

*THE PROLEGOMENA TO TISCHENDORF'S
NEW TESTAMENT.*¹

It was a sad loss to the science of New Testament textual criticism when its two *magistri facile principes* were smitten down together,² some ten years ago, both leaving the texts of their great editions of the Greek Testament, without the necessary complement of prolegomena. It soon became known that in neither case was any important body of notes left behind from which the lack could be measurably supplied; and the loss thus seemed irreparable. The prolegomena and addenda which the friendly piety of Drs. Hort and Freane prepared for Tregelles' New Testament in 1879, welcome though they were, only served to emphasize the loss that criticism had sustained, and to exhibit in clear proportions the magnitude of the task that lay before any one who should undertake to furnish adequate prolegomena, such as the author himself would have prepared had he been spared to the work, to either edition. No wonder that the work of thus completing Tischendorf's great eighth edition went begging for eighteen months throughout Germany and, indeed, the world—for proposals were made to a scholar even in distant America—without finding anybody able and willing to undertake it. No wonder that Dr. Scrivener speaks of it³ as a gallant thing that the grand

¹ NOVUM TESTAMENTUM GRÆCE ad antiquissimos testes denuo recensuit apparatus criticum apposuit CONSTANTINUS TISCHENDORF. Editio octava critica major. Volumen III. PROLEGOMENA scripsit CASPARUS RENATUS GREGORY. Additis curis † EZRAE ABBOT. Pars Prior [initial ornament]. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1884.

² Tischendorf died December 7th, 1874, and Tregelles on April 24th, 1875. It is a curious illustration of the slips that all are liable to, that so considerable a scholar as Dr. B. H. Kennedy could publish in 1882 a sentence like the following: "Others [besides Dr. Scrivener] have worked with honour in the same field at the same time, two of whom are gone to their rest, Tregelles and Alford; three survive, Tischendorf, Westcott, Hort." (*Ely Lectures on the Revised Version of the New Testament*, By B. H. Kennedy, D.D. London, Bentley, 1882, p. v.)

³ *Plain Introduction*, etc., Ed. iii., 1883, p. 48, note 1.

American scholar whose name now appears on the title page of the finished work, did when he allowed himself to be selected for the task. It belongs to the knight-errancy of scholarship. He had taken, however, the preliminary precaution of enlisting in his aid the ripe learning and untiring accuracy of so great a critic as Dr. Ezra Abbot, and conscious of his own energy and industry, he was able to look the labour before him in the face with some satisfaction. That was in the summer of 1876. For eight years the two scholars worked steadily and quietly together, while the occasional rumours of what was doing that reached the outside world whetted its appetite more and more, and gradually taught it what to expect, until no book, except only the Greek Testament of Westcott and Hort, was looked for with keener interest.

Even the first half of it, however, saw the light, unhappily, a fortnight too late to gladden the eyes of one of the co-workers, as the sadly-significant obelus before the name of Ezra Abbot on the title page advertises to every reader. It is a pleasure to note that the whole of the present issue—which has been in type since 1881—and much else besides, have been in advance sheets and proofs in Dr. Abbot's hands, although he was not permitted to see it in the hands of the public. It is, of course, impossible to determine—perhaps impertinent too closely to inquire—just what elements or portions of the book are due to his care. One long section—including most of the discussion *De Capitibus* and all of that *De Versibus*—is specially accredited to him; and doubtless the proofs of the whole did not pass under his revising and ever-watchful eye without visible result. Certainly no one could be before Dr. Gregory in full acknowledgment of the extent and ubiquity of his aid. It was due to his insistance over-riding Dr. Abbot's objections, that the latter's name appears on the title-page. And a sense of personal gratitude very strongly colours

the words in which Dr. Abbot's readiness to give aid to those who deserved it is described on p. 276: "Ipse minime præterire possum partem illam laborum Abboti, quæ ad aliorum scripta attinet; iudicio, erudicione, accuratione, amicitia, omni modo per multos annos multis et in primis iuvenibus textus sacri studiosis subvenit, corrigens, suggerens, restringens, incitans." And something more than a scholar's regret is evident in the brief postscript announcement attached to the *Ad Interim*: "Tristis nuntius allatus est. EZRA ABBOTUS vir clarissimus doctissimus amicissimus, die vicesimo¹ mensis martii apoplexi obiit. Have pia anima!" At the same time, it is important to remember that the book is Dr. Gregory's: "*Scriptis* C. R. Gregory," while it is only "additis curis † Ezræ Abbot." And this, on the other hand, Dr. Abbot was solicitous to have understood and was forward to assert. In *The Harvard Register* for July, 1881—after a hundred and sixty pages of the work had been printed off—he writes as follows concerning his part in the labour:—"The writer has been in constant correspondence with Dr. Gregory concerning the matter, from the beginning, and has revised his manuscript so far as it has been prepared. The proof sheets have also been sent to him regularly from Leipzig for revision. The results of some special investigations will appear in the Prolegomena under the writer's name; but whether any contributions he may have made or may make to the work will permit him to allow his name to stand on the title-page in connexion with that of Dr. Gregory, as he has been urged to do by that all too modest scholar, to whom the chief credit will in any event be due, is yet to be determined. He is glad, however, of this opportunity to express his admiration of the indefatigable industry, patience, and care with which Dr. Gregory has devoted himself to the performance of his task, aiming throughout at a very high ideal of excellence,

¹ It should read "twenty-first."

while perfectly aware that he can receive only the most meagre and utterly inadequate pecuniary return for the vast amount of time and labour spent in the work." It is a pleasant sight to see these two scholars vying with one another in their joint work.

As to the character of the work itself, Dr. Abbot writes : " While the hand of Tischendorf will, of course, be missed in certain parts, it will contain a vast amount of new matter as compared with Tischendorf's Prolegomena to his edition of 1859, and will be printed in a way to make it incomparably more convenient for consultation on any particular point." The justice of this statement is now evident to all ; and the two chief characteristics of Dr. Gregory's volume may be well declared to be its fulness in point of matter and its exceedingly convenient arrangement. At the same time, Dr. Abbot's estimate is very characteristically guarded and is indeed under rather than over the truth. We can adopt it only if we may be allowed to throw a very strong emphasis on the words " in certain parts." In other parts and in other particulars, it must be counted a distinct gain that Tischendorf was not permitted to write his own Prolegomena : and, save that scholars have had to wait a dozen years for them, we are not sure but that we distinctly prefer those that have last come to us to any that he would have been likely to give us.

It must not be inferred that Tischendorf is sharply criticised and great shortcomings exhibited in his work, in these new Prolegomena. The opposite is the fact. And one of the gains that accrue to us from them is the marked rehabilitation of Tischendorf as a critic that results from Dr. Gregory's calm and dispassionate criticism of his work from without. How the magnitude of his labours, the extent and accuracy of his investigations, the exactness of his work, loom up before the reader of these quiet pages ! Tischendorf becomes visibly again " the greatest

critic of his day." His literary activity was marvellous: the mere catalogue of his publications occupy some fourteen closely printed pages; five and a half of which are devoted to works which appeared subsequently to the issue of his seventh edition. His unparalleled activity in textual criticism is exhibited less adequately even in his numerous editions of the New Testament itself than in his work on the Uncial MSS., of which he edited twenty-one, transcribed four, collated thirteen, first brought into critical use twenty-three, and actually discovered fifteen,—among them the Sinaiticus. Between the seventh and eighth editions he increased his uncial apparatus by no less than thirty copies. The extent of his work was matched by its trustworthiness and accuracy—in which qualities he has been surpassed by no critic, as Dr. Gregory very often silently shows and occasionally openly proves against current expressions of doubt and detraction.

Nor would it be fair to compare Dr. Gregory's work with Tischendorf's Prolegomena to his seventh edition, to the disadvantage of the latter. In the interval, the times have changed, knowledge has advanced, and the science of criticism has not been the only thing (though some would like to persuade us of it) that has stood still. The Prolegomena of the seventh edition, moreover, were evidently put together in some haste. But after all allowance is made, the difference remains greater than the time alone will account for, and we should scarcely have been justified in expecting from Tischendorf so extensive, complete, and convenient a treatise as Dr. Gregory has given us. This one part alone, although it carries us only through the description of the Uncial MSS., reaches a length one half greater than the whole of the Prolegomena of the seventh edition. Whatever was of permanent value in the old Prolegomena has been incorporated into these. But this amounts to little more than the section *De legibus in textu*

constituendo (pp. 45-68) and part of the section *De Apparatu Critico* (pp. 33-44) with portions of that *De Grammaticis* (pp. 69-128). It is obvious that subsequent research could scarcely add to what Tischendorf had to say about the apparatus he actually used or the laws that as a matter of fact guided him in the construction of the text. It should be added that these sections have a somewhat antiquated look in the midst of their present surroundings and are by no means the most valuable part of the book. If the book fails anywhere, in fact, it is just here: in the *methods* of criticism, a failure that was inevitable, inasmuch as it is the Prolegomena to an edition published before Drs. Westcott and Hort's epoch-making work was given to the world. With these small exceptions the whole of the book is new, and constitutes nothing less than a marvel of diligent research, painstaking accuracy, and lucid statement. In this aspect, it is more than the Prolegomena of a single edition—though, in its complete form, it promises to be perfectly this—it is *longo intervallo* at once the most complete and trustworthy and the most concise and convenient manual of the matter of criticism in existence.

If this appears to be extreme praise, it is nevertheless only the expression of plain fact. No doubt the book is not perfect. And if it were considered a manual of criticism it would be more imperfect than it is as a body of prolegomena. For example the whole matter of palæography is practically passed over, references to other works being given from which the student may obtain information. Petty errors have also crept in here and there, and small oversights have been made: in a work of this extent this was unavoidable.¹ But if we commence with the section

¹ That the nature of these errors (very few, indeed) and omissions may not be misapprehended the following may be noted as samples:—

P. 215, note 1. H. Stephens' Greek Test. of 1576 does not contain Beza's Latin.

P. 133 (cf. 347). The order of the books in the Peshito is mis-stated.

P. 138. The order of John, Mt., Lk., Mk. is found also in Cursive No. 9 (Sæc. xii.).

De Grammaticis and run through the book, comparison of each section with the corresponding part of the current treatises on the matter of criticism will justify our estimate. Better than that, each section in turn takes its place as the rival or superior of the best extant treatment of that particular subject in our usual hand-books. The section *De Orthographicis*, for instance, suffers nothing in comparison with Dr. Hort's valuable *Notes on Orthography* in the second volume of Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament—though, fortunately, the two treatises proceed after different plans and hence happily supplement each other: in particular, the diligence of Dr. Gregory in adducing the Uncial authority for the various forms which he has collected will be a permanent possession for scholars. *De librorum ordine* advances even on Volckmar's well known paper in Credner's History of the New Testament Canon. *De Versibus* (by Dr. Abbot) is a wonderfully complete little treatise and sets many still disputed or erroneously understood matters at rest. *De Textus Historia* is a wonder of compression and accuracy; and although a little dry and over compressed in the first portion, is the most satisfactory brief account of the editions of the printed text accessible. With the description of the Uncials with which the volume closes, we may compare in general, the lists of Dr. Scrivener's *Plain Introduction*, or, for the MSS. at Paris, the account recently published by the Abbé Martin in his *Description Technique, etc.*; in neither case will it be to Dr. Gregory's disadvantage. It is, of course, out of the question to go here into a detailed comparison with either; it may suffice to say, keeping on the surface, that Dr. Scrivener altogether omits two¹ codices which Dr. Gregory describes,—N^a, and

¹ To prevent errors in comparing the two works, it may be well to mark the following facts: Gregory's T^b is Scrivener's Evangelary 299; Gregory's W^s is Scrivener's T p. xiv; Scrivener's Φ p. xiv has probably no N. T. leaves in it.

O^g; and while Dr. Gregory has missed one Paris MS. which Martin has unearthed (which Martin characteristically calls Ω, *Codex Martinianus*), yet the Abbé has himself missed a Codex in his narrow sphere, which Dr. Gregory describes—O^g.

As already hinted, it is the wealth and trustworthiness of Dr. Gregory's details that give his work its most marked pre-eminence. Here it is impossible even to suggest justifying illustrations. If one wishes to see however, both how a thing ought and how it ought not to be done, let him compare the double account of the *στίχοι* and of Euthalius and his work given by Dr. Gregory at p. 112 and by Dr. Abbot at pp. 153 sq. with that given by Dr. Scrivener at pp. 50 sq. of his *Plain Introduction*, Ed. 3.

In a word, in Dr. Gregory's Prolegomena we have at last a treatise on the matter of New Testament text criticism which is worthy to stand by the side of Dr. Hort's treatise on the methods of criticism,—we have at last a handbook to which we can refer with reasonable hope of finding readily and in concise form what is actually known of the sources of evidence for the New Testament text, and which is prepared in a scientific spirit—with scientific impartiality, and with scientific accuracy. That the second and yet unpublished portion will be equally satisfactory with the first we have every reason to hope and believe. Its issue has been delayed for the special purpose of enabling Dr. Gregory to inspect more closely the Cursive MSS. He has made personal examination of over 390 in Great Britain alone; we hear of his visits to all the great libraries on the Continent, and text-critical journeys even to Greece. Dr. Schaff reports meeting with letters of enquiry from him in the library at Upsala. For the Parisian MSS. he has the advantage of the Abbé Martin's recent descriptions. What a boon it will be to have the long, dry, and untrustworthy

bare lists of the Cursives, on which we have been thus far forced to depend, replaced by a really scientific and complete catalogue and description of them.

Alleghany.

BENJ. B. WARFIELD.

RECENT ENGLISH LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—A most valuable contribution to the literature of "Introduction" is made in the comprehensive work of the indefatigable veteran, Professor Reuss.¹ Indeed, it would be hard to name any single volume which contains so much that is helpful to the student of the New Testament. As its title indicates, it comprehends not only "Introduction," strictly so called, but a history of the New Testament writings; that is to say, of their origin, their collection into a canon, their preservation in MS. and printed form, their translation into various tongues, and their interpretation. Considering that so much ground is covered, the fulness and accuracy of the information given are remarkable. It is needless to say that Professor Reuss' work is not that of a compiler, but of an original scholar, who throughout this encyclopædic volume depends much more on his own research than on the labours of his predecessors. In the history of the canon and of the printed text he is himself a specialist; but the other departments of his work bear equal evidence of competent knowledge and insight. His opinions will not everywhere find favour, as his point of view is independent. But no modern writer has less bias or prejudice. No mind could be better adapted for historical studies. He has no preconceptions or interests which prevent him from looking straight at the facts and recognising what is actually there. He has insight, intelligence, learning, and lucidity.

For the sake of those who possess Professor Reuss' work in one or other of the earlier editions, it may be said that in the last

¹ *History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament.* By Edward W. E. Reuss, Professor at Strassburg. Translated from the 5th edition, by Edward L. Houghton, A.M. (Edinburgh: Clark, 1884.)