogy with the *one* terminal cubit of Noah's ark is entirely lost, and the sense of Beatus is converted into nonsense.

2. On Fol. 70 *verso* we find these words of Beatus: *Et dedit potestatem apostolis dicens, Sicut misit me pater et ego mitto uos* ("And he gave power to the Apostles, saying, As the Father sent Me, so send I you"), altered by the corrector to read: *Et dedit potestatem ecclesie dicens, etc.* ("And He gave power to the Church, saying," etc.).

3. On Fol. 71 Beatus says, commenting on Rev. v. 14, *Eadem animalia sunt seniores qui adorant descriptum et gloriam et eius officiis [sic] describunt* ("These Living Ones are elders, who worship Him they describe, and tell of His glory and works"). The corrector alters the original text so that the MS. now reads: *Eadem animalia sunt seniores qui adorant descriptam ecclesiam, et eius officiis describit* ("These Living Ones are elders who worship the Church they describe, and he tells of her works").

4. On Fol. 37 we read concerning hypocrites: *Et cum apostolo catholicam unam fidem, unum bap̄tismum, unum dominum uidentur colere Christum* ("With the Apostle they appear to follow one Catholic faith, one baptism, one Lord, which is Christ"). This is changed into: *Et cum ecclesia catholica unam fidem, etc.* ("With the Catholic Church they appear to follow one faith," etc.).

This process of assimilation is made more thorough each time the original work of any Church Father is recopied.

The more copyings, the greater the number of assimilations that take place. As with our Commentary, so with the Bible text at the head of the Commentary. The more it is recopied, the more it will approximate to the authoritative Vulgate. It is the knowledge of this fact that nullifies to a great extent the value of the witness of the early Church Fathers in those cases where the Old-Latin text and the Vulgate text are discordant. For the possibility exists that the Bible quotations of the said Father have *since his death* been brought into line with the Received text in Greek or the Vulgate in Latin. Hence we find a much larger pre-Vulgate Old-Latin element in the earliest extant copies of the works of Irenæus than we find in the later copies. And students of patristic writings know that the same text will be quoted in both the Vulgate form and in the Old-Latin form by the same writer even in the same treatise. In such cases the Old-Latin form is almost certainly the form that the writer employed. As an example of this we find in the Morgan MS. St. John xx. 21 quoted in the following three forms:—

(a) *Stout misit me pater et ego mitto uos* (Fol. 70).

(β) *Dictum est: Sicut me pater misit ad passionem et ego mitto uos* (Fol. 81 verso).

(γ) *Cum Dominus dicit: Sicut me misit potens ad passionem et ego mitto pro me uos ad passionem* (Fol. 87).

The first form of the citation is in agreement with the Vulgate; the second form is midway between the Vulgate and pre-Vulgate Old-Latin; the third form is the local Spanish Old-Latin form of the text before the assimilation to the Vulgate. Assimilation is always found in all MSS. to be in the same direction, that is, from the Old-Latin to the Vulgate, and never away from the Vulgate to the Old-Latin.

The following variants may be explained in the light of the primacy claimed for St. Peter:—

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Quia tu es Petrus et super hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam et portæ inferi non præualebunt aduersus eam* (St. Matt. xvi. 18).

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Quia super hanc petram edificabuntur a Spiritu Sancto discipuli eius* ("On this rock shall be built up by the Holy Spirit His disciples").

The Spanish text omits all mention of Peter, the Church, and Hell in this passage. In this connection the context is valuable as showing the drift of the argument and the place in it of the passage quoted. Beatus (Fol. 30) says: *Christiani a Christo uocati sunt. Ideoque ait Dominus. Super hanc petram edificabuntur a Spiritu Sancto discipuli eius* ("Christians are called after Christ: therefore the Lord said, On this rock shall be built by the Holy Spirit His disciples"). The last nine words are erased by the scribe himself (so it appears), and the Vulgate text substituted so as to read: "Christians are called after Christ: therefore the Lord said, Thou art Peter, and on this rock," etc. Who does not see that the alteration nullifies the writer's argument and mystifies and misleads the reader? In this context it should be noted that on Fol. 84 *verso* we have this statement from Beatus: *Hec est prima ecclesia que fundata primum est per Spiritum<sup>1</sup> super Christum petram* ("This is the first Church which was founded at the first by the Spirit upon the rock Christ").

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Cum autem senueris extendes manus tuas et alius te cinget et ducet quo tu non uis* (St. John xxi. 18).

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Cum senueris alius te precinget et ducet quod tu non uis.* ("When thou art old, another shall gird thee, and lead thee whither thou wouldest not").

<sup>1</sup> A later corrector has erased the words *per Spiritum*.

The Spanish text is supported by the Codex Palatinus (*e*), now in Vienna, and attributed by Tischendorf to the fourth or fifth century. The Codex Palatinus exhibits a text agreeing largely with that of St. Cyprian. Thus we have the local texts of Africa and Spain in agreement against the Roman text, and neither of them referring to any stretching out on the cross of St. Peter's hands.

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Jacobus et Cephas et Johannes qui uidebantur columnæ esse dextras dederunt mihi.*

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Jacobus et Johannes qui uidebantur columnæ esse dextras dederunt michi.*

The Codex Alexandrinus in Greek of the fifth century agrees with our text; and thus again we have the earliest African and Spanish testimony in agreement against the Vulgate text. Furthermore, the Codex Fuldensis has a different text, viz., *Petrus et Jacobus et Johannes qui uidebantur columnæ esse*, etc. The Codex Fuldensis (copied 546 A.D.) gives Peter the preëminence by putting his name first of all; but, instead of calling him *Cephas* (with most other MSS.), it calls him *Petrus*. The text of our Commentary (with no mention of St. Peter) best explains the differing order in some of our oldest texts of the insertion of his name, and the vacillation we find, when his name is inserted, between *Petrus* and *Cephas*.

In editing the Old-Latin text of Irish MSS. I had noticed in several passages an absence from the Vulgate of the mention of the Holy Spirit where it occurs in the Irish text. The same phenomenon is found on comparing the Vulgate and Spanish texts:—

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Pacem relinquo uobis, pacem meam do uobis: non quomodo mundus dat ego do uobis (St. John xiv. 27).*

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Pacem meam per Spiritum Sanctum do uobis. [pacem relinquo uobis] non quomodo mundus, ego a Deo do uobis.*

The order of the words *pacem relinquo uobis* in our text leads us to suspect that they have been imported into our MS. from a Vulgate source. They are, as they stand, pleonastic. Omitting them we have this declaration: "My peace by the Holy Spirit I give unto you: not as the world giveth: from God give I unto you."

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Donec occurramus omnes in unitatem fidei et agnitionis filii Dei in uirum perfectum* (Eph. iv. 13).

*Salui erimus ab ira per ipsum* (Rom. v. 9).

*Fundamentum enim aliud nemo potest ponere preter id quod positum est, quod est Christus Jesus* (1 Cor. iii. 11).

*Ille uos docebit omnia* (St. John xiv. 26).

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Donec occurramus omnes per Spiritum eius in uirum perfectum* ("Till we all come by His Spirit unto a perfect man").

*Salui erimus per Domini Spiritum* ("We shall be saved by the Spirit of the Lord").

*Fundamentum enim aliud nemo potest ponere preter a Spiritu Sancto id quod positum est quod est Jesus Dei filius est* ("Other foundation can none lay except that which is laid by the Holy Spirit, which is, Jesus is the Son of God").

*Ille omnes uos docebit* ("He will teach all of you").

Certain well-known and often-quoted texts are found in a different form in our Commentary, viz.,—

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Littera enim occidit; Spiritus autem uiuificat* (2 Cor. iii. 6).

*Si qua ergo in Christo noua creatura* (2 Cor. v. 17).

*Bonum certamen certavi, cursum consummaui, fidem seruaui* (2 Tim. iv. 7).

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Littera enim occidit; sensus uiuificat* ("The letter killeth; the meaning giveth life").

*Que ergo in Christo non uacua creatura* ("The creation which is in Christ is not ineffectual").

*Cursum consummaui, fidem seruaui* ("I have finished the race: I have kept the faith").

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Et nemo ascendit in cælum nisi qui descendit de cælo, Filius hominis qui est in cælo* (St. John iii. 13).

*Quotquot autem receperunt eum dedit eis potestatem* (St. John i. 12).

*In domo Patris mei mansiones multæ sunt* (St. John xiv. 2).

*Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno Patris eorum* (St. Matt. xiii. 43).

*Cecidit super collum eius et osculatus est eum* (St. Luke xv. 20).

*Despondi enim uos uni uiro uirginem castam exhibere Christo* (2 Cor. xi. 2).

*Exiit edictum a Cæsare Augusto ut describeretur uniuersus orbis* (St. Luke ii. 1).

*Sicut misit me Pater et ego mitto uos* (St. John xx. 21).

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Et nemo ascendet de super nisi filius hominis qui est Spiritus* ("None shall ascend above, save the Son of man, Who is Spirit").

*Quodquod autem crediderunt in eum dedit eis potestatem* ("As many as believed in Him, to them gave He power").

*Multe sunt habitationes apud Patrem meum qui est in celo* ("Many are the homes in the presence of My Father Which is in heaven").

*Tunc iusti fulgebunt sicut sol in regno patris mei* ("... in the kingdom of My Father").

*Cecidit super collum eius et fleuit* ("He fell on his neck and wept").

*Christo disponstate uos uni uiro uirginem sanctam* ("Betroth yourselves to Christ as a holy virgin to one man").

*Exiit edictum a cesare augusto censeri omnem iudeam* ("There went forth an edict from Cæsar Augustus that all Judæa should be taxed")<sup>1</sup>

*Sicut me misit potens ad passionem et ego mitto pro me uos ad passionem* ("As He that is Mighty sent me unto suffering, even so for My sake send I you unto suffering").

<sup>1</sup>History supports the Spanish text here. There is no record or verisimilitude of a world-wide tax having been imposed by the Roman Emperor at the time of Christ's nativity. But we know from profane history that Judæa was taxed.

## VULGATE TEXT.

*Quid facient qui baptizantur pro mortuis* (1 Cor. xv. 29).

*Bona est lex si quis ea legitime utatur* (1 Tim. i. 8).

## SPANISH TEXT.

*Quid facient qui pro mortuis baptizantur et Christo consurrexerint* ("What shall they do who are being baptizd for the dead, and have ventured all for Christ?").

*Bona est lex si quis eam legitime custodierit* ("The law is good if a man keep it lawfully").

On Fol. 108 *verso* we read: *In euuangelio dictum est, qui fecerint mandata patris celestis erunt similes patris sui qui in celis est* ("It is said in the Gospel, They who do the commandments of the Heavenly Father shall be like their Heavenly Father"). This saying is not found in any of our Gospels now.

Enough examples have been brought forward to prove that the Bible text, as used in Spain by Beatus as late as the eighth century, was a text that had escaped an ecclesiastical revision that has left its marks on the face of the Vulgate text. And inasmuch as Beatus quotes with approval selections from the Commentaries of Irenæus, Ambrose, Fulgentius, and Victorinus, we must believe that their Bibles too had not been Vulgatized; but were the same in the main, both in contents and in text, as the Bible that he himself used.

In 456 quotations made by Beatus from other books of the New Testament than the Apocalypse, which he introduces by such formulæ as, *Veritas ait, Saluator ait, Dominus ait, In euuangelio dictum est, Apostolus ait* (or *dicit*), we find quotations from every one of the canonical writings except

2 and 3 John, Jude, and Philemon.<sup>1</sup> In many instances the very words in the Spanish text are Old-Latin words, such as were used by Irenæus, Tyconius, Victorinus, Ambrose, and Augustine. And since the Spanish text agrees in vocabulary with these Fathers, we are not surprised there should be an agreement in the message and meaning of the text, which, after all, is made up of that vocabulary. It is significant that we find the text of our MS. in the Apocalypse agreeing, in all three of its variations from the Vulgate, with the only verse of the Apocalypse quoted in that most ancient of Irish MSS., the Antiphonary of Bangor, now at Milan, and published for the Bradshaw Society by F. E. Warren in 1892-95. Thus not only is the Spanish text often in accord with the texts of Primasius and Cyprian in Africa, but also with that of such ancient Irish MSS. as the Book of Armagh (which has, unhappily, been revised in the Apocalypse more than elsewhere) and the Gospels of the sixth century in Trinity College, Dublin, that are named after Bishop Ussher.

The chief result of a close and comparative study of the Morgan MS. has been the realization of *the fact of a local Spanish text*, which, even as late as the tenth century, opposed in many important readings the Vulgate, which was the local Roman text. That the Vulgate text eventually triumphed over all other texts, does not prove that its triumph was due to its greater purity. We cannot accept the Council of

<sup>1</sup> The following is a table of the distribution of the citations found in the Commentary: Matt. 139, Mark 6, Luke 40, John 60, Acts 10, Rom. 28, 1 Cor. 45, 2 Cor. 11, Gal. 11, Eph. 11, Phil. 10, Col. 13, 1 Thess. 9, 2 Thess. 8, 1 Tim. 5, 2 Tim. 6, Titus 4, Heb. 8, James 2, 1 Peter 12, 2 Peter 5, 1 John 13. Of these 456 citations, 244 are now found in a Vulgate form, and 212 in a pre-Vulgate form. These latter are often in agreement with the Old-Latin form of the text current in Africa up to the time of Cyprian, and in Britain as late as the days of the Venerable Bede.

Trent's *ex cathedra* pronouncement that the Vulgate is the final text, or the original text of the New Testament writings. The final text of the New Testament is yet far to seek. Certainly, as Bentley two hundred years ago said, it is found to-day in no single MS. or edition.

It is true that a text akin to the Vulgate had the ascendancy at Rome and Alexandria at the close of the fourth century; but that date is too late to satisfy the mind of the searcher after the actual Apostolic words. The texts which are to-day preserved in a handful of Old-Latin MSS. that were copied in Spain and Ireland between the seventh and fourteenth centuries, are the descendants of local Spanish and local Irish texts, much more ancient than themselves, that have now disappeared. And when we find these Spanish and Irish descendants united in opposing the Vulgate, and its ally the Received Greek text, there is good reason to believe that the Western text of Ireland and Spain holds the more primitive form of the Sacred Writings.

The publication of this Voice from Spain shows how much has yet to be accomplished in the field of textual research before we can even begin to build an edifice that no future discoveries will overturn. The result of the shifting of texts is to teach us that we are *not able* to establish to-day the exact letter of Scripture; but we *are able* to grasp its historic events and their immense spiritual significance. Textual discoveries have set us free from slavery to the letter that killeth, and made us ready (let us hope) for a stricter obedience in the future to the life-giving Spirit of love and liberty.