

*TEXTUAL CRITICISM ILLUSTRATED FROM  
THE PRINTING-OFFICE.*

THE present paper may be characterized as an attempt at bridging over the chasm between two conflicting schools by the process of casting in some hitherto untried materials. I have been encouraged to this step by the friendly counsels of more than one scholar entitled to respect, though neither of these, I am bound to add, has any close idea of the direction which my comments are really likely to take. As a student twenty-five years ago I learnt to regard the *Textus Receptus* as critically no better than "so much rubbish;" and the subsequent fifteen years of my connexion with printing, taking almost their commencement in the correcting of "Alford," have till recently operated to increase rather than diminish the spell which this dogma possessed for a disposition naturally iconoclastic. And yet, with all this influence from the works that came before me, the experiences of the occupation itself were tending almost from the first to arouse misgivings as to the extent to which modern reasonings are often pushed; and now that a notable event has impelled the other side also to speak—to utter much that is most unsubstantial, it is true, and yet with it all "much that might give us pause"—I have been induced to review the lessons taught by my employment, and to apply them, with a strictly modifying effect, to the instances in which textual editors have aroused the deepest offence.

Briefly, then, it will herein be made my effort, while according, in no small degree, with those who have made textual criticism what it is, still to demonstrate that mistakes in processes of copying are so incessant in occurrence that the critic is forbidden to cut out for himself a royal road by attaching an overweening importance to the accuracy of any individual guide. With this design I shall

proceed to cite and classify a number of actually observed mistakes made by the class of copyists with whom my own engagements have brought me into contact; and at the same time to bring out, both by examples and general observations, the phenomena of the Greek text upon which these mistakes appear naturally to bear. By this means, without seeking to assail modern principles root and branch, this paper would place by their side countervailing principles—each class to be preferred as circumstances may determine, and each alternately to cast their rivals into the shade.

It will be convenient to treat the subject under four larger divisions: (I.) the grounds for broadly maintaining an analogy between modern printing and ancient transcribing; (II. and III.) examples bearing respectively upon the two great critical canons—that the shorter reading is preferable to the longer, and the awkward one to the more easy; (IV.) suggestions on the rationale of true textual criticism as accordant with the intermediate tendencies herein evinced.

I. GENERAL ANALOGIES.—I have often wondered whether any idea of the extent to which printers' errors really occur can ever have reached the outer literary world, or at all events any of our textual critics. It would veritably seem that their exclusive conception of them must be formed from the two or three in a sheet, or it may sometimes be more, which come actually before their own eyes; and that thus they have never been brought to realize that these are but the few and desperate survivors of what in the first place were scores or possibly hundreds of times their number. An inspection of any average rough proof would convince even the most incredulous of this fact, and would assuredly prepare them for new ideas on the subject of textual criticism—as soon at least as they had overcome the inclination of their first astonishment to form an unjust conclusion as to the cause of the mistakes themselves.

For printers' errors are not to be sweepingly set down as the result of some extraordinary carelessness, but may distinctly be regarded, after certain abatements have been made, as legitimate samples of those which occur in the work of copyists of every class. We must make some abatement for the element of speed, and yet hardly to the extent that would naturally be anticipated, for we may presently see reason for concluding that in the earliest periods it was anything but unknown. Then there is that most important factor, the difficulty of deciphering authors' manuscript, though even this had undoubtedly its ancient counterpart in the faded strokes which old copies must frequently have shewn. But after such deduction as may be thought reasonable has been made upon these two scores, as well as upon some of a mechanical nature which give rise to the mass of more trivial corrections, I boldly assert that there is not an influence operating to lead the work in the printing-office astray which did not prevail also—in kind if not in degree—with those who so laboriously transcribed our ancient copies of the Scriptures. In fact whether it is the monk tracing out letter by letter a Greek codex, or the lawyer's clerk producing a fair document from a rough one, or the young lady copying a poem into her album, or the compositor putting his author's words into type—with each and all the process is the same, and the causes which conduce to error in either case will in all ages and places affect also the rest.

Then let us glance for a moment at the item of correcting. In the case of printing, the few, or comparatively few, misprints which are allowed to meet the eye of the author are reduced still further in number by himself or by his friends; and then the proof is finally returned and read through again by a reader at the office. And yet, after all this reiteration of care, how many books go forth absolutely free from a mistake? To ensure such achieve-

ment would in many cases be a herculean task, which time and expense alike forbid. Inadequate, however, as the usual precautions prove, would any one for a single moment imagine that even the treasured Vatican Manuscript underwent at its production a fourth part of this toil?

But perhaps the objection may here be offered by some—stronger believers in editorial accuracy than I am—that though mis-spellings and other trifles would often escape notice, the instances of undetected real deviations from the copy would be likely to be extremely few. It is surely sufficient to answer *Circumspice!* There they are, manuscript variations by tens of thousands, of which but a very reduced portion could have survived if any systematic correction of copyists had been carried on. Whatever some may assert about wholesale *wilful* corruption, if every instance were set aside as to which this imputation could be even conceived, the total number would be diminished to a quite inappreciable extent; the theory of *abridgment*—if the triviality of the curtailing does not make it utterly ridiculous—would at the most explain a minute fraction more; and even if we further set aside all those in which harmonizing or glossing influences were suspected, the diminution, though large and important in itself, would, compared with the aggregate, be still but slight. All the vast mass of the remainder would be the silent but too sure witnesses to that systematic *absence* of correction which allowed copies steadily to increase in error as the course of the earliest centuries flowed down. Let not this leading fact be lost sight of: copyists' errors pure and simple cause at least three-fourths of the variations in the digest; and however apt we may be to fix our thoughts upon the remaining fraction, we have to come, for the origin of the large majority, to the mere want of strict supervision of the scribes. Look at that one great source of omissions which critics could not fail to recognize from the first—*homæo-*

*teleuton*, or the passing over from one word in the copy to another which is either the same word or the same in termination. Observe the scores of instances in some manuscripts, especially  $\aleph$  and D, in which long omissions have resulted from this cause, and many of them have either never been supplied at all, or only by a corrector some centuries later on. Need I emphasize this by appending the statement with which the honest candour of Tischendorf has practically demolished the idol he revered? Codex  $\aleph$ , he tells us, was revised by a perfunctory and indolent *diorthota*, who made just sufficient corrections to let it appear that he was earning his money, but sufficient also to shew that had he done his duty he could have made vastly more. And this is the testimony of the most friendly of all witnesses as to the codex supposed by the whole modern school to rank second only in purity of text!

But how stands the matter in regard to B, the supreme Vatican Manuscript itself? Codex B is certainly in some material particulars very far superior to its Sinaitic comrade: it contains decidedly fewer homœotels—of striking ones, indeed, comparatively none; it is much less marked by monstrosities of spelling; and as to readings absolutely impossible or absurd, its worst assailants must admit that they come very far between. But, on the other hand, none would surely dispute that it contains a sufficient number of very serious blunders to prove that at the best it received a most inadequate revision; and the list of charges against it presented on pages 353-4 of the April number of *The Quarterly* (1882) may be said to have served up several bitter pills which the most devoted admirers of that manuscript must find it extremely hard to swallow, though apparently, when  $\aleph$  also was concerned in their compounding, they every one are swallowed by Drs. Westcott and Hort. Then we may turn to the numerous instances in the digest of Alford—a critic who, through the comparative soberness and mode-

rateness of his views, seems to be now ignored by both schools alike—in which he has rejected its readings as glosses, assimilations, or obvious errors of some other class, and as to which all scholars possessed of any approach to his own impartiality will probably be inclined to pronounce that in the large majority of them he was right. Yet again, let us note Dr. Scrivener's important discovery, that in many places its scribe has written his words *twice over*—a fact of which I shall further on bring out the very serious bearing by shewing how the copyist with whom this habit prevails is likely to have perpetrated a much larger number of *omissions*. But perhaps an even more damaging indictment than any to be discovered in individual anomalies consists in the circumstance, admitted both by Tischendorf and Dr. Hort, that the scribe who produced the whole of this codex was identical with the lazy and careless “hireling” to whom was entrusted the duty of revising Codex *N*. May we not ask with some boldness how it is possible to place any inordinate share of reliance upon the workmanship of one who stands thus convicted by his foremost friends? At all events if any of us have been hugging the idea that these ancient codices were labours of love and monuments of Christian zeal, it is time we awakened to the fact that we have been dwelling in a fools' paradise. The writer of the Vatican Manuscript was pretty evidently one rather of that class of whom we still find too numerous examples—who can produce first-class work so long as they choose, but who are as destitute of steadiness as of principle, and must be incessantly looked after or in their “scamping” moods they will spoil the whole. Then as to the Sinaiticus I have been inclined to query whether it is not like the production of a youth—we are concerned of course only with the New Testament portion, for there are stated to have been four scribes engaged upon the codex, including him of the Vaticanus—a youth just fresh from school, who

had obtained high commendation for his handwriting, but who could not have the experience essential to such a task as bequeathing a standard text to after times. My opinion must here be rated for no more than it is worth, but I do most confidently believe that the inordinate estimate of these two manuscripts—an estimate which seems to regard them as nearly equal in accuracy to editions of Alford and Tregelles—is as great a delusion as that which would possess a printer who should send uncomparèd to the press the productions of an able but drunken journeyman and of an intelligent but unproved apprentice. Ask any printer in his senses whether he would follow such a course in a work of importance with the very best journeyman that ever lived; nay, ask the journeyman himself whether he would not be the first to protest against the responsibility. And yet to be “looked down by eye,” and not re-read throughout by copy, is morally certain to have been all the revision that even B and N regularly received.

Then as to the leading fact or pair of facts which operate so powerfully with critics in maintaining the greater purity of these two ancient codices—their presentation of a text which is all but uniformly both *shorter* and *more difficult* than that of others—I must beg them for the present to be willing to hear me out till I have tested the weight of those criteria themselves. Provisionally they will be able to admit the possibility of two families of manuscripts originating by processes respectively these: the scribes of the one have copied nothing beyond the text of their archetype, but have neglected due precautions for the prevention of omissions; those of the other have been most scrupulous in this latter respect, but, in their eagerness to include everything, have swept into the text a host of marginal glosses. It is needless to say that, in the result, one class would be about as defective as the other—the one incomplete and the other impure;

and any royal rule about the intrinsic superiority of either shorter or longer readings would be of no more value than taking an example of either class just as it was. And precisely the same can be conceived as to the difficult or inelegant readings, by supposing that the same scribes who were guilty of the omissions were also negligent in correcting their other mistakes, while the scrupulous ones not only referred to the copy for all that puzzled them, but, if they found the same difficulty there, altered the text on their own authority in the undoubting conviction that it must be corrupt. Now I need hardly add that an hypothesis of this kind will nearly express my own ideas of what is distinctive in the text of B and **N** on the one hand, and of A and especially the Received Text on the other; while in C, it may be said, we find an oscillation between the two systems, and in D a combination of the erroneous features of both. As to this last literary curiosity, may I be allowed to add *par parenthèse* that the co-existence of these two seemingly opposite vices is after all nothing to occasion surprise—an innate propensity for the inclusion of everything that *happens* to be found, and yet an absence of that *systematic* care which overlooks nothing in the actual process of transcribing. When therefore Drs. Westcott and Hort ascribe to D an especial weight in the case of omissions, they must surely be forgetting that, as judged by *their own text*, it does really omit, shall I say, considerably more than all other leading manuscripts put together!

But turning from particular authorities to general considerations, what is the most legitimate and rational conclusion as to the state of the average text of those early times? Fortunately we have it admitted upon both sides that the great mass of the worst existing blunders took their origin long before even B and **N** were produced. And it would be strange indeed if documental facts did



not necessitate this admission. For what was the state of the times themselves during which the earliest copies must have been prepared? Where were then the monks who in later centuries were able in the calm leisure of their convents to devote whole lifetimes to the transcription of the Bible? Troublous days, alas! were those, when neither monks nor convents had been thought of, and when even the professional calligraphers and the publishers as we may term them would often refuse to comprise within their calling anything that might subject them to the dreaded Christian ban. Many, therefore, of the early reproductions would almost certainly be the work of individual private converts—men who, beyond the bare faculty of writing, possessed not a single qualification for their task, and were therefore necessarily unsuspecting of the pitfalls it presented on every hand. And even those copies that were the outcome of professional handiwork would labour under a disadvantage unknown in later years: scribes who were not converts themselves would find the matter entirely *new*, and they would thus be liable to far grosser errors—bringing the work in fact into strictest analogy with that of printing at the present day. But how meanwhile with the unprofessionals? A man would perhaps be temporarily housing some travelling preacher who brought with him a copy of some Gospel or Epistle, and this the host would resolve to transcribe. Eagerly and hurriedly he would devote himself to the labour, anxious above all things to *get it done*; and if the thought of revision ever entered his mind at all, he would leave it till the work of transcription was complete; and before that consummation, it may be, he would be haled off to prison or to death. This of course is an extreme supposition, but a sufficient portion of its features to work havoc in the state of the early text must assuredly have occurred by wholesale; and I believe I risk nothing in the assertion

that an average copy so produced would be *far worse* in nearly every respect than the uncorrected proof of an intelligent compositor. There would be every shade and variety in the kind as well as degree of the inaccuracies committed — some omitting words and phrases, others whole lines and sentences, others abounding in mis-spellings and wrong grammatical forms, and yet others misreading or mentally confounding the words they were about to write. Then other copies would be prepared from these: more inaccuracies would follow—omissions being added to substitutions and substitutions to omissions—while the more conspicuous errors would give rise to marginal conjectures or to emendation by guesswork; and along with all this there proceeded the work of harmonizing, both intentional and from unconscious familiarity, and that of annotating and then confusing annotation with text, with just here and there the bold perversion by way of heretical artifice, or as often of pious fraud; till—why refuse to admit the fact?—the precise wording of the original text came in many a passage to be banished from the sphere of confidence, and probably even in not a few to be a thing that was hopelessly and for ever lost.

Is this dismal picture presented as a true sketch of the origin of our two earliest codices? Only to a partial extent: it is an honest attempt at depicting that widely prevalent corruption in the general influences of which they must more or less have shared, but, so far from being applicable to them in all its enormity, it possesses in their case another side. These two manuscripts, as a part of the outcome of such conditions, require indeed to be keenly scrutinized whenever they differ from other authorities near to their own age; but they are *far too good* to exhibit the full depravity which we may reasonably hold to have been then rather the rule than the exception. So far, therefore, from closing in with the opinions of Dean

Burgon, that they were "vile fabrications," "preserved only for their eccentricity," and such as "no honest copying, persevered in for any number of centuries, could by any possibility have resulted in," we may fully adopt—in words at least, though perhaps not quite in spirit—the verdict of Dr. Hort, that "even the less incorrupt [of the two] must have been of exceptional purity among its contemporaries." In fact nothing will serve my purpose so exactly as taking Codices B and  $\aleph$  at what Dr. Hort himself pronounces them—manuscripts of the Neutral class, or a class whose pedigree has never enjoyed any systematic recension; which has proceeded with the best average care which in those distracted centuries could be looked for, and, while subjected to no extensive wilful perversion, has also never been overhauled or compared except in occasional and individual passages. The manuscripts of the Alexandrian and Western types he tells us *were* subjected to overhauling, and then the great Syrian Recension followed; and this statement lays upon him the burden of proving that such recensions, to the last of which he himself applies the epithet "judicious," would regularly or even usually result in alterations for the worse. It is a case in which mere assumption will not suffice, for unless all that has been just advanced can be set aside as a baseless figment—and we know that Dr. Hort does *not* thus set it aside—the presumption seems rather to amount to a moral certainty that every manuscript in existence must have *required* recension, and that to a very large extent indeed. Call it Syrian or call it what we will, it can scarcely have failed, if it really took place—and I shall state further on that upon that point, as upon others, I cling to an intermediate view—to have brought to light a vast number of omissions and other blunders, and, though often incorporating glosses and making editorial changes that were not correct, it must materially

have purged the Neutral manuscripts from their crying defect of ever-increasing incompleteness. Thus, while we are greatly indebted to B and  $\aleph$  for pointing us to a number of serious marginal accretions, we must consent very often to reverse the modern preference in their favour by restoring those probably genuine expressions which their curtailed text has failed to transmit.

II. SHORT READINGS.—The critical canon which, as handled by each successive editor, is making more and more inroads into the Received Text—that the shorter reading is preferable to the longer one—has undeniably a large measure of reason for its foundation; but it is now so carried into practice that reason and riot are wholly confused, while the safeguards with which it certainly requires to be hedged about seem to me to demand the restoration of perhaps the larger half of the words or passages which it has caused to be erased. There are, of course, abundant instances in which a longer reading can be readily explained as growing out of a marginal gloss or an assimilation or so forth; but there are numberless others in which this is not the case, and in respect of which there is need of more discrimination than the implicit trust in B and  $\aleph$  is bringing into vogue. Thus, on the one hand, we may dismiss the account of the angel troubling the pool as probably a mere superstitious explanation of the mystery of intermittent springs; the three heavenly witnesses must of course go as a simple note of a striking analogy; the doxology, as a liturgical addition, stands only the more absolutely condemned by the efforts of its champions to shew up the weak evidence in its support; and the Lord's Prayer in Luke may, with the far greater probability, be believed to have been written in one of the shorter forms and then expanded from the full one in Matthew (while, by the bye, the total absence of the doxology from every authority in the former seems a safe warrant for assuming

that all the interpolations in Luke had been completed before that conclusion was first appended in the other Gospel). But, on the other hand, how dumbfounded we become when seeking by any process of this kind to explain away such a passage as the disputed portion of the speech of Tertullus. To view it as an accretion seems all but out of the question; but the moment we admit the possibility of an early copyist having skipped it over, the case ceases to present any difficulty at all. It may perhaps have resulted from the phenomenon of *imperfect familiarity*—one which, though it can but rarely operate in a printing-office, is not unlikely to have played a very important part in New Testament transcription, especially in passages just one degree less familiar than the Lord's Prayer, but containing like it a number of co-ordinate clauses (*e.g.* Matt. v. 44 and Luke iv. 18). But in the above case (Acts xxiv. 6-8) we may believe that the scribe had written as far as *ἐκρατήσαμεν*, when on looking back to the copy his eye caught the words *παρ' οὗ δυνήσῃ*, which he may have known to be a part of the same speech, and which at all events seemed naturally to read on; so that apparently the omission, though very strongly supported (were it not for the *versions*, I could not bring myself to defend the passage at all), is only an instance of that momentary relaxation of carefulness from which nearly all errors in transcribing arise. As to the two still more lengthy instances—the last twelve verses of the Gospel of Mark and the story of the Woman taken in Adultery—the most weighty evidence, especially in the former case, rests upon internal grounds, and seems to have proved to demonstration that, whatever may be the intrinsic value of the two passages, they could not have been written by the two Evangelists under whose names they respectively stand.

Considerations of this character will be borne in mind by every rational and candid enquirer; but I submit they do

not justify the elevation into an established critical canon of the dictum, "The shorter reading is to be preferred to the longer." For in this wide sense it is not even needful to refer to the printing-office for illustrations; common sense and the personal recollection of every one who reads these pages will immediately inform him that, when engaged in copying an extract, he is fifty times more likely to *leave something out* than to insert something not in the original. But I am told by a distinguished scholar that this fact has but a partial application to the early manuscripts, the producers of which were "editors and not merely scribes." No doubt there often were editors concerned in the work, but there were scribes as well; and though the same persons may frequently have combined both functions, I shall still maintain—and I am glad to do so with his own approval—that the converse of his words has equal force—"They were scribes, and not merely editors." They may indeed, in the latter capacity, have felt free to make insertions when they judged them to be required; but, in the former, they would be incessantly prone to cut down rather than to enlarge. But I have said enough upon this point already: proof is glaringly before our eyes that, with whatever ability the ancient codices were "edited," they were transcribed by men with the imperfections of ordinary copyists. From my own experiences with one class of these, I will now attempt to illustrate the chief phenomena of omission.

1. *Homœotopy*.—Foremost and gravest among the special inducements to the skipping of words or passages, we shall naturally rank the well-known snare of homœotetel. It is quite needless to specify instances of this in its regular form, but I may remark that it is nothing uncommon for a compositor to omit three or four lines from the mere recurrence of a word of scarcely, if at all, more than that number of letters. My purpose here is—making use of a more comprehensive heading—to specify some modifications

of the way in which two *like places* in the copy may operate to affect the copyist, and that whether they are like words, like terminations, like prefixes, or simply like positions, as from point to point, gap to gap, or the end of one line to the end of another.

a. Homœoarchy.—This is another term which I have ventured to coin, and which may be explained as differing from homœotel in this way: the latter is a confusion of the word or letter with which, upon turning from copy to transcript, the copyist actually broke off; homœoarchy is a mistaking of the one which, upon thus breaking off, he accidentally observed to follow next. The incessant commencement of Greek clauses with *καί*, and the omissions which frequently appear to have resulted (as of the important *καὶ ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* by D $\aleph$  in Luke xxiv. 51), is a sufficient exemplification of this influence, the distinct character of which is worth observing, since, if such cases were classed with ordinary homœotel, the objection would at once occur that no copyist would be likely to break off reading *after* a trifling monosyllable at the beginning of a clause. Still as many copyists may have worked *by lines* instead of by clauses the distinction may not always be a certain one.

b. Doubling.—It very frequently happens in printing that homœotopy occasions a double instead of an omission—the compositor having duly reached the second of the two similar positions, and then, on returning to his copy, resuming at the former in its stead—interruption or some other cause preventing his detection of the repetition. Such an instance as that in Mark iii. 32, *ἡ μήτηρ σου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί σου καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί σου* (A D), may very possibly have been a mere double in the first place, and then the change to the feminine will have been made as preferable to striking the words wholly out; and so perhaps in Rev. xix. 12, *ἔχων ὀνόματα γεγραμμένα καὶ ὄνομα*

γεγραμμένον ὁ οὐδείς, κ.τ.λ. (B and cursives), as the following arrangement of the shorter form tempts one to conclude :—

### ΕΧΩNONOMAGE

### ΓΡΑΜΜΕNONOOY

But here, from necessity of context, when the double had been made (if it was one) it was the former of its two members which came to be changed, and then the insertion of the *καί* would be but a trifle. But the unintelligible presentation of the *plural clause alone* by the seventh-century corrector of **Σ** (which codex had originally contained only a portion of either) affords basis for speculation as to our having here a *conflate reading*—one however not introduced at the Syrian Recension, but only by the eighth-century Vatican codex which Alford distinguishes by the small capital letter B. He, however, is the only editor who has accorded the plural clause even a bracketed reception.

c. Mental Homœotel.—There is a most unmistakable mental effect of homœotel, which operates, not in causing the copyist to look to the wrong word of his original, but in leading him, while actually copying or composing, to think that he has reached a certain word when he has only reached another that resembles it. I cannot illustrate this better than by a mistake which I myself recently committed twice over. Having occasion to copy out a scrap from one of Tennyson's Lincolnshire poems, on writing the line, "But I knawed a Quaäker feller as often 'as towd ma this," the influence of the recurring termination *er* caused me to omit the word "feller;" and on happening to glance shortly afterwards at another paper on the same subject which I had written some months previously, what was my astonishment to see that I had then committed the self-same mistake, for there before my eyes was the same word "feller" inserted with a caret! As a probably similar instance, I have lately noticed a



careful compositor omitting the second of the two names "Venantius Fortunatus." In a language abounding with terminations this influence would be likely to prevail by wholesale, as in combinations of adjectives and nouns of like declension, or any string of words terminating alike; so that very many of the omissions of single words by homœotel may be ascribed with great probability to its effect. The passing over of *καινῆς* by B Z N in *τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης* (Matt. xxvi. 28) may be an instance in point; if not, it may be assigned to No. 2 below. And as *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ Θεοῦ* would probably be written in four contractions of two letters apiece, I incline to attribute to this cause the omission of the last two words by N in Mark i. 1.

d. Combinations mentally produced.—Differing only in detail from the above are the instances in which there is some slight difference in the two terminations, and that of the latter word comes to be joined to the commencement of the former, as when "aggregate estates" is cut down to "aggregates." But this feature, though likely to be of rare survival in the codices, is in itself of very wide operation: for instance, I have seen "mere words" contracted into "merds," where apparently the letter *r* was the sole cause; and so for "Arctic Miocene" I have had "Aiocene," where the only element of homœotopy was the fact of both words commencing with capitals, or perhaps both being a little out of the common. But this last example ought perhaps rather to be attributed to the wider feature to be specified next.

2. *Mental Influence of a Following Word.*—The circumstance of fixing the mind upon the end of a clause, or upon any striking word which it contains, will often operate to cause a copyist to skip over some of those intervening. This is particularly likely to occur when the abbreviated form gives a readable sense (as under the next heading); but this is by no means an indispensable condition. Thus,

for "the influence of Origen" a compositor, as if to give a practical illustration of the words he was setting, allowed the "influence" of that name to cause him to cut down the phrase to "the Origen." Just possibly the thought of "origin" caused the confusion; but in the very same set of proofs, where some Hebrew letters occurred with the words "in Hebrew" clearly written before them, the effect of the *letters* banished the *word* "Hebrew" from the compositor's mind, so that he merely inserted the "in" in meaningless position before the former. Greek examples will be found in plenty by looking at the bracketed single words in such a Testament as Alford's; and I suspect that the debated case of [αἰνοῦντες καὶ] εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν at the end of Luke's Gospel is really nothing more—the homœotel however adding perceptibly to the effect. Quite possibly this last reading may have *come back* to us by conflation; but whence came the αἰνοῦντες as a variation at all? I believe that, though *possible* as such, probability is on the side of its having been *original*; and that then, having been overlooked from this cause by the archetype of B C N, it was in a somewhat later copy inserted in the margin, whence the appended καὶ became torn away or obscured, and thus led to the belief that αἰνοῦντες was a *substitution* for εὐλογοῦντες, as we find embodied in the actual reading of D.

3. *Non-essentiality to Construction.*—This is another principle of extremely common operation, though it is often very difficult to judge whether it or the one preceding prevailed in a given omission: frequently indeed it is only that other's most ordinary form. A few instances from recent proofs may be given at random, all the bracketed words having been left out: "They were [in truth] a stronger party;" "born about [the year] 365;" "though they [may] accept;" "more books [to leave] than I inherited;" "to hit [one of] them on the head;" and even "Omar, the Saracen [emir], assisted." I suspect that it was nothing more than this

mechanical forgetfulness—which results (when not simply from No. 2) from the copyist reading over too long a string of words at a time—which produced the notable omission of B **N** in Mark i. 14, *κηρύσσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον [τῆς βασιλείας] τοῦ Θεοῦ*, and that of the Received Text in Matt. iii. 6, *ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ [ποταμῷ] ὑπ' αὐτοῦ*. Just so when a word or phrase is omitted at the end of a sentence grammatically complete without it, as in Mark x. 21 (by B C D **N**), *ἀκολουθεῖ μοι [, ἄρας τὸν σταυρόν]*: similarly in Matt. xxiii. 38 (by B), *ἀφίεται ὑμῶν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν [ἔρημος]*: and even the notable clause *ὁ ὧν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* (by B **N**) in John iii. 13. Unfortunately some equivalent of that very important little word “not” is, as we all can testify, specially liable to this omission.

4. *Turning of Lines*.—Perhaps no revelation that could be made from the printing-office would occasion so much surprise as that of the vast number both of omissions and doubles which are made by confusion as to the point the compositor has reached at the end of a given line. Even in the case of divided words we very frequently find either the second half omitted or the first half repeated; and from this the examples range up to the skipping or doubling of an entire clause. In those Greek manuscripts which were reproductions *line for line* this influence is likely to have prevailed to but very slight extent; but as it is certain that from time to time the lines were made to vary in average length, and moreover some copyists have shewn great desire to begin sentences regularly with fresh lines, there can be scarcely a doubt that in the course of the transmission of the text down to the fourth century, a large number both of omissions and doubles were actually produced thereby—the latter of course nearly always revealing their character upon the surface, but the former, if the shorter expression happened to give a passable sense, now and again being unsuspected, and so helping to produce that “more concise

text" which we are now called upon to esteem for the mere fact of its conciseness.

5. *Concurrent Turning of Pages.*—I have frequently observed in my own case a momentary confusion between copy and proof, so that on turning a leaf or shifting to a new page or column of the one, I have mechanically done the same with the other—especially if this also was very *near* to the bottom. This is perhaps just worthy of allusion as a *possible* explanation of the omission of some entire sentences in the manuscripts—as, for instance, of the last verse of Luke v. in D. It should be added that omissions of one or two words also frequently result from a concurrent turning of *lines*—thus rendering the fact noted in the preceding paragraph additionally probable when by its means a new line of copy can be begun simultaneously with that of transcript or proof. Thus I had lately so impressive a word as "distinctly" left out by the compositor when it was most *distinctly* written, but chanced to be the last word in the line when his own line was already complete.

6. *Unexplained Omissions.*—After all our efforts at the analysis of errors in printing, there is a residuum of omissions for which no cause can be suggested except that the compositor's attention was distracted for the moment, and he was thus led to suppose that he had *passed* a word which he was in reality only approaching. Instances in a recent series of proofs are: "his reign was [not destined] to be a long one;" "present at Monnica's [death] at Ostia;" "the [enormous] influence;" and even "in most [ardent] pursuit." Such an omission as this last could of course never have passed the ordeal of centuries in the Greek codices, though almost certainly the majority of them would have amended the phrase by deleting also the "most." Do not such examples suffice to make it clear that scarcely *any* omission is too flagrant to be possible in transcribing?

—INSERTIONS.—Before quitting this topic, it seems best

to refer briefly to the feature which forms the reverse of "short readings"—a point which I may introduce by remarking that though *doubles*, from one cause and another, are of extremely common occurrence in printing, the insertion of a word not in the copy at all (beyond some little article or particle) is almost as extremely rare. There are two, or I may say three, cases of exception to be noticed in the ensuing article: the first (III. 8), when the eye wanders to an adjacent spot and catches a word which happens to make sense with the phrase immediately in hand; the second (III. 7), when a syllable that chances to form a word is made to do duty twice over (as seen in the *μαθητευθεις εις* of Matt. xiii. 52). I shall also cite (under "Consecutive Illustrations") a few instances of the genuine mental expansion of a phrase to some familiar form—instances which, were they only more frequent, would materially shake my view of such readings as the *Ἰορδάνη ποταμῶ* in No. 3 above, but which, in my own experience, are on the contrary almost a unique characteristic of one individual compositor. In the same connection I may note the frequency with which words appear in proofs which were not intended by the author to stand, but which he had failed properly to delete; and this occurrence finds its analogy in our Greek codices when the trick of the calligraphers has purposely left a redundant word unexcised for fear of drawing attention to their own inaccuracies. The conduct of the scribe of B in this respect has already been referred to; and he is surely exhibiting an instance of it when writing in Luke xxi. 24, 25, *ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καὶ ἔσονται καιροὶ ἐθνῶν. καὶ ἔσονται, κ.τ.λ.*, where, after copying *πληρωθῶσιν*, he evidently jumped by homœoarchy from *καιροί* to *καὶ ἔσονται*, but on coming to the following words found that his sentence did not read, so went back to the omitted *καιροί*, but would not delete the words substituted therefor.

I now humbly submit, in closing this division, that I have

made out a sufficient case for the easy occurrence of omission, and the comparative rarity of the opposite vice, to justify my calling upon our critics to think again as to the soundness of their canon in favour of short readings, and to hesitate more than they have done before striking from the text any passage or word for which evidence of the least value can be assigned. In a subsequent number I hope to examine the other leading canon, and to follow it up with some consecutive illustrations of them both; after which I shall venture upon some general suggestions as to the lines upon which a compromise of the antagonistic views will apparently have to proceed.

ALFRED WATTS.

---

### BRIEF NOTICES.

THE LIFE OF JAMES CLERK MAXWELL, by *Lewis Campbell, LL.D., and William Garnett, M.A.* (London: Macmillans.) Clerk Maxwell was born with a genius for mathematics quite as remarkable as that of De Morgan or Pascal. While still a lad he contributed original discoveries on recondite curves to the proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh; and before his premature death he had "enriched the inheritance left by Newton, and consolidated the work of Faraday," besides giving a new impetus to scientific investigation and research in the University of Cambridge. Through all, too, he remained a devout believer in the fundamental verities of the Christian faith; and that not, as some have done, by forcibly keeping faith and reason apart, but while resolutely asserting "the right of trespass on any" and every "plot of holy ground," from which the superstitions or the fears of men had warned off the passer by. It was indeed a canon with him "to let *nothing* be wilfully left unexamined;" and hence he suffered his reason to play freely round the truths he most surely believed, and tested them by the very methods he employed in dealing with the large yet very strictly limited province of phenomena which comes within the purview of science.

Under his conditions, favourable as most of them were, it is not easy to conceive a life more pure, vigorous, and beautiful than his;