

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

spondents. The *National Church* newspaper, the organ of the Society, would be the vehicle by means of which the replies to such inquiries might be made public, for the information not only of the individual inquirers, but of the clergy in general. Some assistance of this character has already been given in a pamphlet, published by Dr. Lee, the secretary of the Society, which elucidates the technicalities of the last Burial Act, under the title of "What it does, and what it does not." The pamphlet has gone through sixteen editions. The technicalities of the rating laws, of the tithe rentcharge, ordinary and extraordinary, of the law of dilapidations, of the laws and practices with regard to parish charities, and similar subjects, are often perplexing to clergymen; and some assistance, we believe, might thus be given in an easy form.

We have often been told that the best defence of the Church is the conscientious discharge of their duties by clergymen. Of course we accept this statement as true, but not as the whole truth. The discharge of those duties may be made far easier by an association undertaking to relieve the clergy from the distasteful task of answering unwarranted statements. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself, a man certainly not likely to make an appeal unless there were good grounds for it, has appealed in his recent Pastoral on behalf of the Church Defence Institution to the Churchmen of England; he has proclaimed, with all the authority of such a man, in such an office, the necessity of spreading true information amongst the masses of the people, and of facing boldly the methods and the movements of an organization avowedly maintained in order to disestablish and to disendow the Church of England.

STANLEY LEIGHTON.

ART. II.—THE TEXT OF THE REVISED NEW TESTAMENT.

SECOND ARTICLE.

IT is proposed, in this Paper, to consider more in detail a few important cases of disputed readings in the New Testament, and to discuss the manner in which they have been treated by the Revisers.

These may, for our purpose, be grouped under three heads. First: those which needed no special consideration, the result being accepted by all "competent critics." Secondly: those which fall naturally into smaller groups, so that a few typical

instances would serve as precedents for similar cases. Thirdly: individual instances, in which full discussion of the conflicting testimony would be necessary. In these cases we are secured from needless changes, by the rule that no deviation from the Authorized Version could be retained without the consent of two-thirds of the members present at the final revision.

Instances of the first class will naturally be sought among the changes which are unrecorded in the margin of the Revised Version. They are fully exhibited in the Oxford and Cambridge Texts.¹

The most important of these is the passage concerning the testimony of the heavenly witnesses, which, in the absence of all reliable evidence on its behalf, is silently removed from its long-known place in 1 St. John v.

Another (though not strictly analogous) case may be found in the still undetermined text of Colossians ii. 2; where the evidence inclines decidedly to the reading, "the mystery of God, even Christ;" and where the marginal note is as follows: "The ancient authorities vary much in the Text of this passage." The treatment of this various reading by Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot in their several Commentaries, and by Dr. Scrivener (Introduction), forms a most instructive study in the textual criticism of the New Testament.

In 2 Cor. iii. 3, the preponderating weight of evidence has sufficed to substitute *καρδιας* for *καρδιας* without any marginal note. The sentence is rendered thus: "But in tables that are hearts of flesh."

Others of minor importance may be taken almost at random from any part of the New Testament.

The following, from the early chapters of St. Matthew, are interesting, from the associations which have gathered about the familiar sentences. In chapter i. 25, the words "her first-born" are omitted, and the birth of the infant Jesus is described thus: "She brought forth a son." In chapter vi. verses 4 and 6, the word "openly" is dismissed. In chapter ix. 13, "unto repentance" is omitted; and the sentence becomes, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners."

Similarly, in the narrative of the conversion of Saul in Acts ix., the following changes are made. In verse 5, the word "Lord" disappears. The whole sentence, "It is hard for thee to kick

¹ In this class, no doubt, must also be included a few instances of various readings recorded in the margin, in which there could not have been any serious difference of opinion within the Revision Company; as, for example, the Doxology in the Lord's Prayer (St. Matthew vi. 13); and the celebrated passage included in the narrative of Philip and the Eunuch (Acts viii. 37). Both of these have been rejected in the text, though recorded in the margin.

against the pricks," and the following words, "and he trembling and astonished, said, Lord, what wilt Thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto him," are also banished. In verse 8, the word "nothing" is substituted for "no man." In the 11th verse the phrase, "in a vision;" in the 18th verse "immediately;" in the 19th verse the name "Saul," are all removed; and other changes occur in the same context.

We take another instance from Romans x., where we find the pronoun "them," instead of the word "Israel," in the 1st verse; the word "righteousness" removed from its place after the words "their own," in verse 3; the language of verse 5 made more forcible, because more terse, by sundry minor changes; "of them that preached peace," taken from verse 15; "Christ" substituted for "God" in verse 17.

In the Book of Revelation we find, of course, a large number of changes, arising from the fact that the scholars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were limited to very inferior documentary evidence for the text of this book: evidence inferior even to that which they possessed for the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles.

All these changes prove the reliance which has been placed on the most ancient manuscripts, and some of the most ancient versions. The Vatican MS. B is treated as having almost paramount authority in its original form. The Sinaitic MS. \aleph holds the next place. The old Latin, the early Syriac, and the Memphitic versions, rank very highly in the scale of documentary evidence.

Under the second head may be placed the majority of the cases to which reference was made in the former article. We may now add a few more. In St. Matthew xvii. verse 21 has been relegated to the margin, with the remark, "many authorities, some ancient, insert verse 21, 'But this kind goeth not out save by prayer and fasting.'"

The verse (we are told by Dr. Tregelles¹) is omitted in \aleph first hand, and B, in the Memphitic version according to Mill, in the Thebaic, the Æthiopic, and two of the Syriac versions. It is contained in C D, and in later corrections of \aleph , in the other uncials, and the majority of the cursives, in the Latin version, in two Syriac (the Peshito and Hareclean), and in the Memphitic (according to two of the printed texts.) On this evidence (which Dr. Scrivener pronounces insufficient), the Revisers consistently omit the verse.

The same class of testimony has led them to omit St. Matthew xxiii. 14; to retain the memorable words, "neither the Son," in verse 36 of chapter xxiv.; and to omit the word "new," before "Covenant," in chapter xxvi. verse 28.

¹ With Dr. Hort's Appendix.

These are typical instances of a very large and interesting class of readings, the consideration of which will abundantly repay the labour of the student.

An instance of a somewhat different kind, but itself, too, of a representative character, is to be found in Romans v. 1. In this case the documentary evidence is decidedly in favour of *ἐχωμεν*, "let us have," which has therefore been adopted by the Revisers; while the internal evidence for the indicative mood has led them to place the words "we have" in the margin. Their case may be stated in words quoted by Dr. Scrivener from the Preface of the Five Clergymen (1858):—

An overwhelming weight of authority has necessitated a change which, at the first sight, seems to impair the logical force of the Apostle's argument. No consideration, however, of this kind can be allowed to interfere with the faithful exhibition of the true text as far as it can be ascertained; and no doubt the real word of God, thus faithfully exhibited, will vindicate its own meaning, and need no help from man's short-sighted preference.

In other words, they have not allowed themselves to hazard a conjecture as to what an inspired writer is, or is not, likely to have said. They have not applied "the *paradiplomatic* canon that the itacism of ω for o , so familiar to all collators of Greek manuscripts, crept into some very early copy, from whence it was propagated among our most venerable codices, even those from which the earliest versions were made." They have not assented to the view "that this is one out of a small number of well-ascertained cases in which the united testimonies of the best authorities conspire in giving a worse reading than that presented by later, and (for the the most part) quite inferior copies." (Scrivener, "Intro." 544.)

Under the third head, we include passages which, for their own intrinsic importance, or for the special character of the documentary evidence, must have commanded individual and special treatment. We shall speak only of a few typical instances.

To this class must be referred the last sixteen verses of St. Mark's Gospel; the disputed words in the angels' hymn; the two verses, St. Luke xxii. 43, 44, concerning the ministry of the angel and the agony of our Lord in the Garden; the words in St. John i. 18, "the only begotten Son;" the narrative of the woman taken in adultery, St. John vii. 53 to viii. 11; the word "broken," in 1 Cor. xi. 24; and many other important instances.

Those which we have enumerated are very instructive and important cases of textual criticism, in five of which the result has been an important deviation from the Authorized Version; while, in the remaining instance, the margin contains one of the most striking alternative readings in the whole New Testament.

We shall confine our remarks to two of these—namely, the disputed words in the angels' hymn, and the reading in St. John i. 18.

The external evidence in the former of these two cases, according to Dr. Scrivener ("Introduction," p. 514) is: The reading *εὐδοκία* is found in the morning hymn in A; in the later corrections of **N**, and of B; in the rest of the uncials; in all the cursives; in the Memphitic version; in the three extant Syriac versions; in the Armenian and Æthiopic; the Vulgate; all the forms of the Old Latin; and the Gothic. Dr. Scrivener also claims, on the same side, "the virtually unanimous evidence" of the Greek Fathers, "thirteen of whom flourished before the middle of the fifth century, and must have used codices at least as old and pure as **N** and B."

For *εὐδοκίας* the evidence is, the original reading in B and **N**; the text of A and D; also the old Latin Version, the Gothic, the Vulgate; quotations by Origen, St. Jerome, and Hilary.¹

A strong argument in favour of the reading of the Authorized Version is derived from the rhythmical arrangement of the sentences. Mr. McClellan says:—

As to the rhythm: The bimembral arrangement, necessitated by the genitive, produces a painfully rugged, inharmonious, and disproportionate couplet; while, on the other hand, the triplet, occasioned by the nominative, displays all the smoothness and beauty of symmetry of a purely-constructed lyric.

Dr. Scrivener, representing a view which must have been advocated in the Revision Company, says:—

In the common text all is transparently clear. The blessed words are distributed, after the Hebrew fashion, into a stanza consisting of three members. In the first and second, heaven and earth are contrasted; the third refers to both those preceding, and alleges the efficient cause which has brought God glory, and earth peace. By the addition of a single letter to the end of the last line, by merely reading *εὐδοκίας* for *εὐδοκία*, the rhythmical arrangement is utterly marred, and the simple shepherds are sent away with a message, the diction of which no scholar has yet construed to his own mind.

The words so long familiar to readers of the English Bible, and to communicants in the English Church, could not be surrendered without a fervent appeal on their behalf. In that appeal very many devout persons will cordially sympathize. And the emotional warmth with which Dr. Scrivener and others put forward the internal and subjective evidence, will have a

¹ See Tregelles's "Greek Testament," and Dr. Hort's Appendix to that volume.

hearty response from this very large class of persons. We are confident that, in this case, Dr. Scrivener represents, not only an important school of textual criticism, but a widespread tone of thought and feeling among English Churchmen. They have habitually used the well-known sentence in the most sacred offices of public worship, and have thus learned to associate their own deepest feelings of devotion with its use; and they will find it difficult to resist the current of devotional thought which flows along such a channel. The emotions which stir the hearts of Christian worshippers, when deep personal feeling Godward is inseparably bound up with the sense of fellowship in the mystical body of Christ, cannot be set aside very rapidly. The language of the *Gloria in Excelsis*, in the form in which it is familiar to English Churchmen, with its own grand rhythmical cadence, with its memories of the Holy Communion, with deeply graven experiences of the most sacred moments in our life, must exert a potent influence even on the judgments of men. And to some, at least, this persuasive power will appear irresistible. They will think it hard to conquer the habit and to resist the charm.

Still, it must be said in reply, that this kind of appeal is not textual criticism, nor judicial weighing of evidence. And it may perhaps be described by some as mere blind sentiment. Nevertheless, it is a power; and it demands careful treatment.

On the other hand, even on the ground of sentiment [or of subjective evidence], associations of thought and feeling, equally strong, would be formed in connection with the altered text. And, as a matter of fact, countless numbers of reverent Christians have sung to God, or have silently given Him praise, in words which moved *their* deepest feelings; while they believed and felt that they were singing the true angels' hymn, *Gloria in excelsis Deo, et in terra pax hominibus bonæ voluntatis.*"

The school represented by Dr. Scrivener unhesitatingly pronounces this reading to be a "blunder of some early scribe, who cannot, however, have lived later than the second century."

We have already remarked on the unreliable character of appeals of this kind: however, great their persuasive power. An equally fervent and eloquent appeal might be made on the other side. And if two such contradictory appeals were placed before us, side by side, we should learn how hazardous it must always be to allow textual criticism to be influenced by considerations of this kind. It is obvious that the Revision Company were not in a position to allow weight to the arguments drawn from this source, against preponderating testimony of the reliable documents. Under the conditions accepted by them, they were bound to give full authority to the documentary evidence. If, indeed, that evidence were uncertain, the rule which forbade

unnecessary changes would require the words of the Authorized Version to be inserted in the text, and would place the doubtful alternative in the margin. On the other hand, if a majority of two-thirds considered the evidence for *εὐδοκίας* to preponderate, they were bound to place that reading (as they have done) in the text.¹

We venture to think it questionable whether this testimony is really unanimous in favour of the reading of B and N. We do indeed recognize that, on the principles evidently adopted by the Revisers, the weight of external evidence *inclines* to the reading which they have actually adopted. But, in the uncertainty of the case, we should have accepted it as an act of adherence to the principle of avoiding unnecessary changes, if they had retained the familiar words in the text, and had relegated the deviation to the margin. We could have wished that they had seen it right to adopt in this case the course which they have chosen in another instance (St. Mark xvi. 9): where, retaining the passage in the text, they append in the margin the note, "The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end."

Another very instructive instance of critical inquiry and discussion is supplied by the variation of reading in St. John i. 18. It has elicited a strong opinion from Dr. Scrivener ("Introduction," p. 525). And it has been made the subject of a dissertation by Dr. Hort (Cambridge, 1876). Thus it furnishes a conspicuous occasion for exhibiting the different modes of treatment adopted by different schools of criticism. The words themselves are of profound interest in their bearing on the deepest truths of Christian theology.

The Revisers have retained the reading, "the only begotten Son," although the documentary evidence which weighed with them in other cases appears to preponderate in favour of the very remarkable and unique reading, "God, only begotten." Dr. Hort, in his "Dissertation," gives the evidence thus:—

For *θεός*, N, B, C,* L 33.

Memph., Syrr. Pesh. and Hcl. marg. Valentiniani, Iren., Clem., Orig., Epiph., Did., Bas., Greg. Nyss., Cyr. Al.

For *υἱός*, A C³ E F G H K M S U V X Γ Δ Λ Π.

And all known cursives except 33. Versions: the old Latin, the Vulgate Latin, the old Syriac, the text of the Hcl. Syr., the Jerusalem Syr. Lectionary.

The Patristic evidence admits of various interpretations on some points.

¹ In the Greek Text of Drs. Westcott and Hort, this reading is marked for discussion in their forthcoming Appendix. We shall be better able to appreciate the reasons for the reading adopted, when that Appendix has appeared.

Probabilities of transcription will be recognized as favourable to *θεός*. *Μονογενής θεός* is a unique phrase, unlikely to be suggested to a scribe by anything lying on the surface of the context, or by any other passage of Scripture.

Μονογενής υἱός, and still more *ὁ μονογενής υἱός*, is a familiar and obvious phrase, suggested by the familiar sense of *μονογενής* in all literature, by the contrast to *τοῦ πατρὸς* in the same verse by two other early passages of this Gospel, iii. 16 and 18, and by a passage of St. John's first Epistle, iv. 9.

Thus, on grounds of documentary evidence and probabilities of transcription alike, we are irresistibly led to conclude that *μονογενής θεός* was the original from which *ὁ μονογενής υἱός* and *ὁ μονογενής* proceeded. More than this, no evidence from without can establish; but in a text so amply attested as that of the New Testament, we rightly conclude that the most original of extant readings was likewise that of the author himself, unless, on full consideration, it appears to involve a kind and degree of difficulty such as analogy forbids us to recognize as morally compatible with the author's intention, or some other peculiar ground of suspicion presents itself.

The argument on the other side is stated by Dr. Scrivener thus:—

Every one, indeed, must *feel θεός* to be untrue, even though, for the sake of consistency, he may be forced to uphold it.

Those who will resort to "ancient evidence exclusively" for the recension of the text, may well be perplexed in dealing with this passage. The oldest manuscripts, versions and writers, are hopelessly divided, so that we can well understand how some critics (without shadow of authority worth notice) have come to suspect both *θεός* and *υἱός* to be accretions, or spurious additions to *μονογενής*. If the principles advocated in chap. vii. be true, the present is just such a case as calls for the interposition of the more recent uncial and cursive codices; and when we find that they all, with the single exception of Cod. 33, defend the reading *ὁ μονογενής υἱός*, we feel safe in concluding that former Codices, **N**, **B**, **C**, and the Peshito do not approach the autograph of St. John so nearly as Codex **A**, the Curetonian Syriac, and Old Latin versions.

A somewhat similar treatment of the question is to be found in Mr. McClellan's New Testament. Both these scholars approach the question from the side of internal and doctrinal probability, and discredit the documentary evidence which contradicts this *à priori* reasoning.

The principles of criticism which have been adopted by the Revisers, and which are maintained by the "Critical Editors," appear to be conclusive in the present instance in favour of the reading which has been placed in the margin. And we are unable to reconcile this decision with that which has been accepted in the angelic hymn (St. Luke ii. 14), and in other passages.

In thus offering to our readers a few out of the many cases of various readings in which the Revisers have deviated from the Text adopted in 1611, or have recorded an alternative reading in the margin, we would earnestly commend to all readers of the Greek Testament who have access to a critical apparatus, the careful prosecution of this inquiry for themselves. It will abundantly repay the labour which they may be able to expend upon it. And it will leave on the mind of the student a deep impression of the fidelity with which the Revisers have adhered to their purpose and their commission, of presenting to the Church as near an approach as existing appliances can furnish, to the veritable autographs of the Sacred Writers.

J. F. FENN.

ART. III.—SOUTHERN PALESTINE.

1. *Southern Palestine and Jerusalem.* By W. M. THOMSON, D.D., forty-five years a Missionary in Syria and Palestine. 140 illustrations and maps. New York: Harper Brothers. London: T. Nelson & Sons. 1881.
2. *Le Pays de l'Évangile; Notes d'un Voyage en Orient.* Par EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ. Paris: Meyrueis. 1864.
3. *Our Holiday in the East.* By Mrs. GEORGE SUMNER. Edited by the Rev. G. H. Sumner, M.A., Hon. Canon of Winchester, and Rector of Old Alresford, Hants. Hurst & Blackett. 1881.

IT was a true instinct that led the translators of the Bible who provided for us the Authorized Version in the reign of James I., to intend to prefix to their work an account of the Holy Land. The proofs that such was their deliberate intention are to be found partly, if not chiefly, in the correspondence which took place between them and the members of the Synod of Dort, regarding the rules to be observed in the publication of vernacular Bibles in England and Holland. Some copies of our Authorized Version have such an account of Palestine prefixed. How far this document was viewed as official, and what its real value may have been, we need not now inquire. All that is here urged is that our translators instinctively and truly felt that there is an essential, and, so to speak, organic connection between the Holy Book and the Holy Land.

A very large part of our obligation for having this wholesome thought strongly and deeply impressed upon us in modern times, and, indeed, made part of our whole conception of Bible study,